

These are raw transcripts that have not been edited in any way, and may contain errors introduced by the volunteer transcribers. Please refer to the audio on The Knowledge Base website (<http://www.theknowledgebase.com>) for the original teachings.

The Asian Classics Institute
Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning
Taught by Geshe Michael Roach

Class One: Why Study the Art of Reasoning

[mandala]

[refuge]

Okay. Welcome. This is something like class number thirteen, okay, course number thirteen. When we started the courses, we , [unclear] and I went out and we bought six chairs at Ikea in New Jersey and brought it back in a Honda and I figured if we could make six good translators it would be a big achievement you know. So I'm happy to see that there are many people here. Tonight we're gonna study Buddhist logic. We're gonna start Buddhist logic. I waited twelve courses, thirteen courses to start Buddhist logic because I was afraid ure my first job is to sell you on the idea of studying Buddhist logic and then maybe you won't run away to like the third class or something. So, I'll tell you the story about Gyaltsab Je. Gyaltsab Je was the main disciple of Je Tsongkapa. Je Tsongkapa is really the beginning of our lineage and he was the teacher of the first Dalai Lama. His dates are 1357 – 1419, okay.

Gyaltsab Je – the word Gyaltsab means regent, meaning he took over the show after Je Tsongkapa passed away. He was assigned by Je Tsongkapa. He was appointed as Je Tongkapa's replacement. Perhaps you don't know the story of their first meeting. Gyaltsab Je, at the time, was the most famous logician in Tibet, and in fact, in the winter, we have inter-monastic competitions and we study from his book on logic. It's about four hundred pages long. It takes fifteen years to get through the first two chapters in the winter debate.

So he was an incredible logician. So he heard that this guy from east Tibet was making sort of a big smash in Central Tibet, that he had come from the East. And that people were starting to come to his classes a lot. So he was curious and he thought he would go and blow this guy away in debate. So he heard that Je Tsongkapa was teaching outside of Lhasa somewhere and he decided he would show up and disrupt the class. So, he put on his big debaters costume and his big pandit's hat, you know, and he started off. And he got lost on the way, [laughter] and, and he was on the path, the lecture was already starting you

know, and he, finally he's wandering through this pasture and he meets this young lady who's tending the cows, you know, like a cow-herder. And she's covered with dirt and she's all dishevelled and her hair is all messed. And he says, do you know where big-nose is teaching tonight? Because Je Tsongkapa had a big nose, [laughs] okay. His enemies called him 'big-nose from the east'. And, he said, do you know where big-nose is teaching tonight? And she says, well, what do you mean big-nose? And he says, you know, that guy Tsongkapa coming from, came from, came in from the east recently, you know, lot of people coming to his classes, you know. And she said, no I don't know, but aren't you Gyaltsab Je the famous logician, you know. And he says, yes I am, you know [laughter] [laughs] and [laughs] and she says, I've always wanted to meet a great logician. I, I have this burning question in my mind and I always wanted to meet a great logician, you know, and so. He says, don't worry, I can answer any question about Buddhist logic. So, she points to a cow who's taking a [laughter] making a cow-pie, okay. And, I have this question, you know, when they raise their tail and the poop comes out, it's kinda going up. But then, when they're done, it falls down. And I was wondering which is the top and which is the bottom of the cow-pie, you know. 'Cos going out it's one way and going, when it falls down it's the opposite, you know. And then Gyaltsab je was stumped you know [laughter] [laughs] and he took about ten minutes and then he couldn't get it, he couldn't figure it out and he turned around and he looked at her and suddenly, there's this goddess, blazing with golden light, you know. And she had this incense stick between her hands, you know. She says, I don't know what you mean about big-nose from the East, but if you mean the incomparable, glorious, incredible Je Tsongkapa, master of all the world, you know, of Buddhism, he's teaching over there, you know. [laughs] [laughter] And then there's this beautiful story of what happens. So you never know who's who, okay. That's one of the reasons to study logic and we're gonna get into that. So, I thought I'd tell you what we're gonna study and then show you how it fits into the master plan of, of what you're doing over the long run, five years, okay. So, I think we'll do first the, first the syllabus, okay.

This is what you're going to be studying. Class one, we're gonna go over the class policy – finished that. I'm gonna give you an overview of the course which is what I'm doing now. And then each class will be divided into three parts: first, you'll get content, okay. Content means something to debate about, okay. When we teach logic, which kids in the monastery start at about twelve years old. It's the first thing you ever study in a Buddhist monastery. We'll do the content of logic for about twelve different, ten different classes about, about what are you studying to debate about. And these are great subjects from the ancient logic books that were written about thirteen hundred years ago. And I'll

go into that, where it comes from. Then each class, the second part of each class will be the format of logic. You know, like how do you make a good reason, what's a bad reason, you know, how do you know a reason is a good reason, and things like that, okay. The third part of each class will be, I'll teach you a little bit about Buddhist debating, okay. I don't know if you've ever seen it in a Buddhist monastery, but it's a lot of fun. And, and we'll be doing some, a little bit of Buddhist debating, okay. So that's never been taught to a wide public audience in the United States, so I thought it would be fun for you guys to do it. It's a very, very powerful tool for learning Buddhism. In the monastery we debate every day, except Tuesday, which we're off because it's market day. Every other day we debate twice a day. The evening debates start at six o'clock. You might get out at eleven, you might get out at three in the morning. But you take the lesson that you learned that day and you get in a group of like ten or twenty of your fellow students and you rip it apart by screaming at each other, okay, and it's a lot of fun. If you've ever seen, seen it in a Buddhist monastery, but I'll teach you a little bit about it. This custom has existed for two and a half thousand years and it'd be really good if we could do it in this country, okay. So we'll talk a little bit about that. So, every class will be three parts. First part is something to debate about, some part of Buddhist philosophy, okay. Second part of the class'll be the format of logic – how to make a good reason and what's a false reason. And then, thirdly, the forms of debating – how do you debate, okay. So each class'll be like that.

Section two, class number two, the topic will be – there's a beautiful section in the logic books that outlines the, all of existence. How do you divide, classify all existing things. And it's very useful for Buddhists, okay. We should know. And that'll be the subject matter. The logic, formal logic subject, will be, we'll start to get into how you make a good reason, how do you make a logical statement, okay. And then, the debate thing for that night will be how do you stand, how do you bang your foot, how do you use a rosary. You gotta have a rosary when you debate, okay. You might have to hit your opponent with it, you never know, okay [laughter] and how to formulate a logical statement on the debate ground in the midst of fire, okay.

Class three, there's a special subject called 'Quality and Characteristic' { chi chedrak}. If you want to see emptiness directly this is the most powerful thing you can study. It's about how do you make mental images and how you confuse them with the objects. And it's a very, very powerful subject and we'll do that for the third class. Formal logic will be the idea of similar cases and dissimilar cases. Debating will be how to give your answers. Debating is like a flowchart. It's really cool. The guy that's attacking says, 'I think the Buddha meant this when he said that'. And you, all you're allowed to do when you

respond is, 'yes', 'no', 'yes', no', 'not necessarily', you know. So when you see a debate, you'll see one guy standing up screaming like, you know, his lungs off, and then the other guy just sitting there going, 'yeah, no' [laughter] yeah [laughter] no', you know. And it's really beautiful exercise because it's like a computer program. It's like on-off switch. The guy who's answering can only say yes or no or not necessarily, or something, you know, he has like four answers he can give. Sooner or later, if you frame the questions correctly, you must reach truth, okay. It's very interesting process. And this is the point of debating. If you frame the questions properly, if the questioning goes in a good line, by the end of the night you must reach the truth of something just by answering yes or no, you see. It's like a flowchart. If 'no' go this way, if 'yes' go this way. And you keep throwing questions at the guy and sooner or later you reach the truth of anything. And you can pick any subject that you're confused about, anything you don't understand very clearly, just by answering yes or no, if the debater is a good debater, by the end of the night you must reach the truth, you see. And that's the point of Buddhist debate. It's not who won. You know, Americans are always asking me, they, I had fifteen people went with me when I did my Geshe exam, and I'd come home all sweaty and they'd say, well who won, you know. And I'd say, nobody, everybody wins, you know. It's just yes-no, yes-no and then you reach the truth and everybody's happy and then they go home, you know. And that's the point. It's not a competition. That's a Western idea I think. In a monastery you're just trying to reach the truth and if the questions are good you must reach the truth. And it's really nice. It's really exciting. So you go into the debate ground with all your unanswered questions and you throw them out in front of all your classmates and then sooner or later you get the truth out. And it's really nice. It works. And you can do that about anything you're not sure about in Buddhism. That's the whole point. Formal, class four will be 'Cause and Effect'. There's a beautiful essay on cause and effect in the logic scriptures. For the formal logic subject we'll start to talk about a syllogism, a syllogism; what are the different parts of a syllogism. And then, for debating, there's a really nice thing called a {telngyur} which is, somebody says, 'emptiness is just this black space that you put your mind on'. So, you say, 'well I guess you could perceive emptiness by closing your eyes or something, right?' And that's called a {telngyur}. In Sanskrit it's called a prasangika. And it's a method of seeing emptiness, you see. It has a special ability to help you see emptiness. And the highest school of Madhyamika, the school of Nagarjuna, the school of Je Tsongkapa, the school of the Dalai Lama, is is that. So you're gonna learn to do that. You're gonna learn to make what's basically a sarcastic statement, okay. Oh yeah, so I guess if you close your eyes you see emptiness, right. Okay, {yinpa ta} like that, okay. That's called a {telngyur}.

Class five, we'll talk about 'Mind and their Objects', okay. Subject minds and their objects of the mind. There's a lot of people who teach emptiness wrong. They say when you see emptiness the mind who's seeing emptiness and the emptiness that it sees, they somehow melt into each other, and blah, blah, blah. And if you study this basic subject from the logic texts you won't think that any more, okay. So we're gonna study, that's important for your study of emptiness.

For the logic we're gonna study the different kinds of good reasons. There're three types, we're gonna study the first one. And then for the debating we're gonna learn how to answer a sarcastic question, you know. If somebody says, Oh, you think you can close your eyes and see emptiness? And then you have to learn the two kinds of answers that you give back. And you're gonna, you're gonna learn that, okay. By the way, the debate will be in English, all right. So you don't have to run away tonight, you can wait 'til next week.

It's getting hot in here. I think better – they'll fall asleep you know.

[laughter] [unclear] [laughter] It means if you try it long enough you find out it really works, you know. If you study Buddhism for a while it starts to work [cut] that's illegal, but anyway [laughter]

Okay, class number six, yeah, 'Negative and Positive'. There are different kinds of negative statements, there's different ways to define negative-positive and it's very important. Why? There are schools of Buddhism, even in Tibet, which define emptiness in a very mistaken way. Emptiness is an absence of something. Emptiness means the self-existent thing, which never existed anyway, isn't there, okay. And a lot of schools says other things which are completely wrong and if you study this subject, you'll never fall into that trap. So it's very important. Each subject you study has importance for understanding the higher schools of Buddhism, okay. Emptiness, okay.

Class number seven, the idea of 'Contradiction and Relationship'. What does it mean for two things to be connected or related to each other and what does it mean for two things to be the opposite of each other, okay? And we'll study the logical statements which are used to prove the absence of something. And these are important because those are the logical statements used to prove emptiness itself, okay. So you have to learn them, okay. All the major reasonings used to prove emptiness have to do with proving something, proving that something's not there, okay. And there are two different forms of that kind of logic and you have to study them, okay. The forms of debate on that night, don't miss class seven, debating tactics. How to distract your opponent [laughter], how to taunt him properly [laughter], how to embarrass him in front of a large group of people [laughter], stuff like that. Very good, okay. Okay. We won't do anything like that. Number eight, 'Definitions and How Things are Defined', okay. They

define how to define things, okay. And that's a very wonderful thing to know, okay. The logic part of that will be a special kind of proof for something that you can't see, okay. How to prove something that you can't see; the absence of something you can't see, okay. We'll get into it. Class nine is very important because it's called 'The Concept of Elimination and Perception'. What it means is that according to the logic schools, when you see something, it's because your mind is blocking out all the other things which are not it. Got it? When you perceive something, what's really happening is your mind is eliminating all other possibilities and that's how you establish that something exists, okay. Some Buddhist schools in Tibet believe that that is emptiness. It's called {shentsel} and it's completely wrong. And you have to study all of these wrong ideas about emptiness. So, one of the reasons to study this is to understand why {shen tong} is a mistaken idea, okay. And that's important. You can spend your whole life studying {shen tong} you'll never learn, you'll never ever see emptiness. And you have to understand why that's wrong, and, and this is a presentation of why that's wrong, okay. You got a lot of different stuff in the formal logic there, but basically, it's a summary of the formal logic up to that point. And then, in the forms of debate, we're gonna study what is it that the monks debate. There are about twelve or thirteen different classes debating in the debate ground at any given time and I thought you might like to know what each class is debating. Like, what are the sophomores debating, what are the juniors debating, what are the freshmen debating, okay. And there will be, in a typical night, there'll be twelve or thirteen different groups of monks debating. So I thought it'd be interesting for you to hear all the subjects they're debating. Class ten is really interesting I think. It's the concept of time, time itself, you know. How do we perceive time, what is the nature of time, does the future exist, does the past exist, does it assert any effects on us, how do we define time, why do you perceive the passage of time? And that's gonna be the subject of class number ten. We're gonna discuss, very importantly, bad logic, okay, incorrect logic. There's a lot of things that are incorrect logic in Buddhist logic that are not incorrect in western logic, okay. For example, in Buddhist logic if you present an argument to somebody that they already accept, it's an incorrect reason, okay. It's an untrue reason, okay. If you present, if you try to argue something with somebody that they already accept, then the reason you give is, is false according to Buddhism, alright. If you try to give a reason to someone which they can't already accept, but they just haven't tied it together, that's also untrue logic in Buddhism. And that's very relevant for westerners, you know. Your job is gonna be to be able to discuss Buddhism with other Americans, you know. And the rules of Buddhist logic require that they accept everything you say already but they just haven't tied it together yet. So, you're not allowed to

present anything in an argument, like you're not allowed to talk about future lives in an argument with a person who doesn't already accept future lives, okay, as a , as a proof, you see. You're only allowed to give or to talk about the things which they already accept but they just didn't tie it together. And, actually, that's how western logic works also, but maybe you're not very sensitive to that fact, you see. If you go beyond what that other person already accepts, already you've blown the argument, you know. They may agree with you but it won't be good logic. Probably they won't agree with you because you've, you've mentioned something that they can't accept yet, okay. So, the idea in Buddhist logic is to only use ideas which the other person already accepts, put them together in a new way and help them see the truth of something that will help them, okay. You will be studying that.

I thought you'd like to see the traditional debate year. Like, there's a whole rhythm of the debate in the monastery, how it goes throughout the year. And so we'll, we'll talk about that. All these subjects have never been written down and, and this is the result of a lot of research done over like fifteen years in the monastery, you know. There's this vague schedule and then if you study it for a year or two you figure out there's a logic to it. And it's kind of beautiful so we're gonna be writing all that down for the first time and you'll see an example of that tonight, okay.

That's the general design of the course. I wanted to let you see where this course stands in the whole five year program which has become like I think a seven year program or something like that, okay. I'm not gonna, I mean I have a transparency but forget it, okay.

I wanted to place this course into the context of the courses you've had so far and the courses you're going to have. And I wanted to give you an idea of what's going to be happening in this class for the next five years, okay, because I think some of you know I'm going on a three year retreat and I wanted to clarify that and I wanted to talk a little bit about it, okay. This is the plan for the next five years. You'll get a copy of this, I don't know, you have it, okay. This class is the first thing. February, March '98, these dates are approximate, okay, give or take a month, alright. But I thought it would help you plan your vacations and stuff like that. We'll do this Art of Reasoning. In the Friday night course, which already started, we are studying the first great Buddhist book to be introduced into Tibet. It's the first Lam Rim text and that's by somebody named Atisha. And we're studying a commentary by a great scholar from Sera Me monastery, which we located in Russia only about a month ago. And they typed it in and shipped it over here a week ago and you'll be getting instalments of the translation. But this book has been missing for, since 1959. It was written three hundred years ago. It's a beautiful commentary to the first important book

ever written for Tibetans, to study Tibetan Buddhism. So I think it's kind of auspicious that as American Buddhism begins we have this book to start from, okay. April '98 I encourage everyone to go take retreats, have some short retreats like what we did up in Connecticut, which was really great. May to June '98 we'll be studying Lojong. Lojong is a special kind of Buddhist book, they're usually very short, they were written about a thousand years ago, and they are dealing with every day problems of life, you know. How to use Buddhism in your office; how to use Buddhism with your husband or your wife or your kids, you know, how to apply it to your every day life. And they're very, very sweet. They're very short, very profound. We've never studied any of them in this class. We will pick about three or four lojong texts and you'll be studying those in the next course. That'll be course number fourteen. July – August '98, I encourage everyone to take all of July and go on retreat, one month retreat if you can if Rinpoche has finished teaching by then, which I think he will be, okay [schedule plans for next 5 years]

There's another document in your notebook, which kind of, I don't know, you have the overview, yeah, okay. It's a very beautiful summary of what this course has been, okay, of all eighteen courses and there's about five or six supplementary courses, like how to do a mandala, and stuff like that. This is an outline of what a geshe studies for eighteen years, the thing that's called the overview, okay. And we're done, I mean the concept's done. You'll be finished by the end of '98 and you've covered all the things that a geshe covers, okay. And that will be that. During the three years there'll be courses called seminar courses [plans]

But then I would expect each of you to get out of town and go start a Dharma centre somewhere. Je Tsongkapa took his dearest students and like from Lhasa, and told them to walk to eastern Tibet, a thousand miles away, and don't come back until you've started a hundred and eight monasteries. Like, Ngawang Drakpa, for whom 'The Three Principal Paths' was written – that was a letter written to this poor guy who got banished to east Tibet and he couldn't come back until he had finished a hundred and eight monasteries. And he did it. I don't know if he ever came back though.[laughter][laughs] Anyway, I'd like to see you guys start teaching after that and then you'll be qualified to teach after that. And there's no reason why not, okay. Geshe [unclear] good geshe from that other place, Sera Je I guess it is [laughter] he grabbed me, he called me in Boston and says, you get those Americans going, you can't depend on Tibetans all the time, you know [laughter]. Make a couple of geshe, start some monasteries, get some courses going. You don't need us, you know, get your arses in gear, you know. And he screamed at me for like an hour, [[unclear] so I think we should do that, alright. There's no reason why not. Frankly, that's all

they teach you in the monastery, okay. And there's precious few people who finish it. Out of a class of sixty maybe three or four people finish. In my class two people have finished and maybe one more will finish, okay. And that's all you learn, okay. So that's, there's no reason why you shouldn't start teaching then and helping other people, okay.

Okay, now we'll start the actual class and I'll give you a break pretty soon. I know it's hot and try to stay awake, okay.

If you don't know the rules of this class, you don't have to learn Tibetan, okay. I just put it up for the people who want to learn Tibetan, alright. You can do all the answers in English on the homework, no problem, okay. But you should try, you should try to learn it, okay, if you can. The Buddhist Logic tradition comes from this guy called Shakyamuni, okay. It starts with the Buddha, 500 BC. He started logic. He was a very good logician. He was a master debater. The Sutras are full of stories of him wiping out other schools with, with debate. And, and it was a popular thing in those times. It was not a joke, okay. In ancient India, representatives of different religions, would meet before the king, in the court of the king, and they would debate it, they would slug it out in debate for two or three weeks. And then the king and his ministers would decide who had given the most convincing arguments and the losing religion had to give up their religion and join the religion of the winner. So the stakes were very high. And I, and I, we didn't always win, okay. I mean the Buddhists lost sometimes. And then they would send in the heavy-duty guys and they would recoup it, you know. But there were cases where, you know, Nalanda monastery where they sent a light-weight monk out, he lost, it looked like we had to switch over, and then they'd send Nagarjuna out and he would win the day or something, you know. But it was very high stakes and even up to the 800's and the 900's, the style of meditation followed in Tibet was decided by a debate of that nature. Kamilashila from India, representing the Indians, debated Hashang, representing the Chinese who said Oh, close your eyes and think about nothing. And it was a very serious debate and it went on for quite some time and, and, and luckily, Kamilashila won. And he wrote a huge book that's in the Tengyur, two volumes about how to meditate, which is all the basis of Tibetan meditation is that. So even up to the beginning of Buddhism in Tibet, everything was decided by debating, okay.

In the monastery you start debating at age, you start studying Buddhist logic at age twelve. You learn how to write, you learn how to read, and by age twelve you are thrown into your first Buddhism class, it's how to debate, how to make a good reason, how to think straight, okay. And you do that for three years with your house teacher. Your house teacher is like a big baby sitter who has to teach all the kids. When it reaches a certain point then they're allowed to go and study

with the great geshes and things like that. But for three years you're stuck with your house teacher. Rinpoche has great stories about his house teacher and how he tortured him [laughter] – mutually. And you study like that. Then, at age fifteen, you're qualified to enter the debate, the debate ground, okay, and you're allowed to enter the debates and start. But it's the very first thing you study in the monastery. The book we use, to study Buddhist logic in the monastery is called {tsema namdrel}, okay. It was written by {Lopon Chukyi Drakpa}. {Chukyi Drakpa}'s name in Sanskrit is Dharmakirti. I used to confuse him all the time with Chandrakirti, okay. Don't do that okay. Chandrakirti's the great Madhyamika scholar. Dharmakirti is the big Buddhist logician, alright. He lived about, what is it, 650 AD I think. [cut] Yeah. His book in, well, at the time there were some very heavy debates going on about Buddhist logic. The big founder of Buddhist logic in India was Master Dignaga. He passed away before Dharmakirti was born. Some people say Dharmakirti studied with him directly. We don't really know, okay. But people started to attack Master Dignaga's presentation of logic and so Dharmakirti came to the rescue, alright. And he named his, it's a defence of Master Dignaga's idea about Buddhist logic. And its name is {tsema namdrel}, okay. Say {tsema} [repeat] {namdrel} [repeat]. {tsema} means 'valid perception'. It's like a correct perception but there's a reason to say 'valid'. I always make the distinction like this. I worked in this corporation for sixteen years. Me and Pelma, we used to work on the J.C Penny account. J.C Penny would order like two thousand rings with a quarter carat stone in it. I would have to decide if they were gonna get a cheap stone with a black spot in it or a cheap stone with a yellow colour [laughter]. Sometimes I would make the wrong choice based on their request, you know. They would ask for that. They would say we want yellow colour 'cos the customer doesn't care, they just want something big and cheap. So, so we would go out and buy them. Sometimes we would go out and buy the wrong thing according to the instructions we got. Then my boss would come in and scream at me and you know the emptiness thing about my boss screaming [laughter]. But he would come in and scream at me and he would say, you made a really bad decision to send them that thing they asked for. And I'd say, yeah but at the time it was the right decision based on what I knew. You were out of town, they asked me for that, I bought it for them, I shipped it to them. And he said, it was the right decision at the time, but it didn't work out, so it was stupid and it was wrong. And I said, no, no, it was right at the time so it's a right decision, you know. And that's the difference between valid and correct if you think about it, okay. Valid perception means given the information I had it was the best decision I could've made. It turned out to be wrong, okay. And that's the difference between a valid perception and a correct perception. {tsema} is, is

really the study of a valid perception. Based on what you know, this perception is valid, okay. Is it right? That's another question, okay. That's another question. My argument to my boss was valid is right. He said, no, what makes money is right. [laughs] [laughter] Alright. Okay. {namdrel} means commentary, okay. And Master Dig-, Dharmakirti's famous book is called, 'A Commentary on Valid Perception', okay. Valid perception here is a code word for Dignaga's original work, okay. So it's a commentary on the presentation of valid perception according to Dignaga, okay, but it's written by Dharmakirti, okay. It's important to know what book you're studying. I've told this story. If you ever meet some great Tibetan lama and they ask you what are you studying on Tuesday nights, it's very embarrassing not to know what you're studying or to give the wrong name, okay. So it's very useful to know it, okay. This happened to me with the Dalai Lama's teacher, His Holiness's teacher, and I didn't know the name of the book. And my teacher was sitting there with me and he was very embarrassed. I don't want that to happen to me, okay. [laughter] So that's on your homework. You're studying the basic Indian text you're studying, Dharmakirti, written thirteen hundred years ago, 'The Commentary on Valid Perception', okay, in Tibetan. If you want to know the Sanskrit, it's Pramana Varttika, pramana warttika. You could read that book for the rest of your life, you would never understand one line of it. Trust me, okay. You need a commentary. Luckily, we have these great Tibetan commentaries, alright. And you're gonna be studying the one called {rik lam trul gyi deamik}. By the way, if you're new, all you have to know is the English, okay. We'll torture you with the Tibetan later, alright. By the way, if you're just starting out, you can catch venerable Phuntsok's got a good class going on Friday night about how to learn Tibetan and we have a good video series about how to pronounce the alphabet and stuff like that. So you can try either one of those or both, okay. But you might have to sit and copy the tapes yourself, okay.

Okay. Say {rik lam} [repeat] {trul gyi} [repeat] {deamik} [repeat]

Okay. {rik} means reasoning or logic, okay, {rik} okay, {rik} means reasoning, the science or the art of reasoning. {lam} means a path, okay, a path of reasoning. {trul} means a machine, okay. {trul} is the Tibetan word back in 1900 for a machine, okay {trul kor, trul kor}. {du mik} which in modern Tibetan is called {deamik} means key or starting key. So, you're gonna study a book called, 'The Key for Starting the Logic Machine', okay, 'The Key for Starting the Logic Machine', okay. Who wrote it? His name is Purbuchok Jampa Tsultrim Gyatso, okay. He was from Purbuchok, I don't know where Purbuchok is, like, Idaho or something. [laughter] We just call him Purbuchok, so if you're lazy on your homework you can probably get away with 'Purbuchok', alright. [cut] This is a very, very relatively recent Tibetan commentary. It's an explanation of the

art of reasoning, okay, without which you'd be lost. If you try to study, we memorise parts of Dharmakirti's work in the monastery, and they're totally obscure. You need a commentary, okay. Gyaltseb Je, you can spend one month debating one page of Gyaltseb Je's commentary. It's not appropriate for this class. In the winter debates we often spend four or five days on one page of a four hundred page text. It takes fifteen years to get through it. Nobody reaches the third chapter. There's four chapters, okay. The one guy who knew how to read it passed away in Tibet last year – Yeshe Wangchuk, Geshe Yeashe Wangchuk, okay.

Purbuchok Jampa Tsultrim Gyatso was also known as Yongtzen. Yongtzen means the Tutor, capital 'T', meaning he was the teacher of [student] the Dalai Lama. Okay, he had the position of being the teacher of the thirteenth Dalai Lama, the last Dalai Lama. And his dates are 1825 to 1901. This is the standard textbook used in modern Tibetan monasteries, okay, especially Sera. I believe, yeah, Sera Je and Sera Me both use the same book which is unusual since they're so retarded [laughter] but [laughs] just kidding [laughs] [laughter], but I'm getting you ready for the debate style [laughs] alright. Just kidding, okay, not supposed to do that, except when you're debating, okay. And it's all in good humour. It's like Yale and Princeton thing, okay. And he was a very great master and teacher of the Dalai Lama. Normally, the person who gets to be the teacher of the Dalai Lama, is the smartest dude in Tibet at the time, okay. And he was a great writer. I'm gonna give you one little more piece and then we'll take a break, we'll take a break after that.

Why study logic, okay? I have like half an hour to sell you on the idea of staying in this class, you know. I was expecting the drop out rate for this class to exceed the last one, but nobody left the last one [laughs] okay. We'll see, okay. By the way, it's gonna be a lot of fun and don't worry about it, you can do it, okay. It's really, really fun. By the way, Gyaltseb Je said that the kindest thing Je Tsongkapa ever did for him was to teach him this subject, you know, madhyamika, tantra, everything else, he didn't say anything. He said the kindest thing that he ever did for me was to teach me about logic. Why? Because this is the key to seeing emptiness, okay. If you learn logic well you can see emptiness directly. It's, it's like a, it's a great, I don't know. You can be ready by studying Lam Rim, meditating, etcetera, guru yoga, helping your teacher, helping the Dharma, etcetera, etcetera, and then, if you study these subjects that you're about to hear, it triggers the direct perception of emptiness. If you're ready for it these, these subjects are very famous for triggering that in people's minds, you know. It just goes off. You wouldn't expect it you know, you'd think logic would be the last thing, but there's something about, especially the study of mental images, which is essential for understanding emptiness. So

that's my first sales pitch, okay. It has occurred that by studying these subjects people have seen emptiness directly, okay, especially {chi chedrak}, especially the teaching on mental images which is an important part of the study of logic, okay. So, so that's the first reason to study logic. Secondly, and I'm gonna put up a quotation by the Sakya Pandita, okay, the greatest master of the Sakya teachings that ever lived. There are two kinds of people who study Buddhism and Maitreya also mentions this in his text that I spoke about, okay. There are two kinds of students of Buddhism. This is on your homework, okay. Here's the first kind. By the way, I'm sorry it's uncomfortable. I'm sorry my head's in the way. But, I think by next week we get to go to the higher realm? [laughter] [student: unclear] Sooner or later we get to go to the higher realm, okay [laughter]. It'll be more often than a blind turtle [laughter], okay.

Say, {wang tul} [repeat] {depay} [repeat] {jedrang} [repeat].

There's a big debate in the monastery about the perfection of wisdom. Who did Maitreya have in mind when he taught the Abhisamayalamkara, you know? Two kinds of people; was it type a. or type b.? Okay, what's type a.? Type a. is {wang tul depay jedrang}. {wang} if you know the word for tantric initiation is, means power, okay. {wang} means power [cut] [end side A]

[side B]

Okay, {tulpo} means dull, like a dull knife, okay {tulpo} means dull, stupid head, okay, {wang tul}. You want a good word to use for your debating opponent, there's a good one, {wang tul} [laughter] {depa} means faith, {depa} means faith, {depa} means faith, okay; {jedrang} means to follow somebody, or to follow Buddhism, okay. So what this expression is saying, and this comes from Maitreya, okay, the future Buddha and according to, well, can't talk about it. Anyway, this is from the future Buddha. He says, people who follow Buddhism out of blind faith are stupid heads. And that's the first kind of student there is, okay. They follow Buddhism because they like the guy who's standing up there. He looks nice, saying nice things, who cares if it makes sense or not, such a nice guy, you know, and he looks nice. He's got those red robes on, it must be what he's saying is okay, you know, even if the next guy for next week says the opposite, okay. And this is considered the lousy way to follow Buddhism, okay. You don't wanna be a {wang ngun}, okay, who follows blindly whatever somebody says, okay. You see all these advertisements, you know, so-and-so Lama, close friend to the Dalai Lama. There's so many close friends to the Dalai Lama, I'm not sure how they get time, but, is gonna teach next week, you know, come, you know. And then people go and I, you know I met one one time, I was like, you know, where did you study? He says, well to tell you the truth I didn't study, you know. So I, well, what monastery do you belong to? This is on the phone, right. To tell you the truth I'm not a monk. And, and you're giving

all these initiations and stuff? He said, yeah, yeah, yeah I am, you know. So I went home and I said to Rinpoche, you know, this is crazy, this guy is claiming to be the highest Lama in such-and-such an area, and he isn't even a monk and he never studied anywhere, you know, and people are running to his initiations, 'cos they heard he's a friend of the Dalai Lama. And he said, well, everything he said is true [laughs]. He is a great Lama. He's not a monk, he didn't study and he is the incarnation of Jetsun Dampa from Mongolia, you better shut up and not judge people [laughter] [laughs], okay. Alright. Anyway [laughter] to [unclear] after a Lama, just because you heard something is not good, okay [laughter]. You have to evaluate what the person is saying. You should not follow what people say out of faith. Faith is lousy. Faith breaks down. Faith changes his mind next week, you know what I mean? If it makes sense to you, you should follow it. If it doesn't make sense to you, you should reject it. Period, okay. {depay jedrang} is not preferred method. It should be logical. It should make sense, okay. That brings us to the second type of person. [cut]

Say {wang nun} [repeat] {rikpay} [repeat] {jedrang} [repeat] {wang} again means power, which means mental capacity. It's explained two ways in scripture. One is IQ, okay, one is IQ. One is spiritual smarts. I don't think we have a word for it in English, okay. It's a spiritual IQ. So {wang, wang} can mean spiritual IQ and intellectual IQ, okay. Like, if you've done a lot of good deeds in your life, you'll have a high spiritual IQ. You might not be the smartest person around in a conventional sense, but you have {wang}, okay, you have power, mental power, okay.

{nun} means sharp, very sharp; {rikpay} you had in that book name, means logic, reasoning, okay, reasoning; {jedrang} means they follow that. They don't go after faith, they don't run after somebody 'cos they look nice or they have a nice suit on or they speak nicely, okay. They say to themselves if what this guy makes sense, says makes sense, I'll do it and if what he says doesn't make sense I won't come back, you know. And that's considered the most, the highest intellect in Buddhism. And that's called a, that's called a person of sharp powers. And you're supposed to be like that. Maitreya said I didn't write my book for those {wang tul}'s. I wrote my book for {wang nun}'s. If you wanna study my book, you better be a bodhisattva who's a {wang nun}, okay. Meaning, you don't accept what I say unless it makes sense, okay. Don't accept what I say unless it makes sense. And I'll show you a quotation after the break by, in fact, I'll put it up during the break and you can copy it. It's by the first, it's by the Sakya Pandita, who lived around, I got his dates on there. It's around 1200, okay. One of the greatest scholars who ever lived in Tibet and really the person who founded the Sakya tradition as we know it, okay. Great logician and a great translator from Sanskrit. He memorised the eight thousand verses in Sanskrit –

Prajnaparamita. He used to recite it going down the road, okay. He says the second reason to study logic – what was the first reason? It really helps you see emptiness. It's a big shot in the arm to see emptiness, trust me, okay. Number two: he said if you think about the survival of Buddhism in this world, which is {tendzin}, okay. The Tibetan word {Tendzin}. Whose name is that? Like His Holiness, okay, is called Tendzin. Tendzin means keeping the Dharma safe in the world, okay, keeping the Dharma safe in the world, that it shouldn't get lost, okay. The Sakya Pandita has a very famous quotation from his logic text, which says, the only people who are qualified to keep Buddhism safe in this world are people who understand logic clearly, okay. People who understand how to do logic. And this is his quotation. You don't have to write it now, we'll write it during the break, okay. You thought you were going to get some refreshments. {deta} means like that; {drup} means how to prove something; {dang} means and; {sunjin} means destroying your opponent, okay, disproving something, okay. You can write the Tibetan later, just get the pronunciation, alright; {rigpay} means logic; {shunluk} means the books that teach logic, okay, the great books that teach logic {shunluk}; {gangi shey} means anyone who understands that, okay. {gangi} means anyone and {shey} means understands. Anyone who understands the great books that teach you logic of how to prove things and how to disprove things, okay, that person is a {kepa}. {kepa} means a wise man, Buddhist master, okay; {kepa} means a Buddhist master; {deni} means that guy, okay, that guy is a Buddhist master, alright, {deni}; {dzokpa} means totally enlightened, okay, {dzokpa} means totally enlightened; {dzokpa yi} goes together, totally enlightened, okay; {sangye} means Buddha, okay, Buddha {sangye} is Buddha; {kyi ni} means of; {tenpa dzin} means Tendzin, it's the long form of Tendzin, what does that mean? Somebody who keeps Buddhism in this world safely, okay, a protector of the teachings, a keeper of the teachings, a keeper of the Dharma. So what he's saying is, the second reason to study Buddhism, sorry, Buddhist logic, is that if you get good at it you will really be a person who can keep the Dharma safe in the world. The implication is, if you don't study Buddhist logic, if you don't know how to reason out what's correct explanation of emptiness for example and what's not a correct, what, what's an explanation of emptiness that doesn't make sense, if you can't tell the difference, if you can't think about it, you're corrupting the Buddhist teachings in the world. You're destroying the Dharma in the world, okay. You have to learn how to think clearly. You have to learn how to prove something. If you can't prove what you know to yourself then Buddhism will get corrupted in this world and it will be destroyed. There may be Buddhist books around, there may be Buddhist teachers around, they may be writing very beautiful, flowery books about Buddhism, and Buddhism will be lost, okay. We need people who follow reason.

We need people who can understand why they believe something, okay. If it doesn't make sense to you, you should drop it, okay. If it does make sense to you, you should drop the other stuff and follow this, okay. And, what he's saying is, if you learn how to prove something or how to disprove something, then we consider you safe, you know. We consider you someone who can keep Buddhism safely in the world and we don't want other kinds of people, even if they speak nicely and look nice and wear nice robes or whatever, you know. We want people who speak truth and who can prove it in their own minds, okay. And that's, you must study logic. So, two reasons to study logic so far: first one, it's a big kick-start, jump-start for seeing emptiness. It really is, believe me. Second one: you can't really be a good Buddhist unless you learn how to think clearly and prove things to yourself, okay. And you have to study how to do that. And if we want Buddhism to stay pure in this world, which means it still works, okay, right? It won't work if it gets corrupted, you see what I mean? If it gets corrupted bad enough it won't work anymore. It has to be kept clean which means a good Buddhist shouldn't believe anything until it makes sense to them, until they can prove it in their own mind. And that's the second reason. By the way, it doesn't mean like some dogma or something like that. It means if you corrupt Buddhism to a certain point it won't work anymore, you know. Work to do what? Oh, stop your death and suffering, how's that? You know what I mean? Stop every negative event that ever happens to you and stop your own death, okay. That's the promise of Buddhism, that's the goal. Four Noble Truths. One is to stop suffering, that's the goal of Buddhism. Never to have a lousy thing happen to you including your own death, okay. This is the goal and at a certain point, if Buddhism gets passed down sloppily, without thinking about it, it will lose that ability, you know. At some point, somebody will teach it so wrong that it doesn't work anymore. For example, if you teach emptiness wrong in the ways that I mentioned, they don't work, you know. It won't work anymore. If you want to kill Buddhism in this world, teach somebody emptiness in the wrong way, and within a generation nobody will be able to achieve anything. You see what I mean? So it depends on logic. You have to study logic.

We have one more reason to study logic and we'll do that after the break. So please come back in about ten minutes, okay, ten to nine we'll start.

One question, yeah.

[student] He said, can you see emptiness without studying logic and without studying {chi chedrak}, which is one of the subjects that you're gonna study.

You cannot see emptiness directly if you do not understand the content of {chi chedrak}, okay. Which probably means you studied it in some life, you know. But without knowing the content of it, impossible, okay.

[cut]

Okay, we'll start again. Last reason to study logic, okay. And this is very famous; this comes from the, from the scriptures. The first thing that every kid in the debate ground learns is {nga am dang drawe gangsak gi tsu zung gi gangsak gyi gangsak gi tsu misung te nyampar gyur tare} okay, [laughs], very first thing that we ever learn in the debate ground. I'll put it up for you.

This is the last long thing, okay, so have hope. [laughter] [laughs] I'll give you a minute to copy it. [cut]

Okay, this is the last and maybe the most important reason for studying Buddhist logic. And this is a very, very famous quotation, kids in the monastery start memorising at age seven. This is one of the first things you ever have to memorise. Say, {nga am} [repeat]; {dang} [repeat]; {drawe} [repeat]; {gangsak gi} [repeat]; {tsu} [repeat]; {zung gi} [repeat]; {gangsak gyi} [repeat]; {gangsak gi} [repeat]; {tsu} [repeat]; {misung te} [repeat]; {nyampar gyur tare} [repeat]. Okay, [laughs] alright [laughter]

This is a Scriptural proof for a classical kind of logical reason. The logical reason is called {minowa ...} which means trying to prove something that you can't normally see, okay. Trying to prove something that you can't normally see. An example would be like a hell realm. You know, do you believe in hell? Are you sure that hell exists or doesn't exist? I mean I think that, basically, anyone in this room who says I'm sure it does, I'm sure it doesn't, is being illogical, okay. You're not sure, okay. You haven't seen it or you haven't seen that it doesn't exist, okay. I mean a good Buddhist at our level should say, I don't know, Buddha talked about it, His Holiness talked about it, Khen Rinpoche talks about it, but I'm not sure. I think it's probably true, but to be honest, you know, if I'm really logical, I have to say I'm not sure, okay. And that's an example of this kind of reasoning, okay. And this is the Scriptural source that's always used to describe this kind of reasoning, okay. First, I'll go through the quotation and then I'll talk about the context, okay.

{nga, nga} means 'me', me, okay {nga}; {nga am} means 'me or', okay, me, me or; {nga am drawe} means 'somebody like me', okay. So that first part means, 'me or somebody like me', me or somebody like me. By the way, who's speaking here? The Buddha, okay. This is a direct quotation from the Buddha, okay. And the first thing he says is, if you are me, meaning an enlightened being, who sees every object in the universe in one instant, or if you are like me, meaning some other Buddha; {gangsak} means 'other people'; {tsu zung} means 'you can judge them', you can judge them, okay. So the first part here, oh by the way, the {gi} at the end means 'but', alright, but, you know what's coming right, but, okay. So, so far what we have is, the Buddha is saying, if you're me or someone like me, then go ahead and judge other people from their appearances,

okay, {gi} but, okay; {gangsak gyi} means 'other people' who are not like me; {gangsak gi} 'people other than them'; {tsu misung} okay, {misung} means 'don't judge', okay. So that second part means, but normal people shouldn't try to judge other normal people, okay. If you're me, or somebody like me who can read other people's minds directly, you can judge them, otherwise normal people shouldn't try to judge other normal people. Why? Why not? {nyampar gyur tare}, it's very famous in the debate ground, {nyampar gyur tare}okay, {nyampar gyur tare} means 'you're gonna get in trouble', okay, [laughs] okay. {nyampar} means 'you're gonna fail' {gyur tare} means 'you're gonna', okay. You are gonna fail, you will get in trouble, you will get in hot water, okay. And we memorise that over and over again. When you're first studying logic, when you first get to the debate ground, they drill it into you, {nga am dang drawe gangsak gi tsu zung gi gangsak gyi gangsak gi tsu misung te nyampar gyur tare}and you do it over and over again. You see these kids like standing next to a wall, you know [laughter] and doing it over and over again, you know. And they have no idea what it's talking about really, I mean. This is the Buddha and that's all you ever learn.

It's to prove, that logically speaking, if you're gonna be logical, you have to be very careful about judging other people because you cannot see what's in their mind, you see what I mean. You have to be very careful about judging other people, okay. And here you have to, there's a {ta chepa} means you have to draw some distinctions here, okay. If you see another person beating up another person you can judge them to the extent that you should try to stop it, okay. Obviously. It doesn't mean you should stand there and say, Oh Buddha said don't judge anybody, go ahead, mug this guy, you know [laughter] who knows, you might be a bodhisattva. Who am I to stop you? You know, don't be like that, okay. Doesn't mean that. It means it's your duty as a Buddhist and a bodhisattva to try to stop anyone hurting another person. You must try to stop them but at the same time you have to reserve judgement, okay, about their motives and their state of mind. You don't know. And the better you get at logic the better you will get at knowing who knows who the people around you are, okay. You could make huge mistakes. And people have, okay. You can judge their actions and say, killing is not good, mugging is not good, I have to stop you. I have to try to stop you but by the way, please excuse me if you're a bodhisattva and you're doing something special that's gonna take effect a hundred years from now, I don't know. But, based on what I know, valid perception, this action is wrong and I have to stop you but I don't judge you as a person. I don't know, I don't know who you are. And lots of great yogis do lots of strange things, you know what I mean. It means don't judge other people as people. Judge their actions of whether they're correct or not or whether you

should resist them or not. And if they're hurting someone you should resist them, but, you have to keep in your mind some logical, logically you have to keep something reserved in your mind that, I don't know, maybe something special's going on here, you know what I mean. Maybe this person is somebody special. I, I don't have any idea, you know. Logically, strictly logically speaking, you have to reserve judgement from other people unless you are {nga am dang drawe} you know, unless you're like, can read the other person's mind. And by the way, you will reach a point where you can. Then you can judge them, okay. You don't have to be enlightened to read people's minds. You can do it, but until that time, you can't judge them. Something very cool happened. I looked for this quotation in the Kangyur and in the Tengyur. I surfed the database. We have this database. I found it. It's only there once. It would take you years to find it if you went through the pages. The whole story exists in a very beautiful book by Lord Atisha, okay, by Atisha. And collected all these neat stories from the Sutras that existed in his day. I don't even know if this Sutra exists now, but in his day the Sutra was available, and there's a long beautiful story. And so I did, I translated the whole thing and stuck it in your reading, okay. It's really beautiful and they don't teach it to us in the monastery. I'm not sure if anyone knows about it, okay. And it's in the time of a former Buddha, like, zillions of years ago. And he passes away and he assigns this monk to keep his teachings in the world. And then there's another monk who's very, very good monk, a very strict morality, very good meditator. And the second monk opens a monastery, a small monastery. And he calls all his friends and they get very good at Vinaya, at keeping the monk's discipline. And they get very good at meditating. And they're following what we would call a classic Hinayana lifestyle. They are staying quietly, they don't do a lot of things, they meditate a lot, they keep their monk's things to the letter of the monk's vows and they are making nice progress like that. Then this other guy shows up, the one that the Buddha had appointed, right, and he moves into the monastery with a couple of his followers. And, some people from the nearby town start ask him if he could come over and teach, like come over have lunch with us and then if you could stay and teach us something about Buddhism. So, out of compassion, he agrees to go. And he starts to visit the town more and more and then most days and most nights he's gone, teaching the common people Buddhism. Teaching it to lay people and, and trying to help them because of his bodhisattva motivation. The first monk gets, starts to judge him, he starts to doubt his motivation, and he starts to spread rumours that this monk is doing something strange or something improper in town. And he shouldn't be going to town and teaching the lay people, he should stay in the monastery with us and meditate and concentrate on these things here and the Buddha said that we should do that.

And here's this monk going off to town everyday and we don't know what he's doing and we don't know where he's going. He says he's teaching people but we don't know. And he starts to spread rumours about monk number two, okay. Eventually, the monk's mission in the city becomes so, so successful that he all his followers are going everyday to the city to teach all the people. And there's this great movement is opening up and starting to form in the town among normal people. And so, for the first time, the lay people are understanding Buddhism and everyone is happy and the monks are going everyday. And the other monk is getting more and more jealous and more and more upset. And then, finally, he calls a big meeting of the monks and he says, this is really bad, you know, all these monks are embarrassing us. They're going out in the town, they spend their time with lay people, we hereby make a rule in this monastery that no one can go to town. And so for three months the other monk, out of consideration, follows the rules. Meanwhile, the people in the town are getting upset at all the monks and they're saying, this is terrible, you know, the monks aren't coming anymore. It's all because of this misunderstanding and now it's hurting us, you know, and they're all upset. So, eventually, the second monk moves out, starts a new monastery, starts to teach in one city. It spreads to another city, it spreads to another city, it spreads out of state, it spreads to several states, then the whole country is practising these things and eventually, the whole country is being taught ways to get enlightened, okay. The other monk is going crazy with jealousy, right, and, and not happy at all about it. The other monk eventually died. And then the story is that for, you can read, it's like ten billion periods of ten million years or something, he was born in the lowest hell. After that, he became a monk in a certain Buddha's lifetime but he lost his robes in every lifetime, and these horrible results for millions of years from slandering the other monk.

Then, the Buddha says {nga am dang drawe gangsak gi tsu zung gi gangsak gyi gangsak gi tsu misung te nyampar gyur tare}. That is where this quotation comes from. He says, you can't judge other people. You have to be very, very careful about other people's motivations. You don't know who's a bodhisattva. You don't know who's a tantric deity. And, and that is the goal of logic, you know. This is what we learn. This is the most important lesson of Buddhist logic. You don't know who the people around you are. Concentrate on your own practice.

And then the Buddha says, look go home, don't look around you, concentrate, you know your own mental afflictions, you know you're not enlightened if you're not okay, and, and you know you have to work on your own mind. Don't worry about other people's practice. It's enough trouble to keep your own straight, you know. Don't worry about judging other people's Buddhist

practice, you know, work on your own. And this is the justification that they give for studying logic because if you study long enough logic, you can prove to yourself, that you don't know who the people around you are. You really don't know. Does that mean you shouldn't judge their actions? Of course not, you must judge their actions. You don't join a bunch of muggers because you don't want to judge them, okay. It's not like that.

Here's the punch line, okay, which they never teach you in the monastery. Lord Buddha says, you think that good monk in those days was just anybody? Hey, that was Buddha so-and-so who became enlightened just after that. You know, the bodhisattva who went out among the people. And you think the guy that got, that went to hell for millions of years; do you think the guy who lost his robes for millions of years, was just anybody? Well, I got news. It was me. Okay.[laughs] [laughter]

And it's very, you know, you read it in the Scripture and you're like, ewhhh [laughter] it's like, wow. He's describing the time he spent in hell for judging other people, you know; as a result, the karma of judging other people. And it just makes your spine tingle, you know. The last lines of the Sutra are, 'that was me', okay, 'in my former life'. I made that mistake. Don't make that mistake. And they never teach you that in the monastery so I thought you'd like to have the whole story. And, it's in your reading.

Okay, last few minutes. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm gonna give you the first little bit of formal logic. It's a thirty-second video clip, okay. [laughter] That's all you have the attention span for left, or maybe less, okay. I'll just give it to you in a minute. Say, {tak si kupa} [repeat] {tak kyi tsennyi} [repeat]; {tak si kupa} [repeat] [tak kyi tsennyi] [repeat], okay. What is the definition of a reason in Buddhism? This is the central and the first question that you have to ask as a Buddhist, you know. How do you define that thing called a reason, okay? {tak} means reason, alright, {tak}, {tak}; {tak kyi tsennyi} means that's a definition of a reason, okay, {tak kyi tsennyi} means here's the definition of a reason, okay, what is it? {tak si kupa}, say {tak si kupa} [repeat], {tak si kupa} [repeat]. Very interesting: anything I give you as a reason. There it is, okay. I'll be easy to be a reasonable Buddhist, right? [laughter] [laughs]

[cut]

And that's your last thing tonight, okay. The {tak} means 'reason', okay. {tak} means 'reason'; {tak su} means 'as a reason', {tak su} means 'as a reason'; {kupa} means 'to put forth something'. When you set out your water bowls in the morning, those of you who do, [laughs] that's called {kupa}, okay, it means to arrange things. {tak si kupa} means to give somebody a reason, okay. {tak kya} here means 'reason' again; {tak kyi tsennyi} means the 'definition of a reason'; {tak si kupa tak kyi tsennyi} means, the definition of a reason is anything I want

to give you as a reason, okay. So how's this one? It's right to study Buddhism because the sky is green, okay. It's right to study Buddhism because the sky is green, okay {...}okay, It's right to study Buddhism because the sky is green. Is 'the green sky' a reason? Yeah. Why? Because I gave it to you as a reason, okay. It fits the definition. I didn't say anything about good reason, did I? [laughter] So the first thing you do in Buddhist logic is study the definition of a reason. We'll get to good reasons later, okay. [laughter] And then we'll get to bad reasons, okay. But the basic schtick is that, you begin all your, what's the first thing you debate? What's the first thing in a logic book? {nga am dang drawe..} you know, that quotation. After you get passed that, they say hey, here's the definition of a reason: anything you want to say is a reason, okay. And if you think about it that's what a reason is, okay, {tak si kupa tak kyi tsennyi} {...} Say {yu me} [repeat] {unclear...} doesn't matter whether it exists or not; everything in the universe is a reason. You can use anything as a reason, okay. It doesn't even have to exist, okay. It's right to study Buddhism because rabbits have twelve inch horns, okay, very famous in the monastery { ... }okay, alright. That's the first thing, that's the first definition you have to understand, okay, {tak si kupa tak kyi tsennyi},very important. And that's enough, that's a {tendrel},that's an auspicious beginning to your logic study. And you have to memorise that, okay, in the English or Tibetan. The English is in your reading, okay. That's {tak si kupa tak kyi tsennyi}.

We're gonna hand out rosaries now. We got about six minutes to talk about debating. I'm not gonna start tonight. We'll do a little bit next week. I wanted to give you a little background about what it feels like to debate. So you can start handing out those rosaries. We're gonna give everybody a rosary. They've been sponsored by the rabbit's horns [laughter] credit card [laughs] and they're just an offering to everyone, okay. Do you have a rosary? [student:unclear] [laughter], okay

I mean the way you debate, I, we'll go through it, okay. I'm not gonna do it tonight. I'm not, but rosaries are very important. If you look in the temple at Leon's, there's a guy like that, you know, and that's Dharmakirti, or Dignaga, there's both of them there, but, but, rosaries have been used since ancient India, okay. Every debater has to have a rosary so we're gonna get one tonight. Don't lose it, okay. You wear it on your left wrist, you know. You can tell a guy who's faking it as a debater if he's got it on the wrong arm [laughter] [laughs], you know. By the way, this is why His Holiness always wears them. That's a sign in the monastery, you walk around with that it means, I'm a gun-slinger,{laughter} okay, and they never take them off. I mean the good debaters are, you know, it's like a statement, you know, you want to debate with me, you know. [laughter]

Yeah. [student:unclear]

What's that?

[student:unclear]

Yeah, it's good, okay. I mean, it's why a debater uses it, because, because most people clap with their right hand, okay, most people. But it's very useful, okay. It's very common to ask the guy to count, oh count for me the seven parts of the arya path, okay, come on, come on, come on, one, two, and you count it with him, you see what I mean.

If he's getting sleepy [laughter] there's a disciplinarian and the assistant disciplinarian who is usually your class mate which is very bad [laughter]. And they're allowed to whack people who are sleeping or getting lazy, okay. And you see guys come back from the debate ground with these dots across their head [laughs] [laughter]. It's very embarrassing, it happened to me once [laughter] you come back home with these dots across your head [laughter]. But this is commonly used in a debate. That's your only weapon in a debate, okay. They, they, they play a gong from the top of the temple, the main temple. You can hear it for about a mile. It's called a {kangar}, say {kangar} [repeat]; {kangar} means 'sky drum', and it's a name for this huge gong and then one of the guys gets up there, you know, and goes bong, you know. And the first time you hear it, you get this, the adrenalin starts to go, you know. And they start ringing it about fifteen minutes before the debate starts, and then they start speeding up, you see. They'll go gong and then they'll wait for a minute and then they hit it again. And then they'll hit it every half a minute, and then they'll hit it every quarter of a minute. Then they'll start going dong, dong, dong, dong, dong, dong.. and then you gotta be sitting there in the debate ground. If you show up late you get this [laughter]. I had a debate master who used to have an electric cord, but these are better [laughs] these don't hurt as much. And, and you gotta be sitting down in the debate ground. You're not allowed to take a scrap of paper. You must do everything from memory, you know, everything must be in your mind. Everything has to be ready in your mind. I remember debates we had where the lights went out and you don't even hesitate, you just keep going. You can't see the other guy and you just keep going. You're supposed to keep going. We had a defence one night and, and I was up there, you know, and the lights all went out and I said, the powerful American debater has made the lights go out, now answer the question [laughs] [laughter] and, you know, you're meant to use things to taunt your opponent. [laughter] It's like [laughs] but, it doesn't matter you see because everything has to be in your mind. You memorise everything. And your arguments are, it's beautiful because later when you, especially in America, it's gonna be your job to reach Buddhism to other people. There's not gonna be any more challenging of Buddhism that's

gonna, than is going to happen in America in the next ten years, you see. Buddhism as a, as a belief system, as a world view, it'll be challenged in this country in the next ten years. Buddhism is gonna take off. It is taking off. I mean, we sent out twelve thousand tapes so far without any, it's just word of mouth, you know, and, and it, thousands and thousands of people are gonna be studying it. And it will be questioned, you know, people will question it and you have to be ready to answer it. That's the thing about debate gives you the experience of being questioned constantly. And then, when you have to teach other people, you'll have answers ready because you went through it before. You're good at it already. So you go to the debate ground all you get is a little Tibetan carpet about this size, and you set it down and you sit there. And it's cold, okay, I mean at night. And in my day there was no electricity and we would just be debating under the stars. You don't, you debate outside, in a park. And it's really, really nice at night. And you might go 'til three in the morning, {..damcha} all night, you debate all day and all night, twenty-four hour debate. In the winter debates. And it's just beautiful. It's like being at a football game or something [laughs] or a rock concert, I don't know, but anyway, it's really exciting and it's going on for the whole day and the whole night. And you sit there. But the first thing you do when you get there is a thing called {ku-rim}. Say {ku-rim} [repeat]

[cut]

By the way, don't lose your rosary. If you come next time without one, you'll get one. [laughter]

If you didn't sign your name please raise your hand, okay.

Okay, say {ku-rim} [repeat] {ku-rim} [repeat]. I wanna talk a little bit, we have like one minute, about the motivation for debating, you know. And the first thing you do when you get to the debate ground, they close the gate and, and the new debate ground, which I designed with Rinpoche's instructions, is eight feet high. The wall is eight feet high [laughter] and you can't get out and nobody can see you, you know. They close the gates and then you're in and you sit down in this huge circle, maybe three hundred debaters. In the winter debates there'll be a thousand or twelve hundred debaters, and you start the {ku-rim}. {ku-rim} is prayers before you debate and you will spend, on a typical night, half an hour to forty-five minutes just praying to all these wonderful angels, tantric angels, that you have the right motivation for the debate. That you're not debating for competition, you know, competitiveness; you're not debating to show-off. You will come to the debate ground and you will explore reality with your friends, you see. And this is so cool, you know. You'll explore truth with your friends and you will get to the bottom of truth with your friends. Why? Because then you'll be qualified to, it'll get you enlightened faster, you see.

You'll see emptiness much faster. You can help other people, you know. A typical person, you and me, how many hours in a day, you know, how many people can you teach? How many people can you touch? How many people can you talk to? How many phone calls can you take, you know? You quickly reach your limit. I know, okay. You quickly reach a limit. You can't help more people than that. I mean there comes a logistical, physical limit. You can't be on the phone more than that. You can't sleep less than that, you know. This is our condition. If you debate it, quickly speeds up your perception of emptiness, direct perception of emptiness. And, and quickly after that, you are, you can reach a different kind of body, you know, a Buddha's body. Remember the quality of a Buddha; the quality of a Buddha, you can sit here in the Quaker house on your chair and be appearing to every living being in the universe at the same time. Period. And you can help them directly because you can read their minds. And you can help them everything they need, automatically, okay. This is the quality of a Buddha, okay. The reason to do all the wimpy little helping that you and me do now, is that it causes that other thing, okay. And that has to be your motivation for debating, okay. I know the word logic and the word debating it sounds a little scary, you know. I hated logic in College, you know. I purposely got out of that class, okay, 'cos they're so boring and so stupid, you know. I did [laughs], okay. And it is, okay, if you did it that way. The purpose of Buddhist logic is totally different. If you learn Buddhism well, if you see emptiness directly, you can get very close to a state where you don't have to die. And you can understand why all the bad things happen in the world and you can stop them for? For yourself, you see what I mean. I can't stop them for you, okay. I mean, I can, if I practise Buddhism very, very well, I can in this life enter another reality. You would still see me and I would still look like a normal old guy, okay. What I'm seeing is totally different, okay. I mean if you think His Holiness is like a sixty year old guy who's getting arthritis in his back and he's balding and stuff like that – forget it. He doesn't look like that way to himself, you see. What does the Dalai Lama see when he looks in the mirror? You have no idea. {gangsak kyi gangsak gi tsu misung nyampar gyur tare}, you have no idea what he sees. I have a feeling it's something much different, okay. Really. Honestly, okay. And that could happen to anyone here. And you wouldn't look much different to us, you see. But what you're seeing about yourself would be totally different. What I'm saying is that, I claim right, it's not logical, okay, I claim that if you study this stuff well and you debate it well, you can become a tantric deity in this lifetime, okay. No problem. You can do it, okay. The instructions are all there. It depends on your effort and your learning Buddhism correctly and keeping your book, okay. Frankly. That's what divides the men from the boys, you know, that's what makes you different than you were before

is watching your behaviour and changing it. You can learn all the Buddhism you want, if you don't change your behaviour, I promise it won't do anything, okay. It doesn't, why would you expect it to do anything, right. But, if you learn Buddhism well, you will find out that it's true that a person can stop all the suffering of this life, from the smallest lousy thing on the sidewalk, you know, up to death itself. You can change it. You can avoid it. You can transform it, you know. You really can. That puts a big responsibility on you, especially the people in this room 'cos you're the first American Buddhists, right. If what I said is true you have the potential to save people's lives, okay. If what I said is true every person in this room is a potential teacher and to teach other people how to save their lives. I'm not talking meditating calmly in a corner. I'm talking going to a realm where you don't have to die and where you are a different kind of being. You can do that, if that's true. You have a tremendous responsibility. The longer you fool around, the more people are getting hurt, okay. Every day you lose, is many other people getting hurt, you see. And that's the motivation you have to have when you debate, okay. That's the only reason we're debating. I'm not trying to embarrass you. I'm not trying to make you nervous, you know. It's not some game. It's not some intellectual game or like that. It's not. It's life or death for you and other people, okay. It really is. It honestly is. The purpose to debate is that it quickly gets you to see emptiness directly. It quickly gets you to your spiritual goals, much quicker than anything, than any other intellectual way to study Buddhism. I studied in New Jersey for eight years, every day, under Khen Rinpoche. We translated the Abhidharmakosha. It took me eight years. I went to the monastery to debate for six months. I came back and threw out everything and started over again. You debate for a few weeks, you will learn this thing, it's just wonderful. There's things that will happen in your mind that cannot happen when you sit and read a book and they cannot happen if you sit and listen to someone teach Buddhism. You learn to rip it apart and, and you learn to figure out what you believe and what you don't believe. And there's no way that's better than debating. So it has to be your motivation, you know. You're saving lives, okay. You have to think like that. I'm not just doing it for fun. And I don't want you, it will be fun, but, but people's lives are at stake. And I'm not kidding and I'm not exaggerating, okay. If Buddhism is true, that's the stakes. And this is the best way to learn it fast, you know. And it's a lot of fun, okay. So that's my advertisement for the motivation. And, and we do {ku-rim} in the monastery every Thursday night you don't debate, you do {ku-rim} for three or four hours, you know. And you just sit there and think about these things and that's part of the debate experience. And I want you to remember that. That's my first night's spiel, okay. Don't forget {ku-rim} and we'll do {ku-rim}, okay. {ku-rim} means

you sit there and you think about these things. Why am I doing this? Okay. And you never debate without that. There's no debate in any monastery, Gelugpa monastery, that doesn't start with a {ku-rim}, you know. You sit and you think of why, you know, why am I doing this, alright. That's all. I wrote out the whole {ku-rim}[unclear] for the first time it's ever been written down. And Khen Rinpoche helped me and some other Lamas helped me. I was mostly wa-wa during the {ku-rims}. You know wa-wa? [laughter] Wa-wa, if the {ku-rim}'s three hours long and you've only memorised five minutes of Ganden Hlagyama [laughter] you go wa-wa-wa [laughter] [laughs]. But I just vtrid to have the right motivation, right [laughs] okay, we won't do wa-wa, okay. So remember {ku-rim}and there's a description of {ku-rim} in your reading and I think that's the first time it's ever been written down the whole thing. It's very, very powerful prayers. In an extensive {ku-rim} we do Heart Sutra eighteen times in a row, okay. And you're thinking about emptiness through eighteen Heart Sutras. That's why it's the only thing that I memorised that well, okay, alright. We'll stop there, okay, we'll do prayers.

[cut]

[mandala]

[dedication]

The Asian Classics Institute
Geshe Michael Roach
Course X111: The Art of Reasoning
Class two: An Outline of All Existing Things
February 19, 1998

Transcribed by Angie Overy
Proof: SF

[Prayer: mandala]
[Prayer: refuge]

Tonight we'll do as content, right, every night we'll do a little bit of content and then we'll do a little bit of format, meaning how do you debate, how do you ... how do you make a logical statement and then we'll do a little bit of how do you debate, okay. So, for the content tonight, this is a very important section from a book called the {Dura}. Okay, and I'll write {Dura} for you. I didn't write it for you last time.

Say, {Dura} [repeat], {Dura} [repeat]. As you can see it's really spelt {du dra} all right, and in modern colloquial they say {dura}. {dura} is a kind of literature in which great Buddhist masters of each college of Buddhism have taken the information in the Pramanavartikka. The Pramanavartikka is really, really difficult. In the monastery, every winter, we debate it for three months; it's rare to reach half-way through the book after fifteen or eighteen years. Most people never get to the third chapter. In the winter debates which are the times when the colleges ... when the great colleges meet together, it's like the what are those basket ball play-offs where the ... what are they called? [student: inaudible] Yeah, the NCAA play-offs or something like that. It's like when all the best debaters, you get, you field the team of like fifty guys and you send them to a central monastery. It rotates every year. And then you have an inter-monastic competition, debating competitions for ... we debate for maybe sixteen to eighteen hours a day each other. And you get to meet the best debaters from all the other colleges. And even in that format you can't finish more than two chapters of the Pramanavartikka. It's very difficult. {Dura} is a place where, it's a special kind of book where people have taken the important ideas out of the Pramanavartikka and made separate books out of them. You are gonna be

studying three different {duras}, okay.

Say, {yongdzin dura}[repeat], {yongdzin dura} [repeat]. {yongdzin dura} is the book that you had last week called 'The key to the Logic Machine' or something like that. That's the other name for it. But {yongdzin dura} means the {dura} written by the {yongdzin}. {yongdzin} means a tutor of the Dalai Lama, and Purbuchok was a tutor of the thirteenth Dalai Lama. So, {yongdzin dura} means oh, that {dura} text that was written by the Dalai Lama's teacher. You are also gonna study the {Se Dura}. Say, {Se} [repeat], {Dura} [repeat], {Se Dura}[repeat]. I'll write them for you just so you know, in case somebody asks, okay. I know in the subway they often ask [laughter] which {Dura} are you studying, you know.

Say, {Yongdzin} [repeat] {Dura} [repeat], {Yongdzin Dura} [repeat] okay, so the {Dura} written by the {yongdzin} by the teacher, okay. Oftentimes and nowadays you'll hear in Tibet {yongdzin nyampa nyi} meaning the two {yongdzins}. So, normally, there's a ... there's, there's a set of {yongdzins} who take care of the Dalai lama, who teach. They are in charge, they're charged with teaching the Dalai Lama his Buddhism or helping him remember, okay. It's called {bakchak sepa}, you know, getting him to get back to where he was before. And that's their duty. And if you saw 'Kundun' [unclear] Rinpoche was one of my first teachers, played Ling Rinpoche and then there was Trijang Rinpoche. So, anyway, that's a {Yongdzin Dura}.

The next one is {Se Dura}. {Yongdzin Dura} by the way, is used at Sera, both the colleges of Sera: Sera Je and Sera Me both use the {Yongdzin Dura} to teach their young debaters.

{se} means 'son', like spiritual son, okay. Like, it means 'prince' and it means spiritual son or daughter. So, a close disciple of a great Lama would be called the {se} of that ... of that Lama. Male or female would be called {se}. {se} refers to a lama named Ngawang Trashig. His dates are in your syllabus. I don't remember what they are but he was a student of the great Jamyang Shepa. Jamyang Shepa is the textbook writer from one of the colleges of Drepung monastery. We always say of Drepung – Drepung means pile of rice, and Sera means hailstones, so when we debate them we say, you know what happens to a drepung under a sera, you know [laughs] we can wipe you out. And they say, yeah, but if the debate goes on for a while, the hail would melt wouldn't it, you know. [laughs] So it's like we have a debate like that. {Se Dura} is the, is a great {dura} text written for the college of Gomang in Drepung monastery. Jamyang Shepa's books are the basis if most of the translations of Jeffery Hopkins, Professor Thurman, Christopher George, Joshua Cutler, because they were all students of Geshe Wangyal, who was a Mongol, and the Mongols all belonged to Gomang College. So, that's the lineage, okay. {Se Dura}.

Say, {Ratu} [repeat], {Dura} [repeat], {Ratu} was not one of the big three monasteries in Tibet, but it was an important monastery outside of Lhasa I believe. They had a branch that they used in the summer called Jang, in a little village called Jang. And all the great debaters from Sera, Drepung and Gaden would pack up a knapsack and a sleeping bag and walk to Jang every winter and debate there for three months. And that was the winter debates. And they were put on by Ratu monastery. Ratu monastery was the sponsor and that's where they did the winter debates in, in Tibet. And that's been corrupted sometimes in India, they call Jamyang {unclear} which means the winter debates of Jamyang, which has nothing to do with jang, and is just a confusion, okay. Anyway, Ratu monastery was most famous for a certain logic text, the first {dura} ever written in Tibet was written by a great scholar from Ratu called {unclear} and that's in your syllabus, okay. An you're gonna be studying the {Ratu Dura}. This is the mother of all Dura texts. This is the first great Dura text that was ever written. It was lost until recently. We found the {Ratu Dura} maybe fifteen years ago, fifteen to twenty years ago we found it. Jean Smith found it or helped to find it. And then, there's only one commentary to it in the world, and there's only one copy of that commentary that we know of and that was brought into the computer centre at Sera one day. And somebody said, I think this might be important, maybe you want to input it. And we saved it and it was input. And we approached the head of Ratu monastery who is [unclear] Rinpoche, which you say, Chongla, okay. That's his home monastery. He is the head of Ratu monastery. So, we asked him if he wanted to pay for the printing and he did and we spread it all over Tibet and India. Gave it away all over Tibet and India. So, you're gonna study that commentary and, and the Ratu Dura. You're the only people to study it in the west. It was only just reprinted. We only just found it, okay. And that's the mother of all dura texts, so you're gonna study, the last reading you'll have on the concept of time, comes from the Ratu Dura, okay.

Tonight, we're gonna talk about a ... the dura, the structure of a dura is that there will be about fifteen important topics covered in a dura. And they will take it and it will be presented in three sections which are very cool, okay. And I'll give them to you. This is how you learn something in the monastery. This is a three-step process. Here's step number one, it's called {gak}.

{gak} means to choke somebody, okay, or to stop something. This refers to a step in logic where, in the duras, when you present a subject, first you get a bunch of crazy guys coming up and saying, I think it's like this, okay. And you have like, ten or fifteen crazy guys will come, one by one, in the book and they'll come up and say, I think emptiness is this yellow light that comes to you, you know. And then they'll blow him away. {gak} means they'll blow him away. So

{gak} means, {... gakpa} means we let the other guys come first, you see. It's a very beautiful way to learn. You don't find out what emptiness is right away. You only find out what it's not, you see. So {shelnu gakpa} the first step is very beautiful. The dura starts with the fighting, with debating. And somebody will come and say, emptiness is this green light that shows up over your head, you know. And then we'll blow him away. And that's called {gak}. So the first section of a dura subject is always {shelnu gakpa}, which means blowing away the other guy, okay, {gakpa}. Second step: say, {shak} [repeat], {shak} [repeat]; {shak} means {rangruk shakpa} okay, now we set forth our own position. You see, first you get to hear the wrong positions of the other guys and then in the second step, they'll say, okay, here's what emptiness really is. And you'll have the definition, and you'll have the divisions, and you'll have some clarifications about it, and like that. And that's a little section in the middle called {rangruk shakpa, shakpa}, okay. So, so far, you have {gak shak}, okay, {gak shak}. The last part is called {pong}. Say, {pong} [repeat], {pong} [repeat]; {pong} means to re-blow him away [laughs] [laughter], okay. In step number three they, after they've heard our version of things, they get to come and present some rebuttal, you know. They get to attack our ideas. So, we get up there and say, emptiness means that no object in the world has any nature of its own. So then they'll come back and say, well I guess you think nothing exists or something or, you know. That's rebuttal. They get to come and complain about your idea, which is fair, right. It's some kind of nice that they get to come back. And then we re-blow them away and that's called {pongwa}. Normally, {pongwa} means to eliminate somebody. So it's like Schwarzenager, the eliminator and you {pong} them, you know. And that's {pong}.

So, say {gak}[repeat], {shak} [repeat], {pong} [repeat], {sum} [repeat]; {sum} means those three steps and it's very famous in dura, okay. What are you reading? {gak chak pong sum}, okay {gak chak pong sum}. Oh, what subject? Oh, we're studying {shi drup}, say {shi drup} [repeat]. Okay, that's the subject you're gonna study tonight. The first and most important subject, I think, well maybe not the most important, but the first one is called {shi drup kyi namshak}. And you're gonna study that from the point of view, in the reading, is {gak shak pong sum}. So don't be surprised in the reading, you're gonna get a guy come up and say something stupid and then he gets blown away. And by the time you've had ten guys come up and say ten stupid things about emptiness and get blown away about it you've got a very good idea about what emptiness is. And then you get to hear the {rang} the system, our own system and then they get to come back and fight about the system, okay. And it's very, very good for learning, very, very powerful for learning. So, oftentimes, when we debate in the monastery, we start out with a wrong statement. You see, you want to start

a fight. How do you start a fight in debating? You say something stupid. And if you are a good debater you pick something that the other guy might not be able to disprove, okay. Something subtle. You wouldn't come up and say emptiness is green. You'd come up and say, well emptiness means that things depend on my projections, okay. Things depend on my projections, which is not emptiness, it's ...? Dependent origination, which is the brother of emptiness. That's a positive thing, emptiness is a negative thing, okay. Dependent origination explains how things work; emptiness explains how they don't work, you see what I mean. So, but you could start a good debate that way, you know. You could say, oh, emptiness means, you know, that, okay. And you would go up to somebody and you would say, okay, here we go: I need a rosary [unclear]. First thing, you, the custom, by the way, is ... this is an old custom in Tibet, okay. I mean, it comes from ancient India. When you read a scripture from ancient India, it will say 'thus have I heard'. And then they'll say, somebody like Subhuti approached the Buddha and got down on one knee, you know, and, and dropped his {sen}, okay, he dropped his ... out of respect, he dropped his shawl. And so still in the debating, let's say if Elly is the opponent, okay, the attacker will stand up and then he'll drop his {sen} out of, out of, you know, the first and last courtesy of the debate [laughter] [laughs]. And then you put it, normally, you put it back here, okay. And then, and then you whisper in their ear the, the subject, you know. You say, {dhi chitar chu chen}, okay and it's very mild, you know, you just go like that, okay. You gotta practice [unclear]. I mean we'll stand up and practice it later, okay, briefly. {dhi chitar chu chen}, okay, {dhi}. {dhi} means, is the root syllable of Manjushri. It's a tantric mantra. It's... it is the short mantra of Manjushri, okay. What's the long one? {Om, ah, ra, pa, tsa, na, dhi}, and {dhi} is considered an important syllable in tantra for wisdom, for intellectual, you know, smarts, you know. And if you have a kid in the monastery who's not too bright you say, look go home and {dhi} ten thousand times and come back, okay. And he'll go home and go {dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi} [laughter] and you see it in the monastery. It's a very powerful mantra; it works, okay. {om, ah, ra, pa, tsa, na, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi} and you're supposed to say it until you run out of breath, okay. Ready? Try. {om ah, ra, pa, tsa, na, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, dhi, ...} yeah, okay, like that, okay. [laughter] {dhi} in Sanskrit means light or mind, okay, and it's an important syllable. So anyway, you start out you say {dhi chitar chu chen}, okay, {dhi}; {dhi} means, hey, you know, wisdom, I hope I can remember everything [laughs] [laughter]. {chitar chu chen} means how about this, you know, how about this one, okay. And then you say something like, because the sky is green, okay, because the sky is green. Okay? Because the sky is green, all right. [student: inaudible] Huh? (Dhi) How about this one: because the sky is green, you know. And that's

all you have to say. Is it a reason? Why? {tak si kupa tak kyi tsennyi}, I set it forth as a reason. What does it prove? Who cares. She can evaluate the reason by itself, you see. It'll start the debate already. I can say, because everything is a projection and that's the meaning of emptiness. And she doesn't have to know what I'm trying to prove. I never say what I'm trying to prove. I just say, hey how about this: because the sky is green, okay. And immediately she can say, {tak ma drup}, you're wrong, okay, and then the debate starts, you see what I mean. But you start out normally by that. Very often you'll say, {nang}you know, you quote a scripture and you say, dependent origination and emptiness are brothers, they love each other. That doesn't mean anything, you know. [laughter] So I start out with the {dhi}... because the quotation about emptiness and dependent origination doesn't mean anything, you know. And that's all I say, you know. And that's the start of the debate, okay, like that. That's how you start a debate. So, normally, you start out by saying something crazy because you wanna pick a fight. And if you're really good you say something that's almost right. And that's, and that's what [laughter] [laughs] and you see if he can prove you're wrong, you know. And if he can't then you blow him away at the end and show him why it's wrong, you see. And then everybody learns something. So, it's very ... that's the structure of a dura text. They come up and they start saying things that are wrong and then you hear them get blown away. It's like a big gunfight with Dirty Harry, you know. And then one by one, these guys get blown away. And then, one by one, you learn something subtle about emptiness, until the end of the gunfight, you know all of it. You know, you understand everything about it. So, when you read the reading, remember, the first guy talking is crazy, right. That's the guy who's getting {gak}ed, {gak}, okay, and don't forget it you know, you'll get confused, you know. He'll come up and say, blah, blah, blah, you know. And then, you have to remember he's wrong, all right. Sometimes you get confused. In the Tibetan it's very subtle who's talking, okay. Okay, today... oh sorry.

So the subject for tonight, and we're not gonna start debating today, okay, so don't worry about it. That's a[cut]

Say, {shi drup kyi} [repeat] {namshak} [repeat]; {shi drup kyi} [repeat] {namshak} [repeat].

{shi drup} is a , is a word that means 'existence', okay, existence: things which you can establish exist, okay. {shi drup} is another word for existence; things you can establish as existing, {shi drup}. {namshak} means 'everything you ever wanted to know about', okay; an outline or a treatment of {shi drup}, okay. And that's our subject for tonight. You're gonna study, oh, how about, all existing objects, okay. This is an outline of everything that exists in the universe. Not bad, okay. Kinda cool. And I, I really like this subject. We had to memorize it

early on in the monastery. {shi drup kyi namshak} starts from the top and then goes down through the levels of all existing things. I'd like to tell you how this relates to your personal life, okay. What's the use of sitting there in the monastery and studying the outline of existence, especially if you don't have enough food, you know what I mean? What's this got to do with your personal life? This is very important for understanding emptiness and I'll talk more about how this relates to emptiness. You need to know about {shi drup kyi namshak} to understand emptiness. So, we'll start with that, we'll go down through the levels of it and then I'll tell you how it relates to your own trying to see emptiness. What's the big deal about seeing emptiness? See it in this life, directly, once for fifteen or twenty minutes, and... and you're on your way out of this life, you know. You will become a Buddha within seven lifetimes and you see it directly, okay. And you see it directly. You see all those four things, including that. Those four things are called the Four Arya Truths or the Four Noble Truths. They mistranslated as Four Noble Truths. One of them, you see your own enlightenment, directly. If you can get this class clearly, if you can understand these subjects clearly, you can reach that state, okay. You can ... that's the whole point of this class. That's what we're trying to get to in this class, okay. That's the use of studying this subject. That's my sales pitch for {shi drup}, okay. Once you've had {shi drup kyi namshak} you will be able to reject about ninety percent of the presentations of emptiness you ever hear, okay. You see that they're wrong right away, okay.

Say {yupa} [repeat] {yupa} [repeat]; {yupa} means 'existence itself,' existence, okay; {yupa} means existence, okay. That's the big heading at the top: 'all existing objects'. That's called {yupa}, okay. It has a lot of synonyms for that. I'll give you some of the synonyms.

Say, {sheja}[repeat], {sheja} [repeat]; {sheja} means 'knowable thing', knowable thing, okay. Anything you know, a knowable thing, okay, something which can be known. [unclear] when I was first studying {shi drup} I ... I was like, known by whom? Because there's a lot of things I can't know that exist. You know, if it means that someone has to know it for it to exist, what about all those asteroids out between Pluto and Neptune, you know what I mean. It's not like anybody went out there and saw all of them. I found a text later, and several texts later that say, {nam} something which can be known by an omniscient being. That means it exists, okay, all right. So the tree in the forest thing doesn't apply here. There is no tree in the forest because we're talking about things which are known by a being who sees every object in the universe at the same moment, okay. There is no tree in the forest in Buddhism, okay, that falls down and nobody hears it, right. There's no such thing, okay, {sheja}.

Say, {chu} [chu], {chu} [repeat], {chu} is the Tibetan word for the Sanskrit dharma,

okay, dharma. Dharma has ten different meanings or twelve different meanings, I forget. One of them is the teachings, right? I'm studying Dharma. Another common meaning, probably the second most common meaning is, any existing object, okay. Every existing object is a dharma, okay, is a thing, okay. You can say existing thing, okay. That's a dharma, {chu}. These are all synonyms. If you are a {yupa} you're a {sheja}, if you're a {sheja} you're a {chu}; if you're a {chu} you're a....

Say, {shi drup} [repeat] {shi drup} [repeat]; {shi drup} means, anything which can be established as existing by a correct perception, okay, by a valid perception. It's the same as {sheja} right? Anything which you can establish exists, is called {she drup}, okay. Anything which you can establish as something which exists, okay, is called {she drup}. There's one more. Well, there's lots more, but here's, enough, okay. Say, {yul} [repeat], {yul} [yul]; {yul} means 'object', okay. Any existing object. And we use those words in English also don't we? An object, a thing which you can perceive, a thing which you can know, any thing, okay. These are all synonyms for existence, okay, for an existing thing. By the way, to warn you, they can be used for all of existence together and they can be used as words for 'existing thing' also, you see. This is a {chu}, but {chu} also means all existing things, okay. So you have to get used to that. This is a {chu}, but {chu} also means all existing things. Tibetan and Sanskrit don't have the word for 'a' or 'the'. Now, think how English would be if we didn't have 'the' or 'a'. I mean it would be pretty confusing and it is, all right. And you can get through a page of translation and then suddenly realize they're talking about the other one and go back and change them all, you know, okay. [laughs] They don't have a word for 'a' or 'the'. Try to speak to someone a couple of times without an 'a' or a 'the' in the sentence and you'll see how it is, okay.

We'll divide {yupa}, we'll have... we'll have a [unclear] chart of existence here, okay. There's {yupa}, which is all existence, all existing things. You know, before we divide it, let's give it a definition. Could be on your homework or something.

Say, {tsema mikpa} [repeat]{yupay tsennyi} [repeat], {tsema mikpa} [repeat], {yupay tsennyi} [repeat]. Very famous in the debate ground, okay. {tsema} means a valid perception, okay. You can say correct perception. What does correct perception mean? In this case, you can eliminate the following perceptions and then the rest are all {tsemas}, okay. Eliminate hallucinations, eliminate LSD perceptions, eliminate the things you see under the influence of a drug or alcohol, eliminate things you see when you are really pissed off or jealous of somebody, okay. Those are all called {tsemin}; {tsemin} means they're incorrect perceptions. They're not valid perceptions. You see things that aren't there under those conditions, okay. Those are called {tsemins}. {tsema} how

many {tsemas} do you have during a day? Like, sixty-five per finger-snap, okay. All of them are {tsemas}. What are {tsemings} that I had today? I mean, I had one: there was a leaf blown across the road in the dusk, in dusk, and I thought it was a mouse or something, and I was like, oh stop, you know. And then you, the nature of a {tsemin} is normally, like a few minutes later or sometimes a few years later, you realize you were stupid or crazy, you know. Like, you think someone was trying to get you at work and then it turns out that they didn't have anything to do with it, it was somebody else. And, that's called a {tsemin}. So normally, ninety-nine percent of your perceptions, much more, are {tsemas}, okay.

{tsema mikpa}, {mikpa} means perceived by, okay. Perceived by a correct perception, perceived by a valid perception. {tsema mikpa} means, that thing which has been perceived by a valid perception. It's called {tsema mikpa}. {yupa} you know means existing thing; {tsennyi} means the definition, okay, the definition. So it's interesting. In Buddhist philosophy, in Buddhism, it's like I'm from Missouri, you know, what, I'll believe it when I see it or something like that. Show me state [laughter]. The definition of existence in Buddhism is that which can be perceived by someone who's not crazy, on drugs, overcome by jealousy, you know. And ... and then you can say the thing exists, okay. Prove to me that it exists. I saw it and I'm not crazy, okay. That's the definition of existence in Buddhism. You need to know that, okay. All existing things exist, you can establish they exist as soon as you can say someone has perceived them who's not on drugs or crazy or hallucinating or something like that, okay. Yeah. [student: unclear] They are totally consistent with each other. By the way, I warn you one thing, we are in school number two, for this whole class. Don't forget it, okay. We ain't in Madhyamika any more Toto, okay [laughs] all right. We're in Sautrantika, which is the second school of Buddhism. It's a Hinayana school. And you're gonna get some Mind-Only mixed in, but, but mainly we're talking school number two. There are gonna be some ideas that, that will be presented as part of this class that are not correct. {tsema mikpa} is accepted by all schools as the definition of existence. What they mean by it is, is very touchy and I'll try to warn you when we're getting to points where they're much different to Mister Shantideva's ideas, okay, even though they may use the same language. [student: unclear]

Oh, well that one is more, is more defined as not one of the classic kinds of mistaken perception and then they give you a long list, you know and you have to study. That takes like a year to study that. [student: unclear] I, I think I know what you're saying. But, don't forget, valid perception is not to define as that which perceives something which exists, you see. Then it would be circular, you see. Then it would be circular. Yeah. It's not like that. If you can say valid

perception is a perception which is not one of the invalid perceptions then they give you a list of those and then [student] That's a very long story and each school has their own belief about it. Each school has a different belief about it. You could say, maybe, that it doesn't function the way you expected it to, how's that. The object doesn't function the way you thought it would, okay, something like that. All right, we'd better do it, let me do it in the break or something. Come up to me in the break, okay. I just wanna, if we have time we'll do it. But it's good that you have a question and we'll try to cover some questions, okay.

That's the definition of existence in Buddhism. And if something can be perceived by a valid perception then it exists, okay. All existing things can be divided into two.

[student: inaudible]

I'm sorry. Oh, {yupa tsennyi} means, {yupa} means existing thing and {tsennyi} means the definition of, okay, the definition of. And it's very famous. If you're gonna be in a debate ground {tsema mikpa yupay tsennyi} is like a mantra, {tsema mikpa yupay tsennyi; tsema mikpa yupay tsennyi} Definition of existence is, that which can be perceived by a valid perception, okay.

