

the present form; the former taste is a cooperative condition in the production of the present form. It is the Ge-luk-pa point of view that one can infer directly the attributes of the cause of the form from the presence of the taste of molasses; however, it is not possible to infer the form from the taste. This will become more clear when we look at the background of the discussion of this syllogism and at the syllogism itself in more detail.

The Ge-luk-pa discussion arises from a passage in the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* in which Dharmakīrti discusses the Sāṃkhya assertion that it is valid to prove the existence of the present form of molasses from the existence of the present taste.<sup>a</sup> The Buddhists do not consider this valid, because there is not a strictly defined logical relationship between taste and form. Before discussing the Sāṃkhya and Buddhist points of view, it may be helpful to make clear the basis of the debate under consideration.

In some Buddhist texts, the subject of the debate under consideration is “with the lump of molasses in the mouth.” Of this, Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa notes,

Some books use that as a subject, but I have qualms about it. It is strange; these [that is, the Buddhists and the Sāṃkhyas] are skilled opponents, and it doesn't make sense.<sup>221</sup>

In his opinion, the basis of debate, “a lump of molasses” is not very helpful. If a lump is present in the mouth, it will be directly perceived, and who then would have doubt concerning the existence of the form; why would a sign ever be needed? Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa suggests as an alternative basis of debate, “At the time when there is a sweet taste but the lump of molasses has dissolved and only a slight residue, visible as a yellow stain, remains.”<sup>222</sup> There must be a time when doubt is possible concerning the existence of the form [of molasses]. He adds,

The time when a doubt can exist is when there is a sweet taste but the lump of molasses has melted and only a brownish or

---

<sup>a</sup> In consequence of this assertion, the Sāṃkhyas add that evidently there are more than three kinds of correct signs (effect, nature, and nonobservation), because this sign (that is, the existence of the present taste) is clearly not one of those three. According to Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa, “Dharmakīrti answers that the Sāṃkhya argument depends on one's being able to realize the present form of molasses from the present taste of molasses. If that were true, there would be a fourth kind of sign; but there is no way to understand the present form from the present taste.” This brief account of the background of the discussion of this syllogism is based on commentary from Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa, vol. 3, p. 4.

yellowish stain is left. At that time, there is a difference in the way the two opponents view the situation.<sup>a</sup>

At that time, there is no discernable form and thus there may be doubt regarding whether or not the form of molasses exists. Sāṃkhyas and Buddhists agree that the existence of the form of molasses can be inferred, but the reasons they employ are different. According to the Sāṃkhyas, one can infer the form directly from the taste; according to the Buddhists, one cannot do so because form and taste are not related. As Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa says,

According to the Sāṃkhyas, one infers the present form from the present taste. However, for the Buddhists, the existence of the present taste is not a correct sign [in the proof of the existence of the present form] because there is no relationship between the sign [taste] and the predicate of the probandum [form].<sup>223</sup>

Thus, according to the Buddhists, the Sāṃkhyas would consider the following to be a correct syllogism: “With respect to the subject, on the tongue where there is the taste of molasses but no lump, form exists because taste exists.” But from the Buddhist point of view this is not valid reasoning. The taste cannot prove the form because it is not related with the form. Taste and form occur together as parts of one collection; and they are simultaneous—if one is eliminated, the other is also necessarily eliminated because their production, abiding, and disintegration are simultaneous. But in the technical sense of relationship they are *not* related, because it is not *by the power* of the elimination of the one that the other is eliminated.

According to Ge-luk-pa scholars, this type of effect sign is set forth to explain that one can, in fact, *infer* the existence of the present form from the existence of the present taste; but one cannot use the existence of the present taste as a correct sign in the proof of the existence of the present form. It is only by inferring causal attributes (the fifth type of correct effect sign) that one is able to infer the present form. Lati Rin-po-che comments,

There does exist in general an inferential consciousness that

---

<sup>a</sup> Ibid., vol. 3, p. 6. Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa also says here, “It is easier to understand this debate if one thinks of the form as being, in this case, not the shape of the molasses, but the color. If it is the color, then it is not correct to posit as the subject, ‘with the lump of molasses,’ because if there is a ‘lump’ there is shape; and if there is shape, there is no doubt concerning the existence of form.”

realizes the existence of the present form of molasses in dependence on the existence of the present taste of molasses. However, it is not in dependence on the sign as stated in this syllogism, “The subject, with the lump of molasses in the mouth, there exists the present form of molasses because of the existence of the present taste of molasses.”<sup>224</sup>

Thus, according to these scholars, the existence of the present taste cannot serve as a correct sign proving the existence of the present form because taste and form are not related. Having shown that it is not a correct sign, however, they go on to explain that from the presence of the present taste, the presence of the present form is, indeed, ascertained but only in combination with another ascertainment: ascertainment of the capacity of the prior taste to generate the present form.

