

[The selection here is from a monastic textbook popularly known as The Collected Topics of the Spiritual Son (Sras bsdus-grva), by Master Ngawang Trashī, the spiritual son of the great Jamyang Shepa (1648-1721).]

[Please note that indented statements are usually those given by the opponent. Responses within brackets are those that are usually left unwritten in the Tibetan text, and are understood to be there because of the context following each.]

` , , DGAG SGRUB KYI RNAM BZHAG BSHAD PA LA, KHA CIG NA RE,
DNGOS PO YIN NA SGRUB PA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Here next is a presentation on the concepts of negative and positive. We will first refute the position of our opponents, then present our own position, and then finally eliminate their rebuttal.

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Anything which is a working thing must always be something positive.

SGRA MI RTAG PA CHOS CAN, SGRUB PA YIN PAR THAL, DNGOS PO YIN
PA'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider the fact that sound is not unchanging.
So is it then something positive?
Because it is a working thing.

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

'DOD NA, SGRA MI RTAG PA CHOS CAN, SGRUB PA MA YIN PAR THAL,
DGAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: the fact that sound is not unchanging is something positive.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider the fact that sound is not unchanging.

It is not so, that it is something positive,
Because it is something negative.

DER THAL, RANG DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I BLOS RANG GI DGAG BYA
DNGOS SU BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA GANG ZHIG,
RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA DNGOS SU BCAD
NAS BRJOD DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the fact that sound is not unchanging is
something negative.]

It is so,
Because (1) it is a thing which must be perceived by the state of mind that
perceives it directly through the process of eliminating, directly, the thing
that it denies; and (2) it is a thing which must be expressed through a
process where the wording used to express it does so through a process of
eliminating, directly, the thing that it denies.

RTAGS GNYIS PA GRUB STE, SGRA MI RTAG CES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS SGRA
RTAG PA YIN PA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BCAD NAS SGRA MI RTAG PAR
BRJOD PAR BYA BA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR, DE 'DZIN PA'I BLO LA YANG RIGS
'DRA,

[The second part of your last statement is not correct: the fact that
sound is not unchanging is not a thing which must be
expressed through a process where the actual wording used
to express it does so through a process of eliminating,
directly, the thing that it denies.]

The second part of our last statement is so true,
Because the expression "sound is not unchanging" is one where the fact that
sound is not unchanging is expressed through eliminating, directly, the
idea that sound is something unchanging—by saying so explicitly.

KHA CIG NA RE, RANG GI DNGOS MING GI MTHAR MED TSIG SBYAR BA'I
CHOS YIN NA, MED DGAG YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Whenever the actual name for something incorporates a word for the absence of something, then the thing is always a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something.

SANGS RGYAS TSE DPAG MED CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider the Buddha known as "Limitless Life" (Amitayus).

So is he [a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something]?

Because he is [something where his actual name incorporates a word for the absence of something].

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

MA GRUB NA, SANGS RGYAS TSE DPAG MED CHOS CAN, DER THAL, SANGS RGYAS TSE DPAG MED CES BRJOD PA'I SGRA DE KHYOD KYI DNGOS MING YIN PA GANG ZHIGDE'I MTHAR MED TSIG SBYAR BA MNGON SUM DU GRUB PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the Buddha known as "Limitless Life" is something where his actual name incorporates a word for the absence of something.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the Buddha known as "Limitless Life."

He is so [something where his actual name incorporates a word for the absence of something],

Because (1) the term "the Buddha known as 'Limitless Life'" is his actual name, and (2) the fact that his name incorporates a word for the absence of something is an example of the obvious level of reality.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA SANGS RGYAS TSE DPAG MED CHOS CAN, MED DGAG MA YIN PAR THAL, DNGOS PO YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[I agree to your original statement: the Buddha known as "Limitless

Life" is a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider the Buddha known as "Limitless Life."

It is not so, that he is a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something,

Because he is a working thing.

MA KHYAB NA KHYAB PA YOD PAR THAL, MED DGAG YIN NA RTAG PA YIN PAS KHYAB PA'I PHYIR,

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

Suppose you say that it doesn't necessarily follow.

It does so necessarily follow,

Because anything which is a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something is always an unchanging thing.

KHA CIG NA RE, DGAG PA YIN NA RANG GI DNGOS MING LA DGAG TSIG SBYAR BA'I CHOS YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Anything which is a negative thing is always a thing which has a term of negation incorporated into its actual name.

NAM MKHA' CHOS CAN, RANG GI DNGOS MING LA DGAG TSIG SBYAR BA'I CHOS YIN PAR THAL, DGAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider space.

So is it then a thing which has a term of negation incorporated into its actual name?

Because it is a negative thing.

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

MA GRUB NA, NAM MKHA' CHOS CAN, DGAG PA YIN PAR THAL, MED
DGAG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that space is a negative thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider space.

It is so a negative thing,

Because it is a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something.

MA GRUB NA, NAM MKHA' CHOS CAN, MED DGAG YIN PAR THAL,
THOG REG BCAD TZAM GYI MED DGAG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that space is a negative thing in the sense of
being the absence of something.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider space.

It is so a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something,

Because, by being the simple elimination of all obstruction, it is a negative thing
in the sense of being the absence of something.

DER THAL, 'DUS MA BYAS KYI NAM MKHA' YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that space, by being the simple elimination of
all obstruction, it is a negative thing in the sense of being the
absence of something.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

It is so,

Because it is that space which is an unproduced thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, NAM MKHA' CHOS CAN, RANG GI DNGOS MING LA

DGAG TSIG SBYAR BA'I CHOS MA YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD KYI DNGOS MING GI ZUR DU DGAG TSIG MED PA'I PHYIR,

[I agree to your original statement: space is a thing which has a term of negation incorporated into its actual name.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider space.

It is not so a thing which has a term of negation incorporated into its actual name,

Because there is no term of negation that forms a part of its actual name.

MA GRUB NA, NAM MKHA' CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI DNGOS MING GI ZUR DU DGAG TSIG MED PAR THAL, NAM MKHA' ZHES PA'I SGRA DE KHYOD KYI DNGOS MING YIN PA GANG ZHIG, NAM DANG MKHA' ZHES PA GNYIS GANG YANG DGAG TSIG MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that there is no term of negation that forms a part of the actual name of "space."]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider space.

It is so true, that there is no term of negation that forms a part of its actual name, Because (1) the expression "space" (*nam-ka*) is its actual name, and (2) neither of the two parts of this expression, *nam* or *ka*, is a term of negation.