Say, {takpa} [repeat], {mitakpa} [repeat]]. Don't write this, okay. I'm gonna give you the system that we're gonna blow away, okay. Some people say, okay, that {takpa} means 'impermanent', and that {mitakpa} means, I'm sorry, {takpa} means 'permanent' and {mitakpa} means 'impermanent'. That's ... in Buddhist philosophy, that's a mistranslation and I want to talk about why, okay. I want you to understand why. It's a pet peeve of mine, okay. First, we'll talk about impermanence; what's mistranslated as impermanence. And by the way, if you go home, and you meditate deeply when we get to the section called, well if you meditate deeply on {shi drup} you will see something very deep, okay. {mitakpa} comes in two forms: the gross form and the very, very subtle form. If you can perceive, in this lifetime, what it is in it is very subtle form, you're very close to seeing emptiness, okay. It's a precursor to seeing emptiness so listen up, okay.

{mitakpa} is defined as, very simply, of the Sautrantika, of the Logic, Logic Schools, but it's accepted by all schools, okay [student: inaudible] Oh, this is the right one, okay. Go ahead and write it, okay. It's a good question. In the monastery you say, which hat should I put on? [laughs] Am I a Madhyamika today or am I a Sautrantika today?

Okay, say {kechikma} [repeat], {kechikama} [repeat]; very simple definition of {mitakpa}, {kechik} means 'instant', {kechikma} means something that only lasts for an instant, okay. Subtle impermanence is [snaps fingers repeatedly] you know, it's going tch, tch, tch, tch, tch .., okay, that's the subtle form of impermanence. When you drop your computer on the ground and you break it,

that's gross impermanence. When you're using it all day long and then it wears out after a year, it's been a victim of subtle impermanence, you see. Every moment that goes by the hard disk is deteriorating a bit, some wires starting to loosen, all over the time that you've used it, every millisecond, sixty-five divisions for finger snap, it's been getting older, okay. And that's {kechikma}, something that only lasts a, if you think about it, all of those objects are only lasting for an instant. They're changing by the instant and that's the point of {mitakpa}, okay. I translate it, and I'm always right, as a changing thing. [student: inaudible] There is a different name for the process. This is the victim of the process. This is the thing which is changing, okay, changing thing. Now, what does impermanent mean to you? I mean, what's the difference between, a permanent glue and an impermanent glue? What's the difference between permanent dye and impermanent dye? Huh? One doesn't last and one does last, okay. And that's the meaning of impermanent and permanent. One sticks around and the other doesn't, you know. Permanent Green Card means, permanent resident means it won't wear out 'til you die, okay. And that's what permanent means. Permanent means it will stay around for the foreseeable future; that's what permanent means. Impermanent means it will wear out, like it will stop after a while, okay, and that's the meaning. Now let's talk about something like, oh, by the way, I'll give you the opposite.

[student: inaudible]

Yeah, {kechikma} is the definition of {mitakpa}, okay; that which only lasts for a moment. Something which only lasts for a moment, is the definition for {mitakpa}, okay, of what they translate as impermanent or a changing thing. How about {tongpa nyi}? What does {tongpa nyi} mean? Emptiness, okay. Shunyata. {tongpa} means 'empty' and {nyi} means 'ness', okay. In Sanskrit, shunya is empty and ta is 'ness', okay, emptiness. Shunyata, all right, shunyata. Shunyata is the classic example in the whole world of something which is {takpa}, which is the opposite of {mitakpa}, you see what I mean. It's the classic example of a thing that is, that they mistranslate as permanent, okay. Permanent, okay. If emptiness was permanent, what does that mean? Emptiness [student: inaudible] You just said it; never wears out. What did you say? How did you def... [student: inaudible]. Yeah, it doesn't last, okay. So, if, if permanent's a good translation, then emptiness should last forever. Does emptiness last forever, okay? If it does, then permanent's a good translation. If it doesn't, we should use a different translation, okay. I'm debating, all right. I wish I had one of those guys here. [laughter] Anyway, is the pen perma... {takpa} or {mitakpa}, changing or unchanging? Changing. And, changing by the instant. What's the proof? Eventually you can't write with it anymore. It's been changing all that time. Don't think it ran out of ink the millisecond before it stopped writing. It's

been running out of ink ever since the day it was made. The ink has been evaporating since the day it was made. That the moment the ink was put in there it's been evaporating. In Buddhism we say, the cause for its destruction is its creation, okay. Putting the ink in there is assuring that it's gonna run out. That was really stupid that you put the ink in there [laughter] you know, [laughs] that's why it's running out of ink [laughs] [laughter], okay. It's the cause of its destruction. You don't need to get hit by a car, your body will kill you very nicely, okay, if you don't get hit by a car, okay.

So, does it have emptiness? Does it have its own emptiness? Yes. Why? 'Cos it doesn't have any nature of its own. Oh, no, no, no, it has a nature of being a pen. Forget it. This cylinder could just as well be a... [students: inaudible] chewable object, to a dog that walks in here, okay. It is validly and correctly, can be perceived by a dog, as a chewable object. Forget it, the dog doesn't see a pen, okay, forget it. They see a very, very chewable thing. Just right shape for a [unclear] or something, okay [laughter], a puppy. This is a great chewable object. They would never perceive this as a pen. Therefore, its 'pen-ness' is not inherent in it. It's empty of the nature of being a pen and it's equally empty of being a chewable object, inherently. But those two beings who perceive it, a person and a dog, each impute it or supply it, with that nature. They project that nature onto it, okay. In fact, if you think deeply, that's what it is to be a dog or to be a human. You walking around with that bag of projections is what it is to be a dog. But, I'm not going to get into that, okay. It doesn't have any nature of being a pen from its own side, you see. It doesn't have any nature at all actually. When this pen is destroyed and is melted down and destroyed at the garbage dump, does its emptiness disappear? Yes. The fact, that this particular pen could've been anything else, the fact, that this particular pen doesn't have any nature of its own, goes away, okay. We don't say it stops or starts, okay. That implies a gradual starting and a gradual ending and that doesn't apply to emptiness. Why? Emptiness just blinks out, okay. When this pen is destroyed, on the day that this pen becomes dysfunctional, on ... in the millisecond that it can no longer write, it's, [snaps fingers], okay, I'm talking usable pen, okay, it's emptiness is, goes out of existence. But, five minutes before it ran out of ink, did it have any less of a no-self nature than it did the day it was created? No. It's unchanging. It's totally constant. It is one hundred percent an object which has no self-nature. It is one hundred percent empty. The day it's made, ten days later, two months later, three years later and just the millisecond before you destroy it, it is equally and perfectly void of any self-nature. It could have been a chewable object. It is a chewable object, validly, to a dog, okay. It doesn't have any nature of its own. And that is something that will never be more or less. It's hundred percent emptiness. You can't be more or less empty. It's not, like, oh,

it's got ten percent self-nature today, and it had twelve percent tomorrow, then suddenly; it's not like that. So, permanent is a really crappy translation for the fact that it's unchanging, you see. Emptiness is unchanging. And that's the whole point of {takpa} and {mitakpa}, okay. It's a mistranslation. Is the emptiness of this pen permanent? No. It goes away, okay. So you can't use that word because it is {takpa}. I mean, nobody says it's not {takpa}, okay. So, that's my schpiel. That's on your homework. If you didn't get it you can think about it, okay. The emptiness of this pen will go out of existence. We don't say stop, please, okay. It will go out of existence. Until that moment, it will be a hundred percent pure emptiness, as much as it was the day it was made. And that never changes, unchanging. It's perfectly constant. And that's the meaning of {takpa}. It is not a thing which lasts for a moment or changes from moment to moment. It's not like that, okay. Yeah. [student:[unclear]] Yeah [student: inaudible]. No. At that moment, the emptiness of the puddle of the plastic, comes into an existence, please. Now, be very careful about, if you..., if you medi..., by the way, you cannot perceive this unless you meditate a lot. And, the points I'm making now, can only be confirmed by you, if you meditate on it, deeply. You cannot say that the emptiness of the puddle began. It did come into existence. And there's a serious distinction there. You have to think about it, okay. And, and if you get it, you'll be very close to understanding subtle impermanence which is {kokyur}, it's a hidden reality. It's deep. It's hard to perceive without meditating. Right after that, you'll probably perceive {chi jedrak}. Right after that, you'll perceive emptiness directly. They're very closely related. These three subjects are very closely related. This is very sexy. If you can see subtle impermanence directly, you're very, very far along, okay. I can describe it, you can understand it intellectually, but if you ever really see that everything is like, blinding changing, every second it's a flow of things, you're very close to seeing emptiness, okay. Let me, I gotta go on with it, okay. Sorry. Catch me in the break, okay. Anyway, that's the difference between permanent and unchanging. This pen's emptiness is not permanent but it's unchanging. It's {takpa}, okay. It's not {mitakpa}, okay. Now, I'll write {takpa} for you. By the way, in certain contexts, {mitakpa} is well translated as impermanent. Like, in the Lam Rim, {chiwa mitakpa} means, the impermanence of a person, the fact that they have to die. That's a good translation, you see. In that case, it's okay, but in Buddhist philosophy it's a mistranslation, okay.

I'm gonna be a {kachik}, okay. Say {kachik} [repeat]. {kachik} is the word that's used in the {dura} and elsewhere in Buddhism for some guy comes up and claims something, you know, okay. {kachik} is in trouble the minute he gets called {kachik}, okay. {ka} means, 'mouth', {chik} means, 'one'; {kachik} means somebody comes up, some guy comes up and says, and then they give you the

wrong idea, okay. And the whole thing of Buddhist Scriptures destroying all the {kachiks}, they're like roaches in your apartment, okay, going {kachik, kachik, kachik}. Each guy comes up with a crazy idea. I will be, now, a {kachik} which means, watch out, I'm about to write something wrong, okay. But you can write it 'cos I'll change just one thing and it'll be right.

Say, {kechikma} [repeat] {ma-yinpa} [repeat], {ma-yinpa} you gotta say like with disgust, okay. {kechikma} [repeat], {ma-yinpa} [repeat], okay. {kechikma} means, what? [snaps fingers] Something that only lasts for a moment, okay. Some thing that only lasts an instant. {ma-yinpa} means [student] not. Not. It is not. {ma} means 'not', {yin} mean, {yinpa} means 'is'; it is not [snaps fingers] something that's changing from second to, millisecond to millisecond, okay. By the way, sometimes the definition of {mitakpa} is given as {kechik kyi ... chu} which means, an object which is arising and being destroyed by the instant, you see. Now, I'll debate with you, okay. This is your first debate. Don't get nervous, all right. There's like a lot of you and only one of me after all [laughs]. I need that. Better give me a rosary. I can beat them off with it, if they get too bad, okay. Anyway, okay, yeah. {kechikma ma-yinpa takpa tsennyi yin pechir}, okay. I actually start it like this, okay. Let me see, I don't have enough room here Seamus, later. Okay, let's say that Jay Siller's the opponent, okay. He's supposed to sit there like he knows it all, okay, like that. And then I come up and flail against him. I mean, if he's really strong he just keeps saying, right, no, right, no, no, right and sooner or later, he can destroy me just by saying that if he's, if he's sharp, okay. I gotta keep throwing questions at him and sooner or later, I'll get myself in trouble, okay, because you can always establish the truth by debating, you know. If I start out with something wrong he can always beat me if he gives the right answers. It's a flow-chart. It's a logic program. It's a computer on-off switch, you so. So, I'll come up and say {dhi chitar chuchen}, okay. So, you know, I give him all the respect, {dhi chitar chuchen} how about this one, okay. {dhi} how about this one, what do you think about this one. {kechikma ma-yinpa}, not changing by the instant, {tak kyi tsennyi yin pechir} okay, {tak kyi tsennyi yin pechir}, okay. That's the definition of {takpa}. That's the definition of an unchanging thing. Not changing by, not something that only lasts... not only lasting a minute, second, sorry, okay. {kechikma ma-yinpa}, that which doesn't last an instant is the definition of {takpa}. Then you say, {tak ma drup}, say {tak ma drup}, say, {tak ma drup} [repeat]. By the way, later you can do it in English, okay, but just learn the Tibetan now. {tak ma drup} [repeat] {tak ma drup} It's gotta be like with power, you know, {tak ma drup} meaning {tak}, {tak} means the thing you gave me as a reason, what did I give him as a reason? Oh, that's the definition of an unchanging thing; a thing which is not changing. I'm sorry, that which is not changing, okay, is the definition of, of, of an, of an

unchanging thing. And he said, {tak ma drup}. {tak} means the thing you said last, that reason you gave, {ma drup} means, it's incorrect, okay {ma drup}; {tak ma drup}, {tak} by the way, you can either slap your hands or if you're in a little group and you don't want to blow everybody away, you can [snaps fingers], okay and you can, you know, okay. It's {tak ma drup}, are you telling me that's not the definition? You say, {dir}; {dir} means, right, that's what I said. [laughter] [laughs] {dir}. Then I say, {shok};{shok} means, well, what's wrong, you know. What's the problem here? Why? [student:[unclear]] Oh, yah, you're in big trouble now [laughs], {shok}. He said there's things that last longer than a second that aren't [takpa] [student], yah, so {shok, shok}. Give me one. Anyway, that's a long story. You're going the wrong way [laughter] [laughs] no, you're going the wrong way. By the way, [laughter] all that it says in the Tibetan here, so far, is 'not something which changes by the instant', not something which changes by the instant. Is that a good definition for a thing, an object which is unchanging? No, because what about [students: inaudible] okay. There's a famous example, two famous examples, okay. One of them is, the horns that are proliferating on the head of a rabbit, okay, and there's no such thing, all right. But, is it something, which is not changing? Is it not changing? Yes, it's not changing, okay. It's not changing. It's not changing, but is it a thing, is it a {chu}, is it a dharma, is it a {yupa}, does it exist? No. So, this is a bad definition. I could put into unchanging existing objects I could throw in rabbit's horns. If you leave the definition like this you're in trouble, okay. Not changing, see? I didn't say a thing which is not changing. It doesn't say a 'thing' yet. It doesn't, especially it doesn't say an existing thing, which is not changing. It just says, not changing, okay, that which is not changing. But I didn't say, a thing, which is not changing. That's a big difference, okay. That which is not changing applies to non-existing things. They can't change and they can't un-change, they don't do anything. I have to say, 'a thing', a existing thing which is not changing. So, I have to add here what? What do I have to add? Let's throw in {chu} and that's the definition, by the way. Now, you got two parts: a thing which exists that doesn't change by the instant, is the definition of an unchanging thing, an unchanging thing. Now, you've got a good definition. You have to write that down. That's on your homework, okay, {kechikma ma-yinpa chir takpa tsennyi}. The definition of an unchanging thing is, an existing thing which is not the kind of thing that only lasts for a moment, you see what I mean, okay. Now you've got an airtight definition. [student: inaudible] That's a big debate, you see. Is a rabbit's horn a thing? [student] I, I, in my English translations, I, I say you can say something, okay, you know. Something, which doesn't exist, right. We can say that in English, right? Give me an example, of something, which doesn't exist. So, that can be a general word. [student] I'd say, you better clarify

thing with existing thing, or something like that, okay [student] I don't mind to call it thing. [student] Oh, I'd say, existing object, you see, for thing, okay. I would translate dharma as thing. Yah. [student] As 'a thing', yeah, yeah. But I say you could use 'something' for things that don't exist. Give me something that doesn't exist. Then, you can say, rabbit's horns, you know. Give me something that's a thing and doesn't exist, I think you'd have trouble with rabbit's horns, you see, that's what I'm saying. Think about it. My Lama used to say, 'cook it', okay.

So, you have two divisions of all existing things. They're either changing or unchanging, okay. Take a break and when we come back we'll do the three divisions of changing things, okay.

I'm gonna give you a couple of examples of {mitakpas}. Your homework says, give me what {takpa}, give me the two divisions of existing things. Define each one of those divisions and then give me some concrete examples, okay. Here are the two examples, classical examples, for {mitakpa}, a changing object, okay; a changing object. These are the two examples in Scripture that you see most often. So, you picture some yogi. I, I like to picture this. I often picture this, you know. He's, like, in this tiny little hut in India, it's really hot outside, it's dusk, you know. He's sitting there with his student. First, he made him memorize the Pramanavartikka and now he's explaining it to him, you know, say five hundred years ago in India, okay or a thousand years ago. Maybe a thousand years ago is better. And, and he starts teaching him about {mitakpa}, you know, here's what {mitakpa} means. And the student doesn't get it, you know. What's an example of {mitakpa}. He says, look, look. And he looks around the hut, you know. What's in an Indian hut, if you've ever been there, not much, okay. It's a mud floor, mud walls, couple of sticks holding up the thatch, right. And there's a big water pitcher in the corner because you have to walk to the well 'cos there's no pipes 'cos they're too expensive. And the women spend their whole morning, up 'til noon, standing there waiting for the one faucet to be free. And then, they fill up their kailash, their water, their water pitcher and then they walk home. And they set it there and they cover it. And that's your water for the whole day: washing, drinking, everything else, brushing your teeth or whatever. Those are the objects in an Indian home, so these are the classical objects in the Logic Scriptures. I'm sure it came like that. I'm sure that's why they are. {kawa} means the stick that holds up roof, okay. A pillar, if you will, but I wouldn't call that stick a pillar if you've ever seen 'em, okay. That's a {kawa}. Sera Je just built a beautiful temple and His Holiness inaugurated it in January, and temples in Buddhism, in Tibet, are measured by their {kawas}, you know. My temple has a hundred and fifty-three {kawas} So now, my monastery, Sera Me, is trying to

build a hundred and sixty {kawa} temple, okay [laughter] [laughs], okay. That's a {kawa}, okay. {bumpa, bumpa} means a water pitcher. People translate it as 'vase'; that's not the point. The point is, there would always be a {bumpa} in the room where you're being taught logic in ancient India. There'd be a water... a water pitcher, or a, you know, the thing to hold the water, the day's water. It's those beautiful red clay things. You touch them and they're cool in the summertime. The water stays cool. They're really nice, okay, {bumpa}. There's an important synonym for {mitakpa} which you should learn. Sorry.

Say, {ngupo} [repeat], {ngupo} [repeat]; {ngupo} means, 'a working thing'. I translate it as a working thing, a functional thing, something that does something. Any object in the universe, which changes, also does something. If nothing else, it contributes to the continuation of itself, you see what I mean. It acts as the cause for something. Anything in the world which changes is performing a function, and they're synonyms and you better get used to it or you'll never be able to understand Madhyamika. You'll never be able to study Madhyamika, okay. It's very important in Madhyamika, okay. So, how do we define a {ngupo}? I'll give it to you here. Say, {dunje} [repeat], {nupa} [repeat], {ngupay} [repeat], {tsennyi} [repeat]; {dunje} [repeat], {nupa} [repeat], ngupay [repeat], tsennyi [repeat]. {dun} means, thing, okay, something [unclear], {dunje} means, to do something; {nupa} means, it has the ability. So, anything which can perform a function, all right. Anything which can perform a function, is the definition of a {ngupo}. So, I call it a working thing, okay, so you get used to it. Working thing to me means it does something. It does something. So, emptiness must be a {ngupo} right? I'm trapping you. So, emptiness must be a {ngupo} right? Remember, {ngupo} and {mitakpa} are synonyms; something that does something and something that changes are synonyms, okay. You always change [cut] [end side A]

Something, right. So, changing thing and working thing are synonyms. But, when I presented unchanging things I said a good example would be ... emptiness 'cos it never changes. It's always a hundred percent emptiness, okay. You can't be more or less void of any nature. You either are or you ain't, okay. So, I guess emptiness is not a working thing, right? By definition, right. If it was working it would be changing. If it would be changing you'd have to say emptiness gets more or less empty or something like that. Right? So, make up your mind. Changing thing or unchanging thing? Changing or unchanging? Unchanging thing {yin pa ta}, are you telling me it's an unchanging thing? Yeah. Okay, so it doesn't do anything, right? Right. So, no use to see it, right? Won't get you enlightened. Won't, won't stop your suffering. It can't do anything. What's the use of it? Doesn't have a use. [student:]. Right, it makes all things

possible, boy, that's a, thank you Mister emptiness [laughter], you know. Remember, we said many times if I wasn't empty I couldn't become a tantric deity, right. It must, it better do something, so make up your mind. Yeah. [student] So, it's changing. By doing you change, period, okay. [laughter] [laughs] So it's a changing thing. So, {.....}, okay, are you telling me that Vasubandhu never said, this is one of the ... this is one of the things which don't change? I mean, all Buddhist philosophers throughout history, always said emptiness never changes. [student: inaudible] [laughs] [laughter] It's a, now, at this point Khen Rinpoche would say, you think about it, we'll go on. [laughter] I'll give you a clue, but I'd rather... I mean, if I was Khen Rinpoche, I'd just leave you hanging. There's a distinction between the perception of emptiness and emptiness, right. There's a distinction between the perception of emptiness and emptiness, okay. Chew on that, okay. All right.

So, so far, we have existing things and they went into changing and unchanging. Now I'm gonna give you the three kinds of changing things; three great divisions. And then we'll be done with {shi drup kyi namshak} and it'll be nine o'clock and we can start the real class, okay. All right. I'm gonna give you the three kinds of changing things. Number one is {suk}, okay. Say, {suk} [repeat], {suk} [repeat], okay. Don't say high-tone, right. Low-tone, {suk}[repeat], okay, {suk}. {suk} means a physical thing, okay, in this case; {suk} means a physical thing, physical things. That's the first kind of changing thing, is physical things, okay. Physical things. Another word for physical thing, which you'll find in your reading, is {pembo}, say, {pembo} [repeat], {pembo} [repeat]. {pembo} is defined as {dulda drupa} which means, a thing composed of atomic particles, you know, a composite physical thing. Whereas the emphasis here is on {suk} and I'll give you the definition of {suk}. I don't get to torment you with Tibetan after this year so I'm going to get my money's worth, okay. Just do the top- half, okay. Don't do the bottom- half yet. Say, {suk si} [repeat], {rungwa} [repeat], {suk kyi} [repeat], {tsennyi} [repeat]; {suk si} [repeat], {rungwa} [repeat], {suk kyi} [repeat], {tsennyi} [repeat]. {suk}, the first {suk} means physical, something physical, physical thing, okay. A physical thing, {suk}. People have translated it as 'form'. I don't like that translation. Form, to me, means the outline of something, or something like that. {suk} is, the divisions of {suk} are color and, well, no. I'll tell you what the divisions of {suk} are [laughs]. {suk si rungwa} is the definition of something physical. Let's say blue, okay. Let's talk about this blue. I, I was with my friend's kids the other day and they were reading a book called 'A Wrinkle in Time', and the kids were trying to explain colors to beings who had never seen colors, you see. And what's the only way you can define a color? What would be, I mean, if you were trying to teach somebody from Mars who came here the word 'blue', and you [student] you have to show it. {suk si

rungwa} means, anything you can show as {suk}, is the definition of {suk}, okay. Because, when you get down to colors, you can't do it with words you see. You have to do it, you have to say, [laughs] okay, {suk si rungwa suk kyi tsennyi}. The definition of matter is ,that which can be presented, as being matter, you see what I mean. That you can show to someone {suk si rungwa} means 'appropriate'; {suk si rungwa} means you can show it to somebody as blue. {suk si rungwa suk kyi tsennyi} means, the definition of physical matter is anything which can be pointed to as being physical matter by someone who knows what physical matter is. And that's the definition of physical matter because you can't define it otherwise. You can't go to some planet where they don't have colors and stand there and explain it to them in words, okay. You can't distinguish between blue and green in words to someone who doesn't have colors, okay. So, you get down to the definition of color's very difficult. {suk si rugwa suk kyi tsennyi}, okay. What's an example? Say, {tsaway}, oh, by the way, {suk} here means physical matter, {tsennyi} again means definition, and you better learn the word {tsennyi}, definition, okay. What's an example? {tsaway rekja}. Say, {tsaway} [repeat], {rekja} [repeat]. In your homework you have to write an example, okay, {tsaway rekja}. I don't mind if you do it in English, doesn't matter to me. {tsawa} means, hot; {rekja} means, tangible object, something tangible, something you can touch. A hot touch, {tsaway rikcha}, okay, the feel of something hot, okay. The feel of something hot. {rekja} means something you can touch; {tsawa} means heat, okay, hot, hot object. Okay. Second division. What would you guess would be the second division of changing things? If physical matter is the first one, what would number two be? Mind. The mind, okay, {shepa}. {shepa} means, a mental thing. I think you get in trouble if you say 'mind' because the thoughts are there also, you see what I mean. In English, the word mind means, the main mind. And then you have the thoughts in the mind, you see, in English. And then you get a lot of, I, I would consider, poor translations of Sanskrit and Tibetan, where every mental thing is called mind, you know. The mind of enlightenment, or something like that, or you know, or, or a mind which perceives or something like that. You don't perceive, your mind doesn't perceive, in English, in normal English grammar you say, I perceive it with my mind or something like, you see what I mean? When you translate, try to stick to English, otherwise it gets confusing and people can't understand it and that, then you've destroyed the reason to translate. You might as well leave it in Tibetan. If you want to have something that nobody can understand [laughter] leave it in Tibetan, you know. Here's the definition of a mental thing, okay. Say, {sel shing} [repeat], {rikpa} [repeat], {shepay} [repeat], {tsennyi} [repeat]; {sel shing} [repeat], {rikpa} [repeat], {shepay} [repeat], {tsennyi} [repeat]; definition of a mental thing, okay. The

definition of a mental thing. {sel} is very difficult to translate here. I've asked many Lamas, I've debated it in many monasteries. My current understanding, okay, as Je Tsongkapa would say, which is implying that I may learn more, is 'invisible', okay. Invisible, okay. Usually, it means, 'clear', okay. Usually, the word {sel} means clear but here it means invisible, okay. {shing} means, 'and'; {shing} means, and. {dang, shing, ... } all mean the same thing: and. {rikpa} means, 'aware'. And that's the definition of a mental thing: It's invisible and it's aware. Okay. I think, in the west, we tend to confuse it with the physical matter which it is closely related to, you know. Like, your brain. When somebody says, you know, where's your mind? You go like this. For a Tibetan to go like that, for a Buddhist philosopher, that would be insane to say my mind is here. See, 'cos the mind is ineffable. It cannot be located. It cannot be touched. It's, it's not even up to the end of your skin, you see. It goes beyond. You can think of what's in your refrigerator at home. In a sense, your mind has gone there. Where is your mind? You know, can you see your mind? You know, it's all very difficult questions. Invisible and aware, okay. Examples of mental things, okay. Examples of mental things: {dewa} [repeat], Say {dewa} [repeat]; {dewa} means, happiness, in this case, okay. Happiness. And {yeshe} which means, wisdom, okay, wisdom. These are mental events, okay. These are mental things, mental functions, okay. Those are examples of something mental. Did we cover all changing things? If we did, you might be able to go home. Did we cover all changing things? What about 'Tessie'? Is Tessie changing? That's her, okay. Is Tessie changing? Yeah. Is she something physical or something mental? She combines both, you know, she incorporates both, but what about Tessie? It's a concept really. You see, Tessie is a concept; person, person. Person is a concept, you see. You can't touch person. You can touch Tessie's body. You could, you know, get her mind mad. But, Tessie, quote "Tessie", you see what I mean. That's a little tricky, all right. That's a very subtle thing. You are the combination of your body and your mind, but you are not either one itself. And so, that's a third thing, like a conceptual changing thing, you see. A concept which is changing. Actually, Tessie is a concept, okay. And that whole category of things is called, well, I'll give you the whole thing, what the heck. That's your last thing tonight so don't, don't lose hope, okay. Say, {denmin} [repeat], {duje} [repeat], {denmin duje} [repeat], {denmin duje} [repeat], better get used to it. {denmin duje} [repeat]; {den} means, 'possesses', {min} means, 'not', {duje} means, 'something that does something'. I translate it as an active thing, okay, an active thing. An active thing which is neither mind nor matter. Active, meaning, it does something, okay, {denmin duje}. There's also a {duche} which I'm sure you won't confuse it with because that's different spelling, different sound. Of course, {je } and {che} are different, okay [laughs] and some people

confuse them. But anyway, {denmin duje} is the third kind of changing thing and then we're done with {shi drup}. We're done with what we wanted to get through tonight. The third kind of changing thing, is a changing thing that is neither mind nor matter. And, an example, is Tessie. {gangsak, gangsak} means, person, person. It could be a horse, it could be a dog, it could be a human, it could be Tessie. But, if you think about it, it's an idea. You can't touch, touch Tessie. You can't throw Tessie out of the room. You can throw Tessie's body out of the room, okay. But, Tessie, is an idea that covers her body and her mind, okay. Tessie is a concept. Is it changing? Yes. Okay. But it's neither physical nor mental. It combines both. It's a concept, which combines both, okay. Yeah. [student] Active thing here is only a code word for a changing thing, okay. And people have struggled with it, you know, 'compositional factor', you know. If you wanna make your translations sound scholastic, you know. It just means it does something. {duje} means something that does something, okay. It's a synonym for {ngupo}. It's a synonym for for {mitakpa}. Yeah. [student: inaudible] Excuse me? Tessie can die. Tessie can get old. [student] that's Tessie's body, right [laughs]. That's true. Well, you can start, but your concept of Tessie can be one thing tonight and another thing tomorrow. How's that? That's better. You beat me on that one. Okay. I'll give you all the words here, okay. {denmin duje} is pretty much untranslatable. It means, doesn't have matter and is not mind, but it's all in code, okay. So, you might as well call it something that's changing but is not matter nor mind. It's neither matter nor mind, okay. {duje} means, an active thing. If you wanna translate it, kind of literally, you could say, a, a, an active thing which is neither mind nor matter, okay. Active things which are neither mind nor matter; changing things which are neither mind nor matter. Like, horse; like person, okay. How do you define it? {pem} means, physical matter, {she} means, mental thing, {gangrun} means, either one, {mayinpay} it's not, {duje} means, produced thing, a thing which was produced, okay. {duje} means a thing which was produced. If any student in this class uses 'composed thing' on their homework you have to burn it, okay Phuntsok? All right. [laughs] It's been mistranslated for thirty years, okay. It has nothing to do with composed thing, all right. {duje} means something which was {...} which means, something which was produced by causes and factors, okay. And all that compositional stuff is wrong. Space is, is composed of its directions. It's not {mitakpa}. It's a wrong translation, okay. So, anyway, {denmin duje pem she gangrun mayinpay duje} which means, this is wrong. The definition, of an active thing which is neither mind nor matter, is a produced thing which is neither mind nor matter, okay. That's all. [student] No. Not necessarily. For example, in the Vaibashika system, in the Abhidharma system, when you get to a certain point, like, you'll never be born in the hells again, you get a certain thing grows

on your body, in your, in your continuum which, which keeps you unpossessed of that thing. Okay. And that's another example if you want one. If you want me to go further, we [laughs] okay. {...} in the Heart Sutra. That's what it's talking about. Vaibashika system there are certain things that are neither mind nor matter which exist, {bakchaks}, huge debate about {bakchaks}. Are they mind? No, they live in the mind. Are they matter? No, you can't operate them [unclear]. What's a {bakchak}? A {bakchak} is a mental seed; a propensity, or energy, in the mind. And it's not physical and it's not mental. It resides in the mind but it's neither physical nor mental. There's a huge debate about that, but those are some more examples. They're kinda rare, okay. They're not too common. There's a debate about whether words are physical sounds or concepts, and that would be a {denmin duje}, okay, depending on whose school you're in, okay. I thought we'd have some fun, okay. And then you can go home. I need a rosary. I just want to show you how to start a debate, okay. And so, you're, you're reading, for the debate part of your text tonight, says, we'll talk about three different things about debating. One is posture, one is how to use a rosary and the third one is how to start a argument, all right. So, we'll go through the three. Normally, the defender sits down and then the attacker stands up. Everything is initiated by the attacker, okay. So, when you sit down, I used to like to prefer to be the attacker 'cos at least I knew what was coming, you know. To be the defender, you have to sit there, the guy could ask you anything out of eighteen years of study. He could quote anything out of thousands of pages, you know. Like, you're defenceless. If he, you're supposed to pick, like, a really obscure quotation that he probably forgot, like six years ago, you know. And then you say, what does that mean, you know. And, so it's almost more fun to be the attacker than the defender. But the defender has to sit there and listen really carefully. And then, the attacker, you're like, you come into the debate ground and you're like, you like, you saunter up to the guy and you're already clicking, you know. You're already like, let's see what he probably hasn't heard about that for a while, you know. [laughter] That's if you're lazy, okay. If you're a good debater you pick the things you're not sure about, you see. Like, I'm not sure about this thing that he said about the person not being the physical or the mental. I'd like to debate that, you know. Let's debate whether the person is physical or mental. Can you throw out Tessie's body without throwing her out? You see what I mean? Or, vice versa. And, what is the relationship between those things? And, if you're a good debater, and if you really get into debating for the right reasons, bring out the things that you're not sure about. You know, when you spend time with your Dharma friends in this class, and when you do your debating practice together, okay, which you will, bring out the things that you're not sure about and see if,

sometimes if you have three good guys together, you can figure out something even though none of you knows any more than the other guys. But, just talking it over helps a lot, you know. And so, you try to pick the questions that you're not sure about, okay. And you, you would come up and say, {tong nyi mitakpa yinpay chir}, okay. Like, you say, you start the debate by {dhi}. Say, {dhi} [repeat]{chitar} [repeat], {chuchen} [repeat]; {dhi}[repeat] {chitar}[repeat] [chuchen][repeat], but you say it very quiet, {dhi chitar chuchen}, okay. And then, you say, {takpa} you say, {tong nyi takpa yinpay chir}, sorry, {tong nyi mitakpa yinpay chir}: Emptiness is something that changes, okay. Emptiness is a changing thing. We were, I'm sure about it. Like, take the one thing that you're most unclear about and bring that up. It's very, the comfort level is low; the truth-seeking level is high, [laughter] you see what I mean. And, and you can tell the great debaters, they always bring up the things that they're not sure about even though they may look like a fool for a few minutes. But, if you keep that up for a year or so, you're not a fool any more. You've actually explored all the difficult questions. Gelugpa writers, tend to, in their textbooks, they ignore the easy parts. They don't even write about them. They only bring up the hard parts. It's called {kagne}. So anyway, let's debate something we're all not kinda clear on; {tong nyi mitakpa yinpay chir}, okay. {tong nyi mitakpa yinpay chir}, okay. And, and today I'm not gonna try and teach you debating. I, I mean I just want to show you the posture, okay. So you start out, when you say {dhi chitar chuchen}, you normally have this here. You've paid some respect to them, okay, and it's very quiet. And sometimes, they'll go right down to your ear and say {dhi chitar chuchen}, you know. And then they'll, then you step back and you say, {tong nyi chuchen mitakpa yin te dunje nupa yinpay chir}, okay. And then you give a slap, okay. That's all I want you to learn tonight really, okay. You go, you go down like this {dhi chitar chuchen} and then you, and then you come back and you say, {tong nyi chuchen}, which means, let's talk about emptiness, okay. {ngupo yin te} we'll say {ngupo yin te}, it's a working thing, {dunje nupa yinpay chir} because it performs a function. {dunje nupa yinpay chir}, okay. And you gotta get used to that, all right. So I'll show you one more time then you gotta practice a little bit, all right. [laughs] Okay. Normally, it's your left foot forward. Okay, I'm sorry it favours righties, okay. The lefties'll have to get used to it. So, you're left foot's forward and, and sometimes, you'll even have the toe up, okay. And, and you got this, this'll be like this. Later on you'll be going like this, okay. And if you saw the thangkas, there's, I checked it out. There's two thangkas: Dharmakirti and Dignaga. I honestly don't know which is which. But, in our temple in Leon's house, they're both like this. This has been this way for a long time. And when you're in a debate you be like, you know, like that [laughter], okay. But you start out with it here, you know. And you go {tongpa

nyi chuchen} [unclear] {tongpa nyi}, say, {tongpa nyi} [repeat], {chuchen} [repeat]; {tongpa nyi}[repeat] {chuchen} [repeat], okay. {tongpa nyi} means, emptiness, shunyata, okay. {chuchen} you gotta get used to; {chuchen} means, this is the subject we're gonna debate. In Scripture, it's called {...} which means, the subject under argument, okay. {tongpa nyi chuchen}

So, every syllogism has three parts, okay. The first is the {chuchen}. {chuchen} means, what are we gonna talk about, okay; {chuchen} means, what are we gonna talk about, what are we gonna debate about. What are we gonna be debate about? {tongpa nyi, tongpa nyi chuchen}, okay, {tongpa nyi chuchen}. It could be anything. {tongpa nyi chuchen}. Then you're like this. You're already like this, okay. Left foot, left foot forward. I mean it's just a, it's just a custom, all right. {tongpa nyi chuchen} and then you say {ngupo yin te} and then by then, you're normally, I mean, you don't have to point to the guy but it's like huh, okay [laughter]. Say, {ngupo} [repeat], {yin te} [repeat], {ngupo} [repeat] {yin te} [repeat]; It's a functional thing. It's a working thing, okay. I think it's a working thing. {ngupo yin te} [repeat], okay. That's called {drupjay chu}, okay. Say, {drupjay} [repeat] {chu} [repeat], {drupjay chu}[repeat]. You can read it in your reading, but {drupjay chu} means, the quality that you're trying to prove. The quality that you're trying to prove. What quality? That it's a working thing. That it does something, okay. That it's a working thing, okay. That's called {drupjay chu, drupjay chu} and those are the elements. Element number one: {chuchen}. What are we arguing about? Element number two: {drupjay chu}. What is the quality you're trying to prove about emptiness? See, {drupja} means, to prove, {chu} means, quality. What's the quality you're trying to prove about emptiness? That it's [students] yarrrr [students] working thing. That it's a working thing, okay. So, so far, we have two parts. All I want to do tonight is three parts. You'll be outta here by nine-thirty. You can practice stamping. I hope you don't live above somebody, okay, okay. {drupjay chu, ngupo yin te dunje nupa yinpay chir}. Say, {dunje} [repeat] {ngupa} [repeat] {yinpay chir} [repeat] {dunje} [repeat] {nupa} [repeat] {yinpay chir} [repeat]. By the way, you don't have to debate it in Tibetan. I'll have you in groups in a week or two, in a class or two, and you'll be debating, the English track'll be debating English and that's okay. So, don't worry about it. Don't run away 'cos there's a lot of Tibetan here. But those of you who want to learn, your homework Tibetan, for example, if you debate it for ten minutes, forget it, you'll never forget it. It's really nice. It's really good, okay. {dunje ngupa} [repeat] {yinpay chir} [repeat]. Then, it's like, you gotta practice, okay. Like that [laughter]. I wasn't dancing in Time Magazine [laughter], okay [laughs] all right. You get this up like that, right. And you can tell the new kids, they're like [laughter]. Forget it. It's like that 'cos you need power. You need some, what do you call it? You need some, you

know. So, it's like that and then you're like [slaps hands], okay. Like that, all right. So you gotta practice it at home. Don't, I don't wanna see people like that [laughter]. I did one of my exams like that and I got fried afterwards by Rinpoche, okay [laughter]. So, your arm is up like that, and then a lot of power coming down with a lot of [slaps hand], a lot of power, okay. So you can go home and practice it. You see kids in the monastery, you know, [slaps hand] practising, you know [laughter] [laughs], okay, {dunje nupa yinpay chir} And this, it's just nice to do the old custom. And then you kinda keep it there or you might go, you know, [laughs] [laughter], okay, all right. And there's all this body language. I described it in the reading, but. Then you wait for him to answer. And, if he's slow, you just kinda go [laughter] [laughs], okay [laughs] all right. It's like [laughter] and you're waiting you know. And if, and if after awhile he doesn't answer, you know, you start a Woa. Say woa, I'll do one, okay dooooooo tsa [laughter] [laughs]. Practice, dooooooo tsa, means, come on, you know [laughter] and then you star a woa. If you start a woa it might be nine hundred people will repeat it, see. All the audience will help [laughter] you. And , and it's very embarrassing. Like, you're trying, you're furiously trying to remember where this quotation comes from and there's this woa going on, you know [laughter]. So it's like that; woa tsa. So, first you, this is all you have to learn tonight. {dhi chitar chuchen}[slaps hand]. If you wanna do it in English, dhi, [repeat] we won't change the Sanskrit manta, okay, we'll leave those alone. Everything else we'll translate, okay. {dhi chitar chuchen} how about this one [slaps hand] okay, dhi, how about this one. And then you give a small clap but you don't yell, okay. And then, you kinda back off and you get your left foot forward. And you can even see them like this, you know, or getting ready, you know [laughter] [laughs]. Then they say, {tongpa nyi chuchen} let's talk about {tongpa nyi} you know. And you keep eye contact with the guy, you know, normally, unless you're, like, so disgusted you're like {tongpa nyi chuchen} [laughter], okay, okay {tongpa nyi chuchen ngupo yin te duje ngupay yinpay chir} [slaps hand] , okay and then you give 'em, and it hurts after, you know, I've seen many times in the winter debates, that people's hands are cut open and there's this blood spurting in your face, you know. If you do it for eighteen hours a day it's like, it's like, and it's really good for young monks who are trying to keep their vows [unclear] [laughs] [laughter]. I mean, it's [laughs] [laughter] it's very good. It's actually a very good custom in debate. We do it for five, six hours a day. And then you have certain types of people who are very physical or athletic, and it helps everybody, you know, because by the time you get home you're totally exhausted, you know. And, you're like, and you're refreshed, and it keeps you healthy also. So, it's really nice. It's a great custom. And you're out in the night air and you're excited and everybody's laughing, yo

know. And it really breaks the monotony of studying all day or memorising all day and it's really a lot of fun. So, try it at home and next time, you know, we'll, we'll try to clear things off a little bit and do it, okay. You start out, you do start out like that, {dhi chitar chuchen}, {dhi} how about this one. Let's talk about emptiness. It's a working thing because it performs a function. [slaps hand] Okay. I'll say it again in English. It would be like this: {dhi chitar chuchen}, {dhi} how about this one, {dhi} how about this one. Let's talk about emptiness. Consider emptiness, okay. It's a working thing. Because, it's a thing which performs a function. [slaps hand] Okay. And all these flag stones in the Sera Me debate ground are broken into pieces, you know [laughter], thousands of people smashing them all day long, you know. And that's how you do it, okay. So, you practice it at home like that, okay. The last element, where I said, because it's a thing which performs a function, is called the {tak}, okay. Say, {tak} [repeat] {tak} [repeat], okay, {tak}. {tak} you had last week; it means, reason, okay, the reason. I'm gonna write you those because we have four more minutes and I can torture you a little bit. Say, {chuchen} [repeat] {chuchen} [repeat]. {chuchen} is the subject. What was our subject this time? {tongpa nyi}, okay, emptiness. We said, {tongpa nyi chuchen}. We didn't get that far, right. We were like {tongpa nyi chuchen}, okay, {tongpa nyi chuchen}. Let's talk about {tongpa nyi}; {tongpa nyi chuchen} means the subject is {tongpa nyi}. By the way, the basic requirements for the subject, all though you can study it more carefully in the, in the reading. And, the reading is hard, okay. You gotta spend a lot of time on it. It's like forty pages. We all went crazy doing it; many all-nighters, okay. There are basically two requirements. Your opponent must have perceived that object with a {tsema}, you see, with a valid perception. In other words, you and I can't debate about a [unclear], 'cos you don't know what I'm talking about unless you know Russian, okay. Okay, Mary ,okay. You know, you can't debate about that, a red door, if I say, if I use a language which you don't know, that's not a good {chuchen}, you see what I mean. It must be, first of all, an object which the opponent knows what it is, okay. He has confirmed that this thing exists, okay. [student: how do you know what he knows?] Normally, when you're making a debate with somebody, like, you're responding to a question they made or something like that. Like, somebody comes up to me and says, I think emptiness is a changing thing. And then I'm gonna debate with him, then I have to assume he knows what emptiness is, intellectually, you know. By the way, you don't have to have a perfect understanding of the thing. You understand the word and you have a rough idea of what it is. If you had seen it directly you'd be an Arya, you wouldn't be asking me if it was an unchanging, a changing thing. You would never say that. So, it doesn't mean that you have to perceive it absolutely correctly, but you have to know what I'm talking about

when I'm talking about emptiness, okay. You must have your own {tsema} of emptiness in a very rough way, okay, at least. {tongpa nyi} And the second requirement is, the opponent must be unsure whether or not it is what you say next, you see what I mean. What am I gonna say next? It's a working thing; it's a working thing. He must doubt that fact. He must be unsure about that fact. And those are the two requirements, okay. He must know what the subject is and he must be unsure about whether it's the thing you're about to say. You see, you're about to assert that it's a certain thing; you're about to say, it is a working thing, and he has to be in doubt about that. In other words, you're starting with an assertion, he has to doubt it or you wouldn't be arguing about it, okay. It has to be something he doubts. If the opponent doesn't think, if he doesn't have doubt about what you say, you have just presented an incorrect reason, in Buddhist logic. In the classic proof, you know, if you go up to Dharmakirti and try to prove one of these things, that's incorrect reasoning, you see what I mean. It counts as much as a wrong reason. It's, it's invalid, you can't use it, okay. You can't argue something to someone that they already accept, okay. So, those are the two requirements, basic requirements of the subject. It must be that they know what you're talking about and they must doubt that it is what you're trying to prove, okay. That's all. Okay. Now, {drupjay chu}, what was the {drujay chu}, what was the thing we were trying to prove about emptiness? That it's a working thing, okay. I'll give you the second element. [student] Yeah, you, you've picked the wrong subject, actually [laughs], you know. You've picked the wrong subject. I mean, you can debate it for exercise, for the exercise of it, you know, and they do in the monastery. But, the greatest teachers in the monastery, in front of a thousand monks, will take a position which is totally wrong just to see if this young monk can learn to prove him wrong, because he's trying to help the other person, you see. It's not who wins. The great debaters are searching for subjects that are delicate, you know. It's called delicate in Tibetan. They're looking for subjects that are touchy because they want everyone to learn something profound, you see. And, and, and, and you're trying to explore the unknown together. Really, debate is exploring the unknown. You're not, the American idea that it must be a competition or somebody has to win and somebody has to lose, is very sick and it's totally foreign to Tibetan Buddhism. It's, when you go to the debate ground it feels so nice. It's like exploring the unknown with your friends. And it's great. It feels wonderful. And you go home and you understand so much more than when you went there. It's a beautiful thing. It's a really beautiful thing. And you should never feel embarrassed or shy or say, I had a couple of people come up to me and say, yeah, could I sit in the back during the debating 'cos, you know, I'm not too good at yelling and stuff. You don't have to yell. I don't care if you

yell. The great, great, great debaters are like, {tongpa nyi chuchen}[laughter] , you know. You see the great ones, really, especially as you get older, you get less, you know [laughter] [laughs], you know. But you also get like a violin player, you know. I mean, you just get more, you know. They'll sit there and go {tongpa nyi chuchen}, they're like that. You can't even hear their finger snaps, you know, and they're wiping you out, you know. {laughs} [laughter] But, but you're learning, see. So, don't ever be shy or embarrassed. Never think like that. That's pride. If you think about it, that's pride. Forget your pride. Go in and explore the things you don't know and your mind will get expanded immediately. It's really fun so forget the pride thing, you know. People say they're embarrassed. You're not embarrassed you're just too proud to get embarrassed in front of other people. A good Buddhist wants to learn, you know. You wanna learn something about emptiness. Come on, bring up something I don't know, okay. Let me learn something, you see. That's better. Have that attitude when you debate, okay.

So, that's the {drupjay chu}. What's the requirement for something to be a {drupjay chu}? {...} You can be the object that you're trying, the quality that you're trying to prove about this {chuchen}. What's the quality that we're trying to prove? That emptiness is a working thing. To be a working thing is the quality we're trying to prove. By the way, that second element, the quality you're trying to prove, in Tibetan called the {drupjay chu}, doesn't even have to exist. Because, the definition of the quality that you're trying to prove is simply anything that both you guys want to consider the quality being proven. Because, for example, you can prove that something is non-existent, right? In that case, the thing doesn't even exist. So, it doesn't even have to exist, you see. As long as you both consider it the thing the guy is trying to prove. That's the definition of the quality you are trying to prove. You both consider it the quality that you're trying to prove. And that's enough. It could be a castle in the sky. It could be rabbit's horns. It could be anything as long as you're both in sync that this is what you want to prove about the subject, okay. That's all. The only requirement. It doesn't even have to exist. Yeah. [student] I can say thing you're trying to prove, but see, quality is good because quality of the subject, you see. Quality of the subject [student] you're trying to prove that it's a quality which, which, which applies to the subject. [student] A what? [student] That's the whole statement. [student] No. There's a difference, by the way, there's the distinction about, between what you're trying to prove and the quality you're trying to prove, you see. What am I trying to prove? That emptiness is a working thing. What is the quality about emptiness that I'm trying to prove? Being a working thing. You see, there's a distinction between element number two and element number one plus element number two. What I'm trying to

prove, the statement I'm trying to prove, the idea I'm trying to prove, if you think about it, it's the combination of number one and two. It's that emptiness is a working thing. The fact that emptiness is a working thing. And that's called {drupja}. I wouldn't have brought it up Mister Hahn and you would have got home on time, but since you brought it up [student]. It's great to learn all these and that's, that's part of the class. That's the second half of the class. {drupja} is the combination of one and two. {drupja} means, what we're trying to prove. The statement we're trying to prove. You could call it the assertion, okay. It's the thing we're trying to prove. What are you trying to prove? That emptiness is a working thing. What's the quality about emptiness you're trying to prove? Being a working thing. What's your subject in this debate? Emptiness. Okay. Last part, then you really can go home. Say, {tak} [repeat] {tak} [repeat]. Definition of a {tak} is what? Well it means reason, right, but what's the definition? {tak su kupa} anything you want to say is a reason, okay. Take emptiness. It's, it's a working thing. Because the sky was green on the thirty-second of January [laughter], okay [laughs]. Fine. It's a false reason but it's a reason, okay. It's an incorrect reason but it's a reason. I like to impress on you why it's important to debate. Why is it important to do this? Why is important for you to come back and not leave between [cut]

The Asian Classics Institute

Geshe Michael Roach

Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

Class Three: Quality and Characteristic

February 24, 1998

Transcribed by Angie Overy

Proofread by Linda Salmon

I mean, that's pretty much the definition of Buddha, okay. To be able to sit there in the pew whether you are known to other people or not because we all know {gangsak gyi gangsak gi tsu misung te nampar gyur tare}, right. And be able judge, sorry, be able to be present on every planet in the universe without thinking, without any conscious thought. I mean, it's automatic. {Unclear} which is a common Tibetan name means, automatic. That is the goal of these classes, okay. The goal is that you can reach a place and sit there and be a perfect, perfectly, perfect match with every living creature in the world and help them exactly what they need, all the time, without any premeditation. And that's the nature of a Buddha, okay. To get there, you know, you have to become a Buddha. It's the same thing really. To get there, you have to basically remove mental afflictions forever, otherwise known as nirvana; the definition of nirvana really. But it's not the whole definition of nirvana because the other part is {...} to be able to remove your mental afflictions permanently because you saw emptiness directly. So what would seeing emptiness directly for that.

What comes in the few hours before you see emptiness directly? I'll be Rinpoche for you [laughter] Huh? {Chu chok}, okay. {Chu chok} is called the supreme object, okay. Meaning, the final hours before you reach the direct perception of emptiness. The supreme object. During that stage, you, you understand, perfectly, what it is to be dependent origination, okay. So, you can say, {chu chok} equals understanding dependent origination. Or, you could say, lower reality. [Cut]

This is higher reality, right. [Cut] And to perceive, and to reach {chu chok} you must study emptiness. There's a long learning curve where you're studying emptiness. And, the most important thing to study is mental images, because if you understand mental images well, you will see the meaning, you will see how lower reality works. If you understand how lower reality works, you'll perceive higher reality, directly, very shortly after that. Within the next day, within the next twenty-four hours. After you've seen higher reality you're eligible, directly

right, you're eligible to remove your mental afflictions and reach nirvana. After you've seen nirvana, after you reach nirvana, you can reach Buddhahood, okay. No more than seven lifetimes; typically, seven lifetimes after you see emptiness directly, okay. So, studying mental images is, is in a direct lineage to getting to Buddhahood, okay. You must study mental images. And we're gonna go through them tonight. It's, it is probably the whole meat of the Pramanavartikka. They're not just studying Buddhist logic for fun, okay. And they're not just doing it because it's something scholastically interesting. The whole Pramanavartikka, Dharmakirti's whole shtick, is to get you to understand why you see something, why you perceive something, okay. The different ways that you perceive things. That's his whole reason. Logic is one way to see something and then direct perceptions another way to see something. And he covers both of them. But the guts, the real essence of his book is how do we create a mental image and how do we see things with a mental image, okay? And this, there 'a) if you debate Dharmakirti, Master Dharmakirti's book, you end up, sooner or later, debating what is the nature of perception. How do you see things? Which is to say, what is dependent origination, you see what I mean. Once you understand that it's only, like, a few hours to see emptiness directly, okay. So, it's very, very important. What we're gonna go over tonight is very, very important. First thing: very important. Second thing: very difficult in that this is one of the subjects where you need some kind of energy or power to get it, okay. It's called {kelwa}. Say, {kelwa}[repeat], {kelwa} [repeat]; {kelwa} means you've collected some kind of good karma, some kind of positive energy, and that gives you the, the ability to see what I'm gonna talk about tonight, okay. If you don't have {kelwa} and you look at the reading that you're gonna get tonight, you will, your head will explode, okay, all right. [Laughs] You'll say, I don't care, what the hell. I mean, you'll open up anywhere and you'll say I don't understand what the hell are you talking about, you know what I mean. It's very difficult. And it's difficult, not intellectually, but spiritually, you see what I mean. If you have enough good karma and you open this thing you could be blown away. You could see emptiness within a week or two, okay. If you had enough {kelwa}, when you read this reading that you'll get tonight, it would just blow you away. You would just totally change your whole life, okay. If you didn't have {kelwa}, let's say you had half {kelwa}, then you'd say, this could be useful for my future. I gotta work on this, you know. I gotta really concentrate on this. If you didn't have any {kelwa} at all, or not much, you'd say, this is some logic BS, totally unnecessary, they're just playing with words. It's all sophistry. It's all just semantics. I don't see the importance of this. And then my class would go down to half as many people next class, okay. [Laughs] And I thought it was unsafe to teach these subjects because I didn't want that to happen. I don't

know how many people have {kelwa}. What I'm saying is, be patient with this subject. It could save your life, okay, but it's gonna take some time. And this isn't something you can do the homework at six thirty-five next week, okay. This is gonna take devoted effort and thought to get to the real meaning of this. You can get to it on a very superficial level, you know. I could teach it to you tonight. You can go home thinking, oh, I understand that, what's next week, you know. But there's an extremely profound, deep level here. I'm gonna phrase the class in such a way that I'm forcing you to deal with that level. I had a choice when I translated it. There's two ways to translate it. And I was sitting there and I said, if I translate it the easy way, everybody'll get it, and then they'll go home and think they got it, you know. If I translate it the deeper way, they'll all be confused and maybe they won't come back, but at least they heard it, you know. So, I chose that, all right. It's deep and, and you have to have a lot of good karma to see it, okay. So, if you don't see it or it's not clear to you, don't worry about it. Take one page of the reading and chew on it for two or three weeks, okay. If you get one of the arguments in the reading you'll be okay with the other ones, okay. And, and it's deep. And, and it's a real ticket to emptiness, okay. This is, they call this study the key to Madhaymika, and it is, okay. It's, it's the key to seeing emptiness directly. You must, sooner or later, grapple with these things. So, don't be wimpy, okay. Take it home and attack it, but it's going to take some serious time and some serious effort, okay. It's not crazy, it's not semantical BS; it's extremely profound, okay. And, it's very, very close to understanding dependent origination, which is, if you see the meaning of dependent origination directly, then you are within say, two or three hours of seeing emptiness directly, okay. Very profound; {chu chok}, the last moments of the Path of Preparation. And then, you flop over into {Tong Lam}, the direct perception of emptiness. So, it's an honour to study this subject. It's an honour to teach it. And, and try hard, okay. Put on your thinking cap, okay. It's hard, all right. Here we go.

Say, {chi}[repeat], {jedrak} [repeat], {chi} [repeat], {jedrak} [repeat]. Okay, the vignette, the, the subject for tonight, is {chi jedrak}, okay. It's known that way. Everybody says, what are you studying, you know? What are you debating nowadays? Oh, {chi jedrak}. Oh, cool. {Chi jedrak}, okay. {Chi}, I'm gonna give you the, very important, this is the most important thing I'm gonna tell you tonight. Okay, ready? I'll give you a provisional translation of {chi jedrak}. I'll give you the easy one and then, in about fifteen or twenty minutes, I'll give you the real one, okay. So, here's the easy, here's the general one, okay. It's not the one that's gonna get you to see emptiness quickly, but we'll start there, okay. {Chi}: general. Okay, so, {chi} is the general category and {jedrak} is a specific member of that category. And, I'll give you an example. You could also call it

'sets and subsets' if you know set theory; which I only remember what I got in fourth grade and that's all I know about it. That wasn't Mrs. Melvin, but-. So, here's an example. Car could be the {chi}, which is the general category and the different members of that set can be Chevrolets, Fords, lets say Chevy's, Fords and Toyotas, okay. And these are {jedrak}. Now, what happens when you divide Chevy's into old Chevy's and new Chevy's? Chevy's becomes the {chi}, okay. So, if you divide it this way, it's like that. But, if you restrict yourself to this, Chevy's is the {chi} and old and new Chevy's are the {jedrak}. A very general test, okay, a very general test of whether something is a {chi} of a {jedrak} is to imagine what would happen if you wiped out all the {chis}. Would it wipe out the thing you're talking about, okay? Like, if I were to check and see if an old Chevy is {jedrak} of a {chi}, I wipe out all the Chevy's in the world. Have I, automatically, wiped out all the old Chevy's in the world? Yes. That's one indication that it might be a {jedrak}, okay. Like a general test {... yinpay chir}, okay. Like, [unclear], the {chi} and the {..jedrak}, okay. If you wipe out all the {chis}, then all the {jedraks} get automatically wiped out. That's a general test; there's a more specific test that we'll talk about, okay. That's the general meaning of {chi} and {jedrak}. I'm gonna give you some other meanings of {chi} and {jedrak}, okay, of {chi}. You, you should learn them too, okay. There are three general, generally speaking, three types of {chi}. By the way, the root text here says, {...}; {...} means, just nominally, implying that some of them are not real, okay. When you have a division in Scripture, you can divide this into five different categories, and then they'll say, nominally speaking. It implies that some of them are not real. What's an example? Like, you know what natural nirvana means. What's it mean? Emptiness. Emptiness itself, okay. Is it a kind of nirvana? No. Can you call it nirvana? Yes. Okay. And that's what we say like a nominal nirvana. It's, you can call it nirvana, but it's not a real nirvana, because it's not overcoming your mental afflictions forever. This pen has emptiness but it hasn't overcome any mental afflictions. But, you can say, it has what we call natural nirvana, okay. That's another division, which is not real, you see. It's just given that name. So, I can give you three kinds of {chis}, but I warn you, two of them aren't real, okay. Two of them can be called {chi}. It helps you understand what a {chi} is, but technically, they're not {chis}, okay. {...} Very important in logic. Nominally, you can divide it into three types, okay. Okay, here's the first one. Say, {rik chi} [repeat], {rik chi} [repeat]; {rik} means, a type, okay. A type, like, what? Like, Chevy, okay. A type, a kind, or even, like car. You see car could be a type. How many things are characteristic of that type? Oh, Chevy's, Toyotas, Fords, okay. So you get something of the idea of general types or general quality and the things, which are characteristic of that quality, okay. Like, car would be a {rik chi}, okay. And it's, and its {jedrak}

would be Chevy's, Fords and Toyotas. Chevy's could be a {rik chi}; a, a, a general type and then, its particular members, would be old Chevy's and new Chevy's or Belair's and Corvettes and whatever, okay. All right. Definition of a {rik chi}; I'll just read it to you. I had it in Tibetan here, I said, No, I'm not, I don't wanna torture them too much this time. That existing thing which subsumes the multiple things, which are of its type, okay. This just means, that the general quality and many things are characteristic of it, okay. It's a general quality. What's the general quality? Car-ness. Okay. And, here I present for you a new idea. This is the guts of tonight's talk, okay. If you think about, it's a general quality and things, which are, write this down, this is very important. Think carefully, and I beg you to do that, okay. If you're gonna get out of samsara in this lifetime you must understand what I'm about to say, okay. Think of car, as quote, "car", okay; "car", quote, "car" or the quality of car-ness. If you think very, very carefully, it's the difference between 'a car', 'the car', and "car", okay. You have to think about it. You have to go home and think about it, okay. Very...it's life or death question for you. You have to get the difference, okay; 'a car', 'the car', and "car", okay, "car". Okay, car with quotation marks around it; car-ness, okay. Car-ness is not the same as 'a car', right? A Chevrolet, car-ness is a quality; car-ness is an attribute, okay; car-ness is a nature. And then there are different objects in the world, which are characteristic of that quality. And you have to get used to those terms, okay. Car-ness is a quality; "car ", quote, is a quality or a nature. And there are different objects in the world, which possess that nature or which are characteristic of that nature. For example, Chevy, Ford and Toyotas. And you have to get used to that. You have to get used to that, okay. How your reality is occurring is closely tied to the question of car-ness, okay. Why you are perceiving your reality the way you are. What you're doing wrong. Why you are suffering is directly related to understanding car-ness, okay, the quality called "car", okay. It's very, very subtle and you have to work on it. If you understand it, if you come to a point you can understand it you will understand dependent origination. That will trigger a day you see it directly. That will trigger the direct perception of emptiness. This class is the most important class you've ever had maybe, okay. This, this could trigger a turn of events that could make you see emptiness, okay. The day you see emptiness, I mean, I'll put the carrot out, okay, you can see your future enlightenment directly. And you know how many days left. You know how many lifetimes and you know the nature of those lifetimes. You now what you'll be doing, generally. You know how you'll live. You know your circumstances. So, what else is there to do with this life? You see. You see the Buddha directly. You see your future lives directly. You know exactly how many lives it's gonna be and you see your future enlightenment. So who's gonna do anything for you, okay.

Who's gonna talk you out of or into anything else, you know. You're an Arya. You understand everything. And, and, it's this weird sensation. It's just being totally independent of anything going on in the world. You saw it. Nobody can tell you anything else about it. In, in those fifteen to twenty minutes you see the contents of the entire Scriptures on emptiness. And, and you can go ahead and study them the rest of your life but you've already understood everything they have to say. Period. Your direct perception of emptiness is exactly equivalent to the direct perception of emptiness of a Buddha or an Arhat. Period. It's not anything less than that, okay. It's perfect. And, and you see all these future things and they are true. And so they give them the name, 'Four Arya Truths', okay. Because you see them and you know they are true, okay. You have to understand this kind of thing, okay. This is between you and that carrot, okay. [Laughs] You have to understand the car-ness thing, all right. I'm talking about {chi jedrak} as car-ness, as a quality. And, Chevy's and Fords and Toyotas, that are, characteristic of that quality. And you have to start thinking of {chi jedrak}, in the words, 'quality and characteristic of'. By the way, I don't say, 'a characteristic', scratch that from what I, you know, don't think like that. I'm not saying, 'a characteristic', okay. I'm saying, 'characteristic of', or 'typical of', okay. A Chevrolet is characteristic of the quality called car or car-ness, okay. I'm not saying it's a characteristic of like, blueness or whiteness is a characteristic of this pen. I'm not saying that. I'm saying that, a Chevy is characteristic of, or typical of, the quality called car-ness. And you have to get used to that and you have to work with that, okay. If I lost you or if you feel uncomfortable, stick with it, okay. Stick with it. You must understand this subject eventually, okay; in some lifetime. Just jump over it now, okay. Go home and think about it. And by the way, you have to pray for the blessings of your Lamas, okay. You have to pray also. You really have to get divine assistance on this one, okay. So, go home and do a really good preliminary {...} right, seven steps. And, and work on it really hard, you know. Ask the Lamas for their help, you know. Visualise them and, and ask them for help. It's the only way that it's gonna work. It's the only way that it's gonna happen, okay. Some, some heavy duty Guru yoga would be in order, and I'm not kidding, you know. On the order of building a house or something. I don't need a house, but anyway, something like that. And I'm not kidding, okay. All right. Remember this page here. Get this page down, okay. Make sure you have this page down, okay. Yeah. [Student: could you [unclear]] The page? Yeah. First half of the page says, general quality, underlined, quality; which is "car" in quotation marks or the quality of car-ness, okay. That is the car as a {chi}, okay; car as a {chi}. And then there's a big line across the page and then underneath it says, and those things, which are characteristic or typical of it, which is {jedrak}. An example of the {chi} is, "car", in quotation marks. You're

gonna see all these quotation marks in the reading. You'll say, this guy went crazy with quotation; maybe it stuck on the keyboard or something. Not so. I'm indicating the quality, okay. You can read 'ness' if you want, okay: car-ness. But you must get it. Car-ness, okay, "car." [Student: Question I had, when you taught this before [unclear] quality and characteristics, general and specific, are you labelling those now? Generals, qualities and specifics.] Yeah, the real meaning, the deeper meaning of the word general is, 'quality'. The deeper meaning of the word characteristic is 'characteristic of', okay. And, and, and, you know, you can get up and teach this thing as 'general categories' and 'specific members of those categories', but if you get up and teach it as 'quality' and those and 'characteristic of that quality', if you, much, much more close to the meaning of dependent origination. [Student: Can I ask you repeat what you said about the Chevy and car relationship, seeing them both ways, general and specific and quality [unclear]] General, specific, you could say, [student: [unclear] you could say, cars as general category called 'cars', all cars in the world. And then, its members are, are Chevrolet cars, Ford cars and Toyota cars, okay, and that would be a general category and the members of that general category. And that's one way to teach this class. It will not get you to see dependent origination like dynamite. But, if you call it 'quality', called car-ness, or quote, "car". Quote is very important. What do I mean when I say, quote "car"? What does it mean when you say, "car" in quotation marks? It means the quality of car-ness, okay. And you gotta go home and think about it, okay. And, those objects, which are characteristic of car-ness, okay, which are typical of car-ness, are Chevies, Fords and Toyotas. Those are, that, that's a distinction. It's very subtle. You must learn it. [Student: Same relationship for example a piano] Yeah, yeah, same words, okay, same words, okay. The classical {chi jedrak}, by the way, that's the, that's the main thing. Let me; let me go through, like, on a slow [unclear], okay. [Student: [unclear]] Yeah. [Student: [Unclear]] The deeper one. Yeah, yeah. We're still on {rik chi}. Yeah. We're on a deeper meaning of {rik chi}, okay. We'll go onto the second {chi}. Let me, let me slope through and then we'll, we'll, we'll, you'll get questions later, okay. Some very important subjects I have to throw, okay. And then you can stop me later. Number two: say, {dun chi}. [repeat], {dun chi} [repeat]. I could say, like, three characteristics in the definition of a {dun chi}, so, instead of giving you the technical definition, which is a long story, I'll give you the elements of the definition and that's all you need, okay. Number one a: it's a mental image. Think of your refrigerator at home, okay. [Laughs] I don't know, something intimate, all right. Think of your refrigerator at home, okay. And that image in your mind, okay, is a {dun chi}. All right. That's a {dun chi}, okay. By the way, Buddhist philosophy distinguishes between {dun chi} and {dra chi}. I'm not going to get into {dra chi}, okay. {dun chi},

technically speaking, and it's not the point tonight, {dun chi} is a mental image of something with which you are familiar and which you have already perceived, okay. {Dra chi} as opposed to {dun chi} is a mental image of something you've heard about but not experienced directly. For example, I don't have a {dun chi} of Clinton, President Clinton. I have one of Robert Clinton, but not of President Clinton, okay. But, I have lots of {dra chis}. By the way, I have a of {dun chi} of him on the TV. And I have a {dun chi} of him in film or on video, or on the front of New York Times, or something. But, I don't have a {dun chi} of him, you know. I didn't go to the White House and see him face-to-face, okay. But I have a {dra chi}. I've heard about this guy, I know, generally, what he looks like. I can form a mental image of him based on what I've heard and that's called a {dra chi}. {Dun chi} should be something you've had a direct experience of, okay. Like, your refrigerator at home, okay, I hope, okay. You had a... but you can get a mental image of your refrigerator at home, okay. And that's called a {dun chi}, a mental image. Second quality of it is that you mistake it for the actual object. Now, here, the schools diverge, okay. What they mean when they talk about this in Madhyamika is one thing. What the Sautrantikas, school number two think it means, is different. I'm gonna give you the one that relates to you seeing emptiness directly 'cos that's what we'd like to do, okay. It's very similar to the Sautrantika position but not exactly the same okay. But anyway, it is for example, we given the example many times, you're standing next to a stove in your kitchen. You've put a pot of water on a stove to make tea for your Lama. You've been studying {chi jedrak} like crazy, okay. And, and you're staring at the pot and then suddenly, you realise that you're not looking at a pot, you're looking at a mental picture of the pot. Because, all there is out there is a circle of silver, a black long thing. You see, all your eye can see is clues, indicators of pot. It sees long black thing. It sees silver round thing. It sees glinty, glint, glint, you know. It sees little ovals forming where the bubbles are coming up but they're not bubbles to your eye. They are just colors and shapes. See, the eye can't think, I'm seeing a pot of water. The eye is only seeing colors and shapes. And then the mind, under the influence of your past karma, in fact, ruled and dictated by your past karma, organises those, that data into a certain object, okay. There's black, there's silver, there's shiny – I think it's a pot. And then your mind fills in the blanks. And your mind creates this {dun chi} you see; this mental image of a pot. And then, you're staring; you're actually staring, mentally, at an image of a pot in your mind. And then, you think that's the pot, okay. You mistake that for the pot. It is all you're; actually, all you're getting is some sense data, okay. If you were the roach crawling across the top of the stove at the same moment, getting the same sensory data input, you would interpret, because of your past karma, you'd interpret that as a life threatening hell realm

with a burning iron floor. Do you see what I mean? Validly so. It's no more a pot than it is a hell realm floor, you see what I mean. There's nothing that says it has to be a pot to a roach. It is validly and correctly, a hell realm, burning floor to a roach. I mean, metaphorically speaking. Hell realm metaphors are much worse, but, but to a roach it's a life threatening object as big as a mountain, better run, you know, or you'll get fried, okay. Validly because, because that being's karma is forcing that being to take that same sense data and organise it into a {dun chi}. He's also mistaking his mental image of a, of a mountain burning with mental. He, he's also mistaking that mental image to be an external object and it's not, okay. He's making the same mistake, okay. He's, he's also interpreting it and, and he's also looking at a {dun chi} and not at a real object, okay. And if you think about it carefully, that's what makes him a roach. He is not a roach independently existing as 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. And you're karma's forcing you to organise things mentally into {dun chis} that are much more comfortable, normally, okay. And that's what it is to be a human. There is no human outside that collection of, of perceptions, you see. That's what it makes you different from a roach. That's what makes you a human. It's very interesting. Your karma, it's not that there's a roach's world and your karma throws you in. You know, people say that. It's not true. It's not that there's an animal realm and your karma is throwing you into the animal realm. It's not that there's a pre-existing human realm and your karma is throwing you into the human realm. Your karma is the human realm. His karma, is the animal realm, you see what I mean. It's the {dun chis} which are being forced upon you. It's the way in which your past karma, is forcing your mind to make mental images from the same data, is what forces you into a roach's world, okay. That makes tantric enlightenment possible. You must change your karma. It's, it's lousy right now. It's what we call { ...}. You're stuck with this lousy mix of black and white karma. To make it perfect, and the same fact that allows a roach to see it as a burning floor and the human to see it as a pot of water, can make you see it, experience as the nectar of immortality literally, okay. And it's great. So, {dun chis} are very important. Okay, so {dun chis} are running your world and they make everything possible. Yeah. 3627[Student: Unclear]] Loud [Student: [Unclear]] Yeah. You're having a {dun chi}. She said, if you, it's like you meet somebody and you don't have a, you don't have a real clear mental image of them or perhaps, if you have a sort of, vibration from them or feeling about them. That's also a {dun chi}. That's a {dun chi} to have a mental image of some kind of vague feeling about them. That's fine. Same rules apply. That, that sense data is making you have a, your karma is forcing you to interpret that sense data, as a vague feeling about this person.

No problem. Same rules apply. Same rules apply for every single mental or physical event in your life. They're all {dun chis} and you're mistaking them for some outer object. When you do that, you can hate and you can like and dislike. And then you get into trouble, you see. Only when you think that the object is out there, and is not depending on your own {dun chis} that you have created, can you dislike someone or like someone in the wrong way. You see, only then, can you, can you collect karma by having these negative emotions, the the three. You know, if you really saw that everything you perceive is only your fault, you know, every asshole you ever met, is your problem, you created it, you're, you're maintaining that asshole, you know, then who're you gonna get mad at, you know? You, you'll just go home and be sad that you have such crappy karma and you didn't keep your book, you know what I mean. Go home and be sad that you didn't keep your book; I didn't have time, you know. That's it. You would be freed of the emotion of disliking things. You would reach a thing called nirvana. Why? 'Cos you understood its emptiness, you see. It's very cool. Okay. That's a {dun chi}. You see that it's not the same as a {rik chi}, okay. But you also see that they are very, very sexy connection between them. Something's happening here, you see; car-ness and your mental image of a car; something very close there. And you have to investigate that. It will liberate you if you see the connection, you see. Some intimate relationship between car-ness and the thing in your mind that you see when you think of car, okay. The mental image in your mind when you look at a car. And that brings me to the third quality of a {dun chi}. Take everything in the world, which is not this very pen, and cancel it. What's left? The pen, okay. And that's how you, according to, this is very Sautrantika, okay. This is very Pramanavartikka. This is very Master Dharmakirti, okay. The mental image that you have going on in your head of this pen, is a mental exercise, which your mind goes through every time you perceive something, of cancelling everything that the pen is not. Which leaves the image of the pen, okay, in your mind. Now, that's big deal in, in Sau, in Sautrantika. Yeah. 39 [Student: [Unclear]] You'd say, he asked, like, we've made a distinction between a mental image of something you've had a direct experience of and then we distinguished it from a mental image of something that you've heard about so you can form a picture of it, but what about, like, when you're hallucinating or something, like, you're on acid or something and you start getting these mental image? Do they, do they apply there? I don't know. You could call them {chis}. You could call them mental images. According to Buddhism they would come from some prior experience that you'd had. I wouldn't call them a {dun chi} necessarily. But that's, that's a long story. They are confused images of a hallucinating mind and they are mental images, okay. Where was I, I got lost. I don't know. Anyway, that's the third quality.

This is very Sautrantika idea and, and it will help you a little bit. It's not the main point, okay. I mean, it's interesting to know. It's interesting to experiment and to investigate the process or the, the way in which your mind seems to be doing this. But, I think it's more important to reflect on how this is coming from your past karma. I mean, it's more important for your enlightenment and more important for your tantric liberation, to see how this is coming from your past karma. I'll take some questions later on it, okay, in about fifteen minutes or something. Okay. It's much more important. By the way, some Buddhist schools in Tibet think that emptiness means point number three here. That, the emptiness of something, is the fact that it is the opposite of all, which it is not. It is the negation of all that it is not, called, called by some people {shen tong}. And they think that's what emptiness means. It's not. Dharmakirti spent a lot of time on it describing how it plays a part in perceiving things. It is not the emptiness of an object, okay. Because, if it were, you would have a direct perception of emptiness every time you perceived anything. And that's too easy. Okay. [Laughs] All right. Okay.

Last kind of {chi}. So, if your homework said, give an example of a {dun chi}, you might say, the opposite of all that a, that a pen is not as I imagine it while I perceive something. And, that which I mistake as the real pen, as a real pen, you know. I mistake it to be a real pen. Is there a self-existent, existing from its own side, inherent, having its own nature, real pen out there? No, because it's a chewable object, and you know that. It's not a pen. Right? To a dog, it's a chewable object. That proves it doesn't have its own nature. Okay. Period. By the way, I'll give you a clue in the reading, take note, okay. There'll be a place in the reading where they'll say, like, {dun chis} are false because everything is {dak me}, okay. I mean, this is, you're mental image of a pen, is not the real pen, because everything has its own emptiness. Like, if I come up to you and say, I have a reason, okay, so proving anything, because every object in the world has its own emptiness, Jay Siller, you can say, I agree with your reason. I don't know what you're trying to prove yet but your reason is true. I don't, I will not say to you {tak ma drup}, okay. {Tak ma drup} means, your reason is bad. And you're gonna learn that tonight. There's two debating terms you're gonna learn tonight. Somebody gives you a reason; by the way, it doesn't have to be to prove anything yet; because all things lack any nature of their own. You can say, okay, I do not say {tak ma drup}. I don't know what you're trying to prove but your reason's not bad. Your reason is true, okay. I don't know what you're trying to prove yet but the reason is, so far, good. Okay. So, you won't say, {tak ma drup}. You'll see that in the reading tonight. Don't get confused. They'll try to prove something and the last thing'll say, because nothing has it's own nature. And you can say, okay. Which is to say, everything exists that exists, you know.

My head is my head. I like Cheerio's, okay. I mean, any general truth, okay. All right. Last kind of {chi}. By the way, not to be confused with the Chinese chi, which means, inner wind or something like that. I don't know, okay. I've had students tell me, well which one is that, you know [laughs], okay. Okay. [Laughs] It happens. [Student: Say that in Tibetan.] {Lung}, high-tone {lung}, {lung}, okay. [Student: What is the second?] Is the {dun chi}, [student: {dun chi}] {dun chi}[Student: In English?]. Oh, you can say, mental image. Yeah, mental image.

Very close to the quality but not a real quality is it? Or, is it? You know, what's the difference between car-ness, quote "car," and the mental image you form when you perceive a car? Okay. Explore that question and it will take you very close to seeing emptiness, okay. What's the difference between car-ness or "car" with quotation marks around it, and the {dun chi} that you get when you perceive a car? Okay. It was a huge question in India. What is it in the human mind that allows you to look at four hooves, a big bump, and some horns and say, mahe? This is an Indian ox. You know, what is it in your mind that allows you to understand that the thing is an ox? What is it in your mind that allows you to organise those parts into a thing and think, 'mahe'? I mean, this is a huge question in the Pramananvartikka, okay. The answer, of course, is your past karma's forcing you to organise it that way, okay. Which makes tantric enlightenment possible in this life, okay. But, you gotta keep your book, okay. Okay. Say, {tsok chi} [repeat], {tsok chi}[repeat]. This is easy. A physical collection of parts is called a {tsok chi}. {Tsok} means, a group, a conglomerate, a bunch of stuff, okay. And then, {chi} means, a, a general object in the sense of having its own members, in the sense of having its own parts, you see. There is a use in English of 'members' that way, right? It's a collection of its members, meaning, of its parts. You see what I mean? You could, for example say, a water pitcher, right, is a collection of a handle, a spout, a base and a belly of the pitcher, okay. And that's a {tsok chi}, okay. In, in Abhidharma philosophy, which you'll see in your reading, they use the example of all things are composed of molecules. And all molecules are composed of the eight, of the eight, they're called the 'eight components', okay: four qualities of earth, fire, wind and water and then something to do with the object of the senses of your eye, your nose, your tongue and your body. And they leave out the object of the sense of sound because it's so fleeting and there's a long debate about it. Anyway, you know, in ancient Abhidharma atomic theory, all physical objects are made up of particles, which include eight different qualities. And so, that would be its {tsok chi}-ness, you see. 4832The fact, that it's a gross physical object, composed of molecules. It's a physical collection of parts, okay. Like, any particular car. And I didn't say, "car", okay. And, big difference, okay. This is a lousy {chi}. This is the {chi} you

could kick out right away. This is gross, physical, collection of a bunch of parts. It's not any big {chi}. I don't, what he's trying to say when he says, nominally this is a {chi}, he's saying, come one this is not a real {chi}. {Chi} is, like, intellectual car-ness thing. It's not a particular car made up of its parts, you know, its wheels, steering wheel, the engine, okay. That's very gross. Seeing that or seeing how a car is a collection of its physical parts is not gonna get you that far to seeing dependent origination or, or emptiness, you know. Understanding how you perceive or conceptualise car-ness when you see a car or you think of a car, that process, could get you enlightened. It could make you see emptiness directly. It is the key to seeing emptiness. You must, you know, go home and meditate about this for about five years, okay. All right. [Laughs]. It's worth it. It'll happen, okay. That's all. Let's take a break. If anybody has a burning question come up to me during the break, okay. Take a ten-minute break and come back. [Cut]

Remember, in the unsophisticated version, it doesn't get you to see dependent origination quickly. {Jedrak} could mean member of a, member of a, of a general category, all right. In the more sophisticated way, that does get you to see dependent origination, which does get you to see emptiness, which does remove all your suffering, okay, is like something which is 'characteristic of', you see. And, we could give the example of, say, {ngupo} [repeat], {bumpa} [repeat], {ngupo} [repeat], {bumpo} [repeat]. {Ngupo} means, a working thing, right. It's a synonym for changing thing. Anything that does anything is, automatically, changing by doing something. Anything, which is changing, is, automatically, doing something, okay. And, one day, we're gonna have a great debate about whether emptiness does anything because it's unchanging, okay. Empty space, for example, which is one of the classic examples of an unchanging thing, inspires a perception of it, engenders a perception of it, functions to? No, you can't say that. You could debate it sometime, okay. I'm gonna give you three tests of whether a {bumpa} which means, water pitcher, right. People say, 'vase'; lousy translation. It wasn't the point. The point is you're in a village in ancient India. You're in this little clay hut. And the teacher is teaching this student emptiness and he says, "It's nnnn... water cup, get it?" And, and he's pointing to the water pitcher that's there in the room, okay. {Ngupo} meaning anything that works, anything that does anything, okay. I translate it as working thing, functional thing, okay. [Laughter] [Laughs] If we keep working we'll get Neil Young. {Ngupo} is {bumpa}, a {jedrak} of the {chi, ngupo}, okay. We have to explore that, all right. [Students] [Laughter] I don't know. So, 'working thing' being the quality and 'water pitcher' being the thing which is characteristic of that quality, okay. Being a working thing is the general quality. We have big demons tonight. [Laughter] [Music in the background.] That's a real demon, by the way.

Seriously. Something that would take your mind off of emptiness. Anyway, you get it. Water pitcher is characteristic of the quality called working thing. Thanks. [Laughter] [Laughs] Da-da [laughs] [laughter] Okay. Okay. Three, three tests, you know, three tests between a water pitcher and a working thing. I'm, I'm sorry; I said a very bad thing. I said, 'a working thing'. I'm very sorry. Three tests between a water pitcher and working thing. There's a big difference, okay. So, here we go. The three tests of whether something is a {jedrak} or not. By the way, there ain't any Buddhist Scripture, that doesn't have a direct impact on your enlight..., enlightenment, okay. There doesn't exist one. They're all really incredibly sexy and relevant to your enlightenment. You just have to get someone to explain it to you why, okay. But never think, I mean, logic, people don't study logic. People say, oh this is dumb, you know. This is boring. It is essential for your enlightenment. And all Scripture's like that. If you could come to see that all Scripture {ka} was directly relevant advice to your personal enlightenment, {dam}, we could call you a {kadampa}. And that's what the word means, you know. It's a person who gets it. Je Tsongkapa said, if you can get to this, what's it say, {.}. That's the line, you know. If you can get to the point where you can understand that the Buddha didn't say anything that didn't relate directly to your own enlightenment, you really got, you're really well along the path. And we can call you a {kadampa}, okay. That's the real meaning of {kadampa}, okay. Okay. First one: {kyu ngupo yin}. Say, {kyu}[repeat], {ngupo} [repeat], {yin} [repeat], {kyu} [repeat], {ngupo} [repeat], {yin} [repeat]. First test of whether a water pitcher is characteristic of the quality we know as working thing-ness if you want, okay, is, is a water pitcher a, here's the 'a'. English is different from Sanskrit and Tibetan. Is a water pitcher a working thing? First test. Now you can use 'a' all over the place. Is a water pitcher a working thing? First test. Is a Chevy a car? First test of whether it's a {jedrak} of that {chi}. By the way, I ask you, is there anything, which is a car, which is not a particular, of the set called 'cars'. Because, if there isn't, then, this is stupid. I'll say it again. This is hard to remember [laughs]. Is there anything, which is car, which is not a member of the set called car? How's that? Is there anything, which is a car, which is not, already, a member of the set of thing called car, of cars, cars? Because, if there is, this is unnecessary. I mean, if there isn't, well anyway. Yeah. How about motor vehicle? You see. It's not a {jedrak} of cars. And you gotta get used to that. If two sets are completely equal we don't call one characteristic of that quality. See, characteristic means, those things, which are typical of that, not, the whole set of things which are equal to that. Okay. Different thing. Car and motor vehicle are equivalent sets. They are not, like, one belongs under the other, okay. They're not set and subset, okay. So, this is not enough to define a {jedrak}, okay. What do we have to say on top of this? There are other stuff

that's also that thing but that's not the, a water pitcher, okay. If you want to prove that something is a member of a set, you have to say, well, one, it is what that set is, but two, there's other things in the set that are not it, okay. You gotta get used to that, okay. That's {jedrak}. {Jedrak} means, if you want, a particular thing, which is in that set. And, motor vehicle is not a particular thing, which is in the set called, 'car'. Why? It is that set. Okay. You gotta get used to that. Yeah. [Student: [Unclear]] Absolutely. Almost all, sorry? [Student] No. Car is not; car is equivalent to, motor vehicle. Or, you could say, the set of all cars is equivalent to the set of all, or not equivalent. By the way, in Tibetan Buddhist logic we define, we distinguish between, 'the same as' and 'equivalent to', okay. [Student: Would a motorcycle be a motor vehicle, but not a car?] Oh, I'm using it in the sense of car only, of car alone, okay. Sorry. Okay. I'm using the word motor vehicle, you could say; well give me another set of things. How about all working things and all changing things, okay? Two sets which are totally equivalent. I'm sorry, I meant motor vehicle in the sense of cars only. [Student: Automobile and car] Yeah, that's great; automobile and car. [Student: [Unclear] for the same set?] Absolutely. Yeah. When there are two different names for the same set, you cannot call one of them a {jedrak} of that {chi}. That's all, okay. Car and automobile are not {chi} and {jedrak}. They are two ways to name the {chi} if you're talking about Chevy's; the {jedrak} if you're talking about all functioning things. Got that, right? Okay. First requirement for a member of a set or something characteristic of a specific quality, is that it be that thing. A water pitcher is a working thing. Okay. Second requirement. {Kyu} in Tibetan normally means, 'you', okay. In Scripture it can mean, 'it'. So, those of you who are studying Tibetan, especially if you had Rinchen [unclear] colloquial class, in Scripture, in logic, {Kyu} can mean it. Okay. {Ngupo} means, 'working thing'. {Dang} means 'with' in the sense of sharing a relationship with, okay. {Dang} normally means, 'and' but here it means 'with' in the, in the, in the expression 'to share a relationship with', okay. And, the {drel} at the end means to share a relationship, to share a relationship. It's a verb here. Okay. It shares a relationship, {drel}, with {dang}, {ngupo} working thing, okay, {kyu} meaning, it. So, I'll go, Tibet, you know, English syntax, you know, English word order, it {kyu}, shares a relationship {drel}, with {dang}, {ngupo} working things, such that, it is {dak chik tu drel}. {Dak chik tu} and {dak chik tu} is a nasty idiom. People have abused this poor idiom. It's almost untranslatable, you know. They say, 'one self', 'one essence', 'one being', one, it doesn't mean anything in English. What it means, I translate it like this, and this is the only thing it means. And if you can find a better way to translate it, god bless you. It shares, get this, a pitcher shares a relationship with working thing, such that, to be a pitcher is, automatically, to be a working thing. And that's what {dak chik tu} means.

