



Logical Reasoning

Term 2 - 2025

motivations

Lecture

- ◆ KR GTT's recording: Overview of the three modes (18 mins)

Review & Discussion

- ◇ Is there a difference between “reasons” and “correct reasons”?
 - ◇ Practically, we use reasons to prove a thesis, hence we often say “reason in proving that”
 - ◇ How many possibilities between the reason in proving that and the correct reason in proving that?
 - ◇ Note that “a thing exists or not, it is necessarily a reason proving that”

Review & Discussion

- ◆ What is the general definition of correct reasons?
- ◆ Give examples of the correct reasons in
 - ◆ proving that sound is impermanent by reason of
 - ◆ proving my wealth (health, relationship, fame, jobs, pains, mental stress, etc.) is impermanent
 - ◆ proving that a person is not inherently existent by reason of

Review

- ◇ Take sound, it is impermanent because it is a product, for example, lightning
 - ◇ What does the correct respondent of this specific correct reason need to realise?
 - ◇ What does it mean to say that “the three modes are established”?
- ◇ Consider this syllogism posited to the Buddha, is “product” still a correct reason in proving that sound is impermanent?
 - ◇ Any generalisation or implication

Lecture

- ◆ KR GTT's recording: How to realise sound is impermanent (8 minutes)

Review

- ◇ What is the definition of “product”?
- ◇ Who (what) created sound?
- ◇ “being generated” vs “newly generated not previously existing”
- ◇ “being generated” vs “arisen in dependence upon causes and conditions” and “arisen in dependence upon potency of causes and conditions”



- ◇ Take an example, a building
 - ◇ After it has been newly generated (1st moment), it starts to “change” or “disintegrate”
 - ◇ 1st moment disintegrated, 2nd moment newly generated
 - ◇ 1st and 2nd moments disintegrated, 3rd moment newly generated
 - ◇ They are newly generated moment by moment
 - ◇ Understanding “generated in dependence upon causes and conditions” is the method to realise impermanence

Review

- ◆ When saying sound (or any other compounded phenomena) is impermanent, do we mean “gross” or “subtle” impermanence?
- ◆ What is the meaning of “subtle impermanence”?
- ◆ What causes sound to undergo momentary disintegration?
 - ◆ [or why does sound disintegrate moment to moment?]

Review

- ◇ What is the relationship between product and impermanent?
 - ◇ Comments: very crucial to have a correct understanding about “relationships”

“related”

- ◆ “A” is related to “B” (vs “B” is related to “A”)
- ◆ Related: It (phenomenon A) is different from that (phenomenon B) and the absence of that (B) necessarily entails the absence of it (A).
- ◆ Also, “the relationship in which one does not exist, the other one does not occur”
- ◆ Two types of such relationships: causal and intrinsic (nature)

“A” is intrinsically related to “B”

- ◇ “Product” is intrinsically related to “impermanent”
 - ◇ Product is different from impermanent
 - ◇ If impermanent does not exist, pervasively product does not exist
 - ◇ Product and impermanent are intrinsically same (single entity)

Review

- ◆ Give an example of a permanent phenomenon that is generated in dependence upon causes and conditions.

Discussions

- ◆ Take a subject, “my physical body”, it is a product....
 - ◆ True or false?
 - ◆ If it is true, my physical body is “generated” by causes and conditions
 - ◆ What is the substantial cause of the “current” moment of “my physical body”?

- ◆ Now, take a subject, “my primary mental consciousness”, it is a product because
 - ◆ What is its substantial cause of the “current” moment?

Lecture

- ◆ KR GTT's recording: Behind the use of correct reasons and consequences (7 minutes)

Lecture

- ◆ KR GTT's recording: Six parts of the correct reason

Review

- ◆ Identify the six parts in the following syllogism:

Take a subject, a person, it is not truly established (not inherently existent) because it is dependent arising

- ◆ What parts does a correct respondent [to whom this syllogism is posited] need to realise and have doubt about?

Lecture

- ◆ KR GTT's recording: Definition of Position Property (4 minutes)

Review

- ◆ Take a subject product, it is a position property because it is the proposition property in proving that “sound is impermanent” by the reason of it being a “product”
- ◆ Then we can give a definition of product being the position property in proving sound is impermanent: that which valid cognition ascertains to only exist in relation to the faultless subject of interest in proving that, in a manner similar to the way it is put forth for the person to whom “product” is the first mode.

The first mode: position property

- ◇ Pur-bu-jok's general definition: that which valid cognition ascertains to only exist, in relation to a faultless subject of interest proving that, in a manner similar to the way it is put forth.
- ◇ This is about the relationship between the faultless subject of interest and the reason.
- ◇ Applied this into a specific syllogism:
 - ◇ **Sound** is the faultless subject of interest in proving that sound is impermanent by reason of **product** and **product** is ascertained by valid cognition to only exist [in a manner similar to the way it is put forth] with **sound**, by being mutually distinct from **sound**

The first mode: position property

- ◆ **Sound** is the faultless subject of interest in proving that sound is impermanent by reason of **product** and **product** is ascertained by valid cognition to only exist [in a manner similar to the way it is put forth] with **sound**, by being mutually distinct from **sound**
- ◆ Three main components in this definition:
 - ◆ Sound is the faultless subject of interest in proving that ...
 - ◆ Ascertainment that product only exists with sound, in accordance with the mode of proof (mode of statement)
 - ◆ Ascertainment that product is mutually distinct from sound

The first mode: position property

- ◆ Let's define the first mode in proving the person is not inherently existent by reason of "dependent arising"
- ◆ **Sound** is the faultless subject of interest in proving that **sound is impermanent** by reason of **product** and **product** is ascertained by valid cognition to only exist [in a manner similar to the way it is put forth] with **sound**, by being mutually distinct from **sound**.

Lecture

- ◆ KR GTT's recording: The faultless subject of interest (8 minutes)

The faultless subject of interest

- ◆ Pur-bu-jok's definition of a faultless subject of interest proving that sound is impermanent by reason of it being a product
- ◆ 'that which is observed to be a common locus between what is held to be the basis of dispute in proving that sound is impermanent by reason of it being a product; and a possible person who, having ascertained with valid cognition that it is a product, is interested in whether or not it is impermanent.'

The faultless subject of interest

- ◇ Questions: consider, take sound, it is impermanent because it is a product
 - ◇ Posit the FSOI for this syllogism
 - ◇ Can we posit “sound of music” as the FSOI for this syllogism
 - ◇ [Generalisation] Can we posit an instance of sound as the FSOI for this syllogism?

The faultless subject of interest

- ◆ ‘that which is observed to be a common locus between what is held to be the basis of dispute in proving that sound is impermanent by reason of it being a product; and a possible person who, having ascertained with valid cognition that it is a product, is interested in whether or not it is impermanent.’
- ◆ Define the FSOI in proving that “a person is not inherent existent by reason of dependent arising”