

Three Kinds of *vyavaccheda* (*rnam gcod*) in Tibetan *bsdus grwa* Literature

Hiroshi Nemoto
(Hiroshima University)

Over the past few decades a considerable number of studies have been made on the theory of three kinds of exclusion (*vyavaccheda*, *rnam gcod*): (1) *ayogavyavaccheda* (*mi ldan rnam gcod*) or the exclusion of non-connection, (2) *anyayogavyavaccheda* (*gzhan ldan rnam gcod*) or the exclusion of the connection with that which is other than the qualificand, and (3) *atyantāyogavyavaccheda* (*mi srid rnam gcod*) or the exclusion of the absolute non-connection. This theory, developed by Indian grammarians and logicians, is well-known to Buddhist thinkers such as Dharmakīrti, Jñānaśrīmitra, and Ratnakīrti.

Not surprisingly, later Tibetan scholars are well-versed in the theory of three kinds of exclusion, as can be seen from the Tibetan *pramāṇa* (*tshad ma*) texts. One of the earliest mentions of the theory is in Phya pa chos kyi seng ge's (1109-1169) commentary on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, *Shes rab 'od zer*. Sa skya paṇḍita (1182-1251) then develops the theory to explain the classification of definitions (*mtshan nyid*) in his *Rigs gter* and its autocommentary. Naturally, Tsong kha pa (1357-1419) and other dGe lugs pa scholars pay attention to the theory in their own *pramāṇa* texts. In addition to the Tibetan *pramāṇa* texts, we also find the theory discussed in the Tibetan indigenous grammatical texts which are presumably written under the influence of the *sMra ba'i sgo* by Smṛtijñānakīrti.

We are concerned here with how the theory of exclusion is applied to the debate-logic in the dGe lugs pa's *bsdus grwa* texts (the beginner's manual of dialectics). The authors of *bsdus grwa* texts are fully aware of the fact that the particle "*kho na*" (Skt. *eva*) can be used in a sentence in three different ways. One of the most striking cases where the particle "*kho na*" is used in an intricate fashion is the case of "*rtag pa kho na*." According to 'Jam dbyangs phyogs lha 'od zer (1429-1500), the author of the *Rwa stod bsdus grwa*, the statement *rtag pa kho na yod*, which means: "Only the permanent exists," is false, whereas the statement *rtag pa kho na med*, which means: "The permanent is not the only thing that exists," is true.

The question to be explored is how the theory of exclusion is applied here. By considering this question this paper will afford a clear idea of the principle underlying in the debate-logic.