Okay. [Laughs] To be one is to, automatically, be the other. If you are a Chevy you are automatically a? [Student: Car.] And in Tibetan, that's {dak chik tu drel}. It's an idiom. It's very difficult to translate. You could say one being, one essence. To me, it doesn't give me the, it doesn't convey to me the meaning of it. The meaning is, to be one is to be the other, automatically, okay. To be a water pitcher is automatically to be a working thing, okay. To be one is to be the other and that's all. Yeah. [Student: It sound like it's reciprocal] She asked if it can be reciprocal. It can be.

[End side A]

[Side B]

It doesn't have to be. We have in Buddhist logic, the expression 'one-way' {dak chik} and 'two-way' {dak chik}, okay. What does that mean? Chevy's, to be a Chevy is to be a car, but to be a car is not to be a Chevy necessarily, okay. So, it can be reciprocal, as in the case of automobile and car. To be an automobile is to be a car and to be a car is to be an automobile. We call that, {pen dzik dak shik tu drel}, you know. Which is really called {ying shak nyam} if you want to get fancy in Tibetan Buddhist logic. Or, the relationship can be a one-way relationship only. Chevrolets are {dak chik tu drel} with working things. But, working things are not necessarily; to be a working thing it is not necessarily to be a car. I mean, to be a, yeah, Chevrolet is necessarily a car, but a car is not necessarily a Chevrolet. So, it can go both ways or it can go one way. And you put the thing being related to first and the thing relating to it second. Okay. So you're gonna get confused with that but if you study the translation you'll get it, okay. I object to the translation of one essence or one nature or something like that. It doesn't give me the feeling that the words to be one is to be the other, you know. That's, that's all. So, it's hard to see it in the Tibetan.

Yeah. [Student: [Unclear]] He asked, is, is, does working things have to be the only example here? Is it, is it the definitive example or is it just one example? It's just one example. You could use it about cars and Chevrolets. You could use it about anything. Okay. We were talking about; it's a very good question. What he's really asking is, is this the definition of a {jedrak} or is this the description of a {jedrak} in a particular relationship where we're talking about water pitchers and working things? The answer is the second. Okay. Some things in Buddhist logic you can only define by actually giving a case. And that's how they define {jedrak}, okay.

There isn't really a separate, you could make one up, but they choose in this text, the Dalai Lama's tutor, the last Dalai Lama's tutor, chooses in his text to use this example as the definition, okay. Okay, last quality, if I can find it. The last thing you have to be to be a good {jedrak}, to be characteristic of a certain quality, is {kyu mayin shing ngupo yang yinpay shi tunpa du ma drup}. Say, {kyu}[repeat],

{mayin}[repeat], {shing}[repeat], ngupo}[repeat], {yang}[repeat], {yinpay}[repeat], {shi tunpa}[repeat], {duma}[repeat], {drup}[repeat]. Okay. Tibetan word order is pretty much the opposite of English, unfortunately, okay. Number one. {Drup} means, there do exist, there exist. {Duma} those of you who are studying Tibetan, {du ma} will be your enemy for the next twenty years, okay. Why? Because, it looks like a locative particle followed by a negative, {du ma drup}. It's also the word for 'many' in Tibetan and it's a bitch. Okay. Like, you don't know if it's {duma} or {du ma drup}, okay. This one happens to be {duma}. In about one percent of the cases its {duma} and you will search through your dictionary for weeks and never find it, okay. So, beware of {duma}, okay. {Duma} means many, okay. There do exist, what do we have so far? There do exist many. Now, there is a very beautiful word called {shi tunpa}. Say, {shi tunpa}[repeat], {shi tunpa}[repeat]. I've seen it translated, you know, if you guys learn Tibetan well and start translating in normal English you're gonna put a lot of people out of business. I've seen it translated as 'common locus'. Sounds like some kind of bad grasshopper or something. [Laughter] But anyway, it just means one thing, which is both (a) and (b), okay. And learn to translate it that way, for god's sake. Okay. One thing, which is both blank and blank, and then you just fill in the blank, okay. And please translate it that way. Everybody can understand it. It won't be as mystical but it'll be more correct, okay. One thing, which is both blank and blank, okay. And that's how you should translate, how I suggest you translate {shi tunpa} if you want anyone to read your book past the third page. Okay. One thing, which is both, here's the first part, {kyu mayin}. This {shing} here means, and. And then, here's gonna be the second part; (b), (a) and (b), okay. What makes pitcher, a water pitcher, characteristic of the quality called working thing? The last requirement is that there should exist many other things which are both (a) and (b). What are the two things? You could guess if I gave you five minutes. We don't have enough time. It is both {kyu mayin}, {kyu mayin} means, it's not it, right. {kyu} means it, {mayin} means not. Not what? A water pitcher. Okay. What've we got so far? There must be many other objects which are both (a) not a water pitcher, but which are (b) nonetheless, still {ngupos}, still working things. And if you think about it that what makes, that's what makes something a member of a set, okay. There are many other things, which are both (a) not it, but still belong to that set. Big deal. That's all, okay. And that's all. That's the third requirement. [Student: Can you just repeat that whole sentence again?] Yeah, there should be, there should exist many other things, I'm sorry, I like to say multiple because sometimes there's not that many, okay. I prefer to say multiple. There should exist multiple other things which are (a) not it, meaning not a water pitcher in this case, but which are still (b) working things. All it means is, for Chevy to be a

kinda car; there should be many other cars, which are not Chevy's. That's all. Then you can say that Chevy is a member of the set car, called car if you don't want to see dependent origination quickly. Or, you can say, there are many other things, which are characteristic of the quality car-ness, which are not Chevy's. And there's a big difference in the level between those two statements, okay. All right. [Student: [Unclear]] I was afraid you'd ask me that. He wants me to say them again. One way to say it is, there's a lot of other cars that aren't Chevy's. And that's what makes Chevy's members of the set called, car. That's the normal way to say it.

It won't help you to see emptiness that quick. Think of it this way. There are many other objects which are characteristic of car-ness but which are not Chevy's. Think; learn to think of it that way. There's a big difference between those two levels. One is forcing you to think about mental images and forcing you to think about your reality and what you're doing all day long. According to the highest schools of Buddhism, every single perception you've ever had until the day you see emptiness directly, is mistaken. Every single perception. Sixty-five [snaps fingers] of them per finger snap throughout the length of your life's-s, okay, have been infected by the, by mistaking the mental image for the thing, okay. That's a lot. [Laughs] All right. And somehow that causes all of your suffering. Why? 'Cos it's hard to hate something when you realise that you're doing it. Okay. It's hard to get jealous and, and be attached to a person if you realise that whether or not you get to keep them is totally dependent on you. On, on your mind, you see. It doesn't depend on the other guy or the other girl or something like that. It's you, okay. Okay, last thing. Here's a nice question that you're gonna come across in the reading. And I wanna bring it up because you might miss it, okay. You might get to that part in the reading and, if you live that long through this reading, okay. The, the most famous logical statement ever given by Buddhists in ancient India was to non-Buddhists who claimed that the sound OM was {takpa}, okay. Was an unchanging, eternal thing? OM is the unchanging, eternal nature of the universe or something like that, you know. And then, the Buddha said, come on, it's a {mitakpa}. It's a great example for your life and your death. Sound itself is like tik, ti, ti, ti,....., you know. It's like coming into existence and being destroyed instant by milli, millisecond by millisecond. Forget it being eternal and unchanging. Come on. It's changed; it's changed, like, three hundred times by the time it gets from my mouth to your ear, you know. It's in constant change, okay. And, and that's a metaphor for your life. So, most famous statement in ancient India was, please repeat, {dra chuchen}[repeat] {mitak te}[repeat]{chepay chir}[repeat]. One more time, {dra chuchen}[repeat] {mitak te}[repeat] {chepay chir}[repeat].

Consider sounds, consider sounds.

They are changing things.

Why? Because, they've been made. They are made. They were made by somebody.

Anything that's made has to die. Anything that's born will, will fall apart. Anything you get in samsara you will lose, okay. I mean, that's what they're trying to make, that point, okay. Now, consider the fact that sounds are changing. Okay. Consider the fact that sounds are changing. Is that a {takpa} or a {mitakpa}? Cook it. I'll say it again. What about the fact that sounds always change? Is that {takpa} or {mitakpa}? Is it a changing thing or an unchanging thing? [Students: [Unclear] we got {takpa} and {mitakpa} [laughs][laughter]. It's, it's tempting to say it's {mitakpa} or changing, because it involves changing things, right? Sounds are changing so the whole thing must be changing, right? But listen more carefully. Is the fact that sounds change something that changes or not? No. It never changes. It is totally constant. Ergo, facts are unchanging things, you see. Facts are unchanging things. The fact that sounds are changing is truth itself. And truth doesn't change. In fact, the set of all things about which you can say, sound is changing, is exactly equal to the set 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 empty. Cool? I'll say it again [laughs], okay. The entire set of things, okay, that exist, about which you can say, they exist. This big, okay. And the entire set of things about which you can say, they have no nature of their own, they're only my projections, they're empty and the entire set of things about which you can say, it's true that sound changes, are exactly equivalent. They are the same set and you gotta get used to that. They never change. It's truth itself. Okay. So, I can prove something by saying, Jay Siller is sitting here because sound is a changing thing. You see. You gotta get used to it [laughs]. Or, how about this? Because sound is a changing thing, exists. Which is to say, because reality itself exists, which is to say, because I'm standing here, you know. You see what I mean? It's a truth. It is truth. You gotta get used to that. Cook it when you get home. [Student: [Unclear]] I'm just giving three examples, which happen in Scripture. The set of all things, which exist about, I'm sorry, the set of all things about which you can say, they exist. And, the set of all things about which you can say, they have no self-nature, they have no nature of their own. And the set of all things about which you can say, sounds change, are exactly the same. Okay. The set of all existing things about which you can say Michael [unclear] shakes are the best, is the same as, the set of all existing things about which you can say, they exist. Okay. Think about it. That's a trick question that's on your homework. Okay. Last thing. How many last things can there be? [Laughs] By the way, that's your, that's your, what we call your {dura} topic for tonight. I finished it, okay. {Chi jedrak} is finished. I'm

moving on to formal logic. You're actually getting three classes in one. You're so lucky, okay. This should go on for another hour and a half. We don't have time, so it's gonna go on for ten, nine minutes or so. Then, you get the third class in the last two minutes, all right. [Laughter] Okay. I'm gonna cram through you formal logic, okay. We studied already; we spoke already about the subject and the parts of the logical statement. We talked about the subject, the quality that we're trying to prove about the subject, and the reason. We talked about it last week. We already talked about it.

Let's take sounds. That's the subject.

They are changing things. That's what I'm trying to prove. To whom? To some ancient non-Buddhist who says that OM is permanent, you see; that Om is unchanging, okay. And then, what am I using for my proof: Because, they are made by somebody, sounds are made, okay.

So, first thing, subject: sounds. Quality I am trying to prove about them: they change. Reason I am giving to prove that assertion: because they are made. Assertion itself, combination of elements one and two. The subject plus, what? The quality I am trying to prove about it which is to say, sounds are changing. Sounds are changing things. That's my assertion. We had those all last week. This one is called {chuchen}, it's alias is { ...}. This one is called {drupje chu}. Number two is called {drupje chu}. Number three is called {tak}. Number one and number two together are called {drupja}, okay. You've had that much now. Now, here's a new one. Two words and then you're home free, okay. Say, {tun chok}[repeat] {tun chok}[repeat]. {Chok} means the whole side of something, in Sanskrit, pakshya. It means the whole side of something, okay. Like, very common in Tibetan Buddhism to say, the samsaric side of things and the enlightened side of things, okay. Like, these are pakshyas, these are called {chok}. The four directions are called {choks}, okay. In logic, {chok} means a group of objects, okay. A group. {Tun} means, to get along with somebody. To be in harmony or to be in, what do you call it? [Student: Concord] - Concord with somebody. I'm gonna translate it as 'group of similar cases'. In, in Buddhist logic it means similar cases. And this is called {tun chok}. Similar to what? I'll give you an example. What's that big debate that the non-Buddhists, I'm sorry, that the Buddhists gave to the non-Buddhists? {Dra chuchen}, okay. Let's talk about sounds. {Mitak te}, they are changing things. {chepay chir}, because they are things that are made. Okay. What's the quality we're trying to prove about sounds? That they are changing things, okay. What would be the whole group or set of things, which are similar to, things, which change? Oh, you, the pew you're sitting in, New York City, any changing object, you see. It's the whole set of things which fit that description of the quality you're trying to prove, okay. It's the whole set of stuff that fits the description of the quality you're trying to

prove. In this case, the quality you're trying to prove is? They are changing things. So, who is in the {tun chok}? What kinds of things are in the {tun chok}? Oh, pitchers, water pitchers, pillars, people, cows, cars, okay, mind, anger, jealousy, love. They're all changing, okay. They all belong to that set of similar cases, to that group of similar cases, okay. Why do you have to talk about this? Why do you have to keep getting more and more complicated? Can't we just have a simple syllogism, three things, you know? You're gonna learn, later on, that truth itself depends on whether three relationships hold in the syllogism. If three relationships exist there, you got truth and a good argument and a good reason. And, if three relationships are absent, if any one of them is absent, you got a bad argument and what you're saying is false, okay. You need this group of things to establish two of those relationships. And I'll talk about it later. That's why. I'm setting you up for next time, okay. That's why we're talking about the field of all things, which are similar to, the thing you're trying to prove. The quality, the quality you're trying to prove, okay. We gotta talk about his little brother, which is {mitun chok}, and then maybe you really can go home.

By the way, you would have debated all this by the time you were thirteen in the monastery. This is first subject you learn. Kinda cool. It means they, first they learn how to debate and then they start getting content of the debate. But they don't, not allowed to touch the content until they understand the format, okay. Say, {mitun chok}[repeat] {mitun chok}[repeat]. It's the opposite of {tun chok} so what would it be? It's that group of everything which is dissimilar, okay. You could say, all the dissimilar cases, okay. The group of dissimilar cases. And, if you think about it, three possibilities are here. There are three possibilities for all the stuff in the world that is not like a changing thing, okay. What? Well, how about {mepa}? That's all you needed on Thursday night was, like, three hours of logic class, right? After working all day. Oh, well. Say, {mepa}[repeat] {mepa}[repeat]. {Mepa} means, things that don't exist anyway. Okay. Horns on the head of a rabbit are the classical example in Scripture. Or, what they mistranslate, the poor word got abused again, as sky-flower, meaning a plant that could grow in mid-air. Okay. Like a gardenia that could just sprout and put its roots out in, in mid-air, with no water, no dirt, no sunlight. Just boom, okay. That's what they mean when they say sky-flower. It's a mistranslation. {Nam ka} means, empty space; in mid-air. Okay. A flower that just sprouts in mid-air, okay. That would be an example of something that does not fit in the group of similar cases. Because why? It doesn't exist anyway. How can it be similar or dis-, you know. Okay, number two. Say, {shenpa}[repeat]. By the way, in each case you would say {mitun chok} after that. You'd say, {mepa mitun chok}, {shenpa mitun chok} and then {gelwa mitun chok}. I mean, if you were

debating, okay. But I don't want to overload you, more than I did about an hour ago, okay. {Mepa} means doesn't exist. {Shenpa} means, something other, okay, something other. And it's a deceiving name because what it really means is something too big, like, all existing things. You see? Like, it's something too big. It's just 'other' in the sense of being too, too massive to fit in the field of similar cases. All existing things; you can't say it belongs in the family of changing things. It's too fat to fit into that little car, okay. All existing objects is too big to fit in the little Volkswagen called, all changing things. You could not call it a member of all the group of similar cases. I mean it's like, it has changing things in it, but it's just too big. It goes beyond the field of similar cases. It goes beyond the group of similar cases. It's too broad to be restricted into what we call changing things. And so, we call it, belonging to the group of dissimilar cases by virtue of being something else meaning too big. It's too big, okay. What? All existing things. That big fat guy called, all existing things, is too wide to fit in that little thing called, all changing objects. So, we call it, oh, here's another kind of field, it's another member of the group of dissimilar cases, okay. Third one is easier. By the way, these are all important for establishing whether a statement is true or not. Especially, the five classical proofs for emptiness, okay. So you have to understand these points, okay. Say, {gelwa}[repeat], {gelwa mitun chok}[repeat], {gelwa}[repeat] {mitun chok}[repeat], okay. {Gelwa} means, directly opposite, directly contradictory. What would be the {gelwa mitun chok} for changing things? - The family of all unchanging things. 8835 That's a direct opposite, a direct contradiction. That's a group of dissimilar cases by virtue of being totally opposite of what we're talking about. You could also have a group of dissimilar cases by virtue of not even existing. You could also have a group of dissimilar cases by virtue of being too fat to fit in the family. Okay. And that's all the dissimilar cases there can be. That's your formal logic for tonight.

Now, we'll do some fun. Two minutes of debating. I only want to teach you, tonight, yeah [John Stillwell: Can I ask one question?] Yeah [John Stillwell: About {chi jedrak?}] Yeah [John Stillwell: You said to study emptiness you have to meditate on {chi jedrak} and you gave the example of quality and characteristic. Can you give a specific example of how you would [unclear] quality and characteristic specifically in a specific way and hows that mean to [unclear] towards that process.]? John asked, basically, what he's asking is, if {chi jedrak} is, is like the immediate trigger that would help you see emptiness, how can we turn it into a practical meditation, you know? If my homework, for example, said, 'fifteen minutes per day analytical meditation trying to detect how you yourself tend to take your mental image of an object as being the object itself'. Okay. That that would be my answer. Okay. It means, take something close to you. I mean, for me, I mean, take a, like, a pot of water if you have to make tea

all day, you know; something that you're around all the time, some kind of common object. And try to catch yourself, when you look at it, fixating on an object, which is too perfect. Come on. You never see the back of the pot. How do you know there's a back of the pot? I mean, technically, legally, logically speaking, you don't know if there's a back on that pot. You don't know there's just a big empty space behind the pot that you can't see, but your mind fills it in. And that's another indication of the truth that you are watching a mental image. It's too good. Okay. You can also do it this way. Face it; you can never see the whole pot. What you think you're doing is totally impossible even if you sit here and think about it logically. You can't see a whole pot without focussing on the left side and then moving your eyes to the right side. Right? But then, you're not looking at a whole pot anymore. And if you don't look at the left side and the right side, you can't see a pot either. And come on, you can't see the whole thing at once. That's why your eye is always going like this, you know. Your eye is, like, picking up clues and then the mind is turning it into a perfect {dun chi}, a perfect image. And you think you're watching Michael Roach. You're not, okay. You're seeing my right hand, my left hand, the right side of my head, the left side of my head. And that's all you're seeing. You're seeing indications. And then, your mind is gluing them in together and saying, there's a guy standing up there, a whole guy. Come on, it's impossible. You can't be seeing the whole thing at once. You don't know where my foot is by the time you see my head. Okay. You can't see the whole Michael Roach but you think you are. Something's fishy, okay. [Laughs] And I'm not kidding, okay. I'm really not kidding. You can meditate on it like that. [John Stillwell: So how do you relate that to quality and characteristic what you just said just how you fit those words in.]

Think about Michael Roach-ness, the mental image of Michael Roach and the parts, the data you receive through your eyes of Michael Roach. And try to compare those three things. Try and see if you can find a difference between them. [John Stillwell: Probably characteristic or [unclear]] I don't know. You have to figure it out. Okay. You have to figure it out, really. Okay. Okay, last thing. I'm gonna give a classical debate thing and you just learn. Debate is beautiful because it works like a computer program. It's just on-off switch. Yes-no, yes-no, yes-no. All you have to answer is yes or no, okay. If I frame the questions perfectly, then if you're the person sitting down, right. The attacker stands up and there's another person sitting down, all you have to do is sit there like cool as a cucumber and say, right, no, right, no, right. Once in a while, you're allowed to clarify the question. Do you mean, vase as a concept or as an actual vase? Do you mean a vase or "vase", quote. You see, you can ask that. You're allowed to ask a question. You're also allowed to stall by saying, {uh}

[laughter], meaning, I... I can't hear you; there's all these guys yelling here. [Laughter] And, and in the meantime, you're thinking furiously, you know, like, you know, like you say {uh, uh, la, la} means, I didn't catch it, you know. And in the meantime you're thinking of your answer, you know. Like, you're stalling for the few milliseconds that you need, you know. So anyway, normally, you just say yes or no. And I'm gonna teach you the two answers. Tonight we will only do two answers, okay. These are the two allowed answers to a statement. By the way, there's only a total of four, so you're not, you don't have any problem. We'll do two tonight and two next week. {Chir} is because in Tibetan. Like, you'd say, {dra chuchen}. Say, {dra chuchen}[repeat] {dra chuchen}[repeat]. {Chuchen} means, let's take this for example, right, remember. Let's consider this example. You're stating the subject. {Dra} means, sounds; sounds, things you hear, okay. {Dra chuchen}[Repeat], {dra chuchen}[repeat], okay. {Dra chuchen} means, let's talk about sounds. Okay. So first you make sure the guy knows what you're talking about. Then, you're gonna give the {drupje chu}, what you want him to learn about it that he does not accept yet. {Mitakpa yin te}, okay. I'm sorry, let's do a short way. {Mitak te}, learn {mitak te}[repeat] {mitak te}[repeat], they are {mitakpa}, okay. This is something he does not accept yet. It's the quality you're trying to prove. They are changing things, okay. Now we'll do the whole assertion, right. {Dra chuchen}[Repeat], {mitak te}[repeat], okay. That's all. But there is a colon, okay. Why? Because I'm about to tell you why. That's a colon {te}, okay. Say, {dra chuchen}[repeat] {mitak te}[repeat], okay. And then you're gonna give him a {ba, ba, ba, ba, chir}. And the {chir} in Tibetan is, 'because'. Unfortunately, it comes at the end in Tibetan. You say, it's a made thing because. Okay. All right. In Tibetan, you say the because at the end. It's a made thing because, okay. How do you say it in Tibetan? {chepay chir}[Repeat], {chepay chir}[repeat], {chepay chir}[repeat]. And you go like - Okay. {Chepay chir}, okay. Because it's made, stupid head. Okay. Because it's made, okay. One more time. {Dra chuchen}[Repeat], {mitakte}[repeat], {chepay chir}[repeat], 'cos it's made, okay. And that's supposed to, like, all the non-Buddhists go, Oh I get it, okay. [Laughs] Okay.

Take sounds.

They are changing things:

Because they are made.

You now have two options to respond to me. And I wanna, all I want to teach you, the two options, okay. When you hear {chir}, you know you got two options, okay. Assuming what he said is wrong, okay. Two ways to object to what he said. I know it's a lot to digest in one night and maybe it's not wise to give you so much but we all might die in six months or something. You might as well cram, so bust ass and don't be wimpy, okay. It's a lot. You can do it in

two years or you can do it in one course. We'll try and do it in one course, okay. Who knows where we'll be six months from now, you know, okay. So try, try to be, you know, patient and don't, don't worry, don't think, oh, I'm not gonna get home on time. Forget it. You wanna get enlightened you're gonna have to work a little bit, okay.

Say, {tak ma drup}[repeat]. It has to be, like, with feeling, you know. [Laughter] What the hell are you talking about, okay? {Tak ma drup}[Repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. Sometimes, if you're really disgusted you say, {tak}, okay. Say, {tak}[repeat], {tak}[repeat]. {Tak} means, {tak ma drup} but I'm so disgusted I don't even want to say the whole answer to you. [Laughter] [Laughs] Who could ever believe it? {Tak ma drup} means, your reason is incorrect. {Tak} means reason; {ma drup} means, literally, doesn't exist or is incorrect, okay. Your reason is incorrect.

That's answer number one. Answer number two: say, {kyappa}[repeat] {ma jung}[repeat], {kyappa}[repeat] {ma jung}[repeat]. {Kyappa} means, for two things to be necessarily so. Literally, it means 'to cover', okay. {Ma jung} means, it isn't necessarily so. And I'll give you an example. You ready? Here's some real debates. Got to think of one. The sky {chuchen}, okay. We're talking about a normal midday sky without clouds, okay. Sky {chuchen}. Consider the sky. {..te} it has a color. Why? Because it's blue, okay. Because it's blue. It has a blue color, okay. I'll repeat the statement. Consider the midday sky without clouds in a normal part of the world, this world, etcetera, okay. It has a color: because it has a blue color, okay. And, if you agree with the statement, if the guy by the way, if the guy's stupid enough to say something which is true to start a fight, to pick a fight, all you do is sit there and repeat the verb. It does, okay. [Laughter] And then he's just, like, okay [laughs]. Like, if you say {yinpai chir}, you would say {yin}. He says, {yinpai chir}, you'd say, {yu}; {drupai chir} you say, {drup}; just repeat the verb. That's the easy one, okay. Answer number three which is, yes, just repeat his or her verb. It does, it doesn't, it will, it won't. Okay. {Yin, yu, mayin, me} okay. And that is to say 'yes', I agree, okay. Typical example.

Consider the sky, a normal sky, okay, blah, blah, blah.

It has a color:

Because it has a blue color.

And you would say, it has. Okay. {Yu, mayu}. Now, what if I say,

Consider the sky.

It has a color:

Because it's green with pink polka dots.

Okay. Then what would you say? {Tak ma drup}. Okay. Say, {tak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. The thing you gave as a reason does not properly apply to the thing you gave as a subject. Pink polka dots in a green

background does not correctly describe the sky. {Tak ma drup}, okay. {Tak ma drup}, okay. That's when you use a {tak ma drup}. When his third part of his statement is wrong, say, {tak ma drup}. The whole thing sounds right, repeat his verb. But, what if he says,

Consider the sky.

It's an existing thing:

Because it's blue.

Consider the sky. It's an existing thing: because it's blue. Then you have to say, not necessarily. It's not necessarily true. There's lots of blue things, wait a minute, I screwed it, sorry. [Laughs] [Laughter] That's not, I gave a bad one. Sorry. Scratch that example.

Consider the sky.

It's green:

Because it has a color.

Okay. How about that one. Sorry, okay. Consider the sky. It's green: because it has a color. Okay. Is it true that the sky has a color? So you cannot say, {tak ma drup}. You see, you can't say, your reason doesn't apply to what you're talking about, okay. You can't say that it has a color doesn't apply to the sky. So, you have to say, {kyappa ma jung}. Say, {kyappa ma jung}[repeat]. Hey, just because it has a color doesn't mean it's green. Okay. Not necessarily so. And that's all, okay. And those are the three possible answers really. Two of them mean no, one of them means yes. I'll give you the examples again. Consider the sky. It has a color: because it's blue. And you just say, it does, it is, okay. What was the second one? Consider the sky. It has a color: because it's green. Ah, {tak ma drup}. Sky's not green, okay. It's green, doesn't apply to the sky, with pink polka dots, okay. The what's the third one? Consider the sky. It's green: because it has a color. Okay. You can't say {tak ma drup} because it does have a color. So you have to say, but it doesn't necessarily follow that if something has a color it's necessarily green, okay. And that's the {kyappa ma jung}. Say, {kyappa}[repeat] {ma jung}[repeat]. Okay, got the three examples? That's all. So [laughter] let's check. The sky has a color, because it's red with yellow stripes. Give me the right Tibetan answer. [Students: Kyappa ma jung] Please {tsa} [laughs][laughter]. By the way, {tsa} means, you know, {ngo tsa} means, you should be ashamed of yourself. [Laughter] Okay. The sky, what'd I say? Take the sky, what? It has a color, because it's green, it's red with yellow stripes. Then you say? [Students]{tak ma drup}, okay. Be, have some, I almost used a bad word, you gotta be strong on the {tak ma drup, tak ma drup} Say, {tak ma drup}[repeat] and you kinda stretch out the {tak} and do not say {thak}, okay. First column, {tak}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. It's not true that the sky is yellow, red with yellow stripes, okay. Your reason is

bad. The thing you said in your reason does not apply to the sky, {tak ma drup}, okay.

Consider the sky. It's a pretty pastel lavender in the middle of the day, because it has a color. [Students: Kyappa ma jung.] {Kyappa ma jung}, you say, {kyappa ma jung}[repeat]. Come on, {kyappa ma jung}[repeat], {kyappa ma jung}[repeat]. Come on, it's not necessarily so. Okay, it has a color, doesn't mean it has to be a pink lavender, you know, okay. {Kyappa ma jung}. Those are the three possible answers and you can live on those for years in the debate ground, okay. You just say, {tak ma drup, kyappa ma jung, yin, yin, yin, yin.}. I mean, that's a typical response. You can spend hours in a {yin, yu, tak ma drup, kyappa ma jung, yin, yu}, okay. And like that, just like that. It's going like boom, boom, boom, okay. So just learn those two answers, okay. {Tak ma drup}, say, {tak ma drup}[repeat]; {kyappa ma jung}[repeat]; and, if you're disgusted, {kyappaaa ma jung}[laughs][laughter], {kyappa ma jung}, okay. And then if you agree, just say, repeat the guy's verb {yin} and 'is', okay, like that. I don't want you to get distracted from the main thing. Go home, think about {chis} and {jedraks}, okay. It's the best thing I can tell you. We'll do a short prayer. I'm sorry to keep you late.

[Prayer: short mandala]

[Prayer: dedication]

The Asian Classics Institute
Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning
Class Four: Cause and Effect
Geshe Michael Roach

Transcribed by Angie Overy

.... is through a word and a term; a name and a term. And that's the only existence that things have. And then, the textbooks say, the difference between 'name' and 'term' here is thought and term, you know. The name for a thing as you hear it in your mind or as you apply it and the mental image you have of a thing, {dun chi}. So, you might wanna explore it like that, you know. What's the relationship between the term quality and quality-ness and 'a quality' and 'the quality'? So, there's four different things you have to worry about, okay. Quality-ness, quote "quality", as a term, or mainly meaning a mental image of something, and then, the quality and a quality. And you have to work with that, you know. You have to decide. There's a reason to use quotation marks, because quote "car" is different from car. [students] Yeah. [student] Yeah. Yeah, a general characteristic of something. Something like that. A general nature of something. How's that? But you have to, you have to struggle with that. There's a difference between car and a car and the car. [student] Yeah [student] Yeah [student] You could say that. You could say that. I don't, I think we'd better, come in the break and ask these things 'cos otherwise you, you'll be here very late, and you'll be chasing us out, okay.

One thing I want to say about the class in general. I had a lot of comments on the reading this time and people had a hard time with it. So, I wanna make a couple of comments about the reading. One is I'm trying to translate the whole text, just because if I translate half and then I never translate the whole thing, I'll never have time to do it. Never, ever. So I just thought that while I'm got it in my hands I might as well do the whole thing. I don't mean that you should digest the entire logic text, you know, in this class. It's impossible. So don't get frustrated trying, you know what I mean. You should read the reading, I suggest you take it {kachik} by {kachik}. {kachik} means, one argument, you know. When it says, {kachikma; kachik na re} or {khong na re} at the beginning, in the Tibetan, it means, somebody comes and makes the following claims, usually. Somebody comes and says {kachik} means, one mouth, you know. One person comes and says that. So, take it {kachik} by {kachik}. We call each vignette or each section there a {kachikma}. And do one {kachikma}. It's like a

koan, you know. And, and think about it. Don't try to read that book. I mean, don't try to read that reading, you'll go crazy, you know. [laughter] I mean, nobody does that. I forgot to tell you that, right? [laughter] [laughs] Yeah, nobody does that. They are koans. They are things to be thought about for hours, you know. You cannot rush this reading. Forget it. This is not one that you can fake, you know. You can do the homework. The homework is meant to be fakeable, you know. [laughter] That's something you can just fill in whatever I wrote on the board and you'll probably be okay. But, to really understand this subject, you have to devote many hours to it. And you can't get out of it, you know. And I can't tell you, don't spend hours on it, 'cos you have to, you know. I can't give you some kind of a special exception or something. You must devote time to it. If you want to understand this subject you gonna have to sit there and, and do each {kachikma} until you understand it. And I suggest you do one and then digest that one first, and then, when you get it, go on to the next one. If there's one that's totally impossible for you then skip it and go on to the next one, you know. But don't try to sit there and read it like a novel because you'll never get it. And it's, and you'll just frustrate yourself. I don't mean you to get, the thing that you must know is what I present in the class. The thing that you should come out of this course understanding is what I present in the class. You can spend five or six more years understanding. We spend about, the whole subject in the monastery, takes about eight years or something, you know. The two subjects that you are getting, formal logic and {dura}, takes like, eight years. We debate it for three solid months every year. And in the winter debates, for one month a year, we debate it maybe twelve or fourteen hours a day, maybe more. Sometimes, all night. So, you know, we've memorized all that stuff, over and over, many times. And, and, you know, you can't just sit down and read it. You have to take it bit by bit. Yeah. [student] Yeah. I mean, I like them [student] Yeah. Yeah. We can do that. We can do that. I mean, just you see, they're called {rikpay drotang}

Say, {rikpay}[repeat] {drotang}[repeat]; {drotang} is a special expression in logic that means the format of an argument, you know. Like, how does it go. {tang} means the way, like, {gyup tang} means how a horse trots, you know. Do they trot like that or do they trot like that. {tang} means how you do something and {dro, drotang} means how it goes, you know. How, where do you answer 'yes', where do you answer 'no', when are you supposed to say 'no, I don't get it, or 'not necessarily.' And that's called {rikpay drotang} and once you understand one {kachikma} well, the {drotang} is the same for all of them, you know. Once you understand the possible answers, the flowchart, for one small argument, then the rest is all the same. So we can try to do that if we have extra time. That's like the {lingka} that the student, the teacher promises students, you

know. {lingka} means, {Norbulingka} means, 'Jewel Park', right. The Dalai Lama's summer palace in Lhasa. {lingka} means, to go on a camping trip or picnic; an outing, right. In Tibet, they would go for, like, five days. They still do it in India and, you know, eat for five days and sleep in a tent out near a river, or something. Like, my class will go every once in a while. So, there's this famous story of a teacher who... the students kept asking the teacher can we go for a {lingka}, you know. And he said, Yeah, when all the work's done we'll go for a {lingka}, you know, and [laughs]. And then, week after week, month after month, year after year, they were studying and they never had time to go anywhere. And then, finally, one day they were having a class and outside, a funeral goes by and the body's being carried by. And one of the students said, look, somebody's finally going for their {lingka} you know [laughter] [laughs]. Meaning we won't get a {lingka}. Probably we won't get to that. I don't know. We'll see. But we'll do... we'll do, so don't, don't take the reading personally, okay. I had all these people leaving notes on my bed and stuff, you know [laughs], you know. So, it's... it's just the, the quantity because I want to finish it 'cos I may never have another chance to touch it, you know. The... the content will take years. But don't give up, you know. I mean, don't go home and just put it up and say, oh, he said I didn't have to read it this time. It's not like that. Like, go to the {rangruk}, go to the middle where our system starts and read that for sure. That's what we do in the monastery. We sneak to the middle and find out what we're supposed to believe and then we go back, and you know. You're not supposed to do it that way, but everybody does [laughs], you know. Go in the middle, look at the, you know, the presentation of our system and then, go back to the beginning and hear all the arguments. It might be easier for you. But at least do the {rangruk} you know. At least do the middle of the reading, okay. Ellie's gonna... can you go and pick up the reading today, during the break? [laughs] Can you go with her? Okay. It's a little bit big this time. They couldn't copy it in time. All right.

Tonight's special subject, and don't give up on logic, okay. I mean, you're doing pretty good. I expected it to be about half this many people. It's all the necessary stuff, ammunition you need, to, to study emptiness. You need to know all this stuff, okay, to study emptiness properly. So, so stick in there. {gyun dre}. Tonight's subject is {gyun dre}.

Say, {gyun dre} [repeat], {gyun dre}[repeat]. In English we say, 'cause and effect'; {gyu} means, cause, {dre} means, result or effect. I call it, 'causes and results', okay. Because we can never remember how to spell 'affect' or 'effect' [laughter] or, so, 'results', you can remember, right? Causes and Results, all right. And there are two presentations in the {dura} on causes and results. We are studying the easier one, okay. There's two of them. I'm not even gonna

go to the other one, okay. This one is sixty pages long or something, okay. That's enough. The shorter one, okay, and it's called {gyun dre}. They start out by discussing the definition of a ... of a {gyu}, of a cause. And that's here. By the way, the second part is the same, okay {gyuy tsennyi}. Okay.

Say, {kye je}[repeat], {gyuy tsennyi}[repeat], {kye je}[repeat], {gyuy tsennyi}[repeat]. {kye}with the {da} suffix letter means, to bring something else about, okay. To cause something else to happen, okay. {kye je} means anything which brings something else about. Anything which brings about something else, okay. Anything, which causes something else to occur, is the definition of a cause. Okay. Anything, which brings about another thing, is the definition of a cause. It's popular to translate this as 'generate'. And then they say, generate love or generate compassion. I searched the New York Times for the last thirty years. It's never been used that way, you know. You say, develop an emotion. Develop. But you don't say, generate, in the sense, in ... in the case of an emotion. You generate electricity or you generate other things but, it means, anything which brings another thing about, okay, is the definition of a cause. And these three words, which is {drebu} and {ngupo} and {gyu}, are {dun chik}.

Say, {drebu}[repeat], means what? Result. Okay. I mean, that's the {dre} in gyun dre} . By the way, in Tibetan, it also means rice or fruit, because the big fruit or the big result, in Asia, is rice. That's the one you're hoping for every year. So, the word for rice is {dre}. The word for fruit, like a fruit tree fruit, is {drebu}. And the word for result or effect is {dre bu}, okay. Say, {ngupo}[repeat]. You know {ngupo}. It's anything that does anything; anything that performs a function. I translate it as a 'working thing', and you've had that already, okay, {ngupo}. {gyu} you had tonight and it means, cause. All three of these words are {dun chik}. {dun chik}means, same thing, means the same thing. They are synonyms. They all refer to the same thing, okay. The text is very adamant on that, okay. Anything that does anything is, automatically, a cause. Anything that's a cause is, automatically, a result. Period. Okay. {dun chik} means, they all refer to the same thing, okay. Then people, you'll see the {kachikmas}, they go crazy trying to find something that might be a {drebu} but not a {gyu}. For example, say {ma me ...}[repeat]. {...} means the last instant of something. {ma me} those of you who coming to Friday night, same as {drun me}. It means a butter lamp; the flame of a butter lamp. So, the, the debater, you know, the other guy is saying, {ma me ... chuchen}, you know. Think about a butter lamp at the last moment of its thing. { dre gyu yinpa ta}, are you telling me it's a cause? And then we say, {chi chir}. And he says, {drebay yin pechir}, because it's a result. And you said, result, cause, working thing, all mean the same thing essentially. You said anything that's one is the other. Okay. So, how we gonna answer? Is it a {drebu}? Is it a result? Yeah. It came from the butter lamp of the

moment before, the flame of the moment before. Is it a {gyu}? Is it a cause? Don't forget, this is the last instance of its existence. Huh? Cause for what? That's a little tricky [laughs]. So you have to bring a light in to have darkness, right. Well you, you know, I was thinking about that. You could say it causes your perception of it, okay. We say it's a {kye je} for, it does inspire a sense perception in the next moment. So, actually, the light is already gone out but you're not aware of the lamp light, flame, until the millisecond later according to Buddhist psychology, you know. It takes a millisecond for your eye to record and give the sense data to the eye-consciousness that there is something here. And it helps to create the visual consciousness. So, in the second after it's already gone out, one of the effects is that you're aware of the light. And you're, you're always a moment behind. In Abhidharma psychology, you're always a millisecond behind reality. It's like, the light of some of the stars has already ended, right. I mean, those stars have already gone out of existence, but the, light-years later, the light is only just reaching Earth. We may be looking at stars that don't exist right now but the light took that long to get to us. And it's the same principle. So, you can say it's a cause for the visual consciousness of the next moment, okay. So, it is a cause and a result. And then they say, well what about the last moment of an Arhat, you know. This is a Hinayana school, right. They believe that just after you achieve Arhat or to be an Arhat means that {demrik gyun chepa}. {demrik gyun chepa}, means your mind and your body stop and there's nothing more after that. There's nothing else after that. That's a Hinayana version of Nirvana. It's that you just stop. Your mind stops and your body stops. So then they say, what about that, you know. That's a result but it's not a cause for a person anymore. And then, there's big arguments like that. By the way, Mahayana says, well what, what, what, what Arhat are you talking about please? [laughs][laughter] You know, who achieved Arhat? Who achieved Nirvana, 'cos there's nobody there anymore to be an Arhat. So, how can they be an Arhat, you know what I mean? And they, we don't accept that interpretation. We say Arhat means what? You've finished your negative emotions permanently, okay. That's all. { }Nirvana is, is the condition of ending all your mental afflictions permanently. And, you could have achieved it this morning and you would probably look the same to us, okay. We don't say that you have to go out of existence to get to be an Arhat, okay, or to reach Nirvana. So, this is very tricky and you have to think about it, okay: that everything in the world, which is a cause, is also a result. Anything, which is a result, is also a cause. And, anything, which does anything, is a cause. Anything, which does anything, is necessarily a result. Okay. And you have to think about it. Okay. That's one of the greatest lessons of the study of {gyun dre}, okay. And you have to think about it.

Next we'll do the divisions of causes. Say, {ngu gyu}[repeat], {gyu gyu}[repeat]. Okay. {ngu} means, direct; {gyu} means, cause. {gyu} means, indirect and {gyu} means, cause. Okay. If your pronunciation of Tibetan is correct this {da} drops out and the sound gets shorter. Listen to the difference. This one is {gyu}. This one is {gyu}. {gyu, gyu}. Say, {gyu}[repeat], {gyu}[repeat]. Okay, that's all, different sound only. This is the same {ngu} as in {ngupo} and don't get confused. It does not mean working thing or anything like that. It means, direct, okay. {ngu gyu} means, direct cause. This, by the way, is the {gyu}in, this is the Tibetan word for lineage. Okay. So, if you, if you want to know, it's useful to know. The Tibetan word for tantra is {gyu} without the {va}, okay. Meaning, a sacred thread. And that's another story, all right. [laughs] So these are the, one way to divide causes. You can divide causes two different ways. I'm giving you the first way; {ngu ngyu}and {gyu gyu} Let's take an example of a {ngu gyu}, okay. Say, {pen}[repeat]{gyi}[repeat]{ngalok su}[repeat]{jungwa}[repeat]. I wanna teach you a little bit about how Tibetans corrupt English, okay. It's called {sorshak}. {sorshak} means, busted-up English, all right. And {pen}, {pen} is one of them, okay. [laughs] All right. This is a {pen}, all right, {pen}. And you gotta learn to spell corrupted English right. Like, I was reading the, this Tibetan newspaper with Rinpoche one day. And, it was all about the {wetkin} and the {wob}. And I said, what's {wetkin }and {wob}, you know. He said, that's the pope and the Vatican, you know. [laughs][laughter]. {wetkin, wob, wetkin pob}, you know. So, normally, they only hear our aspirated row, right: {pha, cha, tha} as {pa, ja, ta}. That's why Tibetans or anyone from South Asia talks like, I like a cup of tea and hand me the pen, because, they don't, they don't aspirate anything, okay. And that's, we can't aspirate. So, to them, we sound worse, you know, 'cos what we're saying, like {kawa}, we say, {khawa}. {kawa} is a pillar; {khawa} means snow, {kaba} means where, {ga} means a saddle, okay. And to us, to them, our pronunciation is much worse than that, okay. But you have to get a little bit, if you're gonna read modern Tibetan stuff, newspapers. I said, I saw a statistic that sixty percent of Tibetans under twenty-five write their correspondence in English. They can't write Tibetan. Okay. Tibetan is dying. The language is dying very quickly. You gotta get used to this if you're gonna study Tibetan. {pen, computer, computer}, okay [laughs][laughter]. I have a big computer project [laughter] all right. And you have to study that. Anyway, {pen}. It's good to start to learn those things, okay. Tibetan government tried to get them to use fancy Tibetan words for, like, {...lungten}. Say, {...lungten} [repeat], a physical form seeing wind cloud, which is, television, okay. And it didn't work. They call it TB, [laughter], you know [laughs] It's like the French, you know. Okay. Anyway. {pen gyi}, sorry Eric, {ngalok su jungwa}. {ngalok su jungwa} is an important word to know, okay. It means, the pen as it was a

moment ago, okay. {ngalok} means, 'flopped over into the past'. {lok} means, like, { ... lok} means, turn the pancake over, you know. {lok} means to flop something over. {lok su jungwa} means, flop it over. {ngalok su jungwa} means, the thing that flopped over into the present reality, okay. The pen that flopped-over into the current pen, okay. The pen as it was the moment before. And I translate it that way, okay. The pen as it was a moment ago is called {pen gyi ngalok su jungwa}. The previous flopping-over of the pen, okay. The just-finished flopping-over of the pen, means the pen as it was a moment ago, okay. The pen as it was a moment before. And that's an example of a? {ngu gyu}, a direct cause. For what? The current pen, you see what I mean. The pen as it was a moment ago is the direct cause for the current pen. Say, {pen gyi}[repeat] {ngalok su jungwa}[repeat], {pen gyi}[repeat]{ngalok su jungwa}[repeat]. So, a {gyu gyu} is naturally a {ngalok su jungwa, ngalok su jungwa}, okay. The pen as it was a moment before the pen as it was the moment before, okay. An indirect cause of the pen, is the pen as it was a moment before, it was a moment before. Okay. And you have to get used to that. I mean, in the monastery, you do like twenty of them in a row: {pen gyi ngalok su jungwa yinpa ta}. And you're like, you just keep track whether it's odd or even, you know [laughter] [laughs]. You just listen. You don't even try to conceptualise what the guy's saying. You just keep track of is he doing odd or even, you know. And the you can give the right answer, you know. But sometimes, it's like, seventeen in a row or something, you know. And it just is, it gets you to think faster and to think sharper, okay. So, the, so an example of an indirect cause would be the pen as it was a moment ago as it was the moment before, okay. That's all, all right. That's a {gyu gyu}. The pen as it was two seconds ago, all right, is the {gyu gyu} of the present pen. Is the indirect cause. The direct cause is the pen as it was the moment before, okay. In Tibetan, {pen gyi ngalok su jungwa} is the direct cause; {pen gyi ngalok su jungwa ngalok su jungwa} is the indirect cause. Okay. And you gotta get used to that, okay. What's an indirect cause of this building being here? Lincoln's assassination. And you gotta get used to that, you know. I mean, all the events of the past, in Abhidharma, that didn't prevent the construction of this building, are its causes, okay. That's another story. All right. But you gotta get used to that. Indirect causes are pretty freaky. And, when you start to meditate a lot you'll start to become more aware of the indirect causes of your mind. And very early in your life, I mean, there's a certain stage in meditation, that happens at {jor lam sopa}, where you can start to remember things that happened long ago. And it's by some kind of {ngalok su jungwa, ngalok su jungwa, ngalok su jungwa}. You're able to link into the one that came before the one that came before the one that came before the one that came before, especially in regard to the thoughts you're having. Like, deep in meditation, you

start to be able to trace why you're having this thought back to the first time you ever had such a thought and then, back before that. And it's very cool. And it's called {chu gyu nyi tingin dzen}. It's a special kind of samadhi where you can perceive, especially, Dharma teachings or Dharma realisations that you had a hundred years ago or something; and the stream of them coming into your mind. And that's, {ngalok su jungwa} is very important for that. So, you have to get used to that. You know, there'll come a time, long before you see emptiness directly, where you can trace back the thoughts you've had for many, many decades. And especially, Dharma teachings you've had. And that's a special kind of event that you can expect if you meditate regularly. If you don't meditate regularly or if you're always making up excuses why you can't do it every day, I can promise you it won't happen to you. And you can just sit there in class and be amazed that maybe this thing exists. But, if you do practice everyday, happily and joyfully, and not because you feel like it's an obligation but because you enjoy it, then, then sooner or later, you'll start to have that. And, and it's very cool. It saves a lot of time, right, okay. [laughter] Okay. It's a natural result of meditating frequently. And frequently just means, like, an hour a day or forty-five minutes a day, okay, but without stopping.

Okay, here's the second kind of way of dividing causes. Say, {nyerlen}[repeat] {gyi gyu}[repeat], {nyerlen gyi gyu}[repeat], {nyerlen gyi gyu}[repeat]. And then, the opposite is {hlenchik jekyen}[repeat]{hlenchik jekyen}[repeat]. Those of you who studied the course on proving past and future lives are well acquainted with these two guys. To draw this distinction between them is necessary for understanding why you have been here before, okay. So, we'll go through that now. That's the main application of this distinction is that it helps you to understand why you must have had a past life and why you will have a future life, okay. {nyerlen gyi gyu}, means, I translate it as 'material cause' versus a 'contributing factor'. Can a, can a person act as a cause for a clay pot, a water pitcher? Yes, sure, because they can make it, okay. They can be the person who makes it. So, they are a cause for the water pitcher. If you take the definition of a cause, they help to bring it about, right. They can make that other thing come about. Without the human there, forming it, it wouldn't have happened. Are they the material cause? Are they the stuff that turned into a water pitcher? No. That's the clay or ceramic, okay, whatever. Okay, the clay or the glass or whatever. And that's the distinction, okay. They are not the 'stuff'. When I say material cause, I mean the stuff that turned into the result, okay. And you have to get used to making that distinction. All the other things are just contributing factors. So, it's almost like the main cause and then all the secondary causes. In the case of a plant or a tree, what's the {nyerlen gyi gyu}? What's the material cause? Is a seed. And then, contributing factors are sunlight,

water, the soil, fertiliser, warmth, time, a farmer, okay. All of those things are contributing factors, okay. And that's the difference. {nyerlen gyi gyu} is the seed or the clay and then {hlenchik jekyen} is the potter or the wheel or the kiln or the other stuff, okay. And that's the distinction and you have to make that distinction. Contributing factors for the creation of a human mind at it's first moment of its existence in your mother's womb {hlenchik jekyen}, contributing factors are: your parents, you know, the sperm, the blood, the fact that they had relations. You know, all of these things are contributing factors. They are not the {nyerlen gyi gyu}, okay. They are not the mental stuff that turned into your consciousness at the first moment of your conception. If their mental material were the {nyerlen gyi gyu}, were the main or material cause of your mind at its first moment, you mind would share some of the qualities of their minds, automatically. If they were talented musicians you would always be a talented musician, you know. If they were like, gentle, peaceful, happy people, then the children of peaceful, gentle, happy people would always be peaceful, happy and gentle. And you know that ain't the case. The worst kids in my High School were the kids of all the ministers, the rabbis, [laughs] and stuff like that [laughs], you know what I mean. I mean, that's evidence that the stuff or the material of the mind, which is not a physical stuff but a mental stuff, has not come from your parents, okay. It's come from something else. There must be some mental stuff that turned into the mind, your mind as it existed in your mother's womb at the first moment of your consciousness, of your awareness. And that's one of the proofs for a past life: that, there must have been an instant of consciousness prior to that, to act as the {nyerlen gyi gyu}. To act as the material cause for your mind, okay. And that's, that's where we use material cause. That's where that's an important concept, okay. I'm gonna give you the definition of a material cause. Okay, {rang gi} means 'its'; {dze} is the word I've been using 'stuff', okay, or material. And again, mind can be one kind of stuff; physical matter can be one kind of stuff. I'm using the word stuff in a very general sense, okay. {gyun} means, 'continuation'; {du} means, 'as a'; {tsorwa} means, 'primarily'; {kye je} as we saw before, means, 'brings about another, brings about something else'. So, if you put it into English word order: Anything, which brings about something else, primarily, as a continuation of the same stuff as it was before, is the definition of a {nyerlen gyi gyu}, of a material cause. Anything, which brings about something else, primarily, as a continuation of the same material or the same stuff, is the definition of a material cause, okay. As the clay is for the pot; as the seed is for the tree; as the last moment of your bardo's mind was for the first moment of your consciousness in this life. And that's your meditation, by the way. And it's cool, you know. Go back in your meditation as far as you can. It's very, very good exercise during the study of {gyun dre} to go back as far as

you can remember in your life, you know. Try to go back to the first consciousness that you're aware of. I mean, for me, it's of a blanket in my crib. I remember a certain kind of light blue blanket that was very soft. And, you know, I remembered that. That's the earliest thing that I can remember, normally, you know what I mean. And, and do that exercise, you know. Go back, like, do a meditation where you focus on your current thought and if you meditate a lot, this is easy, okay. Like, you are thinking about something and then you realise that you couldn't have had that thought without a thought you had a year ago. And then, you realise you couldn't have had that thought unless you had another thought a year before that. And then you work yourself back. And you can do that during meditation. Try to get back in theory, okay. It won't be a direct perception. It won't be a direct awareness but try to get back, logically, to the first moment in the womb, okay. And it would have been some kind of very primitive thought that, 'oh, it's hot in here, hot, wet, uncomfortable. Something like that. I mean, according to Buddhist scripture it's extremely uncomfortable and you're aware of it at that moment, you know. While you're in the womb for those nine months you have these primitive awarenesses of being very, very choked-in and hot and confined and that it's very unpleasant for the, for the in, for the child in the womb. And that they're having, already, very primitive awarenesses of how unpleasant it is, you know. Every time the mother moves quickly or jars, even eats certain foods that the, the embryo is very sensitive and is constantly made uncomfortable by those things, you know. And try to go back and imagine the first thought in your mother's womb and then try to compare it to the pot or to the tree and try to see if you can understand why you must have had a mind before, okay. And that's a, that's a good exercise for past lives, okay. And you have to stay aware of this definition. That's the definition. You're looking for the thing that was primarily bringing about a continuation of the mind of the past life, okay. And, that, was the last thought that you had in the bardo. In the, in the, as a spirit between lives, the last conscious thought you had was the cause, the {nyerlen gyi gyu}, the material cause, of the first moment of consciousness in your mother's womb. And you have to get used to that. And you have to explore your mind and see if there's anything left, okay. And you can do it. If you meditate deeply you can, you can get very close to it, okay.

Next thing. Now, I'll give you the definition of a result. Okay. Say, {kye ja} [repeat] {drebuy tsennyi}[repeat], {kye ja}[repeat]{drebuy tsennyi}[repeat]. {kye ja} means the opposite of {kye je}, okay. {kye ja} means, 'anything which is brought about by another thing', okay. Anything which is brought about by another thing, is the definition of a result, okay. {kye ja} means, anything which is brought about by another thing; {drebu} means, a result; {drebuy tsennyi}

means, that's the definition of a result.

Results can also be divided the same way as causes and I'm not going to go into it, okay. Direct results, indirect results, you already know that. I mean, you can figure it out. The result of the material cause and the result of the contributing factors, okay. And you can, I don't have to get into that. Yeah. [student] Yeah [student] You could have a direct contributing factor that was a direct cause, you see. The, the sunlight of the moment, the sunlight of the moment before the, or the potter at the last moment before the pot comes into existence, is the direct cause for the pot but not a material cause for the pot because he doesn't turn into the pot. That's all. Yeah. Okay. So, they're not exactly the same. Okay. I'm gonna pretty much stop there. You have sixty pages of reading on that to play with, okay. We kept this up for about four nights in a row, all right. And, if you see zombies in the class, they were probably helping. But, you should, you should be aware of one thing. And that's called 'relationships'. We'll get into it later. But so far, you've had two relationships that are possible between two different objects. You've had both of them, so far. One is the relationship between a quality and a characteristic, okay. It's the relationship between Chevrolet and car, okay, or car and Chevrolet. To be a Chevrolet is to be a car. And that's called a { ..}, okay. That means a, a relationship where to be one is to be the other, automatically, okay. And that's a { ... }. That's one possible kind of relationship. There are only three possibilities between two objects on this planet or in this universe: either they don't have a relationship or they have a Chevrolet – car relationship, or they have a cause and effect relationship. And those are the only three possibilities according to Buddhist logic, according to Buddhism. And it's important to understand them. Okay, I'll say it again. Two different objects – me and the pen, me and you, you and your mind, your right eyebrow and your left eyebrow, okay.[laughs] There's only three possible things going on between them. One is, no relationship. Okay. The second is, a relationship of identity. I call it a relationship of identity, you know. Like, the relationship between Chevrolet and car. And then, the third possibility is, cause and effect relationship. They are related, in the sense of being, cause and effect. These are the three possibilities that can exist between any two objects in the universe, okay. What's an example of a, of a relationship of identity is, is car and Chevrolet. What's the test of whether a relationship holds? Remove one and see if the other disappears, okay. If you removed all cars in the world would you remove all Chevrolets in the world? Yes. So they have a relationship, okay. If you removed your right eyebrow would you necessarily remove your left, left eyebrow? No. So we say they don't have a direct relationship. If you remove the seed do you remove the tree? Yeah. So they have a relationship, you see what I mean. Now, a tricky one. If we remove all Chevrolets do you remove all

cars? No. So, we say Chevrolet shares a relationship of identity with car, but car does not share a relationship of identity with Chevrolet. It's a one-way, what do you call it, a one-way street. And you have to get used to that. Some of them go two-ways, some of them only go one-way. How many ways does it go between automobile and car? Both ways. You see it's, it's, they're related, you know. If you're a car you're automatically an automobile. If you're an automobile you're automatically a car. If you removed all cars in the world you remove all automobiles. If you removed all automobiles you'd remove all cars. We call it 'two-way identity relationship', a two-way relationship of identity, okay. Is there such a thing for cause and effect? If you remove the tree do you remove the seed? The seed's gone by the time the tree's there, come on. I mean, in Madhyamika, you get very fancy here, okay. Think about it. By the way, the answer is no, they don't have a relationship like that, okay. I mean, if you don't get fancy, all right. If you don't get fancy, it's okay to say, you can remove the tree and it wouldn't effect the cause, okay, the seed. The seed's already gone. If you removed all the seeds in the world you wouldn't get any trees. If you remove all the trees in the world it would not have changed the fact that all the seeds they came from were there. But, they wouldn't have been seeds would they, until there are trees around. For purposes of naming, you see what I mean. For purposes of calling them seeds or calling them causes, you must have a result around. So we say in a very, now I'm getting fancy, okay. You can read it in Pabongka Rinpoche's commentary to the 'Three Principal Paths', okay. The fact that it's a cause depends on its result occurring, you see what I mean. You can't call it a cause until the result is there. So, in a sense, in a sense, if you remove the result the cause doesn't get to be a cause anymore 'cos it didn't cause anything. Okay. But that's getting fancy. Normally, we don't say that. Normally, cause and effect is a one-way street, okay. If there's no causes there's no effect, therefore they're related. Effects are related to causes but causes are not related to their effects 'cos if you remove all the effects you don't remove all the causes. Okay. You gotta get used to that.

Why are we talking about this? It has a lot to do with understanding emptiness and perception, okay. Why? Do cars and Chevrolets exist at the same time? Yes. Do seeds, do seeds and the trees they cause exist at the same time? No. By the time the tree has occurred the causes, the seed has, by definition, gone, because it grew into this big fat tree, okay. It's gone. Then we debate in the monastery, we talk about, oh, the seed with the sprout coming out and what point is it a tree and at what point is it a seed and can you have a seed with a sprout coming out and is a sprout a tree 'cos then you got a seed and a tree. And you say, no, the part of the seed that's a tree isn't a seed anymore, okay. Like that. It's a big, huge debate. When does a seed become a tree? You know. At

what point is the seed gone and the tree is there? Can't you imagine a seed with the sprout coming out half-way, like, you know, those lousy bean sprouts, and they ruin these good sandwiches by putting these things in there, you know. And you're always, like, getting one of them in your teeth. Like, that's still a seed, but there's a sprout coming out of it, okay. That proves to me, right. No, and then they'd say, no, no, the part that's the sprout is gone already and like that, you know. But, if you think about it, that's another proof for emptiness. And you can cogitate on that one, you know. At what point does it become a sprout? And, if you try to pinpoint it you'll go crazy and you'll never find a time. And that's an indication of the emptiness of the growth of a seed, of a, of a sprout, sorry. Okay. Because it's all, isn't it all just your projection when you decide to call it tree or when it becomes tree? You know, theoretically, any moment that you choose to say, this is the moment at which the seed became the tree, could be divided again. And then, which moment is it that it became the tree? The first half of the moment that it became the tree or the second half of the moment that it became the tree? You say, well, the first half. You say, well what about the first half? What about the first half of the first half and the second half of the first half? And then you'll never find a time when it truly, objectively, became a tree. It's a projection. That's another proof for emptiness. And it's a, it's one of the five great proofs for emptiness based on that. Yeah. [student] Loud. [student] Yeah. You can't find, she said, is it same for the moment your mind moved from the bardo into this, into your mother's womb, for example. Right. You can't pinpoint a time because any particular time you can pinpoint you can divide again. So, who's making up this moment? Your projections. That's, that's evidence that there's no external reality there and that it's coming from your mind. And the reason the sun comes up in the morning is a projection of you, okay. But that's another story. We're not doing Madhyamika, are we? Okay.

Yeah. [student] That's a debate. That's a {kachikma}. I'll show you, okay. [student] By the way, I mean, [student] you gotta distinguish between there being a real, externally, existing from its own side, objective moment at which your mind and your past life became, turned into the mind in this life, okay, which doesn't exist. And, you have to distinguish that from the one that apparently exists because your karma is forcing you to think that it exists. And that one, exists. And that one, brought you into this life. And that one's gonna kill you. So, so it's real, you know. Really. Seriously. That one, it, it is a projection, but that's what makes it real, you know. People say, oh, it's a projection so it's not real. I'm sorry, Madhyamika says the opposite: It's real because it is a projection. Yeah. So, don't come and tell me there's no material causes because you can't point the time at which the material cause really existed.

No. There are really material causes because I can't point to a time that it really existed.

Madhyamika says the opposite. Madhyamika says, all this stuff, all this crap is real. When you die of cancer it's gonna be real. Why? Because it's a projection of your mind. Okay. [laughs] All right. Hang on, hang on. Okay. That's all I'm gonna say. You can get the rest from the reading. You better give it some honest hours. You'll never do it later will you? Okay. We'll be onto something else. [laughs] Try. Take it one by one, okay. Go into the bathroom. Take one with you, you know. My bathroom's hard 'cos I got, like, five people need to use it, you know, but I go in there with my, anyway. We'll do a little formal logic to make things more fun. [laughs]

Say, {tak}[repeat], {tak}[repeat]; {tak} means a reason, okay. By the way, {tak} can mean three different things and you better get used to it. {tak} can mean the whole logical statement, can be called a {tak}. 'Consider sounds, they are changing things, because they are made', okay. That's a {tak}. But sometimes, {tak} means, the reason, 'because they are made'. And sometimes, {tak} means, the main thing mentioned in the reason, 'made', 'made thing', okay. So, {tak} you gotta be, it's a very slippery, greasy word in formal logic. Again, I'll repeat. It can refer to the whole logical argument, {tak}. It can refer to the whole thing, 'because it's a made thing'. Or, it can refer to the thing mentioned in the because statement, 'made', 'made thing'; 'made thing' without the 'is' stuck onto it, okay. And then, {tak} is very greasy and it can mean all three. Okay. What's the definition of a {tak}? Anything you put forward as a {tak}, okay. Because the sky is green with pink polka dots everyday, okay. That's a {tak}. Why? Because, I put it forth as a {tak}. To prove what? It doesn't matter, you see. I said, because. You don't need to know anything else. Because the sky, everyday, is green with pink polka dots, is {tak}. Why? {tak su kupa yin pechir}, because you gave it as a {tak}. You gave it as a reason. It doesn't matter what I'm trying to prove. It's a reason. Why? I gave it as a reason. That's all. {tak su kupa tak kyi tsennyi}. Lot of people feel uncomfortable with that, you know. Like, but it doesn't seem right to me. Hey, I didn't say it was the definition of a correct reason. I said, it was the definition of a reason, okay. And you have to get used to that distinction. There's a big difference between a reason and a correct reason, which you know from talking to your boss. Okay. Yeah. Like, the whole statement, meaning, 'consider the horns on a rabbit's head, they are good to eat, because the sky is green with pink stripes'. [laughter] And, that's a {tak}. That's a {tak}. It's a logical argument. [students] It's an irrational, logical argument, yeah. [students] Yeah. By the way, I mean 'logical' as meaning, presented in the format of a logical statement. I don't mean as, ontologically correct, okay. I almost said, entomologically, but you know what I mean, okay.

[laughs] You know, when I say, 'logical statement', I mean an attempted logical statement, okay. Obviously. Okay. An argument, right. An argument that somebody presents to you, okay. That's a {tak}. Yeah. [student] [laughs] He said, at what point does illogical become logical? When it's something you really want, okay. [laughs][laughter] okay. Say, {tak}[repeat] {yang dak}[repeat], {tak yang dak}, {tak yang dak}[repeat]. Okay. You gotta get used to it. It's like a mantra in the debate ground; {tak yang dak}[repeat]. {tak yang dak} means, a correct reason, you know. A reason that holds. And it could mean any of the above: a logical statement which is correct, a whole 'because' statement which is correct, or something you've put forward as the little element in the 'because' statement which is correct, okay. Yeah. [student] To start a debate. By the way, she asked, why would you make a statement that's not correct in the first place?

Every great debater who ever lived, who wants to teach students, you see, you always, I've seen these great, great Geshe get up in the, in the assembly, thousand monks standing there, and they'll, they look at, they look at who's the opponent, and they know that this guy has a problem understanding something, and they pick that. And, they, purposely, take a wrong position. I mean, if you're really, really good at debating, you take these very subtle wrong positions and you see if the guy can prove you wrong. Why? To help everybody else who's listening. These are bodhisattva debaters. They're not trying to win the argument. They're trying to teach the people around them, you see what I mean. It's a whole different mind-set. They're gonna present an argument which is very, very subtle, which is almost true, which is a mistaken idea that most of the monks there have, and they're gonna see if the other guy can prove them wrong, 'cos they want the other guy to prove them wrong. You see what I mean? Seeing debaters in the monastery is beautiful. Like, all these bodhisattvas trying to present an argument, which is very slightly wrong, and seeing if this guy can, it's like setting yourself up in a chess game to be checkmated, just to help the other guy to learn to checkmate you, you see what I mean. And it's a whole different mind-set, you know. It's a very beautiful mind-set. Yeah. [student] Say again. [student] Do they not graduate? They end up, they get the real graduation, you know. Most of the greatest Geshe in the monastery are guys that didn't quite finish their {hlarumpa} you know, 'cos they ended up serving some other Lama or something, you know. There's many people like that. And, I guess they got their real {hlarumpa}, right? But, anyway, say, {tak yang dak}[repeat], [tak yang dak][repeat], correct reason. Definition of correct reason is, and that's gonna be the whole rest of our, of our [cut]. Say, {tsul sum}[repeat] {yinpa}[repeat, {tsul sum yinpa}[repeat], {tak tang dak kyi tsennyi}[repeat]. {tsul sum yinpa}[repeat] {tak yang dak}[repeat] {kyi}[repeat]

{tsennyi}[repeat]. Definition of a correct reason is, {tsul sum yinpa}, okay. {tsul sum yinpa} is a nasty, nasty word to translate. Okay. {tsul} means, 'way', {tsul} means, way; {sum} means, 'three'; {yinpa} means, 'that which is': that which is the three ways. I translate it as, how did I translate that? A, a reason, where the three relationships hold, okay. A reason, where, the three relationships hold. Three relationships have to hold true in a logical statement. And, then, we can say that it's a good reason or a good logical statement, correct logical statement. Okay. {tsul sum yinpa tak yang dak kyi tsennyi}. And, this is very cool. When you give an argument to somebody, if you're a Buddhist, and you're trying to prove something, they have to already accept every part of your argument. And that's a rule of Buddhist logic, okay. You're not allowed to try to prove something to somebody using any idea that they don't already accept, okay. And, and as Buddhists in a new Buddhist country, you better get good at it. And, when you try to discuss Buddhism with your friends at work or whatever, and you have an impasse, it's because you have failed. You see? You have broken the rules of logic. You've introduced something that they cannot accept yet, okay. So, when you're trying to prove something, as a Buddhist, and American Buddhists in the first generation of American Buddhism, will be called upon often to prove things. Right? The next generation will be lazy. They'll believe in past lives because mom and dad told them, you know. I don't look forward to being in that generation. I think I'll get enlightened in this one, you know. You know, they'll be doing their books 'cos mom and dad made them do it, you know. [laughter] And, they'll hate it, you know. But, we're in a very good generation right now. We're in a pioneering generation. We are the {kadampas} of America, right?

And, and if you're gonna stick to Buddhist, the rules of Buddhist logic, you cannot, ever, give an argument to somebody using any concept, any term, any thought, that they haven't already figured out. And, that they don't already accept. And that's the principle behind {tsul sum yinpa}, okay. That's the principle behind the three relationships. You, as a Buddhist in America, have to be able to present your arguments for, for this worldview, using only those things, which the other people already accept, you know. And, that's an art. That's the art of reasoning. Okay. That's the name of the class, right. That's an art form. And, and you can do it, you see. The beauty of Buddhism is that it is logical and only with the information that Americans already understand and accept you can prove every single Buddhist concept to them. Okay. If you do it carefully, and logically. So, we're gonna talk about the rules of logic and then, hopefully, it will effect the way you present Buddhism to other people and to yourself, you see. The Pramanavartikka has for chapters. One of them is called, how to prove stuff to your self. One of them is called, how to prove stuff to

other people, you see what I mean. It's cool. Even Dharmakirti, Master Dharmakirti was aware of this difference. You have to be able to prove things to yourself and then you have to know how to prove things to other people, you see what I mean. And it's very beautiful. You will not be able, and it will not be helpful, and you won't succeed to present Buddhism to other people, unless you stick to this rule of using only those things, which they already accept. And, it's enough in America. You don't have to use voodoo. You know, you don't have to use future lives and stuff like that. Pretas that nobody can see, hell realms that nobody can see, you don't have to talk about them until you establish their existence logically with someone. And you can. That's the beauty of trying to defend Buddhism is that it's logical. And, and you can prove anything about Buddhism, starting from where people already accept. Starting from what they already accept. Yeah. And by the way, if you get to something they don't accept, step back further until you reach something they do accept. [student] Excuse me? [student] Yeah, you can. Jay, Jay brought up a good point [laughs], you know. Can you use reasons that are wrong but you know the other person will accept them and it will help them? You see what I mean? And in Buddhism, you'll see in some of the {kachikmas}, we will agree to something they say so they can hang themselves using their own wrong ideas. Okay? And that's okay, but it's tricky, because someone will quote you out of context. Jay Hahn once said, you know. Somebody will take it out of context and use it so you have to be very, very careful about, yeah, you can argue, you know, things like, well why, god is, god isn't like that, you know. God is a nice guy. Why would god kill people, you know? Why would god make people and then kill them? And, already, you're talking about something that doesn't exist. You're describing how many inches long is the horns on the top of a rabbit's head. And you're arguing whether they're six inches or eight inches, you know what I mean, 'cos the thing you're talking about doesn't even exist. But, you have to use that word because, because you're talking to someone [student]. Yeah, you can do that. It's acceptable to use that, but then, by the end, you have to say, by the way they're [cut]

[end side A]

[side B]

..they're not six inches or eight inches. They don't exist at all. But you can't start out that way either, can you? Yeah. [student] Yeah. Yeah. [student] Yeah. Yeah. She said, well then what does His Holiness mean, the Dalai Lama, when He says, you know, everybody's ideas are useful and that's good enough. Everybody should use their, say {tartuk}[repeat] {tekpa chik}[repeat], {tartuk}[repeat] {tekpa chik}[repeat]: all spiritual paths eventually lead to one thing. You see what I mean? There's this huge debate in Buddhism, are there really

Hinayana and Mahayana and Vajrayana or, you know, are they separate or are they one thing? And we debate it in the monastery day after day. And the answer is no. They all, lead to, eventually, they always lead to Vajrayana. I mean, eventually, they always lead to the highest path. You must, eventually, reach that path. Is it right that everybody in the world should sit here and argue about syllogisms? And is that gonna fit everybody in the world? You tell me. I mean, no, obviously not. And so there's, every spiritual path, which brings a person further along, is valuable because there's someone who needs that right now. And, there has to be all those paths. If there's, if the path exists, it means that it's helping somebody. If it didn't help anybody it would disappear, you see what I mean. So, it does help somebody and it brings them a little closer, you know. But {tartuk tekpa chik}, in the end, they have to enter Madhyamika. In the end, they must see emptiness and the relationship between emptiness and karma. But, but obviously it would be stupid to force people into doing, that, all, you know, right away. It wouldn't be helpful. It would hurt people, okay. Okay, we'll stop. Take a break and then come back in ten minutes, okay.

[cut] Yeah, good. .. for the break. Do you want it back? [laughter] [cut] Okay. [students]

Okay. We said a good reason was one where three relationships had to hold. And, the definition of a good reason is {{tsul sum yinpa}. Say, {tsul sum}[repeat] {yinpa}[repeat], {tsul sum}[repeat] {yinpa}[repeat]. When Rinpoche was first learning English he had a student in Washington named Susan [unclear] and he would call her Tsu sum[unclear], okay. If you ever see her you can call her Tsulsum, okay. So, there are three relationships. I'll give you the three. Here's the first one. Say, {chik chu}[repeat] {chok chu}[repeat]. The thing choked, okay [laughs]. Opening lines of the Pramanavartikka, after the praise of the Buddhas, {chok chu }, which means, first ,there is to be a {chok chu} and then, there should be a {de che ... }, okay. {chik chu} is the first relationship. It's the relationship between the reason , and if you struggle through the second half of the reading, you'll see what {chok} means and {chu} means. And why {chok} refers to the subject and {chu} refers to the reason. Like that. There's {mitun choks}, there's tun choks}, there's {chok chus} and there's {chok kyi drelu} and you can spend a couple of weeks on that.

Say, {chok chu}[repeat], {chok chu}[repeat]. So, we'll give our classic argument, okay. Take sounds; they are changing things; because they are things which are made. Okay. Take sounds; they are changing things; because they are things which are made. It's a classic {tak yang dak}. It's a classic correct statement or correct reason, okay. Take sounds; they are changing things. Consider sounds; they are changing things; because they are made. {chok chu}, the test of {chok chu} would be, is being made a quality that applies to sound? Does number

three apply to number one? Okay. That's all. I mean, when I was in the debate ground, I would just cheat and remember three applies to one, three applies to one, you know. What's three? Because, it's made. Okay. Does 'being made' apply to sound? Yes. So, the first requirement of a correct reason is satisfied; {chok chu} exists, {chok chu} is present. The necessary relationship between the third item and the first item does hold true. Okay. The relationship holds. What? The thing you gave in your reason, which is, 'because it's made', 'it's a made thing', does apply to sound. { chok chu kyi tsennyi}. The long definition is, too long. You can read it in the reading, okay. What does it involve? You don't have to write this, okay. It should involve, look, the other guy better accept that. {tseme ye}, he must have already perceived that it's true that sound is a thing which is made, okay. The first requirement of {chok chu} is that the opponent must have already perceived that that's correct thing, you know. Buddhism is the one and only religion because it's what I follow, okay. {chok chu} holds. The other two don't, okay. I mean, for him. But he's already perceived that Buddhism is something that you follow, okay. By the way, that doesn't make it a correct reason yet 'cos there's two other {tsuls}, right. But {chok chu} holds. The first relationship holds, you see what I mean.

Consider the sky; it's good to taste; because it's blue. {chok chu} holds, the sky is blue. Is everything that's blue good to taste? I don't know. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. That's another question, right. But the first {tsul} holds. The first relationship holds, okay. And that's called {chok chu} and the opponent must have perceived that it's correct. The opponent must already agree that what you said last applies to what you said first: 'sounds are made things', okay.

What are the other two relationships? Well, by the way, if you wanna say, in Tibetan, {dra} means, sounds and {jepa} means, things that are made. And, in the debate ground if somebody says, show me an example of {chok chu}, all you have to say is, {dra jepa}. Okay. {dra jepa}, okay. {dra jepa} is the {chok chu}. That relationship holds. Sounds are made things. Okay. That's the first one. So, if someone asked you on your homework, give an example in Tibetan of a {chok chu}, you could say {dra jepa}. Very con, succinct. I mean, debate language is very, very rapid fire, you know. You don't go through and say, oh, oh, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. You say {dra jepa}, you know. It gives the other guy less time to think, okay.

Number two. Second relationship. Say, {je kyap}[repeat], {je kyap}[repeat]. It's a big long word, okay. Doesn't mean much. I mean, the positive necessity between the reason and the thing to be proven. Let's go slow. What's the reason you gave the guy? Because sounds are made. Sounds are made. Okay. Sounds are things that are made. That was the reason you gave the guy; things that are made. What's the quality about sound that you're trying to prove? It's

a changing thing. It's a changing thing. What's the subject under discussion? Sounds or sound. Okay. So, you have three units, right? Subject, quality you're trying to prove, and the reason you gave. Take sounds, number one. They are changing things, number two. By the way, he doesn't accept that, right. You're trying to prove it to him. So, this is the quality to be proven about sound. And the third thing was the reason you gave for it: oh, because it's a made thing. Okay. Because it's a made thing. To put it very simply, {je kyap} is simply the relationship between number three and number two. What was {chok chu} was the relationship between number one and number three, right. Now, you have the relationship between number three and number two. And if I say it in simple English it'll be fine for you. If something is a made thing it must be a changing thing. That's {je kyap}. That's the expression of {je kyap}, okay. I'll say it again. If it's number three, it must be number two. What was {chok chu}? Number one is number three. I mean, when I was in the debate ground, I, I would get all confused if I didn't [unclear] number one is number three. If number three, number two. That's all. Just remember that. Now, technically, it's a lot more complicated than that, but that's enough to memorise now, okay. {chok chu}, first relationship, number one is number three. What? Sounds are made things. {je kyap}, if it's number three it must be number two. What? If something is made it must be a changing thing. That's all. That's {je kyap}. That's the second relationship that must be true, it must hold true if that's gonna be a good reason, if this is gonna be a proof that holds. So far, we have two of the relationships that must be there. Okay. First one, number three is true of number one. Second one, if something is number three it must be number two. I call it the 'positive necessity'. When I say 'positive', I'm implying there might be a negative necessity. But we'll get there, okay. Let's express the {je kyap} in Tibetan for that proof. And here it is. Very, very classic, okay: {je na mitakpe kyap. Je na mitakpe kyap}. That's expression of the second relationship. I'm simplifying it grossly for you, okay. I mean, the long definition you can see in the text and it's a lot more complicated than it looks. I'm just trying to get you home tonight, okay. Say, {je na}[repeat], {mitakpe kyap}[repeat]; {je na}[repeat] {mitakpe kyap}[repeat]. Anything that's a made thing must be a changing thing. That relationship has to hold if we have a good proof, okay.

Third thing. Say, {dok kyap}[repeat], {dok kyap}[repeat]. To put it simply, the expression of {dok kyap} or the 'negative necessity' is, if it ain't number two, it can't be number three. I mean, to put it very simply, okay. If it ain't number two, it can't be number three. If something's not a? Changing thing. It can't be a? Made thing, okay. If something wasn't a changing thing it could never be a made thing. And that's {dok kyap}. That's the third {tsul}. That's the third relationship which must hold true if you're going to have a {tak yang dak}, a

correct reason, okay. If something, if something wasn't a changing thing it could never be a made thing. That's all. All three of those relationships have to hold true. If those three hold true the thing is a correct reason. Now, there are other details, you know. I'll give you a few of them. You don't have to remember them. You could have a case where a guy got up and said, 'take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's sound'. Is that a good proof? No, 'cos the guy already doesn't accept that sound is a changing thing. So, it's not a proof for him to say, 'sound is a changing thing because it's sound'. Unfortunately, sound fits all the three {tsuls}. Why? Well, sound applies to sound. If something's sound it must be a changing thing and if it wasn't a changing thing it couldn't be sound. Okay. So, they throw in another thing in the definition, in the technical definition, which is this long, okay. It can't be the same as the subject, exactly. You gotta change it slightly, okay. They also say, {...}. {... } means, in the way you stated it, okay. Which means, it's a different thing if I say, 'take sounds, they are changing things because they're made' or if I say, 'take sound, changing things exist because they're made'. If I change the verb there, okay. In Tibetan it's the difference between {yinpa} and {yerpa}, okay. If I say {yerpa} instead of {yinpa}, I open a big can of worms, okay. Technically, all the little pieces fit but I've used a verb that means a lot more than to be 'to be'. I didn't say, 'sounds are made things'. I said, 'sounds have made things' or, 'made things exist with sounds'. And in Tibetan, you know, in Sanskrit and Tibetan that's a big deal. Course, in English, it is too, but it's more subtle in Tibetan. You could have said, 'have' or you could have said, 'is' and there's a big difference between the two. If you think about it, the word 'is,' in English, has both meanings, you know. It is, meaning, 'it exists'. Or, 'it is a book', meaning, its identity is that. There's a difference between, 'it is a book' and 'it is', right. And that's a subtle difference. In English we only have one word and you're gonna have some trouble there, okay. We have the word 'to be'. In Tibetan, you have two separate words for 'to be something' or 'to be'. Meaning, and there's a difference between 'to be' and 'to exist', okay. You don't say, 'this exists a pen'. You say, 'it is a pen'. And, and it's the same in Tibetan. Unfortunately, the English word 'is' can mean to exist or to be something, okay. And you're gonna have to fool around with that. Yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] You can say it either way. It's the same thing.

If something is three, no. You can't say it the second way. Yeah. The quality expressed in the reason applies to the subject. Yeah. You can say it that way. Yeah. By the way, another part of the definition is, 'only applies'. And you'll see that. Meaning, always applies. There's not, like, a time when number three doesn't apply to number one. And that's another part of the definition. So, the definition, the real definition is like that long. Yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah, {je kyap} is, if three, then two [student] {dok kyap} is, if not two, then not

three, yeah. I'm surprised no one said, but that amounts to the same thing, but I'll let you worry about that. [laughs] Okay. Everybody's asleep. Okay. [student] Hang on. If something, here's an example of a {dop kyap}, okay. {dok kyap}, I said {dop kyap} sorry, {dok kyap}. {dok kyap}, with the {tak na}. Say, {tak na}[repeat] {ma jepe}[repeat] {kyap}[repeat]; {tak na}[repeat] {ma jepe}[repeat] {kyap}[repeat]. Which is to say, if something is not made, it cannot be, sorry. If something is not changing it cannot be made. Is that what I wrote there? Yeah. If something is unchanging it cannot be made. All right. And that's {dok kyap}. If those three things are true, if those three relationships hold, then your argument is a good argument. What? If sound is a made thing, that's relationship number one, {chok chu}. If it's true that, anything which is made must be changing, that's relationship number two, {je kyap}. And, if it's true that if it's not changing it cannot be made, {dok kyap}. If those three things are true, then, that's a good argument, to that person. And, he must perceive the truth of those three elements, okay. He must or else it's a bad reason. It's a bad logic for him, okay. There's interesting thing. He must also perceive the existence of each of the terms you use in each of the three slots. What? He must have perceived what a sound is. He must understand what sound is. You can't say, 'svook', or something [laughs] like that. What's a svook, you know. I don't know. Okay. And you can't say, you know, here, where you have to say, 'changing thing'. He must understand what 'changing thing' means. If you say, 'changing thing,' to an Eskimo who doesn't know English, even though, you see, even though it's correct by western terms, in western logic, it's not correct in Buddhist logic. And that's very, very important. You cannot use words to people that they don't understand what they mean yet. In Buddhist logic you just, you just became false. Your argument just became false. It's not real anymore. It's not true anymore. Why? He doesn't know what a svook is, okay. This means you can't go around screaming at people, like, you know, you have to accept pretas, you know. And they're, like, what's a preta? You know. And you see, they have to accept the terms. By the way, they don't have to have perceived it directly. I mean, you can discuss hell realms because they can have a {dra chi} about hell realms, you know. You can discuss the existence of hell realms. It doesn't mean they perceived the existence of hell realms. It means they understand what you mean when you say hell realms. Okay. They understand what the term refers to even though they don't accept that it exists, okay. And that's okay. You can use words like that. But you can't use terms, which they totally can't relate to, okay. And you can't say things about them, you can't, none of those relationships, the relationship of three to one, the relationship of three to two, and the relationship of not two, not three. They must all be, already, something, which he accepts. If you get really sensitive to this point, you'll see that the only

thing you're doing when you prove something to somebody, is you're taking them through something they already accept but they haven't tied it together yet. You see what I mean?

