

Sixth case means the genitive case - the sixth of the eight cases. Sanskrit has eight grammatical cases. We have kind of similar six or eight cases means eight special kinds of linguistic indications. For example in English maybe first one is ngo wo ston pa('i sgra) – name, nominative case or something like that. Second, las su bya ba('i sgra) – the accusative case. Third, byed pa('i sgra) – means the doer/agent so, instrumental case, by such and such. Fourth, dgos ched (kyi sgra), purpose showing, that is the dative case.

Fifth, byung khungs (kyi sgra), place from where that comes – the ablative case. Sixth is 'brel sgra ('brel ba'i sgra), connection with the genitive or possessive case. {The seventh case is rten gnas kyi sgra – locative? – The eighth is 'bod pa'i sgra – Vocative case}

For example, if you talk about the relation between the branch and tree and you [can] say “the branch from the tree,” then where that branch comes from is the ablative. If you say “the branch of the tree,” that is the sixth, 'brel sgra ('brel ba'i sgra), in connection with the genitive or possessive case. The word *of* shows this.

If you say *branch tree* without any connecting particle between there it doesn't make sense. But “of” tree, it shows the relation of the tree and branch. So the text says *is the sixth case – potential and potential possessor* means the consciousness of the potential – nus pa'i rnam shes – Without the *particle of*, *consciousness potential* doesn't make sense. Between there some joining word.

Do you know Tibetan grammar, - gi, gyi, kyi, i, yi nga po, there are five letters which indicate - some of them gi, some of them gyi, some of them kyi, some of them i – that kind of showing this kind – here is yi. Nus pai – nam shes nus pa yi, nus pai, I shows the sixth case. Anyway, similar to branch of tree. NUS PA'I RNAM SHES – the consciousness of the ability, or the ability's consciousness, the potential's consciousness) DE'I TSE NI – if you put that way, then –

*the two are not suitable as different objects, hence, the consciousness of the potential is not suitable to exist as the potential itself;*

That is same time, the ability and the consciousness, the relation like that, same time. Then say these are inherently same time, then it is not cause and effect. So that *the consciousness of the ability* means like consciousness which is ability, itself kind of like ability/potential – showing like same thing. St, *since the two are not suitable as different objects* - not different nature because they should be inherently same nature.

*The consciousness of the potential is not suitable to exist as the potential itself* - NUS PA NYID DU YOD PA MI RIGS – *the consciousness of the ability* and the ability/potential itself kind of same thing, no difference. St, consciousness of the potential means consciousness and potential are at the same time. If they are independently different, or independently same, inherently same – if you say same, you cannot have this here.

*If [it, consciousness] exists [as its potential], the result would have no cause different from itself and...*

If they are inherently the same nature, same thing, no difference in entity, just name word, potential, consciousness of the potential, consciousness which is potential or potential which is consciousness, same kind of thing. If you talk of inherent way, these cannot be cause and effect. Even if one is the result, one is cause – if you accept that way, result which does not have RGYU MED PA CAN DU 'GYUR – cause does not exist there because they are the same thing. if they are inherently the same nature, then you don't have a separate cause,

same way, when rising sprout and its ability or its seed or potential, if they are the same time and not different nature then when the sprout rises *the seed would not be destroyed*, the seed would still be there, not destroyed. Usually there is cause and effect, when sprout rises, its seed is destroyed. Usually direct cause is seed, and sprout is the result. As soon as sprout appears seed is destroyed. If you are thinking here same thing – no different, same time, same entity, if you say same nature then this kind of situation will happen. That is based on inherent kind of nature.

Now second way - those two, the potential and the potential possessor, when you put - if you put the fifth case, ablative. That means the word from as in “the branch from the tree.” If that way, from, then the potential possessor is the consciousness, the potential itself is the seed. Those two are between there – the consciousness from the potential. If that kind of word is out there, - If this time, {consciousness rising cannot have the same time as the seed} The consciousness cannot be produced at the same time as the seed. The seed and consciousness should be separate – one is first ability in seed and then the consciousness will come. Cannot be the same time. seed which is the same time with consciousness cannot rise from that, because –

*Because the result would exist also at the time of the cause. In that case, first of all, present consciousness does not have a potential that is its cause.*

The result will be there at the time of cause. That cannot be because cause and effect are always different times. First the cause and then later the result. St, using this fifth case, they will be different entity or different time - if they are different, this time it cannot be nus pa and nus pa chan same time. Because ablative situation. St, one is first and result is second, cause and effect situation. St, this way cannot have. Both of them, same, inherently. So that is the la nus pa da tha wa. DA LTAR BA LA DE'I RGYU'I NUS PA YOD PA MA YIN NO - st, in this examination, present one cannot have its cause, nus pa, present one – cannot have them at the same time.

Now, in the future, then – *The second: if a potential exists for an unproduced consciousness, if “the potential of the consciousness” is joined/composed, the potential is the basis of qualities and the consciousness is the quality.*

The seed is first, potential. At that time consciousness is yet to come – it is future. if the potential exists at that time, the potential of something - that consciousness - which has not arisen right now, this is also kind of complicated.

When you say “seed of consciousness,” one is the khyad par kyi chos, {khyad chos = attribute, qualification} one is the khyad par kyi zhi {khyad gzhi = basis of attributes, substratum}. These are, I think, subject and predicate. The quality and the base of that quality, maybe subject or predicate. In order to – like tree’s ha (?) or the color of tree or the shape of tree or something like that. one is the quality, attribute, the other is the subject, so khyad zhi, khyad chos. what is wrong if you say ***the consciousness of the potential – nus pa’I nam shes***, (the potential of the consciousness – rnam par shes pa’I nus pa?)?

*There, a future, unproduced consciousness cannot be indicated as a positive entity called “consciousness” – it cannot be indicated as an inherently existent negative entity saying “is not consciousness.”*

consciousness is yet to come, not risen, it will come in the future, but not right now. How can you say the future consciousness itself, possessor of the potential, is inherently existent? Is this future consciousness a consciousness?

Positively you cannot say that is a consciousness because it is inherently not a consciousness because it is inherently not risen - inherently it has not come yet. Relatively you can say it has not come yet, but if it has inherently not come, it will never come because it will absolutely not come. In the same way, if something is past, absolutely past, inherently past, then completely every aspect is stopped, there is nothing.

St, in the future, relatively this is yet to come, but will be coming etc., in a relative sense, dependent situation you can have. But for the inherent situation, you cannot say this is the future consciousness, that which has not yet come. Not yet come means inherently it has not come, absolutely it has not come. So, you cannot say this consciousness is a positive entity, you cannot put that positively.

Then, if that is coming in the future, yet to come, if it is not yet consciousness, you also cannot say it is not consciousness. If you say it is not consciousness in a negative way, it is inherently not consciousness, that means not one time but absolutely. If it is inherently not consciousness, then it will never become consciousness at all. So, absolute kind of thing, that is the main point here. Inherent kind of negative way you cannot show - you cannot say it is inherently not consciousness. Relatively, right now not consciousness but will be consciousness sometime, dependent, relative cause and effect – that way you can say. So here, the main thing is inherent situation.