

*[The following selections consists of the Presentation of the Concepts of Contradiction and Relationship ('Gal-'brel gyi rnam-bzhag), from An Explanation of the Intermediate Path of Reasoning (Rigs-lam 'bring-gi rnam-par bshad-pa), by the Master Tutor Purbuchok Jampa Tsultrim Gyatso (1825-1901), who in his day held the position of Tutor to the Dalai Lama; ff. 26B-31B.]*

*[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.]*

DANG PO 'GAL 'BREL LA DGAG BZHAG SPONG GSUM LAS, DANG PO NI,  
KHA CIG NA RE, DNGOS PO DANG 'GAL BA YIN NA, DNGOS PO DANG  
'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Here is the first section: an explanation of the concepts of contradiction and relationship. For this presentation 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 such that being it is contradictory to being a working thing is always something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a working thing.

RTAG PA'I LDOG PA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider the exclusion of all that is not an unchanging thing.

So is being it then [something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a working thing]?

Because being it is [something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a working thing].

MA GRUB NA, DER THAL, KHYOD DNGOS PO DANG THA DAD GANG  
ZHIG, KHYOD KYANG YIN DNGOS PO YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED  
PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the exclusion of all that is not an

unchanging thing is something which is such that being it is  
contradictory to being a working thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

It is so correct,

Because (1) it [the exclusion of all that is not an unchanging thing] is something  
distinct from a working thing, and (2) there exists no one thing which is  
both it [the exclusion of all that is not an unchanging thing] and a working  
thing.

DANG PO MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DNGOS PO DANG THA DAD YIN  
PAR THAL, RTAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The first part of your statement is not correct: it's not correct to say  
that the exclusion of all that is not an unchanging thing is  
something distinct from a working thing.]

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

Consider this same thing.

It is so distinct from being a working thing,  
Because it is an unchanging thing.

GNYIS PA MA GRUB NA, RTAG PA CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI LDOG PA  
YANG YIN, DNGOS PO YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED PAR THAL,  
KHYOD RTAG PA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The second part of your statement is not correct: it's not correct to  
say that there exists no one thing which is both the exclusion  
all that is not an unchanging thing, and also a working  
thing.]

Suppose you say that the second part of our statement is not correct.

Consider an unchanging thing.

It is so true that there exists no one thing which is both the exclusion of all that is  
not it, and also a working thing,  
Because it is unchanging.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, RTAG PA'I LDOG PA CHOS CAN, DNGOS PO DANG  
'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA MA YIN PAR THAL, DNGOS PO DANG 'GAL BA  
DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: the exclusion of all that is  
not an unchanging thing is such that being it is contradictory  
to being something which is such that being it is  
contradictory to being a working thing]

Consider the exclusion of all that is not an unchanging thing.

It is not so true, that it is such that being it is contradictory to being something  
which is such that being it is contradictory to being a working thing,  
Because being it is something which is such that being it is not contradictory to  
being something which such that being it is contradictory to being a  
working thing.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, DNGOS  
PO DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the exclusion of all that is not an  
unchanging thing is such that being it is not contradictory to  
being something which is such that being it is contradictory  
to being a working thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because there does exist one thing which is both it, and which is also such that  
being it is contradictory to being a working thing.

RTAG PA DE, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR,

And this is because an unchanging thing is just such a thing.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, MI RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YIN NA, MI  
RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is unchanging, then it is always something such that being it is contradictory to being something which is changing.

KA BA'I LDOG PA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider the exclusion of all that is not a pillar.

So is it then [something such that being it is contradictory to being something which is changing]?

Because it is [something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is unchanging].

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, MI RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIGKHYOD KYANG YIN, MI RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the exclusion of all that is not a pillar is something such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is unchanging.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because it is (1) distinct from that which is such that being it is contradictory to being a changing thing, and (2) such that there does not exist a single thing which is both it [the exclusion of all that is not a pillar] and also something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a changing thing.

MA GRUB NA, KA BA CHOS CAN, KHYOD KYI LDOG PA YANG YIN, MI RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED PAR THAL, KHYOD KYI LDOG PA YIN NA, MI RTAG PA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PAS KHYAB PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the exclusion of all that is not a pillar is  
(1) distinct from that which is such that being it is  
contradictory to being a changing thing, and (2) such that  
there does not exist a single thing which is both the  
exclusion of all that is not a pillar and also something which  
is such that being it is contradictory to being a changing  
thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider a pillar.