If somebody accepted that sound was a made thing, if somebody accepted already that all made things are changing things, if somebody already accepted that if it wasn't a changing thing it couldn't be a made thing, then, they're just an inch away, from accepting that sound is a made, is a changing thing. And you're just helping them realise what they didn't tie together yet. And that's all good logic is. You're not allowed to use any other kind of logic with somebody when you're trying to prove something in Buddhism. It's very cool. You are, it's your obligation, as an American Buddhist, to reduce your argument to using facts, which they already accept. And that's difficult and it's beautiful because then nobody will ever complain about it, you know. You're only giving them facts, which they already accept. You're just tying it together in a fresh way. You're giving them a fresh outlook on these facts they already accept. You can prove future lives. You can prove past lives. You can prove emptiness. You can prove karma. You can prove the non-existence of a, of a creator. You can prove the falsity of the worldview of western civilisation. Using, facts that people already accept. You don't have to go into voodoo or mysticism. They don't have to have a spiritual awakening experience on their meditation seat. All of Buddhist philosophy, all of Buddhist beliefs, because they are true, can be confirmed with normal facts that normal people can see. If you are unable, after extended talks with someone to, to demonstrate the truth of the Buddhist worldview as opposed to the New York Times worldview, and I'm not kidding, the worldview of western civilisation which is false, incorrect, then one or two things is happening: either they are so steeped in the voodoo of their western civilisation that they can't, that at some point they're being illogical. Everything you said is true, everything you've said they must accept, they refuse to draw the same conclusion. Then we say, {nang nyin dewa ma sopa me}, you know. I can't debate with some crazy guy, okay. [laughs] In the monastery you say, you know, if you're gonna be crazy, you know. If you're gonna accept all the facts I gave you and then you just refuse to tie them together in the way that is objectively correct, then, then, what can I do, you know. You're crazy, you know. Like, you say, is the sky blue? Yes. Is blue a color? Yes. So the sky has a color, right? No, no, no, no, no, you know. [laughter] [laughs] Then you say [laughs] well, you know [laughter] I can't do anything. I can't work with you,

you know what I mean. I mean, that's the one possibility. But, the more likely possibility is that you have not reduced it to the facts that they already accept. And you must. So, when you talk to people you have to be in that mind frame. If you fail, and we're talking people's lives, right, we're talking life and death here. If you practice Buddhism correctly, you enter a Buddha paradise. You don't have to die like this. You're talking people's lives are at stake. Literally a person's life is at stake on your, on your persuasiveness. Then, you have to be very good at going down to the facts that they already accept. You must reduce Buddhism to the facts that normal American people can accept, you know. And if you stay up there in this ivory tower with things that they could never accept or never understand or and you say, I don't care if the common people don't get it, you know, then really, you're just contributing to their murder in a sense. You see what I mean? You're contributing to their death. You, you have to bring it down to, to what people can accept or, or you're not a Buddhist, you know. You're not presenting it in a Buddhist way because, because those are the rules of Buddhist logic, you know. That, you're required to go down to what they can already accept. And it's your responsibility to try, all right. People's lives are at stake, you know. Yeah. [student] Yeah [student] Then you, then you haven't, he said, what if you wanna start an argument, with the fact that the definition of existence is, that which is perceived by a valid perception as being existing? You can't use that for people who don't accept that. You have to go further, you have to reduce it further. You have to prove that first. You can't use that as a building block. If you can't prove it then I'm not gonna accept it. [student] Yeah [student] You have to prove it according to their own experience. You have to say, you know, doesn't it seem to you, that the way to prove that something exists is, that it's there when you see it's there. And you're not drunk or crazy or hallucinating or overcome with some emotion. And if they have a problem with that then you have to reduce it further. You must reduce it further. Yeah. [student] Oh, yeah. Nothing is a priori. You must be able to prove everything. Nothing is a priori. [student] Sure. [laughs] No time tonight. We can do it. There must be, you have to prove it. You have to be able to prove it or else you're, or else you're already, you know, you're saying, hell realms exist because preta realms exist. Okay. You know. And, well wait a minute, I didn't agree to either one yet, you know. You have to go down to what they can accept. Yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah, yeah. Brookes gave a very interesting question, [laughs]. Can you prove that, proofs themselves, themselves, are valid, you know what I mean. Is, is logic airtight? And this is a common misperception of people. They say, when you get to Tantra you can throw out logic or something like that, you know. No, not at all. But when you get into deep meditation on emptiness, you know, you, you go beyond, you

transcend the limitations of logic. Bullshit. You know. Really. No, really. It can all be confirmed. This presentation that you are getting here is the immediate cause of having the highest mystical experience possible. Which is, the direct perception of emptiness. And don't let anyone tell you anything different. It's false. Totally false. They are murdering you. You know, they are contributing directly to your continued suffering in this planet, you know. You, it's not at all true, you know. The logic is, is absolutely, brings you straight up to those experiences. And Tantra and logic are husband and wife, you know. They love each other. They live together. They're married, you know. Don't ever let anyone say different, you know. We could prove it. I mean, {tsema}, opening lines of the Pramanavartikka. The being, who cares most about all living creatures who's incapable of lying, said that logic is the way, you know. And, and that's the opening lines, but then they go through other arguments. But, but don't let anybody tell you, it's totally false, okay. The way your mind works, the way grammar itself works, the way language works, the way computers work, you know, the way thinking works, is correct. And, emptiness is based on a logical thinking and the highest realisations of Tantra and the highest practices of Tantra, are based thoroughly on logic. And, and don't let anybody tell you something else. It's not, it's just not true. Okay. Yeah. [student] I, I told ya I was waiting for someone to ask that, you know. He said, I can never think of a case where number two would hold where number three wouldn't hold and vice versa. Cook it. By the way, there is no such thing, well, no, you figure it out. Then why would they have three instead of two? You figure it out. Work on it. Come back to me later, okay. It's mainly for the benefit of the opponent, okay. I'll give you a clue, all right. But I used to wonder about the same thing. It's a good question. It's a really good question. Okay, last thing. That 'last thing' syndrome. [laughter][laughs] Very, very simple, okay. Say {dra chuchen}[repeat] {mitakte}[repeat] chepay chir}[repeat]. Okay. Consider sounds, they are changing things, because they are made. Okay. Then you would say what, if you were the opponent? If I say {chepay yin pay chir}, because they are made. If you were debating me what would you say? They are. You just repeat the verb. Right. They are. No argument. I mean, it's a really lousy way to start a debate in the monastery, you know. If you start out with a correct reason then everybody just sits there and looks at you like [laughter][laughs], you know. And then the guy says, oh, oh, {mayin, mayin}, you know what I mean. Then he immediately changes back, you know, 'cos. Every once in a while some kid gets up, you know, and there's a thousand people watching. He's been practicing all morning, you know. You know, {yin pey chir}and he forgets to put the negative in, you know. Everybody just sits there and goes [laughter], you know what I mean. Because he said something

true. You can't start an argument with something true, you know [laughs], okay, normally, okay. [unclear] [laughter] which happens, okay.

So, if I say, {dra chuchen mitakte, ma chepay chir}, okay. Sounds are changing things because they are not made. You say, not {tak}, {tak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. Which is to say, that's wrong. It's incorrect to say that sounds are not made things. That's what {tak ma drup} means, okay. So to, to a proposition ending in {chir} which is because, one of the answers you can give and the most common answer is {tak ma drup}. The thing you said for number three is not correct about number one. It's not true that sounds are not made things, okay. So how about this? {dra chuchen mitakte yin peychir}, okay. Sounds are changing things because they exist. Then what do you say? Yeah, it doesn't necessarily hold. In Tibetan, {kyappa ma jung}. Say, {kyappa}[repeat] {ma jung}[repeat]. It doesn't necessarily follow, okay. It's true that sound is an existing thing. {chok chu} holds, relationship number one holds. But those other two are a problem. Just because something's made doesn't mean it's changing, okay. Just because it's something made doesn't mean it's changing. And conversely, not everything which is changing, not changing, doesn't exist. [laughs] Sorry, [unclear] Sorry. No. Right. It's not true that if something is not changing it can't exist. How's that? All right. Those two and three don't hold. Go home and work on it, okay [laughs]. Two and three don't hold. Now, there's another way to blow a guy away, you know. And this is called {teln gyur} and I'll write it for you. Say, {teln gyur}[repeat], {teln gyur}[repeat]. In Sanskrit, prasangika, okay. Prasangika. {teln gyur} means a statement, I call it a 'statement of necessity', okay. A statement of necessity. Normally, they are absurd, okay. Absurd. If somebody says something stupid, and then you give him back a sarcastic, absurd statement, and that's the normal {droltang}. That's the normal system of a {teln gyur}, okay. So, let's give an example. Somebody says, 'take sounds, they are changing things, because they exist'. You know. And you don't say anything. You just say, 'oh, so I guess emptiness is a changing thing right?' Okay. {tong pa nyi mitakpa yinpa ta}, okay. {tong pa nyi mitakpa yinpa ta}, okay. Oh, I guess, I guess emptiness is a changing thing then, uh? Okay. And you go {taaaa} at the end, you know. Say {yinpa ta}[repeat], {yinpa ta}[repeat]. Which is Oh, I guess space is, emptiness is a changing thing, right? Okay. And then you go {yinpa ta}, okay. And that's called a {teln gyur}. It's a, it's a necessary consequence of his stupid statement, okay. It's a necessary, absurd consequence of his stupid statement. You're just, you don't attack him directly. You just implying something, you know. You're just saying, oh, everything that exists changes, huh? Well, I guess emptiness is changing, right? Changing thing, right? Because, in essence, he said, everything that exists changes. If something exists it must change. He said, by the way, oftentimes, it

follows a general truth, or a universal truth. The opponent will give a {kepa}, a universal truth. Like, everything that exists changes, you know. You say, oh, gee, that's too bad. I guess emptiness is changing right, changing thing. It gets more empty, less empty. There's, first there's less self-existence and then there's more self-existence and then sometimes it's fifty percent self-existence [cut] [unclear] sometimes it's like thirty percent self-existence. Which is ridiculous, right? But you say, oh, yeah, I'm sorry. I guess, I guess emptiness itself varies, right? It's not the hundred percent total absence of a thing that never existed, right? It's, like, sometimes there, sometimes not there, changing, variable, you know. Too bad. Guess we can't get enlightened. You know what I mean. Oh, let's [unclear]. That's called a {teln gyur}, okay. According to the highest school of Buddhism, there are four great schools, right? The highest school's Madhayamika, Middle Way. There are two branches of the Middle Way school. The highest one is called, {Teln Gyur, teln gyurwa}- those who like to use {teln gyurs}, okay. Those who depend on {teln gyurs}. Those who depend on those sarcastic, oh, too, poor little emptiness, it's changing, right. Okay. That's a {teln gyur}. Okay. Why are they called {teln gyur}? They believe that someone, that an opponent, can be led to a correct understanding of emptiness, simply through a {teln gyur}. You know. You, you just had a deeper appreciation of emptiness than you had ten minutes ago. When I started saying, oh, too bad, poor old emptiness, sometimes it's fifty percent absence of a thing that never existed, sometimes it's a seventy-five percent absence of something that never existed, sometimes it's a thirty percent absence of something that never existed, right? And that, already, gave you a deeper appreciation for what emptiness really is. Which is, a one hundred point zero, zero percent absence of something that never could have existed anyway. Okay. And that, already, gave you some deeper insight into emptiness. According to the highest school, the highest Middle Way school, that's enough for you to get a lot of fresh, infor, enlightening information about emptiness. I don't have to go on and say, Look, Brooks, don't you get it? It's impossible for it to be thirty percent empty. It's a hundred percent empty, okay. Just, just, you don't have to go through that. That's a {tak}. That's a {jor ..}. That's an assertion. You don't have to go through that. Just the sarcastic question is enough. And, if he's got any brain at all, he'll say, Oh, hey, you know what, he's right. Has to be a hundred percent empty or it couldn't be empty, you know. So, that's a {teln gyur}, that's a prasangika. And that's why they're called prasangika, if anybody ever asks you. Yeah. [student] Well you, of course you { ...} you perceive emptiness based on infinite number of reasons, okay. [laughs] But, but the assertion is that the opponent can be led to a deep understanding of emptiness simply by asking sarcastic questions, based on stupid things he already said, you know. Using stupid things he

already said. [student] No, you haven't proven anything of your own. But, he gets it. And that's what prasangika means, okay. That's what a prasangika is. Okay. So just learn that. It most often follows a universal statement, okay. If something is a fruit it must be an apple. Oh, I guess oranges are apples, {yinpa teln}, okay {yinpa teln}, all right. And it's just a sarcastic question. Next week we'll get into the answers to a {teln}, okay. There's two answers you can give to a {teln}. I go {teln}. Then you can say two different things and we'll get into it next week. One more thing, okay. [laughter] When you believe the {teln gyur}, you go up. And they never tell you that, okay. {yinpa teln}, say, say these two things {yinpa teln}[repeat]. Hear my voice going down? {yinpa teln}[repeat] Are you telling me, that, okay. That's the way it sounds like in Tibetan. Say again, {yinpa teln}[repeat]. And now, listen to the other one, {yinpa teln}, [laughs], {yinpa teln}[repeat]. That means, it is so, okay. See, the first one is, so is it. And by the way, that's why you get the weird English in the translation, okay. Because I'm trying to give you one English word to give you the {teln}, right. Hear it. So, is it true that – it is so true that. You see what I mean? And that's the two senses of {teln}. I was trying to find one English word that did both things too, okay

If the {teln} goes up, it means you're saying something you really do believe. It is so. You know. It is so true. And in English you go up, you know. Oh, so is it and that's when you go down, okay. Sarcastic one, the false one, the absurd one, goes down. Now, how do you, how do you get that in a text? How do you know if his voice went up or went down? Huh? [laughs] You have to know whether it's true or not. [laughs] You have to know whether our side would ever say that or not. And it's very bad, okay. And you can spend months trying to figure out does this one go up or down. I'm sorry, okay. When you're translating a text, you actually have to skip beyond it to see is it something we believe or not. And then you have to translate it accordingly. You have to get used to that, okay. It's a very unfortunate thing about Tibetan, all right. So, {teln gyur} can also be a necessity that we do believe in, okay. It is so true that all fruits have colors, okay. Oh, so an orange is, is red. Or an orange is an apple, okay. And you have to get used to that. Those are the two {telns}, okay. And then next week we'll, next class we'll start actual debating. And we'll break up into little debate, don't get worried about it. It's fun. Or, maybe I'll just stand here and you can scream at me. How's that? We'll start like that. All right. We'll do some prayers, all right.

[prayer: short mandala]

[prayer: dedication]

The Asian Classics Institute

Geshe Michael Roach

Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

Class Five: Subjects and Objects

Transcribed by Angie Overy

[laughter] I, and we've been to 'Hell's Kitchen', so [laughter] [laughs]. But, if anybody has any good ideas. We're okay, we have space for next course but it's a little tight. So, if anyone can find anything, be nice. We pay rent and all that. There's one sponsor that has an organisation that might be purchasing a building and said we could use it, if we could help find the building. So, it would be like, a church with an adjoining building, or something like that. Church, synagogue, theatre, something like that. So, if anyone, you know, if you're just walking around and you see something, sign put up 'for sale', or something.

[What about the Limelight?].

I would love to have the [laughter]. No, I mean anything like that. Give the ideas to John Stillwell, okay. Give the ideas to John or to Ora. But, but, you know, the way we found this place was that somebody was walking by it one day, and, and asked, and it's, it's worked out okay. We, we looked at other places that cost, like, two thousand dollars a night. This place is much cheaper and, you know. So, if you have any leads, you know, let John know. And we're still looking for that. There's no reading tonight. We tried nobley to finish it and couldn't do it. So you have to make very good notes tonight, alright. I'm warning you, alright. [laughs] Okay. Also, one more announcement: Monday night class is daily practice class. We go over how to do your daily practice. And it's really good because you need that in addition to these courses. You can't have one without the other really. Sometimes we have extra time at the end of those classes. Like this week we had extra time. So, if you're, if you have any burning questions about this course, you're welcome to ask them. We opened it up last week. We did about an hour of practice and meditation and then we had a, like, half hour, forty-five minutes of open discussion about the, this class and other issues. So, if you have any questions that you'd like to ask I think that might be better. Then, we don't have to stay too late. If you have a really quick question that's good for this class, go ahead and try to ask, okay, during the class. And if it's something I forgot or something like that, I'll go ahead and talk

about it. But if you have a more complicated question, like, what was the whole third reading about [laughter][laughs], you know, try, try to come Monday night maybe. And we'll, we'll have a little open question and answer thing after the meditation. So, I'll, you know, we'll, we'll, we'll trade, you know. You have to meditate for an hour and then I'll answer questions, okay. [laughter] Alright? It's a bribe. Okay. Alright, here we go. You finished a lot of the basic {dura} topics. You finished the outline of existence. You finished {chi jedrak}, about generals and specifics. And then you finished, what was last week? {Gyun dre}. You finished cause and effect. There was one more. What was that? No? We only did three? What was the first class? Oh, the first class was the importance of doing it, okay. And that's what you've finished so far. We're going on to, you're doing like, don't forget you're eight years in about three months. So, you're real special. [laughter] [laughs] And, say {yul} [repeat], {yul- chen} [repeat]; {yul} [repeat] {yul-chen} [repeat]. That's the next important subject I'd like to go over. {Yul} means, objects. And then you see the same word repeated here and {chen} means, possessing. So that which possess an object is a...?

[Subject.]

Subject, okay. So, 'Objects and Subjects', is the next, is the next little subject we're gonna study, okay. This is really important for the study of how do you perceive things. This is the excuse for the logic scriptures to get into Buddhist psychology. So, everything you ever wanted to know about Buddhist psychology. It's a huge subject. I intend to do it as an auxiliary course in the next two years. It's called {sem semchung}. It's a whole thing. There's fifty-one mental functions. It's really cool to study it. There's no way we can cover it in detail tonight. We're gonna do the rough outline of it and then I'll do it as a separate course. A short course, like, a three day course or something like that. But, we'll go through the basics tonight. It's very important to know how does the mind work, how does the mind perceive objects. It's especially important in the study of emptiness. If you study {yul yul-chen} properly, you can eliminate about half the explanations you ever heard of emptiness, okay. Like some kind of idea that the mind sinks into the object and they become one. That the subject and the object become one. Ideas like that are totally false. They're not correct. And you can get a better appreciation of it after you've studied {yul yul-chen}. So, people who've had this when they're thirteen years old in the monastery, would never even listen to one of those lectures. I mean, they'd just walk in they'd say, no, this guy's crazy, you know. The {yul yul-chen} is separate. Every Buddhist philosopher ever lived said that, you know. In ancient India, in Tibet, nobody ever said they melted into each other or something like that. There are

expressions like, 'pouring water into water'. That's a different thing. There are expressions like 'non-duality'. That's a different thing. But, it doesn't mean, that somehow you become emptiness. You are a {ngupo}. You are a changing thing. You are {mitakpa}. Emptiness is {takpa}. You could never become emptiness. I mean, they're just totally different things. You are changing from millisecond to millisecond and you always will. Even after you get enlightened you will continue to change from millisecond to millisecond. Emptiness never changes, okay. And, just basically, that's, if you study {yul yul-chen} you wouldn't even have that wrong idea. And you see that wrong idea everywhere, okay. You see it written in all kinds of books all over the place. And it's just false, okay. That's one of the things, one of the applications of studying {yul yul-chen}, okay. We're gonna go on to the definition of a {yul}. Say {tseme} [repeat] {shelwar} [repeat] {ja wa} [repeat]; {tseme} [repeat] {shelwar} [repeat] {ja wa} [repeat]. {Tsema} means, as you know, a valid perception. How many valid perceptions have you had today?

[student – unclear]

[laughs] No. The point is, ninety-nine point nine, nine, nine, nine, nine, nine percent of all your perceptions are valid, okay. What's a not a valid perception? When you're completely drunk and you see something. When you're on LSD and you see something. When you're overcome with jealousy and you think everyone's out to get you, you know. When you're moving in a subway and the other subway's moving and it looks like, you know, you have this illusions of motions and stuff like that. Those are examples of a {tsemin}. But, but ninety-nine point nine, nine, nine percent of your perceptions are, are {tsema}. They are valid. Are they correct? Valid means, given the data you have at your disposal, they're okay. Correct means, does the nature of the object correspond to what you believe about it. Madhyamika says, you've never had one in your life until you see emptiness directly. But don't feel depressed. Everyone's the same, okay [laughter] probably. {Shelwar ja wa} means, 'that which is apprehended', okay. That, which is apprehended by a valid perception. {Shelwar} and {jelwar} can mean, 'to be weighed', 'to be judged', like that. And it, and it means here, to be apprehended. Anything, which is apprehended or perceived, by a valid perception, is an object. Okay. Now, I'll give you some synonyms. Say, {yul} [repeat], {yupa} [repeat], {shel-ja} [repeat]; {yul} [repeat], {yupa} [repeat], {shel-ja} [repeat]. {Yul} means, 'objects', okay, objects, all the objects in the world, okay. {Yupa} means, 'existing thing'. {Shel-ja} means 'anything you can apprehend or perceive with your mind'. And these three are synonyms. Okay. That's kind of a big statement, you see. The definition or a description of existence, is anything

you can perceive with a valid perception. So, the word, all the objects in the world that you could perceive, all the existing objects in the world, and all the things in the world that you could ever apprehend, are the same thing. They're all the same thing. It's another word for everything that exists, okay. These are all equal; the same thing, okay. So, {yul} is very important. Every existing object in the universe is a {yul}, or an object of somebody's mind. Okay. There's a lot of, you know, cosmic dust out towards Pluto. So, who's seeing it? An omniscient being; a Buddha, okay. So, that, it's a {kyeba} in Buddhism. Every existing object is being perceived by somebody's valid perception, okay. {Yuls} can be divided into two types. Say, {ngupo} [repeat], {takpa} [repeat]; {ngupo} [repeat], {takpa} [repeat]. {Ngupo} means, you know, a 'working thing' {dunje ngupo .. tsennyi}, anything that performs a function, okay. Anything that does something. According to Buddhism, anything that changes, anything that does something, is the same thing. Okay. {Ngupo}. By doing something you change. By changing you do something, okay. {Takpa} means an unchanging thing, okay. And all {yuls}, anything you could ever perceive in the universe, anything you could ever put your mind on, is either belongs to {ngupos} or to {takpas}, okay. It's either a working thing or an unchanging thing. And working thing and changing thing and produced thing and made thing and caused thing are all the same thing, okay.

[student – unclear]

You could say {mitakpa}. The text says {ngupo}. I think they're trying to make a point, okay. But it's the same thing to say {mitakpa} and {takpa}. Same thing. Okay. All {mitakpas}, all {ngupos}, all, all working things, can be divided into five. We're working our way down the categories, right. These are basic Buddhist concepts that you need to go anywhere later in your studies, especially about emptiness, okay. Say {pungpo} [repeat], {nga} [repeat]. {Pungpo} [repeat], {nga} [repeat]. {Pungpo} means a pile of something. Like a pile of leaves or a pile of dirt or a pile of rocks or something like that. In Tibetan, it's called {pungpo}. In Sanskrit, it's skandha, okay, skandha. {Nga} means five, okay. {Nga} means five. And this is the famous five skandhas or five heaps. They are five parts of a person. Every person is made up of five different parts. Each one of those parts includes many many members. And so, they're called heaps. I mean it might even be better to translate it as a mountain. You see what I mean? It's like when you say it's a mountain of snow on the street, or there's a mountain of dirt on the street, or you know, meaning a huge pile of something. That's the meaning of {pungpo}. The Abhidharmakosha first chapter says, {pungpo ...}, which means, if you want to know why {pungpos}

are called {pungpos} or why skandhas are called skandhas {...} because it, in the sense of, many things piled together. That's all. It's, it's a group including many objects. Okay. And we're gonna go through the five. These are all the {yuls} in the world. If you cover these five, you covered all the {yuls} in the world. How many {yuls} are there? Exactly as many as there are existing objects in the universe, okay. So it's interesting. In this presentation you can divide every existing object into the five parts of a person. Okay. Here's the first one. Say, {suk} [repeat], {suk} [repeat], okay. We have one {suk} already, and it was, we translated it as 'physical thing', right, physical thing. And the definition of it was {suk su rungwa}. How do you define blue? What's the definition of blue? Anything you point to and say, "look, this is what I mean when I say blue", okay. That's {suk su rungwa tsennyi}, definition of a physical thing is, you know, what's the definition of 'square'? What's the definition of 'round'? What's the definition of 'blue'? You have to show it to somebody and say, "that's blue. That's what I mean when I say blue", okay. And, this physical matter {suk} is often translated as form. Why? Because normally it refers to what you can see with your eyeball: shapes and colours. So if you're studying Buddhist philosophy you have to be able to draw the distinction between general {suk} and specific {suk}. General {suk} is any physical thing: smells, sounds, tangible objects, tastes and things that you can see, okay. In one sense, it can mean the object of the eye, meaning only colours and shapes, okay. In this case, it's all physical matter. It's all physical matter, okay. The first heap, the first part of a person, is all physical matter. There are two types, okay. Say {chiy suk} [repeat], {nang gi suk}[repeat]; {chiy suk}[repeat] {nang gi suk}[repeat]. {Chiy suk} means, 'outer', outer physical matter, outside physical matter; {nang gi suk} means, inside physical matter. There's a big debate in the Abhidharmakosha about what makes 'outside' and what makes 'inside', okay. If you define it as anything where your consciousness covers, then there's this huge debate about the end of your fingernails and your hair, you know. At what point does your hair become not sentient, you see what I mean? If you have, okay [laughter]. But, at what point can you feel when somebody touches your hair, you see what I mean. And, and there's a big debate about it in the Abhidharmakosha. And that the outer, outer physical form would be the chair or the building or something like that; inner physical form would be, for example, your eye faculty. The, the, the cells inside your eyeball, that can detect colour and shape, okay. What do you call it?

[Optic nerve.]

Geshe-la: Optic nerve, okay. The optic nerve would be an example of inner

physical matter. Okay. But, if you think about it, and, and this is something you have to think about carefully. The wall is part of you also. You see, it's part of your reality. You see, it's hard for me to divide between the environment and my body, right. I mean, where does my body stop? Does it stop where I've stopped touching things? So the end of my fingernails is not part of me anymore? Or does it stop where I can see the edge of my skin? Or where does me stop? You see. And in, and in this presentation in the logic Scriptures, they don't draw a distinction for the heap of matter between the wall and my body. Okay. It's just, it's still part of your experience. It's still part of what you call you. And you have to get used to that. When we study the Heart Sutra at Conneticut, it'll be {suk me, tsorwa me, dushe me, du-je me, nampa shepa me, mik me, ...} and it goes like that. You go through all the existing parts of you and it gets real hard to distinguish between you and the wall. Meaning, it's as much a part of your experience as your body is, isn't it? You know, it's not connected, if someone hits the wall with a hammer, you don't say, 'ouch', unless it's your house or something [laughs], okay. But, but generally speaking, it's still part of your experience, you know. When you describe yourself or your being a lot of that is the outside physical matter. And in this presentation that's considered part of your rupa skandha; part of your first heap that makes up what we call you, okay. And eventually, with the Heart Sutra presentation, you will have to see the emptiness of all of those things, of each of the five heaps. You must study the five heaps. Why? It allows you to deconstruct yourself. You see what I mean? If you can break yourself down into five parts and you're looking for a self-existent you in each one and you don't find it, then your self-existent you probably isn't there, okay. So, the exercise, especially in the first chapter of the Abhidharmakosha, is to divide all of reality into five parts called 'you'. And then, examine each one and see if you can find a self-existent you. And you won't. And then you can eliminate that possibility. But you have to, there's a difference between what is objectively the five parts of you and this thing that you feel is you, you know what I mean? If you're really objective about it you are a bag full of certain mental parts and certain physical parts. There's no independent you aside from those parts, you see what I mean. And you have to get used to that. You've been living in your body so long and you've been in your mind so long that you think of it as, as 'Robin' or you think of it as 'Tony' or whatever you are, 'Thomas', you know. You think of yourself that way. But, if you're objective about it, you're just a pile of pieces, {pungpo}, you know. And, and there is no you there if you're really objective about it, you know. There's just a bunch of parts there. And you have to get used to that. That's the exercise in Abhidharma. That's the, the first chapter is devoted to that, to deconstruct yourself. If you're into the {dakye} it would be { ... }, okay. It's the

same exercise. You're deconstructing yourself, okay. And it's, it's the same idea. You're breaking down your parts so that you can get sensitive to the fact. If you really get into the teaching on the five heaps, it's really cool. I mean, go home and find the 'you'. And you got five places to look at. Like, it's like being, having five rooms in your house where you're gonna look for a pink, two-headed, twelve foot elephant, right. And you go through each room and you don't find it. And then, you can say with certainty, there's no pink, two-headed purple elephant in my house. And, by the way, there never could have been. But it helps to have five rooms to check in, right. It helps to say, my house has five rooms, I checked in all five rooms, it's not there. Okay. In the break, okay, 'cos it's gonna be a long one tonight. Trust me. Okay. Second one. Say, {tsorwa} [repeat], {tsorwa} [repeat]. {Tsorwa} means feeling. Feeling, the capacity of feeling. Okay. This is a mental part of you. Is it still a {pungpo}? Yeah. It's {pungpo} number two. It's heap number two. Why call it a heap? Well, if you state it simply, you have three kinds of feeling: good, bad and in-between; good, bad and neutral. If you wanna get more fancy, good physical feeling, good mental feeling, neutral, bad physical feeling, bad mental feeling. Five. You wanna get really fancy? Eighteen. Feeling good about what I see, feeling neutral about what I see, okay. Feeling bad about what I see. Feeling good about what I smell, etcetera, etcetera, okay; all six senses. So {tsorwa} is a big {pungpo}. It's a big pile of different events, okay. {Tsorwa }, that's how it's defined in the Abhidharmakosha. {Tsorwa} is simply defined as the ability to experience objects; to experience the content of an object. You know, good, bad or medium or in-between. That's feeling, okay. We talked about why feeling, you know, there's fifty-one mental functions in this school that you're in tonight, okay. Why, out of all fifty-one {tsorwa} got to be its own category is something we talked about before. Do you remember?

[student – unclear]

Geshe-la: Yeah, {korwa} okay, that's the first chapter Abhidhamakosha. These are separated out and treated separately because feelings are what get you I trouble. It's what causes your suffering. I like this. I don't like this. And then you collect bad karma for the things you like and the things you don't like, okay. Does that mean you should stop feeling things 'cos they cause you all your trouble? No. Buddhas feel great and they like it, okay. Does it mean you shouldn't be attached to your feelings and just let them go on like and observe them? No way. Buddhas very much enjoy the bliss that they have and they're very attached to it. They have no intention of going back to hell or anything like that. Seriously, okay. That's not true. All those things are not true. Does it

mean that in order to get a good feeling, you should never commit a bad karma? That's what it means. Yeah. That's what it means. Why not? 'Cos it doesn't work anyway. Okay. That's ignorance, you know. To do something bad to get a good feeling is ignorance 'cos that isn't how they come, okay. That's all it means, okay. Do Buddhas enjoy the pleasure they { ..}, you know, of course. They love to be in bliss. They would like to get everyone there too, you know. It's not like you can't have your cake and eat it too. You can, you know. Buddhas have their cake and eat it too. { ... }in the very deep secret teachings, you know, it's like a worm. And that I can't tell you about. Okay. [laughter] {Tsorwa, dushe}. Say, {dushe}[repeat], {dushe}[repeat]. The Abhidharmakosha { ... } which means, and this poor word gets mistranslated and mangled and abused all over, okay. {Dushe} means, discrimination, that's all. This is good. This is bad. This is tall. This is short. This is red. This is blue. I like this. I don't like this. Okay. Those are all {dushe}. Why do you imagine {dushe} got to be a separate category? Oh, second big trouble- maker. Okay. I like him. I don't like him. I like this. I don't like this. This is mine. This is yours. Okay. Does that mean we should just give up thinking anything is mine or anything is yours? Does it mean that we should ignore the distinction between what hurts us and what is nice? Not at all. Buddhas have {dushe}, okay. All living creatures have {dushe}, okay. Buddhas can distinguish between this is hell and this is a Buddha paradise and I wanna stay in the Buddha paradise, okay. Of course they do. Of course they have {dushe}. This is the bad {dushe}. This is the {dushe} that says, this is mine, this is yours and I want yours. Okay. But, if you just say, this is mine and this is yours and I'm gonna collect good karma with mine and I'm gonna collect good karma about yours, then that's fine. There's no problem with that. You don't have to give up discrimination. It's not a goal of Buddhism to be a vegetable somewhere not wanting to feel anything and not able to tell the difference between good and bad or tall and short and feels good or feels bad. That's not a goal. Obviously it's not a goal, okay. And poor American Buddhists who heard about it, you know, were like, trying for twenty years not to feel anything or not to like anything, you know. It's not the point. Buddhas like to be in Buddha paradise and they would like to free all sentient beings. And they don't like to see us suffer. And they better be able to draw that distinction, okay.

[cut]

Geshe-la: Say {du-je} [repeat], {du-je} [repeat]. {Du-je} is another much mangled word, you know, much abused word. It's, it's heap number four, right. It's defined like this in the Abhidharmakosha: {du-je pungpo shi le shen}, which

means, the fourth heap is everything that's not in the other four heaps. And that's all. Everything about you that didn't make it into the other four categories, right. We only have four so far, right, there'll be one more. Anything, that didn't make it into one, two, three, and five, is number four. Okay. What's in there? Well, in this school, there's forty-nine different mental functions after subtracting feeling and discrimination, okay. There's, Magda is there, okay. Magda's body is stuck in number one. Magda's feeling is stuck in number two. Magda's discriminating is stuck in number three. Magda's consciousness or awareness is stuck in number five. But Magda is none of those. She has those but she is a person and the person belongs in number four. Okay. These are all different qualities of a person that aren't included in the other four heaps, okay. So, the Abhidharmakosha defines this one as, 'hey, everything else'. Okay. And then people say, you know, samskara or what is it? They come up with really weird translations. I call it 'other factors'. The word {du-je} means, factor. You can translate it as other factors. What does factor mean here? Something that acts as a cause. How many parts of you act as a cause? Everything. Why? 'Cos they all perform a function. Okay. That's all. So, it just means all the parts of you that didn't make it into the other four parts. I guess, technically speaking, your emptiness might be here, but I'm not sure, okay. That's part of you and it doesn't change, okay. Was it making it into {du-je gi pungpo}? Maybe. I don't know. Okay. Number five. That would make a good debate, by the way, you know. Where is your emptiness in this outline? Because it doesn't change it can't be called a {du-je}. It's not physical. It's not mental. But, it's part of you. Yeah.

[student - unclear]

Oh, I'm sorry. It is a division of {ngupos}, working things.

[student - unclear]

Say again.

[student - unclear]

No. Not all existing things are {ngupos}, okay. Say {namshe} [repeat], {namshe} [repeat]: your awareness, your consciousness. Okay. Americans tend to think of the word mind as equalling the brain and that's totally wrong. Right? Where is your awareness? If I don't say 'brain' and if I don't say 'mind', but I just say your 'awareness', where is it? And where did it come from? And why do you have it?

And why aren't you like a rock, you know? Frank Zappa's 'Help on the Rock', right. That's an old one. Okay. [laughter] But, like, how do you know that you're not a, I mean, what's the difference between you and a stone? Right. I mean, where does this thing come from that you're aware of everything? Where did it come from? Why do you have it? Where is it? You know. Is it on the other side of the room or is it here, you know? Is it in your refrigerator at home or is it here? Mine already went to bed [laughter], I mean, mine is dreaming about my bed, you know. I mean, it's, it's just this general thing that you're aware of everything, that things are happening to you, okay. That you know things. That you're aware of things, okay. {Namshe}, okay, awareness. Six different types: {namshe} connected to your eye, {namshe} connected to your ear, {namshe} connected to your nose, {namshe} connected to hearing your own thoughts in your own mind. Okay. So, we get six, six different categories. We just finished all existing objects, okay. Now we can go onto

[student - unclear]

huh?

[student - unclear]

Yeah. Well, {yul, yul-chen}. We can go onto all existing subjects, okay. Yeah.

[student - unclear]

There's not much to say about {takpas}, okay. Emptiness, empty space, the fact that you'll never go to hell again if you reach a certain level, you know. The fact that the sky is blue on this planet, on this days. Like that. It's not the function of this class to go into {shi drup kyi namshak} which we finished already. The function of this class is to discuss subjects and objects, right. So that's a rough outline of objects as they treat them in this subject. Now we'll get to subjects, okay. Say {rang yul} [repeat] {la} [repeat] {jukpay} [repeat] {chu} [repeat]; {rang yul} {la} [repeat] {jukpay} [repeat] {chu}[repeat]. {Rang} means, 'its own', okay. It's own. {Yul} means, 'an object', right. {La} means, 'in', okay. {Jukpay} means, how did I translate that? 'Engages', okay. And {chu} means, any 'existing thing'. In Sanskrit what? Dharma. Okay. Any existing thing which engages in an object, is the definition of a subject. Now, I ask you a question. You guys are already experts at {shi drup kyi namshak}. You had it in class number two. Right? [laughs] [laughter] It's hot in here. Okay. So, {mitakpa...} , okay, {mitakpa ...} ,okay. Which means, it's too bad that there's no division of

changing things, you know {mitakpa ... }, you know. That's a shame. Okay. You have three choices, okay. I said {me} which means, there don't exist any divisions of changing things. Now you have three choices because I said {chir} at the end, right, {mepay chir}. {Mepay} [repeat] {chir} [repeat], okay. I ended with {chir}. He heard {chir} so he knows he has three choices, okay. If he wants to agree, which should never be the case. I mean, if I'm a good debater I should bring up something to fight about, right. But, suppose I'm like a dumb debater and I brought up something that we didn't fight about. Then, he would just repeat the verb, which is, {me}. Okay. Which means, yeah, I agree. You can't divide changing things at all. There's no divisions of changing things. There's one kind of changing thing and there's not two kinds of changing things, okay. Now, I'm giving you choices, okay. Listen carefully, ha, ha [laughs] [laughter]. Or, you could say {tak ma drup |}. Say, {tak} [repeat] {ma drup} [repeat], {tak ma drup} [repeat]. Which is to say, it's not correct to say there's no divisions to changing things, okay. That's not correct to say. And then, the third one you could say would be, {kyappa ma jung}, which means, yeah there's no changing things but whatever you're trying to get to, forget it, [laughter] okay. So, which one would you like?

[student: tak ma drup].

Yeah. Say {ta} [repeat], not {tak}, okay. {Tak ma drup} means I couldn't get the rope to tie the guy up [laughter], okay. {ta ma drup} means, {ta, tak ma drup} means, you know, that's bad. That's not true, okay. So, {ta} [repeat] {ma drup} [repeat], {ta ma drup} [repeat]. Then, we learned last class, I come back with a {teln gyur}. I come back with a prasangika. I come back with a sarcastic statement, right. Oh, {yerba yerba ta} okay. Say {yerwa} [repeat] {yerba ta} [repeat]. Then you get this disgusted look on your face [laughter]. {yerwa} [repeat] {yerba ta} [repeat]. You telling me that there are divisions to, I mean, it's a stupid thing to say, but, are you telling me that there's divisions to changing things? You can divide changing things up? And then, you have to, like, say 'yeah, that's what I said', you know. [laughter] Okay. And that, that's your logic thing tonight. You say, {du} [repeat]. And you say it with authority, you know. You say, {du} [repeat]. That's what I said, yeah. {Du} is the same as {du} in {du kam} meaning, 'desire realm'. {Du} means, desire. Meaning, I agree, I assent, okay. {Du} means that. So you can remember, there's a store in the village called, Dokam, right. It's {du kam}, right, {du}, okay. Just think 'dah', alright. [laughs] [laughter]. Okay. { ... } you telling me there's a division? {Du} [repeat], okay, {du} [laughs] okay. Then there's a {shok}. Say, {shok} [repeat], {shok} [repeat]. {Shok} means, let me have it, okay. {Shok} is {drok}. {Drok}

means 'present them please', okay. But it's like, hey, come on, rip 'em up, you know. Let's go. Okay. {Shok}. By the way, when you say {tak ma drup}, you better have your {shok} ready already. [laughter] Right? If you say, there are divisions, I disagree there's no divisions. I say, you telling me there are divisions? You say, "Yeah". I say, {shok}. And you better have it ready right then, you know. Or else you should not have said, {tak me drup}[laughter], you know. You should have said, "I, I didn't hear that. What did you say?" [laughter] [laughs] And that's {la}. Say {la} [repeat]. {La} means 'I, I didn't quite catch what you said'. [laughter] And meanwhile, your mind is going like, what, what should I answer, what should I answer, okay. But you shouldn't, never give your answer until you're ready with your counter examples, right. Like, you better have some divisions ready in your mind before you say {tak ma drup} because {shok} is gonna be there in about two seconds, you know. And then, you see a lot of guys in the debate ground, they get lazy; {tak ma drup}, {du}. There's a {shok} and they go [laughter], you know. And they don't have anything ready. And then everybody goes, {dooo tsa}. Say {dooo tsa} [repeat]. {Tsa} means, you should be ashamed of yourself, okay. [laughs] {Shok}. Now you've had lots of time to think about it. [laughter][laughs] {shok, shok, shok, shok},{shok, shok, shok, shok, shok}, {shok, shok, shok}. {dooooo tsa}. [student] [laughs] Give me any division of a changing thing. Come on. There's three, right? You can do it in English. I don't care. [Suk?] Yeah. Physical matter, mental stuff, and how about anything that's not either. That's the third one, right. [unclear] three. Now, where does, here's the definition of a {yul chen}. Now, we're gonna debate. And we'll be doing this for the rest of the five- year course that ended two years ago. Which one is a {yul chen}, okay? How about Fran Dayan. Which one of those three, I'm assuming that emptiness can't be a subject, right. Emptiness can't perceive anything, right. So, in which category do you wish to put {yul chen}? {Yul chen ...}, okay. Where you gonna put {yul chens}? Subjects. Where we gonna put subjects? {Ma yinpa ta}, okay. Right. I said a {teln}, right. That's one of those, oh you telling me it's mind? You say, what? {Du}, {du}, say {du} [repeat], {du} [repeat]. Yeah. If I had to choose between those three: mental thing, physical thing or something between. I'll choose mental thing, okay. Then I say, then I better have a counter example ready, right. See I've set this all up, you know, like, hours ago, right. She can't go anywhere, you know. The minute she stepped into the debate ground, she was in trouble. [laughs] Okay. So, I, I have all my counter examples ready. {Gangsak chuchen}, okay, {gangsak chuchen}. Say, {gangsak} [repeat] {chuchen} [repeat], {gangsak} [repeat] {chuchen} [repeat]. Oh hey, let's talk about Magda again, okay. {Gangsak} means, person, you know, a person. Could be anybody, okay. Natasha. Leon. Okay. Let's talk about Magda, you know. Subject {ma

yinpa ta}, oh, poor Magda, I guess she can't be a subject then. Right? [Because she's physical matter?] No, she's not physical. She, she's between, right? Remember? Magda's between. Magda possesses a body, Magda possesses a mind, but Magda, is neither the mind or the body. There's something else called 'Magda' that possesses those two things, right. But you said, {yul chens}, subjects, have to fit into mental category. Like, we both agree that her mind is, is a subject. But according to you, she, poor, poor Magda can't be a subject. She can't engage her object. She can't engage in an object. She can't have a Michael and Zowie's shake. It's like the worst thing that could ever happen, you know. So, {yul chen ma yinpa ta}, you telling me she's not a subject? Which means, she can't go and buy a Michael and Zowie shake. She can't engage an object.

[Fran: And now I'm going to say it's neither].

Geshe-la: [laughs] Then, you can say, it's both. How about both? So, your mind can be a subject and you can be a subject. Why? Because you fit the definition. What's the definition? Any existing thing which can engage an object, okay, engage in an object. So, what about her {suk}? Who should I pick on? [unclear], like, half awake. [laughter] What about her physical matter, subject {ma yinpay chir}. So, I guess her physical, Magda's physical body can't be a subject? Subject {ma yinpay chir}. Now, you have three choices. You can say, {mayin}, which means, right, I agree. Of the three kinds of changing things, Magda can be a subject and Magda's mind can be a subject. The mind is easy, right. She's seeing me right now, okay. But can Magda's body be a subject? {ma yinpar chir}, cannot be. {Ma yinpar chir}. Say, {tak ma drup}[repeat], okay, if you wanna go that way. But, you better have your counter example, right. [laughter] Say, {mayin te}[repeat] {mayin te}[repeat], and why not? Okay. {mayin te} means, you know, colon, that's a colon. {Te} is a colon. Like, you'd know if you studied Tibetan, {te}. {Mayinte} means, why not, okay. May I ask why, why not? No. We already covered {demin duche}. We all agreed that Magda can be a subject, because she can buy a Michael and Zowie's shake. She can engage an object. And we all agree that Magda's mind, her visual consciousness, for example, is engaging an object right now. Which is my red face and my bald head, okay. But, what about Magda's body? Can it be a subject? Subject {mayinpay chir}. And you said, {tak ma drup}. Subject {yinpa ta}, are you telling me she can't be a subject, her body? {Du} she said {du}, I think so, yeah. {Yinte}, why?

[students - unclear]

Huh? That makes her an object. If you can see her it means she's an object. I'm asking, can her body be a subject?

[students - unclear]

Yeah, that's a, that's a answer. It's a perfect answer, okay. Her sense faculties, okay. Her eye. Her optic nerve, okay. There's a patch of cells on the back of the eyeball that, according to Master Vasubandhu, sixteen centuries ago, can detect shapes and colours. And that's physical cells, you see what I mean. And they report to the mind what they are detecting, okay. And that's, that's an example of a physical matter which can be a subject. So all three categories of changing things can be a subject, okay. Her eye faculty, which is physical, which reports to her visual consciousness what's going on, and then a moment later, her mental consciousness says, 'oh, I think this is Michael Roach's face' or something like that, okay. And then, obviously, Magda as a person can be a, can be a subject because she can go buy something, okay. And obviously, her mind, her visual consciousness which says, 'oh, hey, he's got a red suit on', can, can also engage in objects, you know. Okay.

[Student - unclear].

Can't? Hey, in a debate, debate. Let's go.

[Student: How, how can the, how can the visual, you said the eye faculty, how can the eye faculty engage in an object without a consciousness or an awareness, it's not physical matter]

Okay. She said, if there's no visual awareness yet, then the, then the eye faculty, the optic nerve cannot engage in an object. Yeah. {Yinpa ta, yinpa ta}

[student - unclear]

{yinpa ta}

[student - unclear]

Okay, okay, come on, come on, {yinpa ta} [laughter] Okay. { ...}, okay. Take the first instant of a visual, of the optic nerve being aware of self, of being aware of shapes and colours, okay. {Kechik .. chuchen}, okay, {yul chen yinpa ta me yerta}, doesn't exist, right? Doesn't exist, right? It's not aware of it's [unclear].

[student – unclear]

Oh-ho [laughter] {yinpa ta}, so it is aware? In the first instant?

[student – unclear]

It's picking up, it's picking up colour and shape. Is it picking up colour and shape? It's not picking up colour and shape?

[student – unclear]

So, you could poke somebody's eyes out and they could still see physical objects. So it has to come the moment before.

[student – unclear]

It has to come the moment before. It reports to the visual consciousness, this is going on. In fact, it creates the visual consciousness. You see. It is the {hlenchek jekyen} of the visual consciousness. It's the contributing factor that allows visual consciousness to grow at all. And if you don't think so, poke your eyes out and see if you can see anything, you see what I mean. But, in the first instant, it hasn't done what yet? It hasn't created a consciousness yet 'cos that comes a millisecond after. Remember we said you're always one millisecond behind? I'm sorry. You know, you're never in the present. The present that is, the present is happening a millisecond before you're aware of it because the present creates your awareness of it.

[student – unclear]

I'm using a very ambiguous word so I can get away with all the interpretations I want. [laughter] It's my right. It's my right. [laughs] Okay. I mean, engage, I mean, either the person buying the shake or the eye consciousness being aware of redness, or the optic nerve recording data. And that's what I mean by engage. So I can get away with all three that I want to. Yeah. [So can a tree be a subject then?] That's a good, say, {shing chuchen}. Say {shing} [repeat] {chuchen} [repeat]. By the way, you wanna learn Tibetan perfectly? Debate, you know. Why? You get to use colloquial. You get to say, 'hey stupid-head', you know. But, you also get to use Scriptural language. The, the, the language you use for debate, has not changed in two thousand years, you know what I mean.

You're still using the same words that we used two thousand. It's like, hey stupid-head, thou art wrong [laughter], you know. [laughs] And you learn all of Tibetan language very fast. It's extremely fast, okay. Say, {shing chuchen} [repeat], {yul chen yinpa ta} [repeat]. 'Oh, take a tree. I guess it's a subject'? Then what's your {tak}? What are you gonna say? Because why?

[Student: I'm asking you.]

No, you, your move. [laughter]

[student - unclear]

You said what about a tree.

[Student: Because it's a result in the same way that if a retina responds to light, so leaves do and turn themselves...]

Oh, say, {tsema loma kunde nyewe chir}. Say {tsema} [repeat]. I'm sorry. Yeah. {Tsema loma} [repeat] {kunde} [repeat] {nyewe chir} [repeat]. It's a, it is a debate. This debate already exists in the logic Scriptures. {Tsema lo ma kunde nyewe chir} means, because the leaves curl up at night and go to sleep. Okay. {Tsema lo ma kunde nyewe chir}, because they seem to respond in the same way that the, you know, they respond to stimula, stimuli the same way that the eye consciousness does, okay. {Tsema lo ma kunde nyewe chir}. And they say, no. In Buddhism, they say, no. They say, I mean, I, I won't do the whole debate with you, but in Buddhist philosophy, in real Buddhist philosophy, the growth of a plant is very similar to the growth of a crystal. And it's not considered to be sentient life. It's not considered to, to have a mind. Okay. [I'm not saying that. I'm saying that it's important to...] That it responds to stimulus?

[Student: Ya because that's what you're saying.]

No. I said it transmits it to the consciousness. [laughter]

[Student: So are you saying that they have to be both?]

Huh? It engages its object.

[Certainly a leaf must be engaging light.]

I don't think so, {tak ma drup}. [laughter] {Tak ma drup}. That's not how I used the word engage.

[student – unclear]

Huh? I see it's object though, right? Its object. Engage its object.

Student: [If this were true then the ngupo would be a subject as well. Like any changing thing would...].

Why? 'Cos it engages its object?

[Student: ... it changes, its impacted by something that interacts with it.]

I'd say that impacts it but doesn't engage it. How's that? Engage in, okay. Anyway. [laughter] Okay. Anyway. Write to Tashi, Ngawang Tashi [laughter] [laughs]. Okay, we'll go on a little bit. The other way to get out of a debate is to change the subject.

[Student: Does 'engage necessarily involve sentience?]

In this case, yes. In, in the way the word is used in this definition it involves sentience, yeah. And there's a big debate. I mean, the Japanese Buddhists, believe that plants live. No, no, no, no traditional Buddhist in India ever said that. Nobody, you know. It's not, it's not a Buddhist belief. Period. You can emanate as a tree. I mean, it could be that a Buddha is emanating as a tree. But that's, that would be like a, an illusion of a tree or something like that. But, there is no Buddhist school from, from, from the Buddha that, that ever said that.

[Student: Why is it necessary that flesh be of a subject nature]

Sorry?

[Student: Why is it necessary that flesh be of a subject nature]

Flesh?

[student – unclear]

{ } Take pork, dead pork meat in the store { .. yinpa ta}. Is it a subject?

[No.]

So, I didn't say it was necessary. Okay. [laughs] I didn't say {kyappa}. You said {kyappa}. Not all flesh is sentient.

[Well it reacts to heat doesn't it?]

Huh?

[Won't it react to heat?]

Steel reacts to heat. It's not sentient. It melts.

[Aren't you outside physical matter? Where do you end?]

Huh?

[Physical matter is only a subject if it also engaging mental objects... aren't you saying that?]

Well, I, I would say that. I would say that. Yeah. I would say that. Could you have a case where there was an eye, an optic nerve working where there was no awareness of the optic nerve working? That's a tricky question. That's a tricky, there is a thing called {nang la ma ngerpa}. Say, {nang la} [repeat] {ma ngerpa} [repeat]; {nang la ma ngerpa} [repeat]. And in fact, {nang la ma ngerpa} means, you're watching TV, you're really engrossed in it, and your mom comes in and says, 'dinner's ready'. [laughter] Okay. And, and you don't hear her, okay. But, but we believe there's been some, you know, auditory nerve change, you know. So, I think it might be possible to say [laughter] that in theory it's possible. That, that the auditory nerve has...

[Wait a minute. That proves our point - that something changed yet there was no awareness].

I didn't say that it had to be aware. I'm just giving you an example of where you don't have to be aware but that's a {tsemin gyi lo}. That's a non-valid perception. Okay. In this school, [laughter] yeah, and in my definition, what? {Tseme shelwar ja wa}. But, in this school, {nang la ma ngerpa} is not a {tsema}. It's one of the three kinds of {tsemings}. Okay.

[But then just nerve objects, objects of the nerve, [unclear]... sensory data, its not about perception in the first place.]

That's true. By the way, the two, out of the three {yul chens} [laughter] only one is a real {yul chen}, okay. How's that? So, you win. [laughs] [laughter] But, you should have said, 'how could a, how could a, how could your optic nerve have a {tsema}', you see. How, how could Magda have a {tsema} because Magda is not mind. How could Magda be a {tsema}, you see what I mean? When Magda buys a Michael and Zowie's shake and I say that the subject is Magda herself, then you should have said, 'oh, then she's a mental thing, right'. I say, why? She says, oh because that shake is defined as an object because it's engaged by a valid perception. So that makes Magda a valid perception. Poor girl. We always thought she was a person, you know. Alright? Like that. Yeah. You're right. I mean, it's a { ... }, which means, my division was a theoretical one and not a literal one, you see what I mean. Like when we divide what? Nirvana. And we talked about it. There's a natural nirvana, which is not a nirvana at all. Like, when we divide the Three, {pelma}, the Three Jewels, okay. [laughter] Right. Like, when you divide the Three Jewels, remember we had the same distinction in the Friday night class. One of them isn't a Jewel at all. Like, anyone who wears this, this, an ordained person isn't, is only a, a symbolic Sangha, okay. A Buddha image is only a symbolic Buddha. A Dharma book is only a symbolic Dharma. Okay. They are not the real Dharma, not the real Buddha, not the real Sangha. Okay. What's the real Sangha? Yeah. Anyone, who's seen emptiness directly, etcetera. So, that we call a, a nominal division, which implies it's not a real division. And, to be frank, you're correct and your arguments are true [laughter] in that, two of the three subjects that they mention in this text, are not real subjects. Because, their objects are not objects by virtue of being apprehended by a valid perception, which was the definition of a subject, object, sorry. Okay. We'd better do one more. Let's see. I won't give you the Tibetan for all those last three types because you know it, and I hereby exempt you from doing it on the homework, okay, alright, 'cos we gotta go on. {Shepa}, mental things can be divided into two kinds. Say {rang rik} [repeat], {shen rik} [repeat], {rang rik} [repeat], {shen rik} [repeat]. {Rang} means, itself, right, 'self'; {rik} means, it knows itself. In psychology this is called apperception. It means the ability of the mind to know itself: self, self-awareness. How's that? Self-awareness. Okay. {Shen rik} means, awareness of something else, other than itself; {shen} means, something else. And, in the Buddhist logic schools, which are what, do you remember which of the four great schools of ancient India they are? Mainly Sautrantika. Okay. Sautrantika. Which is not the same as

Svatantrika. Okay. Alright. Sautra comes from Sutra. You can remember. These are people who are Sutristis; people who follow Sutra. Okay. They believe that all types of awareness can be divided into two: self-awareness and awareness of other things. Okay. What is the definition of self-awareness? It's called {dzin nam} which means, the ability of the mind to be aware of itself at the same instant that it's perceiving something outside. For example, when I look at the blue of the pen, there's an awareness of the blue, but there's also an awareness of the looking at the blue. You see what I mean. There's an awareness of seeing the blue and there's an awareness of the blue. And, the awareness that I'm watching blue is called {rang rik} in this school. Master Shantideva, if you remember, went through a long story of why according to the Prasangika, the highest school of Middle Way, this is a wrong idea. Okay. And then they said, well then, how do you remember blue? How do you remember 'I saw blue' if there was no self-awareness of seeing blue, see what I mean. Like, tomorrow, when I'm sitting there at Michael and Zowie's having my three o'clock brownie and I remember the class last night and I say, I saw the pen because I remember talking about the self-awareness thing, you know. Well, how do you remember that you saw the pen if there wasn't any self-awareness at that moment? And Master Shantideva would say, look, if you remember blue, you must have been there. There doesn't have to be some separate awareness of yourself at that moment, okay. We're talking at the same moment, right? I mean, a millisecond later, you're aware of yourself. That's a different thing. They believe that, at the very same instant that you see blue, you're already aware of yourself seeing blue. And the other schools say, not necessarily. You know, if you can remember blue, then you must have been at the Quaker House holding the pen up, you know, or, you know, close to the pen.

[cut]

[end side A]

[side B]

That's all. Yeah.

[But wouldn't {rang rik} be truly the cause for the valid perception.].

Yeah, it is. Ah, well, no. It is the valid perception. [laughs]

[You don't have to have awareness at the time that you are aware of some the other thing, then go back to the same thing that....]

Ya, you, you have an awareness, first you have an awareness of blue and then later, you have an awareness that you were aware of blue, you see what I mean. And, it's a deduction.

[And those are two different things.]

If there was, yeah, they are two different things. Yeah. One is a {shen rik}, the awareness of blue is the awareness of something else. And then, {rang rik} in this school, would be a simultaneous awareness that you are looking at blue. And, it's proven, by the fact, that tomorrow you'll look back and say, I was looking at blue. In this school, okay. In this school. Okay. Anyway, don't worry about it. Higher school's say, there's no such thing as, as the mind being aware of itself at the same moment as it sees something else, okay. It is aware of itself in the next millisecond. That's okay. We say that's okay. Okay. There's another, there's {shen riks}, and then we'll take a break, can be divided into {sem}. Say {sem} [repeat], {sem jung} [repeat]. {Sem} [repeat]; {Sem jung} [repeat]. The two divisions of the awareness of other objects, right. We finished with self-awareness of the mind. Okay. We're onto all your other kinds of consciousness. All your other kinds of mental events, okay. And the two kinds are called {sem} and {sem jung}. {Sem} means, main mind, your primary mind, primary consciousness. The mind itself. {Sem jung} means, all the mental functions running around in the mind. Like what? Well, there's some that accompany every state of mind. Like what? Feeling, discrimination, attention, concentration. Bugs have {tingin dzin}. Bugs have a form of samadhi. Why? They're able to focus on one object for an extended period of time. Like two milliseconds. Okay. That's enough to call it {tingen dzin}, okay. {tingin dzin} according to Abhidharma, every state, every mind in the universe has some ability to pay attention to something for a while. Has some ability to concentrate on something for more than a millisecond, okay. And these are all {sem jungs}: jealousy, anger, sleep, okay, virtuous states of mind. These are all {sem jungs}. In the Abhidharma system there are forty-six. In the system that you're in, the Buddhist logic schools, there are fifty-one. And, I'd love to do them. And we will do them, okay. Like, in the next eighteen months or so, we'll have a separate little three-day course or something. We'll go through the whole thing. It's a very beautiful subject – Buddhist psychology. And, I don't have time to do it tonight. Fifty-one separate mental events and they're very cool. They're very interesting. Like, by the way, Thubten Choney translated it about a hundred

years ago, was it? No. She translated the whole text and it's, she did a nice job on it. Even like the, the pride, the, the pride, the mind of pride is of nine different types and stuff like that, you know. It's a very interesting subject you can get into.

We'll stop there and we'll take a break. We'll come back in about ten minutes, okay.

[cut]

Geshe-la: Okay, we had one division of mental things into two. What was that? {Rang rik} and {shen rik}, okay: the mind knowing itself and the mind knowing other things, okay. There's another way to divide it. If your homework question was, you know, what's the way that those lower Buddhist logic schools think about it? You can say, the mind knowing itself and the mind knowing other objects. And if it says, by the way, what's another division that you can make, okay? Here's the other one. Okay, say {tsema} [repeat] {tsemin gyi lo} [repeat]; {tsema} [repeat] {tsemin gyi lo} [repeat]; another way to divide all mental things into two. {Tsema} you know, is valid perception, valid perception. Ninety-nine point nine, nine, nine, nine, nine, nine percent of all your perceptions, okay. {Tsemin gyi lo} means the opposite, okay. {Lo} means, mental event or state of mind; {tsemin} means, which is not valid perception, okay. A mental event which is not a valid perception, okay. {Tsemin gyi lo}. Examples of the non-valid are, are what you see on LSD, are what you see when you're very drunk, are what you see when you are very angry or jealous, you know, paranoias you have or misperceptions that you have due to strong emotions. Other things that happen, like, in Tibetan they say, the appearance of the trees moving because you're in a row-boat and you're rowing past them and it looks like the trees are moving. But actually, on the shore, but actually, it's you moving, but it looks like the trees are marching by, you know. And that's called a, that's a typical example of a {tsemin gyi lo}, a non-tsema. That, that impression that the trees are walking by or something like that, is an example. Yeah.

[student – unclear]

It's true that all perceptions are tainted by that, yeah. That's a different story. That would be the distinction between correct and incorrect perception whereas this is the distinction between valid and invalid. And that's a long story. And we should do it someday. That's Pramanavartikka second chapter. It's fantastic. And we don't have time to do it tonight.

[student – unclear]

That's not necessarily the distinction, okay, whether you know it or not, okay. Right.

[What if you are just kinda waking up?]

That would be kinda like that, yeah. Okay, I'm gonna give you very famous definition of {tsema}. Okay. Very, very famous. Say {sardu} [repeat] {miluway} [repeat] {rikpa} [repeat]; {sardu} [repeat] {miluway} [repeat] {rikpa} [repeat]. Very famous on the debate ground; it's like a mantra, okay. {Sardu} means, fresh, okay, fresh. Like fresh vegetables, okay, fresh. {Miluway} means, unerring. Unerring. You can say, unmistakable, but it's a little bit touchy, okay. Unerring. {Rikpa} means, how did I translate it? Perception. Okay. A fresh, a fresh unerring perception. A fresh unmistakable perception, okay. Why do they say 'fresh'? In this school, memory is not a {tsema}, okay. In this school, a memory is not a valid perception. They have a list of states of mind which are not valid perceptions. One is memory, things, memory is not a valid perception in this school. In the highest school it is, okay. So, the definition of {tsema} in Madhyamika Prasangika is {miluway rikpa}, okay. And they cut out the {sardu}, the 'fresh' part, okay. But, in this school, you have to say 'fresh'. {Miluway} means, unmistakable: {rikpa} means, perception, okay. That's the definition of a, of a {tsema}, of a pramana, of a valid perception, okay. There are two kinds of valid perceptions. Say {ngun sum} [repeat] {jepak} [repeat]; {ngunsum} [repeat] {jepak} [repeat]. {Ngun sum} means, a direct perception. Like, the perception of the colour of this pen, okay. That's a {ngun sum}, a direct perception. Your awareness of your thoughts would be a direct perception. In this school, self-awareness would be a direct perception, okay. Those are all direct perceptions. They don't involve some kind of conceptualisation, in this school, okay. They don't involve some kind of conceptualisation. In the other schools it's a touchy subject. {Jepak} involves conceptualisation. The main type of {jepak} is deduction and I'm gonna show you the three kinds of {jepak}, okay; the three kinds of conceptual perception, as opposed to direct perception. Direct perception, you're just seeing blue. You're not, like, in this school, you're not going through some conceptual process about 'oh, it's blue and blah, blah, blah'. Okay. But, for {jepak} you have to go through some kind of conceptual process, especially, in the case of deduction, you know. Take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's made. If, based on that statement you perceive that sounds are changing things, you just had a {jepak}, okay. You just had a deductive

perception. You can see a lot of things with {jepaks} that you cannot see with {ngun sums}, okay. Your first perceptions of emptiness are {ngun sum} or {jepak}? [Jepak]. {Jepak}, okay. {Jor lam}, second of the five paths, Path of Preparation, is defined by increasingly more subtle, intellectual, deductive perceptions of emptiness. They are not direct perceptions. When you get to the Path of Seeing, path number three, {tong lam} is a {ngun sum}, okay, direct perception of emptiness. And that's the difference, okay. I'm gonna give you three kinds of {jepak} and then that'll be about it tonight. I said about it, okay. [laughter] [laughs] In the debate ground, you have to very sensitive to words like 'primarily' or, or 'mostly' or 'pretty much' [laughs], 'seems to me', yeah. The three kinds of {jepak}, okay. The most famous one, the principal one, by the way, it's essential to understand, that in Buddhism, in Buddhist philosophy, a {jepak} is as good as a {ngun sum}. Okay. Do you see the pen? Does a pen [laughs], does a pen exist in this room? I mean, does a pen exist in my hand? Yeah, okay. Is there a pen in my hand? Yeah. You didn't hear it hit the ground. You cannot see the pen with any direct perception but you're using {jepak}, okay. Now, you're perceiving the pen with {jepak}. And, in Buddhism, that's a hundred percent as valid as {ngun sum}, as seeing it directly. And you have to get used to that. If you decide that there are future lives through deduction, they exist. That's a {tsema}. That's a pramana. Anything perceived with a pramana or a {tsema} or a valid perception, exists, okay. You don't have to see directly your future lives and your past lives to act on them because you can deduce them. From what? Oh, anybody who knows {gyun dre} pretty well can deduce them, okay. That difference between a {nyerlen} and a {hlenchik jekyen}, difference between a material cause and a supporting factor, contributing factor. If you understand it clearly, you can deduce that future lives and past lives exist. And then, you don't have to think, that you're, have any less perceived them, than someone who directly after the path of seeing saw their future lives directly, okay. Your perception of future lives, if you understand, through deduction that they exist, is one hundred percent as valid, as good as the perception of someone who, who in a deep state of meditation, saw their future lives directly. It's exactly as valid. And you have to get used to that. Okay. It's a {tsema}. And anything that a {tsema} sees, is existing. Period. That's the definition of existence in Buddhism. So, the next three kinds of {jepak} you're gonna see, you have to get used to the fact, in Buddhist philosophy, if you perceive something with these, it exists as really as I'm holding the pen here, okay. You have to get used to it. It's as valid. {Ngutop}, say {ngutop} [repeat] {ngutop}[repeat]; {ngutop} is the deductive conceptual perception, okay. Deduction, based on a deduction, based on logic, okay. He, he had that blue thing in his hand; his hand moved like that; I didn't hear anything hit the floor;

ergo, the pen is still there. And that's a deduction, okay. {pen, pen, pen chuchen}, [laughter] okay. Consider the pen, okay [laughs] {la pa la yernte}, it is in your hand, because it was there the moment before and you put it around your back and I didn't hear anything hit the ground, {yinpai chir}. And you can say? (Snoring sound from Geshe-la) [laughter] {Yinpar chir}. {Yin}, okay. Right? If you agree you just repeat the verb, right, {yin, yin}. {Yinpai chir}, because it exists, because it exists behind my back. {Yin}, okay. And it's a hundred percent as valid as seeing it in my hand, okay, unless you're on acid or something. Okay. {Ngutop}. Say {drakpa} [repeat], {drakpa} [repeat]; {drakpa} means, famous or well known. Like, it's the 'kirti' in Dharmakirti and Chandrakirti, okay. Losang Drakpa, which is Je Tsongkapa's monk's name.

But, in this sense, it means, 'by convention', okay, by mutual convention, right. By the agreement, of the whole world, or by the agreement of all the people who know that world. Like, do you like Uncle Sam or not? [laughs] [laughter] It's not April yet but you can still dislike Uncle Sam, okay. Uncle Sam, the perception of the federal government when I say, 'Uncle Sam', because you are aware of the convention that 'Uncle Sam' refers to the government, is a {jepak}. Okay. It's a conceptualisation. Okay. You don't see Uncle Sam, I'm sorry, you don't see the federal government, you don't conceptualise directly in your mind when I say 'Uncle Sam'. You go through a process. You say, oh, uncle, uncle, oh Uncle Sam, yeah, yeah, federal government. You see? There's this conceptual process where you understand a convention that is not immediately recognisable from the word. He's not anybody's uncle. He's everybody's enemy. Alright. And he's a Sam, Uncle Sam, oh, yeah, yeah, it's not anybody's uncle, it's the federal government, you see what I mean? The classical example in Buddhist philosophy is the house of Mr. Rabbit, okay. Mr. Rabbit's house [laughter] and in Tibetan it's {ribong chen}, okay. Say {ribong} [repeat] {chen} [repeat], {ribong} {chen} [repeat]. This is the 'man in the moon', okay. In Asia, when you look up at the moon, they see a rabbit's head. Okay. They see a rabbit's head in the, a design there. So, everybody knows when you say, 'Mr. Rabbit's house is full today', you're talking about the moon, okay. It's like 'Uncle Sam', okay. So, in Scripture you might come across, oh {drakpa jepak}, an example of conventional, conceptual perception, valid, is 'Mr. Rabbit's house'. And, everybody knows, although you guys don't know, that it refers to the moon. And that's all. These are conventions. They're not immediately recognisable from the word itself, okay. Third kind. Say {yi-che} [repeat] {jepak} [repeat], {yi-che} [repeat] {jepak} [repeat]; {yi-che} means, rational belief, okay, rational belief, {yi-che}. And this is where you have a valid perception of something that it really exists, because someone who is, for you, an

unquestionable authority, said so. Okay. Somebody, who's unquestionably authoritative, said so. Okay. And, obviously, in Buddhism, it's very hard to qualify as an unquestionable authority, okay. We're very picky about unquestionable authorities, okay. And, and, by the way, {tsema, tseme kyebu}, a pramana person in Buddhist Scripture means, a person who cannot lie. Okay. So, the exercise in Buddhism is, you have to establish that the person in question cannot lie. Okay. The Buddha, by the way, one of His first rules was don't believe anything I say unless you check it out and it fits you. And, you've argued it, and you've discussed it, and you've debated it, and you've come to believe it by logic and by reasoning and by thinking about it. But don't accept what I say just because I said it. Okay. He said that. Okay. And you have to live by that. And America has had enough beliefs where it was 'just believe anything', right. You know, you had it when you were a kid. You know, 'mom and dad said'. You said, why? And they said, 'don't ask any more, just believe it', okay. And, and you're in this class because you rejected that, okay. So, I'm not, I don't want you to think you got to a point now in your Buddhist studies where Michael Roach got up and said, 'okay, there's a new kind of valid perception, just believe whatever I say', you know.[laughs] Okay. It's not like that. Rational belief, okay. And it involves a preliminary step of establishing that that person or that authority cannot lie. Okay. Now, maybe you've met a person like that or maybe you haven't, you know. But, but in Buddhist Scripture we allow for the possibility that there's a being who cannot lie. And that if you studied the question carefully, you could establish that there is a being who could not lie. And then you just sit and listen, right. I mean, if, if first you've established that this person cannot lie and would never claim to have seen something without seeing it, you see what I mean. That's also implied. That then, after that, if they say there is a hell realm, you could take it to be, {yi-che jepak}, you know. Based on rational belief in this person who is incapable of telling a lie, and incapable of misrepresenting reality, they said it so you can buy it. Okay. And then, but again, you have to personally establish them as unquestionable, okay. And, if you have not, then you're not allowed to have a {yi-che jepak}, okay. You cannot have a {yi-che jepak}. But in, in the monastery, and in your studies, you will reach a point where you'll recognise certain people as being unquestionable. I mean, you get the feeling after awhile and you, you do certain tests, you do certain checks, and then you get to a point, like, if I see something in the computer, I get a hit. I go surfing for a certain idea. I get a hit. It's S-5320, you know. I know this is Je Tsongkapa's commentary on a certain text, you know. Okay, whatever it says I can trust it. You see what I mean? And it's like that, okay. And you have to get used to that possibility. We allow for it, okay, in the monastery.

[student – unclear]

No. No. Not at all, okay. [laughs] By the way, why not accept everybody as an unquestionable authority? Because somebody will get up here the next night and say, 'it's okay to drink alcohol'. Or, 'abortion is alright', you know. Or, or, you know, 'once you reach Tantra you can do whatever the hell you want', you know. It's all beyond normal morality or something like that. Okay. That's all, if you just believe anybody who just gets up here and starts talking, you will suffer, you see. You will continue to do things that make you suffer. You can't do that. It has to be logical. It has to fit with the rest of Buddhism. It has to be provable to you. And if you start buying everything that somebody says, even if they are wearing a red suit, even if they are said to, in the poster that you read, to be the Dalai Lama's best friend, which there, He got so many 'best friends' I can't believe it, you know. No. What they say has to be provable to you. Any, what anyone says in Buddhism. The Buddha Himself said, don't believe what I say. Check it out, okay. And, and that has to remain a rule in American Buddhism or else we'll, we'll get all kinds of voodoo and all kinds of weird things. And you will get hurt from that, okay. Yeah.

[student – unclear]

He said, how can you call the Buddha a person who never lies, if we all know that when He was teaching people of lesser capacity, the Buddha often simplified things to the point where, technically, it wasn't true anymore, okay. For example, the Buddha taught self-awareness. There's a Scripture where the Buddha teaches self-awareness. When you get to the higher schools of Buddhism, they say, that's not correct. It doesn't exist. Okay. He taught it as such-and-such a Buddhist school, you see what I mean. He, He presented it as a such-and-such a Buddhist school and you have to say it that way. And, and that's a, there's a subject called {trang-nge}, the art of interpretation. How do you know when the Buddha was speaking literally and how do you know when the Buddha was speaking figuratively? Lord Buddha said, kill your father and kill your mother. He meant, if you're not able to practise the spiritual life well at home staying with your parents, then move out and go stay somewhere else. Okay. That's what He meant. And you have to know how to interpret the Buddha, you know. How do you know when He was speaking literally and how do you know when He wasn't? We're gonna cover that subject in around October, November. We're gonna have a whole course on it. {trang-nge} will be the last formal course of the, of the, of this whole thing. Okay. So, that'll be the

subject. So hang around 'til then, alright. Alright, one more thing. [laughter] The last, I have to, I try to give you a little bit of formal logic every night, okay. We've been through reason, which was defined as? Oh, wait, wait, wait, wait. Nobody on earth could ever give a definition of a reason; {tak kyi tsennyi yepay chir}. Okay. {tak kyi tsennyi yepay chir}. You say? I say, nobody on the planet could give me a definition of a reason.

[student – unclear]

Say, {tak ma drup} [repeat], {tak ma drup} [repeat]. Wrong. Okay. That's not correct to say. Oh, {tak yarta}, are you telling me that you could?

[students: Du.]

{Du}, okay, say {du}. {Shok, shok.}

[student – unclear]

Yeah. Anything you put forth as a reason. Anything you give as a reason. {tak kyi tsennyi yinpa teln}, are you telling me that's a reason, definition of a reason? {Du}, okay. You know how faxes send a, I forget what they call it. There's a confirmation signal or something. It, it, it confirms that it sent itself or something. So, at the end of that, this is the whole exchange, it goes like this: nobody on the earth could give me the definition of a reason. And she says, wrong. He says, oh are you telling me somebody could give me that reason? Right, {du}. What is it? And then she said, anything you put forward as a reason. I said, is that the definition of a reason? And she says, {du}. So that last thing, that last step is a reconfirmation, okay. I'm just checking. Is that what you meant to say? And you say, {du}. What do you want to do about it, you know, {du}. Alright. So, {tak su kupa tak yangdak kyi tsennyi yinpa teln}, so, I guess any reason you put forth is a good reason, right, {yinpa teln}.

[No.]

Why did you say that?

[I didn't say that.]

Yeah. It's, like, I didn't say that. Who said that? Who said that? Say {chi chir} [repeat], {chi chir} [repeat], okay. When do you use {chi chir}? When I say, oh,

so I guess anything I put forth as a reason is a good reason. I added a word, right. And you say {chi chir}, you know. Why do you say that, you know. Who said that? Okay. So, there's two, what you have to learn tonight is just that. There's two answers to a {teln} statement. There's two answers to that sarcastic statement we talked about last week, last class, you know. I come down with a {teln}, right. Are you tell, oh, oh, so I guess anything I put forth as a reason is a good reason. And she says, {chi chir}, who said that? Okay. Got it? If I end with {chir}, she has three options: right, meaning, repeat what I said- is or has, okay; or she can say, {tak ma drup} which means, wrong; or she can say {kyappa ma jung} which means, you're right but it doesn't necessarily prove what you're trying to prove. That, we had already, okay. The last class we had my response to her, oh, are you telling me, anything I put forward as a reason, is the definition of a reason? And she says, {du}. So, to tell, when I go down on a {teln}, {yinpa teln}, she can say, {du}. Right, that's what I said. What do you wanna do about it? Okay, {du}, okay. Then I do my reconfirmation to her, but I'm being sneaky. I'm changing it slightly, okay. Oh, are you telling me the definition of a reason, of a good reason, is anything I put forward as a reason? And then she says what? {Chi chir}. Say, {chi chir} [repeat], {chi chir} [repeat]. Who said that? [laughs] Alright. Why, why, wherefore? Okay. It means, {chi chir}, right. Now you know all the responses in a debate. If you think about it, you only have five choices, right? If I say, because the, nobody could give me a reason, could give me the definition of a reason. She says, {tak ma drup}, wrong. Okay. And if I say, the sky is green because it has a colour. {kyappa ma jung}. Nice, okay. Say, {kyappa} [repeat] {ma jung} [repeat], {kyappa ma jung} [repeat]. Sometimes you just go, {kyappaaa} [laughter], okay, {kyappa majung}. Which means, dah, of course it has a colour but that doesn't prove it's green, okay. See, if you said, {tak ma drup} what would it mean? The sky doesn't have a colour. You can't say, {tak ma drup}, you see. You can't say, wrong. Okay. What did I say? Oh, consider the sky, it's green, because it has a colour. You can't say, {tak ma drup}, 'cos then, you'd be saying that it doesn't have a colour. You have to say, not necessarily. Just because it has a colour doesn't prove it's green. Then you say, {kyappa ma jung}. Say, {kyappa} [repeat] {ma jung} [repeat], {kyappa ma jung} [repeat]. But, now, I say, the sky has a colour because it's blue. Right. You can just go like, by the way, you don't say {du}, okay. {Du} is only a response to my sarcastic one. Are you telling me the sky has a colour? {Du, du}, okay. Are you telling me the sky has a colour?

[students: Du].

Right. So, the sky is a changing thing, I'm sorry, unchanging thing, right. {Chi

chir}, [laughs] you know. Who said that? Okay. I didn't say that. Who said that? Okay, you gotta get used to those five answers, okay. One is to just agree, right. One is {tak ma drup}, which is, wrong. One is {kyappa ma jung}. Oh, yeah, what you say is right. Consider the sky, it's green, because it has a colour. Yeah, I agree the sky has a colour, but that, doesn't prove it's green, okay, {kyappa ma jung}. Now, if I come down with a {teln}, are you telling me the sky is blue? Right, {du}, okay. Oh, so, you're telling me the sky is green, right? {Chi chir}, who said that? Okay. {chi chir}. So, you got five basic answers now. Okay. We'll check, we'll do a few next week, okay. But that's, that is all the answers in a monastic debate. And, if you know those five, and if you could understand the language, then sooner or later you reach the truth about any given question. It's great. It's really interesting. In the, in the confines or the restrictions of those five answers, you can reach the truth about any subject. It's very cool, okay. That's all you need to engage in a Tibetan monastic debate, you know. You could be a real geshe in, like, a week probably [laughter], you know, 'cos there's, all you need is to answer, you know, you can fake a debate in a monastery too. You know, you're just, like, {tak ma drup}. Or you say, {du}. And you don't even know what the guy's asking you, you know. You say, {chi chir}. [laughter] You could go on like that for, like, ten minutes, you know. [laughter][laughs] And, and they don't know what the, I mean, pretty soon it reaches, like, it's crazy, you know. Like, you, you agreed the sky is green and blue and everything else, you know. [laughter] [laughs] But, you know, if you can't hear the guy very well, you can always just take a shot, you know. And, That's an option. Okay. Three kinds of good reasons and then we really are done tonight. Three, three kinds of good reasons. How do you say 'good reason', by the way? Correct reason. {Tak yangdak}. First chapter Pramanavartikka: {... }, there's only three kinds of correct reasons are possible, okay. {Tak yangdak} means correct reason. First one is called a, say {dre tak} [repeat] {yangdak} [repeat], {dre tak} [repeat] {yangdak} [repeat]. {Dre tak}, {dre} means, {drebung}, you had it last class. What is it?

[A result].

A result. Okay. A result. An effect or a result, okay. {Tak yangdak} means, a good reason. So, a good reason which involves a result, okay. A good reason which involves a result. I'll give you the most famous example from Buddhist Scripture for the last thirteen centuries, okay. Say, {du deng gi} [repeat] {la la} [repeat] {chuchen} [repeat] {dulwa yerte} [repeat] {me} [repeat] {yepay chir} [repeat]. Another, again, okay. {Du deng gi} [repeat] {la la} [repeat] {chuchen} {dulwa yerte}, I'm sorry, screwed it. {Me yerte} [repeat] {dulwa yepay chir}

[repeat]. {Du deng gi la la chuchen} means consider a mountain pass where there's a big cloud of smoke. In Tibet, you're sitting in the Lhasa valley, and you're looking out towards Drepung, that inferior, I mean, great Drepung monastery, and there's a mountain pass behind it and you see this huge cloud of smoke. Okay, {du deng gi la la chuchen}, consider a mountain pass covered with smoke, okay. {Me yerte}, say, {me yerte} [repeat], there must be a fire over there. Okay, {me yerte dulwa yepay chir}. Say, {dulwa} [repeat] {yepay chir} [repeat], because there's a big cloud of smoke over there. And that's the classic correct reason where the reason is the result, okay. And that's the first of the three types. Okay. {Du deng gi la la chuchen me yerte yipay chir}, okay. Consider a mountain pass covered with smoke, hey, there must be a fire over there, because there's smoke. Where there's smoke, there's fire. Okay. And that's a classic proof in Buddhism. First kind. The reason to learn all these is to learn all the different ways you can prove emptiness. And you must do it {tak yepa}. Say, {tak yepa} [repeat] {tak yepa} [repeat], {rikpa tak yepa} [repeat]. Very famous in Madhyamika. You must be able to prove emptiness a thousand different ways, okay. By the time you see emptiness directly you better be able to prove it about a thousand different ways. Okay. And all of these are for the purpose of establishing emptiness. I mean, we're trying to get at emptiness. And we're gonna use all these tools. You have to have a huge toolbox. When you go in to your one-month retreat to try to see emptiness directly, you better have a big toolbox to take with you. And it's gonna be all these different reasons that you understand about emptiness. And you cannot perceive it directly, without understanding many different ways of proving it. And that's the whole point of doing this class. It's not a boring, well, may be boring, but it's not a meaningless class in, in logic. There's a very specific goal in mind. If you get good at this, the odds that you will see emptiness directly, in this life, are very much higher. If you never get good at this, the odds are very lousy, okay. So, you have to, you have to work on it, okay. Number two. Say, {rangshin} [repeat] {tak yangdak} [repeat], {rangshin} [repeat] {tak yangdak} [repeat]. It's called a 'correct reason of nature'. And, I'm not gonna go over it tonight. I just want you to know the name of it, okay. That's on your homework. You don't even have to explain it. Okay. We're gonna get to it next week, okay. It's correct reason based on some kind of nature. Okay. Say, {ma mikpay} [repeat] {tak yangdak} [repeat], {ma mikpay} [repeat] {tak yangdak} [repeat]. {Ma mikapay} means the absence of something, okay. The absence of something. These are correct reasons that are used to prove the absence of something. And we'll get into that about two classes from now, okay. Most of the proofs of emptiness are {ma mikapy taks}. Why? Emptiness is simply the absence of a self-existent thing that never existed anyway. And could not have existed.

Okay. I think you gotta get used to that. It's not like we're denying something that ever was there. It never could be there. Never will be there. Isn't there now. Okay. There's a mental idea of a self-existent thing, right, { ... }. Until you can understand what you think is there you can't ever establish that it's not there. But the actual thing that you think is there, forget it, never was there, never could be there, {gakja}. Okay. The thing that we deny; the thing that was never there anyway, okay. And we're trying to prove the lack of it, the absence of it, the emptiness of it. Okay. So, that's where we're headed, alright. We'll just go straight to some prayers, alright.

[One question?]

Yeah.

[Ngupo right, ...unclear... a false deduction]

No, 'cos we're talking divisions of {tsema}, divisions of correct

[If you put the pen behind your back and somehow I have a perception of that pen behind your back by some crazy illogical process.]

Yeah. That's not a {ngutop jepak}, yeah. You can come a correct conclusion by wrong reasoning and it's not a {jepak}. It's not a {tsema}. Alright.

[cut]

[prayer: short mandala]

[prayer: dedication]

The Asian Classics Institute

Geshe Michael Roach

Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

Class Six: Negative and Positive

Transcribed by Angie Overy

[prayer: short mandala]

[prayer: refuge]

Okay. Tonight we're onto sixth class and [unclear] have that structure of three parts. One will be selection from {dura}. {dura} being all of the basic subjects that come from the logic books and the books on Buddhist perception. And then we'll do a little bit of debating. We'll learn one more piece of debating: {droltang, droltang} meaning, the format. You have to keep working on the format of it. Okay. So, we'll do those three things. The part from the {dura} today is called {gak drup}. Let me see [cut]. Say, {gak drup}[repeat], {gak drup}[repeat]. {gak drup} is a special study called, 'Negatives and Positives', negative and positive. [unclear] is the study of {gak}, okay, of negatives. {gak} and {drup}. It's really important for the study of emptiness. I gave a talk up in [unclear] Massachusetts this weekend, three days, right. It's an unusual place because they're, they attract a lot of people from different Buddhist traditions, you know. There were people from all sorts of Buddhist traditions. And, so it's interesting place to teach because they know something about Buddhism. They've all studied some Buddhism. Most of them. And then it's interesting to teach because every school that they come from be it Japanese Zen or Shri Lankan or Burmese or Thai, Theravaden traditions, or, even some other Tibetan traditions. They all have their own versions of what emptiness is. And it's very interesting, you know. The, some of the ideas that were presented as [cut] [unclear] okay. The ideas are bad. One idea was that, she said she had spent ten or ten years I think, staring at the floor, you know. That she had been taught to stare at the floor. And, she was wondering what, what was supposed to happen, you know. [laughs] And I'm, like, I don't know, you know. And she felt like, she looked to be about fifty [cut] sorry for her, you know. I think she said fifteen years even. I don't know. But she had spent a long time staring at the floor. And this had been taught to her as the meaning of emptiness or that she could understand emptiness this way. Another person was, had spent, you know, years watching

their breath. Just watching their breath for years. And then, every time a thought came up, they were supposed to just follow it and watch the thought. And that was gonna make them see emptiness. And then, another person said they went to this place and they taught them that emptiness meant that they should clear their mind out of every thing. And, if any thought came up, then they should try to find a meditation place, where there's no thoughts at all, you know. Which is impossible, according to all Buddhist theory, you know. All, all Buddhist theory, you know. To have no mental content at all is impossible. Even someone perceiving emptiness directly has, is focussing on something, you know. And, like that. It was very interesting. The other guy, he, he was in a, a, a tradition that taught them that the, what do you call it? The luminous nature of the mind was emptiness, you know. That the way, that the fact that you are aware, is what emptiness is and if you could just focus on that, that you would see emptiness. So, all these people didn't get the {gak drup}, okay. They didn't have the {gak drup} teachings, alright. And that's what I thought that it's really nice that you have {gak drup} today. And it was very sort of depressing, you know, that they, they kind of, you could see this emotion in their face of their world crumbling, you know. I mean, the more they heard, the more it became obvious to them that they had wasted five years or ten years on something that doesn't have anything to do with emptiness. And it was, it was kind of bittersweet, you know. They were kinda happy that they got a good explanation. And then, they were kinda sad that, when they saw that that was obviously not what emptiness was. And it, and they all, I think most of them got what emptiness really is 'cos it makes sense, you know. Once you hear a good teaching on it, it's not like anything very esoteric. Pretty clear what it is. So, it's important to study {gak drup}. If you study {gak drup} well, you won't get into these strange ideas about staring at the floor for ten years, okay.