GZHAN YANG , CHOS NYID CHOS CAN, RANG GI DNGOS MING GI MTHAR DGAG TSIG SBYAR BA'I CHOS YIN PAR THAL, DGAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

We can also make this point another way.

Consider the nature of things.

So is this then a thing where its actual name incorporates a term of negation?

Because it is a negative thing.

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

RTAGS GRUB STE, MED DGAG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the nature of things is a negative thing.]

It is correct,

Because the nature of things is a negative thing in the sense of being the absence of something.

RTZA BAR 'DOD MI NUS TE, RANG GI DNGOS MING GI MTHAR DGAG
TSIG MA SBYAR KYANG , RANG DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I BLOS RANG GI
DGAG BYA DNGOS SU BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I
PHYIR,

[I agree with your original statement: the nature of things is a thing
where its actual name incorporates a term of negation.]

But you can't agree with our original statement,

Because—even though it is a thing where its actual name incorporates no term of negation—the nature of things is a thing which must be perceived by the state of mind that perceives it directly through the process of eliminating, directly, the thing that it denies.

KHYAB STE, RANG DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I BLOS RANG GI DGAG BYA
DNGOS SU BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN NA DGAG PA YIN PAS
KHYAB PA'I PHYIR,

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But it does necessarily follow,

Because anything which a thing which must be perceived by the state of mind that perceives it directly through the process of eliminating, directly, the thing that it denies is always a negative thing.

DE LA KHA CIG NA RE, GZUGS CHOS CAN, DGAG PA YIN PAR THAL,
RANG DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I BLOS RANG GI DGAG BYA DNGOS SU BCAD
NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose that, on this point, someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider physical things.

Are they then negative things?

Because they are things which must be perceived by the state of mind that perceives them directly through the process of eliminating, directly, the thing that they deny.

MA GRUB NA, GZUGS CHOS CAN, DER THAL, RANG DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I RTOG PAS RANG GI DGAG BYA DNGOS SU BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose you say that it's not correct [to say that physical things are things which must be perceived by the state of mind that perceives them directly through the process of eliminating, directly, the thing that they deny].

Consider physical things.

They are so such things,

Because they are things which must be perceived by the conceptualization which perceives them directly through the process of eliminating, directly, the thing that they deny.

MA GRUB NA, GZUGS CHOS CAN, DER THAL, RANG 'DZIN PA'I RTOG PAS RANG MA YIN PA RNAM PAR BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

Suppose you say that it's not correct [to say that physical things are things which must be perceived by the conceptualization which perceives them directly through the process of eliminating, directly, the thing that they deny].

Consider physical things.

They are so such things,

Because they are things which must be perceived by the conceptualization which perceives them directly through the process of eliminating, directly, all that they are not.

To this last we answer, "It doesn't necessarily follow."

MA GRUB NA, GZUGS CHOS CAN, KHYOD 'DZIN PA'I RTOG PAS KHYOD
MA YIN PA RNAM PAR BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PAR
THAL, KHYOD GZHI GRUB PA'I PHYIR,

And suppose you said that it wasn't correct [to say that physical things are things
which must be perceived by the conceptualization which perceives them
directly through the process of eliminating, directly, all that they are not].

Consider physical things.

They are so things which must be perceived through the process of eliminating,
directly, all that they are not,
Because they can be established as existing.

KHA CIG NA RE, BUM PA CHOS CAN, SGRUB PA MA YIN PAR THAL,
DGAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider a water pitcher.

It is not so true, that it is something positive,
Because it is something negative.

MA GRUB NA, BUM PA CHOS CAN, DGAG PA YIN PAR THAL, RANG
DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I RTOG PAS RANG MA YIN PA RNAM PAR BCAD
NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

Suppose you say that it's not correct [to say that a water pitcher is
something negative].

Consider a water pitcher.

It is so something negative,
Because it is a thing which must be perceived by the
conceptualization which perceives it directly through the
process of eliminating, directly, all that it is not.

To this we answer, "It doesn't necessarily follow."

MA GRUB NA, BUM PA CHOS CAN, KHYOD DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I RTOG

PAS KHYOD MA YIN PA RNAM PAR BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS
YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD GZHI GRUB PA'I PHYIR,

And suppose you say that it's not correct [to say that a water pitcher is a thing
which must be perceived by the conceptualization which perceives it
directly through the process of eliminating, directly, all that it is not].

Consider a water pitcher.

It is so a thing which must be perceived by the conceptualization which
perceives it directly through the process of eliminating, directly, all that it
is not,

Because it is something which can be established as existing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, BUM PA CHOS CAN, DGAG PA MA YIN PAR THAL,
SGRUB PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And suppose you did agree to that original statement [that a water pitcher is
something negative].

Consider a water pitcher.

It is not so true, that it is a negative thing,

Because it is a positive thing.

MA GRUB NA, BUM PA CHOS CAN, SGRUB PA YIN PAR THAL, BUM PA
DANG GCIG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a water pitcher is a positive thing.]

Consider a water pitcher.

It is so a positive thing,

Because it is one and the same as a water pitcher.

KHA CIG NA RE, MA YIN DGAG YIN NA, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS
RANG GI DGAG BYA BKAG SHUL DU CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG
SGRUB PA GANG RUNG DNGOS SU 'PHEN PA'I CHOS YIN PAS KHYAB
ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is a negative in the sense of not being something, then it is always a thing where the term which expresses it directly implies something else—either a negative in the same sense or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies.

LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA BA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider the fact that John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day. So is it then [a thing where the term which expresses it directly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies]? Because it is [something negative in the sense of not being something].

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

MA GRUB NA, LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA BA CHOS CAN, MA YIN DGAG YIN PAR THAL, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG 'PHEN PAR BYED PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the fact that John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day is something negative in the sense of not being something.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the fact that John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day. It is so a negative in the sense of not being something, because it is a thing where the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.

DER THAL, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS NYIN PAR ZAS ZA BA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS MTSAN MO ZA BA SHUGS LA 'PHANGS PA GANG ZHIG, MTSAN MO ZA BA SGRUB PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the fact that John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day is a thing where the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies.]

It is so,

Because (1) the term which expresses it directly denies that he eats during the day, and implies indirectly that he eats at night; and (2) the fact that he eats at night is something positive.

RTZA BAR 'DOD MI NUS TE, LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA
BA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU
BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG
DNGOS SU MI 'PHEN KYANG SHUGS LA 'PHEN PAR BYED PA DE YIN PA'I
PHYIR,

[I agree to your original statement: The fact that John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day is a thing where the term which expresses it directly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.]