It is so true that there does not exist a single thing which is both the exclusion of  
all that is not a pillar and also something which is such that being it is  
contradictory to being a changing thing,  
Because anything which is the exclusion of all that is not it [a pillar] is always  
such that being it is not contradictory to being a changing thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, KA BA'I LDOG PA CHOS CAN, MI RTAG PA DANG  
'GAL BA MA YIN PAR THAL, MI RTAG PA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PA'I  
PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: the exclusion of all that is  
not a pillar is such that being it is contradictory to being  
something which is changing.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider the exclusion of all that is not a pillar.

It is not such, that being it is contradictory to being a changing thing,  
Because it is such that being it is not contradictory to being a changing thing.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, MI RTAG  
PA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR TE, KA BA DE DE 'DRA'I  
GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR, RTAGS SLA,

[It's not correct to say that the exclusion of all that is not a pillar is  
such that being it is not contradictory to being a changing  
thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so this way,

Because there does exist one thing which is both it [the exclusion of all that is not a pillar] and also a changing thing;

And this is true because a pillar itself is just such a thing.

This reason is easy to accept.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN NA, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing, then it is always such that being it is not contradictory with being something which is not contradictory to being a working thing.

KA BUM GNYIS DANG GCIG CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.

So is it then [such that being it is not contradictory with being something that is not contradictory to being a working thing]?

Because it is [such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing].

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, DNGOS PO YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR TE, KA BUM GNYIS PO DE DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher is such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because there does exist one thing which is both it [that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher] and also a changing thing;  
And this is because the two of a pillar and a water pitcher is just such a thing.

MA GRUB NA SLA, RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, KA BUM GNYIS DANG GCIG CHOS CAN, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG , MI 'GAL BA MA YIN PAR THAL, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

If you say it's not correct, the answer is easy.

Suppose though you agree to our original statement, [saying that that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher is such that being it is not contradictory with being something which is not contradictory to being a working thing].

Consider that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.

It is so not something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is not contradictory to being a working thing,  
Because it is something such that being it is contradictory to being something which is not contradictory to being a working thing.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIGKHYOD KYANG YIN, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is not contradictory to being a working thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because (1) it is distinct from that which is such that being it is not contradictory with being a working thing, and (2) there exists no one thing which is both it [that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water

pitcher] and also something such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing.

MA GRUB NA, KA BUM GNYIS CHOS CAN, KHYOD DANG GCIG KYANG YIN, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED PAR THAL, KHYOD YIN PA MI SRID PA'I SHES BYA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher is such that there exists no one thing which is both it and also something such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.

It is so true that there exists no one thing which is both it and also something such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing,  
Because it is something which no one thing can be.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN NA, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is such that being it is not contradictory to something which is not contradictory to being a working thing, then it is always such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing.

DNGOS MED CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider a thing which does no work.

Is it then [such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing]?  
Because it is [such that being it is not contradictory to something which is not contradictory to being a working thing].

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, DNGOS

PO DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR TE,  
SHES BYA DE DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a thing which does no work is such that  
being it is not contradictory to something which is not  
contradictory to being a working thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because there does exist one thing which is both it, and which is also such that  
being it is not contradictory to being a working thing;  
And this is true because "knowable thing" is just such a thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, DNGOS MED CHOS CAN, DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL  
BA MA YIN PAR THAL, DNGOS PO DANG 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree with your original statement: a thing which does no  
work is such that being it is not contradictory to being a  
working thing.]

Consider a thing which does no work.

It is not so a thing which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a  
working thing,  
Because it is a thing such that being it is contradictory to being a working thing.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, YOD PA DANG 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN NA,  
RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is such that being it is not contradictory to being a  
thing which is contradictory to being a existing thing, then it is  
always such that being it is contradictory to being an unchanging  
thing.

MA BYAS PA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider a thing which is not made.

Is it then [such that being it is contradictory to being an unchanging thing]?

Because it is [such that being it is not contradictory to being a thing which is contradictory to being an existing thing].

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, YOD PA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN PA YOD PA'I PHYIR TE, RTAG DNGOS GNYIS PO DE DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a thing which is not made is such that being it is not contradictory to being a thing which is contradictory to being an existing thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because there does exist one thing which is both (1) it [that is, a thing which is not made] and (2) such that being it is contradictory to being an existing thing;

And this is true because the two of unchanging things and changing things is just such a thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, MA BYAS PA CHOS CAN, RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA MA YIN PAR THAL, DE DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree with your original statement: a thing which is not made is such that being it is contradictory to being an unchanging thing.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

It is not so, that it is such that being it is contradictory to being an unchanging thing,

Because it is such that being it is not contradictory to being just such a thing.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, RTAG PA YIN NA, KHYOD DANG RTAG PA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PAS KHYAB PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a thing which is not made is such that being it is not contradictory to being an unchanging thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because anything which is an unchanging thing is such that it is one thing which is both itself and unchanging.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, DNGOS PO DANG 'BREL BA YIN NA, DNGOS PO DANG 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Anytime something is such that it is sharing a relationship with a working thing, it must also always be such that it shares a relationship with what is sharing a relationship with a working thing.