There is apparent agreement among Ge-luk-pa scholars that two inferences are generated in dependence on the syllogism under consideration, “With respect to the subject, with the lump of molasses in the mouth, there exists the capacity of the former taste of molasses to generate the later form of molasses because the present taste of molasses exists.” One is the inference realizing that the former taste has the capacity to produce the present form, and the other is the inference realizing the existence of the present form. As Lati Rin-po-che says,

Thus in dependence on a correct effect sign that is a means of inferring causal attributes two different types of inferential consciousness are produced, one that realizes the existence of the capacity of the former taste of the molasses to produce the present form and one that realizes the existence of the present form of the molasses.<sup>225</sup>

Knowing that the cause of the present taste of molasses has as attributes both form and taste, one can conclude that the former taste of molasses serves as cause of the later form in its capacity as supporting condition. Then, from the present taste one can infer the capacity of the former taste to produce not only the later (that is to say, the present) taste, but also the present form (the attributes of form and taste go together). Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa puts it clearly,

Here [in this illustration] we are dealing with cooperative conditions. One understands that the former taste of molasses has the capacity to produce the present form of molasses. If [one understands that] there exists the capacity of the former taste

of molasses to produce the next [moment of the] form of the molasses, then one has to understand also [the existence] of the present form of molasses.<sup>226</sup>

There are important similarities between Pur-bu-jok's fifth type of effect sign and Mokṣākaragupta's third:

When the colour, etc., [of a citron, etc.] is the object to be proved, the taste, etc., is to be determined [as the logical mark as effect] through both being dependent [for their production] on one and the same set of causes, as [we infer] the color of a citron from its taste.<sup>227</sup>

In this proof, the predicate is "color" and the sign is "taste"; according to Mokṣākaragupta, from taste one infers color because they depend on the same set of causes. He posits this type of effect sign to demonstrate how the causal relationship between phenomena such as color and taste is to be ascertained: through their depending on the same set of causes.

In Mokṣākaragupta's explanation and that of the Ge-luk-pas, a similar illustration is used, one that addresses the same problem of how form (or color) can be inferred from taste. Ge-luk-pa scholars would agree with Mokṣākaragupta that the color and taste of molasses (or of a "citron") depend on the same set of causes; as Lati Rin-po-che says, "The taste and form of the molasses are produced from one collection of causes."<sup>228</sup> Mokṣākaragupta explains his illustration this way:

In this...case, the preceding colour is the material cause in relation to the colour to be produced, and the [preceding] taste [which is the material cause of the subsequent taste, necessarily cooperates with the preceding colour] as the auxiliary cause (*sahakārikāraṇa*) [for the production of the subsequent colour]. This is the logical [relation] involved in the production of the lump [of citron] at the subsequent moment from that at the preceding moment.<sup>229</sup>

This is very similar to the Ge-luk-pa commentary on the example posited by Pur-bu-jok. The shared cause of the color and taste of molasses includes a former moment of color and of taste. The former taste is the dominant condition for the production of the present taste and is a supporting condition for the production of the present color. Ge-luk-pa scholars go on to emphasize the complexity of the inference involved: from the taste of molasses one does in fact infer its form, but the presence of the taste cannot serve alone as a correct sign of the presence of

the form.<sup>a</sup>

Ge-luk-pa scholars explain that, in a correct proof, there must be a precise technical relationship between sign and predicate, but between taste and form there is not such a relationship (as there is between fire and smoke). It is acceptable to conclude from the presence of smoke that there is also fire, but to conclude from the presence of taste that there is form is a much more complex inference. This takes one into the background of the functioning of reasoning: It is only because one knows that fire is the cause of smoke that smoke can serve as a sign proving the presence of fire; and it is only because one knows that certain qualities of an object occur together (the color, shape, taste, etc., or molasses, for example) that one can infer from the presence of one the presence of the other. However, Ge-luk-pa scholars consider it important not to view this latter inference as arising simply—in the same way as the inference understanding the presence of fire arises.

There is no relationship between taste and form, and thus ascertaining form from taste is a more complex operation of inference than ascertaining fire from smoke. A person must know that form and taste occur together and that former and later moments of form and taste are in a relationship of cooperative cause and cooperative condition—understanding the relationship between the whole collection of causes and the collection of effects. In its capacity as cooperative condition, the former taste produces the present moment of form. By the presence of the present moment of taste one infers this complex relationship, giving rise to two inferences, one of which is of the present moment of form. Thus one does in fact ascertain the presence of the present moment of form, but not simply—not through ascertaining a simple cause-and-effect relationship.

Pur-bu-jok briefly presents another way of dividing correct effect signs. He writes,

In another way, when correct effect signs are divided, there are two. This is because smoke is a correct effect sign that relates to the similar class as a pervader in the proof of the existence of the direct cause of smoke on a smoky pass, and smoke is an effect sign that relates to the similar class in two ways in the proof of the existence of fire on a smoky pass.<sup>230</sup>

The two types are (1) correct effect signs that relate to the similar class

---

<sup>a</sup> See, for example, the comments above by Ge-shay Pel-den-drak-pa and Lati Rin-poche.