You can't agree to our original statement,

Because even though the expression "John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day" does not directly imply something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies, it nonetheless does do so indirectly.

DER THAL, LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA BA ZHES PA'I
SGRA 'DIS NYIN PAR ZAS ZA BA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS MTSAN MO ZA BA
SHUGS LA 'PHEN PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's incorrect to say that, even though the expression "John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day" does not directly imply something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies, it nonetheless does do so indirectly.]

It is so,

Because the expression "John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day" directly denies that he eats during the day, and indirectly implies that he eats at night.

BYAS PA LA KHO NA RE, LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN BAR ZAS MI ZA BA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG SHUGS LA 'PHEN PAR BYED PA MA YIN PAR THAL, BRAM ZE CHANG MI 'THUNG BA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG SHUGS LA 'PHEN PA MA YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

On this point, someone may come and make the following claim:

It is not so, that the expression "John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day" indirectly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording,

Because it is not true that the expression "The Brahmin drinks no alcohol" indirectly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.

Our answer to this is, "It doesn't necessarily follow."

RTAGS GRUB STE, BRAM ZE CHANG MI 'THUNG BA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG DNGOS SHUGS GANG RUNG DU MI 'PHEN PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And it is correct to say that it is correct [to say that the expression "The Brahmin drinks no alcohol" indirectly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording],

Because the expression "The Brahmin drinks no alcohol" neither indirectly nor directly implies something else—neither a negative in the sense of not being something, nor a positive—incidental to denying what it denies

directly in the actual wording.

DER THAL, BRAM ZE CHANG MI 'THUNG BA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS BRAM
ZE CHANG 'THUNG BA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN
MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG MI 'PHEN PAR BYED PA
YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And this is so,

Because the expression "The Brahmin drinks no alcohol" implies nothing else—
neither a negative in the sense of not being something, nor a positive—
incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.

DER THAL, BRAM ZE CHANG MI 'THUNG BA MED DGAG TU 'JOG DGOS
PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And this is so,

Because the expression "The Brahmin drinks no alcohol" must be considered a
negative thing in the sense of an absence of something.

KHA CIG NA RE, MA YIN DGAG YIN NA, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS
RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN
MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG 'PHEN PAR BYED PA YIN
PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is a negative thing in the sense of not being
something, then it is always such that the term which expresses it
implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being
something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies
directly in the actual wording.

RTAG PA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider an unchanging thing.

So is it then [always such that the term which expresses it implies something
else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—
incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording]?

Because it is [a negative thing in the sense of not being something].

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

MA GRUB NA, RTAG PA CHOS CAN, MA YIN DGAG YIN PAR THAL, DGAG
PA GANG ZHIG, MED DGAG MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that an unchanging thing is a negative thing
in the sense of not being something.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider an unchanging thing.

It is so a negative thing in the sense of not being something,
Because (1) it is a negative thing, and (2) it is not a negative thing in the sense of
being the absence of something.

RTAGS DANG PO MA GRUB NA, RTAG PA CHOS CAN, DGAG PA YIN PAR
THAL, RTAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The first part of your reason is not correct: it is not correct to say
that an unchanging thing is a negative thing.]

Suppose you say that the first part of our reason is not correct.

Consider an unchanging thing.

It is so a negative thing,
Because it is unchanging.

MA KHYAB NA KHYAB PA YOD PAR THAL, RTAG PAR GYUR PA'I SGRUB
PA RANG DBANG BA MED PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not necessarily the case that something is unchanging just
because it is a negative thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not necessarily the case.

It is so necessarily the case,

Because there is no such thing as a discrete object which is a positive thing and still unchanging.

DER THAL, SGRUB PA RANG DBANG BA YIN NA DNGOS PO YIN PAS KHYAB PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that there is no such thing as a discrete object which is a positive thing and still unchanging.]

It is so,

Because anything that is a discrete object which is a positive thing must always be a working thing.

GONG DU 'DOD MI NUS TE, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG 'PHEN PAR BYED PA YIN KYANG , RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA 'GOG PAR BYED PA MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[I agree with the original statement above: an unchanging thing is always such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.]

You can't agree with the original statement above,

Because even though an unchanging thing is such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—it is not something that does so incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.

DER THAL, RTAG PA ZHES PA'I TSIG 'DI LA DGAG TSIG SBYAR BA MED PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that, even though an unchanging thing is such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—it is not something that does so incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.]

It is so,

Because [in the Tibetan] the expression "unchanging" [*takpa*] does not incorporate a negative term.

KHA CIG NA RE, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN
DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG 'PHEN PAR BYED PA YIN NA,
RANG NYID DGAG PA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Anything which is such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—must always be a negative thing.

BYAS PA CHOS CAN, RANG NYID DGAG PA YIN PAR THAL, RANG ZHES
BRJOD PA'I SGRAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG
RUNG 'PHEN PAR BYED PA YIN PA'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider a thing which is made.

So is it then a negative thing?

Because it is such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive.

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does follow.

MA GRUB NA, BYAS PA CHOS CAN, KHYOD CES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS CHOS
GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG 'PHEN PAR BYED
PA YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD CES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS KHYOD KYI RGYU
RKYEN 'PHEN PAR BYED PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a thing which is made is such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive].

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider a thing which is made.

It is so such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive,

Because the term which expresses it implies that it had causes and conditions.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, BYAS PA CHOS CAN, DGAG PA MA YIN PAR THAL,
SGRUB PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[I agree to your original statement: a thing which is made is a
negative thing.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider a thing which is made.
It is not so, that it is a negative thing,
Because it is a positive thing.

MA GRUB NA, BYAS PA SGRUB PA YIN PAR THAL, DNGOS PO SGRUB PA
YIN PA GANG ZHIGDE GNYIS 'DRA BA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a thing which is made is a positive
thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

A thing which is made is so a positive thing,
Because working things are positive things, and the two are similar cases.

KHA CIG NA RE, BYAS PA CHOS CAN, SGRUB PA MA YIN PAR THAL,
DGAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider a thing which is made.
It is not so, that it is a positive thing,
Because it's a negative thing.

MA GRUB NA, BYAS PA DGAG PA YIN PAR THAL, SGRA BYAS PA DGAG
PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose you say that it's not correct [that a thing which is made is a

negative thing].

A thing which is made is so a negative thing,
Because the fact that sound is something which is made is a
negative thing.

MA GRUB NA, DER THAL, SGRA BYAS PA YIN NO ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS
SGRA BYAS PA MA YIN PA RNAM PAR BCAD NAS BRJOD DGOS PA'I CHOS
YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

And suppose you say that it's not correct [to say that the fact that
sound is something which is made is a negative thing].