DNGOS PO DANG 'BREL BA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider sharing a relationship with a working thing.

So is it then [such that it shares a relationship with what is sharing a relationship with a working thing]?

Because it is [such that it is sharing a relationship with a working thing].

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DNGOS PO DANG BDAG GCIG TU 'BREL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that sharing a relationship with a working thing is such that it is sharing a relationship with a working thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because it shares a relationship with "working thing" such that to be it is to automatically be a working thing.

MA GRUB NA, DNGOS PO CHOS CAN, KHYOD DANG 'BREL BA DE,  
KHYOD DANG BDAG GCIG TU 'BREL BA YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD DANG  
'BREL BA KHYOD DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIG, KHYOD DANG 'BREL BA  
YOD PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that sharing a relationship with a working  
thing is sharing a relationship with "working thing" such  
that to be it is to automatically be a working thing.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider a working thing.

Sharing a relationship with it is so sharing a relationship with it such that to be it  
is to automatically be it,

Because sharing a relationship with it is (1) distinct from it, and (2) sharing a  
relationship with it exists.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, DNGOS PO DANG 'BREL BA CHOS CAN, KHYOD  
KHYOD DANG 'BREL BA MA YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD GANG ZAG GI BDAG  
MED YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree with your original statement: sharing a relationship  
with a working thing is such that it shares a relationship  
with what is sharing a relationship with a working thing.]

Consider sharing a relationship with "working thing."

It is not so, that it is what shares a relationship with it,

Because it is one example of the truth that the person has no nature of his own.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, DNGOS PO DANG 'BREL BA YIN NA, DNGOS PO DANG  
BDAG GCIG 'BREL YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Anything that shares a relationship with a working thing always shares a relationship with the working thing such that to be it is to automatically be the working thing.

DNGOS PO'I PHYI LOGS SU BYUNG BA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider a working thing in the moment after it.

Does this then [share a relationship with the working thing such that to be it is to automatically be the working thing]?

Because it does [share a relationship with the working thing].

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DNGOS PO DANG DE BYUNG 'BREL YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a working thing in the moment after it shares a relationship with the working thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It does so,

Because it shares a relationship with the working thing such that it came from it.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DNGOS PO'I 'BRAS BU YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that a working thing in the moment after it shares a relationship with the working thing such that it came from it.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It does so,

Because it is a result of the working thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, DE CHOS CAN, DNGOS PO DANG BDAG GCIG 'BREL MA YIN PAR THAL, DNGOS PO DANG DE BYUNG 'BREL YIN PA'I PHYIR,

RTAGS BSGRUBS ZIN,

[Then I agree to your original statement: a working thing in the moment after it does share a relationship with the working thing such that to be it is to automatically be the working thing.]

Suppose you agree to our original statement.

Consider this same thing.

It is not so, that it shares a relationship with the working thing such that to be it is to automatically be the working thing,

Because it shares a relationship with the working thing such that it came from the working thing.

Our reason has already been proven.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, KA BUM GNYIS DANG GCIG DANG 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL  
BA YANG YIN, KA BUM GNYIS DANG GCIG DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI  
'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

There exists no one thing which is both (1) something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher; and also (2) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.

DE YOD PAR THAL, SHES BYA'I RDZAS YOD CHOS GSUM TSANG BA DE  
DE LTAR YIN PA'I PHYIR,

But such a thing does so exist,

Because the presence of all three of the material qualities for "existing thing" is just such a thing.

*[The "presence of all three of the material qualities" for any particular thing is, as we will see in Class Eight, the definition of its definition. The three material qualities are: (1) generally speaking, the thing is a definition; (2) it does apply to a typical example; and (3) it is the definition of no other thing than what it defines.]*

DANG PO GRUB STE, DE YANG YIN, KA BUM GNYIS DANG GCIG DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED PA'I PHYIR TE, BLO'I YUL DU BYA RUNG DE, DE DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the first part of your reason applies to your example: it's not correct to say that the presence of all three of the material qualities for "existing thing" is the kind of thing such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher.]

But the first part of our reason is correct,  
Because there exists no one thing which is both (1) it and (2) also something such that being it is contradictory with being that which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher;  
And this is true because "that which can be made an object of the mind," [which is the definition of "knowable thing",] is something which is such that being it [the presence of all three of the material qualities for "existing thing"] is not contradictory to being it [one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher].