So, we'll go to the definition of a {gak}, {gakpa}.

Long, okay. You don't mind. This is the longest thing tonight I promise. I decided to lay off you guys a little bit so it's only a forty page reading and [laughter]. And I figured that if it's too much for you and it's too much for me. I was going crazy too. And Winston drove too fast so you didn't get as much reading as you could have. [laughs] Okay. Take some time and write that. [cut] In Tibetan they say { .. gu ma re}. Say, { ... ma re}[repeat] means, you don't have to carve it, just write it. Okay. [laughter] [laughs] Alright. Say {rang}[repeat] {ngu su}[repeat] {tokpay}[repeat] {lu}[repeat] {rang gi}[repeat] {gakja}[repeat] {ngu su}[repeat] {che ne}[repeat] {tok}[repeat] {gupay}[repeat] {chu}[repeat], okay. We'll go through the parts. First of all, the thing should be a {chu}, which means, it exists. It's an existing thing. Okay. A negative is, first of all, a thing which exists. An example would be emptiness, okay. Emptiness is a negative

thing, alright. We're talking about the definition of a negative thing. This is {gakpay tsennyi}, okay. {gakpa} is a negative thing. So, first of all, it should be an object. It should be a thing. And there's this huge debate about {mepa} itself, about non-existence itself. Does non-existence exist? You see. And it's a bitter debate in the monastery. I've seen, the Abbott of Tashi Hlunpo, which is one of the great monasteries, punch it out with one of my classmates in a, in front of a thousand monks. And they had a hard time deciding, you know, does non-existence exist. But that's another story. You can decide that in Winston's debate class. Okay. {rang} means, it, meaning, the negative thing, okay. {ngu su tokpay} means, to perceive it directly. Which perceives it directly. The state of mind which is, {lo}, okay. The state of mind, which perceives it directly, should {che}. {che} means, to eliminate, okay, to eliminate something. This is the same root as {dorje chepa}. What's {dorje chepa}? Diamond Cutter. Okay. {chepa} means, to cut or to eliminate something, okay, by cutting something out. Alright. {chepa}. {ngu su che pa} means, it directly cuts something out, okay. What does it cut out? It's {gakja}, okay. {gakja} means, anything that you deny the existence of, okay. Anything which you say, this is not what we're talking about, okay. That's a {gakja}. Okay. In Madhyamika theory, {gakja} means, the thing that emptiness is empty of, okay. The thing that emptiness denies. The thing that the idea emptiness says doesn't exist, never did exist, never could exist. Which is what? A self-existent thing, okay. {rang gi gakja} means, when you say, for example, emptiness, {rang gi gakja} is its own thing which it denies, okay. {rang gi} means, its own, okay. So, so far, what we have is, in order for the mind to perceive this thing, the mind must first eliminate something else. You see what I mean.

The mind must first exclude something else directly. In order to perceive emptiness you must first exclude self-existent things. Okay. So, {rang gi gakja} means, the thing which it excludes, the thing which it denies. First it must exclude that. And, that's the only way that it can {tok}. {tok} means, to perceive the meaning of the thing, okay. So, the whole long sentence means, and you can put this on your homework, something like this, okay. Definition of a 'negative thing', I have it here, let's see, 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. So, I'll give you some examples, okay, and you tell me what's the process. What's the process? Like, if I say emptiness, when I say emptiness, your mind can only perceive that thing by eliminating something, you see what I mean. It's the absence of something. Okay. When I say emptiness, and by the way, this is your homework assignment, your meditation assignment, okay. We're trying to, the whole purpose of this class is to get you out of the mood of thinking of emptiness as something positive. Okay. It's not the floor. It's not

the thoughts running around in your mind. And it's not the fact that your mind is aware. Emptiness is the absence of something and it's a {gakpa}. It's a negative thing, okay. How do you perceive a negative thing? What's the definition of a negative thing? The mind which understands that thing directly, the mind which perceives that thing directly, has to first exclude something else and then it can see that thing, see what I mean. It has to exclude what that thing denies. So, emptiness denies a self-existent object. And for you to see emptiness, either intellectually or directly, first you have to eliminate or exclude a self-existent thing, okay. That's one example and that's why emptiness is a negative, okay. Because it can only be perceived by the mind which perceives it directly through the process of excluding directly that which it denies. Okay. And that's the definition of a negative thing. There are some more classic negative things. How about what we call {nam ka}, okay? Say, {nam ka}[repeat]. I'll give you, I'll write it for you. By the way, before we do that, how are we gonna write emptiness in this school? What's the Tibetan word for emptiness? {tongpa -nyi}. This school doesn't accept the idea of {tongpa -nyi}, you see. We're in a lower school. We're fishing around in the lower schools. Okay. They don't call emptiness, emptiness. They call it, one of the things they call it, is, you won't see the word emptiness used in the lower schools. You'll see 'selflessness', anatman, okay, or you'll see {chu-nyi}. Say {chu-nyi} [repeat]; {chu-nyi's} like, dharmata, meaning the real nature of things, okay. It includes the word for dharma. It means the 'dharma-ness' of things. Okay. I translate it as the real nature of things. {chu-nyi} is a {gakpa}; {chu-nyi} is a negative. Why? If you wanna perceive the real nature of things, first you have to exclude, mentally, all those things which are not it, okay. And by now, somebody in the class, like, [laughs] maybe, Mark, should say, wait a minute, in this school they said everything was like that. Right? Didn't they say in this school that to perceive anything you had to exclude all that it was not? You see what I mean? Like, you perceive the pen, in this school, by a process of excluding, everything which is not the pen, you see what I mean. You take everything, which is not the pen and then you reverse it and you get the pen. It's called the {dokpa}, right? And you've had that. That's like a principle of this school. It's very important in this school. The {dun chi}, the way you get to form a mental image of something, is by excluding, everything which the thing is not. The text is careful to say, that's what we're not, we're not talking about that when we describe how you perceive a negative. That's a different thing. You see, that's how you form the mental image and that's done through a process of eliminating or reversing everything, which it is not the thing. The opposite of everything, which is not the thing, is the thing. Okay. And that's true of perceiving all things in this school. But that's not what we're talking about when we're talking about a negative. And that's why they

add the extra words in there, okay. They're not saying everything in the universe is a negative, you see. If this was the meaning of negative then you could never find a positive thing, okay. So, in this school, that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about a process where you directly eliminate, consciously, pretty much consciously, you eliminate, mentally, everything else. Let's give another example of a negative thing in this school. Okay. Or in all Buddhist schools. [cut]

Say, {nam ka}[repeat], {nam ka}[repeat]. People translate it as 'space', okay. We talked about it, you have to get good at this word, okay. {nam ka} is a special idea. {nam ka} can mean space, like the element of space; {nam ka} can mean the sky. In Tibetan, you say {nam ka} is the sky. Like, {kam dro} is a sky-goer, a dakini, okay, a Buddhist angel. And, {nam ka} means sky. But, in Buddhist philosophy, {nam ka} means the space, which this pen occupies, okay. The space, which this pen, occupies. I like to translate it as 'empty space'. Okay. Empty space. Is empty space {takpa} or a {mitakpa}? Does it change or does it not change? It's, careful, does it function or not? Careful. I'll give you a couple of arguments. Like, if you, let's debate it, okay. Alright. Who's gonna be a victim? Seamus, okay. [laughs]

{nam ka chuchen}. Okay. Take empty space. Alright. {mitakpa yinpe}, it's a changing thing because {rengawa yinpay chir}, okay. {rengawa} means, sometimes it's there and sometimes it's not, okay. {rengawa} means, sometimes it's there and sometimes it's not. Okay. So, I'll say it again in English. I'll say it in Tibetan. {nam ka chuchen; mitakpa yinpe; rengawa yinpay chir}. Okay. So, take empty space; it's a changing thing; because sometimes it's there and sometimes it's not.

What do you say? Huh? Say, {tak ma drup}? Meaning, I disagree that sometimes it's there and sometimes it's not. You have two choices remember. What do you have, what are the two choices to {chir}? First one? {tak ma drup}, which means, empty space is not a thing which comes and goes. {nam ka rengawa mayin}, okay. And then you can say what? The other choice is, he's a real good {kyappa ma junga}, okay. [laughter] The other choice is {kyappa ma jung}. {kyappa ma jung} means, okay, I admit that it comes and goes, but that doesn't mean it's a changing thing. Okay. I admit that it comes and goes but that doesn't necessarily make it a changing thing. So, which way are you gonna go Seamus? Oh, by the way, you can always agree. You can always say {yin}, you know. You got three choices really, right: I agree that space is a changing thing or, disagree that space comes and goes or, just because space comes and goes doesn't mean it's a changing thing. Okay. What's your choice? Come on. [laughs] He says he agrees. Okay. [laughs][laughter] That's the easy way out 'cos he doesn't have to do anything, right.

So, I'll say, {nam ka chuchen rengawa yinpa teln}. When I go down, it means, what? Are you telling me it comes and goes? Okay. {nam ka chuchen}, say {nam ka chuchen}[repeat]. Oh, you guys are sleepy. {nam ka chuchen}[repeat] {rengawa}[repeat] {yinpa teln}[repeat]. You telling me it comes and goes? You say, {du}, okay. Say {du}[repeat]. That's what I said, yeah, yeah. That's what I said. Okay. That's what I said, okay. So, take the space in which this pen occupies, {rengawa yinpa teln}, are you telling me it comes and goes? You said {du}. {du}, say, {du}[repeat], {du}, okay. And, it's pretty good, you know. When I take, when I take the pen back, the space goes away, right? Well, when I occupy it, it goes away, right? Which one do you want Seamus? Okay. When the pen is there it's occupied and when it's not there, it's not occupied, so it changes, right? It comes and goes, right? No, it doesn't. It doesn't. It's always there, okay. When it's occupied, it has to be there or the pen couldn't be there. When the pen's not there it's been there anyway, you see. And that's the real meaning of empty space. And some people never get it. You know, there's some Scriptures that, I mean, some people think, oh, space is the distance between me and the wall. But that, you don't get it, there's a deeper meaning of empty space. It's the place where this pen is. And whether the pen occupies it or not, it's always gonna be there. Okay. It doesn't ever change. It's empty space. From that sense, it's not changing, okay. Everybody agree? You agree to easy. Yeah, {ngupo mayin pa teln}, so, since it's not a changing thing I guess it's not a working thing. I guess it doesn't do anything. {ngupo mayin pa teln}, you telling me it's not a working thing? Luis? Doesn't do anything? It doesn't or it does? {ngupo mayin pa teln}, I said, are you telling me it's not a working thing? Are you telling me it doesn't do anything? [laughter] By the way, don't forget, if you agree it's a working thing, you must agree it's a changing thing. You're in trouble if you agree it's a working thing. Then you have to agree that it comes and goes. Then you have to agree that it comes and goes. Don't forget those are synonyms:{takpa, ngupo, mitakpa, ngupo}, yeah, what was another one? {chepa dunchik}, okay. They all mean the same thing. Make up your mind, {ngupo mayin pa teln}. [laughter] I gave you a moment to think, okay, {ngupo mayin pa teln}. So, I guess it doesn't have any function because Seamus, and all of us, we established that it doesn't change. It doesn't come and go. Anything, which has a function comes and goes. Anything, which comes and goes has a function. By coming and going you function. You do something. You effect other things. {ngupo mayin pa teln}, {.. } say something. [laughs] [laughter] Hey, by the way, in a debate you just take a shot in the dark, you know. You go {du}.[laughs][laughter] {mayin pa teln, ngupo mayin pa teln}. Huh? No. To {teln} you only have two choices. What are they? {chi chir}, like, huh, who said that? Say {chi chir}[repeat], {chi chir}[repeat]. So, I said,are you

telling me it's not a working thing? And you said, {chi chir}, I didn't say that. You're saying that. Okay. What's the other choice? {du}, yeah, right, right, it's not a working thing. Okay, which one you gonna go for? This is like 'Truth or Consequence' [laughter] {yinpa teln}. {chi chir}. Oh ya. Oh ya, means, I got you now, okay. [laughs][laughter] {ngupo yinpa teln, ngupo yinpa teln}, so you're telling me it's a changing thing, I'm sorry, does it perform a function? I'm sorry, is it a working thing? Are you telling me it's a working thing, {ngupo yinpa teln}? {du}, that's what I said. Stick up, stick to your guns, okay. In debate you have to be shameless, okay. {ngupo yinpa teln}. {du}. {du-je yerpe yinpa teln}, so it performs a function, right? Good. {du}[laughs][laughter] {yerte}, how so, please? [laughter][laughs] [student] Yeah. I mean, it provides a space for the pen to be in, right. It provides a space. That's a function, okay. I mean, this is a big debate in the Abhidharma. Okay. Space has a function because if it wasn't doing its shtick the pen wouldn't have a place to stay, right. So it's providing a space for the pen. What did you say? [student] I didn't catch it, say [student] Oh, she said, the pen doesn't stay in space. That means the thing is kicking it out of space I guess. Space isn't always providing space for the pen you mean, right? Something like that. This is where Rinpoche would go on and say, you have to think about it. Okay. [laughter]

The debate, the debate is that, I mean, technically, they would say it's not, it's not exerting itself, it's not influencing a function, it's not exerting an effort or it's not exerting a function by just being there. And it's, and we can't, technically, say that it is working; it's not working to provide a space for something, you see what I mean. It's just a simple absence of something. And, and it's very tricky if you say it 'allows' a thing to stay there. We can't say that. If you say that you're in trouble on the debate ground. You can't say, empty space allows a space for things to be. It just is. It's just there. It's just the absence of any obstruction. Okay. And I'll give you the definition. Well, the definition of space is that: it's the simple absence of any obstruction. And it's always there and it never changes. And, technically, you can't use the word it 'provides' a place for things to stay although there's a huge debate about it. So you're not, you know, it's, it's, a very difficult question. It's a big question in Abhidharma. They argue about it a lot. Yeah. [student]

Say, {.. }[repeat] { .. }[repeat], the simple absence of physical obstruction, is the definition of empty space in, in Buddhism. Yeah. [student] Yeah. It's still there. Right. No. This is obstructing. The pen is obstructing. The pen ain't, the space is just sitting there. The, the space is not pushing anybody out of that space, the pen is pushing other things out of that space. There must still be { .. } there where the pen is or the pen would be pushed out of the space. That's all. That's all. You gotta get used to it. But what I want you to get, [student] no, nothing else.

So, I wanna, the, the pen is { ..}, the pen is a thing which pushes out other things. Nothing can stay there as long as the pen is there. But, if there were no space there, the pen would be kicked out. But it's not, so it proves there's empty space there. Okay. Sometimes it's occupied, sometimes it's not, it never changes. In fact, I like to think of it as place itself. And you gotta work with that. Okay. Anyway, it wasn't the point of bringing it up. And we gotta go or else, I don't mind to stay 'til eleven but some other people get mad at me. Especially the Quaker House and John Stillwell. Okay.

All I want you to really get about this, is that to put your mind on the thing called 'empty space', you have to exclude the concept of something which is obstructing, you see what I mean. That, that prevents something from being there, you see. To perceive what I say, when I say empty space, especially because of the word 'empty', which I've added, okay, just to make it easier for you, you have to in your mind, exclude, mentally you exclude, physical objects. Things that would stop something else from being there, you see. So, when I say, empty space, from now on, your mind should go through a process of first excluding something which is not there. What's not there? Obstruction. If obstruction's not there, empty space, you see what I mean, { .. }; the simple absence of an obstruction. But, what, the point I'm trying to make is that, is to get you sensitive to the definition of a negative thing: you have to exclude something, to perceive it, you see what I mean. Mentally, you have to, you have to, directly say, oh, empty space, he means something where there's nothing that, that is blocking other things, okay. That's all. That's all. Rinpoche like to call it 'blockers'; there's no blockers there. 'Cos he saw it on TV, he heard it on the football game and he's, like, that's what blocker is. [laughs][laughter] Yeah. Yeah, real quick though, okay. [student] Ah, we can say, she said, is any space really empty because there's always sub-atomic particles there. There's not enough to block the, block the insertion of the pen into that place. That's all. Student] By the way, the fact that they're there means that there is space there because it's allow-oop, it's, it's a giving it-oop, it's where they are, okay.[laughs] That's all. If it wasn't there, they'd get pushed out, you see what I mean.

Second question. [student] Oh, there's a big debate about it in the Abhidharmakosha third chapter. She said, explain gravity according to all this. In the Abhidharmakosha they say, everybody knows the Earth is flat and why doesn't water fall off the side? [laughter] Third chapter. By the way, not so silly as it sounds, you know. Long story, but I'm not gonna go into it. Anyway, they say, the karma of sentient beings who live on that planet, prevents the water from falling off the sides. Yeah. [student] Leon asked, does the emptiness of the pen reside in place? I don't think they would say that because they only talk about things residing in a place with regard to physical matter I think. Like, you

can't position your mind. You can't say that your mind has a location. Where do formless realm, when you take birth in the formless realm, where do you enter the formless realm? Remember we had it? It's in the place you die. So, there's no? There's no {bardo}. Why? There's no {bardo} being. You go straight to the formless realm. Why? You don't have to get anywhere. The function of a {bardo} is to get you to your new birth - place, you know. So, there's no {bardo} for a person being born into the formless realm 'cos you just are born there wherever you die. And then you're not in any place anymore. So, I think, I would say that, probably Buddhist Scripture says that, place is a place for physical objects. I would, I would, you know, I would say it that way. And I would debate it by using the {bardo} thing, you know. Yeah. [student] Hang on one second though. But, I could say, you could say, that, and you do say, that emptiness is attached to its object, you see what I mean. But, it doesn't mean that it's located in the same place as the pen. Like, the pen has its own emptiness and that emptiness goes out of existence, please, we can't say, 'destroyed', when the pen is destroyed. It goes out of existence. So, it is a quality, which is attached to the pen, but we wouldn't say, I don't think, that it's located at the same place that the pen is located. But, but you could, you know, if you wanted to debate me and we were in the debate ground, if I was gonna take your side, you know, I would say, oh, isn't it based on some kind of, doesn't it have a locus? And the guy, would have to say, yeah, it has a locus. Then I'd say, then it has a location, right? And then he'd say, not necessarily, and then, we'd go like that, you know. Yeah, I'm sorry. Go ahead. [unclear] [student] I don't, she said that, the idea of place is like a vessel and, I'm repeating for the tape, okay, 'cos it doesn't pick up your question easily. So, couldn't you say that your mind is, is located where your body's located, is that what you mean? [student] Oh, place. I think that you're falling into the trap of thinking of space as the location, of, as the distance between two walls or something. That's a trap and it's common. You know, the Abhidharma, what's it say? {namke ... }, in the first chapter. It says, space doesn't refer to the vault of space, to the vault of the sky. And also, don't get into the trap of thinking that space refers to the place between two walls or two, that's not the real meaning of space. It's the, it's the lack of physical obstruction; the simple absence of physical obstruction. Okay. Excuse me? He asked, is, is what? Space? [student] That's a huge debate, okay, and I like the question. There are three interpretations among the four Buddhist schools of what dependent origination means. The, the lowest group, which is the first three schools lumped all together called the "Functionalists", because, they believe that anything that works must have some existence in and of itself. They say that thing is dependently arising when it depends on its causes and it's, and it's, what was the thing we had? Supporting conditions, contributing factors,

okay. The second group, which is the lower half of the Madhyamika school, says, some, that's no good because that doesn't cover things like empty space, which also has its own dependent arising quality. So, your definition is not good enough. You have to extend, extend it wider. If you restrict it to causes and, and to the fact that things depend on their causes, you're not going far enough, because then you exclude empty space which must have its own dependent origination, because, it has its own emptiness. Okay. And they say that you should say, that a thing is dependently arising when it depends on its parts. And then they give the example of empty space. And then the guy says, what are the parts to empty space? And he says, east, west, north, south. How's that? The four quarters, you see. Okay, 'cos location, you can locate something by, you know, relative to direction. Anyway, we better go onto the class. Alright.

I'll give you one more negative that I like. How do you spell that? Say, {hlejin} [repeat] {tsunpo}[repeat] {nyinwor}[repeat] {se}[repeat] {mi sa}[repeat]; {hlejin} [repeat] {tsunpo}[repeat] {nyinwor}[repeat] {se}[repeat] {mi sa}[repeat]. {hlejin} means, Devadatta, okay. I'd like to translate it as Joe Blow or John Smith or, it's, it's meant to be, like, John Doe, you know. It's meant to be, you know, Joe Schmoe, okay. And, we'll see how you translate it when you become translators, okay. It just means Joe Anybody, okay, {hlejin}, Devadatta. It comes from ancient India. They're just trying too say, 'John', okay. I, I think I translated it as John Smith or something. Okay. {hlejin}. {tsunpo} is an ancient, ancient word. You never ever see it. It means, chubby. Okay. [laughs] {tsunpo} means chubby, okay. {nyinmo} means, daytime; {nyinmor} means, during the daytime, during the day. Okay. {se} means, food; {se} means, food. {mi sa} means, he never eats food during the day. Okay. John Smith, that extremely chubby fellow, never eats food during the day. Okay. I think they're probably referring to some monk who was being very righteous and not eating after noon, you know, and then he kept getting fatter and fatter, right. [laughter] And never ate anything but that little thing in his bowl every day, you know. I believe it's probably a joke like that, okay. This is a {mepa}. This is a {gakpa}, okay. If you think about it, this is a {gakpa}. This is a negative thing. Why? Because, it's, it's directly stated, you know, he doesn't eat during the day. Okay. And you exclude in your mind that he eats during the day. In your mind, the {gakja} here is, chubby John Smith eating during the day. And when I say, think of chubby John Smith who doesn't eat during the day, you picture this portly guy, who's not out in the restaurants during the day, you know, in the east Village. Okay. He doesn't frequent them during the day. But, immediately, something else comes up in your mind. Which is what? He's gotta be hanging out there at night, okay. [laughs] [laughter] He's gotta have some bagels under his pillow, you know, something, okay. And, and, it's, it, we call it, that it

implies, in Tibetan it's called {penpa}. Say {penpa}[repeat] {chu shen}[repeat] {penpa}[repeat]. I'll spell it for you. I hope I spell it right. Let's see. [cut]

Say, {chu shen}[repeat] {penpa}[repeat], {chu shen}[repeat] {penpa}[repeat]. Any negative statement or any negative thing or any negative expression, which {chu shen penpa} is a different kind of negative, you see. {chu shen}, {chu} means dharma or thing, {chu} means thing; {shen} means, some other thing. Okay. {chu shen} means, some other thing. {penpa} means, it implies some other thing. Okay. {penpa} by the way, is a word in Tibetan which means, to project. When you shoot an arrow it's called {da penpa}. The karma that threw you into this life is called {penjen gyi le}, okay, {pen}, {pen} means, to project, a projectile something. So, when I say, chubby John Smith never eats during the day, it's projecting into your mind another thing, you see what I mean. And that's a different kind of negative thing. And you have to learn those two kinds of negative things; very important. And I'll give them to you again. The first kind is a simple absence of something. [cut]

The second kind implies something else. Where is emptiness? Sorry, the true nature of things in this school, right. I have on my Sautrantika hat this course. I can't say 'emptiness'. I have to say, either, 'selflessness', or, the 'true nature of things'. Okay, 'cos they don't believe that that's the same thing as emptiness. That's a long story. And that belief is not shared by any of the higher schools, okay. Which one of these two, into which one, will you put emptiness itself? I'm sorry, the true nature of things? Yeah. It's the simple absence of what? A self-existent thing. Tell me what a self-existent thing looks like. Describe to me a self-existent thing. [students] The credit, on my credit card, okay. [laughter] All the readings I ever got done well in advance of the class. [laughs] Okay. [laughs] The hair in the middle of my head, you know. You could say anything, you see. If I ask you to describe a self-existent thing you're in trouble. There's no such thing. How long is a rabbit's horns? You see? You have to ask me, sorry, we can't describe a self-existent thing, but we can describe what people think of when you say self-existent thing. You see what I mean? There's a big distinction. You can describe what people think of when I say self, when they perceive a self-existent thing, or they think there's a self-existent thing. Oh, what's that? It's a thing that doesn't depend on their karma. The bad things that happened to you today, the people that treated you bad today, the people that irritated you today, the situations that you did not like in your life today, all came from somewhere else. They are not your own mind doing its thing 'cos you collected the karma to make it happen. They're, they are somebody else. That person is stupid and they better get their act together. No, no. You better get your act together. Okay. All of those people in the world that you think are stupid, what's the test? If they can create a mental affliction in you, then, you are

holding them to be self-existent. Very interesting. Very, very interesting. Okay. What's the test of whether you got your emptiness metre running or not? Can they upset you, 'cos if they can, you're not understanding their emptiness. Okay. Period. Anytime that another person or situation could cause you any kind of stress or discomfort or any kind of dislike of them, you're not understanding their emptiness, by definition. It's very cool. You wanna know how good your emptiness understanding is? See how pissed off you're getting at other people. Okay. You wanna see at anytime during the day, you know, is emptiness understanding at a peak or at a valley? How pissed off do you get? You know, really. And I'm not kidding. It's a very interesting test because you cannot have a mental affliction unless you're holding the thing to be self-existent. Which it never was, never could be, never will, isn't now. Okay. You can't, your mental afflictions feed off your ignorance. Okay. They need ignorance to eat. To, to live, they need your ignorance. Okay. Anytime you have a dislike someone and feel upset. Anytime your mental stream is disturbed, right. { ... }, definition of a mental affliction: any kind of thought that could disturb your peace of mind. Once your peace of mind is disturbed, by definition, you're having a mental affliction. And, by definition, you're taking that problem, or that problem person, to be self-existent. It's very interesting. It's very, you know, that's why they say, go up on a cliff and have someone, you know, like, go like that. Stand behind you and go, go like that. And you get this emotion come up. You couldn't have that unless you saw the thing as self-existent, okay. It's very interesting. Yeah. [student] [laughs] Shouldn't be happy in the sense, he said, does that mean you shouldn't be happy or sad. You can be sad, okay. I mean, Buddhas are sad, right, but their mental streams are not disturbed or upset, you see what I mean. There's a fine distinction between being upset and being sad, you know. You can be sad about the fact that you created this person and you have to put up with them for the next, until you purify the karma. You can be sad about it. They, they have compassion, right. They have a sadness. You look at Trijang Rinpoche's picture, you know, you see it in his face. He's sad about us, you know, but he's not upset. So, there's a distinction, you know. {rang ..}, his mental continuum is not thrown off balance, you see what I mean. It's not, there's a big distinction between that. [student] [laughs] That, you can be happy, but never be so happy that you would do, by the way, another test, is your happiness or your joy about something, legal or not? Okay. Would you do something negative to somebody to keep it? That's the question. That's the test of whether you're seeing that thing as self-existent. I mean, we talked about the negative one, right. What's the test of whether happiness or joy is ignorant or not? Would you fight to keep that thing? Would you hurt someone to keep that thing? Then, it's ignorance, you see what I mean. And that's a very fine line

too. Okay. Yeah. [student] He says, but in a case where, say, somebody punches me in the face, wouldn't I feel pain and wouldn't I feel upset? You guys who studied the Diamond Cutter know about the guy who suffered under the hands of the king of Kalinga, right? Kalinga. The king of Kalinga was wandering through the forest one day. He caught his wife with a Buddhist monk. The Buddhist monk was teaching her sweet Dharma. He took it the wrong way. He tied him down and he slowly cut off all his fingers and toes and feet and arms. And, the Buddha's relating this story during the Diamond Cutter Sutra and He said, I felt the pain but I did not get angry. You see? And that's the distinction. Yeah. I did not lose my balance. I did not lose my peace of mind, but, of course, I was in intense pain. And there's a distinction between the two, okay. Okay.

There's a word for simple absence. And these are the two divisions of all negative things. Say, {megak}[repeat] {megak}[repeat], a simple absence of something. Examples are, space, empty space; the simple absence of physical obstruction. Simple absence of tangible obstruction. Yeah. [student] I mean, when I say space I mean empty space, okay. [student] There's no such thing as, well, when I say empty space, I mean, the empty space, can be occupied by an object. [student] Yeah. It's still empty. [student] It's always empty. Yeah. Yeah. How about available space or something? It's always available, okay. [student] Yeah. Yeah. If it weren't empty the thing couldn't occupy it. That's all. You got the idea. I hate this, I did not say 'empty space' in this reading. Why? And here I'll answer a homework question for you. Okay. The opponent says, all negatives must be such that the words which express them have a negative word in them somewhere, like, 'un' or 'non' or 'less' or 'empty'. And the guy says, no. What about {nam ka}? Okay. Space. {nam} doesn't mean 'no', 'not', 'un', 'less'. And {ka} doesn't mean that. So, there, ergo, that's not, did you notice that was not a part of the definition of a negative? Okay. You can have things which are positive and which have a negative sound, have a negative word in them. For example, I like it, {mitakpa}. Okay. {mitakpa}. Supports my theory, okay. What's {mitakpa} mean? [student] No. Woa. Changing, okay. But in the Tibetan there's a negative particle there; not unchanging, you see what I mean, {mi takpa}. Okay. Now, what is that? Is that a negative? {mitakpa} Think first. I'm not referring to the wording. I'm referring to the concept. To perceive 'changing', do you have to reject anything else? No. It's a positive event, you see. You're just watching the thing change. You can go out and watch the traffic on the George Washington Bridge. That's a {mitakpa}. And you're just watching it. Okay. So, {mi takpa}, which has a negative word in it, doesn't, doesn't necessarily have to be a negative concept. We're talking the concept of a negative thing, okay. Yeah. [student] That's difficult. No, because

{pa's} attached to all adjectives in Tibetan; all nouns, all verbs. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, it would be nice. I got another question for you though, while I'm on the subject, okay. We can knock off another homework question. How about {dra mitakpa}? How about the fact that sound is a changing thing? Think carefully, okay. This is a hard one. I ask you, okay. Let's debate. Nah. How about {dra mitakpa}? By the way, I remember, Art once asked a beautiful question in class. I'll never forget it, you know. He was sitting there, you know, in his way, and he said, wait a minute Rinpoche, he burst into class, you know. He says, are all unchanging things negative? And Rinpoche said, yeah, I guess so. Okay. You know, he couldn't think of one that wasn't. So, now, I ask you again. [laughs][laughter] {dra mitakpa}, the fact that, the fact that sounds are changing things, is it positive or negative? It sounds positive, right? Now, I'll say it a different way. And it only dawned on me this afternoon, you know, 'cos I've struggled with this for a while. How about, sound is always a changing thing? [student] It's closer to, 'sound is never an unchanging thing', right. So, how about if I put 'always'? I like to do that. Let's say, always. Sound is, I'm talking about general truths, right. We've been struggling with general truths. And there's even some confusion in the text I think, okay. Sound is, sounds are changing things or, and I'm gonna emphasise the 'always'. Sounds are always changing things. Huh? [student] Yes what? [student] [laughs] I know it's true. And it's a universal truth. I'm asking is it a positive thing or a negative thing? That statement. That truth. If I say, sounds are always changing. [student] Huh? She said, that happens to be an unchanging thing. That's true, according to me, okay. There's a little bit of a debate in the reading today, okay. [student] He said, some truths, are changing. What truth is changing thing? {shok} [laughter] Come back to me in a couple of days, okay. No. Anyway, [student] think about it. Is it a concept, which you can only perceive by eliminating something else? It really is, you see. And I believe that's the point. And I'm struggling with it myself so you play around with it when you go home, okay. But I believe, and as far as I can tell in the text, all general truths are {mayin gaks}. [cut]

It's a negative, which implies, something else. And I'll give you two examples. One sounds like a negative and one doesn't sound like a negative, okay. Be careful. Here's the one that sounds like a negative: John Smith, that chubby guy, doesn't eat during the day. Okay. That's a, that sounds like a negative, especially 'cos it has that 'not' in it, right? It's easy. See, you're getting confused between the concept of a negative and the wording of a negative. And don't do that. Okay. The definition of a negative was not, anything I say that has a negative in it, like, 'not or' no' or 'un' or 'non' or, like that. Okay. It was, rather, anything that you could only perceive directly by eliminating or excluding

something else directly. Okay. Don't forget that. Okay. So, it's obvious that, the expression, 'John Smith who's chubby, never eats during the day', is a negative in the sense that it implies something else. Okay. It projects something else. What? He stuffs himself at night. Right? It directly states he doesn't eat during the day. It indirectly implies that he stuffs himself at night. It actually directly implies that according to Buddhist, okay.

How about the following one? What was in the other one? Did you like what I cooked for you today? What you cooked this time was really good. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. [laughs][laughter] Okay. I'll say it again. What you cooked this time was really good. Okay. Is that a negative? Is that a negative statement? What you cooked, this time, was really good. According to Buddhism, it's a {mayin gak}, okay. It's a {mayin gak}. Why? Because, you're excluding all the other times when they cooked really bad. Okay. To, to perceive the truth, the general truth that what they cooked was really good, you have to forget all the bad dinners they ever made you. Okay. To perceive the truth that this dinner was really good, you mentally you have to try to forget all those nights that they burned it [laughs], okay. And that way, you can establish in your mind, this one was good, okay. This one was good.

I assert, that all general truths, are the same. When I use the word 'always', when I say sounds are always changing things, I'm excluding, what I'm essentially saying, is they are never unchanging things. You see what I mean? And you gotta cook that. It looks like, in this text, that all general truths are {mayin gak}. Okay. That's tricky. Now, whether those are functional things or changing, that's another question. Yeah. [student] I'm sorry, say again. [student] A rabbit's horn. Okay. [student] he said, how do we know a rabbit's horn [student] yeah [student] yeah. He said, how do we know that rabbit's horns don't exist? How about I say this? When I refer to a rabbit's horns, I refer to rabbit's horns, which are easily observable on most of the rabbits that Americans normally run into in our common experience, you know. And that's, you know, you have to say that. In the debate ground, you start out with saying, look, for the next three hours, when I refer to a rabbit's horns, I'm talking about the one we both know can't exist. [student] Yeah. Yeah. Sure, sure. Yeah. We have to deal, he said, are you talking about observable and [unclear] perceptions? Of course. We have to deal with our own reality, you know. I mean, yeah, we do have to. Now, how do we do that? There's a big debate in the Pramanavartikka. Like, do you, is your normal reality defined by taking several examples of rabbits that you've seen and then drawing some kind of broad conclusions about all rabbits? I mean, how do you determine or how do you conclude that rabbits don't have horns? How many rabbits did you check, you know what I mean? And really, there's a debate about it, and

[student], yeah, yeah. It's similar, yeah. [student] It does, yeah. Yeah. They could just have a, what do you call it, a hormonal problem or something like that. And that's true [cut] [end side A]

[side B]

That's really true. We're talking about general. Everybody knows he sneaks cookies at night in the monastery and stuff like that. Okay. Yeah. [student] Yeah, you could say that, yeah. In our current, accepted, convention of a rabbit. [student] Yeah, you could say that. He said, by definition, when we define a rabbit, we don't define it with horns. And he said it's the same as talking about a round square, by definition, a square has four corners. By definition, our normal definition of a rabbit, would not include horns. Okay. Yeah. [student] It's equal to a what? [student] {takpa}. That's a huge debate. According to Michael Roach it is. I mean, general truths, to me, are {takpa}. There is a debate in the Scripture and you'll see some greasy stuff going on in your reading tonight. Sorry, you know. There are, sometimes {mayin gaks} are called, 'working things that are negatives'. Okay. And it's not clear in my mind and I admit it, okay. To me, a general truth, has to be an unchanging thing, you know. The, the really good Sautrantikas distinguish between, the expression of a general truth and the general truth itself. They say that the expressions of general truths, the words, or I guess you could say the fact that, okay, rabbits don't have horns, for example, the wording, or in a sense, the quality, right, is always {takpa}. Is always unchanging. But, but is that thing unchanging, is a big debate, okay. [student] No such thing [student]. He said, all universal truths have to be expressions. Then, all universal truths are sound? [student] {yinpa teln} [student] Huh? So, if we never say them they're not general truths? {yinpa teln} [student] Huh? [laughter][laughs] [student] They are convention, yeah. [student] You can say that. I guess you could say that. I'm not gonna say either way. Okay.

These are the two kinds of negatives, alright. And one thing you should know. Did you have a question? Alright. Maybe we take a break there. One more, yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] Right. [student] By the way, it's in the inflection of my voice, isn't it? You see, it's in the inflection in my voice. In English, in this example, it's in the inflection. If you wrote it down on a piece of paper and said, I liked your food this time, it could be a {mayin gak}, it could be a negative which does imply something else or it could be a positive. But when you hear my inflection, this time, then you know [laughs] okay. Alright. Take a break, okay, right.

[student] [unclear] said, what's the difference between the absence of something and not being something? This is not an elephant. Okay. That's not being something else. You see what I mean? And then, emptiness is the absence of

self-existent thing in this room. You see what I mean. One is the fact that the thing is not here and one is the fact that this is not the thing. In English, it's the difference between the word 'is' and the word 'exists' sometimes, you see. He is or he is not President of the United States and then, the President of the United States doesn't exist. Those, are two different things, you see what I mean? One is a {mayin gak}, one is a {megak}. Okay. The absence of the President of the United States would be a {megak}. The fact that Joe Schmoe is not the President of the United States is a {mayin gak}, okay. And those are just the words that I use to translate {megak} and {mayin gak}, okay, and you might want to get used to that 'cos it's on your homework that way. We try to be merciful, okay. All you really need to remember is 'simple absence' and 'implying something else', okay. By the way, if your homework were to ask, describe a {mayin gak} in general, okay. Describe number two here in general. Then you'd say, something like, that's how we do the final, right. It's a negative thing, where the wording used to describe it, used to express it sorry, where the words used to express it imply something else. You see what I mean. They imply something else.

Incidental to denying what they already deny, you see what I mean. When you say, he's fat and he doesn't eat during the day, you're, you're denying that he eats during the day. So, incidentally, incidental to denying that he eats during the day, you are implying what? He eats at night. Okay. By the way, somebody asked me, is that always the case, is that, you know, a {kyepa}. It's not a {kyepa}, right. He could have some kind of problem. He could have stopped eating during the day yesterday, you know, or whatever. So, it's not a {kyepa}. But remember the context. It's a bunch of monks sitting in the monk cafeteria, wondering why this guy who never eats more than a little bowl of food, keeps getting chubbier and chubbier. You know, like, maybe something's going on here. Okay, you know. [laughs] Okay. 'Cos classically, you're not supposed to eat after noon, alright. A monk is not supposed to have any food after twelve until the following morning, okay.

Okay, we'll go on to some formal logic that's very short today. We talked about the definition of a reason. What was the definition of a reason? Anything you give as a reason. Okay. Because the sky is filled with pink polka dots and pink stripes, okay, is a reason. Okay. Is it a correct reason? No, because the three relationships don't hold. Okay. Here we go. Because the sky is pink with green polka dots, okay. Is it a correct reason? No. How can you say that? How can you say it's not a correct reason when you don't even know the other elements yet? I didn't say, consider this, it's that, because it's that. You know. And already, you're telling me it's an incorrect reason. How can you say that when you don't even know what relationships I'm talking about yet? Aren't you

supposed to wait until you hear the thing I'm talking about, and then the thing I'm trying to prove about it, and then the reason? And then, you're gonna see if those three relationships hold. Is number one number three? If someone is number three does it make it number two? If something's not number two does it mean it can't be number three? You didn't wait. You just said, incorrect reason. [laughter] [student] Huh? [student] He's right. Okay. He said, the relationship between one and three is never gonna hold anyway 'cos number three doesn't exist. Okay. Doesn't exist. So consider non-existence. I guess we can never say that self-existent things don't exist because, the definition of non-existence would be, something, which is not perceived by correct perception. [student][laughter] [student] I can't [laughs], well, how about we just put it this way. Look, non-existence, consider non-existence; it does exist; because, the sky is pink with purple stripes, or something like that. [student] [laughs] Doesn't number three imply number one? Oh, so, a sky that's pink with green stripes or whatever, is not something that's true about things that don't exist? [student] Okay, you got me. Alright. We'll go on. That's a kind of a tricky one, okay. It's a big debate in the monastery. Does, does the horns which grow on a rabbit apply to non-existence? When I'm trying to prove non-existence don't I have to use a thing in the reason which is impossible? And then, how could you have a relationship between a non-existing thing and an impossible thing? So how could you, how could the three relationships hold? You gotta, you gotta cook that one. I mean, I've seen really great debaters debate it hour after hour, okay. Kinda tricky. Anyway, where were we? Okay. And, the definition of a good reason, was where those three relationships hold. Why are we talking about that? What's the main reason to talk about this? I mean, if you had to go outta here and, and find some practical application of that, what would it be? There will be no Buddhists in the West who have to use proofs more than the first generation. You are the first generation, right. It'll be up to you to prove things more often than all the Buddhists who come after you, you know. You'll be constantly asked by people, throughout your life, if you become a good Buddhist and a good Buddhist teacher, which I hope you will, you'll be asked to prove things. And, and you will always remember this class. And, you'll always remember, something is not a good reason for them, unless the three relationships hold, and unless what? They accept the three relationships. Right. By the way, to accept the three relationships, they must accept the words used to express the three relationships. You can't say to them, consider hungry ghosts, you know. They do live in such a realm because blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. And they don't even accept, the idea of a hungry ghost yet, you see what I mean? You can't prove a quality of a hungry ghost to a person who doesn't even accept that thing yet. You have to go back. You have to step back. You have to start

proving that the mind is, doesn't die when the body dies. And then, you have to start proving the possibility, that some kind of really bad karma could create an impression of a hungry ghost existence. And then you have to establish the existence of a hungry ghost. But you can't go arguing about hungry ghosts first, okay. Don't do it. You know, I see all these western people, westerners who try to teach Buddhism, and the first class is about the hell realms, you know. And the people are just getting uncomfortable, you know. This is what Father so and so was yelling at me about, you know. And it's just as unprovable when they present it as when he presented it, you know. Don't go that way, you know. First, establish that the mind doesn't stop when the body stops. And, by the way, there's not a shred of evidence possible that, the mind stops when the body stops. Okay. There's not. There's not a single shred of evidence to support that. It's a cultural thing that Mrs Melvin taught you in the first grade or something. It's New York Times worldview. Okay. And it's wrong. And there's not a shred of evidence that supports that. So, you have to go that way first. And then you, and then you describe how different states of mind grow. Like, you know, the concept, Franklin and what's the guy's name, Thomas, Thomas Jefferson sitting around a table in Philadelphia in seventeen seventy-four, I think, and discussing what kind of a country do we want here. And they had these bitter debates, you know. One guy said, a monarchy and George's gonna be king, George Washington this time. And then, and I remember I read that Benjamin Franklin's landlady used to ask him every time when he came home, well, what is it Mr Franklin? Are we gonna have a monarchy or a democracy? And he'd say, I dunno yet, you know, we're still talking. So, the concept, in two men's minds, you know, two hundred years later, is sucking out forty percent of your income, you know. [laughs] [laughter] You know what I mean? [laughs] And it was just a little idea in a guy's mind. Don't tell me that thoughts don't grow, you know what I mean; that concepts don't grow. Of course they grow, you know. A seed planted in your mind in first grade of a thing called ABC has become your very sophisticated {ka, kha, ga}, right. Now, you're able to do that in other languages as well. And, of course, those seeds are staying where? In your mind. You know, so don't tell me they don't grow. I mean, start like that. What I'm trying to say, is the reason we're studying formal logic, and never forget it, is that you get sensitive to the fact that when you present Buddhism to somebody, you must go backwards until you reach common ground. And that, in Buddhist logic, is more important than the truth of the statement itself, okay. A statement is not true, in Buddhist logic, until it's accepted, on common ground, by both parties. Period. That's very earth shaking, you know. I could give to you a true statement but, it's not true for you and neither, generally speaking, is it true, unless both parties accept all three terms and the relationships that I described.

It's very interesting. The implication is he already accepts all three relationships, he just never put it together the way you're putting it together for him. And that's where you should start your arguments for Buddhism. Why? Because, we want Buddhism to be bigger than Christianity and we want to take over every church in New York City. We're starting with our first one, right. [laughter] Not like that, okay. Why? Because you can stop death this way; you can help people stop their death. Really. Honestly. That's why we're here. It's not like a debate between this or that. That doesn't matter. This is a method, which any particular person can use, to stop their death in this lifetime. Period. And that's a precious thing. And, if there's a clever way or a good way or a valid way to present it to people, then you better learn it. And the goal here is reduce it back to common ground. Do not lay arguments on people that involve Sanskrit, Tibetan, you know, hell realm, preta things, that they can't accept yet. Start with common ground, you know. His Holiness is very good at it, right. And then, work up to more, okay. If you can't prove future lives from common ground, then they probably don't exist, okay. That's the idea. So, we go to the second kind of a good reason. Last time we did a good reason which involves a result, right, {du deng gyi la la chuchen ... }. Okay. Consider a mountain pass covered with smoke, okay. There must be a fire there. Because, I can see all the smoke there, okay. And you have to, that's a, a correct reason where the reason given is a result, and so it's called, 'a correct reason which involves a result'. Today we're gonna do, say, {rangshin gyi}[repeat] {tak yangdak}[repeat], {rangshin gyi}[repeat] {tak yangdak}[repeat]. {tak yangdak} means, a good reason, right, a correct reason, okay. {rangshin} means, 'which involves a nature', okay. A correct reason which involves a nature. Here, the word 'nature' is a little bit deceptive, misleading. And, you have to think of it as, if something, to be, to be one thing is to automatically be the other. You have to remember that phrase, okay. Remember, to be a Chevy is automatically be a car. So that's called a {rangshin} relationship, a nature relationship. Why? The nature of all cars, all Chevys, is that they're cars. Okay. And you have to think of that. So, this is a reason, where the thing given as a reason, is such that, to be that thing is to, automatically, be the thing that you're trying to prove. Okay. And that's all. I'll say it again. The thing given as the reason, to be the thing given as the reason, is to automatically be, the quality that you're trying to prove. I'll give you an example. I'll say it one more time. Okay. [laughs] This kind of correct reason, is a reason where to be the thing in the reason, is to automatically be the thing that you're trying to prove; the quality that you're trying to prove. I'll say it in that one, two, three, okay. Remember the three parts? What are the three parts? Consider sound, number one. It is a changing thing, number two. Why? Three, because it's made. Okay. That's the classic proof, {dra ... } Okay. Consider

sounds; they are changing things; because they are things which are made. Okay. Classic, correct reason. That happens to be a {rangshin gyi tak yangdak}. Why? To be a thing which is made is to, automatically, be a thing which is changing. Okay. To be number three is automatically to be number two. If your hand is tired you can just write that. Three is automatically two. I'll say it again. Consider sounds; they are changing things; because they are things which are made. What's the relationship between number two and number three? Is, if you are number two are you automatically number three? If you are a changing thing are you automatically a made thing? Yes. Okay. Does that always hold true in a correct reason,{rangshin} reason? No. I'll tell you why. Consider sound; it's a changing thing; because you can hear it. Okay. Consider sound; it's a changing thing; because you can hear it. Are all number threes number twos? Are all things that you can hear automatically changing things? Yes. Okay. All things that you can hear, which means sounds, are automatically changing things. But is the reverse true? Are all things which are changing automatically things you can hear? No. So, there are two kinds of {rangshin gyi tak yangdaks}. And we just got out of it easy, okay. In one, the relationship between three and two goes both ways. In the other, the relationship only goes one-way, okay. That's all. In some of them, to be two doesn't mean you have to be three. That's all. In some of them, to be two means you have to be three. But, they're both valid, okay. I'll give you the two logical statements again.

Consider sounds; they are changing things; because they are made things. In this case, the relationship between three and two goes both ways. Every made thing is a changing thing and every changing thing is a made thing. Is that always the case? No. What about the reason where I say, the logical statement where I say, consider sounds; they are changing things; because you can hear them? Is it a proof that just because you can hear something it's a changing thing? Yes. Okay. But, is it a proof that every changing thing has to be something you can hear? No. Okay. What's a {chuchen}? Give me an example. Colors. Okay. Like that. Right. Those are the two kinds of valid, you know, correct reasons of {rangshin}, okay. And that finishes that. And you're glad. Okay. Last thing. I gotta give you some new debate stuff, alright. Anybody have a rosary? Thankyou. Okay. Okay, I'm just gonna check your, your {chirs} and your {tak ma drups} and your {kyappa ma jungs}. Okay, are you ready? Be careful. By the way, don't space out and sit in the back. There'skids in the monastery who do that and they end up in the computer centre. Okay. [laughs] [laughter] Or cooking. [laughs] You don't wanna do that in your next life, okay. [laughs] Alright.

Take sounds; they are changing things; because they are made. What do you say? {yin}, okay. {chepay yinpay chir},okay. And you say, {yin, yin},okay.

Oh, {chepay yinpa teln}, you telling me they're made things? {du}, right, that's what I said.

{mayin pa teln takpa yinpay chir}, no they're not, because they're unchanging things.

{tak ma drup}, yeah, {tak ma drup}. Which is to say, they're not unchanging things, stupid-head.

{takpa mayin pa teln}, you telling me they're not unchanging things?

{du}

{takpa yinpa teln ma chepay yinpay chir}, yeah they are, they must be unchanging things because no one ever made them.

{ma chepay yinpay chir}. No. When I end in {chir}, you can only say {tak ma drup} or {kyappa ma jung}.

{tak ma drup}, right. They're not things that didn't have, that weren't made by anything.

{yinpa teln}, yes they are, because {takpa} and {ma chepa dun-je yinpay chir}, because everything that's unchanging is always unmade. Huh.

{kyappa ma jung}, yay. [laughs] we're gonna change you, you know, in the monastery, this is how you get stuck with a name like {kyappa ma jung} for the rest of your life. [laughs] [laughter] Oh, here comes {kyappa ma jung}. [laughs] [laughter]

Yeak. Okay. I said, it is true because everything unchanging is unmade. And, and he said, yeah, that is true, everything unchanging is unmade, but that doesn't prove what you're trying to prove, stupid-head. Okay. {kyappa ma jung}. [laughs] Alright.

Oh, so {dra chuchen ma chepa yinpa teln}, are you telling me that sounds are unchanging things? {yinpa teln}

{chi chir}, who's gonna be {chi chir}? [laughs] [laughter] Say, {chi chir}[repeat], {chi chir}[repeat]. And that's like, who said that? You know [laughs], okay. I didn't say that, okay. So, now you got, that's all your answers. By the way, you can sit and memorise your homework for an hour or you can debate for three minutes. It's the same thing. You gotta learn to debate, okay. It's fun too. And you learn it like that. Like, half you guys didn't want to learn {tak ma drup} and {kyappa ma jung} and here you are, you're always stuck with it, right. It's really good. Okay. So, we'll do it one more time.

Now, we'll do today's homework and go home and do it with your friends, okay.

{nam ka chuchen megak yinte gakpa yinpay chir}, I'm sorry. Yeah. {nam ka chuchen}, say {nam ka chuchen}[repeat], {nam ka chuchen}[repeat]; {megak yinte}[repeat], {megak}[repeat] {yinte}[repeat]; {gakpa yinpay chir}[repeat].

Okay. Consider empty space; it's a, it's a negative in the sense of being a simple

absence of something; because it's a negative. Okay, {nam ka chuchen}, it's a negative in the sense of an absence of something, because it's a negative, {gakpa yinpai chir}. [students] {kyappa ma jung}, which means, just because something is a negative doesn't mean it's a simple absence of something.

Hey, {gakpa ... } are you telling me just because something's a negative it doesn't have to be a negative in the sense of the absence of something?

{du}, that's what I said.

{shok}, show me something. Show me something that's a {gakpa} and not a {megak}. Show me something that's a negative and not a negative in the sense of the absence of something.

[student: chubby Jo] Yeah, yeah, yeah. Come on. [laughter]

Chubby Joe {chuchen mayin gak yinpa teln}. [laughter] By the way, it's very cool in the debate ground. You just interrupt somebody halfway through. And, you know, chubby Joe {chuchen mayin gak yinpa teln}, sorry, {gakpa yinpa teln}. Are you telling me chubby Joe's a negative thing? [laughs] {yinpa teln} [unclear] give me an answer, man.

Oh, {du, yinpa teln, gakpa yinpa teln} [laughter]. Chubby Joe {gakpa yinpa teln}. Andy {chuchen gakpa yinpa teln} [laughter] [laughs], you telling me Andy's a {gakpa yinpa teln}? Say. Andy {chuchen gakpa yinpa teln}. Is Andy a negative? Because, fat Joe's, a negative. [laughter] [laughs] {doooootsa} [student:du] Oh, Andy {chuchen gakpa yinpa teln}, you see what I mean. And, good. By the way, if, if you're in trouble, just keep going. You can't lose anything. [laughs] [laughter]

So, Andy's a negative, right? {du, du} Okay. Yeah. [laughs]

{mayin gak yin megak yin}, okay. That's how you say, 'or or', okay. Is he a negative in the sense of an absence or negative in the sense of not being something please? {megak yin, mayingak yin}, because there's only two kinds, which we all know. It's either got to be the absence of something or not being something. Right? And they're different things. In English, he is not Andy or Andy doesn't exist there in that second pew, Andy. {megak yinpa teln}, simple absence of something Andy, okay. Okay. {yinte} [laughter] {yinte} [laughter] Where's Andy? [laughter] {yinte} why? [laughs] There's no Andy, right? Andy {megak yinpai chir}. [laughter] [laughs] Andy's the simple absence of Andy. [laughs] Okay. Anyway, you'll never forget those words, okay. I mean, I had some kid come up and wipe me out during my pre-Geshe debate. I'll never forget the stuff he was debating about, you know. Okay.

{mitakpa chuchen gakpa yinpai chir}, okay, {mitakpa chuchen}, let's talk about {mitakpa}. You ready [unclear]. Don't pretend you're listening to that thing, okay. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. {mitakpa chuchen}, what's {mitakpa} mean? Changing thing. Okay. But, in Tibetan, it's not {takpa}, right? {mitakpa chuchen}

gakpa yinpay chir}, that's a negative thing. Okay. {mitakpa}, not unchanging thing, is a negative thing, {yinpay chir}, {yinpay chir}. You've got two choices. You can say {tak}, well, you got three. You can say, right {yin}. Okay, consider {mitakpa}, okay. It's a changing thing. I'm sorry. It's a negative, {gakpa yinpay chir}, okay, {mitakpa gakpa yinpay chir}. Changing thing is a negative thing. Good, {tak ma drup}. Say it with authority, {tak ma drup}[repeat] {tak ma drup} [repeat].

Oh, {mitakpa chuchen}, are you telling me it's not a negative thing? {mitakpa's} not a negative thing? Are you saying that? No, you say, {du}; {du}- that's what I said. Go, {du, du} [repeat], {du}, okay. {yinte}, why? By the way, if you want to get out of it easy just say, oh, it's one of the two negatives, or something like that. You can say anything you want actually. [student] Yeah, yeah. I mean, they'll close the Quaker House after a while. [laughter][laughs] I don't think it will last for ten minutes though. [laughs] What did you say about this [unclear] on? [laughter]

{gakpa yinte}, why is {mitakpa} a negative thing? Why are you saying {mitakpa's} a negative thing? He just said it was. [student] I said {mitakpa}, I'm sorry, you said {tak ma drup}. So, you telling me it's not a negative thing? Changing, now let's see. Hanging thing is not a negative thing, right? {du, du}, okay, {du}. Right. {takpa mayin pa teln}, are you telling me, I'm sorry, {gakpa mayin pa teln}, are you telling me it's not a negative thing?

{du} that's what I said.

{yinte mi gaksik yinpar chir}, it is a negative thing because the word 'mi' is a negative in Tibetan. Okay.

[student: kyappa ma jung}. Ah, nice, nice, nice, nice, nice. Okay. What just happened? I said, come on [unclear] {mitakpa} is a negative because it's got a 'non' in the front of it. And then Jay said, that doesn't prove anything, {kyappa ma jung}. Of course it has a negative, a negative on it. That doesn't prove it's a, it's a negative thing. Okay. Yeah. {ma .. ta}, are you telling me it doesn't prove it? {student: du}, {du}, right. Okay. Good, you beat me. Finished. Okay. That's a nice one.

How about this one? [unclear] do nice one.

{dra mitakpa chuchen}. You're so hot. You're on a roll, okay. [laughs] [laughter] {dra mitakpa chuchen gakpa mayinpey chir}. [student] [laughter] {dra mitakpa chuchen}, means let's talk about the fact that sound is a changing thing, okay. The fact that sound is a changing thing, {dra mitakpa chuchen}. {gakpa mayinpa teln}, so, I guess it's not a negative thing according to Mr Jay Hahn? [student] [laughs] Just to be a bodhisattva. Come on. You don't have to be a bodhisattva. Just be yourself. {mayinpa teln / mayinpey chir}, it's not a {gakpa}? The fact, that sound is a changing thing, is not a negative thing, {mayinpey chir}. [student]

No. you can either say, [student: du]. No, you don't say {du} to a {chir}, right. You can say, {yin, mayin}, you can say {mayin}, it's not. It's not a negative thing. [student] it's not a negative thing? [student] Okay. Then you go like this. This is the lesson for tonight, okay. We have six minutes to do this one. { ... } [laughs] [laughter]

Say, { ... } [repeat], { .. } [repeat]. Okay, {pecha} means, a Tibetan book, a scripture, right, {pecha}. The honorific, the polite word is {chakpe}, {chakpe}, like, hand, okay. Sometimes, you add the word {chak} to things to make them honorific. Like, you don't say, Khen Rinpoche, here's your mula. You say, Khen Rinpoche, here's your respectful holiness's money, which is {chak wu}, okay. So, you add the word {chak}, okay. So, in Sera Me monastery, the greatest monastery, we say it that way. And each, each monastery has their own, and you can tell who a person studied with by how they say, 'you contradict the holy Scripture'. Okay. You contradict Scripture. You contradict the holy Scripture. Okay. Say {pecha .. } [repeat], {chakpe .. } [repeat]. And then, the people from Ganden, right [claps][laughter], okay, they go [claps], okay. [laughter] Like that, you know. And then they, when we contradict Scripture, they go { .. }. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. Alright. [laughs] [laughter] Okay. They make fun of us and we make fun of them. Okay. By the way, two ways you can prove something. Say {lung}[repeat] {rik}[repeat]; {lung}[repeat] {rik}[repeat]. Who's that nice monk? That incredible bodhisattva attendant, out there in New Jersey? Jampa Loungrik. That's what his name means, okay. We should all be like that, right? If we have enough classes, maybe. {loungr} means, Scriptural authority; {rik} means, logic. Two ways to prove something in Buddhism. Okay. You can either use {loungr} or you can use {rikpa}, okay. And, it's such a famous thing that they call kids, when they get ordained, they say, okay, your name is Scriptural Authority or Logical proof. [laughs] [laughter] Jampa Loungrik, okay. By the way, your first name comes, normally, from your khenpo. Which, which really means, in Vinaya, the person who gave you your vows. The, the former abbot for twelve years was named Jampa [unclear], so there are about two hundred monks in Sera Me called Jampa. [laughs] Okay. He ordained everybody for twelve years. Everyone who came in, you see. So, they all get the same first name. So you make up names for them, like, {kyappa ma jung} [laughs], okay. So, it's either to use {loungr} or {rik}. Now, as far as Scripture, you have to use one that's accepted by both parties. Okay. When we debate in the winter debates, between all the Gelugpa colleges, you can't use Scriptural authority from your college, you can't use your college's textbooks, okay. You have to use, like, Je Tsongkapa or the First Dalai Lama or somebody like that, okay. That's the, because you, you can't use Scriptural authority unless the other party agrees to it. And, you see so many American Buddhists trying to use a Scriptural

authority that the other party doesn't accept, you see what I mean? Such-and-such a Rinpoche said so. I don't care. I don't accept that as Scriptural authority, you know. I don't care. It doesn't, you see, you have to choose something that the other party agrees. And you cannot, in the rules of logic, use a Scriptural authority that the other person doesn't accept. And by the way, Scriptural can mean a person, right. You can't quote somebody that they don't accept, okay, and say, that proves it. You know, you're wasting your time. Go back to common ground. You're breaking the rules of debate, okay. You're breaking the rules of explaining something to somebody when you pull out such-and-such a Rinpoche who they don't accept, okay. Can't do that. When you debate among Tibetan schools you would debate using the Kangyur or the Tengyur; the Word of the Buddha or the word of one of the great Indian commentators. And, that would be accepted by all Buddhist schools in Tibet. Okay. When you debate Buddhist schools from other countries you might have to go, I like the Abhidharmakosha, because that's accepted by all, all, all Buddhist schools in the world that I'm aware of. Probably there's one that I'm not aware of that doesn't accept it. But everyone accepts the Abhidharmakosha. Just using the Abhidharmakosha you can prove almost anything you want to prove if you know it well, okay. So you have to be sensitive to where your opponent is coming from, okay. And then, normally, when you quote a person in debate, you say, { ... }, okay. Which means, I'm speaking of the incomparable, the great, the holy, the glorious, the unerring master of all attainments Kedrup [unclear]. { .. }, say { .. } [repeat] {gurpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat]. Which means, and you better accept it. Okay. By the way, this is the textbook writer from Sera Me, who wrote all the textbooks back in the fourteen and fifteen hundreds. So ,if you quote from him and the guy's gotta accept it, you know. And then you say, I am quoting this person and you don't use their { ..}. You never refer to your Lama, like, Nagarjuna, Tsongkapa, okay. You always have to say, the great Tsongkapa or the master Tsongkapa, or something like that. It's a Buddhist custom. It's, it's a vow, in fact. It's important, okay. So you always do it like that.

What was that last thing? You must memorise the quotation you use. You can't go into the debate ground with a piece of paper. They would laugh you out of the debate ground. It's gotta be, they would say here, it has to be here in your mind. By the way, that proves your mind's not here, right. [laughter] They say, it better be in your mind, okay. And when you go to the debate ground you have to have that quotation ready, okay. And, and what you don't wanna do is get into a quotation that you can't finish, okay. [laughs] It's really embarrassing.; You say, { .. } scripture says, and everybody goes, you know. And then you say, ah, er, um, [laughs] [laughter] you know. Then you get really

in trouble, okay. That's all. Yeah. [student] Yeah, sort of. { ... }, like that, you have to be able to quote the Scripture, okay. What do you want me to quote? Anything. [student] Oh, say, { dura... }[repeat] It is stated in the {Se Dura}, okay. That's, by the way, we switched Duras tonight. We just went to a different text 'cos the presentation on Positives and Negatives is presented very well from the text from Drepung monastery, okay. [laughs] [laughter] Okay. Yeah, you're studying the Se Dura. It's a different one, okay. We'll stop there. But, anyway, those are the conditions. You can either prove something logically or you can use an authority that both people accept. And, don't let me see you American Buddhists going around quoting people that they other party cannot accept. That's no good. You broke the rules of your own tradition. Okay. Can't do it. Okay.

[cut]

[prayer: short mandala

[prayer: dedication]

[cut]

Also to remind you that there is no class on Thursday, okay. It's a, you should do some important virtue. It's the day that Lord Buddha was conceived, or came out, came out? Yeah. [laughter] [student] Quick, quick, quick
[announcement]

The Asian Classics Institute

Geshe Michael Roach

Course XIII: The Art Of Reasoning

Class Seven: Contradiction and Relationship

Transcribed by Angie Overy

Stillwell said he had to meet me after class in a dark restaurant. I thought if I wore my wire I could record everything, [laughs] you know. [laughs] Anyway. See the class is getting thinned out a little bit. Stick with it, okay.

I was thinking about it, you know. I, I, actually, I didn't want to teach logic for a long time because I thought everyone would run away. And then, then I felt like it was, that, that it was necessary to teach it. I felt like we reached a point where you need it or you can't really read Madhyamika Scriptures. You can't really read Scriptures about emptiness, serious scriptures. And it's hard. And it's necessary. And you have to do it. So, then I was thinking, where else could you get this, you know. And you can't. Okay. There's no place else, that I'm aware of, where you can get this in a coherent way, you know what I mean. And I thought it's important that we finish it before this, this series of classes ends, you know, series of courses. I thought it's pretty much the only time we'll ever have to do it I think in the near future. So, you are the lineage holders and you are the ones who are gonna have to pass it on to other people. So, work hard and, and sweat a little bit, okay. I mean, I've made it as digestible as possible, but you're still gonna have to work a lot to get it. And it's very, very important stuff. So, stick in there, alright. I think I only just started informing people that you don't have to read it from the beginning each reading. And I should have told you, maybe, earlier, but the easy part is in the middle, okay. It's called {rangruk}, you know, where we present our own position. So, there's no way you can get through all the {kachikmas}, all the arguments, okay. I think Tony realised, you know, we'll debate the first four or something like that. And then, maybe, realise he got it, you know. They are, each one of them, a separate thing to learn. And, if you only get through a few of them, that's fine. And I divided them with lines on the reading so see if you can digest one or two. You have the rest of your life to do the rest of them. And then go to the middle and find where we present our own position and make sure you understand that. And

that's a lot easier. But I don't at all expect you or think that you'll ever have time in this class series, to read all of the {kachikmas} and digest them. They all make sense, by the way. None of them are silly. I mean, some people read them and they say, oh, they're just playing with words or something like that. It's not that at all. Each one has a very important point to make and each one is necessary for you to understand our own position clearly. And it's, and some day you'll realise that. And none of them are stupid and none of them are tricks. They're all very important. So don't, you know, I heard people say that about {dura}, about the {kachikmas}. Oh, they're splitting hairs, or what's the point of talking about this, or they're just playing with words or something. It's not like that at all. Each one is a sacred experience if you take the time to get into it, you know. And each, each one will give you deep insight into something important so don't, don't just skip them or something like that. But try to take them slow, you know. Like, digest one at a time. Don't try to read the whole thing like a novel. I mean, Buddhist books are not like that. You don't read a Buddhist book from cover to cover and then put it up on a shelf and go to the next one, you know. You, it's, it's a lifetime's relationship with this book and that's why you memorise a book in Tibet. And, and it's like getting married or something, you know. That book will be with you the rest of your life. And, you memorise it, you debate it, you go back and memorise, rememorise the parts you don't remember, debate it, forget it, memorise it again, debate it. I had a Mongolian teacher, Geshe Kelden, who, on his death-bed in Howell, in the back where Jampa, where Ngawang lives, was studying {dura}. And, and I went in and I said, you know, Geshe la, with all due respect, you're, you're dying, you know, why are you reading, he's from Gomang, Drepung, so he's reading the {Se Dura}, right. And, I'm saying, you know, why are you reading fifteen-year old logic stuff, you know, for fifteen year olds? And he says, this is the most important thing for understanding Madhyamika and I wanna be ready next life too, you know. And he was dying. And he had tuberculosis. He had one lung cut out in Buxhall refugee camp and he could hardly walk his whole life. And then, at the end of his life, he's sitting there on his back reading the Se Dura. I remember, he was in the hospital and they took off all his robes and they put on this thing that went up to here. It was really gross because his legs were sticking out and everything else. He didn't care. He was finishing his Se Dura, you know. And, you know, he was, like, exposed to the air, and he, and it was really terrible to see him like that. But he was, he was sitting there on his back reading Se Dura, you know, and saying I'm getting ready for my next life, you know. So, so take it, you know, you'll never get a chance like this so try to get it this time. It's very, very important stuff, okay. Okay.

Tonight's torture, [laughs] I, I giggle while I'm translating these and then the

people who are with me say, what are you giggling about? And I say, I get revenge for all those years on the debate ground when I didn't know what the hell was going on, you know. [laughs] [laughter]

Say {geln drel} [repeat], {geln drel}[repeat]. This 'n' is a pre-nasal, right, so don't get worried about it. It's between the {gel} and the {n-drel}, okay. And the {n-drel} in {drel} is very important because without the 'n' it becomes {trel}, which means the opposite of {n-drel}. So, this is a very touchy one and you better get the pre-nasal right, okay. {gel} stands for {gelwa}; {gelwa} means, contradiction, okay. And then, {drel, drelwa} means, relationship. And tonight's topics from the {duras}, from the Dura text, will be {geln-drel}. {geln} is the study of when are two objects contradictory and {drel} is the study of when do two objects relate to each other, when do they share a relationship. And we're gonna explore the different kinds of contradiction and the different kinds of relationship, okay. Both of them very important for understanding emptiness and cause and effect, dependent origination, okay. Well first, let's talk about what makes a thing {gelwa}. Two qualities make something {gelwa}, well, they make two things {gelwa}, right. {gelwa} will always be talking about two things, whether two things are in contradiction, whether two things contradict each other. So, when you're talking about contradiction, by definition, you're talking about two separate things, two things which are distinct from one another. And that's called {tade}. Say {tade}[repeat], {tade}[repeat]; {tade} means separate or distinct, okay. And I think the only thing to say here is that there are two different, there are debates about what's the meaning of separate and what's the meaning of distinct. For example, if you call this thing Geshe Lobsang Chunzin or if you call this thing Michael Roach, it's the same thing, right? So, is Michael Roach {tade} from Geshe Lobsang Chunzin, you see what I mean? Are they distinct from one another? And, generally, in Buddhist logic, we consider them distinct, okay. { ... } because the, the main, the primary name is different or something like that. There's two, two different identities to the same thing. But, the main thing is that the two things should be distinct from one another, okay, to have relationship. In this case, I'm sorry, I don't think that's a good example. {ngu min} means, main name, okay. And, and I don't know what you wanna consider my name, main name, but if two things, if something has a main name and a secondary name, that doesn't make it distinct from itself. You can't be distinct from yourself. Okay. But me and the pen are {tade}, okay. We're distinct from each other. Why? Because, when you conceptualise them, the primary name is separate. That's one way to describe {tade}, okay. Mainly, you can think separate or distinct from one another, okay. So, the first thing to have a contradiction between two objects, they have to be two objects. Okay. You can't have, you can't say two things are contradictory, you can't say there's a

contradiction if there's not two things there. That's all. Okay. There has to be two separate things there. In Buddhist logic, the word contradiction, I mean, distinction or separate, implies the existence of each one of those two things, okay. And that's a rule. That's an a priori, okay. And you gotta get used to that. When I say, two things are distinct from each other, or when I say, two things are separate from each other, I'm assuming that they exist, okay. So, for example, in Buddhism, you can't say that something which doesn't exist contradicts something which does exist, because one of the pair, there's no {tade}. There's no distinction there between the two objects 'cos there are no two objects. There's only one object. Okay. So you can't discuss the, whether or not something which does exist contradicts something which doesn't exist, okay. And that's a general rule. Now, whether or not non-existence itself exists is a bitter debate in Buddhism, but that's another story. Right now, let's say {tade pe} some texts say, {tade pe chu}, okay, existing things which are separate. Okay. And you have to get used to that. So, {tade}, when we say {tade} or separate or distinct from each other, we're assuming that the two things exist, okay.

The second feature of a contradiction is that there should be no {shi-tunpa}. Say {shi-tunpa}[repeat], {shi-tunpa}[repeat]; {sh-tunpa} means - this is tricky, {mepa} means, there is no {shi-tunpa}, okay. {mepa} means, there is no {shi-tunpa}. And, {shi-tun} has, like, a hundred lousy translations in books that you can buy at East-West Bookstore and other places, you know. I mean, there's a thousand lousy ways to translate it. I, I've seen 'common locus', somebody told me 'stratus', what was that? 'Common stratus' or something like that. Come on, it just means, one thing, which is both things, okay. One thing which is both A and B. You can translate it like that. {shi} means, 'foundation'; {tun} means, 'harmony'. Okay. And what it means is, one thing which can be both A and B and it's always like that. Okay. Sometimes, it's A and B and C. Sometimes, it's A, B, C and D. But, anyway, it's one thing, which could be both of those things or more. Okay. And that's called a {shi-tunpa}, okay. A real {gelwa}, the ultimate meaning of contradiction, is that two objects are separate from one another, distinct from one another, and there is no one thing which can be both. Okay. {shi-tun mepa tade yinpa} and {shi-tun mepa}. I'm simplifying but that's the basic thing, okay. That's the meaning of contradiction. Two kinds of contradiction, yeah [student] well, it's a good question. He asked, do you mean both of them contradicting each other? In Buddhism, you can contradict one way and not contradict the other way. Okay. And we have to, we'll talk about that. But you can say that A is contradictory to B but B is not contradictory to A, at the same time. Okay. Or, you can say that A shares a relationship with B, but B doesn't share a relationship with A. For example, a tree bears a relationship or shares a relationship with its seed. And, it's a relationship of the kind we call,

coming from its seed. The relationship of something that came from something else. So that, in Buddhism, the tree is related to the seed. So, there's a one-way relationship. But, we don't say, that the seed is related to the tree. Okay. It didn't come from the tree. There's only, but we'll get to that, alright. And that's, that's something you have to, we'll talk about it. But in, in Buddhism, it can be contradictory one way and not contradictory the other way; A can contradict B but B not contradict A. Okay. And that's a, we'll get into it, okay. Maybe we won't, but anyway, okay. Two kinds of, of contradictions. Say {pendzin pangel} [repeat]; this is the first kind of contradiction. {pendzin} means, 'mutually', okay, {pendzin}; {pang} means, 'eliminate'; {gel} means, 'contradiction'. And you can call this, I translate this as, 'the kind of contradiction which is mutually exclusive'; where the two things are mutually exclusive, alright. And what it means is, no one thing can have both, okay. No one thing can be both. For example, one example would be, changing thing and unchanging thing, okay. Changing thing and unchanging thing, they're contradictory. Why? You could never find a {shitungpa}. You could never find one thing that is both changing and unchanging, okay. By the way, anytime we talk about contradiction in Buddhism, we're talking purely or wholly one and wholly the other. Okay. For example, does, are, blue and red contradictory, are they {gelwa}? In Buddhism, they are, okay. Why? They are. And then, somebody says to me, well what about the American flag, you know? It's red, white and blue. But in Buddhism, when we say contradictory, we mean it's, it cannot be wholly blue and wholly red, all blue and all red at the same time. No one object can be all blue and all red at the same time. And then, people come up with purple and stuff like that, but that's, that's not the point. It cannot be all blue and all red at the same time, so those two colors are contradictory, contradictory. They're contradiction, okay. And that's the first kind of contradiction. I wanted to give you some examples of them. And, and {pentdzin pangel} means {yongchu nangchu}, it's a special, {yongchu nangchu} means, there's a special kind of contradiction where, when you perceive one of them it automatically excludes the other one, okay. When you perceive, when one of them is present it automatically excludes the possibility of the other one's presence, okay. And that's called, and that's necessity in {pendzin pangel}; {pendzin pangel} should be like that. So, what it just means is that one thing cannot be both. Another example would be a, a water pitcher and everything which is not a water pitcher, you see. That's what we call a totality {pendzin pangel}, meaning, there's nothing else in existence besides those two, okay, {pendzin pangel}. No one, one of them is the opposite of the other considering all things in existence, okay. So, like, the pen and everything, which is not the pen, covers everything in the universe. And that's one kind of {gelwa}. There are other kinds of {gelwas} like, hot, I should say, heat and coldness, okay,

heat and coldness. No one object can be heat and coldness at the same time but there are other objects in the universe which are not heat and coldness, you see what I mean. So, like, the mind, okay. So there are, this, this is another kind of contradiction where no one thing can be heat itself and coldness itself at the same time but there are other objects in the universe which are not heat and coldness. Okay. Yeah. [student] It's true. Yeah, that's true. That's true. They can't exist without the other. That's true. [student] Yeah. He said, heat and cold are not heat and cold from their own side because they're relative to each other or something like this. [student] He said, for example, if one person's experiencing it as hot and one person's experiencing it as cold, then why can't heat and coldness be simultaneously present in one object? But, then you can say that about anything, you know. This pen is a chewable object and a pen, so are you saying that, a pen and chewable object are not contradictory? To be, to one person's experience perhaps. Maybe, you can say it that way, okay. I mean, one person can be a Tantric deity and a demon to two different people but that doesn't mean, that those two things, are not contradictory, you see what I mean. Let's put it that way. Also, there's a difference, that we're gonna get into, between hot and cold and heat and coldness. Okay. There's a difference between heat-ness, heat sorry, heat and coldness and hot and cold. And we'll talk about that. Okay. I'm talking about absolute coldness and absolute heat as absolutes. Okay. Yeah. [student] I call it, well, I would call it, what do you call, comprehensive or something like that. But in Tibetan there's not a, there's another division in Tibetan but I'm not gonna go into it. But I'll go into it since you asked. There'd be a [laughs] a direct contradiction and a indirect contradiction, okay. And, in the case of {pentsun pang-gel} it would be, a direct one would be a water pitcher and everything which is not a water pitcher. Okay. And, an indirect one would be {takpa} and {chepa}, okay. {takpa} meaning an unchanging thing and {chepa} meaning a thing which is made. Okay. {takpa} is directly contradictory to what? {mitakpa}. I mean, mentally. And when we say contradictory we're talking about mentally. When I say changing, I'm sorry, when I say an unchanging thing is directly contradictory to what, you think, changing thing. Okay. I'll say it again. When I say, give me the direct contradiction of an unchanging thing, you think, unchanging, I'm sorry, changing thing, okay. And that's what pops into your mind and that's what we call a direct {pentsun pang-gel}, okay, a direct mutual exclusion. Okay. That's a direct one. Now, an indirect one is, unchanging thing and a thing which is made. Okay. Because, a thing, which is made is always a changing thing and a changing thing is a direct contradiction of an unchanging thing. That's all. Okay. And that, we call a, a indirect contradiction; an indirect mutual exclusion, okay. I'll go over it again. [laughs] When I say, what's the opposite, what contradicts

unchanging, you think, changing. Okay. Then, if I say, well, can any one thing be both unchanging and something, which is made? And you go through this mental process, you see. You say to yourself, well, anything that's made must be changing and I know that changing is the direct opposite of unchanging, so, no, it's a contradiction. But there's a, you have to go through a process to reach that. Your mind goes to 'changing' and then it goes to 'contradicts unchanging'. So, your mind first goes to 'made' and then your mind goes to 'changing' and then your mind says that contradicts unchanging directly. So that's what we call, a mutual exclusion, which is indirect. Okay. Yeah. [student] Oh, that's a good example. {takpa ngupo}, he's, he's mentioning, unchanging thing and working thing, is that direct or indirect? Indirect. What about working thing and existing thing, which doesn't do any work? That's direct. You see what I mean? {ngume ngupo} are {pentsun pang-gel, ngupe pentsun pang-gel} and {ngupo} and {takpa} are {gyu gyi pentsun pang-gel, gyu}, okay, {gyu} meaning indirect. Okay. And that's in your reading. You can see that. In fact, here's the example of a direct one: {ngupo} meaning, a thing which does something, any, a working thing and then, {ngume} meaning, something which doesn't do anything, something which has no work. By the way, and, when we say that, we're always implying an existing thing which does no work, okay. You can't just say, something, which does no work because things that don't exist at all do no work, also. Okay. You always have to be careful when you're debating, right. You have to say, an existing thing, which does no work, is the direct contradiction of a thing, which does do something, okay. You gotta be careful there, okay. Yeah. [student] Leon said, it sounds like a semantic thing rather than a mental thing. Yeah. [student] Yeah. Leon said, they're, after all, they're all the same thing; working thing, changing thing and made thing are all the same thing. But, yeah, the, semantically, as, as you'll see in, it's actually already been in the logic text, they each have a different way of producing the conception in the person who hears that word, you know. The, the {dun-chi} you get, the mental image you get from each word is different. And, even though they all refer to the same set of things, it is, yeah, it's semantic in that sense, that does the word have the power to suggest, directly, to the mind, what does it suggest directly to the mind. And, and that's, yeah, each one of those three has a different, and that was, if you go back and look at the distinction between three different qualities asserted, the qualities we're trying to prove, in the discussion of formal logic. In discussing the quality you're trying to prove they discuss that distinction. You can go back and look at it. It's in that section. Okay. Even though working thing, changing thing and thing which was made, all refer to the same set of things, they give you a different mental picture when I say them. Okay. And, yeah, this does refer to, are the two mental pictures directly contradictory, okay. And that's the

distinction, okay. Here's the second kind of contradiction. Say, {hlenchik}[repeat] {mine gel}[repeat], {hlenchik}[repeat] {mine gel}[repeat]; {hlenchik} means, to stay together, {hlenchik} means to stay together. You probably, you might remember the word {hlenkye} meaning, ignorance which is inborn. So, {hlen} has the meaning of two things, which always come together; {hlenchik} means, together. {mine} means, they can't stay, they can't coexist, okay; {hlenchik mine} means, they cannot coexist. {gel} means, a contradiction; a contradiction which involves, I would call it, I think in the reading I call it, what did I call it? Mmmm. Diametrically opposed, how's that, diametrically opposed. An example, I mean, one of the kind of light-hearted examples in Scripture is, {ukpa} and {charok}; say {ukpa}[repeat] {charok}[repeat] {ukap}[repeat] {charok}[repeat]; {ukpa} means, an owl, {charok} means, a crow. And supposedly, they don't get along. They don't like each other and they can't stay on the same branch together. And when people teach this to children in the monastery, they say, hey, it's like an owl and a crow, you know. Like, they can't coexist on the same branch. But, the real examples, in Scripture, are {nyenpo} and {pangja}. Say {nyenpo}[repeat] {pangja}[repeat], {nyenpo}[repeat] {pangja}[repeat]; {nyenpo} means, an antidote for something or a fix for something or a counteragent for something, okay. And {pangja} means, in, in Buddhism, it means a negative spiritual quality, a negative quality of a person. So, {nyenpo} can be translated as a spiritual antidote and then {pangja} would be a negative quality that you had that you'd like to get rid of. {pang} means, to get rid of something; {pangja} means, to be gotten rid of. For example, if you had a problem with laziness, if that was {pangja}, something you wanted to get rid of, then, a death meditation would be a {nyenpo}, you see what I mean. If you had a problem with desire and, for sense objects, {pangja}, then you could meditate on, there's a thing called 'skeleton meditation', where you, it's in the Abhidharma. And you start with this, you start with a tiny point in the centre of your forehead, and you picture it as rotten, as rotting, like, gangrene or something. And then it starts to spread and you, and you do this meditation, you let it spread and spread and spread until your whole forehead, you can see the bone. And, and then you let it rot and keep, and then the skin peels off. And you keep going down through your whole body. And then you start with the carpet and you see it start to fray and get old and stinky. And then you reach the pews and you see them rotting and falling apart and eaten by worms. And then you go out to, to the walls of the building and see them collapsing, you know, as they will, right? And, and rotting, and, and falling down. And then you go out to the whole of Manhattan and see it as it will be one day; just a ruin, you know, everything rotting, rusting, things falling down, stinky. And then you go to the ocean, then, you dry it up, as it will be one day, you know. And

you let all the fish sit there stinky. And you destroy everything until you cover the whole planet, you know. And then you, you bring it all back and, and you come back to this dot here. That's, that helps remove desire. And those are, those are {nyenpo}, okay; {nyenpo} means a spiritual antidote for {pangja}, means, a negative personal quality, okay. Yeah. [student] Yeah. They didn't really give a definition but, oh, I'm sorry, there is a definition in your reading. It's two things which conflict with each other in such a way that they act against the continued existence of each other. Okay. [student] Yeah. Well, let's talk about it this way. They talk about a process with {hlenchik mine gel}, okay. The second kind of contradiction implies a process and it's described like this; the death, the meditation I just described, which is called {... tingindzin}, skeleton samadhi, okay, [laughs] and, and this desire for objects, sense objects, the, the meditation encounters the desire, okay. There's an encounter and then the meditation starts to work on the desire and wear it down slowly, slowly. And then, as the meditation gets stronger, the desire gets less. So, it's a process where one starts to work against the continued existence of the other, okay. Until, finally, one of them has, has overcome the other. But it's, it's a gradual process of encountering, working on it, and then, removing it. Whereas, mutual exclusion, just means, look, the minute this is red it can't be blue anymore, okay. That's all. Immediate exclusion of the other quality, you see the difference? And those are the two kinds of contradiction. The second one is not a legal contradiction only the first one is the real meaning of contradiction. Okay. So, generally, although we speak of two kinds of contradiction, the first one is the real one, okay. And I'll give you another example, which is a little harder. Can one state of mind be grasping to an object as self-existent and, at that same moment, be understanding, its emptiness perfectly? Impossible. You see what I mean? Cannot be. You cannot be, directly understanding, a thing's emptiness and at the same time be grasping to it as being self-existent. No, no one state of mind, meaning, a millisecond state of mind. You can alternate between the two in, in a few minutes, thousands of times. But, at the millisecond that you're understanding the emptiness of the thing, you cannot at that same moment, perceive it as being self-existent. So, in that sense, those two states of mind are {pentsun pang-gel}; the first kind. Okay. No one state of mind can be both. No one millisecond of your mind can be both. So, in that sense, they are mutually exclusive. But in the other sense, you know, as a problem in your mind, as a problem in your life, as a problem in your ongoing mental continuum, now I'm talking about the continuum of your mind, they are {hlenchik mene gel}, okay. I always say they are like two guys that say, 'this town ain't big enough for both of us', you know. I mean, you can't go on thinking of things as self-existent as your wisdom gets stronger, okay. As your understanding that things are empty

gets stronger, slowly, the perception of them as self-existent has to start leaving town. First he has to move out of mid-town, out to the suburbs, and then, finally, he has to leave all together, you know. But, but there is a period, where one is working against the other. Okay. So, that's a delicate example, okay. It's an example of, both, in a sense. Okay. Relative to one millisecond of mind they are mutually exclusive to, exclusive, and, and you could call them {pentsun pang-gel}. Relative to a mental continuum, they are antidote and problem and they are working against each other through a process, and that's called, {hlenchik mene gel}. And that's a good example of both. Now, heat and cold are the same and I think I screwed it up earlier tonight. You figure it out, okay. [laughs] I mean, no one thing can be hotness and coldness at the same time, am I right? But, but heat, but hot and cold can work at, no, hot and cold, nothing can be hot and cold at the same time. But, but warmth and coldness can work, yeah, I think I messed it up. Let's reverse that, okay. Ah, you figure it out. I had trouble with it. I think I screwed it up on the reading, okay. You, you check, okay. In one sense, they're mutually exclusive. No one object can be heat and cold at the same time. How's that? But, with regard to the process that, which, you know, you know, when you have a cold room and you turn on the heat, then slowly, the heat begins to work on the cold. So I guess heat and cold are {hlenchik mene gel} and hotness and coldness, the text says, {tsar-rik and trang-rik}, a cold sensation and a hot sensation, are {hlenchik mene gel}. Sooner or later one pushes out the other. And heat and cold in and of themselves are mutually exclusive. How's that? Okay. The, the text makes that distinction, alright. I don't know if I got it right in the English but you worry about it.