It is so,

Because the expression "sound is something which is made" is a
thing which must be expressed in such a way that eliminates
the possibility that sound could not be something which is
made.

Our answer to this is, "It doesn't necessarily follow" [that, because the expression
"sound is something which is made" is a thing which must be expressed in
such a way that eliminates the possibility that sound could not be
something which is made, then the fact that sound is something which is
made must be a negative thing].

'O NA, KHYOD RANG LA GZUGS DGAG PA YIN PAR THAL, GZUGS ZHES
BRJOD PA'I SGRAS GZUGS MA YIN PA RNAM PAR BCAD NAS BRJOD
DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Well then, according to you physical things must be negative things,
Because physical things are things such that the expression "physical things"
must be expressed in such a way that eliminates everything which is not a
physical thing.

'DOD NA, SGRUB PA MED PAR THAL, GZUGS SGRUB PA MA YIN PA'I
PHYIR,

[I agree physical things must be negative things.]

Suppose you agree.

So are there then no positive things at all?

Because physical things are not positive things.

'DOD NA, GZHI GRUB NA, DGAG PA YIN PAS KHYAB PAR THAL, SGRUB
PA MED PA'I PHYIR,

[I agree that there are no positive things at all.]

Suppose you agree.

So is it then the case that anything which can be established as existing is always
something negative?

Because there exist no positive things.

RTAGS KHAS, 'DOD MI NUS,

You already agreed to what we just stated as our reason.

And you cannot agree to our first statement, [that anything which can be
established as existing is always something negative].

KHA CIG NA RE, GZUGS DE GZUGS ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRA 'DIS GZUGS
MA YIN PA RNAM PAR BCAD NAS BRJOD DGOS PA'I CHOS MIN ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

It's not true of physical things that they are things such that the
expression "physical things" must be expressed in such a way that
eliminates everything which is not a physical thing.

DE YIN PAR THAL, GZUGS DE GZUGS ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS GZUGS MA
YIN PA RNAM PAR BSAL NAS BRJOD DGOS PA'I CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR,

They are so,

Because it is true of physical things that they are things such that the expression
"physical things" must be expressed in such a way that excludes
everything which is not a physical thing.

DER THAL, GZUGS ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRA GZUGS LA SEL 'JUG YIN PA'I

PHYIR,

[It's not correct that physical things are such that the expression "physical things" must be expressed in such a way that excludes everything which is not a physical thing.]

It is so,

Because the expression "physical things" applies to physical things in an exclusive way.

KHYAB STE, SEL 'JUG CES PA'I SEL BA'I DON NI CHOS DE MA YIN PA RNAM PAR SEL BA LA LTOS DGOS PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And this is necessarily so,

Because the words "in an exclusive way" in the expression "apply to something in an exclusive way" mean that one must rely on excluding all that the particular thing is not.

` , RANG GI LUGS LA, DGAG PA'I MTSAN NYID YOD DE, RANG DNGOS SU RTOGS PA'I BLOS RANG GI DGAG BYA DNGOS SU BCAD NAS RTOGS DGOS PA'I CHOS DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Here secondly is the presentation of our own position. There does exist a definition of a negative thing, because it is the following:

A thing which must be perceived by the state of mind which perceives it directly through a process of eliminating, directly, that which it denies.

DGAG PA DANG , SEL BA DANG , GZHAN SEL DANG , LDOG PA BZHI DON

The four terms "negative thing," "exclusion," "exclusion of all other," and "reversal" all refer to the same thing.

GCIGDGG PA LA DBYE NA GNYIS YOD DE, MA YIN DGAG DANG MED DGAG GNYIS YOD PA'I PHYIR,

Negative things may be divided into two different types: things that are negative in the sense of not being something, and things that are negative in the sense of the absence of something.

MA YIN DGAG GI MTSAN NYID YOD DE, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS
RANG GI DGAG BYA BKAG SHUL DU CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG
SGRUB PA GANG RUNG 'PHEN PA'I DGAG PA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist a definition for a "negative thing in the sense of not being something," because it is the following:

A negative thing such that the term which expresses it implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies.

MTSAN GZHI NI YOD DE, SGRA MI RTAG PA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist a classic example of a negative thing in the sense of not being something, for it is "sounds are [always] changing things."

MED DGAG GI MTSAN NYID YOD DE, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS
RANG GI DGAG BYA BKAG SHUL DU CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG
SGRUB PA GANG RUNG MI 'PHEN PA'I DGAG PA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist a definition for a negative thing in the sense of being an absence of something, for it is the following:

A negative thing such that the term which expresses it does not imply something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies.

MTSAN GZHI NI YOD DE, GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist a classical example of a negative thing in the sense of being an absence of something, for it is the fact that no person has any nature of their own.

DGAG PA LA DBYE NA LNGA YOD DE, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS
RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN
MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG DNGOS SU 'PHEN PA

DANG , SHUGS LA 'PHEN PA DANG , DNGOS SHUGS GNYIS KAR 'PHEN PA DANG , SKABS THOB KYIS 'PHEN PA DANG , RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG MI 'PHEN PA DANG LNGA YOD PA'I PHYIR,

Negative things may be divided into five different types:

- 1) Those which are such that the term which expresses them directly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording;
- 2) Those where the term which expresses them does this implying indirectly;
- 3) Those where the term which expresses them does this implying both directly and indirectly;
- 4) Those where the term which expresses them does this implying by context;
- 5) Those which are such that the term which expresses them implies nothing else—neither a negative in the sense of not being something, nor a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.

DANG PO RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG DNGOS SU 'PHEN PA'I DGAG PA YOD DE, BUM PA GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED YOD PA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist the first type, the kind which are such that the term which expresses them directly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording, because one would be the fact that the fact that no person has any nature of their own is true of a water pitcher.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN

DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG DNGOS SU 'PHEN PA'I DGAG PA
YIN PAR THAL, RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG
ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG PA GANG ZHIGCHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG
DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG DNGOS SU 'PHEN PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose you say that this is not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so true that it is the kind of negative thing which is such that the term which expresses it directly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording,

Because (1) the term which expresses it denies what it denies directly in the actual wording; and (2) it also directly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive.

RTAGS DANG PO GRUB STE, BUM PA GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED YOD PA
ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRA 'DIS BUM PA GANG ZAG GI BDAG TSIG ZIN LA
'GOG PAR BYED PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The first part of the reason you gave is incorrect: it is not correct to say that the term which expresses the fact that the fact that no person has any nature of their own is true of a water pitcher denies what it denies directly in the actual wording.]

