

DE 'DRA BA'I TSUL GYIS RIGS PAS PHAR LA BKAG PA DANG - Now this is a little bit interesting, how, [32:00] for example, Sautrantika and lower schools - doesn't they, ... and sprout and seed and also don dam par drub pa, ultimate or.. - but they will say still at the time of seed, sprout will not come. When the sprout rises, the seed is gone. Same thing for fire and etc. Isn't that? So what is there (their idea)? They are not subtle like this but I think they have also a lot of don dam pa ma drub pa means the sprout is ultimately existent, seed is ultimately existent – the sprout is related to the [33:00] seed, that relation is not ultimate, they may say. There are many imputed things, RTOG PAS BTAGS PA TZAM. Any kind of general things, relationship, general or particular – also particular, the tree itself that is *being* particular of this, then that also not real. Something which is being general of that, also is not real. So many tog pai tag tzam. Ngo po med pa, ngo med, means many, many ngo med's we will have. OK?

For example, no elephant, is general. {No elephant exists, **exists general.**} Right? [34:00] **It has particular no elephant, {which also exists} also general,** not elephant also is general. It has many particulars. We are all particulars of the no elephant, right? Non-elephant. This place is no elephant. Particular has that right, yeah?.... But that doesn't mean the particulars themselves do not exist, truly. They are ngo po, they will say. **Being as particular of that is not real, etc.**

{All med gags are ngo med – all non-affirming negations are unreal. Drel wa, relation, has drel wa po, relater, and drel yul, object of relation. Relations are ngo med, but not all are ngo med – seed = drel yul, sprout = drel pa po.}

Also chi dang che drag - general and particular, are not real. Relations are not real, general is not real, **any chi means being chi, chi is not real.** [35:00] Chi is real, saying that is Vaisheshika, non-Buddhist, chi ngo po wa. Chi ngo po wa means generality is real ultimate general thing – believing that chi ngo po wa believers. Samkya believes chi ngo po wa. Vaisheshika is a believer of chi ngo po wa. Then we have to reject that is the Buddhist way, there is no chi ngo po wa. {Chi is ngo med, je drag is ngo med, relation is ngo med.}

For example, white cow and black cow are particulars. Cow is the general {category.}. Is cow not real [36:00] – or cow as being general and those two – white and black cows - are particulars of that cow and general cow is not real. **That is relation is not real. General itself not real.** There is a lot of discussion. Anyway, leave that one here. You can somewhere debate that.