Okay. Yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah, they have to be distinct from one another. [student] Yeah. Well, I didn't make that a separate quality. Like, on the homework, it'll say, give the two criteria to be contradictory. And you'll say, they have to be separate objects and they have to be such that no one thing can be both at the same time. And then, when I threw in they have to be existing things, I want you to know that when, in Buddhism, when we say separate we're assuming existing objects. So, if some guy came up to you in the first {kachikma} after the {rangruk} in this very reading and said, non-existent things are contradictory to existing things, you have to say no. Well, why? 'Cos they're not distinct. Well why? Because, they're not distinct objects. Well why? Because one of them ain't an object. Okay. And you won't get that unless I tell you that, okay. That's all. [student] Sure, {tsennyi ... }, okay; definition of existence is that which you can perceive with a valid perception, okay. Not what the New York Times says. Okay. By the way, I thought you might like to know, the text from Sera doesn't give all this detail but the one from Drepung does. Okay. [laughter] [laughs] Don't tell Rinpoche I said that.

Example of a direct contradiction for {hlenchik mene gel}: you see, they divide, they divide that one where they don't get along with each other, where they stop each other's continued existence or they work against each other's continued existence. They also divide that into direct and indirect in the Drepung Scripture, which Se Dura, which is pretty cool Dura I have to admit, okay. They give two examples: light and dark, light and darkness, okay, light and darkness. I mean, when you turn on the light, it encounters the darkness and then there's a process of the light removing the darkness, okay. And that would be a direct, a direct contradiction of diametric opposites, as opposed to, a direct contradiction of mutually exclusives. Okay. In that, in that sense of, turning on the light, okay, in that context of turning on a light. And then, hot touch and cold touch, you know. If the room is cold and you turn on the heat, then slowly, the feeling of warmth removes the feeling of cold. Okay. The tangible object called warmth removes the tangible object called cold, how's that. Because when you say tangible object you're talking about one person, how's that. Okay. Now, here's an example of an indirect one. They say, huge clouds of smoke and a feeling of coldness on a certain location, okay. So, on a certain block, there are incredible, huge, billowing, you know, you've seen, you know a building is well on fire. You know the whole building is on fire if you see this kind of smoke. It's huge masses of smoke. And then, you're thinking about something cold in that location. You cannot see the fire but you see the smoke.

And that's an indirect contradiction, an indirect contradiction of diametric opposites, okay. The, you know that cold cannot be there 'cos you see this huge smoke even though you can't see the direct opposite of cold which is fire or heat, okay. And that's a case of an indirect one, which is not covered in your reading, okay, 'cos your reading comes from the, today's reading comes from the Sera manual, okay. Alright.

We'll go onto relationships. Yeah. [student] Yeah. There's a debate in the, you'll see, they'll say, is there anything which is not a contradiction? And the answer, I think, is no if I remember correctly. There's a {kachikma} about it and they say, find something, which is not a contradiction. And then finally they say, I can't, you know, okay. By the way, no one thing is a contradiction, ever. But everything that exists will eventually be involved in a contradiction, which if you've been alive long enough, you know that, right. Okay.

Say {dak chik gyi}[repeat]{drelwa}[repeat], {dak chik gyi}[repeat] {drelwa}[repeat], okay. There are two kinds of relationship. Now we're done with contradiction, okay, we're onto relationship. You're moving through the Dura at an unprecedented speed. [laughs][laughter] You can get the fifty pages of {kachikmas} in the reading, okay. We, by the way, I'd really like to thank all those people working on the readings. It's a hell of a lot of work. It's like, it's

like, many, many nights; many, many late nights. And a few people are really working hard on it. Which you can probably guess if the thing is getting so huge, you know. But anyway, {dak chik gyi drelwa} means, the kind of relationship where, to be one thing, is to automatically be the other thing. Okay. It's the kind, {dak chik} means, one self or one being. And, I don't like, and I don't encourage you to ever translate things in a weird way, where you come out with some weird expression. Like, the relationship of one selfness-ess-ess or something like that, you know. And that's the way they do it in a university. And we're freed from that restriction, right. We don't have to impress anybody. We just want to get to the meaning of the thing. The meaning of the thing is, a relationship which, is such that, to be one of the things is automatically to be the other thing. And let's call it that. Okay, and not, a relationship of single - selfnessicity or something, okay. [laughter] We can just say what it is. And I hope, I pray that you spread Buddhism this way because otherwise it won't spread and it will die in the minds of a few people and nobody will benefit by it. You have to find words, common ground, right. The rule of Buddhist logic, must find common ground. It begins with common language, common words. Words that the people that you're talking to can understand, you know. Otherwise you have already broken the rules of Buddhist logic because you are outside of common ground, okay. So, by the way, this is an example of a relationship, which can go one way and not the other way, okay. What is the relationship between {mitakpa} and {chepa}? What's the relationship between a changing thing and a thing which is made? It's a {dak chik drelwa}. It's a relationship, such that, to be one is automatically to be the other. Okay. Anytime you are a changing thing you are automatically a made thing, a thing which is made. Anytime, you're a thing which is made, you're automatically a changing thing. This is a two-way street. This is a two-way relationship, such that, to be one is to be the other, automatically, okay. How about car and Chevrolet? Not. It's only one-way. Okay. When you're a Chevrolet, to be a Chevrolet is automatically to be a car. But, to be a car, is not to automatically be a Chevrolet. Okay. So we say, and you gotta, this is very tough, for those of you learning Tibetan. I had some students over the other day. We were talking about sentence structure. And these are people who never studied grammar in High School, which seems to be what they do nowadays. And we were saying that English is, normally, SVO. I mean, I learned that when I was teaching. Rinpoche went to Georgetown University and I spent six months of torture explaining him SVO, you know, subject-verb-object. Okay. I mean, most English is, you know, 'I like you', okay. 'I go to the store'. Okay. And that's subject-verb-object. The sentence order of Tibetan, as you may have noticed, is what? SOV, not B, okay, SOV, you know. 'I you like', 'I to the store go.' Okay.

And that's the normal SVO, I'm sorry, SOV. Okay. Now, in, in expressing relationship or contradiction it gets very nasty and it's very idiomatic. And, if you don't get it right the first time, you will wander in the Madhyamika Scriptures for years, okay. So get it right. Here it is. It's very idiomatic. You say, in Tibetan, when you say that something is related to another thing, such that, to be it is to be the other thing, you say the other thing first. Sorry, second. [laughs] [laughter] Okay. Had a hard day, okay. [laughs] [laughter] Okay. The thing being related to is second. The thing relating to it is first. So you say, Chevy-car {dang dak chik}. And you use the word 'and'. {dak chik} means, one, one being, okay. And what this sentence means is, to be a Chevy is to automatically be a car. And I hope you translate it that way. Okay. It's very difficult Tibetan. Yeah. [student] [laughs] You say, Chevy – car {dang dak chik}, okay; Chevy – car {dang dak chik}. That's all. To be a Chevy is to be a car, okay. To be a Chevy is to automatically be a car, and, and I hope you translate it that way. And, you know, if you don't know this idiom you can really, {dang} looks like 'and', and {dak chik} means 'one guy' and what the hell's going on here, okay, very difficult. By the way, {gelwa} is expressed the same way. You would say, for example, let me find some empty space. [cut]

Let me think about it. How about this one? Say {yupa}[repeat] {mitakpa} [repeat] {dang}[repeat] {gel}[repeat]; {yupa}[repeat] {mitakpa}[repeat] {dang} [repeat] {gel}[repeat]. I gotta be careful, okay. It goes like this: being all existing things is, contradictory to being, something which is changing. Okay. I'll say it again. And that's how you have to translate it, okay, very nasty. And you can go home and look it over a couple of times, okay. I'll say it again. Being all existing things, is contradictory to, being a changing thing. Okay. But reverse it, okay. Being a changing thing, is not contradictory to, being an existing thing. Alright. So, this is a one-way relationship of, of being one to be automatically be the other. Okay, it's very tricky. You have to think about it. Being all existing things, is contradictory to, being a changing thing. All existing things, is not a thing which is a subset, or which is equal to, the set of all changing things, okay, although the opposite is true. All changing things are a subset of existence itself. And for this you have to know a rule of logic that, if a set includes both changing and unchanging things, we consider it unchanging. Okay. All existing things, includes things, which are changing and things, which are unchanging. But, when I say, all existing things, I'm sort of stating again a general truth, am I not? And in that sense, it's unchanging, okay. It will always include those many objects, okay, whether they happen to be around or not. How's that? At any given time, whether examples of them, see what I mean. The 'is-ness' of the universe is unchanging, okay. The, the things that are in that shoebox may be changing or unchanging but the shoebox itself is unchanging, okay. So, {yupa

mitakpa dang gel / mitakpa yupa dang mingle} and you have to go home and chew on that, okay. Alright. Being a changing thing is, not contradictory to, being existing things, but being existing things is, contradictory to, being a changing thing. Okay. And, and you have to get used to that, alright. You have to chew on that, okay. I'm just trying to help those people who are trying to learn Tibetan with the impossible idiomatic syntax here. You will, never get over it unless somebody trains you, you know, to, to work with it. So, you gotta work with it.

It will come up often in the Madhayamika Scriptures. You will never be able to read a lot of Nagarjuna or Je Tsongkapa or anybody else, Shantideva on emptiness, if you don't understand the structure, okay. That's all.

It's awful quiet out there, okay. [laughter] laughs] Okay. Say {bumpa}[repeat] {bumpay dokpa}[repeat]; {bumpa}[repeat] {bumpay dokpa}[repeat]. If you want a good example for a relationship, such that, one thing is automatically the other, you could use {bumpa}and {bumpay dokpa} on your homework. That usually wakes them up. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. [laughs] That's why I invented the homework.

Say {bumpa}[repeat] {bumpay dokpa}[repeat]; {bumpa} means, a water pitcher. I hope my students never translate it as 'vase'. That's not the point, right? And {bumpay dokpa / dokpa}, is that tricky thing meaning, the reverse of all that a thing is not. Okay. The reverse of all, that a thing is not. What's the reverse of all that this pen is not? It's the pen. Okay. But {bumpay dokpa}is not the same as {bumpa}, right. Okay. Is one of them unchanging? Nasty question. Anyway, pen and the, opposite of all which the pen is not. How's that? Pen and {dokpa} means, the reverse of all that the thing is not. Remember {dokpa} is very important in this school, because that's, according to them, how you perceive things; by eliminating all that the thing is not you, you perceive the thing. And some Tibetan Buddhist schools have mistaken that for emptiness, okay. Yeah. [student] Yeah, or the opposite. [student] Yeah. Yeah. [student] Everything that's not what it's not. Okay. [student] Right. And those two things are related that way, you see. Those things are, such that, the minute that you are the pen, you are automatically the opposite, of all that the pen is not. Okay. And they are two separate things. Okay. They are two, they're distinct from one another. Do they refer to the same thing? Yes. Are they two separate things? Yes. They're distinct. How's that? They're distinct. The, the opposite of all that the pen is not is distinct from the pen. Are they the same thing? Yes. [students] [laughs] Perhaps in the way, that you perceive them. Okay. When you, by the way, when you perceive the reversal of the pen, I call it the reversal, all that the thing is, the opposite of all that it is not, you're actually perceiving, you're excluding the opposite of all that the pen, you're, you're excluding the

opposite of the exclusion of all that the pen is not. How's that? But, when you perceive the pen, you're just perceiving the exclusion, of all the pen is not. But, when you perceive the exclusion of all the pen is not, you're perceiving the exclusion of all that it's not the exclusion of all that the pen is not, okay. [laughter] [laughs] And by the way, you better get used to thinking like this because you, you, if your mind isn't into this, if your mind's not sharp enough to handle that easily, then you're gonna have trouble with emptiness, you see. Sooner or later, you gotta buckle down and, and read those {kachikmas} and be able to get through them fluently, you know. Sooner or later you're gonna have to if you want to see emptiness directly. It's not just word games of logicians in a college, or something like that. It's, you mind has to be able to quickly move to those things so that you can perceive emptiness directly. Sooner or later you're gonna have to buckle down and be able to do that. Okay. That's all. Yeah. [student] You're, you're beyond me now. [laughs] [student] Yeah, yeah, you can say that. In this school especially, yeah, that's necessary for perceiving [student], yeah you can say that I guess, yeah. He says, you can talk about it because that distinction exists so therefore the distinction is important and they are distinct and I guess you could say that. It's important that they're distinct because to understand how you perceive the pen you have to be able to perceive the second one which is that the, how you perceive the pen is by excluding all which is not the pen, okay. [student] Yeah. You could say that. [student] Yeah. You can't. Yeah. Okay. Yeah. [student] Yeah. Nominally, they're distinct, conceptually they're, they're distinct [laughs] and ontologically they're not distinct. That's fine. That's alright. You can say that. Okay. Okay, we got into some big words. Alright. I'll lay one more on you, what the heck. Then we'll have some fun. Say, {dejung gi}[repeat] {drelway}[repeat], {dejung gi}[repeat] {drelway}[repeat]; the second kind of relationship, okay. Which is a cause and effect relationship if you want to say it easily. {dejung} means, 'which came from it'. The relationship of a thing and the thing which it came from. Okay. The relationship between a thing and the thing which it came from. By the way, this is not a two-way street. Okay. We're talking about the relationship of a thing, with the thing which it came from and not, the relationship of a thing which is about to produce a thing which doesn't exist. Okay, 'cos that can't be a relationship because they're not distinct because they're not two distinct objects because they're not two objects because one of them ain't an object yet. Okay. And then you get into this nasty debate. Well, by the time the tree's there the seed's not there so you don't have two distinct objects so there's not two objects so you can't have a relationship. And then we say, over a period of time, [laughs] you know what I mean, or something like that, you know. Conceptually, or, or when you speak of the thing result, you're assuming you're

talking about the cause in the same breath, okay. By the time you call a thing a result, you're also conceptualising its cause. It's technically true that at the instant that the result is there the cause is already gone but we can still speak of a relationship over a period of time. Okay. Like that. Okay. Given a, we can still speak of, of Tessie over the whole period of her life. We can say, in her whole life she's only eaten this once. Even though all the Tessies from the millisecond that we're talking about on back don't exist anymore. Okay. But, we can still say, whether or not she's eaten something because we can still consider her over the length of her lifetime, okay. That's all. Here's an example of two things which are, which share a {dejung gi drelwa} one-way. Okay, only one-way. And we'll find out which way later, okay, after you write the Tibetan down.

Yeah. [student] That was last semester. [student] Ah, no. Abhidharma School, Abhidharma School. [student] Yeah. He said, is this the school that accepts that cause and effect don't have to happen sequentially, that they could happen at the same time. Mainly Abhidharma School. This school, I believe, also has a presentation similar to that. I don't remember if they have that particular [unclear]. They might but I, when they talk about relationships they say it's impossible. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah.

Say {ngupoy}[repeat] {chi-lok su}[repeat] {jungwa}[repeat], {ngupoy}[repeat] {chi-lok su}[repeat] {jungwa}[repeat]; {ngupo} means 'working thing', any working thing, {chi} means, later, {lok} is a Tibetan word that means, especially when you say it with a 'sa', okay, it's like, when you flip a pancake, that's called {lok, lok} the pancake. So {chi-lok}, remember in future lives class, I'm always talking about the thing that flops over into, that's the flap-jack thing, okay. {chi-lok su jungwa} means, 'a working thing in the moment after it', okay. I like to translate it that way: a working thing in the moment after it. Working thing, millisecond number two. Okay. Working thing, as it will exist, in millisecond number two. The, the flop-over of working thing millisecond number one. How's that? {chi-lok su jungwa} means, {jungwa} means, happened, so {chi-lok su jungwa} means, flop, and now we're into the second instant of the thing, okay. The thing in its second instant bears or shares a relationship of having come from something else with {ngupo}, meaning here, the original thing. Okay, the original working thing. Okay. So, pen of millisecond number two, shares a {dejung gi drelwa} with, pen of millisecond number one.

But, we cannot say, that pen of millisecond number one, shares such a relationship with pen of millisecond number two, because number two hasn't happened yet. Ouch. I was hoping I could get away with it and say, oh, let's take a break. [laughter] [student] Pen, of millisecond number two, which you can call, {ngupoy chi-lok su jungwa}, okay. The, the working thing as it is the moment after it, okay. Pen of millisecond number two, shares a {dejung gi

drelway}, with pen of millisecond number one. But, pen of millisecond number one, doesn't share such a relationship with of, of, with what? [student] It doesn't exist yet. What are you talking about? Okay. That's all. That's all. It doesn't exist yet. You can't say that, alright. [student] Yeah, but they say that's okay. [laughs] No, they say, at that moment, in millisecond number two, you can be considering the entire duration, you see. That's why I brought up Tessie in the length of her life. But, it doesn't matter how much length of life you talk about when you're talking about Tessie tomorrow because that can not be included in length of life yet 'cos it hasn't happened yet. That's all. It's a, it's a fine point, okay. You can consider, as a group, the milliseconds of the present and the past together. Let's put it that way. You cannot consider, as a group, [cut]

[end side A]

[side B]

the milliseconds of the present and the future together because the future ones don't exist yet. That's all. And have never existed, how's that? Okay. Okay, that's relationship. I think I'll give you a well-deserved break and when you come back we'll do something much more interesting. Okay. Yeah. [student] Sorry? [student] Which one? [student] Oh, that's a good question. Leon asked, which, what's the subject of the sentence? You can say, the working thing of the moment after it shares a relationship with the original working thing. Okay. [student] No. I'm talking from the point of view of the second millisecond. [student] Yeah. Yeah. [student] Yeah, if you want to, you can say, the working thing from the point of view of the result, okay. Of, of it being a result, is the result, shares a relationship of having come from the working thing of the moment before it. How's that? Something like that. [student] Yeah. Really, well, you can also talk about this, this structure is a, shares a relationship of having come from Lincoln's assassination. And, and we say that, you know. Somehow Lincoln's assassination affected this structure and we can say that it bears a relationship with Lincoln's assassination. But, we can't say, that Lincoln's assassination, at the time of the assassination, bore a relationship with, shared a relationship with this Quaker House, which didn't exist yet. That's all. And Madhyamika Prasangika has a different idea about the past, present and future and we'll get into that someday. [laughs] Yeah. [student] Yeah, they do, yeah, yeah.

Okay, take a break.

[announcement]

Help. No. Good job. [laughs] Okay. {dak chik gi drelwa} we already talked about; a relationship, such that, to be one is to be the other, okay. We're, maybe it's more accurate to say, a relationship, such that, to be the first one is to be the second one. Which may not be true of the second one to the first one, alright.

Okay. It is rolling. I wanted to give you three criteria for that relationship, okay, three criteria. Homework question, wake up. Okay. First one is that they should be {daknyi chikpa}, {ba da ka dak, nya kiku nyi ta nyi} [laughter] oh, you're lucky, okay. [laughs] Say {daknyi}[repeat] {chikpa}[repeat]; {daknyi chikpa} means, well, so far, it means, like, something like, to be one is to be the same thing, or something like that. Okay. And the trick here is that something which is a changing thing can be, is a {daknyi chik} with something which is a changing thing but they don't have a relationship because there's no two separate things. How's that? Okay. To be one, I don't know how to say it. Anyway, same thing, how's that. Same thing. Okay. {daknyi chikpa}, same thing, alright. You can say same thing about, you know, Winston is the same thing as Winston, how's that. But they don't, they don't share a relationship because they're not separate. So, so far, we don't have all of the required characteristics. The first characteristic is that they should be the same thing. Okay. But we have to have some other characteristics here, okay. What's the second characteristic? Ah-ha. They should be separate from each other, okay. Which means that Winston can't have a relationship with Winston. I mean, this kind of relationship, okay, so [laughter] [laughs] alright. Okay. Should be separate things. Okay. [laughs]

And here's the third quality. Say {chu de}[repeat] {me na}[repeat] {kyu}[repeat] {me gu}[repeat], {chu de}[repeat] {me na}[repeat] {kyu}[repeat] {me gu}[repeat]. Okay, {chu, chu de} means, 'that thing'. In, let's take the example of cars, okay. Let's say that {chu de} means, that thing, meaning cars. Okay. Cars. {chu de}, cars. That thing, okay, {chu de} means, that thing. I'm using the example of cars. For example, those cars-s, okay, {chu de}. {me na, me na} means, 'if they ceased to exist'. Okay, {me na} means, if they ceased to exist. {kyu} here, means, 'then this thing', meaning the Chevy, okay. {kyu} here, this thing, meaning in this case, in our case, the Chevy {me gu}, would have to cease to exist. Okay. So, three requirements for that relationship to hold between two objects: they should be the same thing. I mean, car, Chevy's the same thing as a car, right, in a sense; should be separate; and, if you wiped out all the cars in the world, you'd have to wipe out the Chevy. That's the test of whether they share this relationship. Okay. That's all. That's a, that's a general description of three qualities that you'd have to have for them to share a relationship, such that, to be one is to be the other. Okay, {daknyi chikpay drelwa}. Okay. Let's move on, everyone's got that.

[student] Yeah, or it could be both ways, you see what I mean. If you took away all changing things then you take away all made things, for example. Okay. They are separate things. They refer to the same things but they are separate things. They're distinct. How's that? Why don't we use the word

distinct? I think in the reading I used the word distinct. Maybe that's better, okay. Alright.

Last thing your, huh, which last thing? Your formal logic, okay. You're deep into it. We have covered two of the kinds of correct reasons. One involved a relation, an identity. One involved cause and effect. Now, we've reached {ma mikpay tak}.

By the way, to make up for logic I'm gonna do Lojong next course. So, if you quit tonight, come back and, when is it, May, okay. [laughter] That'll be straight, you know, office Dharma, you know. What do you do in your office, okay. Two extremes.

Say {ma mikpay tak}[repeat] {yangdak}[repeat], {ma mikpay tak}[repeat] {yangdak}[repeat]. Okay. This is very difficult to translate. People wander all over to translate it. You know that famous prayer of Je Tsongkapa? Je Tsongkapa's mantra: {mikme tsewe terchin chenresig / mikme / mikme} means, 'not perceived', okay, {tsema ma mikpa}, okay {tsema ma mikpa}. Here it means a similar thing; {ma mikpa} means, not perceived, okay. I call it, well, we'll get there. {ma mikpa / tak} means, a reason and {yangdak} means, a correct reason. A correct reason, to prove, the absence of something, okay. A correct reason to prove the absence of something. Okay. So now, we have three kinds of correct reasons. One is where the correct reason involves the nature of the other object. One is where the correct reason has a cause and effect relationship with the other object. And here we have a correct reason for proving that something ain't there. And that's so important that it's treated as a separate kind of reason, okay. It's so important that it's split off as a separate kind of reason, {ma mikpay tak yangdak}. Okay. In fact, you could not have the other two relationships, because we're trying to prove a, an absence. An absence can't have a relationship, but talking about that later, alright, {ma mikpay tak yangdak}.

I'll give you a classic one. Okay. {dungi shi dir chuchen}, say {dun gi shi}[repeat] {dir}[repeat] {chuchen}[repeat]. Okay. And then it's a long story, { .. }, something like that, which would mean, consider this room; if there were someone in this room who doubted the existence of hungry ghosts, okay, then there could be one in this room who remembered the hungry ghost they saw. Something like that, okay. In other words, or you could say, consider all the people in this room; nobody in this room has a valid perception of a hungry ghost; because everybody in this room doubts the existence of hungry ghosts. Okay. Meaning, if you prove that no one in this room has had the cause of, of knowing about hungry ghosts then, you can say they don't know about hungry ghosts. If no one in this room has perceived a hungry ghost with a valid perception then we can say that no one in this room could ever have a valid memory of a hungry ghost. That's all. Okay. Or the following would be a

proof: consider everybody in this room; it would be improper for anyone in this room to say that hungry ghosts exist if no one in this room had had a valid perception of them. Okay. That's a classic, okay. I'll say it again. Consider this whole room; it would be improper for anyone in this room to swear that hungry ghosts exist; if there were no one in this room who had perceived them with a valid perception. Okay. What's, what's the {je kyap} there? What's the reverse necessity, you know? What is the, the general truth that they're saying there? If you haven't had a valid perception of a, if a Buddhist has not had a valid perception of a hungry ghost, then a Buddhist would never go around telling people, oh, hungry ghosts exist. Okay. That's the implication. It's very powerful. I'll say it again. I mean, the {tak yangdak/ ma mikpay tak yangdak} is the following: consider this room full of people; no one in this room would ever, all being good educated Buddhists, no one in this room would ever go around swearing that hungry ghosts exist, if no one in this room had seen them with a valid perception. Period. Okay. And that's a classic {ma mikpay tak yangdak}. It's a proof for proving the absence of something. Okay. What's, what's absent in this room? The propriety, of swearing that, hungry ghosts exist, okay. The correctness of swearing that hungry ghosts exist is not present in this room if no one in this room has had a valid perception of a hungry ghost. Okay. That's all. We're talking about the propriety, okay, the rightness, that it would be right for someone in this room to swear that they exist if they had not had a valid perception of them. And that's an airtight {ma mikpay tak yangdak} in Buddhism, okay. And obviously it has applications to how you present Buddhism to other people. You meet many American Buddhists who, who go from making claims which seem to be correct maybe, about what the Buddha might have said, to claims that the Buddha never said, but all with equally insufficient authority, you know what I mean. And you don't wanna be like that. It turns people off. You step beyond common ground right away, you know, by claiming, you know, you have to believe in these things. Why? 'Cos we do, you know. Just like Santa Claus and, and all those, and the guy who made the world, you know. No thanks. I've been through that, you know. I want, as a Buddhist, you cannot assert the presence of a thing until you've had a {tsema} or a pramana about that thing, period. Okay. And that's, that's the classic {ma mikpay tak}, okay. Yeah. [student] Oh, she said, how can you assert that you're a Buddhist if you've never had a valid perception of a Buddha? I would say that you could assert that you're a Buddhist if you have had a valid perception of teachings which you consider to be authoritative of Buddhism or something like that, right. I mean, to say you're a Buddhist is not to say that you've had a direct perception of Buddha. We don't know until you've perceived emptiness directly, you probably will not ever directly experience a

Buddha. On that day you do. Okay. But you can have a deductive perception of a Buddha. By the way, did I say, direct? Did anybody here say, direct? You know, I didn't say direct. I've had a {tsema} of a, of a preta. I've had a {tsema} of a hungry ghost 'cos Rinpoche said so. Okay. For me that's, that's {tsema}. That's {loun gi tsema}, right, Scriptural authority of a person, I, I perceive or I've established in my mind, to be infallible. He said so. Okay. Can you present that to a non-Buddhist? No. You know, can you present that among company, one person of whom doesn't accept that authority? No. Okay. And that's the difference. I didn't say direct perception, right, direct valid perception, 'cos that's why we went through the kinds of valid perception, right. There's direct, {ngunsum}; there's {jepak}, and there's those different kinds of {jepak: ngutop, lung}, what was the third? {shung gi jepak} and, huh? Rational belief? No. It was convention, I think. It was convention. I mean, Uncle Sam, refers to the American government because by convention, everyone agrees it. And I've had the direct, I've had a deductive perception of, of the American government when somebody talks about Uncle Sam. You know, I haven't met this guy called Uncle Sam but, by convention, we understand that we mean the US government that sucks our taxes away and, you know. I perceive them through that word, okay. That's all. Okay.

Two kinds of {ma mikpay taks}. By the way, this part is gonna be the same, so you can just write this if you wanna be lazy and I'm sure Phuntsok won't mark it wrong. [laughter] By the way, somebody made a really good suggestion. It was Randy, actually. And it was, why don't you post the answer keys before the quiz, you know, after everyone has finished their homework already, okay. And we'll try and do that, okay, for the next class. If you get here a little bit early next time we'll try and post the answer keys outside so that you, even if you screwed it up on the homework, at least, when you take your quiz, you know what it's supposed to be. Okay. And, and that makes sense to me so, I'm, it'll be on a, of course, since we're all Buddhists, nobody will cheat or anything like that, okay. You would be, you would be denying worldview if you thought that passing the quiz came from cheating, right? You would be denying cause and effect. You'd be spitting on cause and effect. Seriously. Okay. Worldview, correct worldview, {yangdak gi tawa} says that cheating on a Buddhist homework, quiz [laughs] you know, would only lead to a negative result, okay. And if you happened to pass because you copied it onto your hand and then wrote it down on the paper, it's not because you copied it on your hand and wrote it on the paper. It's because you did something good in the past. And you have to start thinking like that. That's correct worldview. Okay. You have to separate the results of your past deeds from the consequences of your present deeds. That's, that's the skill of being a Buddhist, okay. Alright.

Say {minangwa}[repeat] {ma mikpay}[repeat] {tak}[repeat] {yangdak}[repeat], {minangwa}[repeat] {ma mikpay}[repeat] {tak}[repeat] {yangdak}[repeat]. The main word here is {minangwa}. {ma mikpay tak yangdak} we already had; this whole thing here. And it meant, a {yangdak} means, a correct, {tak}, reason, for proving {ma mikpa}, the absence of something, okay, the absence of something. By the way, it's not always, technically speaking, an absence. It can be not being something but that's the way it's named. It's called that although it's not always for an absence. It can be for something not being something else which is not the same as absence. Okay. Anyway, that's the name of the reason. Okay, {ma mikpay tak yangdak}. {minangwa} means, generally speaking, the, the thing that you're denying, right, you're denying something. For example, what was I denying before? The propriety of any Buddhist who hasn't had a pramana or a valid perception about hungry ghosts to get up and say, hungry ghosts must exist. We say so. Okay. What am I denying there? The propriety of saying that hungry ghosts exist, okay, if you haven't seen them or, or you can't prove them in any other way, okay. What's the main element in that statement? Hungry ghosts don't exist. What's the key word there really? What's the key of the whole argument? What's the key of his problem? Hungry ghosts. Okay. I mean, the real problem boils down to hungry ghosts, you know. Do they exist or not? I mean, this is difficult to decide. These things are difficult to perceive. We call them {keldun; keldun} means, something that's kind of beyond us. It's beyond our normal experience. That's the meaning of {minangwa}. {minangwa} here means, it is not apparent. Okay. It's not something, which is apparent, to whom? Mainly to the other guy, okay. So, if the main element that you're denying, which is something about hungry ghosts, is something that the other guy has trouble confirming or not, we call it, a {minangwa}, okay. How do you translate this? A correct reason for proving the absence of something which is a, which is abstruse or difficult for the other person to perceive. Okay. Trying to prove the absence of something, we're trying to deny the existence of something, that the other person might find difficult to perceive. Okay. The thing we're denying involves something that's difficult for the other guy to perceive. What's another example? {dun gi shi du chuchen}, take this guy in front of me, {yinte yurme dam ...}, I can't say whether he's a Buddha or not, I can't say whether he's seen emptiness directly or not, {ma yinte tseme ... }I haven't had a perception about that. I can't, I don't have a valid perception about that. I can't say if Jay Siller had seen emptiness directly or not. I can't say, you know. I cannot assert that. I cannot get up here and say he has or he hasn't, okay, if I had not had a direct, sorry, if I had not had a valid perception about it, okay. That's all. And, and that's the reason for studying this kind of reason. And this is the one that came in the first reading when we discussed the reason

or the purpose of Buddhist logic. And one of the main reasons was not to go to hell for ninety-nine million zillion aeons like that guy did. Who was that guy? The Buddha, okay. And then when he got out he said {gangsak gyi gangsak gi tsu misung te nyampar gyur tare}, don't do it man, you know. Don't, don't judge Jay Siller, you don't know, you know. You can't tell, okay. You haven't had a valid perception about it. This is a {minangwa ma mikpay tak}. Take Jay Siller, it would be incorrect to make an assertion about whether or not he's seen emptiness directly if you hadn't had a valid perception about whether or not he had seen emptiness directly. Okay. That's all. That's a great {minangwa ma mikpay tak} because it is not apparent to me or to a normal person who's gonna be the opponent in this debate, whether or not this person has seen emptiness directly. It's a difficult thing to tell about somebody. And it's, it's a custom even for people who've seen it directly not to say or not to say in a very direct way that they've seen it directly, okay. So, so you're gonna have trouble about that. So that's a {minangwa ma mikpay tak}. It involves something which is very difficult to perceive, okay, especially for the opponent. And the purpose of it gets down to the purpose of all Buddhist logic which is you cannot, you have to learn, what do you call it, there's a word in English? I forget the word. You have to learn to be somehow, it sounds like critical, almost, huh? Critical or [student], not discerning. Something where you don't believe it until you see it, sceptical, almost.

Something like that. It's not sceptical, but anyway. The purpose of Buddhist logic is that the better you get at it the more you realise how much you don't know, you know. The better you get at Buddhist logic the more sensitive you become to the fact of how much you don't really know and how much you're assuming, in a very illogical way, especially about other people. Okay. And all the bad karma you're collecting that way, okay. Who knows who they are? You see what I mean? Do you have a valid perception about it? And if not, the Buddha called it {me .. }, it's like, there's a special barbeque pit in ancient India where they, they make a big pit and then they fill it full of firewood, and then they burn it all day. And then there's this, the grey color of the, of the ashes, looks like the grey color of the sand around it and you might just walk onto it not realising. And then, suddenly, you're in six feet of embers. And He says, don't, {me ...}, you know. It's like a pit of embers to think you know much about other people, you know. Don't, use your Buddhist logic to establish to your own mind, to prove to your own self, that much of the judgement you have of other people if not all of it, is invalid. You can't tell. You don't know. You know, you don't have a valid perception about it, so be careful. That's the big deal about {minangwa }, that's why they create this category of logic, okay. What's the second one? By the way, that has applications up to the highest

teachings of Buddhism obviously, if you think about it, if you've had them, okay. Alright. It has profound application in the highest teachings of Buddhism, okay. Maybe you can say you have to get pretty good at this before you can really appreciate the highest teachings of Buddhism, {kye rim}, okay. By the way, you don't have to write the whole thing 'cos this much is the same.

Say {nangrung}[repeat] {nangrung}[repeat]. That's really the last thing from formal logic tonight. {nangrung} just means, the thing can appear to the perceptions of your opponent, to the normal perceptions of your opponent, okay. It's not, like, some difficult to perceive thing like whether or not Jay Siller has perceived emptiness directly or, or whether or not there's hungry ghost perception here, or something like that. For example, if I say, consider the top of this pen, there's no car there, because there's no Chevvy there. Okay, that's a {nangrung ma mikpay takyang dak}, okay. You don't have to be a person with ESP to perceive the truth of that, you know. A normal human being in this room who knows what a Chevvy is and what a car is can perceive it. So, it's a, it's a, it's a reason for proving the absence of something which, which is something which could appear to the valid perceptions of the normal opponent, okay. That's all, okay.

In the last section on debating, okay, you got a, can I borrow your rosary? I thought you might like to learn some, I call that section, 'debating tactics', okay. Tactics means, I like to call it the 'Mohammad Ali' tactics, okay. I dunno, I used to like to watch Mohammed Ali fight. The first thing I ever said to Rinpoche, I mean Rinpoche, I was like twenty something years old. And I walk in there and he gave a class. And I was late 'cos it snowed and the car broke down and I had to hitch-hike and all this stuff and I got there late. And they were just about to let out and then it let out. He said, hang around. And I hang around and I was standing there, and I'm waiting for the word from the Master, you know. The Dalai Lama has sent me to meet this Lama, you know, and said you have to go study there, that would be good. So, I'm, like, waiting and he's, he, he looks, I remember he was sitting at the table there in the kitchen. The other house didn't exist yet. And, and I'm standing there and I'm waiting, you know. What's he gonna say to me, you know. And I'm all nervous. And he says, hey did you watch Mohammed Ali fight last night? [laughs] [laughter] You know, and I'm, like, no. [laughs] And then, I'm, like, judging him, you know. I say, well you know fighting's not very good, you know. It just beats up people and stuff like that. He says, oh no, no. He doesn't want to hurt anybody. He just want to be good at what he does, you know. [laughs] [laughter]

And that was our first exchange. So anyway, Mohammed, the great thing about Mohammed Ali is, was rope-a-dope and stuff like that. It was all these taunt, taunting the other guy to the point where he gets so confused before you even

punch him, you know what I mean. Before you, before you swing your arm, he's already, like, in another world, you know. Like, he's already confused. And he's already, he's like, wondering what the hell you're doing. 'Cos you're standing there, like, that, you know, hit me. You know, like, this last fight with this Mexican guy and he just stood there and let the guy punch him until the guy got so tired and then he just hit him once, you know. [laughter] And this is, this is a skill in debate and that's to, to, to rope-a-dope, you know. It's to, to get your opponent so confused and, and, and distracted that you can wipe him out with your point, okay. And I'm gonna teach you some of those, okay. It's very much a part of debating. Is it much, is it part of debating because you wanna be mean? Obviously not. Is it a part of debating because you want to hurt the other guy's feelings? You better forget that when you walk into the debate ground. Is it a part of debate because you wanna beat the other guy? Not at all. You wanna help him. Okay. You wanna get him, help him get to a place where he can focus his mind totally in the middle of mayhem, you know. In the middle of chaos he can keep his attention and he can keep his very complicated chess moves in mind, you know. Even while you're saying all these things about him and you're egging on the other people, okay, to say, to start whoa and [unclear], you know. And you're hitting him on the head with this thing. But, he's keeping, his concentration, is unshakeable. And, and it's gonna be useful for him later when he meditates and, you know, people are, fire trucks go down Sixth Street or they make a movie there or some stupid thing. You're trying to concentrate and there's noises and stuff like that. It's very, very important to learn to do it. So, these are not just a game. It has a very great use for everybody involved, okay. So, here we go. [laughs] Who do I pick on? I, I made a list of them in your reading, okay. And I went to Rinpoche and I said, how do you spell all these stupid things 'cos nobody in the monastery knows, okay. They're just things that people have always said during debates and they could mean three, four different things. And he said, I don't know. And he's the Abbott of Sera Me monastery, you know, and the greatest debater on this planet maybe. And he says, I don't know. So, we sat down together and we worked it, you know, out what they probably used to mean or something like that. They've just taken on new meaning. I mean, nobody thinks of them as word anymore. They're just things you say when you get the guy in that corner and then you say it, you know. And it doesn't particularly have much meaning anymore. It's just the emotion of the thing is what it's supposed to be. Okay. So, let's start like that. {gelwa la ...chir}, okay. So, wait, you start like this, {dhi chitar chuchen}, okay. Let's get somebody else to do it. Jacquie? [laughs] [laughter] No, come on, come on. Okay. Pick on him, okay. Maybe, Phuntsok. Yeah, do you mind to sit here? Come on, come on, come on. [laughter] No, come, come, come, come.

[unclear] right here, okay. We can catch this historical moment on film. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. I think you sit, you're facing this way so everybody can see. Alright. And you gotta go home and practice this, okay. So first thing is [student] well, I'm calling him the attacker and he's the defender, okay. In the reading, he's the attacker and he's the defender. And if the monk has improperly only used half of his shawl by folding it like that [laughter] then, when he drops it, there's, there's nothing left here, okay. And that happened to me one time and I got in trouble. But anyway, you didn't get away with it, anyway. So, first thing, you drop, you put your {sen} back like that, okay. That shows respect for his opponent. By the way, this has been done since the time of the Buddha, right. The opening of the Diamond Cutter Sutra, you know, Shubhuti puts his shawl up there and he gets down on his right knee and, okay. Anyway, you go up and you and you go down close to his face. Okay, ready? This is always on your left hand, okay.

Okay, {dhi chitar chuchen}[repeats], okay, {dhi chitar chuchen}. Okay, what's the {dhi}? What's }dhi)? [students] Yeah. The root syllable for wisdom, okay. It's like, I hope we can all be smart tonight, okay, {dhi}.

{chitar chuchen / chitar chuchen} means, how about this? So, if you're gonna do it in English I don't mind, okay. {dhi}, how about this one, okay. {dhi} how about this one, {dhi chitar chuchen}. Then you start your debate. {gelwa la} [repeat] {yewa}[repeat] {mepay chir}[repeat]. Say {mepay chir}[repeat], {mepay chir} [repeat]. {gelwa} means, what? By the way, this is the way to learn a lesson. Don't go home with a stupid fifty page incomprehensible reading [laughter] and, and, and try to read it, you know. Get one of your friends and get the most important homework questions and debate them. And then you'll learn them in, like, an hour. And then you don't have to read all that stuff, okay. {gelwa la yewa mepay chir}; {gelwa} means, what? Yeah. Contradiction. {yewa} means, different kinds, {yewa} means, divisions, okay. {me / me} means, what? There aren't any, okay. There's aren't, there's no different divisions of contradictions, okay. Then he says, [student: tak ma drup]. Louder. {tak ma drup}, okay [laughs] {tak ma drup}, okay. Say {tak}[repeat] {ma drup}[repeat] {tak ma drup}[repeat]. And I don't care if you do it in English or Tibetan. If you're a Tibetan track I suggest you do it in Tibetan, you know. If you're not, that's okay. {gelwa la yewa mapay chir}; he said {tak ma drup}. Then you confirm, fax machine confirms back, you know. Are you telling me that there are divisions of {gelwas}? {gelwa la}[repeats] {yewa}[repeat] {yerpa teln}[repeat]. Say, {yerpa teln}[repeat] {yerpa teln}[repeat]. Are you telling me there are divisions to {gelwas}? Mr. [student: du] {du} [student: du] {du}, okay.

By the way, don't say {du} if you ain't got them ready. [laughter] Okay, don't say {du} if you're not ready. And now, I'm gonna teach you the first tactic; the

stalling tactic, okay. [laughter] Say, {ah}[repeat] No, listen; {ah} [repeat], {ah} [repeat];{ah} means, what did you say? Okay. [laughs] [laughter] You can also say, {la}[repeat]; that's a little more polite, okay. {la}[repeat], okay, and I wrote them down for you in the reading, okay. Say {ah}[repeat], {ah}[repeat], {ah} means, what the hell are you saying? Okay, {ah}. Okay. And you can also say {la}[repeat]; {la} means, I didn't quiet catch what you said, you know. [laughter] Okay. And what you could do in that few seconds while he's, you know, repeating, is you can think real fast what to say, okay. So {yerpa teln} [student] Are you ready? Okay. Then you say, {shok}, okay. By the way, that's low-tone {shok}, right, {shok}. Say {shok}[repeat] {shok}[repeat]; {shok} means, show me. let's see 'em. Okay. {shok} [laughs] [laughter] By the way, [laughter] don't, this is for the, this is for the three year olds, okay. [laughter] {shok} [laughter] This is for the kids, okay. [laughter] I don't want to see you sissies, okay. {shok} [repeats], you gotta get that {shok}[laughter] [laughs] {shok} [laughter] Okay, {shok, shok, shok, shok, shok, shok}. [student] Okay, by the way, you ready? {whoaaaaaa chir}.

Okay, some, I asked Rinpoche, is it {che} or {chir} or {chu} or what is it? And he says, I don't know, you know. [laughter] Apparently, you know, this is a winter debate thing between colleges and this is the most popular way to say, come on, say something, you know. Some people say it's {chir} which means, you know, because, you know, he said {chir} what are you gonna say man? Say something, { doooo che}, you know. Some people say it's {che}; {che} means, stalled, hey you stalled man. Let's get going, okay. [laughter] It's the {che} in Diamond Cutter; { .. che}, okay, you're stalled. Some people say that. Rinpoche says, it's probably {chir}. Nobody knows, okay. {dooooo chir} [laughter] Hah-hha-hah, okay you gotta learn [unclear], say [unclear][repeat], ha-hah [laughter] okay. I'm just trying to teach you all the ones you might hear. Say, ha-hah [repeat] [laughs] He's been a [laughs] [laughter] He's a natural. [laughter] Okay, ha-hah means, come on, you're a laughing stock, okay [laughter] laughing stock. Okay. Okay.

Now, say {shok, shok}[student] {...}[student repeats] Are you telling me it's direct contradiction and indirect contradiction, is the two, is the two main divisions? [student] Again, please. [laughter] Yeah. He says, {du}, right. {du}. {ooh tsa / whoa tsa}, okay. And that's another thing you gotta learn, okay. Ready? {ooh tsa}[repeat], {whoa tsa}[repeat],okay. {tsa}, we were trying to figure out what {tsa}, I've heard two versions in the monastery. One is {ngo-tsar}, say {ngo-tsar}[repeat]. If you studied mental functions or bodhisattva vows, {ngo-tsar shepa ..};{ngo-tsar} means, to be ashamed or to be embarrassed, okay. So {tsar} means, you should be ashamed of yourself, the {tsar}[unclear] and you do it with the back of your hand like that. And, usually, you do it twice,

you know. You do it like {tsar ..}, {whoa tsa ..}, okay. Alright, like that. And you should be ashamed to give an answer like that. If you really want to rub it in you go [laughter], okay [laughs]. Try it. [laughter] It means, is this getting red? [laughs] [laughter] You're a disgrace. [laughter [laughs] Okay.

You say, {gelwa yinpa teln}, are you telling me that's the division? {yewa} [student repeats] {yinpa teln}[repeats] {du}. {mayinpa teln}[repeats], no it's not, okay, because the {..}is {pentsun pang-gel}[repeat], {pentsun}, by the way, easiest, fastest way to learn. It's been four minutes, they have already learned most of the vocabulary, see what I mean. It's the totally the easiest way to learn. Your Tibetan and your Scripture reading just accelerate, like, a hundred percent, okay.

{pentsun}[repeat] {pang-gel}[repeat]{dang}[repeat]{hlenchik}[repeat]{mine gel}[repeat]. Okay. Say again {pentsun}[repeat] {pang-gel}[repeat]{dang}[repeat]{hlenchik}[repeat]{mine gel}[repeat], {yinpay chir}, that's the real divisions. [student] [laughter] [laughs] Say, {tak ma drup}[student repeats]. Okay, now I wanna teach you another one, {kyappa long}. Say {kyappa long}[repeat], {kyappa long}[repeat], okay; {kyappa long} means, give me the {kyappa}, you know, give me your new, screwed up, stupid {kyappa}, okay. And you'll see that you're wrong, okay, {kyappa long}. Okay. So here, it would be, okay, those are the two main divisions of {gelwas} but those aren't the main divisions of {gelwa}. Just because they're, those, the main divisions of {gelwa} doesn't mean it's the kind of {gelwa} I'm talking about, or something like that. It's an indefensible {kyappa}, okay, it's an indefensible statement of necessity. So, when you think he's getting close to one, you say, {kyappa long}, okay. You get him in a corner and you say, {kyappa long} okay, give me your stupid {kyappa} and everybody'll go {whoaooo chir}, okay. [laughs] Alright, {kyappa long}, that's another one, {kyappa long}. There was another one. [unclear] Can't remember. Let me check. It's in the reading. [student] Okay. Let's see. Oh, {{labda}, you know. Okay, say {labda}[repeat], {labda}[repeat]; {labda} means, say something already, okay. You ask him a question, you say, {yinpay chir}. And he sits there and goes, you know. You say, {labda, labda}, okay, {labda, labda}. By the way, you can start a {whoa} whether you're right or not. It's a good way to buy time. And, fifty percent of the people who join you haven't even been listening. [laughter] And they don't know if he said something stupid or not. And, oftentimes, some guy'll give a great answer but the opponent, to get out of it, will start a {whoa}, you know. [laughter] And then it looks like he's wrong and he's not wrong, okay. But this is the way it goes.

Oh, there, there's one more. Okay. Do you agree that sound is a made thing? [student: yes] And do you agree that if something is made it must be changing? [student] So now I ask you, is sound a changing thing, and don't forget you're a

non-Buddhist who thinks that OM is an unchanging thing. [laughter] No, no, don't forget, you're the, you're, by the way, you, you take a, take wrong positions all the time, okay. It makes it more fun. Okay. Don't get into American competitive, pride, bullshit, you know. Take a position which you know is wrong and let the other guy prove you wrong and it'll help everybody, you know. Don't try to be right all the time. It's the best way to be a lousy debater. Take an interesting wrong position and let's see where we can go with it, you know. You, my friend, are a non-Buddhist who believes that sound is unchanging. I'm playing the Buddhist who's trying to convince you that sound is a changing thing, even the sacred syllable OM, okay, is a changing thing. So I say, so don't forget where we're coming from. You're a {..yangdak} means a proper opponent for my debate. And you can say that, you know. In the monastery you can say, okay, look, I'm gonna play the Buddhist, you play the Hindu, okay. Do you agree? So now, you gotta defend it, you know, like it's your own, you know. You gotta defend it with your heart. Okay, ready? {dra chuchen mitakte chepay chir}, take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's something made.

[student: agree]

No you don't [laughter] [unclear] {doooooo che} [laughter] Let's try again. You're the non-Buddhist, okay. [laughs] [laughter] Okay, {dra chuchen mitakte chepay chir}, take sounds, they are changing things because they're made things.

[student: tak ma drup]

Hah. So you believe that sound is a changing thing, right? I'm sorry, you believe that sound is something that's made, right?

[student: yeah]

And you believe that if something's made it must be a changing thing, right?

[student: yeah]

And you still say, sound is unchanging.

[student: yeah]

{kordhi korsum} [laughter] Okay ,okay.

Say {kordhi}[repeat], {korsum}[repeat]; {kotdhi}[repeat] {korsum}[repeat]. Okay,{kordhi korsum} means, man you just, {kordhi korsum} means, you just travelled in a big circular reasoning, you know what I mean. Meaning, you know, you, now you just crazy, you know. You accept one thing, you accept the other thing and you do not accept the necessary consequence of accepting those two things. And we call, in Scripture, in logic it's called {korsum}. Say {korsum} [repeat], {korsum}[repeat]. Which means, three circles, okay, {korsum}. In logic you'll see it in logic texts, {korsum}. At this point you'll see {korsum}. In the monastery you can either say {korsum}, but you gotta do a, a {kor}, okay. Or you can say {kordhi korsum}, okay. You go {kordhi}, try {kordhi korsum},

okay. Like, man you just went in three big circles. First you say sound is a made thing. Then you say if something's a made thing it must be a changing thing. And then you say that sound is not a changing thing, {kordhi korsum}. Say {kordhi}[repeat] {korsum}[repeat], okay. And the {dhi} is, again, I asked Rinpoche. Nobody knows what's the {kordhi korsum}, you know. He says, I guess, it's Manjushri's seed syllable, okay, again. It could be {korte korsum} which would mean that you've done three circles, something like that. So, those are all the, those are all the wild expressions you do to try to shake his concentration, okay. And then, so you gotta try to debate, I'll give you one debate for, to do between yourselves. And, you gotta find a partner, okay. I debated with myself for about five years in the, in the lobby of the temple 'cos I couldn't find anybody who wanted to do it. And then Benjamin Altman agreed to do it on the phone and we did it on the phone for, like, a year, okay. And so, you know, if you can't find somebody to do it with, then do it, you can do it with yourself but it's like playing checkers with yourself or something. It's not too much fun, okay. And I'll give you, there are no, there are no divisions to a, to contradiction, okay. Start out, one guy starts out like that. The attacker starts out with something crazy, okay. There are no different types of contradictions. Okay. Okay, there are no different types of contradiction. And then, he says, {tak ma drup}, okay. He says, are you telling me there are different types of contradiction? And he says, {du}. By the way, you can do it in Tibetan, or it doesn't matter, okay. {gelwa la yepa yinpay chir}, there's no divisions of contradictions. And then, he says, not correct. And I say, then, there are divisions? And he says, right, {du}. And I say, {shok}. And then, he says, {pentsun pang-gel}, say {pentsun}[repeat] {pang-gel}[repeat], that mutually exclusive thing; {dang}[repeat], and, {hlenchik}[repeat], sorry, {mine gel}[repeat], {hlenchik}[repeat] {mine gel}[repeat], okay. And, if you do that for, like, ten minutes, your, your homework is like that. It's not a question. Okay. {yerte / shok}, show me the two, {shok}. In Tibetan. [student] {pentsun pang-gel} [student] {dang}, okay, second one, [student] {hlenchik mine gel}, pre-nasal there, {hlenchik mine gel} [student] {yinpa teln}. You telling me those are the two divisions? Okay. {hlenchik mine gel / shok}, give me an example of diametric opposites, okay. Give me an example, any example, {shok, shok}. [student] What? {nyenpo dang}, {pangja .. }

So he said, spiritual antidote and some kind of bad quality that you have, okay, {nyenpo dang pangja nyi}, okay. {.. chuchen}, yeah, {hlenchik ...}. I'm sorry. Ah, ah. Oh, let's say, {...}so I guess there's no one thing that can be both? [students] {whoa tsar}, okay. I said, there's no one thing that can be both and he said, well that doesn't prove that they're not, that they're not contradictory, okay. But that's the definition of contradiction, you see. There cannot be one

thing, which can be both. Now, he's probably gonna say, no, that's the definition of {pentsun pang-gel} but don't forget that the, what, Roy, what was that line? What was that line in the text? {pentsun pang-gel dang gelwa dun-chik}. He came up to ask me, what does that mean, okay. He's got that little text there, right. Don't forget, this is the only real contradiction. The first one is the only real kind, okay, if there's mutually exclusive kind. Now he gave me {nyenpo} and {pangja}; {...}, one thing can be both. What do you say? {yinpay chir}, can be. You got three choices. Give me one of them: {yu}, there is such a thing which can be both; {tak ma drup}, I don't agree there's such a thing which can be both; {kyappa ma jung}, yeah, there is such a thing that can be both but that doesn't prove what you're trying to prove. {shok}, {tak ma drup}, he said, there is no one thing which can be a {nyenpo} and a {pangja}. {...}, you telling me there's not? [student: du] {... chuchen}, take your body, your precious human rebirth, {...} so, I guess it's not an antidote to your spiritual problems and also something to be given up eventually. [laughter] [laughs] [student]

Yeah, { ...}, by the way, you have to say {...}, which means, the, the dirty, impure physical body that you have taken on in this life. {...}, I guess it's not both because there's nothing that's both. [laughter] {labda} [student] {mayinpa teln}, it's not both? Precious human rebirth, {mayinpa teln}, so I guess it's not a precious human rebirth? [student: kyappa ma jung] Ah {tsa}. [laughter] [laughs] So, it is a precious human rebirth? [laughter] Yeah. And you do have to give it up when you reach your Buddha paradise, the dirty body that you took on this life. [student: du] oh, and you can't use it to overcome your mental afflictions for example and reach Buddha-hood with it? This precious human rebirth. [laughter] Yeah, {kordhi korsum}, alright. You just made a big circle, okay. Now, if he's really good, he'll say, well, come on you don't use your physical body. You use your mind, you know, or something like that. And then we'll get into well why do they talk about, you know, is it useless? Can I just get rid of my body and use the mind? Something like that, okay. Alright. Thankyou. [laughs] Alright, we'll do prayers, alright. Try to practice a little bit, alright [unclear] and then, next time, we'll do a little more with, next time we'll actually get into groups, okay, and I'll go around and help each group a little bit. [student] Yeah.

[prayer: short mandala]

[prayer: dedication]

The Asian Classics Institute

Geshe Michael Roach

Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

Class Eight: Definitions and the Things They Define

Transcribed by Angie Overy

First thing, I'd like to ask you all to, to pray this evening for Cecile Brenner. Cecile Brenner is married to Peg Brenner who has been kind enough to, to house MSTC Washington for the last twenty years or so, okay. He's in critical condition tonight, okay, so if you can pray for him, okay.

Tonight's subject: Say, {tsen-tsun}[repeat],{tsen-tsun}[repeat]. This is the subject tonight from the {Dura}. And I was running out of subjects towards the end so I started picking the hard ones, okay. But then I decided I wanted you guys to debate more the last few classes, so it'll be short. So, we'll finish before the break and then we'll do some more fun things after the break, okay.

{Tsen} stands for {tsennyi} and {tsun} stands for {{tsunjal}. Say {tsennyi}[repeat] {tsunja}[repeat], {tsennyi}[repeat] {tsunja}[repeat]; {tsennyi} means, the definition of a thing, okay, the definition of something. For example, the definition of {ngupo}, or working thing, is {dunjin ngupa}, anything that performs a function, okay. So {tsennyi} means the definition and {tsunja} means, the thing which you are defining. In the west this is called 'definidum' or something like that; definidum? Or something like that. I just call it the thing you're defining. How's that? Okay. I prefer to call it that, alright, [laughs] 'cos I can't pronounce the other one, alright. So say {tsennyi}[repeat] {tsunja}[repeat], {tsen-tsun}[repeat] {tsen-tsun}[repeat]. So we're gonna study tonight, we're gonna talk about the definition of definition itself, okay. How do you define something? How do you make a definition of something? And in, in Buddhism, I don't know if you noticed yet, but this is critical, you know. You have to decide, how you're gonna define a thing, before you can talk about it. Both parties have to be on the same wavelength, in the sense of, agreeing to the definition of something before you can debate it properly. So, very typically, in the debate ground, you'll say, I don't think we're on the same wavelength, you know, what, what do you mean when you say that? You see what I mean? What do you mean when you use that word? And then they have to give a definition for

it. And then, you check to see if the definition and the thing it's supposed to define have certain relationship between them, okay. Do they have, do the rules regarding how you define something apply? Is this definition airtight for the thing he's trying to define? And we call those, the qualities that a good definition should have, are three, okay. And I'll give them to you now. Say {dze-yu} [repeat] {chu sum}[repeat] {tsangwa}[repeat], {dze-yu}[repeat] {chu sum}[repeat] {tsangwa}[repeat]. Let's do the easy parts first. {sum} means, three, okay. That's pretty easy, okay. {tsangwa} means, all three should be there, {tsangwa} means, complete, okay, {tsangwa} means all three should be there. {chu} here means, a quality, three qualities have to be complete. Three qualities have to be complete if something is to be a good definition. Okay. Now, we get to the hard part, {dze-yu}, okay. And I'm gonna talk a little bit about {dze-yu} and it's brother {tak-yu}, okay. Everybody got that part? Okay. We're looking for three qualities that are {dze-yu}, okay. And I'm gonna talk about {dze-yu}. Say {dze-yu}[repeat], {tak-yu}[repeat], {dze-yu}[repeat], {tak-yu}[repeat]; {dze} means, 'stuff' or 'material', okay, {dze}. {dze} means, material or stuff, okay. And {yu} means, it makes it an adjective in this case, okay; it's material, {dze-yu} means, it's material. The thing is material. {tak-yu} is the opposite; {tak} means, sort of, how would you say? Made up by the mind, or something like that, okay. You can say, nominal, {tak-yu} would be nominal or something that exists only as an idea, okay, is {tak-yu}. So, {dze-yu} means something that has some material existence and {tak-yu} means something which only has a, a conceptual, a conceptual existence. How's that, conceptual existence, something like that. The idea of {dze-yu} versus {tak-yu} in Buddhism is a huge subject and you can spend years just talking about the difference between the four Buddhist schools of ancient India about what material versus conceptual means. Okay. And, each school has its different idea. When we get into the Mind Only School in November, or late October, it'll be the last regular class of this series, we're gonna talk a lot about {dze-yu} and {tak-yu}, okay. Because, in their school it's very important to, this distinction is very important, okay. And it's a little bit different for each school. By, then 'ninety-nine, if you remember, is gonna be a huge review of fifteen courses, okay. Which, I think, it will be really cool, 'cos, kind of, we can wrap up everything in your mind. For a Geshe candidate, that's what you do from the day you finish your last class to the day you get your final Geshe exam, which can sometimes be ten years apart. Okay. Depending on how many guys are in front of you 'cos they only graduate two a year in Hlarumpa and they only graduate four a year Lingtse. So, you know, depending on what number you are in the priority, you know. We're lucky at Sera Me because we're actually one of the smaller colleges. We only have about a thousand monks. Sera Je has about two thousand so you have to wait twice as

long or something.

{dze-yu} is defined as, something which, when you want to perceive it, you don't have to focus on all its parts and then conceptualise the whole, okay. Remember, we're in a lower school now, okay. Don't start complaining to me about it, alright. We're not talking Madhyamika anymore. Don't forget what hat you have on they say in the monastery, okay. You have a Sautrantika hat on this time. You're Hinayana School, this time. So, for them, something material means, you can just perceive it straight and you don't have to look at all its parts and then conceptualise it in a certain way, okay. And they say, examples are, colors, okay, the, the, the objects of the five senses, for example. It's not like you have to divide up the smell of some fritte french fries from Second Avenue, which I don't get to have much anymore. And, and then, you have to think, oh this is the, this is this smell, this is this smell, this is this smell and then conceptualise it into a big smell or something. You just smell it, you know. When you see 'blue', you don't think, like, oh light blue, dark blue, medium blue, you just think blue, okay. It's not, like, a big decision. And it's not, like, you have to perceive it via seeing all its parts and then conceptualising it, in this school, okay, in this school. So that's the meaning of {dze-yu}. Examples are colors or other objects of the senses and also the mind. Okay. The mind itself, in their school, in their belief. Like, you don't have to think about the left side of your mind and the right side of your mind, or anything else. You just perceive your mind, right. You're just aware of it. It's not like you have to analyse it and put together some kind of conceptualisation about it. You're just aware of the mind and you're just aware of colors. And that's all. It doesn't go through a process, in their school, of seeing the parts and then putting something together, okay. So, the definition is, more or less, perceiving it doesn't depend on perceiving its separate parts and creating a conceptualisation or something like that: {dze-yu}, okay, material. Those things exist in a material way. And then, {tak-yu} is the opposite. These are things, which you must perceive the various parts, and then, put them together in a certain way. Examples would, examples in the, examples in the lower Madhyamika school would be, a car or a person, car or person. Which, if you think about it, do they belong in the category of mental things, physical things, or things which are neither and which are ideas? You see? Where do they belong? Where does car, where does Winston, belong in there? Yeah. It's {demin duje}, it's the third choice, okay. When you say Winston, you're not referring to Winston's mind alone. When you say Winston, you're not referring to Winston's physical body alone. You're referring to a concept, which includes both, covers both the physical body and the, and the mind, okay. It's a, it's an idea really. It's a concept. That would be {tak-yu} in this school, you see. Perceiving Winston depends on perceiving the physical

body, having a {jepak}, deductive perception of his mind, we assume he has a mind, he's moving around. Not sure, right, could be an emanation or whatever. And, and then, we put that together and call it Winston, and that's {tak-yu}, okay, that's {tak-yu}. Okay, in this school. You'll come back to meet these two guys many, many times in the future. Very important in Madhyamika, very important in Mind Only, okay, and they'll take on different meanings in those schools. What's it got to do with {tsen-tsun}? Well, the definition of a definition, was {dze-yu chu sum tsangwa}, right? Say {dze-yu}[repeat] {chu sum}[repeat] {tsangwa}[repeat], it must have those three material qualities. Okay. If the three material qualities are present, the thing is a good definition. And here are those three qualities, which I'm sure, you're dying to learn. Okay. You don't care as long as it's short, right, so you don't have to memorise too much. Say {chir}[repeat] {tsennyi}[repeat] {yinpa}[repeat], {chir}[repeat] {tsennyi}[repeat] {yinpa}[repeat]; {chir} means, generally speaking. If you're from {Gelrong}, like Gelrong Khyentse Rinpoche, it's {spir}, okay, {spir}, okay. Like, in the outlying regions of Tibet they still pronounce it probably the way it was originally pronounced, {spir}, okay. {chir} means, in general; {tsennyi} means, definition; {yinpa} means, it is. So, generally speaking, it is a definition, okay. It sounds like a definition, okay, 'that thing which performs a function', okay. So, that's the first thing. I mean, it's generally structured, sounds like a definition. That thing which is hot and burning, which is the definition of what? Fire. Okay. That thing which is wet and flowing: definition of fire. That thing which is hard and self-supporting: earth. That thing which is light and moving: the element of air, wind. Okay. And those are definitions, {...}, okay, those are all definitions. So, generally speaking, it should sound like a definition, alright. First thing, right. It should be, it should be, like a definition, okay. Is that enough? No. Second quality. Say {rang gi}[repeat] {tsenshiy}[repeat] {tendu druppa}[repeat], {rang gi}[repeat] {tsenshiy}[repeat] {tendu druppa}[repeat]. Okay, {rang} means, 'its', its, {rang gi} means, its. {tsenshiy} is an important word and you should learn it, okay. When you learn {tsennyi} and when you learn {tsunja} you should go ahead and learn {tsenshiy}, okay. {tsenshiy} means, a definitive example. So, you have {tsennyi} meaning definition, you have {tsunja} meaning the thing which you're trying to define, and then, you have {tsenshiy} meaning a defining example or a definitive example. For example, {ngupo} or a working thing would be a {tsunja}, something to be defined. {duje ngupo}, that which performs a function, would be a {tsennyi}, a definition. And then, {tsenshiy}, a water pitcher, would be a classic example, like a definitive example, okay. So, {tsenshiy} means a definitive or a classical example of that thing, alright. {tsenshiy tendu druppa} means, {tendu} means, 'on top of', {druppa} means, 'to exist'; to exist on top of, in Buddhist philosophy means, 'it should apply'

perfectly, to, to a classic example, okay. So, if I come up to you and say, this water pitcher is a classic example of a {ngupo}, of a working thing. You should say, well, what do you propose as a definition of a working thing? And I say, anything that performs a function. And you say, does that apply perfectly to this classic example that you gave? And I don't say anything. I just pour you out a glass of water. Okay, {dun-je ngupo}. Okay. It performs a function. Drink it. Okay. And so that's like a proof. That's a proof that what I proposed as a definition applies perfectly to the classic example that I've given you as a, as a {ngupo}. Okay. So that's the second test of the validity of a definition, okay. Third test, final test. Say, {shen gyi}[repeat] {tsennyi}[repeat] {mayinpa}[repeat], {sheng gyi}[repeat] {tsennyi}[repeat] {mayinpa}[repeat]. It should be something that's not a definition for any other thing. Okay, {shen} means, 'any other thing'. Okay, I've simplified the Tibetan here 'cos I didn't want to give you a twenty line thing, okay. {Shen gyi} means, 'something else'; {tsennyi} means, definition; {mayinpa} means, 'it's not'. Okay. In other words, it can't be so fuzzy that it could apply to another object as well. It should be precise. It should not be appropriate as a definition for any other thing. It should fit the thing it defines and no other thing, okay. Should be airtight in that way, okay. There's also a thing called {tsen tsun kyi go gye} which is eight relationships between the definition and the thing defined. And those are kinda cool and we don't have time to do them, so, get back to me later, alright. For thing defined, for the thing defined, they are very similar, okay. What do you guess would be the first one? The three qualities of something defined. Generally speaking, it should be a thing, okay. I mean, everything can have a definition, alright. It should be a thing that you could define, okay. It should be a thing that you can define. By the way, every existing object can be defined. Every existing thing can be a {tsunja} sooner or later, okay. Like, there's a definition of {dun-je ngupo} also. Okay. There's a definition of the definition of a working thing also, right. And it would be the {dze-yu chu sum tsungwa, tsangwa} of {dun-je ngupo} of, of that which performs a function. And then you can go on and on and on. Okay. You can also have the definition of the definition of a working thing. And then you can have the definition of the definition of the definition of a working thing. And, like that, you see. Every object in the universe can have its own definition and should have its own definition. So, the first requirement to be a, something which is defined, should be, it's appropriate to be defined. I mean, it's just something you can choose to be defined, okay. Second quality would be what? On, on the [student], what's that? [student] Oh, yeah. It should apply to a typical example, okay. So, not only should, 'it performs a function', apply to the water pitcher, but the description or the word, 'working thing', should also apply to a water pitcher. Okay. It applies nicely to its typical example. Okay. People

should be able to say of its typical example, that it it is, it is it, okay. Thirdly, It shouldn't be the thing defined by any other definition, okay. And that's all, okay. Those three qualities, when you're talking about the definition of a definition, are called, the three material qualities. Those three qualities, when you're talking about the definition of something to be defined, are called, the three conceptual qualities. Okay. Why? I don't know, okay. I was sitting there during the meditation and trying to guess, okay. I used to worry about it in the debate ground. I haven't had time to check it out thoroughly in Scripture. I'm not sure. It's not mentioned directly in this section. It may be somewhere else. But it seems to me, which is more material and which is less material, between fire, the concept fire, and then, hot and burning? Which is more material? Hot and burning seems to be more basic to me, you see. Hot and burning, it feels like something you could burn your hand on as opposed to the concept 'fire'. When you say, fire is defined as hot and burning, in English, you often put, what, around the fire? You put quotation marks. That, I think, is the way in English, and I'm not sure yet, my thinking on it's not clear, is the way we indicate a {chi}, to me, a quality, a general principle. You see, the idea of fire as opposed to a fire, okay. You know, work on it, but I think, when you put, when you say 'fire', quote, is defined as that which is burning and hot, then the burning and hot, to me, is more material. And, 'fire', quote, becomes more conceptual and I believe that's why definitions are called more, the three material qualities. That's hot and burning, right. And then, the thing which you're defining, quote 'fire', is more of a conceptual thing at that point. When you're talking about the definition of quote 'fire', I think, it's more conceptual. And that may be why, although I haven't confirmed it in scripture and I want to admit that, that's called, the three conceptual qualities. Okay. By the way, in this school {takpa}, meaning what? Unchanging thing. And {tak-yu}, are synonyms. We'll talk about it some day. Difficult, okay, it's difficult. Oh, I knew that would get Jay Hahn going. No. [laughs] [student] Oh, conceptual, okay. Fire, with quotation marks about it, around it, is that, is that, is that an idea? Is that a mental picture? Is that, perhaps, something unchanging? You see what I mean? The concept of 'fire'; fire as a quality, you know. Is that, perhaps, something unchanging? Think about it, okay. You have to cook that, right. Yeah. [student] It should be true of the typical example. Like, what you normally do, is you say, what are you trying to define? Working thing. What's your definition? Anything which performs, a function. Give me a typical example: a water pitcher. Okay. Then the, then you have to decide, is this, a working thing? Okay. [student] Yeah. Is this a working thing? Is the example, the {tsenshiy} which he gave, the classic example or the definitive example, does that apply to the definitive example? Can you say, of a water pitcher, that it's a working thing? That's all. That's all.

Remember, normally, an example, a {tsenshiy} should be a {shi tun}, one object which combines two or more qualities of the definition and of the thing defined. That's all. That's another fancy way of saying that, okay. The thing that you choose as the classic example should incorporate both the definition and the thing defined in one object. And that's what makes it a classic example. A pitcher should be both a working thing and a thing which performs a function, okay. It should be one thing, which incorporates both, okay. Then you can say, this is a good definition, to fit that example, okay. [student] Can we make up new definitions? [student] Oh, no, no. We can, you have to. You will. Yeah. Can you make up new definitions? Sure. Are there classic definitions for most objects in Buddhism? Yes. Okay. And, you know, they get debated in the monastery, from time to time, they encounter a new object and someone says, should we change the definition [unclear]. For example, when I was in my student years in the debate park, fluorescent lights were a big debate, you know. Is this hot and burning 'cos it looks like fire, you know? And then everybody would go up and grab one and say, no, you know, it's not too hot. And they'd say, well, is that fire or not? And there would be this huge debate would break out, you know what I mean. And yeah, once in a while you come across something like that, okay. That's okay. Okay. If you think about, let, let's pick a, let's pick a typical definition and this'll be the last part of definition 'cos it's not, it's not a, there's, it's not a extensive subject in the {Dura}, okay. It's important, it's very important, but there's not a lot to say about it, okay, [laughs] in the {dura}. Let's take a definition and see how it works, okay. Let's take this definition. By the way, try to write both lines, okay. Write both lines. I'll take a break while you carve it. [laughter]

The {matrulway} had a problem, okay. This is, cut this out here, okay. It means, 'boo-boo' and I think the computer did a boo-boo just to prove it on that word, okay.

[unclear], did you have a question? I'm sorry, didn't see you over there. [student] Did I say that? [student] By the way, if you're wishy-washy, sooner or, she asked, is it good tactic to be wishy-washy in debate? I mean, when you're in trouble, you wanna try to stay obscure, yeah. [laughs] [student] Oh, no. That, generally speaking, in the first part of the definition of a definition, is just saying, you could take out the 'generally speaking'. I mean, it should, you could say, it should sound like a definition, or it should be, be thought of as a definition, or the two parties should consider it a definition, or somebody should propose it as a definition. That's all 'generally speaking' means here. Okay. It doesn't mean what it usually means in a debate when you're trying to cover your rear end in case there might be an exception somewhere in the universe. Which is what, yeah, I was talking about that. You always say {chu tang}, you

know. That way, if some one does figure out a counter example you could say, oh, that's why I said {chu tang}, okay, generally speaking, okay. [laughs]

Say {sardu}[repeat] {miuway}[repeat] {shepa}[repeat] {gangchik}[repeat], okay. By the way, you always say, {gangshik}like that. Say {gangshik}[repeat], {gangchik} means, the thing is A da, da, da, da, da, and B da, da, da, da, da, da. And the {gangshik} is always between the A and the B, okay. And that's how you say, look, this thing has to have two parts to it. It is da, da, da, da, da {gangchik}, then you pause and you take a smoke, and then you say, and da, da, da,da, okay. And there's always supposed to be a pause between them, okay. So {gangchik}, if you look up{gang} in the dictionary, what do you find [Tsultrim La]? 'What', you find 'who' or 'what' or something like that. {chik} means, 'a' and then you go crazy. {gangchik} is an idiom, okay,{gangchik} means, it has to be both A and B. And B comes after {gangchik} and A comes before {gangchik}, okay. And that's all. You've already met {sardu miluway rikpa} or {sardu miluway shepa}. It was the definition of? [students] {Tsema}, valid perception, pramana. Okay. Valid perception was defined, in this school, as {sardu miluway rikpa} or {shepa}, same thing, okay, {sardu miluway shepa}. {Sardu} means, 'fresh', because in this school recollections aren't {tsema}, they're not valid perceptions. Remembering the pizza you ate this afternoon, ain't, doesn't have the same ontological status, as biting into it, you see what I mean. In this school, okay. In the Madhyamika Prasangika there's a debate about it and they decide that memory is a valid perception, okay, of a remembered object, okay. And, therefore, of the pizza, okay. You can debate it later. {Miluway, miluway} means, 'unerring', which generally means that thing that you thought it was and the thing it really was were the same. Okay. Although, on an ultimate level, no one who hasn't seen emptiness directly yet, has ever had a truly unerring perception of anything, okay. And that's another story. But that's again another school, okay. {Miluway} means, unerring; {shepa} means, 'state of mind'. {Gangchik}, when you reach {gangchik} and you're a translator, you go back here and put, one, okay, [laughter] that's all. And that's all. And you should do it that way, by the way. Okay. It, it, the one and the two that are used in English to, to do that, to, to, to designate two very necessary parts of a statement but which are separate from each other, is exactly the right way to do {gangchik}, okay. And it has the same power in Tibetan. It's like, I'm gonna give you two things and I'm gonna separate them with {gangchik} and each one is important, each one is necessary, okay. It's much stronger than {dang} or {shing} or {ching} or {la} or anything like that, okay. {Tokdrel} means, 'free of conceptualisation'; {matrulway} means, 'unmistaken'; and {shepa} again, means, 'state of mind'. So, I'm proposing this as a definition. I'll say it in plain English once or twice through. You concentrate on what you think might, it might be the definition of,

okay. What's the {tsunja} here? What am I trying to define with these two lines? You know, what's that, charades, you know. I'm thinking of a state of mind, it's fresh and it's unerring, it does not involve conceptualisation and it is not mistaken. What state of mind am I talking about? [student] Huh? [student: valid perception] [student] {ngunsum}, ah, thankyou, {ngunsum}, a direct valid perception. Okay. Because an indirect valid perception, like, a deduction, involves thinking, right: oh, A is C so C has to be B so A must be B. Okay. That's not free of conceptualisation. This is a definition of direct valid perception, okay. Let's see how each part of the definition acts in defining a direct, comma, valid perception, alright. The different parts of the definition are meant to achieve two goals. One, goal number one, eliminate other types of things that might be mistaken for the thing we want to define. So, if you think about it, there's two goals of all definitions, and this is important, okay. There are two goals of all definitions. The first is to eliminate or to disallow other types of perceptions that we might be talking about, okay. That's the first goal of a definition. The second goal of a definition is to address common misperceptions about it, common mistaken ideas about the subject. Okay. And those are two goal of all good definitions, alright. It should eliminate other types of perceptions, in this case, that might be mistaken for it. And it should eliminate or it should address some wrong ideas that people normally have about it. Like, if I was gonna define nirvana for an American audience, I might not only say, you know, it's the permanent stopping of your mental afflictions 'cos you've seen emptiness directly, I might also add, and by the way, it's not that you disappear and go into some never-never land twilight zone. Okay. I mean, I might also want to add that to eliminate some common wrong ideas that my audience has, you see what I mean. Or I might want to do that with other things in Buddhism. And when you describe objects or Buddhist ideas to an American audience you often find yourself adding new parts to the definition to address their unique wrong ideas about it, okay. Emptiness is the general absence of a self-existent thing. And by the way, it's not that you sit there and try to make your mind black, okay. That's all, alright. Let's go through each part of the definition of this definition and see which parts are acting to prevent, to disallow dissimilar types, other types that might be mistaken for it. And, which parts are meant to address specific wrong ideas that certain people have, okay. And then, you'll get the idea of how definitions work. And then we'll be done with definitions, right. Yay. Okay. [laughs] Fresh and unerring. [cut] By the way, Jay Hahn, by, it's a rule that a teacher should continue to ask questions of a student until they screw up, you see. I mean, if they get something right, you should keep asking them until they finally get something wrong. I think Khen Rinpoche's very good at this. What other states of mind are there besides direct, that's a {mayin gak}, right,

valid perception? What other, I'll, I'll, I'll say, there's two other states of mind. Tell me. [student] That's only one. [laughs] That's not bad. Now, divide that into two. [student] No, divide, if I throw out all the states of mind in the universe which are direct valid perceptions, how many other states of mind do I have left, generally speaking? Two. [student] Yeah, great. Invalid perceptions we can throw out. An example in Scripture, is standing on the full moon day on a dark night with no clouds and you look up and you press your eyeball like that, you can try it with the Quaker House lights up there, and it works, okay, and you see two. Okay. Try it out. You press your eyeball and then there's two of them, okay. That's an example of a {tsemin}, okay, the perception of two lights when there's only one is a non-pramana. It's a non-valid perception. It's an invalid perception. So, yeah, Jay is right in one sense. When you say, direct valid perception, you are disallowing that, that kind of direct invalid perception, right. And? [student] Great. And, all valid perceptions, which involve, like, logic or conceptualisation, you know, deductions. Okay. So if I throw out all the direct valid perceptions in the world, I got two things left: all the screwy perceptions and all the perceptions that are not direct, you know, the indirect ones. Like, where I have to sit there and figure it out. You know, what does the back of Winston's shirt look like? I don't know. Knowing him it's probably white, you know. Now, Elizabeth, could be checkered, [laughs] could be striped, could be leopard skin, you know. I don't know. You see what I mean? And that would be, you see that takes a, a, a deductive process. I'm perceiving the back of their shirts but I'm doing it through deduction, okay. So this, when I say, 'fresh and unerring', which of those two other states of mind have I already disqualified? [student] The invalid perceptions. Give me an example. Okay, that's all. Oh, look, two Winstons, you know. That's invalid, okay. Why? The reality and the appearance don't correlate, okay. [student] Yeah, generally, what makes it invalid is a long story. We'll, we'll get there some day, okay. So, 'fresh and unerring', first of all eliminates the invalid states of mind. So it has, this part of this definition, is functioning to disallow or disqualify, a certain other type of perception, okay. Which is what? Screwy perceptions. Okay. That's the first. This definition is cool. Now, what about, 'free of conceptualisation', Mr Hahn? [student] It eliminates the other type of valid perception which is the deductive ones, okay. By the way, I'm saying deductive in a very general term. Of course, you know, there's, you know, what do you call it? Conventions and there's Scriptural authority perceptions in addition to deductive perceptions. There's actually three types of conceptual valid perceptions, okay. But the most common one is {ngutop}, which is deductive. So, I'm using the word in a general sense. Yeah. [student] She said, couldn't you, isn't 'fresh' to say, no you can have a, this is fresh. The first moment of this is fresh, okay. [student] It is free

of conceptualisation but it's not fresh. So when I say, 'fresh', it's eliminating, in this school, memory, memories, okay. That part of the first part is, is disqualifying memories, okay. Yeah. Which, in this school, are not valid, are not valid kinds of perception. Unmistaken, why do they put 'unmistaken' there after they've already mentioned unerring? We have to talk about. We didn't get there yet. Okay. But these two parts of the definition, the ones that I've underlined twice, those function to disqualify other types of perceptions, okay. Now, what are those other parts of the definition doing in there? They address wrong ideas of special groups of people, okay. They address wrong ideas of particular groups of people. For example, if I chose to define emptiness as the general absence of a self-existent thing, and by the way, it ain't some black, what do they call it? Black hole in your mind, okay, it's not that. The second part of that definition is, technically, not necessary unless I'm speaking to Americans who have such a wrong view about it that I have to add that to clarify the definition. See, that's what I'm saying, definition involves two goals. One, disqualify dissimilar cases. Two, address your audience's specific wrong ideas. And then, your definitions are cool, okay.

Unmistaken, here, there are schools of Buddhism that think, that in a sense, when I see two lights, it's, it's not mistaken. Okay. Because all, it's valid, right. I mean, if you squish your eye, there are two, in a way, you know. There are schools who think that, okay. And, the reason to add 'unmistaken', is to say, okay, you can have a direct perception but it's not necessarily valid. It's not necessarily unmistaken. Like, Ellie was kind of tending towards that viewpoint, right? Look, if you see something with your own eyes, it's probably correct, right. {ma kyapp, kyappa ma jung / shok}; squish your eyeball, okay [laughs] alright. It's a direct perception you can't deny but it's not unmistaken. So, the word unmistaken here, which seems to be superfluous, is not. It's meant to address the common misperception that might pop up in almost anyone's mind that, if I see it with my own two eyes it must be correct. {Ma kyapp}, squish your eye. Okay. That's all, okay. You can have a direct perception, which is not, a valid direct perception. That's all, okay. Now, the other one here is, 'free of conceptualisations', also addresses a wrong idea. There was a school of ancient India called {rikpa chen}[unclear], the logic schools. I translated it as the 'logicians', okay. And they believed that even the perception of blue involved a conceptualisation, you know. You had to think about it in some way or your mind had to glue together the parts of the blue to see that blue or something like that. Sounds like somebody else, right? But anyway, it's to address that misperception, that we also add the words 'free of conceptualisation'. It's to address their wrong idea that you can have a direct valid perception, which does involve conceptualisation, okay. That's all. Okay. So those are the two functions

of a good definition. And I'm gonna give you the words for those, if I can find them. Say {rik}[repeat] {mitun}[repeat] {selwa}[repeat],rik}[repeat] {mitun}[repeat] {selwa}[repeat]; {rik} means, 'type' or class, type. Okay. {mitun} means, 'dissimilar', which are not similar, okay; {mitun} means, dissimilar types. {selwa} means, it eliminates them, it disqualifies them, it disallows them. Okay. That's the first quality of a definition or the first type of definition or part of a definition. Those parts of the definition, which are meant to disqualify, in this case, the case we had, two things: deductive valid perceptions and invalid perceptions. Okay. So the parts of a definition or definitions, which are meant to disqualify, dissimilar types of things are called, {rik mitun selwa}, okay. What's left? What's the other, what's the other half? Parts of the definition which are meant to disqualify? [student] Common wrong ideas, common bad ideas. Like, when I say, and by the way, it's not a black hole in your mind, okay. Don't sit there and meditate on black. Black's not a negative thing, by the way, okay. Black is a positive thing. Emptiness is not, closing your eyes and concentrating on black, okay. {Lok tok selwa}; say {lok tok}[repeat] {selwa}[repeat], {lok tok}[repeat] {selwa}[repeat], okay. Write it down and then we'll do it. [cut]

{Lok tok} means, 'wrong idea', {lok } means, 'wrong', {tok} means, 'to perceive'. Yeah. In this case, it means an idea, {lok tok} means a wrong idea, okay. By the way, I'm sure everyone who's studying Tibetan is sensitive to the fact that this {tok} doesn't have a {sa} secondary suffix. Because, when it gets a {sa} secondary suffix it becomes 'realised correctly', okay. Which is nasty, you know. {tok} without a {sa} means to think something in the sense of being wrong. Like, a paranoia is a {tokpa}, okay. But {tok} with a {sa} means to realise something in the sense of, when I say, 'realise', I thought he was my friend {tok} but I realised {tok} that he wasn't, okay. The sound is completely the same. The spelling is different, okay. And in the monastery, often when you're in a debate, you'll stop and say, are you talking about one with the {sa} or not, you know. And they'll say, I don't know. I say, well you better tell me and then I'll get back to you, you know. [laughs] Okay. Alright, {lok tok selwa} means, it disqualifies or it disallows, wrong ideas. Parts of a definition or specific definitions, which are meant to address and disqualify dumb ideas about that thing, which the other person has, okay. And those are the two qualities of definition, okay.