But the first part of our reason is correct,

Because the expression "the fact that the fact that no person has any nature of their own is true of a water pitcher" denies, in its actual wording, the possibility that any nature of their own that belonged to some person could ever be true of a water pitcher.

RTAGS GNYIS PA GRUB STE, BUM PA GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED YOD PA
ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRA 'DIS BUM PA GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED YOD PA
DNGOS SU 'PHANGS PA GANG ZHIG, BUM PA GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED
YOD PA MA YIN DGAG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The second part of the reason you gave is incorrect: it is not correct to say that the term which expresses the fact that the fact that no person has any nature of their own is true of a water pitcher also directly implies something else—either a

negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive.]

But the second part of our reason is correct,

Because the expression "the fact that the fact that no person has any nature of their own is true of a water pitcher" (1) directly implies that the fact that no person has any nature of their own exists, and (2) the fact that the fact that no person has any nature of their own is true of a water pitcher is a negative thing in the sense of not being something.

RTAGS DANG PO SLA, GNYIS PA MA GRUB NA, BUM PA GANG ZAG GI
BDAG MED CHOS CAN, KHYOD YOD PA MA YIN DGAG YIN PAR THAL,
KHYOD GZHI GRUB PA'I PHYIR,

The first part of our reason is easy to accept.

Suppose you say that the second part is not correct.

Consider the fact that no person has any nature of their own.

The fact that it is true of a water pitcher is so a negative thing in the sense of not being something,

Because it can be established as existing.

GNYIS PA RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN
LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA
GANG RUNG SHUGS LA 'PHEN PA'I DGAG PA BZHAG TU YOD DE, LHAS
SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA BA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist the second type of negative, the kind which are such that the term which expresses them indirectly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording, because one would be the fact that John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day.

DER THAL, LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA BA ZHES PA'I
TSIG 'DIS RANG GI DGAG BYA NYIN PAR ZAS ZA BA DNGOS SU BKAG
NAS MTSAN MO ZA BA SHUGS LA 'PHANGS PA GANG ZHIGMTSN MO ZA
BA SGRUB PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the fact that John Smith, who is chubby,
never eats during the day is an example of this kind of

negative.]

It is so,

Because (1) the expression "John Smith, who is chubby, never eats during the day" indirectly implies that he eats at night, incidental to denying directly what it denies: that he eats during the day; and (2) his eating at night is a positive thing.

DER THAL, ZAS ZA BA SGRUB PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

It is so,

Because eating is a positive thing.

GSUM PA RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN
LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA
GANG RUNG DNGOS SHUGS GNYIS KAR 'PHEN PA'I DGOS PA BZHAG TU
YOD DE, LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA BA LUS RID PA MA
YIN PA YOD PA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist the third type of negative, the kind which are such that the term which expresses them both directly and indirectly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording, because one would be the fact that there exists a John Smith who is chubby, who doesn't eat during the day, and who is not thin.

DER THAL, LHAS SBYIN TSON PO NYIN PAR ZAS MI ZA BA LUS RID PA
MA YIN PA YOD PA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS NYIN PAR ZAS ZA BA DNGOS SU
BKAG NAS MTSAN MO ZA BA SHUGS LA 'PHANGS, LUS RID PA MA YIN
PA YOD PA DNGOS SU 'PHANGS PA GANG ZHIG, MTSAN MO ZA BA
SGRUB PA DANG , LUS RID PA MA YIN PA YOD PA MA YIN DGAG YIN
PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the fact that there exists a John Smith who is chubby, who doesn't eat during the day, and who is not thin, is the kind of negative thing such that the term which expresses it both directly and indirectly implies something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.]

It is so correct to say just this,

Because (1) the expression "There exists a John Smith who is chubby, who doesn't eat during the day, and who has a body that is not a thin one," indirectly implies that he eats at night—and directly implies that there is a body which is not thin—incidental to denying directly that he eats during the day; and (2) the fact that there is a body which is not thin is a negative in the sense of not being something.

BZHI PA RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG SKABS THOB KYIS 'PHEN PA'I DGAG PA BZHAG TU YOD DE, GANG ZAG GCIG RGYAL RIGS DANG BRAM ZE'I RIGS GANG RUNG DU NGES NAS KHYAD PAR MA NGES PA'I TSE 'DI NI BRAM ZE MA YIN PA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS BRAM ZE YIN PA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS RGYAL RIGS YIN PA SKABS THOB KYIS 'PHANGS PA NGES SHES DGOS PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist the fourth type of negative, the kind which is such that the term which expresses it implies through the context something else—either a negative in the sense of not being something, or a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording, because one would be where you had determined that a particular person must be either of the royal caste or the Brahmin caste, but were unsure of which; and then someone says "They are not a Brahmin." The actual wording here directly denies, in its actual wording, that they are a Brahmin, and then implies—through the context—that they are of the royal caste; and this is the process you have to go through to determine which they are.

RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG MI 'PHEN PA'I DGAG PA BZHAG TU YOD DE, BRAM ZE CHANG MI 'THUNG BA DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

There does exist finally that kind of negative where the term which expresses it implies nothing else—neither a negative in the sense of not being something, nor a positive—incidental to denying what it denies directly in the actual wording, because one would be the fact that a certain Brahmin does not drink alcohol.

DER THAL, BRAM ZE CHANG MI 'THUNG BA ZHES PA'I SGRA 'DIS BRAM

ZE CHANG 'THUNG BA TSIG ZIN LA DNGOS SU BKAG NAS CHOS GZHAN
MA YIN DGAG DANG SGRUB PA GANG RUNG DNGOS SU YANG MI
'PHEN SHUGS LA YANG MI 'PHEN, SKABS THOB KYIS YANG MI 'PHEN PA
YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the fact that a certain Brahmin does not
drink alcohol is a kind of negative where the term which
expresses it implies nothing else—neither a negative in the
sense of not being something, nor a positive—incidental to
denying what it denies directly in the actual wording.]

It is so,

Because the expression "The Brahmin does not drink alcohol" implies neither
directly, nor indirectly, nor by context, anything else—neither a negative
in the sense of not being something, nor a positive—incidental to denying
what it denies directly in the actual wording: that is, that the Brahmin did
drink alcohol.

DE DAG MA YIN DGAG DANG MED DGAG GNYIS SU 'DU TSUL YOD DE,
DANG PO BZHI PO MA YIN DGAG DANG , PHYI MA MED DGAG TU 'JOG
DGOS PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

These five can be grouped into two categories: negatives in the sense of not being
something, and negatives in the sense of the absence of something. This is
because the first four should be considered negatives in the sense of not being
something, and the last should be considered a negative in the sense of the
absence of something.