RTZA RTAGS GNYIS PA MA GRUB NA, DE'I RDZAS YOD CHOS GSUM TSANG BA CHOS CAN, KA BUM GNYIS DANG GCIG DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, KA BUM GNYIS DANG GCIG DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR TE, BLO'I YUL DU BYA RUNG DE DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's incorrect to say that the second part of your reason applies to your example: it's not correct to say that the presence of all three of the material qualities for "knowable thing" is the kind of thing such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water

pitcher.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct to say that the second part of our reason applies to our example.

Consider the presence of all three of the material qualities for this same thing.

It is so something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher,

Because there does exist one thing which is both (1) it [the presence of all three qualities for "knowable thing"] and (2) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being one and the same as the two of a pillar and a water pitcher;

And this is true because "that which can be made an object of the mind" is just such a thing.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, DNGOS PO DANG 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN,  
DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN, DNGOS PO  
DANG 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YANG YIN, DNGOS PO DANG MA 'BREL  
BA DANG MA 'BREL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN PA YOD ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

There does exist one thing which is a combination of all of the following: (1) something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a working thing; (2) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a working thing; (3) something which shares a relationship with something which shares a relationship with a working thing; and (4) something which does not share a relationship with something which does not share a relationship with a working thing.

DNGOS PO DANG MI 'GAL BA DE, DE 'DRA BA'I GZHI MTHUN PA YIN PAR  
THAL, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN PA YOD PA GANG ZHIG, DNGOS PO

DANG MA 'BREL BA DE, DE 'DRA BA'I GZHI MTHUN PA MA YIN PA'I  
PHYIR,

So is something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a  
working thing then just such a combination?

Because (1) there does exist one thing which is all of those and (2) that which  
does not share a relationship with a working thing is not such a  
combination.

GNYIS PA MA GRUB NA, DNGOS PO DANG MA 'BREL BA CHOS CAN,  
DNGOS PO DANG 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YIN PAR THAL, DE 'DRA'I  
GZHI MTHUN PA YIN PA'I PHYIR, RTAGS DNGOS,

[The second part of your reason is not correct: it's not correct to say  
that that which does not share a relationship with a working  
thing is not such a combination.]

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

Consider that which does not share a relationship with a working thing.

Is it then something which is such that being it is contradictory to being  
something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a working  
thing? Because it is just such a thing; [that is, one thing which is a  
combination of all the above].

[It's not correct to say it is just such a combination.]

But the reason is what you've already said directly.

'DOD MI NUS TE, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA YANG YIN, DE DANG 'GAL BA  
YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN PA YOD PA'I PHYIR TE, DNGOS PO'I RGYUR  
GYUR PA'I TSAD MA DANG DPYAD SHES GNYIS DE LTAR YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree with your original statement: that which does not  
share a relationship with a working thing is something  
which is such that being it is contradictory to being  
something which is such that being it is contradictory to  
being a working thing.]

But you can't agree to our original statement,

Because there does exist one thing which is both not related to it [to a working thing] and which is also not such that being it is contradictory to being the working thing;

And this is true because the two of a valid perception and a recollection which act as a cause for a working thing are just such a combination.

MA GRUB NA, DE GNYIS CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA YIN PA GANG ZHIG, DE DANG 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the two of a valid perception and a recollection which act as a cause for a working thing are just such a combination.]

Suppose you say that it's not correct.

Consider these two.

They are so,

Because they are something which is both (1) not related to a working thing, and (2) also such that being them is contradictory to being a working thing.

DANG PO GRUB STE, DE'I RGYU YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The first part of your reason is not correct: it is not correct to say that the two of a valid perception and a recollection which act as a cause for a working thing are not related to the working thing.]

But the first part of our reason is correct,

Because they are its cause.

GNYIS PA GRUB STE, YIN PA MI SRID PA'I SHES BYA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The second part of your reason is not correct: it is not correct to say that the two of a valid perception and a recollection which act as a cause for a working thing are such that being them is contradictory to being a working thing.]

But the second part of our reason is correct,

Because they are a knowable thing which cannot be.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN,  
RTAG PA DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN, RTAG PA  
DANG 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YANG YIN, RTAG PA DANG MA 'BREL  
BA DANG MA 'BREL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN MED ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

There is no one thing which is all of the following: (1) such that being it is contradictory to being something such that being it is contradictory to being a thing which is unchanging; (2) such that being it is not contradictory with being something such that being it is not contradictory to being a thing which is unchanging; (3) related to something which is related to a thing which is unchanging; and (4) not related to something which is not related to a thing which is unchanging.

DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PAR THAL, RTAG PA DANG MA 'BREL BA  
DE, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR,

But there does exist one thing which is all of the above,  
Because that which is not related to an unchanging thing is just such a thing.