The whole formal logic subject for tonight, right, I'm done with {tsen tsun}, okay. And that's pretty much all there is in {tsen tsun}, alright, but there's a lot to cook, right. The whole formal logic thing I'm gonna finish in two minutes, okay, 'cos from now on, we need time to debate, okay. So, here you go. Okay, say {nang rung}[repeat] {mamikpay}[repeat] {tak yangdak}[repeat], {nang rung}[repeat] {mamikpay}[repeat] {tak yangdak}[repeat], okay; {nang rung} means, {nang} means, 'to appear', {rung} means, 'appropriate' or 'possible', {nang rung} means,

I'm translating it as 'perceptible to the opponent involved', okay. This is, remember we had last time, we were talking about proving that something's not there which they would have trouble seeing anyway. Which involves something which they would have trouble seeing anyway. For example, a preta, a hungry ghost or something like that. Or whether Jay Siller has or hasn't seen emptiness directly. Or whether he's a Tantric deity or not, okay. That's, that involves something which is not normally perceptible to a normal person, okay, to the opponent. So, there's a whole realm of logical statements which are meant to address how touchy it is to talk about things that people can't see directly. Okay. Which are imperceptible normally. And we decided that it was one of the most important functions of logic to convince yourself that that's the case and you've gotta be really careful about judging other people, okay. Who knows, I mean, one of the most important goals of Buddhist logic, is not so much to defeat your opponent. In fact, in the Pramanavartikka, one quarter of the chapters are entitled, 'logic for your own self', you know what I mean, proving things to yourself, you see what I mean. And it's proving to yourself logically that you, how much of the world that you don't know if it's one way or the other. I don't know what's on the back of your shirts. You know, maybe you all went out and had a party and put, hey this stuff really works and probably [unclear] there. And it was his idea and he spray-painted everybody's, I don't know. You know what I mean? I can't assume that the backs of your shirts, don't have anything on them, you know what I mean. But how much do we assume all the time, especially, with other people? And how much intense bad karma you collect when you do that. And then that, disqualifies you from reaching a Buddha paradise, you see what I mean? It's not like a sin. And, there's no god up there, keeping track and blah, blah, blah. The karma of that prevents you from reaching a Buddha paradise in this life. So stop it. Be a logician. Be a strict Buddhist logician. You know, be sceptical of everything in a good way. You know, I don't know if this person's a bodhisattva or not. They seem like a pain in the arse to me at work. Maybe there's some reason why. I'll keep my mind open. I'll reserve three percent of my judgement about them. I'll give it a three percent chance that this guy is a bodhisattva sent to help me deal with my patience or anger, okay. And, and you have to allow that, you know. The purpose, one of the most important parts of, purposes of Buddhist logic is to straighten out your own behaviour and reach a Buddha paradise. That's cool. Okay. Now, we're talking about {nang rung}; {nang rung} means things you can see, okay. Proving the absence of things that involve something you can see. And this subject's not so long, okay. The other one is vital and very important. That's where the guy goes into, the Buddha tells the story of His past life and all that. When you get to {rang rung mamikpay tak}, there's just a long list of

permutations, okay. And I haven't bothered to give them all. There's sixteen permutations, two of them don't hold and blah, blah, blah, okay. I will, though, give you a few examples of a {nang rung mamikpay tak}, since you have to name them on your homework. Okay. First one, which I think is the one on your homework okay, consider {me me.. gyatso la chuchen}. That's the debate in the monastery, okay. Say {me me}[repeat] {..}[repeat] {gyatso la chuchen} [repeat], okay; {me} means, what? Fire. {me}, okay, {me} means, there is no fire, {me me}; {tsema} is {..}, night time, {me me ..}, {gyatso}, you know. Tenzin Gyatso is His Holiness, okay. The ocean, Dalai, in Mongolian, okay. {.. gyatso la chuchen}. Let's talk about a night time ocean. Why are they talking about a night time ocean? They're talking about on the surface of a huge body of pure water at night, okay. {...}, say {..}[repeat] {me te}, there's no big, billowing smoke there, okay, {me mepay chir}. Say {me}[repeat] {mepay chir}[repeat], because there's no fire there. Okay. You can confirm it. I mean, just stand on the shore, you look out, total black. Okay. There's no smoke out there. Why? You couldn't start a fire out there anyway, okay. I mean, okay, in theory, a plane could've just crashed there and there's still smoke but the plane went under, like, flight whatever. Not talking, normal case, normal ocean, normal night, you know. Pitch black night. You look out or you know, turn off the light, fill up the bath tub, [laughter] stare at the, you know [laughs] stare at the top of the water. There's no smoke there that's resulting from a major fire, okay. And you can confirm it just sitting there, that's all. That's what it means, okay. Now, the thing used as the reason, 'because there's no fire there', is, what's its relationship to the thing you're trying to prove is not there? It's, normally, its cause, okay. Fire, okay, I'll repeat it. Take your bath tub, take, take your night time dark, dark bathroom, bath tub surface {chuchen}, you know. There's no smoke there. There's no huge puffs of smoke there because there's no fire there, okay. So, the thing given as a reason, the main element in the reason is, fire. The result of it is smoke. You're proving the absence of smoke by proving the absence of its cause. Okay. That's all. That's all. Now, technically speaking, you can have the result in moment number two, millisecond number two, and there could have been a fire there in millisecond number one and the plane went under the water. And that's theoretically possible but we, we're not talking in those terms, okay. Okay, second one would be this. Consider a rocky mountain crag, consider a bare rocky mountain crag, okay. {shapa me te}, say {shapa}[repeat] {me te} [repeat], there's no Juniper trees there, okay, {shapa me te shing mepay chir}. Say {shing}[repeat] {mepay chir}, because there's no trees there, there's no vegetation there. Okay. What's the relationship between vegetation and Juniper trees? [student] it's like a {kyapje}, we call {kyapje}. I mean, one covers the other, okay. I mean, if there's no vegetation, there can't be any Juniper trees,

okay. That's all. One covers the other. And, like that. You can read the rest from the examples, okay. Those are ways of proving that something doesn't exist there. And, and generally speaking, Juniper trees and smoke, are not {keldun}. {keldun}, anybody? They're not abstruse objects, okay. They're not, like, looking twenty kalpas into the past or something like that, you know. Anybody could normally see smoke if it was there, you know. Anybody could see a Juniper tree if it was there, normally speaking, okay. It's not like pretas or the existence of the direct perception of emptiness in Jay Siller's mind. It's not like something that you and I can't confirm easily, okay. That's all. Okay. We're gonna take a break and on your way back in you gotta go through this door. And you're gonna get a chance to pick a number out of a hat. And you're gonna go into groups of three people. So, three people are gonna get number five, for example. And then, by random selection, of your karma, [laughter] you're gonna be with two other people. And then we're gonna have a debate up on the screen and you're just gonna practice doing it. And then I'll walk around and help you, okay. And that's very much the way we do it in the monastery. By the way, the last part of the reading tonight, discusses special kinds of debates in the monastery, you know. I sat down and just thought about all the different kinds I've ever been in. There must be, like, fifteen different kinds of special debates. Geshe debates, {rikchen} debates, {tsoglan}, all night debates {..}, winter debates, home debates, college debates. There's all these beautiful kinds of debates. Debate is used in, like, fifteen different contexts in the monastery. Debates, with your roommate, debates with your Scripture teacher. And I just wrote out, all the, all the general kinds. It's nothing that I have to teach you per se. But I thought that you should read it. It's nice. It's interesting. All the different ways, in which debate is used, in the monastery. So take a break. And on the way back come back through this door. Pick your number and then when I say, start, the, the ones will be over here, okay. So, like, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, up to say, ten, okay. And then, if your number is eleven or higher, the elevens'll start over there and then it'll work out to here, okay. And then just get in groups of three. I think in the open space there, alright. Come back in ten minutes and we'll start, alright.

Hello. Please. Okay. Two of your group have to sit down and face towards the centre, okay. And one of your group has to stand up and face them, okay. So try to spread out a little bit, okay.

[students] If you only have two people in your group that's fine, okay. One person stand up and one person sit down. [students]

Okay, everybody ready? [whistles] [students] Yeo. [students]

The debate master that I studied under had an electrical cord that he used. Anyway. He didn't plug it in but he hit you with it. Okay. [laughs] Check this

out.

Say {rikpay}[repeat] {droltang}[repeat], {rikpay}[repeat] {droltang}[repeat]; {rikpay droltang} means, {droltang} means, 'the way it goes', okay. {droltang} means the way it goes; {rikpay} means, 'a debate'. Okay, {rikpay droltang} means, the whole, how the thing works. You know, first you say this, then he says that, then you say this, then he says that. I've given you one here, okay. And you should practice it, alright. First of all, the guy who's standing up, turn to your opponent and say, ready? Is your foot ready? Is your hand ready? You're gonna start a fight, okay, you gotta pick a fight. [students]

Okay, ready? The person standing up say, {bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {yinpay chir}[repeat]. Yeah, nice. Okay, one more time, one more time.

{Bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {yinpay chir}[repeat]. Okay. Oh, nice. Okay, you're starting a fight. You're starting a fight because you're saying, shh, shh, shh, hey, [unclear] [laughter], {bumpa} means, a water pitcher, right; {takpa} means, unchanging thing; {yinpay chir} means, because. Okay. You're starting the fight by saying, because a water pitcher is an unchanging thing. Okay. What are you trying to prove? It doesn't matter. [laughter] [cut]

[end side A]

[side B]

[laughter] Okay. And when you start a debate you always start like that. You just start with the 'because', okay. You go, 'because water pitchers are unchanging things', okay. Say again, guy standing up, {bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {yinpay chir}[repeat], okay. Alright.

Now, you guys sitting down get to respond. Okay, guys sitting down, ready? Shhh, 'eh [whistles] [students]

Say, guys sitting down, {tak}[repeat] {ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. Which means what? Your reason is bad. Okay. The reason is bad. I don't care what you're trying to prove. Stupid reason, okay, {tak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat].

Okay, here we go. Do the first part again. The guy standing up, I'll call you number one, okay; {bumpa takpa yinpay chir}[repeat]. And they say, {tak ma drup}[repeat]. You gotta, by the way, you gotta stretch out the {tak}, okay, {taaaak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. Okay, one more time.

Number one: {bumpa takpa yinpay chir} [repeat]

{tak ma drup}[repeat], okay. This is, this is {rikapy droltang}; no matter what the guy says, if it ends in {chir} and you wanna pick a fight say, {tak ma drup}, okay. [laughter]

Now, back to number one. Number one is gonna say, you ready number ones? The guy standing up, okay; {bumpa takpa mayinpa tel}[repeat]. Yeah, good. One more time: {bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {mayinpa tel}[repeat].

[students] Okay, what's that mean? Are you telling me that water pitchers aren't unchanging things? Okay. Ready? Are you telling me water pitchers aren't unchanging things? And the guy sitting down says, right, that's what I said, okay, {du} [repeat], {du} [repeat]. Okay, now you gotta practice the whole thing again, okay.

{Bumpa}[repeat], the guy standing up, {bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat].

{Tak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. Okay.

Then, you come back with , oh {bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {mayinpa tel}[repeat].

And they say, {du}. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. [laughs]

Okay, now number one says, {mayin tel}[repeat], which means, which means, 'why the hell not?' [laughter] Okay, {mayin tel}[repeat], why not? Okay. Why not?

Number two says, number two, {bumpa}[repeat] {mitakpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}. Okay, the guy sitting down doesn't clap his hands, okay, his or her, okay. Say again, {bumpa}[repeat] {mitakpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat]. Why not? Because, water pitchers are changing things, stupid head, okay. {Bumpa}[repeat] {mitakpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat], okay.

Then, the guy standing up has gotta confirm, do you really believe that? Okay, ready guy standing up, there's gonna be a slap here, okay; {bumpa}[repeat] {mitakpa}[repeat] {yinpai tel}[repeat], okay.

Are you [students: du], yeah, nice, {du}, okay, {du}, which means, yeah that's what I said. Okay, you have to practice this at home over and over again. This exchange, okay, this exchange over and over again. Okay. Try it one more time.

Guy standing up: {bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat]. You're starting a fight. You're picking a fight. You're picking a fight: water pitchers are unchanging things.

Then, the other guy says, {tak ma drup}[repeat], {tak ma drup}[repeat]. Okay.

Then you say, oh, guy standing up, ready: {bumpa}[repeat] {takpa}[repeat] {mayinpa tel}[repeat]. Are you telling me [students], {du}, that's what I said.

Then, the guy standing up, {mayin tel}[repeat], why the hell not?

[students], {bumpa}[repeat] {mitakpa}[repeat] {yinpai chir}[repeat], because vases or water pitchers are changing things, okay.

Oh, guy standing up, {bumpa}[repeat] {mitakpa}[repeat] {yinpai tel}[repeat].

{Du}[repeat]. Okay. Alright

Practice it with your own group and I'll walk around and critique you, okay, just that exchange. Do it for about ten minutes, okay.

[students: practice]

Hello, hello, hello. We'll stop there, okay. Practice that at home with all your family and stuff. And see you on, when? Tuesday. Monday night, no class, next Thursday, no class. Monday night is {..} and next Thursday is {sojong}, okay. [student] Somebody asked me to just say it again, okay.

You start out by saying, {bumpa takpa yinpay chir}.

And they say, {tak ma drup}.

You say, {bumpa takpa} and then, very disgusted sound, {bumpa takpa mayinpa tel}. [laughter].

And they say, {du}, that's what I said.

I say, {mayin te}, why the hell not? Okay.

Then they say, {bumpa mitakpa yinpay chir}, okay.

They say, oh {bumpa mitakpa yinpa tel}.

They say, {du}.

Okay. This is {rikpay droltang}. I'll say it one time in English, okay.

Because a water pitcher is an unchanging thing.

What are you trying to prove? It don't matter. It's stupid already. Okay. You don't have to hear it, the assertion, the reason is bad already, okay. One more time:

Because a water pitcher is an unchanging thing. That's a way to pick a fight in the debate ground, okay.

And the other guy says, {tak ma drup}, wrong. Okay. You can just say, wrong. If you're gonna do it in English, wrong. Okay.

And then the other guy comes back sarcastically, the guy standing up, are you telling me that a water pitcher is not an unchanging thing, {mayinpa tel}.

The guy says, {du}, right. That's what I said. Okay.

Then, you just check in with him; {mayin te}, why the hell not? Why, why isn't it an unchanging thing?

And then you come back with, {bumpa mitakpa yinpay chir}, because it's a changing thing stupid, okay. 'Cos it's a changing thing, okay.

And then, you confirm, you reconfirm. Are you telling me a water pitcher is a changing thing, {bumpa mitakpa yinpa tel}?

And then, you say, {du}. That's what I said. Right. Okay.

And that's enough. Next time, we'll do the next series, okay. But this, the point of learning this, {rikpay droltang} means, this fits every debate you ever start, okay. You can just plug in different words. You can go home, debate with your friend, plug-in different things. Doesn't matter. The structure is always the same. {Rikpay droltang} means, the structure of a debate. It always starts like this, okay, I mean. So, practice that and you got down all the other ones. By the way, everyone who thought they would never learn Tibetan have just learned, like, ten words of Tibetan. Right. And this is the way to learn Tibetan. You can

sit there all day long with dictionaries and books and you won't learn any Tibetan. You debate for six months you can read anything. It's cool. So, go home and debate. Okay. See you next time. [applause] [laughs]

We have to do prayers. Ready? Okay.

[prayer: short mandala]

[prayer: dedication]

The Asian Classics Institute

Geshe Michael Roach

Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

Class Nine: The Concept of Elimination in Perception

March 24th, 1998

Transcribed by Angie Overy

Tonight we're gonna do a subject called {shen-sel}. Say {shen sel}[repeat], {shen sel}[repeat]; {shen-sel} is not studied in the monastery until you've gone to the winter debates for about three years. The first class in the winter debates is about fifty guys. After the, by the time you get to the second year it's about twenty guys. By the time you get to the third year it's about five guys. And there were only two of us who went to the fourth year. So you're up around {shen-sel} and it looks like that, okay. So, you're getting there, okay. [laughs]

The reading for {shen-sel} is very difficult. It's very long. It's about fifty pages long. Don't try to read the whole thing, okay. Go straight to the end of the fist part, as you know, and then, read, read the, roughly, through the formal logic section, and then I, I think it would be nice if you read the last part very carefully. The last part is a, is a essay about all the different debating classes that go on at Sera Me Monastery. And, fourteen different classes, like Junior, Sophomore, Freshman, that, that, it goes for twenty-two years. In twenty-two years you have to finish fourteen classes. And, the structure has never been written down before, so Rinpoche and I worked on it. And I like it. It's nice. And these, these courses are based on that, you know. That's the whole structure of the five or seven year course, whatever it was, okay. And, the whole structure comes from that. So I thought you might be interested to see how it comes from that. So that's the twenty-two year course in the monastery and it goes through six subjects. And that's what the whole structure of what you're doing is based on. So, I thought it might be fun if you saw all the, all the rationale behind it and all the things that they study and what they do in each year of the twenty-two years. So, that might be fun for you to read, okay. Don't try to read the whole first part, okay. You can do that during the long break that we have which is, I think, a month or something.

Say {shen-sel}[repeat], {shen-sel}[repeat]. This is another idea of the Buddhist logic schools. And, many of the details here are not accepted by the higher schools. So, the question is, did the Buddha teach them or not? [student: yes] {sangye .. yinpa tel}, are you telling me it's taught by the Buddha? [student: yes] Oh, yeah. [laughs] I didn't teach you 'oh, yeah', yet. [laughter] [laughs] oh, yeah, means, you're in trouble now. [laughs] {Sangye .. yinpa tel}, it's taught by the Buddha? [student: yes]

Okay. {Sangye chuchen}, which means what? Consider the Buddha. {tsema kyebu mayinpa tel}, so He's not a person of pramana, he's not a person of {tsema}? [student] You just say, yes or no, okay. [laughter] [laughs] {..mayinpa tel}, so He's not a, He's not an infallible person? He's not a person that can't lie, right? All you say is {du} or {chi chir}, please. If you disagree, say, {chi chir}. If you agree, say, {du}. No, that's the {tak ma drup} and that's the {chir}, right. You can only say {du} which means, right, I agree or {chi chir} which means, who said that? I didn't say that. Okay. {Tsema kyebu mayinpa tel}, so I guess He's not a person who can't lie. [student: chi chir] {chi chir}. Oh, {tsema kyebu yinpa tel}, so He is a, is a person who can't lie? [student: du] So, whatever He says is true? [student: du] Oh, yah, {... shen sel chuchen}, so let's take {shen-sel}. I guess He never taught it? {Sangye .. mayinpa tel}. I guess He never taught it? [students] This is where you get to use what? {kordhi korsum}. [laughter] Okay, you've gone around in a circle, right. The Buddha did teach it. Okay. Why? You'll see from the description of it that it's very important for the study of emptiness. And, incidentally, you'll see as we go through the kinds of {shen-sel}, how it addresses three common misperceptions about emptiness. So, it's important to go through {shen-sel}. Okay. That's why it's important to study {shen-sel};. It's not that {shen-sel} is, necessarily, accepted by the higher schools, all the details of it, but it's important for understanding the fine mistakes that you might make about emptiness which were made by Tibetan schools all through the history of Tibetan Buddhism. I mean, there were schools of traditions in Tibet who thought that {shen-sel} was emptiness, okay. And it's wrong. And we have to see why, you know. We have to see why, okay. It's close and no cigar, okay.

What happened to the pen? The first kind is called [student], oh, I'm sorry. {Shen} means, 'something else', {shen} means, something else, other. And, {sel} means, 'to eliminate it'. I translate this word as, 'exclusion'. You have the whole thing as exclusion. Literally, what it means is, the exclusion of what is other. Okay. And we talked about the concept already, {dra mayinpay le lokpa} means the, all which is not, all which is not, sound. I'll say it again. All, which is not all, which is not, sound. Which is another way of saying, sound, it's another way of getting at sound but through a different process. And in fact, according to this

school, that's how you perceive a thing. That's how you perceive an object. It, it's, like, some kind of Picasso thing where you're eliminating, or Rorschach, you know. You're eliminating what it's not in order to get at what it is. And that's, according to them, how you actually conceptualise things, okay. So {dun rang shen, shen-sel} [cut] means, different versions of that concept. The first one is called, {dun rang sen}; {dun} here I'm translating, it's, it's a big word and you don't have to worry much about it, 'objectification'. It, I don't like to use words like that but it, it fits in this case, okay. Normally, {dun} means, object, normally, {dun} means, the meaning or the actual object, okay. Here, I mean 'objectification' in the sense of you're creating an object by, in a sense by, rejecting all that it's not, you see what I mean. So, I'm calling that process, 'objectifying', creating an object by eliminating, mentally, everything that it's not and, thereby, establishing what it is. And, that's not the same as being what it is, okay. A, a pen looked at from the point of view of all that it is not and a pen looked at from the point of view of being a pen, are two separate ways of looking at the pen. Okay. [cut] And, they're important for the study of emptiness. That's all. Because, some schools have claimed, falsely, that the emptiness of the pen is the fact that it is void of all that it is not. And, if that's what it was to see emptiness directly, you and me would be outta here a long time ago, okay, 'cos that's no big shakes. Okay. It doesn't get you liberated to see that. It doesn't stop you mental afflictions from rising to see that, okay. That's very simple. Okay. So, and then {rang sen} means a specific instance of something. So, in a way, it's getting at, by the way, specific instances as opposed to {chik sen}. {chik sen} means, the concept of a thing. The concept of 'pen'. The general concept of pen. And then, {rang sen} is a specific example, a specific instance of the pen. And here, [unclear] that specific instance from the point of view of being everything which is not what it's not. Okay. That's all. And it's two different ways of looking at the pen. It's two different ways of looking at the pen. This one is negative, right? It's the opposite of the opposite. It's the opposite, it's the reverse of all that it is not. So, it's a way of looking at it, at a pen which requires you to make some kind of negations, double negation, in fact. It's two ways of looking at the pen. So, in a way, you can say, either the pen is an object, or the pen is an objectification. As an object it's a? Positive or negative? Positive. As an objectification it's a negative and that's the point, okay. You're cancelling out everything that it's not and arriving at the pen. And that's why I added 'cation' there, to make it into a process, okay. And that's what the concept here is. How many {dun rangsens} are there? According to this school, only functioning objects, only working things, can have {dun rangsens}. Okay. Space, for example, could never have {dun rangsen}. So, the implication is, a working objectification of something. Okay. An objectification

of something, that does something. Now, why get into so complicated, you know, what's the point? What's the point of doing that? As you'll see when you get to the higher schools, the lower part of the Madhyamika school, people, the lower half of the Madhyamika school, called the Svatantrika, the {rang gyurpa}, they have a problem with functioning things, you know. They, and everyone below them, all those schools have a problem that they can't understand how a functioning thing could be empty, you know. I understand that, you know, a concept might be empty, a theory might be empty, an idea might be empty, a fantasy or a memory might be empty, but a pen or a car that, you know, gets me from here to there. It does something. That must be inherent in the object. And, since you and I have that same problem, that we are much more likely to think, to think that something that does something is self-existent, the Buddha decided, I better teach {shen sel}. You know, people have a problem here. You know, people think that, okay, I can understand how a general idea is empty of self-existence but a pen? That does exist from its own side. You know, the fact that the pen is either writing or not writing, is not something that I'm making up with my mind, it, it has that. The classic example, when you get to {rang gyurpa}, that big thing that you see every morning, what? The rising of the sun itself. Okay. Like, I can understand how a pen might be, you know, some kind of projection of my mind, but the sun? I mean, there's three billion people seeing that thing, you know what I mean. I mean, that function is not like some projection from my mind, you know. If, if, if what you say is true, then three billion people must be having a collective projection of this function of this orb going through the space. And that's exactly what Madhyamika Prasangika says. Okay. Three billion people have collectively collected the karma to see this thing do the same thing. And, when that karma runs out, what? You're called blind, you're called put in prison for the day, you're called put in my office for the day with no windows, you know what I mean. I mean, the karma wears out, or dead, okay. It is a karma and it wears off. And there's lots of people in the world who can't see the sun. Okay. And, and it has the karma, when we have the karma for it to shift every twelve hours or so, you know what I mean, that it's gone. And, that's not an accident. And it's not an independent external event. It's, it's, it's a projection. And, but it feels so real, you know. I mean, I could see how a pen, you know, whether or not the pen writes today, is up to my past karma. I understand that. I can accept that. You know, I'll stop stealing people's pens at work, and, and then the pen in the class will work and I'll be able to read the overhead, which, if you laugh, you have wrong view. Okay. If you laugh you don't understand worldview, okay. That's, exactly, the only reason why the pen would ever work in this class for each individual person, you see what I mean. If you laugh, you don't get it. You see what I mean? The

pen only works in so far and so long as the karma that you collected for it to appear to work is still working. And it wears out and there'll be the last day you see the pen write in the Quaker House. And you may not want it to stop but it will stop, you see what I mean, 'cos it's a projection. It's not working from its own side. It's very hard to accept with the sun, so in order to address that fact, the Buddha taught {dun rangyi shen sel}, okay. You can add {shen sel} to the end of all these, okay, {dun rangyi shen sel}. So, each functioning object, each working object in the world has its own nature of being the opposite of all that it is not, okay. We call it, if somebody asked you for an example of it on your homework or something like that, you better get used to {mayinpa le lokpa}, okay. If you're gonna study Sautrantika, second school, Buddhist logic and perceptual theory, you better get used to {mayinpa le lokpa}. It should be like a mantra. Okay, say {mayinpa le}[repeat] {lokpa}[repeat], {mayinpa le}[repeat] {lokpa}[repeat]; {lokpa} always think of pancake, okay. {lokpa} means, 'to flop over'. {lokta}, means 'wrong view', it usually means 'arse - backwards', okay. And {mayinpa le lokpa} means, 'the opposite of all that it's not'; {mayinpa} means, 'what it is not' and then, {le} means, 'than', t-h-a-n; {lokpa} means, 'the reverse'. Okay, the reverse of all that it is not, okay. And it's like a mantra. When you debate this, every winter for twenty-three years, or if you make it that far, {mayinpa le lokpa, mayinpa le lokpa, mayinpa le lokpa}, okay. In this school, that's how you perceive something, okay. In English you say 'of' in Tibetan you have to say 'than'. The opposite, 'the reverse than'. But in English you say, 'the reverse of'. Second kind of {shen sel} is called a {loy shen sel}. By the way, we won't go through deep today and we'll do debating [unclear] your pen ran out of ink, see [laughs]. I'm sorry, your karma ran out of ink. [laughs] Say {loy}[repeat] {shen sel} [repeat], {loy}[repeat] {shen sel}[repeat]; {lo} means, 'mind', okay, general mind. {loy shen sel} means, I call it a 'mental exclusion', a mental type of exclusion. And this is just this fact that, in this school, when you conceptualise something you mentally make an image of the opposite of all that it is not, okay. So remember, this is the opposite of all that the pen is not and it's, and it's an object. And, in this school, the, the pen is ultimate reality because it does something. Okay. That's what makes something real in this school, okay. It's funny because, in the higher school, the fact that it doesn't do anything in the normal sense, is it's ultimate reality, [laughs] okay. But in this school, if it's working, if it's driving, if it's writing, if it's burping, it's real. Okay, that's what makes it real. With {loy shen sel}, it's just can you imagine it in your mind, you see, {loy shen sel} means, 'making an image, it's the imaging of an object. It's the mental opposite of all that it is not, okay. It's the appearance to your mind of an image of the opposite of all that the thing is not. And, you're getting very close to {dun chi}, okay. You're getting very close to what is really at the root of

dependent origination, okay. Because, in the highest school, you are mistaking a mental image for the actual object, okay, in the higher schools. So, here, you're very, very close to it. And I imagine that Lord Buddha was thinking, well, I'll teach them {loy shen sel}; when they get grown up enough we'll go to {dun chi}, you know what I mean. So, it's like, an intermediate step, okay. {loy shen sel} means the image that's produced in your mind, the image that's, it's defined as, 'the image which appears to conceptualisation'. Which is created by, negating all that a thing is not, okay, and that's how you image something in your mind. Okay. [laughs] Could say it's the mental image of the opposite of all that the thing is not. The mental, see here we're emphasising mental image, which appears to a certain state of mind known as, in this school, conceptualisation, as opposed to, direct perception, okay. But we don't have to get into that, okay. So, who shall I pick on? [student] Oh, you wanted to debate, okay. [laughs] Ah, {r... chuchen}, okay. What's a {...}? The horns of a rabbit. The horns on a rabbit's head, okay. Real horns, on a normal rabbit's head, as we have experienced them in our life up 'til now. {.. chuchen}, okay, {shen sel yinpay chir}. So, there is a {shen sel} for {...}? Okay. For a two-headed fifteen foot purple elephant that's stampeding through this Quaker House tonight at this moment. There is a {shen sel} for it. Is there a {shen sel} for it or not? {yinpay chir}. [student] {tak ma drup} [repeat] Not {tak}, {tak} [repeat] {tak ma drup} [repeat] Oh, okay, {...}, so I guess there isn't any {shen sel} for a two-headed purple fifteen foot elephant that's rampaging through this Quaker House tonight, {yerta}. If you agree, say {du}. If you don't agree say, {chi chir}. [student: la] [laughs] {mayinte} [laughs] Good example of {la}, okay. What was {la}? Ah, I didn't quite catch that, which means, he's buying time, okay. [laughs] { ...}, does it or does it not, have a {shen sel}? That elephant, that's stamping through the Quaker House tonight? [student] Right there. [laughter] {...} does it have a {shen sel} or not? {labda, dooooo che} [student] Say something, you [unclear] all you can [unclear] you're gonna get in trouble anyway. [laughter] Say {du} or {chi chir}; {du} if you agree, {chi chir} if you don't agree. Is there a {shen sel} for that poor elephant? {chi chir}, why the hell do you say that? [laughter] So, no, it means that's what he's saying, okay. And I say, oh, so there's not, doesn't have a {shen sel}? That's why elephant doesn't have a {shen sel}? The poor elephant, that's rampaging through the Quaker House, right now at this moment. [student] Yeah, yeah. Is there a {shen sel} or not? You're saying, not. I think you're saying, not 'cos it doesn't even exist, right? {merta} So, if it doesn't exist, you can't have a {shen sel}, right? That's what you're saying, right, {yinpa tel}. So, if you agree say, {du} if you don't say, {chi chir} [student] So, doesn't exist, it can't have a {shen sel}, right? If you agree, say {du} if you don't, say {chi chir}. [student: du] okay. So, you can't imagine that

elephant, right? [student: du] [laughter] So, you {lo merta}, so you don't have a mind? [laughter] {Sem chen mayinpa tel}, so you're not a sentient being? You are a sentient being? Are you a sentient being? {du, du}, so you have sense, {du}. You have sense, right? [student: du] You have a mind, right? So, you can have a {shen sel} about an elephant, right? You can make a mental picture of the elephant I talked about: fourteen feet high, it's pink, it's rampaging through this Quaker House tonight. [student: du] So, has a {shen sel} because it has a mental {shen sel}. [student: du] {ngo tsa ..} [laughs] [laughter] By the way, [unclear], classic {shen sel} is the first one. That's a, it's a trick question, okay. He was right up to the last moment. So you can't pick on him really, okay. He was right up to the very last moment and then I pulled out a new idea. The only real {shen sel}, in this school, is something that does something. It's the {shen sel} for something that does something. Those other {shen sels} are just imaginary, okay. And, if you read the text carefully, it will say anything that's {den me}, has a {shen sel}, has a {loy shen sel}, okay. Anything that's {den me} has a {loy shen sel}. What's {den me}? No true nature of its own. Okay. In this school they don't say shunyata. They don't use that word, okay, {den me}, selfless, truthlessness, okay, lack of true existence. Okay. Anything which is {den me} has a {shen sel}, okay. So now I say, ah-oh, [laughs] I don't remember that one. [laughs] [laughter] {... chuchen}, let's talk about that elephant, okay, non-existent thing; {den me yinpa tel}. So, are you saying it lacks true existence? Huh? [student: du] {yerta}, so, it must exist, I guess. {du} or {chi chir}? Oh, so it doesn't exist? Does exist or not? {...} If I say, are you telling me it doesn't exist? Say {du} or {chi chir}. Don't get flustered, just say something. [laughter] [laughs] {chi chir}, oh {...}. When you say {chi chir} you're saying, no. When you say {du} you're saying, yes, to a {tel}, right, to a {tel, yinpa tel}. Are you telling me that elephant exists? {... yinpay chir} . When she says {chi chir} I have to come back with a {chir}. She said, why? I said, because [laughter] {...}, lack of self-existence. It has emptiness, {shok}. [student] {chi chir} means, who said that, implying I don't agree, okay. So, I'll go back to the {chi chir} okay, {yinpa tel} so I guess you're telling me that the elephant exists, right? [laughter] [student] {chi chir}, good. Which means, I didn't say that. Who said that? {den me yinpay chir}, because the elephant has its own emptiness. No, no. To {chir} you have to answer what? If you agree to the reason but it doesn't prove what I'm trying to prove, you say {kyappa ma jung}. If you don't agree with the reason I gave, you say {tak ma drup}. {den me yinpay chir}, it must exist because it, it doesn't, 'cos it has its own emptiness, so it must exist. [laughs] [students] I love this. When you're having a good debate, you get two different answers. [laughs] [laughter] {tak ma drup} or {kyappa ma jung}; {kyappa ma jung} means, I agree it has its own emptiness but I don't agree that proves it exists. How's that? Or, you can

say {tak ma drup}, which means, I don't agree that it has its own emptiness. [student: tak ma drup]. {den me mayinpa tel}, so it doesn't have its own emptiness? [student: du] Oh, yeah, so {.. den me yinpa tel}so, so it, so it is self-existent? [laughter] Huh? [laughter] So it is self-existent? { den me yinpay chir yinpa tel}, [laughs] {den me yinpa tel}, so it has it's own self-existence, right? {chi chir, den me mayinpay chir}. It's not one, I shouldn't say 'thing', I can't say 'thing', see. I have to say, it's not something, which has its own emptiness. It's not something, which is typical of, emptiness. How's that? By the way, just 'cos we have to go home tonight, {yume ..}, say {yume}[repeat] {..}[repeat]{..}[repeat] {den me}[repeat]{..}[repeat]. Okay. {..}are you telling me it doesn't matter whether a thing really exists or not, it's {den me}. It is a kind of emptiness. It has its own emptiness, okay. Yeah, you could get into a huge debate. You could say, oh, then it has its own quality, right? I say, yeah. Oh, then it holds its own quality, right? Right. So it {..} its own quality, right? Right. So, it's a dharma, right? Right. So, it's an existent thing, right? No. [laughs] It's difficult. [student] In this school, {...} doesn't matter whether something exists or not, you see. The quality of not being self-existent stretches farther even than the quality of existence itself. Even fourteen foot purple elephants that were never in this room, will never be in this room and could not be in this room, cannot be self-existent. [student] No. It's not a quality 'cos there's nothing for the quality to be based on. But that's another story, okay. Anyway {loy shen sel}, the first kind of {shen sel} applied only to working things. I'm just trying to help you when you get to the reading. When you, when you hit that thing about self, no self-existence, remember it applies to all, to all. I can't even say 'things', right, to all whether existing or not, okay. {loy shen sel} applies similarly to, to all whether it exists or not. Anything which lacks a self-nature is, has a {loy shen sel}. Why? Because you can imagine it. You can picture it, the opposite of all that it is not, okay. You can picture it, right? It can't exist but you can picture it. And, if you couldn't picture it Mr [unclear], you couldn't have said to me, there is no elephant here. Right? You could not have said there's no elephant here if you hadn't had a {loy shen sel} of an elephant because you couldn't have denied its existence here because you couldn't imagine it, okay. How's that? So, if you deny that there's an elephant here you must have been having a {loy shen sel} about it, okay. Even though it didn't exist you, in your mind, you pictured this perfect fourteen-foot, purple elephant, two-headed elephant rampaging through the Quaker House probably stepping on all the refreshments we're supposed to have later. [laughter] Yeah. [student] Ah, tricky. He 's trying to set me up. I don't bite. [laughs] Another way to get out of the debate is just not to bite in the first place. He says, can an imaginary thing function in this school? The, the image of a thing can function, how's that? An imaginary thing cannot function,

how's that? You know, [student] yeah, thinking you're gonna get fired that day when you're not, can give you an ulcer. [laughter] Right? [student] No, really, right? And, but the firing doesn't give you an ulcer 'cos it doesn't exist 'cos the boss wasn't intending to fire you in the first place. But, but the image of it, yeah, the image can, can raise hell, right. Okay, last one. And by the way, it's the same with all self-existent things, right? Master Shantideva said, {...} you must be able to imagine what a self-existent thing would be like or you will never perceive emptiness directly, okay. A self-existent thing would be like the sun rising every morning from its own side. That, that only exists, as an image in your mind. There is no thing, which corresponds to that, to that image in your mind, okay. It doesn't exist. The sun is rising because you personally have the karma to enjoy its light on that morning. And that will wear, that is wearing out every time you perceive it and you will die some day and not be able to see the sun anymore. [student] Yeah. [student] I wouldn't say any [unclear], that's another debate, okay.

Say {megak}[repeat] {megak gyi shen sel}[repeat], {megak}[repeat] {megak gyi}[repeat] {shen sel}[repeat]. In this school the same thing. You've studied {megak} already. And in fact, when they get to the definition of {shen sel, shen sel} they say, I'll tell you what, I'll take a break today. I don't have to write a definition for {shen sel} because I already wrote the definition of {gakpa} and they're the same thing. Okay. Okay. It's a negation. It's an exclusion. Whether you call it exclusion or whether you call negation it's the same thing. Okay, {megak} is that negative in the sense of being an absence of something as opposed to negative in the sense of being not something. The first kind of {shen sel}, if you think about it, was a negative of the first kind, right, in the sense of not being something. Okay. It is not the opposite of all, it is not all that it is not. Okay. It is the opposite of all that it is not. So, when I say, {bumpa mayinpay le lokpa}, the reverse of everything which is not the vase, you go through two negations there. That's a {mayingak}. That's a negation in the sense of not being something, okay. But, when I say {megak}, what's a classic {megak}? There's two. One is ultimate reality. One is plain old reality. Huh? Emptiness itself is a {megak}, okay. It is the simple absence, in this room, of something which never could have been here anyway, which is, for example, a pen that was functioning from its own side and not because your karma's forcing you to see it function. The pen which could function from its own side; the person in this room that could piss you off, existing from their own side, doesn't exist. That's a, and the fact that that doesn't exist is emptiness and that's a {megak}. It's a simple absence of something. Any negative event which ever happens to you, whether it's a person or a traffic jam, and that was what master Shantideva chose to take off from in his chapter on Patience, if it existed from its own side, if it were not

your fault, it would be a self-existent thing. And the absence of that is what we call emptiness. Okay. Which implies you have to take responsibility for your own world. And you have to keep your book and get enlightened, okay. Okay, {megak}.

That's about all on {shen sel}, okay. In, in the monastery in the winter debates it's about a one month thing. You debate it for about, I don't know, two or three hundred hours, you know. It's a rich subject. It's the whole end of the first chapter of the Pramanavartikka. If you think the {Dura} is hard, the {Dura} is an oversimplification of the Pramanavartikka. Everything in your reading is an extreme simplification of the Pramanavartikka, you know. So, someday, we have to go do that. Yeah. [student] I didn't say that. He said, I don't see why an imaginary thing doesn't have a quality. The, the thing that the, the image refers to doesn't have a quality, yeah. A, a two-headed purple elephant that could be rampaging through this room doesn't have a quality because there's no basis to support the quality. Like, I have an arm, because I have a torso to support it. I have Michael Roach's color because there's a Michael Roach to support it. But, but there's nothing to support it so there's no qualities that it has otherwise it would be a thing that possessed its own qualities which is pretty much the definition of a dharma, of an existing thing. Okay. Okay, at this point in the, we're on to formal logic, okay. You've become masters of {shen sel}. [laughter]

Oh, I have to go back to {shen sel} for one thing. On your homework I asked you for examples of each one. For number two, which was what? The mental, the mental exclusion, okay. You can say, I have to add a [unclear] here, okay. Say {tokpay}[repeat] {nang yul}[repeat], {tokpay}[repeat] {nang yul}[repeat]; {tokpa} in this school means, the process of conceptualisation, working to perceive a thing through some kind of mental picture as opposed to seeing it directly. When you see blue you're not, you're not having {tokpa}, you know. When you imagine how much you dislike your boss, {tokpa's} almost like a sentence in a sense. Or you're using some kind of, you're working through a mental image, in this school, okay. And that would be {tokpa}, okay. Like, they say, when you perceive blue you just perceive blue. But, when you're thinking about the blue now, you're using a {tokpa}, which is a {jepak tsema} a {rang, rang tokgi, tok} what is that, {ngutok}. Anyway, so we're back to this, {tokpa} means some kind of conceptualisation; {nang yul} means, the image that you think you see, okay. {nang yul} means, the object that seems to be, that seems to be appearing in your mind; the image of the object, {nang yul}, okay. And, as we said, the {nang yul} for rabbit's horns or for a two-headed fifteen-foot purple elephant, does the {nang yul} exist or not? Yes. Does the thing exist or not? No. Okay. Great. {nang yul}. Yeah. [student] Ah, that's not the point. The point, in

this school, is if you have anything else than a direct perception, you're using a {nang yul}. You're working with a mental image. But, when you look at blue directly you're not using a mental image. You're not doing it by means of a mental image. But, when I go like this and I say, in you know, is there a blue pen behind my back, then you use logic, {jepak tsema}, indirect valid perception. And you are seeing blue in your mind and you're using a mental image. In this school that's {tokpa}. [student] Not at all. She said, if you don't see something directly does that exclude it having a {tsema} towards it? No, we went through that. There's all those {jepaks}. There's conventional perception, indirect perception based on convention. Did you, did you run into Uncle Sam today? Will you be ready for Uncle Sam by April fifteenth? [laughter] You know, and, and by convention you have a perception of this federal bureaucracy eating up your taxes, okay. That's an indirect perception by convention. Is there a blue pen behind my back? If you say yes you're having a, then what we call a logical perception of a pen behind my back, okay. And the Buddha says, that if you commit sexual misconduct the city you live in will have bad pollution. Do you believe it? Seriously. Okay. Yeah. I do. I have a kind of indirect perception of that fact because of Scriptural authority, because I trust the source. Okay. That's all. Those are three kinds of indirect perception all involving a {nang yul}, okay. [student] Ah, they, they work through an image. They perceive their object through use of images as opposed to, in this school, you know, direct perception, okay. Anyway, {tokpay nang yul}. An example of the third one: say {bumpa} [repeat] {mayinpay}[repeat] {tongwa}[repeat], {bumpa}[repeat] {mayinpay} [repeat]{tongwa}[repeat]. This is the {shen sel} of an object which is the simple absence of something, right. It's the {megak} one, the simple absence of something. And that's the general fact that no object, I'm sorry. Every object is devoid, and that's the real meaning of emptiness, right? Every object, is devoid of anything from that group of things, which it is not. It is devoid of anything that belongs to what it is not, okay. That's different from saying the opposite of everything that's not the pen. The opposite of everything that is not the pen is the pen. But here, and that's a {mayingak}, which is another reason why it's not emptiness. Okay. But that's another thing. But {megak} is the fact that this pen is simply, doesn't have anything which has to do with all that it is not. That's all. It, it is simply devoid of that. We're not saying anything about the pen or anything like that. We're not saying anything about its pen-ness. We're just saying, this pen lacks anything that doesn't belong to it. Okay. That's all. And in your mind it should just kind of draw a blank, you know, just draw a blank. By the way, that's emptiness too. And that's why the Buddha taught this one. He said, look what's real emptiness? Draw a blank, okay. Look around this room. Try to find a self-existent object. And, when you come up with a blank, you just

perceived emptiness. Okay. It's not the opposite of the opposite and it's not the positive thing. It's the fact that something's absent in this room. What? Two-headed purple elephants and self-existent things that never could be, never will be and aren't now, okay. But what are they like? I don't know. You figure it. Twelve inch rabbit's horns. A sun that comes up every day because it wants to come up and not because your karma's forcing you, or because some big dude in the sky has made his sun to come up. Okay. If you want a non-existent sun those would be a couple, okay. Alright. [cut] - they call me and say, you asked for examples on the homework and you didn't give any. That's why I put a message machine on now. It's a message - destroying machine. Okay. We did that.

Oh, we better add one more part, {perna}. [student] Of number one? It would be a working thing looked at from the point of view of its being the opposite of all that it is not, you see what I mean? A working thing, looked at from the point of view, of being the opposite of all which it is not. And, in that sense, it's a negative and a working thing at the same time. Okay. Which is a little tricky. Sometimes it's defined that way. Something which is a negative and a working thing at the same time.

Say {perna}[repeat] {dra chuchen}[laughs]; {dra chuchen}[repeat] {mitakte}[repeat] {jepay chir}[repeat] {perna}[repeat] {bumpa shin}[repeat]; {dra chuchen}[repeat] {mitakte}[repeat] {jepay chir}[repeat]{perna}[repeat]{bumpa shin}[repeat]. Okay, that's a classic {jorwa}. That's a classic logical statement. That is the classic logical statement. It's also a logic mantra for every twelve year old in the monastery, okay. {jorwa},it's a {jorwa}; {jorwa} means, 'put together', okay. It has million different meanings: yoga, 'yog', okay. {nyeljor} comes from that, yoga, yogi, yoke in English, comes from that, okay. And it means all these logical elements put together. You have reached a point, you are well, well through {Dura} now. You're about three quarters of the way through. You've gone through it like a rocket ship, okay. [laughs]

Someday you'll actually learn the whole thing. And, no, actually you're getting the main points but you have to go back and chew on those readings for years and debate them with your friends in Union Park between courses, okay. We've reached a point in the text where they say, okay, okay, okay, let's slow down a bit. Let's make sure everybody in this room understands all the elements in this logical statement. Okay. What's the subject? What's the reason? What's the thing we're trying to prove? Stuff like that. So we're gonna take the same thing. Your homework, it gives you fourteen different parts here that you have to identify. Okay. It asks you to identify fourteen different parts; fourteen different parts in this logical statement already. By the way, in English all you got so far is: take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's a thing which is made.

It is, for example, this is the {perna} part, okay, it is for example, like a water pitcher. Why do you say, 'for example like a water pitcher?' Why do you give an example? It's to put you on common ground with your opponent, right, the idea of common ground. You must have common ground, okay. He already accepts that a water pitcher is a made thing. He already accepts that if a water pitcher is a made thing it must be a changing thing. He already accepts, in fact, that a water pitcher is a changing thing. He accepts all that. He just didn't put it together for sound yet, okay. That's what makes it a good logical statement. You have total common ground with this guy. He accepts everything you accept. He just hasn't tied it together yet. That's all. And, and the example is the case where he's already tied it together. You say, come on, you can understand this with a water pitcher, right? He says, yeah, I understand that. Well, sound's the same thing. Okay. That's all. Because we were fighting people who said that sounds aren't like water pitchers. OM is unchanging. OM is eternal. OM never changes. Okay. Right? This is, the source of this statement came from ancient, ancient debates between Buddhists and non-Buddhists, okay. That's why this is a classic example. Okay, here we start on the fourteen elements. You know these, you know formal logic, and then we can go further, okay. What's the, what's the subject that we're debating about in, in this one? That, in English, {...}. What's the subject? What are we debating about? What's the thing we're debating about? Sound. That's all. Sound {yinpa tel}, are you telling me sound is the subject here? {du, du}, say {du}[repeat]. That's what I said. Are you hard of hearing or what? [laughs] {Du}, okay. {Dra chuchen yinpa tel}. Let's pick on somebody else. Marty, {dra chuchen yinpa tel}, you telling me sound is the subject in this case? [student: du], {du} say, {du}[repeat]. Okay, got me, right. Finished. The subject is sound. And in Tibetan, {chuchen}, okay, {...}, okay, but this is the short name. Okay. Second {shendun chuchen gyume} I'm [unclear] Oh, [laughs] [laughter] {drupja ..}, what are we trying to prove? What's the assertion, {drupja ..}? That sound is a changing thing. That's all. In Tibetan, {shok, shok} [unclear]. In Tibetan {shok}, sound is {dra mitakpa yinpa tel} [student: du]. {du, du}, that's what I said. Prove me wrong if you're so smart. Okay. I mean, that's how you have to be in the debate ground. Take a stand and stick with it. Let him prove you wrong. Half the time they can't even when you are, okay. [laughs] [laughter]. Okay. Okay, {dra, dra mitakpa} is the {drupjay chu}, I'm sorry, {drupja, drupja}, the thing to be proven. The assertion, the thing you're trying to prove. The idea or the concept you're trying to prove, that sound is a changing thing. A lot of debating is hutspa, right. You, you pretend, you play polka, right? You say, yeah, I'm right, okay. And you just pray, you know. By the way, in the text they do cover these elements but not all of them, so it probably is wise to write it down. I mean, I wish they had just said,

okay, here's fifteen or twenty elements and here's what they are. But they don't. They give you, they, they, they, what do you [unclear] they tempt you. They give you, like, ten or something. They don't give you all of them. Okay. Let me see what's the next one. Okay. [laughter] [laughs] Laura Seagal, quality to be proven {...}. What's the quality to be proven here? What's the quality we're trying to prove here? [student] Say again. Being a changing thing. See what I mean? We'll try to prove that that quality applies to sound. So, 'being a changing thing' is the quality we're trying to prove. It's part of the {drupja}. If you, if you divide the logical statement into four parts now, right: subject, quality you're trying to prove, reason and good example that your opponent already accepts, okay. It's number two, it's element number two here. It's the thing you're trying to prove about sounds: being something changing, being a changing thing. In Tibetan {mitakpa} is the {drupjay chu}. Being {mitakpa} here is just {mitakpa}, okay. They just say {mitakpa}. They don't say be, {mitakpa yinpa} or something like that, okay. It's understood in Tibetan. That's the quality you're trying to prove about the subject, sounds. Okay. You're a lousy boss because you pressure me too hard and you keep changing my priorities. Okay. You {chuchen}, lousy boss {yinte}, 'cos you keep changing my priorities, okay. That's all. {drupjay chu}? Being a lousy boss. Okay. Assertion, {drupja}? You is a lousy boss. Reason? You keep changing my priorities.

The quality to be proven in its explicit form, I don't think we talked too much about that, okay. What is the quality to be proven? Being impermanent, being a changing thing, okay. Being a changing thing is the quality to be proven. Don't forget, they can be an explicit form of that which is the one you actually say. And then, there could be the implicit form of that which is, maybe, its definition, or something similar or something like that. We distinguish between the explicit form of the quality to be proven and the implicit form of the quality to be proven. What would be the explicit form? What would be the obvious stated form of the quality to be proven in this case? Being a changing thing, okay. It's normally the same thing, okay. {...} {mitakpa} is {ngu} means, in this case, direct or explicit. Explicit. Yeah. Directly stated. How's that? {ngu jyi drupjay chu}. The, the quality to be proven as it is directly stated, how's that? I call it explicit. This is important for a lot of other proofs okay. We'll get into it later. What do you think is going to be the next element? This is the explicit one {mayingak, mayingak}. [laughs] Yeah, yeah, it's gonna be the implicit one. What would it be for {mitakpa}? What would it be for a changing thing? Huh? [students] No, no. If I say, what's an, what's an, what's an indirect way to say 'changing thing'? You could say 'working thing' or you could say 'something that only lasts a moment', which happens to be the definition of a changing thing. Okay. Why don't we say that, {kechikma}. {Kechikma} means, something that only lasts a

moment. You want the one above it? [student] Yeah, yeah you just, if you're lazy, just change the first word here. If you prove for somebody that something is changing do you prove for them that it's something that only lasts a moment? There's a huge debate about it. Okay. Do you have to have seen that something is something that only lasts a moment in order to see that it's changing? [student: yes] In practice, yes, you have to experience the qualities of a thing before you experience, you know, the definition has to be experienced before the thing that's defined is experienced, in a sense. If you don't experience 'hot and burning', we can't say that you have experienced fire, okay. So, supposedly, if you've understood something about fire, you should have understood it about that thing which is hot and burning. But there's a huge debate about it. Okay. That's another story. What is the idea that we're denying with this logical statement? What's the {gakja}? By the way, here's a usage of the word {gakja} not meaning a self-existent thing as it means in the Madhyamika School. Here, it's just what is it that we are denying? What is the idea that we are denying? [student] Wo, wo, what? [student] That what is unchanging? [student] That sound is unchanging. That's all. That's the idea we're denying. In Tibetan it would be {dra takpa}, okay. Very simple, {dra takpa} is the {gakja}. Remember {gakja} from the old Madhyamika days? That wasn't so long ago. December, I think, okay. In Madhyamika it means the object we deny, meaning a self-existent object, normally. And here, it's meaning, the idea we deny. In logic, it's the idea that we deny. It's the opposite of the {drupja}, of the thing, of the idea we're trying to prove, of the assertion. How many we got now? I don't know. Six? Oh, man, I wanna ask you. Refreshments.

What's the quality that we're denying about sounds? What's the quality that we're denying about sounds? What's the quality that we're trying to prove about sounds? [student: being a changing thing] Being a changing thing. So, what's the quality that we're denying about sounds? Being an unchanging thing. And that's called {gakjay chu}. In the monastery they never do it for you like this. You have to figure it out, okay. It's good to have it done for you once, okay. Confirming or denying an idea, is often done by, checking all of the similar cases. What is, what is the set of, the group of similar cases in this case? Not made things. All, all changing things. All changing things. You're checking to see if, if a made thing is necessarily in that big group that we call 'all changing things'. And that is the critical group here. In fact, in Tibetan it's called, the pivot. The whole argument pivots on this. Does that thing fit in that big fat group called 'all changing things'? So you kinda, in a sense, have to check them. Do you go through and check everyone? No, or you, or would have taken you eternity to see that I have a green pen behind my back. You see what I mean? You don't go through but you check on a, on sort of, like, a typical basis, okay.

There's a big debate about that. But the whole group of similar things, which is called {tunchok}, which you have, is all the changing things in the world. So you can say all those dharmas which are unchanging, I'm sorry, changing in the world, which is {mitakpay chu}. {Mitakpay} means, changing; {chu} means, all the things in the universe that are changing things, is the {tunchok}. It's the set or the group of similar cases. And your goal, as the opponent, is to figure out, you know, do, does a made thing fit in that group or not? Okay. Does a made thing fit into that group or not? Okay. We'll do one more and then we'll take a break 'cos it's exhausting. By the way, I had somebody say, what was it? [cut] Oh, they were just talking about how they didn't feel very special or something like that. I said, if you've survived this class so far you must be special, you know. And then they said, no, not so special you know. I'm just a regular old person. I said, no you're not. I mean, in the monastery they say that if you can make it through the first few years of this stuff, you have a good chance of seeing emptiness directly, you see. Because, the karma to be interested in this stuff, the karma to be interested in the idea of all that a thing is not, the karma to be thinking about mental images and do they represent the thing itself or do they not represent the thing itself, and am I mistaking my mental image for the thing itself, and where does the image come from? Your past deeds. Where does your reality come from, your perception of your reality? Your past deeds. And, and, and, and being well acquainted with all those fine points and getting into them and swimming in them, requires {kelwa}. Means what? Incredible virtue. Extraordinary virtue. This subject would put ninety-nine point nine, nine, nine, nine, nine percent of all Americans to sleep within ten minutes, okay. And, somehow, you care about it, you know. Somehow you're attracted to it. Very close to seeing emptiness directly. This is the key. To understand the concept of mental images and what's not there and what you're doing, what the mistake that you're making that has thrust you into this life of suffering is, is all there. The key is right here. So, I'd say if you're in this room you're special, you know what I mean. And, and, and I believe it and so don't go round showing me a mopey face, okay, [laughter] you know. You can be mopey-faced at work but if you're here you're special 'cos you're close to, you're flirting with emptiness. Direct flirtation with emptiness, okay. [laughter] [laughs] Alright, last one. [laughter]

Say {mitun chik}[repeat] {mitun chok}[repeat], the field of dissimilar cases, okay. Why is that important? Well I'll give you an example: take sounds, they're changing things, oh, I love it, {dra chuchen, dra chuchen mitakte yinpay chir}. Take sounds, they are changing things, because they exist. [student: kyappa ma jung] [unclear] {kyappa ma jung} back there. [laughter] [laughs] No, you can either say, {kyappa ma jung} which means, not necessarily. Just because it's an

existing thing doesn't mean it's changing. Or, you can say, {tak ma drup} which is, sound is not an existing thing. {Dra chuchen mitakte yinpay chir}, okay. Take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's an existing thing. And then you should say, [student: chi chir]. No, you can either say {tak ma drup}, which means, it's not an existing thing. When I say, {chir} you only have two choices: {tak ma drup} or {kyappa ma jung}. {Kyappa ma jung} means, I agree it's an existing thing but that doesn't make it a changing thing. {..}, which way are you gonna go? {Kyappa ma jung}. So, {.. mitakpay ..}, which means, just because something exists doesn't mean it's a changing thing automatically? [student: du] {du}, yeah [unclear] [laughs] {du} [laughter] Yeah, that's what I said, just because it exists doesn't mean it's a changing thing necessarily.. {Shok ..}, show me something. Show me something that exists and is not a changing thing [cut]

[end side A]

[side B]

{..} Huh? [student: namka] {namka chuchen}, say {namka chuchen}[repeat], {namka chuchen}[repeat], {yinpa tel}. He said, empty space. You say, it exists? [student: du] {du}. And it's not {mitakpa}? [student: du] {du}. And he beat me, okay. [laughs] [laughter] Okay. I go back and I check. I said, all, all existing things must be unchanging, sorry, changing. He says, not necessarily so, {kyappa ma jung} I said, are you telling me just 'cos something exists doesn't mean it has to be changing? {Du}. {...}, what are you gonna show me? {..} means, 'whadya', whadya, {sha} means, show me, okay. What are you gonna show me? He said, {namka chuchen}, take empty space. Then I go back and confirm. Oh, {yinpa tel}, are you telling me it exists? {Du}, that's what I said. {Mitakpa mayinpa tel}, are you telling me it's not a changing thing? {Du}, yeah, that's what I said, what are you gonna do about it. I gotta shut up. He beat me on all points, okay. Fini. Okay. By the way, the reason 'because it exists' is not a good answer, is that it fits in the {mitun chok} also. Get it? It also fits those things which are not changing so that's why the idea of the group of similar cases and the group of dissimilar cases is important because {yerpa} leaks into the dissimilar case group. {Yerpa} also applies to unchanging things. So it's a lousy answer, okay. That's why you have to understand {tunchok} and {mitun chok}. If it leaks over that border, between similar cases and dissimilar cases, and in this case, 'because it exists', leaks over the border into unchanging things; lousy reason. There's no {je-kyab}. What's {je-kyab}? We're gonna meet him after the break. Okay. So, you have a few more to go. And then we'll do a little bit of debating tonight. We're gonna debate that same debate. So, I'll have it up there in writing. This time you have it in English. This time you have it in your reading and all that stuff, okay. We'll see you in ten minutes, okay.

[unclear] happy. [laughter]

Take sound. Take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's made. What's the reason? {Tak ...}, what's the reason? [student: chepay chir] Yeah, {chepay chir}. Ooh, {chepa}, we say {chepa}. Short name is {chepa}. Say {chepa}[repeat] {chepa tak}[repeat], {chepa} is the reason, okay. {tak yinte}, by the way, it's a custom when you teach to keep going until the student makes a mistake. {Tak yinte}, why is it a {tak}? Why is it a reason? Why is it the reason? What makes it a reason? {Tak yinte}. {tak su kuppā yinpay chir}, say {tak su kuppā}[repeat] {yinpay chir}[repeat]; because you said it as a reason. That's a {tak kyī tsennyi}, that's the definition of a reason. Okay. Agreed? [student:du] Ah, good. Then {dra takpa yinpay chir, tak yangdak yinpa tel}. So, I guess 'because sound is an unchanging thing' is a good reason, right Miss Magdha? {tak yang dak yinpa tel}, I guess it's a good reason, right? {Yinpa, chi chir}, say {chi chir}[repeat], why do you say that? Oh, it's not a good reason, {tak yangdak mayinpa tel}. It's not a good reason. [student:du] {du}, right, that's what I said. It's not a good reason. {yinpa tel}, by the way, when I go up, it's not sarcastic anymore. It's what I believe, okay. Say {yinpa tel}[repeat]. It is too a good reason because {tak su kuppā yinpay chir}, because I gave it as a reason. [student] Ah, ah, hey, wake up back there. [laughter] {kyappa ma jung}[laughs] [laughter] {...} Are you telling me just because I put something forth as a reason it doesn't make it a good reason? [student: du] {Du}, that's what I said, stupid head. Okay. {chepay tak}, wake up back there, alright. [laughter] [laughs]. Okay, now we get into those three relationships. Three relationships must hold if the thing is a good reason. [cut]

Three relationships must hold if the thing is a good reason. One must be three. If something is three it must be two. And, if something is not two it can't be three. {Chok chu, je-kyab, dok- kyab}, okay. Those three relationships that must hold if the thing is gonna to be a good reason, okay. This is the {chok chu}, okay. It's the relationship between one and three. {Dra} what? {Jepa}, the fact that sound is a made thing, okay. {Jepay yangdak kyī}, who didn't I, Placide, I didn't pick on you. So, {...}I don't think a good opponent has to accept this, {...}. A good opponent doesn't have to accept this. He doesn't have to accept that sound is a made thing. Does he already accept that sound is a made thing? Don't forget the proof. Take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's a made thing. Did he already understand that it's a made thing? Yes, because it's, the definition of a good reason is, a, a reason where all three relationships hold. He must have already seen that sound is a made thing. So he accepts {chok chu}. He accepts {chok chu}. That's the first relationship. You can check, by the way, I don't know about you, but I already had a debate with somebody this morning, and they were being illogical. And I could see there wasn't any {chok chu}, you see what I mean. You'll get good at it after awhile. You'll say, Oh, my gosh, my

boss just did an attempted logical statement to me and he's missing the first relationship. [laughter] [laughs] You know. That's why he doesn't make sense, you know. [laughs] [laughter]

Here's {je-kyab}: if three, two. {Jena} means, if something is a made thing, {jena} means if something is a made thing, {mitakye kyab}, it must be a changing thing. And that is the expression of the second relationship. That's the expression of what we call, what did we call, the positive necessity. The positive necessity: if something is number three it must be number two. The second part of your checklist of three items that have to be present if the thing is a good reason. Okay. One must, one and three must be true and if something is three it must be two must be true, okay. That's called {je-kyab}. On your checklist of the three necessary relationships it's number two. Yeah. [student] I'm saying it's the same thing. Three must relate to one and if, if something is three it must be number two. And what's the last one? If something's not number two it can't be number three. If something's not a changing thing it can't be a made thing, okay. And that's the third one. Where did it go? I think we should have about thirteen with this one. What have you got? [students] Well, this one's now thirteen, right? {Mitakpa ma jepa kyab}. And this name I think I left it off the homework key, okay, the name of it, I think. Okay. The name of this one is {dok-kyab}. Yeah. [student] I'm sorry, you're right. This should, I'm sorry, he's right. This is a mistake, okay. Everybody scratch this off. {Tak}, okay, he's right, {takpa ma jepay kyab} which is the opposite of {mitakpa}, okay. Sorry. Please correct that on the homework keys as well or Phuntsok's hand will get tired.

I know you'll appreciate that this is all done at four in the morning or five in the morning. Okay. Say {tunpe}[repeat] {tunpe}[repeat]; {tunpe} means a good example to prove this thing. {bumpa}, just like a water pitcher, dumb-head. What's the difference between a sound and a water pitcher? Same principle, okay. That's {tunpe}. {Tunpe} means a good example.

Okay, last thing before we do a little bit of debating. Did everyone get their numbers by the way? You have them. [laughter] [laughs] [students] That'll be right. Why don't you start going round now and just, are they in a hat or something? Most people jump, pick out of a hat, okay. And we'll show you the last part later. Just walk around and give people one.

Last thing. If you read the reading there are actually, something like, six different ways to divide good reasons. For example, you could divide good reasons into positive ones and negative ones. You could divide them into those three kinds that we had: results, nature and negative, like that. But there's a very interesting one. The last one, I think, is the most important one. And I think to indicate that in the text they have this big ornament in front of it, meaning, hey guess what, this is the most important one. All correct reasons can be divided

into those that you give yourself and those that you give to others, okay. It's very interesting. And, and if you think about it this is the whole essence of Buddhism, right? We talked about it in the Friday night class. And, I mean, really Buddhism is a private thing. What you're trying to prove is emptiness to yourself. You're meditating on emptiness to yourself for example. In logic, in the opening reading, what was the most important thing to prove? You don't know about other people. You can't judge other people. For all you know they could have been enlightened a million years ago, forget ten days ago, you know. I'm talking a million years ago. You don't know that anybody in this room wasn't enlightened a million years ago. Come on, use a {tak yangdak}, you know, {mi..chuchen}. Consider all the people in this room, {sangye mayinte}, they are not enlightened Tantric deities. Now give me a {tak yangdak}, you know, give me a proof that they're not. [student] Huh? [student] {dukngel... yinpay chir}, because they're experiencing {dukngel, tak ma drup} [student] He said, because they're not Buddhas yet because they're still experiencing suffering. {tak ma drup}. Which is what? They're not experiencing suffering. Prove it, you see what I mean? There's no {...}. There's no {tak yangdak}. There's no correct reason. You can't prove it. You can prove it for? Yourself, perhaps, okay, if you are. I don't know. But I am, okay. So I can prove it for myself. Anyway, all good reasons must be divided into two kinds. Those which you present to your own mind and those which you present to others, okay. And I'll give you those and that's the last thing for tonight. This is democracy, she's choosing your [laughter], this is like having the, it's like when someone hands you a fortune cookie, you know, it's like you don't have any say. Yeah. [student] I'm sorry. I'm sorry. If I'm a Buddha can I give a {rangdun kab kyi tak yangdak}? [student] Could I [student] Yeah. [student] Oh, I think, I think you could say that if I could read your mind, 'cos what, what does the text say? {Nga'am dang drawe mayinpa ... gyur tare}, you can't judge other people unless you are like me, meaning, unless you are someone who can read other people's minds. Okay. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] Oh, I can never give that as a reason to you 'cos I don't know if you can do it or not, you know. [student] Well, unless you could read other people's minds. [student] Yeah, yeah, or to know, you don't have to be a Buddha to read other people's minds. {tong}, a person who's seen emptiness directly can read other people's minds for a short time afterwards automatically.

Say {rangdun}[repeat] {kab kyi}[repeat]{tak yangdak}[repeat]; {rangdun} means, 'for your own sake', {rangdun} means, 'for your own sake'; {kab} means, 'on that particular occasion', okay, on the occasion of your own sake. Meaning, in, in the, in the context, how about 'in context'. In the context of yourself, {rangdun kab}, means in the context of yourself. {Tak yangdak} means, 'a good reason', a

correct reason. Okay. And the opposite of that would be {shendun kab kyi tak yangdak}. We had {shen} tonight in {shen sel}. It meant 'other thing', other, okay, {shen} means, other. And those are the names of those two reasons. I'm not gonna give you the other five divisions. You can look them up. You can read them, okay. But we gotta start debating, okay, so let's go for it. Okay. Yes {kyappa ma jung}. [laughter] [student] Oh, I think you missed {tak}. {Tak} was number ten and it was {jepa}, yeah. And Magdha was the one who gave it to us, okay. Okay, please take your positions. Okay. We don't have a lot of time so try to do it okay [cut]

[end side B]

The Asian Classics Institute

Geshe Michael Roach

Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

Class Ten: The Concept of Time

Transcribed by Angie Overy

... And it's, you know, John announces it every night. But I guess when he does it, I don't listen to it either, but they're quite serious now. So, no drinks or food inside here or in the lobby, at all okay. When you leave tonight please be sure that place is spotless. Please don't abuse the maintenance guy. He, apparently he's very upset at us and you know, it's sort of depressing 'cos we're supposed to be Buddhists. And we're supposed to be all very compassionate and considerate of other people and then sometimes I'm embarrassed by the, by what we do, you know. On a normal human, we care for all sentient beings, but not for the people in the [laughs] Quaker House, I don't know. But we have to be better at it, okay. They really didn't want to renew past Thursday and we only after long talks. There is no other place. We looked at a synagogue, they asked us for two thousand dollars a night. And, you know, I can't find any other place in the Village. So if we get kicked out of here I don't know we could do a, what's that [unclear Square Park, but it's kinda busy at night. So [laughs] you know, so very serious, okay. This is a great deal as places go, as far as the cost of it, so, so we really will get kicked out. They were very clear. And they said probably not, no matter what we do we probably can't get another booking here after the next course. But at least let's not, they said if there's a bad night they'll just ask us to leave, you know. So please, no food or drink at all. I don't know how we're gonna take a break. I guess just have some air or something. Maybe you could go outside and drink or eat something. Okay. Sorry about that. If you can find a better place, you know, be happy to, please look, okay. I mean, this place was just found by somebody walking by one day. And if you find anything let John know or let Ora know, okay. Alright.

The reading tonight, I didn't finish the whole reading. What you're getting, I don't know, did they get it yet? No. In the break? Did you get a reading yet? No. Okay. It's a very nice thing called the {chutok gye}. Say {chutok}[repeat] {gye}[repeat] {chutok gye}[repeat]. It's the monastic debating schedule at Sera Me, okay. And this is a very ancient document and an ancient system. And I got a hold of a very ancient, a copy of a very ancient thing that describes how the

schedule goes for the whole Dharma schedule for the whole year. So it's kinda cool. You can see how it goes from semester to semester and what things they do at what times during the year and stuff like that. So I think you'll enjoy it. It's down to the day, you know. And typically there are eight debating sessions per year. On the first one there's a thing called {...tsok} and they all meet together and they do special prayers. Then they count heads. They count how many monks are there. And then, the next two days are called {shinglong} and that's begging for firewood. On the first day you go out to the suburbs the villages around Lhasa City and you ask for firewood. And the families have it ready for you 'cos they know the monks come on that day. And then the next day you go to Lhasa City and you collect firewood. And this is firewood enough for fifteen days. Then you debate for maybe a week or two weeks and then there are {dam.. chenmo} which means the great Geshe debates. And throughout the year Geshe are being examined. Normally, every year, two Hlarumpa Geshe, two or four {...} Geshe, which is number two; four Lingtse Geshe which is number three and then a bunch of {...} geshe which are the lowest level. And then there'll be {...} which are pre Geshe examinations. So, that whole schedule and the whole special year, all the events of the year at Sera Me, we got a hold of that. And Khen Rinpoche took a long time and clarified a lot of difficult points on it.

I'm thinking it'll be useful in the future in America when we decide on our schedules and we can design it after Sera Me's debating schedule. It's a very nice schedule. It's a rigorous schedule. And I thought it would just be useful for you to see it and it's kinda beautiful to see how they spend the whole year. It's about ten pages long the whole annual calendar. And then I gave you the original, it's a handwritten copy of the original chart. So you can take, like, three months and try to figure that out. It's in [unclear], it's in script, okay. And it looks kinda cool. It's totally incomprehensible, but if you want to, you know, some of the people who are studying that can try to see if they can understand that, okay.

Tonight we're gonna do, say {du sum}[repeat] {namshak}[repeat] {du sum}[repeat] {namshak}[repeat]; {du} means time, like, Kalachakra is {dunkhor}, okay, The Wheel of Time; {sum} means the three times: past, present and future, okay; {namshak} means all about that thing or the presentation of the three times. And that's the final lecture in this series of ten. I thought it was kind of cool. I had students asking me about what do Buddhists think about the nature of time and I thought it would be interesting for you guys to see how they present it in each of the schools. It's a big point of departure from the different schools. One of the points that differentiates Madhyamika Prasangika, the highest Madhyamika, from all other schools, is what they think about the nature of time. So I thought I'd give you a little bit of that also. Tonight, mainly, we'll

get it from the [cut] by the way, it's not just some kind of, I mean, it's interesting philosophically but it's not the only point. By the end of tonight we'll be talking about the emptiness of time and that's really where we're trying to get to, okay. It's not just an interesting discussion about the nature of time. It also applies a lot to the nature of emptiness, okay. Say {do depa}[repeat] {do depa}[repeat]; {do depa} I translate it as Sutrists School, okay. They are the higher of the two Hinayana schools in the great four schools of India, okay. So, Sutrists School. Why are they called Sutrists? Because they put a lot of emphasis on using sutra to prove things, okay. There are a couple of groups inside the {do depa} and tonight we're gonna talk about the [cut] say {rikpay}[repeat] {jedrang}[repeat] {rikpay jedrang}[repeat]. This is a part of the {do depa} that follows logic much more than the other part which more follows Scripture. And they're called {rikpay jedrang}; {rikpa} means logic and {jedrang} means follower, followers of logic. So the whole presentation that I'm gonna give you on the nature of time tonight comes from the logic followers inside the Sutrism school, okay. And they have special beliefs that the other Sutrism school doesn't have, that the other parts of the Sutrism school doesn't have. But this presentation is gonna be on the nature of time from, from their point of view, okay. The ideas of this school are, are kinda cool. If you think about it you will probably accept their school. If I didn't tell you, we don't accept this school, you probably wouldn't have any problem with it. And it raises a lot of questions. For me, when I read this stuff, in the Abhidharma there's a big debate about time in the third chapter. There's a big debate here and there's a big debate when you get to Madhyamika Prasangika. And every time I come out, like, dizzy 'cos I can't figure out what's going on afterwards, you know what I mean. I forget, I can't remember, I can't figure out what's right, you know what I mean. And I'm not afraid to admit it. Anyway, we'll just go with them. I think this is the kind of thing we have to go home and think about it. I can't stand up here and give you everything about this tonight. I'll give you what they say but you have to go home and figure it out, okay. And it's gonna take a few days of thinking about it, okay. It's just the nature of time. If you start thinking about time carefully you get confused. To me it's the nature of time. You know, thinking about time is, you know, you start to get lost right away, okay.

Say {depa}[repeat] {depa}[repeat]; {depa} means past time, time which is in the past. {datawa}[repeat], technically, this is {ta tarwa}, okay, {ta tarwa} and in colloquial it gets changed to {tanda}, {tanda}, okay, but I've put it halfway between, okay, {datawa}. {datawa} means the present tense, okay, present time. And {ma-ongpa} means {ma} means not and {ongpa} means to come, 'not come yet' means the future, okay, the future. The discussion of the three times, by the way, I've put in two sexy parts from the, from the discussion of it. One is pure

dialectic. Two guys go at it about the nature of time. And I think that's very interesting and just to see how they punch it out is very, it's very, very interesting to me. You're not going to get that reading tonight. Sorry. Okay. So you better take good notes tonight. But this part is not gonna be in your reading. I just didn't have time. The other thing took like twenty hours or something. You know, figuring out the schedule thing. So take good notes, alright? And I'll try to get it all to you before you take your quiz, your final or something. I'll try to finish one at least by Thursday, okay. They start out the discussion by asking, oh and then I give you the {rangruk}, okay. Then I give you our own position, okay, which is only a couple of pages long. They start out by saying, what shall we give as the definition of the past and the future. And, since you have to write this on your homework and your quiz and all that, you'll be glad to know there isn't any. Okay. Because it's [cut] say {mepe na}[repeat] {tsennyi me}[repeat], {mepe na}[repeat] {tsennyi me}[repeat]. Okay, {mepe na} means, look it doesn't even exist, {mepa} means they don't exist and so {mepe na}, {tsennyi me} means they don't have any definition. There is no definition. Okay. They don't exist. In this school, the past and the future, the past is gone, can't, can't see it anymore, doesn't do anything. It's just gone, doesn't exist. Future isn't here yet. Okay. So, how can you define it? There is no definition. Okay. I mean, in, in, what do you call it? In non-relative sense, in absolute sense, okay, now I'm qualifying it, right. In a non-relative sense or in an absolute sense the future doesn't exist yet and the past has already gone into non-existence so you can't have a definition. There is no definition 'cos those things don't exist. You can't have a definition {tsennyi} without a {tsunja}, right? Without a thing to be defined you can't have a definition, okay. And they just don't exist. You can't see, the future didn't happen yet. The past already happened. They're gone. Past is gone, future's not here yet. They don't exist. You don't need a definition for them, okay. Finished. That was easy. Okay.

But, okay, [laughs] relative to a particular object, which is existing now, okay. See, in absolute terms, this is their school, okay, so don't pick on me, alright. Probably I couldn't do anything better actually. In absolute terms the past and future don't exist. Now, if you say, in terms of a certain object, you know, can we, can we establish a past relative to this current object that exists here? And can we establish a future relative to this particular object? They say, yes. Okay, now here's the definition of the past, for example, relative to a particular object, okay. Two parts. Say {bumpay}[repeat] {dusu}[repeat] {kye sinpa}[repeat], {bumpay}[repeat] {dusu}[repeat] {kye sinpa}[repeat]; {bumpa} means a water pitcher, {bumpay dusu} means, 'in the time of the water pitcher', okay, like, if the water pitcher was here at eight o'clock. Okay. {bumpay dusu} means, in the time or relative to the time of the water pitcher, okay, that the water pitcher is

present. Okay, {bumpay dusu} means, relative to the time that the water pitcher is present, say, eight o'clock, okay. The first requirement for something to be past tense is that it should already have started or begun, okay. {kye sinpa}, {kye} means, began; {sinpa} means, already; {dusu} means, at the time of; {bumpa}, the water pitcher. So, at the time that the water pitcher is already there, we're trying to define the past relative to a water pitcher, alright. So, relative to a current water pitcher, present water pitcher of the present moment, the first requirement of the past, is that it should already have begun by the time that you have the water pitcher. How about, 'by the time' for {dusu}, okay. By the time you have the water pitcher it should have already begun, this past thing, okay. Second requirement. Say {bumpay}[repeat] {dusu}[repeat] {gak}[repeat] {sinpa}[repeat], {bumpay}[repeat] {dusu}[repeat] {gak}[repeat] {sinpa}[repeat]. Okay, {bumpay dusu} is the same, by the time of the water pitcher, okay, by the time of the water pitcher, {gak sinpa} means, it must have already stopped also, okay. It must have already stopped also. So, by the time of the water pitcher, now we have a point of reference, okay. By the time of the water pitcher which is present time eight o'clock water pitcher, it should have already begun and already stopped. And in logic, in the debate ground, you better be careful to say, by the time of the water pitcher blah, blah, blah and by the time of the water pitcher blah, blah, blah. If you leave one out you're in trouble. Okay. You have to say it this way. The definition of the past relative to a water pitcher is by the time the water pitcher exists it should have begun and by the time the water pitcher exists it should have stopped already. And that's the way you have to answer it in the debate ground. If you get lazy and you only put in one 'by the time of the water pitcher' you get blasted by your opponent, which you can already feel what it feels like, right, a little bit. Okay. Okay. Alright. They're just waiting for something like that. And they won't tell you right away. They'll play you along for about twenty minutes like a fish on a hook. And then they'll start reeling you in. Yes {kyappa ma jung}. [student] That's just what I said you better not say. Just technically speaking because that can be phrased, by the time of the water pitcher it should have begun and by the way, it should have ended, you see. Whether or not there's what you call in English grammar, distribution of the clause to both parts of the statement, it's not clear. You see, it can be ambiguous and in logic you have to straighten it out. You have to repeat it, okay. It's a custom. It saves you a lot of grief in the debate ground if you do that, okay. If I was gonna give you the definition of the, of the present now, okay, it's something like this. The first part is the same {bumpay dusu} which means at, by the time of the water pitcher. The dot, dot, dot is {bumpay dusu}. By the time of the water pitcher, say {drup sinpa}[repeat] {drup sinpa}[repeat], it should have already happened, okay. It should have already happened, {drup}

means it already happened, it came out already, okay. It already happened. We're talking about time itself, right, time itself. It should have already happened and {bumpa dang}, say {bumpa dang}[repeat] {du nyam}[repeat] {bumpa dang}[repeat] {du nyampa}[repeat], okay. {bumpa dang} in Tibetan you have to say, {bumpa} means water pitcher, {dang du nyam} means, going on at the same time, simultaneous, okay; {du} means time; {nyampa} means, equal; {dang} here means, with: equal time with the pitcher, okay. So, the definition of what? The present, okay. The definition of the present for a water pitcher, okay. The definition of the present relative to a water pitcher is it should have occurred by the time of the water pitcher, okay, and it should be simultaneous to the water pitcher. That time which has occurred by the time of the water pitcher and which is simultaneous to the water pitcher is called the present time relative to the water pitcher. Right? Okay. You alright? Okay. It'll get worse. Okay. [laughs] Say {kye shinpa}[repeat] {kye shinpa}[repeat]. Thos eof you who are learning Tibetan {shinpa} means to be in the act of something, like, present, what do you call it, present progressive tense or something like that. To be in the process of {kye} means, beginning; it is in the act of beginning, okay. It is in the process of beginning {kye shinpa/ ma kyepa}, say {ma kyepa}[repeat], but it hasn't begun yet, okay. And the dot, dot, dot is {bumpay dusu}. At, by the time of the water pitcher, eight o'clock, okay, by the time of the water pitcher it is in the act of becoming or occurring and it hasn't occurred yet. It hasn't started yet, okay. And that's the definition of the [student] boo { ..me tsennyi, ..}, you telling me there's a definition of future? [student] Huh? I said [laughs] {kye shinpa} [laughs] {kye ma sumpa}, yeah, {ma-ongpa tsennyi yinpay chir}, so that thing which has, which is in the process of occurring and which hasn't occurred yet is the definition of the future, {ma-ongpa tsennyi yinpay chir}. Yeah. [student] {..yinpay chir}, you said so, now you say {tak ma drup} [laughter] [laughs] make up your mind. Here's a {du} over here. [laughter] {yinpa tel, ma-ongpa tsennyi yinpa tel}, are you telling me that's the definition of the future? {ma-ongpa tsennyi yinpa tel/ ma-ongpa tsennyi yerta}, so you're telling me there is a definition of the future? [student: du] {du, peche ... cha pe .. yinpay chir}, scripture said, the book says, {mepe na ... tsennyi me pechir ..}, it said, {...} you have to get used to, okay. {...} means, look the book said, because it doesn't exist {mepe na tsennyi me pechir}, there's no definition for it, {...}. So you contradict Scripture, right? {... yinpa tel} [student: kyappa ma jung] { ... yinpay chir}[laughs] {... yinpay chir}, you have to accept it, you have to accept the Scripture. {.. yinpay chir}. [student: the Scripture's interpretable] This is a {yongdzin}[laughter] This is {..yongdzin yinpay chir}, this is the teacher of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. [laughter] [student: it's interpretable] {Yongdzin kepe yarta} so you don't accept the teacher of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama? [student: it's

interpretable teaching] Ah, ah {tragne yinpa tel} Huh? {tragne yinpa tel}, you telling me it's, it's figurative he says. It's figurative, {tragne yinpa tel}, {yinpa tel} are you telling me it's figurative? [student: du] {..mayinpa tel}, not literal? [student:du] Not literal. So, {... yin}, so who's position is it if it's not the {rikpay jedrang gyi do depa}, if it's not those logic group within the Sutrism school, then whose position is it? Right? It must be somebody else's, must be somebody else's, {yarta}. Is it somebody else's, {kyerang ma .. yinpa tel} must be Abhidharma school, I guess. [laughter] No {... ma-ongpa ngupo ..yinpay chir}, they accept that it's a thing, functioning thing. Forget it. Not only do they say it exists, they're a working thing, the past and the present. So it's not an Abhidharma school? Well I guess, well whose school is it? You said it's figurative so it must be somebody else's school. No, anyway, you can go like that. And each school has its own belief about it. [laughs] No, you can go, alright, yeah, you did pretty good. Indefensible position: just keep stalling, okay. [laughs] [laughter] Keep moving on, you know, another thing, and hopefully the debate master will ring the bell, you know. [laughter] [laughs] Okay. {Kye shinpa}, no, it was a good debate though, it was a good debate, pretty good, {kye shinpa ma kyepa}. Okay. So, that's the, what is that the definition of? Why did we get into that argument? Somebody said that's the definition of future. Would you like to amend yourselves? Yeah, relative to a pitcher, okay, relative to the time of a water pitcher. Okay. There is no definition for the future 'cos the future doesn't exist, okay. Alright. Now, some tricky ones. Where is that? [cut] I get in debate I always lose the thing. [cut]

They're debating outside already. Yeah. [student] Excuse me? [student] I'm not biting right now, we'll get there, okay. He asked me if a future water pitcher exists. We'll talk about it. Let me finish and then we'll debate it, okay.

Say {bumpay gyu}[repeat] {bumpay gyu}[repeat]. I'm gonna list fifteen different ideas, okay, fifteen different ideas. And you tell me, you tell me if they exist or not.