DGAG PA YIN NA RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA
TSIG ZIN LA 'GOG PAS MA KHYAB PA YIN TE, MA YIN DGAG LA MA
KHYAB PA GANG ZHIGMED DGAG LA YANG MA KHYAB PA'I PHYIR,

It is not necessarily the case that, just because something is a negative thing, the
term which expresses it denies what it denies in the actual wording. This is
because this is neither necessarily the case with negatives in the sense of not
being something, nor the case with negatives in the sense of being an absence of
something.

RTAGS DANG PO GRUB STE, RTAG PA DANG SHES BYA GNYIS MA YIN
DGAG YIN KYANG , RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA

TSIG ZIN LA 'GOG PAR BYED PA MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The first part of your reason is not correct: it's not correct to say that it is not necessarily the case with negatives in the sense of not being something that the term which expresses them denies what it denies in the actual wording.]

But the first part of our reason is correct,
Because—even though the two of unchanging things and knowable things are negatives in the sense of not being something—they are not such that the terms which express them [in Tibetan] deny what they deny in the actual wording.

RTAGS GNYIS PA GRUB STE, NAM MKHA' DANG CHOS NYID GNYIS MED
DGAG YIN KYANG RANG ZHES BRJOD PA'I SGRAS RANG GI DGAG BYA
TSIG ZIN LA 'GOG PAR BYED PA MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The second part of your reason is not correct: it's not correct to say that it is not necessarily the case with negatives in the sense of being an absence of something that the term which expresses them denies what it denies in the actual wording.]

But the second part of our reason is correct,
Because—even though the two of space and the true nature of things are negatives in the sense of being an absence of something—they are not such that the terms which express them deny what they deny in the actual wording.

Selection from the collected topics:
The Concept of Exclusion in Perception

[*A Presentation of the Concept of Elimination in Perception (gZhan-sel gyi rnam-bzhag), from The Collected Topics of the Spiritual Son, ff. 136B-138B.*]

[*Please note that indented statements are usually those given by the opponent. Responses within brackets are those that are usually left unwritten in the Tibetan text, and are understood to be there because of the context following each.*]

, GZHAN SEL GYI RNAM BZHAG BSHAD PA LA, KHA CIG NA RE, KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL GSUM PO GANG RUNG YOD NA, KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL YOD PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Here next is a presentation on the concept of exclusion. On this point, someone may come and make the following claim:

If any one or number of the three kinds of exclusion exists for something, then the exclusion for that thing always exists.

RI BONG RVA CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL YOD PAR THAL, KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL GSUM PO GANG RUNG YOD PA'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider the horns of a rabbit.

Does an exclusion then exist for them?

Because any one or number of the three kinds of exclusion exist for them.

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

MA GRUB NA, RI BONG RVA CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL GSUM PO GANG RUNG YOD PAR THAL, KHYOD KYI BLO'I GZHAN SEL YOD PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that there exist any one or number of the three kinds of exclusion for the horns of a rabbit.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the horns of a rabbit.

Any one or number of the three kinds of exclusion does so exist for them,

Because there does exist the mental kind of exclusion for them.

MA GRUB NA, RI BONG RVA CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI BLO'I GZHAN SEL YOD PAR THAL, KHYOD 'DZIN RTOG PA LA KHYOD MA YIN PA LAS LOG PAR SNANG BA DE KHYOD KYI BLO'I GZHAN SEL YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the mental kind of exclusion exists for

the horns of a rabbit.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the horns of a rabbit.

The mental kind of exclusion does so exist for them,
Because the mental kind of exclusion for them is the image of the reverse of all
that is not them which appears to the conceptualization which grasps to
them.

MA GRUB NA, RI BONG RVA CHOS CAN, KHYOD 'DZIN RTOG PA LA
KHYOD MA YIN PA LAS LOG PAR SNANG BA DE KHYOD KYI BLO'I
GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, BDAG MED YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the mental kind of exclusion for the
horns of a rabbit is the image of the reverse of all that is not
them which appears to the conceptualization which grasps
to them.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the horns of a rabbit.

The mental kind of exclusion for them is so the image of the reverse of all that is
not them which appears to the conceptualization which grasps to them,
Because they are something that has no nature of its own.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, RI BONG RVA CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL
MED PAR THAL, KHYOD KYI DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL MED
PA'I PHYIR, DER THAL, KHYOD DNGOS PO MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: an exclusion does exist for
the horns of a rabbit.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider the horns of a rabbit.

It is not so, that an exclusion exists for them,
Because there exists for them no exclusion of the kind which is the objectification
of a specific instance;
And this is so true, because they are not a working thing.

KHA CIG NA RE, DNGOS PO YIN NA, DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL
YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is a working thing, then it is always an exclusion of
the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance.

BUM PA CHOS CAN, DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL,
DNGOS PO YIN PA'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider a water pitcher.

So is it then an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific
instance?

Because it is a working thing.

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agreed that it does necessarily follow.

'DOD NA, BUM PA CHOS CAN, GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, DON RANG
MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: a water pitcher is an
exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific
instance.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider a water pitcher.

So is it then an exclusion?

Because it is an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific
instance.

'DOD NA, BUM PA CHOS CAN, DGAG PA YIN PAR THAL, GZHAN SEL YIN
PA'I PHYIR,

[I agree that a water pitcher is an exclusion.]

Suppose you do agree.

So is a water pitcher then a negative thing?
Because it is an exclusion.

MA KHYAB NA KHYAB PA YOD PAR THAL, GZHAN SEL DANG DGAG PA
GNYIS DON GCIG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But it does necessarily follow,
Because "exclusion" and "negative thing" are terms that refer to the same thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD MI NUS TE, SGRUB PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: a water pitcher is a
negative thing.]

But you can't agree to our original statement,
Because a water pitcher is a positive thing.

KHA CIG NA RE, BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA DE BUM PA'I DON
RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

The reverse of all that is not a water pitcher is, for a water pitcher,
an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific
instance.

BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA CHOS CAN, BUM PA'I DON RANG
MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL MA YIN PAR THAL, BUM PA'I DON RANG
MTSAN GYI CHOS MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Consider the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher.

It is not so true that it is, for a water pitcher, an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance,
Because it is not that existing thing which represents the objectification of a specific instance.