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PAR THAL,  
RTAG PA DANG 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YIN PA GANG ZHIG, DE DANG  
MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN, DE DANG 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA  
YIN, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA DANG MA 'BREL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that that which is not related to an  
unchanging thing is just such a thing.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so just such a thing, one that combines all four;

Because it is something which is (1) such that being it is contradictory to being something that is such that being it is contradictory to being an unchanging thing; and (2) it is such that being it is not contradictory to

being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being this [unchanging thing]; it is related to what is related to this [unchanging thing]; and it is unrelated to what is unrelated to this [unchanging thing].

DANG PO MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIG, KHYOD YIN NA, RTAG PA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN DGOS PA'I PHYIR TE, KHYOD YIN NA RTAG PA DANG THA MI DAD YIN DGOS PA'I PHYIR,

[The first part of your reason is not correct: it is incorrect to say that that which is not related to an unchanging thing is such that being it is contradictory to being something that is such that being it is contradictory to being an unchanging thing.]

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

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because it is (1) distinct from this [thing that is such that being it is contradictory to being an unchanging thing], and (2) if something is it [that is, if something is something which is not related to an unchanging thing], then it must be such that being it is not contradictory with being an unchanging thing;

And this is true because if something is it [that is, if something is something which is not related to an unchanging thing], then it cannot be distinct from an unchanging thing.

RTZA RTAGS GNYIS PA MA GRUB NA, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA CHOS CAN, KHYOD DE DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, DE DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR TE, RTAG PA DE DE LTAR YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The second part of your original reason is not correct: it is not correct to say that that which is not related to an unchanging thing is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being an unchanging thing; it is related to what is related to an unchanging thing; and it is unrelated to what is unrelated to an unchanging thing.]

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

Consider that which is not related to it [that is, to an unchanging thing].

It is so such that being it is not contradictory with being something which is such that being it is not contradictory with being it [an unchanging thing],

Because there does exist one thing which is both (1) it [that is, something which is not related to an unchanging thing], and (2) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being it [an unchanging thing];

And this is true because an unchanging thing is just that.

RTZA RTAGS GSUM PA MA GRUB NA, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA CHOS CAN,  
DE DANG 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YIN PAR THAL, DE DANG 'BREL BA  
DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIG, DE DANG 'BREL BA MED NA, KHYOD MED  
DGOS PA'I PHYIR,

[The third part of your original reason is not correct: it is not correct to say that that which is not related to an unchanging thing is related to something which is related to a thing which is unchanging.]

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

Consider that which is not related to it [to an unchanging thing].

It is so something which is related to something which is related to a thing which is unchanging,

Because it is (1) distinct from that which is related to it [to a thing which is unchanging], and (2) if there existed no things which were related to it [to a thing which is unchanging], then it could not exist either.

RTZA RTAGS BZHI PA MA GRUB NA, RTAG PA DANG MA 'BREL BA CHOS  
CAN, KHYOD KHYOD DANG MA 'BREL BA YIN PAR THAL, KHYOD BDAG  
MED YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[The fourth part of your original reason is not correct: it is not correct to say that that which is not related to an unchanging thing is not related to something which is not related to a thing which is unchanging.]

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

Consider that which is not related to an unchanging thing.  
It is so true, that it is not related to itself,  
Because it is an example of a thing which has no nature of its own.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, SHES BYA DANG 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN,  
SHES BYA DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN, SHES BYA DANG  
'BREL BA DANG MA 'BREL BA YANG YIN, SHES BYA DANG MA 'BREL BA  
DANG 'BREL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

There does exist one thing which combines all the following: (1) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a knowable thing; (2) something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a knowable thing; (3) something which does not share a relationship with something which shares a relationship with a knowable thing; and (4) something which shares a relationship with something which does not share a relationship with a knowable thing.

SHES BYA DANG MI 'GAL BA DE, DE 'DRA BA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PAR  
THAL, DE 'DRA BA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA GANG ZHIG, SHES BYA DANG  
'BREL BA DE, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN MA YIN PA'I PHYIR,

So then is something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a knowable thing this kind of combination?

Because (1) there does exist just such a combination, and (2) something which shares a relationship with a knowable thing is not such a combination.

DANG PO DNGOS, GNYIS PA MA GRUB NA, SHES BYA DANG 'BREL BA  
CHOS CAN, SHES BYA DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YIN PAR THAL,  
DE 'DRA BA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR,

You have already agreed directly to the first part of our reason.  
Suppose then you say that the second part is not correct.

Consider something which shares a relationship with a knowable thing.

So is it then something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a knowable thing?

Because it is just such a combination.