Okay. Well, no, let's not do it that way. We'll do {bumpay gyu}. That's one. What is, {bumpa} is what? Water pitcher. {Gyu}? Cause. Cause of the water pitcher. Okay. Now I'll give you another one. Say {bumpay}[repeat] {drebu} [repeat], {bumpay drebu}[repeat]; the result of a water pitcher, okay, {bumpay drebu}. [cut]

Say {ngupo}[repeat] {ngupo}[repeat], means what? Working thing. Now, this is where it gets tricky, okay, and I lose it sometimes. So, if you catch me just tell me. I'm not shy about it, okay. Cause of the water pitcher: present or future? I'm sorry, present, past or future? [student: past] Yeah, okay, I mean, I would say past, right. Relative to the time of the, [students] relative to the time of the water pitcher, because generally speaking, it could be present also, right? I

mean, if the, if the, he's right. In this school it has, good, has to be present. Okay. If I say the cause of a water pitcher it has to be present, okay. Because, in their school, by the time it's gone it doesn't exist anymore. Okay. In their school if the {bumpa's} already here, if the water pitcher has already occurred, then the cause of the water pitcher doesn't have any status anymore as an existing object. It's gone, come on, it's already done its thing. It's spent itself in producing that baby and it dies, okay. So it's gone. Okay. So, from one point of view, the cause is, has to be present tense if it exists, right. Then again, causes always come before the thing so they're past, right? Little tricky, starting to get greasy, okay. Same with {bumpay drebu}, okay. Relative to the time of the {bumpa}, yeah [student] She said, look, didn't you say many times that even the highest schools of Buddhism accept, that by the time the result has come out the cause is gone, but as a process you can say that the thing exists, you know. Which school are you in? [student] Oh [student] Yeah [student] Yeah, and she's saying this, what she's saying is this. I ask you does the past exist? In this school? No. Does the past of a specific object exist? In this school, yeah. That's what you're trying to say. Yeah, yeah. She's just pointing out the difference between that. So you can say that the cause of a, of a water pitcher exists in the present as a past thing, how's that? Alright? The cause of a water pitcher exists in the present as a past thing, okay, in this school. Yeah. [student] {Bumpay gyu ...} [laughs] [laughter] {bumpay gyu ..}, so in this school, in the present time, there's no cause for a water pitcher? {bumpay gyu ...} {Du}, okay. {Ma-ongpa ... chuchen}, take the cause of the next moment's water pitcher, okay, {..}, so I guess it doesn't exist, right? [student: I didn't say that] Hah, {bumpay gyu me yinpa tel}, so I guess that's not a cause for the water pitcher? [student] {bumpay gyu yarta} [laughs] Oh, it is not the cause for the water pitcher? {kechik ... chuchen}, we're talking about that [student] Ah {tsa..}[laughter] [laughs] {... mayinpa tel}, so are you telling me, like, this microphone is different from the microphone that was here when I started? Are they {tade yinpa tel}, you said different. Okay. Are they different things? So there's two microphone's, right? I thought I had a lot already. [laughs] Anyway, we can go all night on that. I'd love you to debate it, okay. Be, feel free. But not when the Quaker House is going to threaten us with throwing us out, okay, if we go over. {bumpay drebu}and then {ngupo} is a working thing. And you could say it exists in the present time, okay. If it's doing something, it better be existing now, okay. I'm gonna throw you some, this is a game I played on your homework, okay. I better check 'em off one by one. I'll give you the easy ones first. Now, don't forget, we have three choices. I'm giving you three choices. Now I'm gonna start making list. You tell me which one of those three choices fit the things I'm gonna write now. Okay. What are your three choices? Cause of the pitcher, result of the pitcher or

working thing, okay. I'll give you some easy ones to get you used to it, okay. We'll call them one, two, three, okay. Number one is cause of the pitcher. Number two is result of the pitcher. Number three is a working thing. Yeah. Say, {kechikma}[repeat] {kechikma}[repeat]; something that only lasts a moment. Okay, {kechikma}. Which of the three does it best fit into? Number three, okay. {kechikma} and {ngupo} are same thing, refer to the same thing. Obviously the other two are also {kechikma} but the one that best fits is {ngupo}, okay. A working thing is by definition a thing which only lasts a moment. It is changing by the microsecond. As it asserts its effect it is changing. It's wearing out. Okay, {kechikma}. That's easy one. Let's find a better one. How about, say {kye}[repeat] {shinpa}[repeat], {kye shinpa}[repeat]; {kye} means growing or starting or beginning and {shinpa} means in the act of, right, in the act of beginning. I'm putting my pen away so I can debate the first person who bites. Which one? Uh. What's uh? Uh means, alright, come and get it. [laughs] Make my day. [laughs] Number two {yinpa tel}, {ka ri}, which one? {bumpay drebu, kye shinpa} in the act of beginning, that which is in the act of beginning. By the way, I'll give you a fourth choice, nah [laughter], no that's not fun. In this school {kye shinpa ..} [student: gyu] Huh? {kye shinpa gyu yinpa tel, kye shinpa}, that which is in the process of beginning. {kye shinpa mayin}, okay, it didn't happen yet, okay. That's a clue Mr Siller, {kye shinpa chuchen ..} Ah? {gyu} is here, {gyu} happened 'cos the pillar, the pitcher's already here. {kye shinpa}? Ah? {kye shinpa ..}, {kye shinpa}, that which is in, I'll give you another, I'll repeat my clue. [laughter] [laughs]. {kye shinpa mayin}, it didn't happen yet, okay. It's a trick question. It's also a trick question on your homework, okay. [student] What, which, what does it most describe in your mind, 'that which is about to occur'? How's that? Huh? No, I mean, just in general, what does it, past, present or future? Future. And in this school? Doesn't exist. Okay. None of the above. It doesn't exist. In this school, doesn't exist, okay. In this school, there's no such thing as that which is about to occur, okay. In the {bumpay dusu shinpa}? Is there anything which is about to occur relative to the time of the water pitcher? Yeah. The water pitcher of the next moment. And that's fine. And you can call that the future. But, but until you give it a point of reference it doesn't exist, okay.

You gotta get used to that. Here's one more. Say {bumpa la}[repeat] {tu te}[repeat] {ma-ongpa}[repeat], {bumpa la}[repeat] {tu te}[repeat] {ma-ongpa}[repeat]; {bumpa} means water pitcher, {tu te} means relative to, okay, relative to. Relative to the water pitcher, {ma-ongpa}, didn't come yet. Which of the three? Or, we have a fourth now, right. Which of the three? No, does it describe the cause of the water pitcher, the result of the water pitcher, the water pitcher as a working thing, or is it something that in this school couldn't exist

anyway? {Bumpa la tu te ma-ongpa}, that thing which relative to the water pitcher has not yet occurred. [student] It's the result, okay. As long as we put the qualifier, you know, relative to an existing water pitcher, that thing which has not occurred yet is the result of the water pitcher. Got it? Okay. I'm doing all the easy ones first, okay. This is gonna be difficult 'cos we're out of transparencies. Okay, I'll keep writing on here.

Say {bumpay}[repeat] {dusu}[repeat] {depa}[repeat], {bumpay}[repeat] {dusu}[repeat] {depa}[repeat]; {bumpa} means water pitcher, {dusu} means by the time of the water pitcher, {depa} means past already. Does it describe the cause, the result, the water pitcher itself or nothing, none of the above? Cause, okay, the cause of the water pitcher. By the time of the water pitcher it is past, okay. By the time of the water pitcher the cause is past, okay. Yeah. [student] {dusu depa} just {dusu depa} or just {depa}? If you didn't put {bumpa la tu te}, [student] yeah [student] yeah, if you didn't put in a 'relative to the water pitcher' you, you'd be in trouble. Then, it would be a non-existent thing, okay, which isn't a thing anyway. Okay. Does that work? [student] Present tense, makes it present tense.

{Dusu depa}, here's the one I have a problem with. If you get this one then I think you'll be okay. Abhidharma has a lot of difficult ones. Say {bumpay}[repeat] ma-ongpa}[repeat], {bumpay}[repeat] {ma-ongpa}[repeat], future for a water pitcher, future for a water pitcher. [students] Anyway, the text clearly says, {bumpay gyu}, okay, {bumpay gyu}, the cause of the water pitcher is future for a water pitcher. [student] You tell me. I mean, that makes it easy, {bumpay dusu ma-ongpa} is very clear, right? That would be the, the, think thing which is future at the time of the water pitcher. This just says, in the Tibetan, 'future for a water pitcher' and, and it fits into the cause of a water pitcher, okay. [student] Not the future causes. Well, maybe the future causes but he didn't say that. I think you have to cook it a little bit, okay. This is the tough one for me. This is the tough one for me and, and in the Abhidharma, when you study it deeply you have to get into this, this feeling of relativity. Is the future coming towards you? Is the future something that hasn't come yet? Or, is the future something that you are moving through and in a sense it already exists and then it goes into the past? And then, the future becomes the past. And you have to struggle with those things. The text says this best describes the cause of the pitcher, future for the pitcher, okay. There's a thing in Madhyamika where, in a sense, the pitcher is the cause for the cause of the pitcher. It's easy to say that the cause of the pitcher is the cause for the pitcher. But is the pitcher, which occurs later, the cause for the cause for the pitcher? Can you say that? By the way, I'm not in Madhyamika-Prasangika now, okay. You can see it in Pabongka Rinpoche's commentary. Is there any sense in which the water pitcher can be a cause for the

cause of the water pitcher? In what sense? [student] She said it wouldn't be a cause if there wasn't a water pitcher. Yeah. You couldn't call it the cause of the water pitcher until the water pitcher has occurred. So from that point of view, the cause of a water pitcher is future relative to the water pitcher. You see what I mean? From that point of view there isn't any cause of a water pitcher until a water pitcher has occurred. So it has to wait until a water pitcher has occurred before it becomes the cause of a water pitcher. Now is that what they mean here? I don't think so. I'm just flirting with you, okay. You figure it out. Okay. I don't know. Huh? [student] That amounts to the same thing though, you see, thinking of the water pitcher as a water pitcher can't occur 'til the water pitcher occurs, you mean, something like that? [student] Yeah, this is talking about, well, is it or isn't it? It's talking about the cause of the, he says they're talking about the cause of the water pitcher. Let's do an easier one. I was at the San Diego zoo with my niece and nephews and I saw Miss [unclear] do her thing. Miss Frizzle? Yeah. The father's know her. And she just keeps going. I guess she's like a children's daytime show thing, okay. By the way, this other one, at what point, for whom is the pitcher future? How about we translate it 'pitcher future'? For whom is the pitcher future? For which of the three is the pitcher future? For the, for the cause of the pitcher. [student] Okay, so in that sense, maybe it fits. How's that? Okay. If you translate it as pitcher future, how's that, okay. [student] For which of the three is pitcher future? For the cause of the pitcher. And they say, cause of the pitcher best describes {ma-ongpa}, sorry, {bumpay ma-ongpa}, okay. How about that? Let's do it that way. Sounds good, okay, pitcher future. For whom is pitcher future? For the cause of the pitcher, okay. Now we have pitcher past, okay, {bumpay depa}, pitcher past. For whom is pitcher past? The result of the pitcher, okay. This best describes the result of the pitcher, okay. Lost yet? Alright. Let's do a little more. It'll get worse. That's why I didn't give you a reading, to make it really interesting. I've got one more here that's kinda cool. Yeah. [student] Yeah. [student] Yeah. Absolute. Everything I'm listing now is absolute. By itself, by itself, one of those phrases describe it. [student] Yeah, yeah. [student] Yeah, not relative to anything else. [student] Yeah, I have not given any other qualifier, okay. Okay, one more easy one.

Say {jik}[repeat] {shinpa}[repeat], {jik shinpa}[repeat]; {jik shinpa} means, {jik} means 'destruction' or being destroyed, okay. And {shinpa} means 'in the act of' or in the process of being destroyed. We already had {kye shinpa}, in the act of starting. And which of the three did it fit into? [students] None of the above. It was a non-existing thing. Okay. That thing which is in the act of beginning but has not begun yet doesn't exist, okay, in this school. You're describing the future, in a, in an absolute sense, not relative to anything else, and that doesn't

exist in this school, okay. But how about {jik shinpa, that thing which is in the act of being destroyed? Yeah. [student] {Ngupo}. Great. Thanks {kyappa ma jung}. It describes a current thing. It describes this pen. It's in the act of falling apart. It's in the act of being destroyed, okay. So don't get fooled. In the act of beginning, don't count for nothing in this school. It's {me pa}, doesn't exist. In the act of falling apart or being destroyed, that describes the present, okay. That describes present as all of us can attest to who are over forty, okay. [laughter] Take a break, ten minutes. When you get back we'll do the highest school's version of time, alright.

Quick overview of what, of what the {tengyur-wa }think about the past and the future, okay, the higher Madhyamika school, the Prasangika. What do they think about the past and the future? They say all three times are functioning thing, okay. They bsay all three times are working things. They don't like it when the Sutrists say a past pen, for example, doesn't exist. They don't like that. Okay. They say, more or less, it exists but exists as a past pen, okay. And that's the distinction. I'm gonna give you two reasons. This comes on your homework, alright. There are two arguments that you can find in Madhyamika-Prasangika for, for why are the past, present and future all working things. By the way, the lowest school, which is what? The Abhidharma schools, Vaibashaka. They also say that the past, present and future they are all working things but they say it for a much different reason. And they're wrong, okay. So they say the same thing but they don't say it for the right reason, okay. The highest school says all three times exist as, as working things, okay. I'll give you two reasons why. And they get into this fight because of karma, okay. Like, the big question is, how can a deed which I do today affect me a thousand years from now? Why? You know, either it stops or it doesn't stop. If it stops how can it do anything? How can it affect me? And then the different schools get into huge arguments. Some people say, this school wouldn't say that, but some, some, some Sautrantikas, some Sutrists would say, oh, well future karma and past karma do exist. Okay. The past and the future don't exist, past karma and future karma do exist. I mean, they get out of it that way. Some of them would say, oh when you commit a deed it plants a {bakchak}. Where? Well then the Mind Only school says in your {kunshi nyampa shepa}, okay, in your alayavishnaya. In your, in another part of your mind which is only function of it is to store seeds of karma. So the original impetus, the original deed is finished and it is gone and it doesn't exist anymore but there's been an imprint put on your mind and that imprint replicates where? In a separate consciousness. In a separate part of your mind until the day that it meets the conditions that make it ripen, okay. Yeah. [student] I'm sorry, what? [student] No, not separate. They wouldn't separate. They said it's the same continuum of the same, they

would say it's continuum of the same mind. Oh, it's a, no, I don't mean, I mean separate in the sense of separate from your eye, ear, nose, taste, mental. They say separate from the six consciousnesses. The [unclear] fact there are several other consciousnesses which the other schools don't accept, okay. One of them is foundation consciousness, which is the store, or storehouse consciousness where it stores those things. Yeah. [student] Yeah, it is the lower of the two Madhyamika, of the two Mahayana schools. Yeah, of the two greater way schools, Mahayana. So, down here is Mind Only, sometimes known as Yogachara and then, up here Madhyamika divided into two parts – Lower Madhyamika and Higher Madhyamika. So it is the lower of the two Mahayana schools, okay. Four great schools in India, two of them Mahayana, two of them Hinayana, okay. The next schools up say, well the karma stays in your, I'm sorry, Abhidharma school would say that the karma stays in your, in your five heaps as they travel on. In the stream of the five heaps, okay. And then, the lower Madhyamika school would say, no the karma stays, by the way, they wouldn't say the karma stays but the {bakchak}, the seed created by the deed stays in your mental consciousness and floats on from year to year in your mental consciousness, stays there, okay. Now, what does the highest school say? And this is how we get into the argument. This is how the whole argument begins, okay, of time itself. And they say, look, when you commit a karma, by the way, up to now, especially in the Diamond Cutter Sutra, I taught you the last one I just said. I didn't teach you the ultimate one, okay. Here's the ultimate one, alright. They don't stay in your mind stream. They stay in "Tessie". They are carried in "Tessie", alright. They are carried in "Winston", alright. In the person as a projection. The projected person they are carried throughout time. The reason a million years can go by between hitting someone on the head and getting hit ten thousand times on the head is not that that karma sits around for a million years. It's that a seed, a mental seed is created which is carried on by the person, that you think you see, because you're forced to see that by past karma. Now that gets very subtle and that's why I didn't bring it up yet. Okay. I'll say it again. It doesn't just stay in your mind and float on through the next million years. It stays with you as you are projected by your mind forced to do so by your past karma. And that's where karma really stays, okay. That's all Madhyamika answers. So the first part, if your homework said give two reasons why the highest Madhyamika school says the past and the future are working things, okay. Let me see which one I put first. In the case of a karma that's how it's done. It's a karma of the past can still affect you because a mental seed is planted in you as a projection of your own mind, okay. If you want to explain to somebody in a easy way, in, in a figurative way, you say, oh you see this seed gets planted in your mind and carried until it ripens. And that's what I always

tell you, right. I mean, ultimately, not even that. It is carried in your projection of yourself as you move through time as you continue to project yourself, forced to do so by your past karma. You continue to project the existence of those {bakchaks}. It's very cool, okay. Makes sense. [student] It's getting much, it's just getting more and more accurate. It's not so, yeah, and you're continuing to project a thing called "Jay Hahn", okay. So the {bakchaks} or the mental, the seeds of karma in Jay Hahn's being keep being projected too by Jay Hahn and they exist or they are carried on in the "Jay Hahn" that you keep thinking that you see. Now, is that a real Jay Hahn? Absolutely. Why? Because, you're just projecting it. Wait a minute, if I'm projecting it he's not real. Sorry, Nagarjuna said, Je Tsongkapa said, because you're projecting him he's real. And if you weren't projecting him he couldn't be here. Because if you weren't projecting him he couldn't change for example. But we know he changes 'cos first he gets up and says you can drink stuff in the back and then gets up and says you can't drink stuff in the back, you know what I mean. [laughter] So he must be a projection. Okay. Yeah. [student] She, she said, can you describe how they stay in the Mind Only School, how they stay in the foundation consciousness. The description of how they're planted there: by being, by being present. And the description of how they go on: by replicating. And, the description of how they ripen: by meeting the appropriate conditions. Is all the same, it's all accepted by the highest schools of Buddhism. We just don't accept that you have to make up a separate kind of consciousness for those little dudes to live in because they stay in "Leon" as projected by Leon, okay. That's all. Alright. I asked my teacher that question once. Now, the easier answer to the question of why does the higher school think something past or future could still be working, okay. Now I'll give you the easier one. They say put your mind on a pen at the moment of its destruction. Does the destruction of the pen have a cause according to you {do depas}, you {rikpay jedrangs}, okay, you Logic group in the Sutrist School. Come on, I ask you, {jikpe gyu ..}, okay, is there a cause for the destruction of the pen? Yeah, {du}, so pen {shipa gyu yarta}, so there must be a cause of the past pen? Now get that jump in your head and you've solved the question, okay. Get that jump in your head and you've solved the question. What is the jump? Does the destruction of the pen have a cause? Yes. So, does the pen which is past, have a cause? Yeah. So how can you say it's not a functioning thing? How can you say it's not a working thing? Anything that has a cause, anything which is caused, anything which is produced, anything which is grown, anything which lasts for only a moment, anything which has a working {dunchi yinpay chir}, it's all the same thing. I'll go through it one more time. It's hard for me [unclear]. Does the destruction of this pen have a cause? Yeah. The dog comes in and chews it up, okay. What's the next moment? There's a destroyed pen,

right, destroyed pen. Does that have a cause? A pen which is past? Yeah. Its destruction. Its destruction, okay. So, if it has a cause it must be a {ngupo}, right. He can't say {tak ma drup}, you can't say {chi chir}, you can't say no, okay. And that's all. That's how the Madhyamika-Prasangika beat them. Okay. They say, does the destruction have a cause? Does the destruction of it have a cause? Yes. So the destroyed pen has a cause, right? Yeah. So, it's a working thing, right? Right. So the past is a working thing, right? They don't want to admit it but they have to, okay. [student] Object past, how's that? Object past, where, yeah, but once you prove a past object you can prove the past. I mean, it doesn't matter, right. If a past object is a working thing then the past is a working thing. [student] [laughs] One more thing then we'll get to that. Later. By the way, they say that's true because you can't go around saying that there are causes for the birth of a thing and then say the thing has no causes. They give them a {rikpa .. sum}, okay {rikpa gosum} means, 'parallel reasoning'. And I'll give it to you one more time. Does a thing have its causes? Does the beginning of a thing, I'm sorry, does a beginning of a thing have its causes? Yes. So does that thing have its causes? Yes. So does the beginning of the destruction have it, does it, does the destroying have its causes? Yes. So therefore the destroyed thing has its causes. Right. They say, higher school says, same thing, same argument. Okay, I'll go through it one more time. Does the, does the birth of a thing have its cause? Yes. So therefore the thing has its cause. Right. Does the destruction of a thing have its cause? Yes. Does the destroyed thing have a cause? Yes. And they, well, Madhyamika-Prasangika says it's all the same, okay. Now those are the two reasons they give. One is referring to karma, how karma works and how it's stored in your, in you as projected by you. And the other is, is a little more easy, okay, and that's by parallel reasoning. Yeah. [student] Prasangika, mainly. Higher, higher school of Madhyamika, [student] Ah, what do the [unclear] say? They don't accept that the past and the future are changing things. I think they might accept that they're unchanging things. [student] Prasangika is the highest and the lower is called Svatantrika, Svatantrika, okay, not to be confused with Sautrantika. And when Tibetan lama's say it they say Sutrantika and Sutrantika, so be careful, you'll get confused, okay.

Okay, little bit of formal logic. Take hope, this is your last formal logic lesson. The light's not going on. Maybe we'll just cancel it. Too bad. [laughter] Your karma changed. We're gonna get into bad reasons, okay. Incorrect reasons. And if we run out of time tonight we'll debate on Thursday, okay, 'cos that'll be a short class. But I think since we had the discussion with the Quaker House as early as a few hours ago we better not push it tonight.

Say {tak tarnang}[repeat] {tak tarnang}[repeat]. What do you think might be a good definition for {tak tarnang}? Anybody. {Tarnang} means, 'bad',

'incorrect' [cut]

[end side A]

[side B]

Okay, {tak} means, reason, okay. {Kyappa ma jung}, what do you say? [student] He says, a reason where the three conditions don't hold. {tak tarnang ...}, you telling me that's the definition of a bad reason? [student: du] {tak tarnang ..}, so I guess a bad reason exists, right? [student: du] Ah, {tak tarnang ...} [laughter] [laughs] {tak ...} You. [laughter] You, hiding behind the pew [laughter] after so bravely saying {du}[laughter]. {tak tarnang yarta}, are you telling me there is such a thing as a {tak tarnang}? I can't reach you anyway. [laughter] {shok} No, name any existing thing and let's talk about it, any existing thing you want. Name any existing object. I don't care. Okay, flower {chuchen}. Take a rose, it's an existing thing, 'cos it's a kind of flower, {tak tarnang yinpay ..}. So, I guess that's a bad reason; flower's a bad reason? Huh? [student] [unclear] You just told me, you just said a flower is a bad reason. I just gave it as a good reason. {...}, anything that exists in the world is a good reason, come on, what's the matter with you {kyappa ma jung}? Don't pretend you're reading that book. [laughter] [laughs] {...chuchen}, anything that exists is a good reason I say. Any {tak ma drups}? Anybody want to bite? {... makyata}, you telling me if something exists it's not automatically a good reason? [student: du] {Shok} Give me any one thing that exists. Everything's a good reason, come on, {tak su kupa ..}, everything that exists is a good reason. Come on, come on, where've you guys been? Whose class were you in? Huh? [laughs] Everything. Huh? No, {...}, doesn't matter whether it exists or not it's a reason, right? I'm not talking about that. I'm not talking about that. I'm not saying {tak su kupa tak si tsennyi}, anything I put forward as a reason. I'm saying, anything that exists is a good reason, can be a good reason for some proof. [students] That's all I'm saying. Good. So {kyappa ma jung} you can't give me a reason, a definition of {tak tarnang} 'cos we just talked about for an hour and a half how poor old past and future didn't have any definition 'cos they don't exist. {tak tarnang} doesn't exist either unless you say {de drup} [laughter] By the way, if you want to get slaughtered in the debate ground in Sera Me, by the way, anyone who wants to go better tell me in the next few weeks, okay, in September, okay. {de drup kyi, de drup kyi} means, 'of the particular proof', you gotta say {de drup kyi}, okay. There's no such thing as a bad reason. Anything that exists can be a good reason in some proof, for some proof, okay. If you think of one let me know Thursday. Later. [laughter] Or I'll prove to you why we won't be here next week. {de drup kyi}, okay, for some, {de drup kyi} means for some kind of reason, in a particular reason it's a bad, it's a bad reason. Three kinds, okay. I'm not gonna put, I'm not gonna repeat for a, 'in a

particular', okay.

Say {gelway}[repeat] {ten-tsik}[repeat] {gelway}[repeat] {ten-tsik}[repeat]; {gelwa} means, 'contradictory,' as you know, because you studied {geln drel}, contradiction and relationship, alright. Most of our relationships turn into contradictions. [laughter] Anyway, {ten-tsik} means, {ten-tsik} means reason but they use a different word for reason, okay. And I think it's 'cos they don't want to give the thing the status of being a logical reason 'cos it's a bad reason. They don't seem to want to use the word 'reason' with, with, with something that's illogical. So they {ten-tsik} is another word that means a kind of a reason, how's that, alright, sort of a reason. Alright. {Gelwa} means contradictory and it's where the thing you're trying to prove is the absolute opposite of the thing you're giving as the reason, okay. So give me a, give me a, {dra chuchen ...} right, take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's made, {dra chuchen ..}. Keep the subject and the reason the same. Change the second element and give me a {gelway ten-tsik}. Anybody. Take sound, it's [student] yeah, or it's not a changing thing, because it's made, okay. And that's just contradictory because being made and not being a changing thing are totally contradictory, okay. That's where the thing you give as the reason {tak} and the {drupje chu}, the thing you're trying to prove, the quality you're trying to prove are just totally contradictory, okay. That's easy. The dot, dot, dot means, 'in a particular proof', right?

Say {ma ngepa ten-tsik}[repeat] {ma ngepa ten-tsik}[repeat]; {ma} means 'not', {ngepa} means, 'definite', okay. Let me see my example. [cut]

The answer key is messed up, okay, on this. We gotta fix that, alright. It's last question, part B, six B is messed up. Anyway, take sound, it's something you can hear, because it's a changing thing. Take sound, it's something you can hear, because it's a changing thing. Good reason? No. Why? Because it's not definite. Why? Just because something's a changing thing doesn't mean it make it definite that it has to be a thing you can hear, okay. I reversed it on the key, okay. In both of these two examples which of the three relationships have failed Mr {kyappa ma jung}? [student] Yeah, the two necessities have failed, okay. It's true that sound is a thing you can, is a, is a thing you can hear. And it's true that sound is a made thing. So the {chok chu} or the relationship between the subject and the treason holds tight. But those other two collapse and that's what makes them bad reasons. One collapses because of the direct contradiction between two and three and one collapses because just because something is three doesn't prove it's number two. Okay. Now, what do you guess the third kind of bad reason involves? A collapse of relationship number one, okay, alright. And we call it, say, {ma druppay}[repeat] {tak tarnang}[repeat], {de drup kyi ma druppay tak tarnang}, a bad reason for a particular proof, because the reason doesn't

work out. Meaning, the reason and the subject, something's screwy there. Something's wrong with the reason, okay. I'll give you a bunch of examples. Ready? How about I give you seven examples? All you have to do is catch one of them for your homework, okay. But these are the seven classic examples, okay.

Consider a guy [unclear], take the guy in front of me, Jay Siller, he's suffering violently because he's been stabbed with the horn of a hare. Okay. Good reason? No, because the third, the thing positive in the position number three is, doesn't exist at all, okay. So that's the first kind of bad reason of this third type, is where the thing you give as the reason just doesn't exist at all, okay. Got it? Take the horn of a hare, it's a changing thing, because it's made. Take the horn of a hare, it's a changing thing, because it's made. No, because element number one doesn't exist. Now, when you get into proving the non-existence of something this gets very tricky. Like, the non-existence of a self-existent thing doesn't exist either, but can you ever prove that? Because then you'd have a case where the subject didn't exist. Very touchy, okay. Big debate in the monastery. Okay, number three. Take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's a changing thing.

You hear this kind of logic daily, okay. [laughs] [laughter] It's a changing thing because it's a changing thing, okay. If the two terms are not different it's a lousy proof, okay. And many, many arguments that you hear throughout the day, especially at my office, were like that, okay.

Take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's sound. Again, the same problem; the first element and the third element cannot be the same, okay. It's not a proof, okay.

Take sound, it's sound, because it's changing. Okay. That's also not a proof, okay.

Take sound, it's a changing thing, because you can see it with your eyes. Okay. That's a, that's a case where the thing you give as the reason doesn't apply to the number one; number three doesn't apply to number one, okay. How many we got? We got six so far. I'll give you one more if you agree to go home on time. Twist my arm. Okay. This is a tricky one, okay, for those of you who ever get to read the original text. Take trees, they have minds, because their leaves curl up and go to sleep at night. Okay. Take trees, they have minds, because their leaves curl up and go to sleep at night. Okay. That's a pretty classic proof. And this is called a case where part of the reason doesn't apply to the subject. Which part? The reason is what? Because their leaves curl up and go to sleep at night. The 'go to sleep at night' part, okay, doesn't apply to trees. That's all, okay. It's where you give, like, a dual reason and part of the treason doesn't apply to the subject anymore, okay. Alright. You give, you give multiple elements in your

reason, and part of them, don't apply to the subject. Those are seven ways in which the reason itself can be screwy, okay, jut doesn't work out, okay. [student] You can give a zillion reasons. People do, don't they? That's okay. You can keep giving reasons. You can chain the reasons, you can daisy-chain the reasons. There's no problem there, okay. Yeah. [student] We're getting there, okay. If your opponent doubts one of your elements you can't use it. That's another way of, kind of a bad reason, like, sound is a changing thing because you can see hungry ghosts sitting here, okay. Sound is a changing thing, because you can see hungry ghosts sitting here. If they have doubt about one of the elements, about the very existence of one of the elements, it's a bad reason. And we do that a lot, okay. The final kind of bad reason and then we're done is called bad for that, bad for the school that's represented by your opponent, okay, bad for the school of your opponent. Okay. You can't give, and I think, see they give the example of a Jain arguing to a Buddhist, okay, which we used to do a lot in the old days. And the Jain says to the Buddhist, take a tree, it has life, because it dies when you peel the bark off. Okay. Take a tree, it has a mind, because it dies when you peel the bark off. Okay. And they, the expression 'dies when you peel the bark off' is not, in Tibetan and in Sanskrit, you don't say 'die', you say 'dries up', you see what I mean? So, they believe that a tree dies and, in fact, in English, we use that word too. In Tibetan we don't say 'die', just it 'dries up'. So, it would be inappropriate for a Jain to come in here and say, look, trees have minds because they die when you pull the bark off, okay. It's not a good reason because the school of the person you're making the argument to. I, I brought this up last because I don't want you to use that kind of reason in the United States, okay. You have to stick to common ground. The reason for studying logic, the reason you came in here, the reason you took this course, hopefully, is that as Buddhists we should be logical in our, in our defence of Buddhism. And you'll be called on in this generation more than any other generation to defend Buddhism, you know. And it's embarrassing when you see some Americans defending Buddhism, you know. They're just as illogical as the schools they're arguing against, you know. They happen to be right but they don't know why. Kedrup Je said, all of you, this is, like, five centuries ago, you Tibetans all believe in past lives and you all believe in future lives and you can't give me one good reason why they exist. You just believe it 'cos your mommy and your daddy told you so, you know, and that's the only reason. All of you Tibetans who believe in future lives, you're acting like you believe in it, you're trying to respect karma and all that, the laws of karma, but you can't give me one good reason why future lives exist. You can't prove it. You have to be able to prove things. And as a Buddhist, I mean, theoretically, you can save people's lives with Buddhism. If you didn't get it yet the purpose of these whole

courses, the fifteen courses, is to save your life. You shouldn't, if you do these courses well and if you keep your practice well, if you meditate well, if you do retreats and especially if you track your vows from hour to hour. If you tracked your behaviour, track, write down every couple of hours what you're doing, and if you're keeping your vows, you will reach another realm in this lifetime, okay. You will change and you will go into another realm and you don't have to die there. And your body changes and everything around you changes. You might look the same to the people around you but you're not, you're not the same. And for you you've already reached a different realm where you don't have to suffer anymore. Your body actually starts to get younger and then it changes completely and you don't have to die like that. You don't have to go through that. If that's true, and by the way, that's the only goal of these classes, it's the only reason why Buddhism is, exists, is to reach that, okay. In one lifetime if you practice Tantra, okay, in one lifetime. It's the only reason to come to these classes. It's the only thing you really want. You can do it. Now reverse that thinking. If you fail in, in, in your presentation to people, if your presentation is lazy or illogical and if they, and if because of that they reject Buddhism as a Path, as a method, then I would say you've murdered them in this, you know what I mean. You, you've destroyed their chances not to die which is almost the same as murdering them. I mean, I had a person, I was getting a sponsor, I said, you gotta help me. You have to help me. I don't have enough money. I need money to spread this stuff, you know, I really need it. If you don't, you're almost murdering people, they, like that. Anyway, I still believe that. I mean, maybe it's kind of tacky to do that to your sponsor but [laughter] to tell you the truth I, I really do believe it. I sincerely believe it, you know. If you don't, if you found a way or a path, which by, meditating short time every day, very nicely; by keeping sweet, holy, sacred vows, by checking them regularly; by doing your Tantric retreats properly; by doing all the practices nicely, if you could reach another realm and not die. And, if you could give that gift to someone but, because you're too lazy to think it out clearly or you don't find common ground with that person, if you lay on them ideas that they're not ready to accept, and if as a Buddhist you haven't been trained as a logician, you know. By the way, in the monastery, they say {tsen ..}, they don't call you a student, they call you a {tsen..}. When you get into the monastery you're a logician. The word for the study of the five great books is {tsenni}, logic, you know, reasoning. And it's because you, you can't help people if you can't present these things logically to people who don't accept anything of what you're getting at, you know. So, really, their lives are in your hands and you have to be sensitive to what's good logic and what's lousy logic. And that's been the purpose of this course, you know. Hopefully, you go use it now and be very sensitive that, I think the

biggest failure of westerners is that last one we had. Ten courses, you know, many debates, many suffering, you trying to get through those readings, we came down to the last three minutes, okay. And the point is: be sensitive to lousy logic. Be sensitive to that the people that you're talking to belong to a different school called western civilisation and their worldview is wrong. It doesn't work. It doesn't work for them and they suffer through a life and they die unnecessarily. It's a, it's a tragedy. It doesn't have to happen. It could have been prevented, you know. It's like Three Mile Island or something if the guy hadn't pushed the switch or something. You can, if you're careful, and if you're well educated, well trained and if you think clearly and you present Buddhism to other people logically, then, you can save their lives. And that's been the purpose of this course, okay.

The next course will be Lojong which is how to have a good heart during the day, you know, all day long. And I think it's a good change of pace from all this logic stuff, okay [laughs] and I think it's gonna be a really sweet class. We already chose the texts. There's some beautiful Lojong. It's, like, how to develop a good heart texts. And I think they're very, very sweet. They're very much like parables of the west, you know. They're very beautiful. They're something that you can use from day to day. And we'll be doing that. I think it starts around May fifteenth.

Last thing I think, well two things. We're also gonna have a transcription project going on through the break. Which means we would like to get some of this stuff typed up and on the web so that people could access it throughout the country. There are about, I think twelve thousand tapes have been ordered already and sent out by volunteers here. And we'd like to get everything typed so that people could access it on the web. And there'll be a search engine. So, like, if you don't remember how to do your water bowls, you type 'water bowl' and it jumps to the day that, that it was explained. Or if you don't understand some, if you don't remember why the Madhyamika-Prasangika thinks time works like that, you can just type in 'time' and it'll jump to the day that time was discussed and stuff like that. But we need, somebody has to type them in. So, if you have any extra time during that break, time whether it's present, past or future, talk to Ora, okay. Alright. And she'll be, just type, if you don't have equipment we can loan you equipment. It's just typing tapes out. And I think there have been about forty people working on it and it's going really good. It's also very good for prisoners. We have a lot of prisoners in the course and they can't get tapes. They're not allowed to have tapes. Many of the prisons don't allow tapes so they can't continue, some of them, to study. All they get is the readings, okay. And that would be cruel to send a guy in prison [laughs] [laughter] the readings you had, okay. [laughs] So, right? So we need you,

okay. So if you can help please talk to Ora afterwards. And then we'll have a review. I think you should come on Thursday if you can. I'll do all the thank-yous on Thursday, I think, okay. So, [student] oh, we're gonna hand out all the answer keys for all the home works, okay. We changed the policy on the answer keys. I want everybody to have them so you know the answer clearly and correctly, okay. So we'll be doing that, alright, as clear as I can make it.

Okay, we'll do a short prayer.

[prayer: short mandala]

[prayer: dedication]

Geshe Michael Roach
Course X111: The Art of Reasoning
Class Eleven: Class Review

Transcribed by Angie Overy
Proof: SF

All right, tonight is review for the final examination and then, we'll also do a bit of debating later on. There's some nice, little tiny debate that we'll do, okay, very powerful one, all right. So, as usual, all the questions on the final come from the quizzes and I am gonna go over some of the questions that might appear on the final. And, at the end of this class, you're gonna get the answer keys for all of the homeworks. Is that right? Yeah. Because we want you to be able to see the, you know, the expanded answers. Sometimes I don't have time to go through with the whole detailed answer during the class, so you'll be able to study the keys even for the last two classes, okay, but you probably won't get your homework back on time for that. So this way you have the official ones. I think they fit on both hands if you make them about six point, okay. But, you probably don't even have to bother, you can just write it out and bring it into class with you, okay.

We'll start with good old Jay Siller. {Tibetan} Nobody could ever show me the {shung} for this class. The {shung } means the classical text on which this class is based.

{ ... }

[student: tak ma drup]

{...}You telling me there is a {shung} for this class?

[student: dir]

{shok, shok, shok} give me, tell me

[student: tsa]

Don't tsar me, just show me [laughter] [laughs]. It's too early to tsa me. You didn't beat me yet. {shok, shok, shok, shok, shok}

[student: Pramanavartikka]

Yeah, Pramanavartikka, {po la ...} in Tibetan? Tibetan? [laughs] {sha kyī me pechir}Yeah, there is no.

No, we'll go around with it. Pramana is what? Valid perception in Tibetan?

[student: tsema namdrel]

Tsema Namdrel, okay, Tsema Namdrel. You gotta know the name of the book you're studying, okay. It's embarrassing if you don't know the book you're

studying, right.

{ ...me pey chir} Nobody could ever show me the author of that text.

She's smart. She's not {tak ma drup}ing until she thinks of the answer, okay.

{tak ma drup ... yerta}So you can show me the author?

{der} {shok} Who? Huh? Dharmakirti {yin pay ta} [laughter] Huh? {der}

{.....yin pay ta} You telling me Dharmakirti is the author of this text?

[student: der]

{ mayin pay ta} No such thing as Dharmakirti

[student]

Master Dharmakirti [student]

Oh, Master Dharmakirti [laughter]. You don't call Rinpoche, Lobsang, okay.

[laughter] You don't call Dharmakirti, Dharmakirti; Master Dharmakirti

[laughter], all right, please. All right, all right. You don't call your Lama, 'hey

you', okay, 'Roach'. [laughs] [laughter]Well, maybe you do. Yeah.

{.....} Can't tell me the year in which he was born, approximate. {.....}

[student: tak ma drup]

Not {tak ma drup,- Tak ma drup,} You can't give me the year that he was born, roughly, roughly.

650 AD, okay.

Let's see what the next question might be. Mmmm. Who's the next victim? He looks too innocent. How about Pelma? Ready? Don't pretend you're reading

that book. [laughs] [laughter]. One reason to study Buddhist logic? {cha kyi me

pey chir}, any reason. Why do they say it's important to study Buddhist logic?

[student: unclear] She said, once you understand it, you can help many people.

How about a negative reason? By the way, you can help many people because then you learn mainly, the idea of common ground. That you don't, that the

definition of good reason is? {tak yang dak kyi tsennyi yin pey chir}, no one can

show mw the definition of a good reason? {tak yang dak kyi tsennyi me pey

chir} Anybody got cue tips? [laughter] [laughs]

S[[unclear]]

{tak yang dak yinpata} Is the definition of a good reason? Anything you give as

a reason? Oh, take sound, it's a changing thing, because it's a three-headed

purple elephant. {tak yang dak yinpa ta}, three-headed purple elephant, {tak

yang dak yinpata}, three-headed purple elephant is a good reason, right?

{tak si kupa mayin pata}I didn't give it as a good reason, I didn't give it as a

reason? You telling me I didn't give it as a reason? [student: unclear] { ngoooo

tsa}[laughs] [laughter]. Hey, you thought you're getting out of it [laughs] {tak

yang dak kyi, shok, shok, shok} {uhn} {tak yang dak kyi tsennyi shok}

[student: unclear] {tso tso yinpa}, {tak yang tak kyi yinpata}[student: unclear]

{uhn}[student: unclear] Are you telling me that's the definition, where the three

relationships hold, is the definition of a good reason? {mayin pata yerpa tak yang tak kyi tsennyi yin pey chir...} By the way, you can review everything this way. This is the way to really do it in the monastery. And you just truck through it in like twenty minutes and you know it much better. {yinpa ta ... yin pey chir} The definition of a good reason is, anything that exists. [student: tak ma drup] Yeah, { yinpa ta ... mayin pata}, you're in trouble, but keep going. [laughter] So, you're telling me anything that exists is not the definition of a good reason? I don't, {der}, okay, {shok}, now you're in trouble. Now you're stuck. {shok, shok, shok}, give me something that doesn't fit {sung ja mayinpa de shok}, show me something that contradicts my definition, right. If it's a bad definition there must be something that doesn't fit my definition, okay. I said {yerpa} by the way. I said, those things which exist. I'm not talking two two-headed purple elephants, okay. I said, anything which exists, is the definition of a good reason.

[student: inaudible]

I, sh [laughter] [laughs] {shok, shok, shok}. He's gonna give me an example of, a counter example, right. When I say {shok}, {shok} means give me your counter example, come on. Show me the thing that doesn't fit my definition, okay. Show me the thing that wipes out my definition, okay. So {shok}, you're in trouble man. { shi drup na, tak yang dak.

Say, {shi drup na} [repeat], {shi drup na} [repeat], {shi drup na} [repeat], oh boy, bad; {tak yang dak} [repeat] {yinpe} [repeat], {kyup} [repeat]: Anything that exists is a good reason, period. It is. {shi drup na tak yang dak yinpe kyup} Everything in the universe is a good reason, for something, okay. There is no definition of {tak yang tak}, okay, please. There is no definition of {tak yang tak}, {duk gi tak yang tak}, right?

[student: unclear]

I don't mind. Go ahead. There is no definition of a good reason. You have to say a good reason in a particular context, see what I mean. [student: inaudible]

A good reason in a particular logical statement. But, everything in the universe can be a good reason for something, you see what I mean? [student] I don't mind. You wanna take that? [student] Huh? Okay, so I'll say, take everything that can be perceived by a valid perception as a totality; it exists because it exists as a totality. { tak yang tak mayin pata}. You telling me that's not a good reason? [student] I didn't repeat it. I said, that which is perceived by a valid perception to exist. And then I said, it exists, and then I said, because the totality exists. That's okay. Those are three separate things. [student] Sure. The Buddha does. That's the definition of the Buddha, okay. Okay. All right [unclear] my weapon, all right.

Okay, anyway, better say in the, can't define a good reason. It has to be a good

reason for a particular proof, okay. Then you can say, the definition of a good reason in a particular proof is, {te drup kyi tsul sum yinpa, {yinpa}. Say, {te drup kyi} [repeat], {tsul sum yinpa} [repeat]. A reason where the three relationships hold, okay. A reason where the three relationships hold. {mayin par ta} By the way, when you wanna bridge on to a new subject you say, 'no it's not'. And then you can say anything you want, you see what I mean. Then you can move on to any subject in the world, okay.

{mayin par tel, cha kyi me pey chir} Helen Mchale. I forgot your pen, by the way. I had it in a bag and I forgot to bring it. Anyway, [unclear], empty. Give me any one of the three relationships. The definition of a good reason in a particular proof is that where the three relationships hold in that particular proof. What are the three relationships? Give me any one of them. {shok}, {shok, shok} Anne Lindsay? Anyone. [student: unclear] Yeah, the subject and the reason. There has to be a relationship between the subject and the reason. Take sound; it's a changing thing; because it's a made thing, okay. Take sound; it's a changing thing; because it's a made thing. The word, the idea 'made thing' must apply to the subject, which is sound. Does 'made thing' apply to sound? Is sound a made thing? Yeah. So the first relationship holds. It's called {chok chu} in Tibetan, okay, {chok chu}. Second one? {shok} Huh? {je kyap}, say, {je kyap} [repeat] which means, if it's three it must be two, okay. Basically. That's the expression of the {je kyap}, it's not the {je kyap}, okay. If a thing is made, it must be changing. Is that true? It holds. Now, we check the third one. {sum ... shok}, what's number three? [student: inaudible] Yeah. If it's not two, it can't be three. Which is called the {dok kyap, okay, {dok kyap}. Those are the three relationships. They have to hold, okay. Those three relationships have to hold and then it's a good reason, okay. For? [student: inaudible] the particular proof, okay. You always have to say that.

Which brings us back to the original reason for studying Buddhist logic. Placide [laughter], negative reason. I mean, what's the goal of studying Buddhist logic? I mean, I'll tell you very honestly. I mean, the ultimate goal of this class is what's about to be said by Marie Placide. [laughter] [laughs] You know. And I'll give you a clue. The Buddha made a mistake in one of his past lives. And then he said, we better study logic.

[student: inaudible]

She's going back to the positive reason, which is, you know, that you learn that you shouldn't present a Buddhist argument in a non-Buddhist country to try to help people and, and be using terms that they don't accept yet, can't do that. Part of the {tsul sum}, part of the three relationships has to be that they already agree to all three. Never forget that. They must already agree to all three relationships. They just didn't tie it together yet. Like, it's almost a good {shi

gyur} a perfect opponent, is someone who is just temporarily blind to a truth which he should've seen a long time ago. He knows one is three; he knows if it's three it must be two; he knows if it can't be two it can't be three, but he just didn't tie it together yet and your job as a Buddhist is just to tie it together for them. Oh yeah, I always wondered why I was suffering, you know. Yeah, I never did quite believe all those other stories. Oh yeah, I guess that would make sense that's that why I'm suffering. You know, it has to make sense to them, okay. But that's not the answer to my question [laughter]. It's very inspiring though. [laughs]

Negative reason to study logic; it was in the first reading, {shok}
[student: inaudible]

Yeah, [student] so you don't judge other people. You can't tell, I mean, the ultimate purpose of Buddhist logic is to establish to yourself, beyond a doubt, logically, that you don't know what other people are thinking unless you can read their minds. {nga am dang drawe.... nyampar gyur tare} which is one of the ways to say it, okay. I taught you Lord Atisha's way. The way I just said it is the way we say it in the monastery, in the debate ground; little bit different but same meaning. Unless you are me or someone like me don't try to judge other people; you will fail. Who said it? Lord Buddha. Why was he speaking from experience? He was the bad guy in that story, right. He was the guy who accused this bodhisattva of messing around in town. And then he was the guy who ended up going to hell for countless aeons, okay. I mean for many, many aeons. And losing his monks vows for many aeons because he accused somebody of something and he didn't have a valid perception about it, okay. And that's all. That's the main thing, it's a {ma .. pe tak yang tak}, it's a {minowa ma yi pe tak yang dak}. What's a {minowa ma yin pe tak yang tak}? Anybody in the mood? Yeah. Excuse me? Yeah. It's where the, it's a proof for the absence of something, where you're trying to prove the absence of something, which cannot, normally, be perceived by that person's normal perceptions, okay. It's like saying, consider the person in front of us, he shouldn't assert that hell really exists, because he hasn't had any valid perception that it exists, you see what I mean. And then hell, whether or not hell exists is not something that most people can tell, okay, directly with their perceptions, okay. And that's... that's an example. In this case, what's the {chir chin}? What are we talking about? Where did the Buddha make his error? What was the {minowe dun}? What was the {kel dun}?

[student: unclear]

But what was the object that he couldn't see that well? The other monk's intentions, or, the other monk's activities. I guess you could say the other monk's true intentions, he couldn't tell. He couldn't tell, but, he thought he could

tell. He assumed he could tell because of the outward behaviour, okay. And that's where he made his mistake, okay. And, and the Buddha's, the whole, if you only come out of this class with understanding that logically, you've actually gone a long way to developing the ultimate goals of bodhicitta training and tantric training, you know. It's a profound truth that affects deeply your success in the practice of the secret teachings. You cannot tell. You don't know for sure, okay. And, and that's actually very important, okay. And if that's all you ever get out of this class, then it was worth, like, ten weeks of boring syllogisms and stuff, okay. [laughs] I mean, if it even prevents you from one judgement of another person you're ahead. It's worth ten classes to, to come out of here, at least tonight, remembering that you can't really know what the people around you are thinking unless you can read their minds. And you can, with practise, but that's another story, okay. So, to me, that's the most important quotation and you'd better learn it. It will be on the final exam, okay. {nga am dang drawe} and, and memorize it. It should be like a mantra. It'll save you all this hell realm time, right, okay.

Who are we on to? Mister Bill Culler. {yinbe} nobody could tell me the definition of existence in Buddhism.

[student: [unclear]]

You {kyappa ma jung} [laughter] [laughs] There is no definition of existence in Buddhism. How do you know something exists in Buddhism? What's the test to say I know that that exists? [student] Yeah. Anything which is perceived by a valid perception {tseme}, say {tseme} [repeat], {mikpa} [repeat], {yerpai} [repeat], {tsennyi} [repeat]. Better get used to it. It's like a mantra on the debate ground, okay. {tseme mikpa yerpai tsennyi}, okay. {tseme mikpa yerpai tsennyi}; anything which you can perceive with a valid perception exists. What about, Miss Laura Seagal, the unknown moons of Pluto? {me pa ta} So, I guess they don't exist? No, you can either say, 'I agree' or, 'why the hell did you say that; I didn't say anything like that'. [laughs] [laughter] I knew, somehow I knew you'd say that. [laughs] Because nobody can perceive an invalid perception.

[student: inaudible]

Good, good answer. She said {tak ma drup} I said, the moon, the unknown moons around Pluto that we haven't discovered yet don't exist because no one has perceived them in a valid perception. And she said {tak ma drup} which means it's untrue, it's incorrect to say that no one's perceived them with a valid perception. {tsennyi mepa yarta} Are you telling me somebody has perceived them with a valid perception? {shok} Yeah. {nam kyen} Say {kun kyen} [repeat] {kun kyen kyi sik}, okay. {sik} is what? The honorific of {tong}. You don't say 'Buddha {tong}', you say 'Buddha {sik}', okay. The Buddha has with his sacred eyeballs, sacredly perceived, yeah, yeah. That's a good answer, okay.

Okay. Oh, you want me to pick on you [laughter] okay. [student: how do we know what the Buddha has perceived?]

Only from what he states, you see what I mean. Yeah, I ... we don't really know that he's seen, I just proposing moons that did exist, okay. We only what he has stated, you know, in scripture. He taught for fifty years; he taught thousands and thousands of teachings [student: he never mentions those moons?] No, he didn't mention those moons. We're, we're assuming that he did, or something like that. That's all. Yeah. Not technically correct. We're not technically correct. Anyway, I'm saying they do exist, if they do exist, how, how would they be, okay, or anything else, okay. The ... the true balance in my checking account[laughter] something like that, okay [laughs], you know, anything like that, okay. We know there must be one but no one's perceived it, okay [laughter]. I mean, if the Buddha's omniscient he perceives it, or she, you know. Okay. While we're on the subject { yu po la}you can't divide all existing things into two very convenient categories.

[student] I say, you can't. [student] Oh, you can't [laughter] okay, move on to the next question. [laughter] [laughs] Okay [laughs] Cameron can you? Don't think you're gonna get out of it 'cos of the camera thing [laughs]. Can you? Two, very basic, categories of all existing things. [student: unclear] Give me some very simple, basic ones like maybe the first one I taught you guys. [laughter] [student: unclear] Yeah, changing things and unchanging things, okay, {mitakpa} and {takpa}, okay, {mitakpa} and {takpa}, okay. {takpa la sha kyi me pechir}there's no such thing as unchanging things because you can't give me an example. [student] I'm saying that [laughter] [student: tak ma drup]. Then you say {tak ma drup}. {sha ki yata}you can show mw an example? [student: dir] dir; shok [laughter] {shok, shok, shok}Yeah, good, emptiness, right, or space okay, empty space; two good examples.

You ready [unclear]? {mitakpa sha kyi me pechir}, no one could give me an example of a changing thing. Just say, I disagree. {shok} can you give me an example of a changing thing? Yeah. Fine [laughs], okay. So that's the most basic division.

Jay Hahn, {mitakpa la}but you can't divide changing things; there's no basic division of changing things. [student: inaudible] right, there's not, okay. [student: there are. There are. {dak ma drup}{....} you telling me there are divisions of changing things? {shok}[student: mental things; physical things] Mental things, physical things, [student: active things either mental....] good and changing things which are neither physical or mental, okay. {shepay suk} and {demin duje}, okay.

Alice [unclear] {...}you couldn't ever show me an example of a mental thing. And don't get angry [laughter], okay {sha kyi me pechir} Huh? If you ... if you,

there, you can't give me any example of a mental thing {sha kyī me pechir}. Say, {tak ma drup} which means, 'it's not true I can't give you an example'. Then I say, {shok} give me some example of a mental thing, like an emotion [laughter] [laughs]. That's all, or wisdom, or ignorance, or jealousy or anything else, okay. That's all. That's all.

Magda [laughter] [laughs] {...} the mind doesn't have an existence, a definition, there's no definition for, for a mental thing. {...} what's the definition of a mental thing? Do you remember? It was ... say {sel shing} [repeat] {rikpa} [repeat]; {sel} can mean 'clear', in the sense of invisible and it can also mean 'aware', okay; {shing} means 'and'; {rikpa} means 'knowing', okay. And I told you 'invisible and knowing', okay. And then somebody asked me, how do you know it's not the {sel} that means aware. And I said, well, it never made sense to me to define something as 'aware and knowing', because they seem to be the same thing to me, you know what I mean. And I searched through a long, I searched every, I searched a hundred and twenty thousand pages today in the computer. It took about twenty minutes or something. And every, every example that in, in the last two thousand and a half years, right, they never state anywhere absolutely clearly. There's one case, in the Bodhisattvacharyavatara, where he seems to say, the {sel} part doesn't mean invisible, it means aware, almost in the sense of self-awareness. Like, you're aware, like the, something mental should be, should be a state of awareness, almost like self-awareness. And, in the lower schools, they say it is a self-awareness; Master Shantideva says it's not a self-awareness. And then, {rikpa} means knowing. So it's a difference between awareness and knowing. So I guess you could define it as 'aware and knowing', okay. I told you invisible and knowing because to me it's more useful to think of it that way. Probably, technically, it should be 'aware and knowing', but I think both are useful definitions. In the highest schools, if awareness means self-awareness it doesn't exist and you can't explain it that way. But you could also have some kind of awareness that's not a pure self-awareness, you know. You are aware of yourself because you are aware of yourself the next moment. So you have some kind of awareness of yourself even though it's not technically a self-awareness at the same moment, okay, that's all. Anyway, {sel shing rikpa ...tsennyi}, definition of a mental thing is that which is aware and knowing. How's that? Okay. Knowing outside objects and aware somehow, a quality of awareness, okay.

What've got for Vilma? {suk kyī} no one can give me a definition for a physical object, physical thing. [student: unclear] {...} you telling me you can define physical matter? [student] Wait a minute, you just said [laughter] [laughs] I said, no one can give me a, well, technically, you're correct. You're just saying you can't do it, right? [laughs] I said, I said, no one can give me a

definition of physical matter and she said, wrong. So I said, well [student: unclear]- I'm sorry, {suk kyi tsennyi sha kyi me pechir} nobody could give me a definition of physical matter.

[student: tak ma drup]

{...}you telling me somebody could give me a definition of physical matter?

[student: dir]

{shok}I hope it's you [laughter] [laughs] She said, anything you can know in your five senses, okay. {... chir chen}, let's take, for example, the physical matter that exists in the dharmadhatu, okay. If you ever wondered what dharmadhatu really means it is in Abhidharma and it's the subject of the consciousness of the mind, okay. It's what, it's what, it's what your mental sense looks at. It's the bunch of stuff in your mind like the thoughts that are, that, the thoughts that you hear, belong in a category called the dharmadhatu, okay. And pictures that you make in your mind belong in a category called dharmadhatu; that you make in your mind, I already got her, you see. She said, anything you could see, you could point to with your five physical senses or something like that. But see, there is a mental, there is a, in Abhidharma, okay. I'm cheating. There's a, when you visualise something, that's also a kind of color, and that counts as physical matter, counts as physical form, okay. So, in Abhidharma it says, if somebody wanted to defeat your definition they'd say, hey, what about the purple that you see in your mind when I mention purple elephants? Okay. Is it a color? Yes. Can you see it with your five senses? No. Okay. So I, remember, I asked him for a counter example, and I didn't get one, but I'm giving you a counter example. Is that perceivable with your five senses? [student: unclear] Huh? [student] Oh, yah, I'm assuming, we're talking about a person who does know. That's all. There isn't a counter example, so that's not the definition of physical matter. Anybody else got one? You're close. You're really close. Yeah, anything you can point to as being physical matter, okay. And, normally, it has to be one of the five. I mean, it's hard to point to somebody's mind and say, you see that purple in Vilma's mind, you know. Yeah. Okay. But normally, it's anything you can point to as being physical matter, because it's so hard to define 'red', you see. How do you define red? You have to say, look this is red. That's how you define physical matter, you know. Physical matter is made up of colors and shapes, mostly; visual physical matter. So you're, like, defining it by showing it. That's how you define physical matter; something you can point to as being physical matter. Yeah. [student: inaudible] You could say that. I think you could say that. I'm not sure all the schools will accept that the purple that you visualise is physical matter. By the way, if you really want to get into it, there's a distinction between particular, particulate matter – matter which is made up of tiny atoms of stuff and matter in

general. There's a distinction made. The Buddha's samboghakaya, the body you will have in your heaven, is not made up of atoms, but it has colors and shapes. You can see it, but, but it's not like other kinds of matter. So, that's very touchy. It gets very touchy when you get to a Buddha realm. It's physical matter but not particulate matter. And there's a huge debate about it, okay. But it's not the same as the matter that makes up your bones and stuff like that, okay. Yeah. [student] No, that's why I gave her as a counter example. She restricted the definition to the five senses and in Abhidharma you have to count, yeah, the one which is in the dharmadhatu, okay.

Ooh, let's see here [unclear] I think we just need an example of something that's changing, but not mental or physical, okay. Ready? How about {kyappa ma jung}? {demin duje} okay {demin duje}, changing thing that is not matter or mental. {kangsak}yeah, okay {kangsak}'Andy', okay. Andy's not Andy's nose and Andy's not Andy's mind; Andy is something that we ascribe to the combination of those two, and it's a changing thing, okay. All right. Excuse me? Yeah. [student] Instead of mind, why not say,? [student] Oh, that's very cool. He said, I understand why you can't say that Andy's mind is Andy and I understand why you can't say that Andy's nose is not Andy, but what about all of Andy's physical parts and all of Andy's mental parts together? Isn't that Andy? Okay. And that famous question in madhyamika, very famous question. And the answer is, {kyappa ma jung} [student] Yeah, very beautiful answer. And it takes months and months in madhyamika class to get to that, you know. He said, you have to draw a distinction between the inert or the simple combination of Andy's mind and Andy's body; there's a difference between that and Andy's mind and Andy's body thought of as Andy by all of us. And that's two different things. And until you think of him as Andy, just the simple combination of his mind and his body, is not Andy, okay. There's an additional requirement, which is in all the reading you're doing. It's called the imputating factors, you know. Until there's the thought which imputes 'Andy' to that mind and body, he's not the {demin duje}. He's not, he's not the person, okay. There's a big difference between those two. Yeah. [student] Very cool. Yeah. When we held up the pen, in the class in the winter, and we did that exercise, first you concentrated on the white and the blue without thinking of it as a pen and then you looked at the white and the blue and think of it as a pen. And you can strip off, a good meditation on emptiness is strip off your imputation of it as a pen and just look at white, blue cylinder. And then, lay it back on. It's like a, it's like one of these things, it's like one of these transparencies, you can, you know, you can think of this pen as a blue and white cylinder and not think of it as a pen. Look at it the way an Eskimo would. If an Eskimo came in here from five hundred years ago and saw this thing in my

hand, they would think, beautiful blue and white stick, I wonder how they got it so smooth, you know. And you're looking at it a different way; you're imputing or you're laying on it another conception of pen. And that's a good exercise for meditating on emptiness. You can strip it away and you can put it back on, you know. You can think of it as a pen and then think of it as a cylinder and then think of it as a pen and then think of it as a cylinder. And you get used to the idea that its 'pen-ness' is not a self-existent quality. It's not innate. It's coming from you. And once you get more sophisticated you go to the blue and the white itself and see if you're not doing the same thing with that. And if you keep that up it's very powerful, you know. It's a very good emptiness meditation. But be, be delicate with it; don't go round saying there's no pen or I will tickle you with it, okay [laughs] all right. I'm not suggesting there's no pen. Anyone who thinks so can come up during the break and I'll do my thing. [student] [laughs] No, I'll tickle you with a tickling machine, okay.

Okay, you know my favourite class of this whole thing, what, is what? {chi jedrak} okay. Say, {chi jedrak} [repeat], {chi jedrak} [repeat]. {chi jedrak} meaning 'quality and characteristic'. If you wanna think of it more crudely, 'generals and specifics', okay; 'sets and members of the sets'. But if you wanna get sophisticated, and hopefully you did some meditation on it, 'quality and characteristic'. Very delicate. The truth behind that and the truth behind real changing {mitakpa}, real changing quality and gross changing quality are both things that I want you to explore in the next month, okay. Try to see subtle, what they call, subtle impermanence. Try to see the subtle changing nature of a thing as opposed to the obvious changing nature of a thing. I mean, if I pull these beads apart and they all fall on the ground, that's the gross impermanence or the gross changing quality of this thing. But, but there's another thing happening here, you know, even as we talk, moment-to moment, millisecond-by-millisecond, even more subtle than that. And they say, you have to have a lot of virtue and you have to meditate a lot to see that. You can't see that right now. You know I'm talking about something. You believe there's a deeper impermanence there, that it would be very cool to see, but you have to practise it. And that's a very good thing to do in the next month, okay. It takes a lot of practise to see subtle impermanence. It takes a lot of meditation. It takes a lot of serious meditation to perceive that directly. And it takes even more to perceive the difference between a quality and a characteristic, okay. It takes a lot of careful thought and meditation. If you want something to do for a month start with subtle impermanence and then go on to see if you can understand the quality, and, and something being char-, read those, read the reading on quality and characteristic. I don't remember which number that was, do you? Three. Read reading number three over and over again. I mean, if you want something

to do for the next month that would seriously contribute to you seeing emptiness directly, concentrate on that one. And it's hard, you know. If, if you, the sign that I know if you're reading it, is you'll come like John Stilwell and say, why all those quotation marks around all those things, okay. I mean, that's a sign that you read it, okay. And think about that. It's the same subject, okay. Why are those quotation marks around those things, you know? What's the difference between car and quote "car", you know? And if you get it, you'll be very close to seeing emptiness, okay. It's very, very important, extremely important, okay. So, go to subtle impermanence, play with that. And when you get tired of that, they call it, there's a special word called 'alternating meditation'. Normally, it's between shamatha and vipassyana, but you can do it between subtle impermanence and quality. And, and in your practice for the next month, month and a half, alternate. When you get dried out on one go to the other one until you get very good at it, you know. And then they say you can just flip between them, and, and, try, try to figure it out. Try to figure out the difference between car and quote "car", and you'll be very close to seeing the true nature of dependent origination, which is extremely close to seeing emptiness, okay. Yeah. [student] [laughs] With a car or? [student] With quality itself? That's nasty. [laughs] That's really nasty. I would say, one is quality, as a, as a, Jung called it, what do you call it? What did they call it? [student] An archetype, yeah, it's similar to that idea, okay. Quality as an archetype; quality as a, as a perfect concept, as opposed to quality in real life, you know. Quality as a, as an ideation, you know. Quality as a concept. And then, quality as it applies to an object, you know what I mean. And see, that's a very subtle, I mean, I wouldn't go that far. I would just, work on car versus quote "car", you know what I mean. And then, when you get really good at that, you can go to quality and quote "quality" [laughs] you know what I mean. Basically, [student] if, if you understand why in English we can have four different distinctions: car, quote "car", a car, and, the car. Why do we use those, why do we distinguish in English between car, quote "car, a car, and, the car? And if you meditate on that for a month you might get very close to seeing dependent origination, which itself, is very difficult. And that takes you to the door of seeing emptiness directly. You have to go through seeing dependent origination first. The real meaning of dependent origination: how you are using ideation or conceptualisations to get to things. Why are you using archetypes or mental images {dun chis}, you know. That's, that would be a good meditation, okay: car, quote "car", a car, and, the car, okay. [student] Yeah. It doesn't matter, I don't think the order matters. Probably I'd start with the easy ones like 'a car', 'the car', okay. But if you get the difference between those you'd be well on your way. [student] Excuse me? [student] They're not, they don't have the

articles that we do in English; they don't have 'a', they don't have 'the', but there's ways of expressing it in the syntax of a sentence that it's clear which one they mean and they're different, okay. The four distinctions are there in every language in the world because every, every human mind thinks that way. Why are they there, is I'm asking, is what I'm asking. Yeah. [student: inaudible] Excuse me. [student] She said, does that help to meditate on subtle [student] How to meditate on subtle impermanence? I would say this: she said how would, I understand how you're describing to meditate on quality and characteristic, but how do I meditate on subtle impermanence? There are a couple of clues, okay. One, meditate on why it's true, according to Buddhism, that the beginning of a thing destroys it. Why the beginning of a thing destroys that thing without the need for any other influence, you know. The birth of a child kills the child, you know. Why? Why is that? And, and Buddhism is very strict about it. It says, without any other external causes needed to kill the child; just the fact that it's been born. And it applies to pens and chairs and every thing else, New York City, you know. Why, how is it that the creation of a thing destroys it without any other intervening factors necessary, okay. That, that would be one way to meditate on subtle impermanence. Another clue, I'm just giving you clues, okay, would be why is it that when the mala or the rosary is created we say it has a beginning and then it stays for a while and then it ends. We say it has a beginning and an ending and a staying, right. Sometimes they leave out the staying in order they say, in the Scripture, to enhance your renunciation, okay, but we won't do that [laughs] [laughter] 'cos people say 'stay' they cling to the stay and they forget the end. And actually they, in the Abhidharma Scripture, some of them leave out the staying, 'cos they don't want people to get attached to the staying, okay. Beginning, staying, ending, applies to the rosary but a very heavy thing – does this rosary have its own emptiness? Yeah. What is the emptiness of this rosary? It's the fact that it's not anything other than a projection forced on me by my past karma, okay. It's not anything else than that. What's its dependent origination? The fact that it is, I am forced to project it as a result of my past deeds, okay. That's its dependent origination. Its emptiness is that it couldn't have been anything else. It couldn't have been anything else. If you want to meditate, you know, if Elly's in the mood, after you finish that other stuff about the subtle impermanence of this, the subtle changing nature of this thing, then meditate on why its emptiness is {takpa}, its emptiness is unchanging. The rosary is changing and you cannot say that the emptiness begins and you cannot say that the emptiness ends. You must say, the emptiness came into being and the emptiness came out, you know, went out of being. But you can't say it stopped or it began because that implies change. Try to explore the difference between those two things. Explore the difference

between the rosary beginning and stopping and then the emptiness of the rosary which never changes. It, it is, it comes into being and it goes out of being, but it never begins or ends. Last question: if you destroy the rosary does its emptiness go away? Yes, okay. Do you destroy the emptiness? No. And, if you wanna understand subtle impermanence, explore those things. And the, I can't tell you more. You must meditate, you know. You can't see any more than that if you don't meditate on it, you know. I can't describe to you any more about that, you know. You have, I'm telling you there's a vast and vital difference between those two things, but I can't, but then from there you have to take the ball and run with it, you know what I mean. Then you have to meditate. If you don't meditate on it you will never get it, okay. You must be in a deep states of meditation to get these. That, and the quality and characteristic. You'll never get it in a class. You have to go home and meditate on it and you must. It's something you must, you must grasp those two concepts to see emptiness directly. They are hurdles over which you must jump to get to the direct perception of emptiness. And no teacher can give you any more than what I just did. Now you have to go and meditate on it, you can't see it any other way. It's {keldun} right, it's too deep, okay.

That's a description, it's not a perception. You're not perceiving it, you, you are perceiving my description of it. To perceive it you have to go, you have to go and learn to, you have to go and meditate at least an hour a day, okay. Yeah. [student] yeah [student] but it doesn't change and it's not destroyed. And, and why we have to say that, I, you have to go meditate on it, okay. All right.

Let's take a break 'cos that's pretty auspicious, okay. Go and have your non-existent drinks and food and [laughter] [laughs]. I suppose you could have something out in the, in the courtyard, I guess. It's like uh, uh.

So you better know the three kinds of {chis}, all right, very important to see emptiness.

You better know why it's important to know quality and characteristic to see emptiness, okay. Those of you who took the Future, Proof of Future Lives class, you studied the idea of a material cause and you're gonna have to understand a material cause, what a material cause is. Again, it's the stuff that flops over into the thing. For example, the clay for a ceramic pot, or the seed for a tree; and you're gonna have to understand that and understand its application to future lives, to proving future lives. One of the things that you'll be called on most to do in the United States as the first American Buddhists will be to defend the idea of future lives. They say, if you don't believe in future lives, it's very hard to make any progress in Buddhism. And I think that the idea of future lives may be getting diluted by the new-age interpretation of Buddhism, you see what I mean. I mean it's very much a reason to study Buddhism that you aren't gonna

die when you die. It's not over, you know. You do have to go somewhere and it's, and we can't just cover it up or pretend that's not true. It, it's, it's very important to teach people that, to explain to them why that's true because going on from there is a very frightening process. And, and you can't do anything about it if you don't believe it so we shouldn't lose that teaching. That should be a strong teaching in American Buddhism. It shouldn't be that Buddhism becomes a cult of feeling good or something like that or of feeling happy in your meditation or something like that. You are dealing with very violent circumstances of your so-called future life, your next life and it's no joke. And we have to be able to explain to people logically why that's true, okay.

You already had that. You already had that. Let's see. I think it's important to know what a valid perception is. What makes a perception valid, okay. {sardu miluway rikpa}, okay; 'new, unerring perception', in this school. The 'new' part in this school because this school doesn't accept that memory is a {tsema} is a pramana, okay. Two kinds of valid perception: this one[demonstrates] and this one, okay. And they're both, why is that important in Buddhism? There are many things that you can't see with your eyes. Like, when you're dealing with America and you're dealing with capitalism and you're dealing with life in New York City, it's all what you can see. It's the realm of what you can see and touch and buy, you know. But when you're dealing with Buddhism and trying to escape this realm into another realm much of what you're dealing with is invisible right now, you know. Much of what you're dealing with is, you can't see right now, you know. You hear me talk about hells, you hear me talk about a Buddha paradise, you hear me talk about all this stuff; you have to be able to develop your capacity of reasoning so that you can move beyond what you can see. And you can't get there any other way, you know. The original or the initial perceptions of emptiness, the initial perceptions of your future lives are gonna be this one [demonstrates], you know. They're gonna be of something that you can't see with your eyes and you're gonna have to develop your powers of reasoning to where you can accept it because it's logical. And, and you can act on it because it's logical. And you've gotta get to that point. Later on it will become a direct perception s much as this. You will be able to see your future lives. You will be able to see the day of your enlightenment. You'll be able to confirm the existence of your other lives, directly. But there's a, there has to be the reasoning first, okay. And you have to get used to the idea that the perception which sees the beads this way and the perception which sees the beads this way are totally equal in their validity. They're both as powerful as the other. And you have to get used to that because you are in a realm called Buddhism, where many of the places you have to go to reach your goals in this life, are gonna be invisible to you, you know. And, and especially the higher

teachings, the secret teachings, they run off of logic, you know, because if you trust your emotions, or, or, or your culture you can't, you won't be able to do them. You won't be able to practise them, you know. They have to be, by that time, you have to be running off of very powerful logic, because your culture is running the opposite way, you know. And, and your instincts might run the opposite way. You have to depend on reasoning and on logic and, and, and, because at that point, so much is invisible that, that there's very little to be, you know, that you can see and confirm with your eyes or your nose, you know. The texts say that, by the way, you know. By the time you get to that stage of the higher teachings that are necessary to reach enlightenment in one life, you're not running on your nose and your ears and your eyes anymore. You're running on your spiritual sense, based on logic, you know, based on reasoning. And it's much more, it's a difficult place to be in and you might as well get used to it now. You have to establish truth by thinking carefully and not ignoring these questions anymore because you can't see those things. Death is real whether you can see it or not. What's gonna happen to you after that is real whether you can see it or not. The forces that created this world and that are creating your death are invisible but you godamn well better figure them out; and you don't have much time, you know what I mean. And so, reasoning, you better, you have to know the two kinds of valid perception, okay.

Three kinds of good reasons.

The two kinds of negatives and, again, I stress the negatives, the study of negatives. The most important negative of all is what? Emptiness. Okay. {megak}, the simple absence of something. I want you to study the different kinds of negatives so that you get a deep appreciation for the fact that emptiness is the simple absence of something. And, and that will disqualify about ninety-five percent of the wrong ideas about emptiness, because they're all positives or {mayin gaks} but they're not {megaks}, okay. They are not the simple absence of something that never existed, never could exist, never will exist, okay. And get used to that. And, and every time you meet a person who claims to be teaching emptiness and they describe it any other way say, hey, wait a minute, is that a {megak} or a {mayin gak} or a {drupa}? You, you seem to be describing a positive thing, you know. That's not what emptiness is. Emptiness, every book says emptiness is a {megak}, emptiness is an absence of something. It's not like some golden light or some black light or, or watching your mind, okay. Or watching your thoughts come and go or something like that. Those are not {megaks}, they're not the absence of something, okay. Can't be emptiness; automatically disqualified.

Two types of relationships are important, okay. There's a relationship between quality and characteristic and there's a relationship between cause and effect, and

it's good to know the difference, okay. Especially when you're studying karma, okay.

The ultimate application of the reason to prove the absence of something, okay. The ultimate application of that one; you gotta work on that.

Remember that long question where you had to identify all the elements in a logic question, in a logical statement? That's on the final. [laughs] [laughter] okay, all right. If you didn't figure it out yet, go the 'Three Jewels' on Saturday and Sunday, you know, get some help. Huh? Yeah, there were fourteen in it, yeah. If you know that you know formal logic. You can go through the other schmeils and memorise the definitions and all that, but if you know, this is the subject, this is the thing you're proving, blah, blah, blah, then, you'll be all right. Then you understand logic, you know. Whether you use it or not is another thing, okay.

We studied, the last thing we studied, was the subject of time, and there was this cute little question where you had to fill in the three different groups and stuff like that. I like that question, okay. Especially important, I think, to look into in what sense is, what did we say? Future vase, the vase future, the future water pitcher, future for the water pitcher; we said it a better way though, what was it? [students] Future pitcher, was that it? Being related to the cause of a pitcher? Pitcher future, yeah, yeah, yeah. Pitcher future. It's pitcher future, somehow being related to the cause of the pitcher, okay, pitcher future is somehow related to the cause of the pitcher. And you have to think, there's some things you have to think about. Unfortunately, you just can't answer them. Okay. That's all the final stuff.

It's a custom in the monastery, you know, when they examine you for your Geshe, they torture you [laughter] [laughs] for like, seven to ten days or something. And, and you get to do all these different things, painful things, you know, and it's really hassle. And then slowly you get through the week and you start to get towards the end of the week and you know you reached [cut] [end side A]

[side B]

And the last part is the most difficult. Every one in the monastery can come up and pick on you, you know, and ask you questions. Everybody. And you just have to sit there, like late into the night, and finally, you know, the debate master says, he makes some sign, you know, and dong, it's all finished, you know. And then every body sits down and there's this big quiet and it feels so good, you know, [laughs] and then you know you're done, you know. And then one guy gets up, I don't know how they choose the guy, I still don't know, and he gets up and he makes a certain debate to you. And I thought it'd be auspicious to end on that debate, okay. You have this in your reading, okay.

I designed this particular exchange with a whole bunch of sneaky stuff in it so you have to practise it, you have to think about it, you have to look at it. Both sides get a chance to be right and both sides are wrong, or are they? Okay. And you have to think about it, okay. So we'll do it with, who can we pick on? Elly, are you ready? [laughter] {korwa}does, does samsara have a limit? Okay. I say samsara does have a limit, okay, does have an end, okay. Samsara does have an end; think about it, okay. First stop and think about it, you know. You know, is, every pain you ever had had to have come from a bad deed. That bad deed had to have come from a former state of ignorance. That ignorance had to come from former bad deeds, etcetera. There was no beginning, okay. That's scary because it makes you feel like maybe there's no end, you know what I mean. And that's the debate. This is from {parchen}, this is from the study of the perfection of wisdom, okay. {korwa la}I say there's an end to samsara. [student] She said, you can't say {dir} to a {chir}[laughter] {korwa la}because there is an end to samsara. {yer} just repeat my verb. I said {yer}, it has, okay. {yer...} are you telling me there is an end to samsara? [student] So there must be a beginning to samsara? Right? {yata} You telling me there's a beginning? [student: tak ma drup] We say a front - end and a back- end; in Tibetan there's a word, front-end and back-end, okay. When some body asks you, does samsara have an end; you have to say, do you mean front end or back end, okay [laughter] [laughs] [unclear] There is an end to samsara [student] There is no end to samsara? [student: there's a back end but no front end] Don't get so, all you can do is say 'yes' or 'no', I'm sorry. [laughs] okay [student: Yes, there's an end to samsara] No there's not, because there's no final end. There's no, there's no back-end to samsara. {chi ta me pechir}there's no back-end to samsara. No, you should say, {tak ma drup} or {kyappa ma jung} Huh, So there is a back-end of samsara, you telling me there is? [student:dir] No there's not because samsara's limitless. [student] Ho, ho means by the way, now I gotcha, okay [laughs] [laughter] So you're telling me it is limitless? {kyappa ma jung} means it is limitless but that doesn't mean it doesn't have an end. When you say {kyappa ma jung} that's what you're saying, okay. It is limitless but it doesn't have an end. [student] {tak yata}So, so it is limitless? She says {tak ma drup}, they say {kyappa ma jung}- you guys wanna make up your minds? [students] Oh, so it's not limitless? Right? Samsara's not limitless. So, if the beginning of something is infinite, the thing is not infinite? {uhn}[laughter] If I can count my past lives and never end in the counting, that's not limitless? It'll never end. If I start to count my past lives, you know, like if I count this one as one and my last one as two, there is no end. It's infinite. [student] It's infinite. So it's limitless. It's limitless. It has no limit. [student: if you're going in reverse] In reverse [laughs] So, numbers themselves are not infinite? [student: no, numbers are finite]

Numbers are finite? Are the total number of numbers finite or infinite? Infinite, right, right. Is the number of numbers infinite? Why? 'Cos you can always add one more. Okay. That's all. You can always add one more. So the front-end has a limit like one, integers okay, positive integers, has one and it goes infinitely, so we call it infinite {yin pa ta}, {dir}, so samsara's infinite. {dir} so samsara never ends because it's infinite. [students] You just said it's infinite. [students] Huh? But numbers are infinite the other way and you still say it's infinite. What are you talking about? You don't say numbers are infinite? Lives are, oh {tsa}so, show me the first past life you had. Huh? Future lives are finite? I'm not talking about that. I'm saying, are your future lives finite or infinite? [student] I'm saying lives, my question is lives. I'm not saying past or future, you're saying past or future. If you wanna get up and debate me you can do it. I'm asking you. Are your lives infinite or finite? So they're infinite. So samsara doesn't have an end, because samsara's infinite. Huh? It is infinite. It is infinite. You don't say [unclear] if someone asks you are numbers infinite, you say yes they are. Why? 'Cos they're infinite in one direction. It's the same thing. {rikpa ..}same thing. You call numbers infinite 'cos they stretch out infinitely in one direction, right? So samsara's infinite. Same thing, what's the difference? I can count my past lives backwards and never finish. Same thing. Exactly the same thing. That's how I define it. So samsara's infinite, right? So samsara's infinite. [students] Is samsara, no, really, seriously samsara's infinite then. In the same way that numbers are, in the same, in the same way that numbers are infinite. I mean, what's the definition of infinite? What's the example of infinite? From this point in space you can travel into the universe and never reach an end; that's infinite, right? So from that point of the current life and working backwards you can never find a last life. That's infinite. That fits every sense of infinite that you can give me. Right? So samsara's infinite [students] Well you give me a definition of infinite if you don't like my definition [laughter]. Seriously. Get straight here. You define infinite. I say infinite in the mind of everybody in this room means they're standing on planet Earth and they look up at the sky and they realise that if they kept travelling in some kind of spaceship or something, they would never reach the end of the universe. There's always one more inch. There's always one more inch. Or, the other meaning of infinite would be, you start numbering with numbers and you can't reach the end because you can always just add one more, so it's infinite. It's unending. {yinpa} You give me a better, you wanna change it to, do you think everybody in this room thinks of infinite in any other way? That's how they think of infinite. Come on, I grew up in America, what do you have? What else? [students] Infinite means you can always add one more and you can't reach the end of it. No, we have to define, we don't have common ground here.

We don't have common ground. We don't have common ground. We don't have common ground. We have to make sure we mean the same thing when we say infinite. From my currant perspective, going into the thing I'm talking about, I can always add one more. To me that's infinite. What are you talking about direction? From my rear end [laughter] the universe is infinite [laughter]. From my front end [laughter] the universe is infinite [laughter] I'm not kidding. I'm not kidding [unclear] telling me direction, okay. [students] [laughs] [laughter] From my back end too it's infinite [unclear] [laughter] It is, I'm not joking, come on. You can go the other way. Go down from one. Split it in half, it's a half. Go split that, it's a quarter. Split that, it's an eighth. It's infinite that way too. Back end and front end. You want a back end you got a back end [laughter]. I'm not kidding. It's infinite. It's infinite. That's the meaning of infinite. {yin pa tel} or you give me another meaning. Show me something else that's infinite. [student] Huh? [student] So past lives are infinite? Oh, okay, I gotcha, I gotcha, I gotcha. This is the crux. So past lives are not samsara? [student] past lives are not samsara {yinpata}[student] [unclear] [laughter] She said past lives [unclear] [laughter] [unclear] you said [student: you have the red outfit on] You said, past lives are samsara, so samsara's infinite, right? [student: you have a red outfit on] [unclear] just stick to the subject, don't talk to my, [unclear] [laughter] Get back to the question here. Are past lives infinite? {dir} Are past lives nirvana? [students: no] So they must be samsara. {dir} So samsara's infinite? [students] Huh? [student: kyappa ma jung] Oh, so if my past lives are infinite, my samsara's not infinite. {dir} So my past lives are not samsara. [students] [laughs] So my past lives are samsara? {dir} So if these beads [laughs] how can I say, are these beads round? And if they're round do they have a circular outline? So these beads have a circular outline? So, if that's true, then let's go the other way. Are my past lives infinite? Are my past lives samsara? They're not samsara? [laughs] nirvana {yinpata} So they're not produced by my bad deeds and mental afflictions? [students] In general, in general, in general. By the way, we're talking about past samsaric lives, of course. Yeah, yeah. The Buddha doesn't have lives-s-s anymore, just one, okay. So past lives are samsara, right? Let's, I'll do it again and you know, [unclear] I'll make it easy for you guys. [laughter] Is the bead round? If something's round, does it have a circular outline? So, so can we say that beads have a circular outline? Right. Got it? Are you past lives, are the beads round, each, each individual round, bead? If it's round does it have a circular outline? So therefore we can say that beads have a circular outline. Right. Now, are past lives infinite? Are forced past lives samsara? So samsara's infinite by same reasoning. {tak ma drup} [laughs] [laughter] All right. {...} Say {...} [repeat] Okay, whatever you wanna make up is fine with me, you know. {...} Oh, okay.

So, samsara doesn't have an end? [students] Because it's infinite; 'in' means negative, 'finite' means it has an ending, fini, fini, right, right? I just got through that - back end, front end, doesn't matter [laughs] [laughter]. If it's infinite in one direction it still counts as infinite. Okay, so it's infinite.

So, samsara doesn't have an end?

[student: tak ma drup]

Samsara does have an end. [students]

Why? [laughter] [laughs] [students] Say, I'm sorry, if samsara's infinite? That's what I'm saying. I'm saying you can't. I'm saying we could just go home.

[student] Right. [student] No, oh, no, I say there's no end, there is no end. It's infinite. [students] Aahhh, anyway. Samsara {la chi ta yata} are you telling me samsara has a , we'll go to the end, okay. We got two more minutes. [laughter] [laughs] You telling me that there is a back end to samsara? Say {dir} [repeat] {yer te}, why the hell? Why? Say, {dang zing gyi} [repeat] {nyenpo} [repeat] { tokden} [repeat] {yer perchir} [repeat]. [repeat]

Because the tendency to hold things as self-existent has a powerful antidote, which is called, the direct perception of emptiness. That proves you don't have to suffer. That proves you don't have to suffer anymore, okay. Period. End of debate. And then, every body goes Taaaaaaa. Ready? Taaaaaaa [laughs] Okay.

Okay, that's in your, [unclear] gonna like that one. And then you got this thing in your heart, like your Geshe's over, you know, and you can go home and have some tea, okay.

Okay, I have a few thank-yous.

[acknowledgements and applause]

Okay, couple of things, we have to stop. Next class I think starts around May 19th and as I said it will be Lojong. Total departure from this class, okay. I'm just trying to make sure you come back, okay. [laughter] It's very sweet teachings that were invented about a thousand years ago about how to have a good heart from day to day in your office, in your family, at home. How to develop a good heart. And we'll do some very famous Lojongs. One is called by the Diamond Lion, {Dorje Senge} and the one that I really like which I don't think has been taught in this country that I'm aware of is called {shempa shi drel}; Pabongka Rinpoche used to love it. It's Sakya. Very powerful, by Drakpa Gyeltsen, very, very, very great Lama of our lineage, and, so, that'll be the Friday night. We'll concentrate on that on Friday night. [other announcements]

I wanted to say one thing. As I said at the beginning, Gyaltsab Je said the kindest thing Je Tsongkapa ever did for him, you know, he taught him all these tantras, he taught him all these incredible meditations, everything. He said the kindest

thing he ever did was to teach me logic, you know. And, really, I feel very proud that, that we did a transmission. What we just did was a transmission, you know. You don't get, you haven't delved into years of logic. I mean, it could be years, right, but you have a very, very thorough understanding of all the main subjects of Buddhist logic. And I don't want to see it die in America, you know what I mean. I, the transmission has occurred, you see what I mean. The book is there, most of it, okay. [laughs] [laughter] try to finish it, okay. And now I want to see you pass it on to other people. It's very, very important for the perception of emptiness. You must have it. It's called the key to emptiness. And, don't let it stop with you now. I did my job. My schtick's finished, okay, transmit it, you know what I mean, okay. And now you have to go over it and transmit it to other people, okay. And that's a big transmission. We're talking about, really, it going from the eastern world to the western world. And, and this is one big group of people; the survivors of the logic class, class thirteen, you know.[laughs] You are the survivors of the logic class and now you have to transmit it to other people, okay. You really have to, you have to take good care of this knowledge and make sure, don't leave logic for last, don't say, teach it to your students. And make them do logic and make them do debating. Please, please learn debating. We'll start debating now in all of the classes. And start doing it with each other, okay, and follow the rules, all right.

I also want to thank John Stilwell who does a lot of work. [applause] And, and I want to thank you really for coming 'cos I, it forces me to learn these things again and you're very kind. I perceive you as very kind to ask me to teach and to keep having me teach. I take it as a great kindness. It's for me a very beautiful life and very precious time, okay.

So, we'll do some prayers, all right.

[cut]

[mandala]

[dedication]

**Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning--NYC
RAW TRANSCRIPT**