MA GRUB NA, BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA CHOS CAN, BUM PA'I
DON RANG MTSAN GYI CHOS MA YIN PAR THAL, RANG MTSAN GYI
CHOS MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher is not that existing thing which represents the objectification of a specific instance.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher.
It is so true that it is not that existing thing which represents the objectification of a specific instance,
Because it is not an existing object which represents the objectification of a specific instance.

MA GRUB NA, BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA CHOS CAN, DNGOS PO
YIN PAR THAL, RANG MTSAN GYI CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR, RTAGS KHAS,

[It's not correct to say that the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher is not an existing object which represents the objectification of a specific instance.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher.
So is it then a working thing?
Because it is an existing object which represents the objectification of a specific instance.

You already agreed to this reason.

MA KHYAB NA KHYAB PA YOD PAR THAL, RANG MTSAN GYI CHOS
DANG DNGOS PO GNYIS DON GCIG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It doesn't necessarily follow that, just because something is an existing object which represents objectification of a specific instance, it must always be a working thing.]

But it does necessarily follow,

Because the terms "existing object which represents the objectification of a specific instance" and "working thing" both refer to the same thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA DNGOS PO MA YIN PAR THAL, BUM PA MA YIN PA MA YIN PA DNGOS PO MA YIN PA GANG ZHIG, DE GNYIS LA KHYAD PAR MED PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher is a working thing.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

It is not so, that the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher is a working thing, because (1) all that is not all that is not a water pitcher is not a working thing, and (2) there's no difference between this and the other.

KHA CIG NA RE, KHYOD KYI DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YOD NA, KHYOD MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA YOD PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If there exists for something an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance of the particular object, then there must always exist the reverse of all that it is not.

KVA BUM GNYIS CHOS CAN, KHYOD MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA YOD PAR THAL, KHYOD KYI DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YOD PA'I PHYIR, KHYAB PA KHAS,

Consider the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.

So does there exist the reverse of all that they are not?

Because there does exist for them an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance.

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But you already agree that it does necessarily follow.

MA GRUB NA, KVA BUM GNYIS CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI DON RANG
MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YOD PAR THAL, KHYOD DON RANG MTSAN GYI
CHOS YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that there does exist for the two .]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.

There does so exist for them an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification
of a specific instance,

Because it would be the existing objects which are the objectification of a specific
instance of them.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, KVA BUM GNYIS CHOS CAN, KHYOD MA YIN PA
LAS LOG PA MED PAR THAL, KHYOD YIN PA MI SRID PA'I SHES BYA YIN
PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: there does exist the
reverse of all that a pillar and a water pitcher is not.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.

It is not so true, that there does exist the reverse of all that a pillar and a water
pitcher is not,

Because they are a knowable thing which nothing can be.

KHA CIG NA RE, KVA BUM GNYIS CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI DON RANG
MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL MED PAR THAL, KVA BUM GNYIS DE DE MA YIN
PA GANG ZHIG, DE LAS THA DAD PA GCIG MED PA'I PHYIR ZER NA
RTAGS PHYI MA MA GRUB PA YIN TE, RTAG DNGOS GNYIS KYIS STONG
PA'I KVA BUM GNYIS DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider the two of a pillar and a pitcher.

There does not so exist for them an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance,

Because (1) the two of a pillar and a pitcher is no such thing, and (2) there exists no single such thing which would be distinct from them.

Our answer to this would be, "The latter part of your statement is not correct."

And this is true because an example of such a thing would be the two of a pillar and a pitcher which is devoid of being both an unchanging and a changing thing.

KHA CIG NA RE, BUM PA'I DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL 'JOG PA'I TSE NA, RTAG DNGOS GNYIS KYIS STONG PA'I BUM PA DE 'JOG DGOS PA YIN ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Whenever you establish something as being, for a water pitcher, an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance, then you must establish a water pitcher which is devoid of being both an unchanging and a changing thing.

DE MI 'THAD PAR THAL, BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I BUM PA DE BUM PA'I DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL LA BZHAG CHOG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

But it's not so that this is the case,

Because it is allowable to establish the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher as being, for a water pitcher, an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, BUM PA'I DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, BUM PA'I GZHAN SEL YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that it is allowable to establish the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher as being, for a water pitcher, an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so, for a water pitcher, an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance,
Because it is, for the pitcher, an exclusion.

KHA CIG NA RE, BUM PA'I MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL 'JOG PA'I TSE NA,
BUM PA GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED DE 'JOG ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Whenever we establish something as being, for a water pitcher, an exclusion of the kind which is a negative that involves the absence of something, then we always establish, for a water pitcher, the lack of any self-nature to the person.

DE MI 'THAD PA YIN PAR THAL, BUM PA LA BUM PA MA YIN PA MED PA
DE BUM PA'I MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL LA 'JOG DGOS PA YIN PA'I
PHYIR,

But this cannot be the case,

Because we must always establish the exclusion of the kind which is a negative that involves the absence of something, with regard to a water pitcher, as the condition that a water pitcher has nothing about it which is part of all that is not a water pitcher.

DER THAL, BA LANG LA BA LANG MA YIN PA MED PA BA LANG GI MED
DGAG GI GZHAN SEL LA 'JOG DGOS PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And this is so the case,

Because we must establish the exclusion of the kind which is a negative that

involves the absence of something, with regard to a cow, as the condition that a cow has nothing about it which is a part of all that is not a cow.

DER THAL, TSAD CHEN LAS BSHAD PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And this is so the case,

Because this is how the *Great Book on Valid Perception* explains it.

KHA CIG NA RE, BLO MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I BLO DE BLO'I DON RANG
MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG
PA'I BUM PA DE BUM PA'I DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PA
GANG ZHIG, DE GNYIS 'DRA BA'I PHYIR,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

It must be the case that the state of mind which is the reverse of all that is not the state of mind is, for the state of mind, an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance,

Because (1) that water pitcher which is the reverse of all that is not the water pitcher is, for a water pitcher, an exclusion of the kind which is a specific instance of the water pitcher, and (2) the two are similar cases.

'DOD NA, BLO MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I BLO CHOS CAN, BLO'I GZHAN
SEL YIN PAR THAL, BLO'I DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PA'I
PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

Suppose you agree to our statement.

Consider that state of mind which is the reverse of all that is not the state of mind.

It must then be the mental kind of exclusion,

Because it is, for the state of mind, an exclusion of the kind which is the objectification of a specific instance.

To this we answer, "It doesn't necessarily follow."

KHO NA RE, BLO CHOS CAN, KHYOD MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I KHYOD,
KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD YIN PA SRID PA'I
DNGOS PO YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA 'DOD LAN THEBS PA YIN TE, RTZI BA'I
TSE NA, BLO MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I BLO DE BLO DE'I GZHAN SEL YIN
PAR 'DOD CES RTZI RIGS PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider a state of mind.