RTAGS DNGOS, 'DOD MI NUS TE, DE DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR TE, KHYOD KYANG YIN, DE DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR TE, BUM PA DANG GCIG DE DE LTAR YIN PA'I PHYIR,

You have already agreed directly to the reason.

But you cannot agree to our original statement here,

Because it [something which shares a relationship with a knowable thing] is something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being this thing;

And this is true because there does exist something which is both (1) it [that is, something which shares a relationship with a knowable thing] and (2) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being that [knowable thing];

And this is true because that which is one and the same as a water pitcher is just such a combination.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, SHES BYA DANG MI 'GAL BA CHOS CAN, SHES BYA DANG 'BREL BA DANG MA 'BREL BA YIN PAR THAL, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[Then I agree to your original statement: something which shares a relationship with a knowable thing is something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a knowable thing.]

Consider something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a knowable thing.

So is it then something which does not share a relationship with something which does share a relationship with a knowable thing?

Because it is just such a combination.

RTAGS DNGOS, 'DOD MI NUS TE, DE DANG 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR TE, DE DANG 'BREL BA DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIG, DE DANG 'BREL BA MED NA, KHYOD MED DGOS PA'I PHYIR,

You've already agreed directly to the reason.

You can't agree to our original position,

Because it [something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being a knowable thing] is something which does share a relationship with something which does share a relationship with a knowable thing;

And this is because (1) it is distinct from something which does share a relationship with a knowable thing, and (2) if the thing with which it shares a relationship ceased to exist, then it would itself cease to exist.

RTAGS SLA, BYAS PA LA KHO NA RE, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN YONGS RDZOGS DE YOD PAR THAL, KA BA DANG 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YANG YIN, DE DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN, DE DANG 'BREL BA DANG MA 'BREL BA YANG YIN, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN YOD PA'I PHYIR NA, 'DIR MA KHYAB, RTAGS GRUB STE, KA BA DANG 'GAL BA DE DE LTAR YIN PA'I PHYIR,

The reason we've given is easy to accept.

Suppose, relative to this same point, someone comes and says:

It is so, that there does exist a typical example which incorporates all the conditions stated.

Because there does exist one thing which is (1) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a pillar; (2) something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being this same thing; (3) something which does not share a relationship with something which does share a relationship with this same thing; and (4) something which does share a relationship with something which does not share a relationship with this same thing.

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

The reason, by the way, is itself true, for something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a pillar is just this kind of combination.

MA GRUB NA, KA BA DANG 'GAL BA CHOS CAN, DE 'DRA'I GZHI MTHUN  
YIN PAR THAL, KA BA DANG 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PA GANG  
ZHIG, DE DANG MI 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA YIN, DE DANG 'BREL BA  
DANG MA 'BREL BA YIN, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YIN PA'  
PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that something which is such that being it is  
contradictory to being a pillar is just this kind of  
combination.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a pillar.

It is so just such a combination,

Because it is (1) something which is such that being it is not contradictory to  
being something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a  
pillar; and (2) it is something which is such that being it is contradictory to  
being something which is such that being it is not contradictory with  
being this thing [a pillar], (3) it is something which does not share a  
relationship with what does share a relationship with this thing [a pillar],  
and (4) it is something which shares a relationship with what does not  
share a relationship with this thing [the pillar].

RTAGS DANG PO DANG GNYIS PA SLA, RTAGS GSUM PA MA GRUB NA,  
DE CHOS CAN, DE DANG 'BREL BA DANG MA 'BREL BA YIN PAR THAL,  
DE DANG 'BREL BA MED NA KHYOD MED MI DGOS PA'I PHYIR TE, KA  
BA'IDGAG GZHI DE DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

The first and second elements in our reason are easy to accept.

Suppose you say that the third is not correct.

Consider this same thing [something which is such that being it is contradictory  
to being a pillar].

It is so something which does not share a relationship with something which  
does share a relationship with this thing [the pillar],

Because it is not necessarily the case that, if something which did have such a relationship ceased to exist, it too would have to cease to exist;  
And this is true because a place where there is no pillar is an example of that.

RTAGS BZHI PA MA GRUB NA, KA BA DANG 'GAL BA CHOS CAN, DE  
DANG MA 'BREL BA DANG 'BREL BA YIN PAR THAL, DE DANG MA 'BREL  
BA DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIG, DE DANG MA 'BREL BA MED NA,  
KHYOD MED DGOS PA'I PHYIR, RTAGS SLA,

Suppose you say that the fourth element in our reason is not correct.

Consider something which is such that being it is contradictory to being a pillar.  
It is so something which shares a relationship with something which  
shares no relationship with a pillar,  
Because (1) it is distinct from something which shares no relationship with a  
pillar; and (2) if something which shares no relationship with a pillar  
ceased to exist, it too would have to cease to exist.



