

༡། །ཚད་མའི་གཞུང་དོན་འབྲིང་པའི་བསྟུས་གྲུ་ལྡན་ལ་པར་བཤད་པ་རིགས་ལམ་འཕུལ་གྱི་ལྡེ་མིག་

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

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

Chapter One: Mutual Exclusives and Relations

Author: Purchok Ngawang Jampa

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

Translator: Tenzin Dongak (Fedor Stracke)

Table of Contents

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

Mutual Exclusives and Relations

Refutation of Others' Systems

Debate One

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

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

Debate Two

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

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

Debate Three

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

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

Debate Four

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

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

Debate Five

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

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

Debate Six

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

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

Debate Seven

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

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

Debate Eight

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

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

Debate Nine

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

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

Debate Ten

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

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

Debate Eleven

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

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

Debate Twelve

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

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

Debate Thirteen

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

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

One's Own: Definitions & Divisions

Exclusives

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

Relations

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

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

Refuting Objections

Objection One

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

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

Objection Two

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

Burbu Chok: **No Pervasion.**

Objection Three

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

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

Objection Four

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

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

Objection Five

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

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

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

© 2003 Tenzin Dongak