That state of mind which is the reverse of all that it is not is so, for
it, an exclusion;

Because it is an existing thing which can be.

Our answer to this is, "We agree." And this is because, when you are
determining how to read this point, it is correct to read it in such a way that you
would answer "we agree" to the fact that the state of mind which is the reverse of
all that a state of mind is not would be an exclusion *for that mind*, [and not a
"mental kind of exclusion"].

BYAS PA LA KHO NA RE, BLO MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I BLO BLO'I GZHAN
SEL YIN PAR THAL, BLO MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I BLO DE BLO DE'I
GZHAN SEL YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB, 'DOD MI NUS TE, BLO'I
GZHAN SEL YIN NA RTAG PA YIN PAS KHYAB PA'I PHYIR,

On this particular point, someone might come and make the following claim:

That state of mind which is the reverse of all that is not the state of
mind is so a mental kind of exclusion,

Because that state of mind which is the reverse of all that is not the
state of mind is an exclusion for that state of mind.

To this we answer, "It doesn't necessarily follow."

One could though never agree to the statement,

Because anything which is an exclusion for a state of mind is always an
unchanging thing.

KHA CIG NA RE, RTAG PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I RTAG PA DE RTAG
PA'I GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, BUM PA MA YIN PA LAS LOG PA'I BUM

PA DE BUM PA'I GZHAN SEL YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

It is so true that that unchanging thing which is the reverse of all that is not the unchanging thing is the exclusion for that unchanging thing,

Because that water pitcher which is the reverse of all that is not the water pitcher is exclusion for a water pitcher.

Our answer to this is, "It doesn't necessarily follow."

'DOD NA, DE CHOS CAN, RTAG PA'I GZHAN SEL MA YIN PAR THAL, RTAG PA'I DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL MA YIN, RTAG PA'I MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL YANG MA YIN, RTAG PA'I BLO'I GZHAN SEL YANG MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And suppose you agree to that statement.

Consider that unchanging thing which is the reverse of all that is not the unchanging thing.

It is not so true, that it is the exclusion for that unchanging thing,

Because it is neither the type of exclusion which is a specific instance of the unchanging thing; nor the type of exclusion for the unchanging thing which is a negative that involves the absence of something; nor the mental type of exclusion.

RTAGS DANG PO MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, RTAG PA'I DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL MA YIN PAR THAL, GANG ZAG GI BDAG MED YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The first part of your reason is not correct: it's not correct to say that an unchanging thing which is the reverse of all that is not an unchanging thing is not the type of exclusion which is a specific instance of the unchanging thing.]

Suppose you say that the first part of our reason is not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is not so true, that it is the type of exclusion which is a specific instance of the

unchanging thing,
Because it is one example of the lack of any self-nature of the person.

KHA CIG NA RE, 'DU MA BYAS KYI NAM MKHA' CHOS CAN, MED DGAG
GI DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, MED DGAG GI
GZHAN SEL YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider unproduced, empty space.

It is so true, that it is the type of exclusion which is a specific
instance of a negative thing which involves the absence of
something,

Because it is a type of exclusion which is a negative that involves
the absence of something.

To this we answer, "It doesn't necessarily follow."

*[Please note that this text uses the above unusual spelling for "unproduced" several
times, so we have left it as is.]*

BYAS PA LA KHO NA RE, MED DGAG CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI GZHAN
SEL YIN NA KHYOD KYI DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YIN PAS
KHYAB PAR THAL, KHYOD KYI GZHAN SEL YOD PA'I PHYIR ZER NA

Suppose someone else, in response to this exchange, comes and makes the
following claim:

Consider a negative thing which involves an absence.

It is so true, that anything which is an exclusion for it is that type of
exclusion which is a specific instance for it,

Because there does exist an exclusion for it.

RTAGS MA GRUB PA YIN TE, BRTZI BA'I TSE NA MED DGAG DE'I GZHAN
SEL YOD PAR RTAGS MA GRUB CES RTZI DGOS PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

To this we answer, "It's not correct to say that." And this is because, when you
read this statement, you would have to read it as "there does exist an exclusion

for this particular negative involving an absence," and would therefore have to answer, "It's not correct to say that."

KHA CIG NA RE, 'DU MA BYAS KYI NAM MKHA' DE MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL MIN ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Unproduced, empty space is not an exclusion which is a negative thing that involves the absence of something.

'DU MA BYAS KYI NAM MKHA' CHOS CAN, MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL YIN PAR THAL, MED DGAG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Consider unproduced, empty space.

It is so an exclusion which is a negative thing that involves the absence of something,

Because it is a negative thing which involves the absence of something.

MA KHYAB NA KHYAB PA YOD PAR THAL, MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL DANG MED DGAG GNYIS DON GCIG YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It doesn't necessarily follow.]

But it does necessarily follow,

Because "an exclusion which is a negative thing that involves the absence of something" and "a negative thing which involves the absence of something" both refer to the same thing.

RANG GI LUGS LA, GZHAN SEL DANG DGAG PA GNYIS DON GCIG YIN PAS MTSAN NYID 'JOG MI DGOS,

Here secondly is our own position. Because the terms "exclusion" and "negative thing" refer to the same thing, there is no need to posit a definition for exclusion.

DNGOS PO YIN NA KHYOD KYI DON RANG MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL YOD

PAS KHYAB LA, DNGOS POR GYUR PA'I DGAG PA DANG DON RANG
MTSAN GYI GZHAN SEL GNYIS DON

If something is a working thing, then there always exists an exclusion for it which is the objectification of a specific instance. The terms "negative thing which is a working thing" and "an exclusion which is the objectification of a specific instance" both refer to the same thing.

GCIGBDG MED YIN NA KHYOD KYI BLO'I GZHAN SEL YOD PAS KHYAB
LA, BLO'I GZHAN SEL DANG RTOG PA'I SNANG YUL GNYIS DON

There is always a mental kind of exclusion for anything which is such that it possesses no nature of its own. The terms "mental kind of exclusion" and "object which appears to a conceptualization" refer to the same thing.

GCIGGZHI GRUB NA KHYOD KYI MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL YOD PAS
KHYAB LA, MED DGAG GI GZHAN SEL DANG MED DGAG GNYIS DON
GCIG YIN NO, ,

If a thing can be established as existing, then there is always an exclusion of it which is a negative thing that involves the absence of something. And the terms "exclusion which is a negative thing that involves the absence of something" and "negative thing which involves the absence of something" refer to the same thing.