KHA CIG NA RE, MI 'GAL BA DANG 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN NA,  
'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA YIN PAS KHYAB ZER NA,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

If something is such that being it is not contradictory to being  
something which is such that being it is contradictory to being  
something which is not contradictory, then it must always be  
something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being  
something which is contradictory.

'GAL BA'I LDOG PA CHOS CAN, DER THAL, DE'I PHYIR,

Consider the exclusion of all that is not something which is contradictory.  
So is it then [something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being  
something which is contradictory]?  
Because it is [something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being  
something which is such that being it is contradictory to being something  
which is not contradictory].

MA GRUB NA, DE CHOS CAN, DER THAL, KHYOD KYANG YIN, MI 'GAL  
BA DANG 'GAL BA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN PA YOD PA'I PHYIR,  
'GAL BA DE DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

[It's not correct to say that the exclusion of all that is not something  
which is contradictory is something which is such that being it is  
not contradictory to being something which is such that being it is  
contradictory to being something which is not contradictory.]

Suppose you say it's not correct.

Consider this same thing.

It is so,

Because there does exist one thing which is both it, and also a thing which is such  
that being it is contradictory to being something which is not  
contradictory.

And this is because being something which is contradictory is just such a thing.

RTZA BAR 'DOD NA, DE CHOS CAN, 'GAL BA DANG MI 'GAL BA MA YIN  
PAR THAL, 'GAL BA DANG THA DAD GANG ZHIG, KHYOD DANG 'GAL  
BA'I GZHI MTHUN MI SRID PA'I PHYIR TE, 'GAL BA 'GAL BA MA YIN PA'I  
PHYIR,

[Then I agree with your original statement: the exclusion of all that  
is not something which is contradictory is such that being it is not  
contradictory to being something which is contradictory.]

Suppose you agree with our original statement.

Consider this same thing [the exclusion of all that is not something which is  
contradictory].

It is not so something which is such that being it is not contradictory to being  
something which is contradictory,

Because (1) it is distinct from something which is contradictory, and (2) there is  
no one thing which can be both it and something which is contradictory;

And this is because being contradictory is not something which is contradictory.

---

GNYSIS PA RANG LUGS BZHAG PA LA, 'GAL BA LA MTSAN NYID DANG DBYE BA GNYIS,

Here is the second part, where we present our own position. We proceed in two steps, covering the definition of what it is to be in contradiction, and then the different types of contradiction.

DANG PO NI, KHYOD THA DAD KYANG YIN, KHYOD YIN PA MI SRID PA YANG YIN PA'I GZHI MTHUN DU DMIGS PA DE, RANG NYID 'GAL BA YIN PA'I MTSAN NYID,

Here is the definition of what it is for two things to be in contradiction:

The two things must (1) be distinct from each other, and then they must be such that (2) it is impossible for any one thing to be both of them.

GNYSIS PA 'GAL BA LA DBYE NA, PHAN TSUN SPANG 'GAL DANG , LHAN CIG MI GNAS 'GAL GNYIS,

There are two different ways of being in contradiction: contradictory in the sense of being mutually exclusive; and contradictory in the sense of being diametrically opposed.

DANG PO NI, RNAM BCAD YONGS GCOD KYI SGO NAS MI MTHUN PAR GNAS PA, PHAN TSUN SPANG 'GAL GYI MTSAN NYID, DE DANG 'GAL BA GNYIS DON

The definition of the first of these, to be contradictory in the sense of being mutually exclusive, is as follows:

Two things which conflict with each other in such a way that the presence of one automatically means the absence of the other.

The two terms "contradictory in the sense of being mutually exclusive" and "contradictory" refer to the same thing.

GCIGDE LA DBYE NA, DNGOS 'GAL DANG , BRGYUD 'GAL GNYIS, PHAN TSUN DNGOS SU MI MTHUN PAR GNAS PA, DNGOS 'GAL GYI MTSAN

NYID, DNGOS SU GNOD BYA GNOD BYED MA YIN ZHING , GZHI MI MTHUN PAR GNAS PA, BRGYUD 'GAL GYI MTSAN NYID,

Things which are contradictory in the sense of being mutually exclusive may be further divided into two types: those which contradict each other in this way directly; and those which contradict each other in this way indirectly.

The definition of things which contradict each other in this way directly is "Two things which conflict with each other directly." The definition of things which contradict each other in this way indirectly is "Two things which are such that no one thing can be both, but which are not such that one immediately obviates the other."

