**Sopa, Lhundub. Steps on the Path to Enlightenment:
A Commentary on Tsongkhapa's Lamrim Chenmo,
Volume 5: Insight. Wisdom Publications.
[glossary entries]**

Contradictory (*’gal ba*). Two things are contradictory if nothing instantiates both; in other words, there is no common ground or shared basis. Among various ways of being contradictory there are two basic ones. See *directly contradictory* and *indirectly contradictory*.

Directly contradictory (*dngos ’gal*). This includes directly contradictory in the sense of being mutually eliminating (*phan tshun spangs te gnas pa’i dngos ’gal*). Two things are directly contradictory if the terminology itself shows that it is impossible to be both things and impossible to be neither. This means that by eliminating one side you prove the other. This kind of proof gives rise to an immediate understanding. So if two things are contradictory in terms of reality but not in terms of terminology or understanding, then they are not directly contradictory. See *indirectly contradictory in the sense of being mutually eliminating*.

Indirectly contradictory (*brgyud ’gal*). There is a less strict way and a stricter way of being indirectly contradictory. This entry deals with the first. Two things are indirectly contradictory in the less strict way if there are no instances that are both, yet there are instances that are neither. An example of this is red and yellow. Whatever is red cannot be yellow, and whatever is yellow cannot be red. There is no positive common ground: something that is both. But there is a common ground of their negations: something that is neither red nor yellow, such as blue. So if something is not red, then it does not have to be yellow. It can be a color other than those two. Therefore red and yellow are not strictly contradictory. In Western philosophy, they are called contrary. See *indirectly contradictory in the sense of being mutually eliminating*.

Indirectly contradictory in the sense of being mutually eliminating (*phan tshun spangs te gnas pa’i brgyud ’gal*). A stricter way of being indirectly contradictory is where being both things is impossible and being neither is impossible. There is no third ground or possibility at all, whether positive or negative. If something is not F then it must be G, and if it is not G then it must be F. These are contradictory in terms of reality, but they are not contradictory in terms of terminology or understanding — so according to Buddhist logic, they are not directly contradictory. An example of this is permanent and produced. Permanent and produced are contradictory in the sense of being mutually eliminating. But they are not directly contradictory in the sense of being mutually eliminating. If you mentally or verbally cut out permanent, this does not mean you will naturally understand produced. Or if you cut out produced, then you do not necessarily understand permanent. See *directly contradictory in the sense of being mutually eliminating*.