

- C: *Dhii!* The subject, in just the way [Mañjushri debated]. Posit the pervasion between functioning thing and non-associated compositional factor.
- D: **Whatever is a functioning thing is necessarily a non-associated compositional factor.**
- C: It follows that whatever is a functioning thing is necessarily a non-associated compositional factor.
- D: I accept it.
- C: It [absurdly] follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue, is a non-associated compositional factor.
- D: Why [is an eye consciousness apprehending blue a non-associated compositional factor]?
- C: Because of being a functioning thing. You asserted the pervasion [that whatever is a functioning thing is necessarily a non-associated compositional factor].
- D: The reason [that an eye consciousness apprehending blue is a functioning thing] is not established.
- C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue is a functioning thing because of being consciousness.
- D: The reason [that an eye consciousness apprehending blue is consciousness] is not established.
- C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue is consciousness, because of being clear and knowing.
- D: I accept [that an eye consciousness apprehending blue is clear and knowing].
- C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue is consciousness.
- D: I accept it.
- C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue is a functioning thing because of being consciousness.
- D: I accept [that an eye consciousness apprehending blue is a functioning thing].
- C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue, is a non-associated compositional factor because of being a functioning thing.
- D: I accept it.
- C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue is not a non-associated compositional factor because of being consciousness.
- D: There is no pervasion [i.e. even though an eye consciousness apprehending blue is consciousness, it is not the case that whatever is consciousness is necessarily not a non-associated compositional factor].
- C: It follows that whatever is consciousness is necessarily not a non-associated compositional factor, because a common locus between the two, consciousness and non-associated compositional factor, does not exist.
- D: The reason [that a common locus of the two, consciousness and non-associated compositional factor does not exist] is not established.
- C: It follows that a common locus of the two, consciousness and non-associated compositional factor, does not exist because non-associated compositional factor is defined as a composed phenomenon which is neither matter nor a consciousness.
- D: I accept that a common locus of the two, consciousness and non-associated compositional factor does not exist.
- C: It follows that whatever is a consciousness is necessarily not a non-associated compositional factor.
- D: I accept it.
- C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue is not a non-associated compositional factor.

D: I accept it.

C: It follows that the subject, an eye consciousness apprehending blue, is a non-associated compositional factor because of being a functioning thing.

D: There is no pervasion [i.e. even though an eye consciousness apprehending blue is a functioning thing, it is not the case that whatever is a functioning thing is necessarily a non-associated compositional factor].

C: **It follows that whatever is a functioning thing is not necessarily a non-associated compositional factor.**

D: **I accept it.**

C: [Your] basic thesis is finished!