DANG PO'I MTSAN GZHI NI, DNGOS PO DANG DNGOS MED GNYIS LTA BU, GNYIS PA'I MTSAN GZHI NI, TSA GRANG GNYIS DANG , BDAG 'DZIN DANG BDAG MED RTOGS PA'I SHES RAB GNYIS LTA BU,

A typical example of the first would be something like the two of "working thing" and "a thing which does no work." A typical example of the second would be "heat" and "coldness," or else "the state of mind which holds that things have some nature of their own" and "the wisdom which realizes that nothing has a nature of its own."

GNYIS PA NI, RGYUN BCAD BYA GCOD BYED KYI SGO NAS MI MTHUN PAR GNAS PA, LHAN CIG MI GNAS 'GAL GYI MTSAN NYID,

Here is the definition of the second kind of contradiction—of things which are contradictory in the sense of being diametrically opposed:

Two things which conflict with each other in such a way that each one acts to stop the continued existence of the other.

MTSAN GZHI NI, GNYEN PO DANG SPANG BYA GNYIS LTA BU,

A typical example would be a spiritual antidote and the negative personal quality which it allows you to eliminate.

CHOS DE DANG BDAG GCIG 'BREL GYI MTSAN NYID YOD DE, KHYOD CHOS DE DANG BDAG NYID GCIG PA'I SGO NAS THA DAD, CHOS DE MED NA KHYOD MED DGOS PA'I CHOS DE DE YIN PA'I PHYIR,

The definition of what it is to share a relationship with something else in such a way that to be the first is to automatically be the other is as follows:

Whenever two existing things are such that, to be the first is by nature to be the second, but in such a way that they are separate things; and where—if the second were to cease to exist—then the first would have to cease to exist as well.

MTSAN GZHI NI, BUM PA DANG BUM PA'I LDOG PA LTA BU,

An example would be the relation between a vase and the exclusion of all that is not the vase.

GZHI LA SBYAR NA, DNGOS PO DANG BDAG NYID GCIG PA'I SGO NAS  
THA DAD, DNGOS PO MED NA KHYOD MED DGOS PA DE DNGOS PO  
DANG BDAG GCIG 'BREL GYI MTSAN NYID, MTSAN GZHI NI, BUM PA  
LTA BU,

Here is an actual application of the concept. The definition of what it is to share a relationship with "working things" in such a way that to be a particular thing is to automatically be a working thing is "something which is such that to be it is by nature to be a working thing, but in such a way that they are separate things; and where—if 'working things' were to cease to exist, then the particular thing would have to cease to exist as well." A typical example here would be a water pitcher.

DE BYUNG 'BREL GYI MTSAN NYID YOD DE, CHOS DE DANG RDZAS THA  
DAD PA'I SGO NAS CHOS DE'I 'BRAS BU'I RIGS SU GNAS PA, CHOS DE  
DANG DE BYUNG 'BREL GYI MTSAN NYID YIN PA'I PHYIR,

The definition of what it is to share a relationship with something else in such a way that the first has come from the second is as follows:

Whenever two things are such that to be the first is to be the kind of thing which is the result of the second, in such a way that to be the first is not to be, by its very essence, the second.

MTSAN GZHI YOD DE, DNGOS PO'I PHYI LOGS SU BYUNG BA RNAMS  
DNGOS PO DANG DE BYUNG 'BREL YIN PA'I PHYIR,

A typical example would be the relationship of one coming from the other between those things which are a working thing the moment after it, and the original working thing.

---

GSUM PA RTZOD PA SPONG BA LA, KHA CIG NA RE, YOD PA DANG MED PA GNYIS CHOS CAN, THA DAD CING GZHI MTHUN MI SRID PA YIN PAR THAL, 'GAL BA YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA, RTAGS MA GRUB BO,

Here is the final part: eliminating our opponent's rebuttal. Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider the two of existence and non-existence.  
So are these then two things which are discrete from one another,  
and which are such that no one thing can be both?  
Because they are two things which are contradictory.

To this we answer, "The statement you gave as your reason is not correct."

, 'DOD NA, YOD PA DANG MED PA GNYIS CHOS CAN, YOD PAR THAL, THA DAD YIN PA'I PHYIR,

Suppose you do agree [that the two of existence and non-existence were two things which are both discrete from one another, and which are such that no one thing can be both].

Consider the two of existence and non-existence.  
Are they then something which exists?  
Because they are discrete from one another.

---

KHA CIG NA RE, DU BA CHOS CAN, DE BYUNG 'BREL YIN PAR THAL, ME DANG DE BYUNG 'BREL YIN PA'I PHYIR ZER NA MA KHYAB,

Suppose someone comes and makes the following claim:

Consider smoke.

It is so then a relationship where one thing has come from another,  
Because it shares a relationship with fire such that it has come from  
the other.

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

*[Please note that this section continues, but was not translated due to the quantity of material.]*