

, 'DIR SMRAS PA, @18B GAL TE BDAG
DANG GZHAN DANG GNYI GA DANG
RGYU MED PA LAS DNGOS PO RNAMS
SKYE BA YOD PA MA YIN NA, JI LTAR
BCOM LDAN 'DAS KYIS MA RIG PA'I
RKYEN GYIS 'DU BYED RNAMS ZHES
GSUNGS, BSHAD PAR BYA STE,

'DI NI KUN RDZOB PA YIN GYI DE KHO
NA NYID NI MA YIN NO,

, CI KUN RDZOB KYI RNAM PAR GZHAG
PA BRJOD PAR BYA BA YIN NAM ZHE
NA,

RKYEN NYID 'DI PA TZAM GYIS KUN
RDZOB GRUB PAR KHAS LEN GYI,
PHYOGS BZHI KHAS BLANGS PA'I SGO
NAS NI MA YIN TE,

DNGOS PO RANG BZHIN DANG BCAS PA
SMRA BAR THAL BAR 'GYUR BA'I
PHYIR DANG, DE YANG RIGS PA MA YIN
PA'I PHYIR RO,

, RKYEN NYID 'DI PA TZAM ZHIG KHAS
BLANGS NA NI RGYU DANG 'BRAS BU
GNYIS PHAN TSUN LTOS PA'I PHYIR,
NGO BO NYID KYIS GRUB PA YOD PA
MA YIN PAS
DNGOS PO RANG BZHIN DANG BCAS
PAR SMRA BAR 'GYUR BA MA YIN NO,

§81. At this point [the opponent] says,
“If things do not arise from self, from other,
from both or without a cause, then why did the
Exalted One say, ‘With ignorance as condition
(avidyāpratyaya), the impulses (saṃskāra)
[come to be]’?”

Reply: This is the surface [level] (saṃvṛti), not
true reality (tattva). §82.

[Question:] Is it, [in the case] of the surface level,
not necessary to point out how it is established
[i.e., in terms of svataḥ, etc.]?

[Answer:] The surface [level's] establishment
through mere conditionality* is accepted [by
us]; not, however, [an establishment] through
acceptance of the four-fold position.**

because [that] would entail [our admitting] a
doctrine [which posits that things are] endowed with
own-being*** and because that [acceptance of
any of the four positions] is inappropriate.

For when mere conditionality is accepted,
owing to the mutual reliance (anyonyāpekṣa)
of cause (hetu) and effect (phala), there is no
establishment implying own-being.****

Thus, a doctrine [whereby things are posited as]
endowed with own-being is not [maintained by us].

* (idampratyayatāmātra) ** (pakṣacatuṣṭaya),
*** (sasvabhāvavāda), **** (svābhā- vikī siddhiḥ

We accept the establishment of conventional
truth in terms of mere conditionedness, not on
the basis of adhering to any of the four
positions.

Otherwise there is the consequence that things
possess intrinsic nature,

[And] which is untenable.

If one accepts this mere conditionedness,
cause and effect will then be mutually
contingent and thus will not exist by virtue of
an essence.

As a result, one will then not speak of things
as being endowed with intrinsic nature