DETERMINING POSSIBILITIES

With regard to the mode of using this reasoning, I am going to give you a good form of it so that it will be pure, so that your reasoning will be pure and correct. If when you are first training in reasoning you do not do it completely correctly—if there are some faults in the mode of reasoning—then, having gotten used to this, it is more difficult to correct it later on than it is to learn it in the beginning.

In Tibet we considered the initial training in the path of reasoning to be very important. One establishes this basis in the beginning, and no matter if forty or fifty years pass, one becomes a great ge-shay or whatever, this basis, that which was set at the beginning, remains just as it was. Therefore, when we talk about people who have trained in definitions, we ask, "Is their path of reasoning pure?" There are two ways in which reasoning can be pure or impure; one is that, if when debating one mixes in a lot of conversational questions and answers, this is a sign that one's reasoning is not good, is not pure. The other measure of whether one's path of reasoning is pure or impure is if one, even though using the correct vocabulary and not mixing in a lot of colloquial sentences and so forth, confuses the order, saying what should come earlier later and what should come earlier; in this case also one's reasoning is said to be impure.

What is the purpose of making one's path of reasoning pure? Even though it may be a bit more difficult in the beginning, if one trains at it, then when one approaches even difficult topics one will be capable of thinking about them in a very deep manner.
Because you know the general procedure of reasoning quite well already, I have hope that this particular class will be of help to you in furthering this. I will myself be considering whatever techniques there are in order to improve your path of reasoning.

C. 
If one agrees with this statement, one would say
If one does not agree, one would say
In this case we will assume that one does not agree, and thus the defender says:

D. 

C. 
If more than one reason is given one says

D. 

C. 

D. 
One might ask the defender to spell out what reason he was saying was not established in order to make it more clear for the audience; for example, there might be a situation where several hundred people were listening, and they might not all be clear on what the referent of the "first reason" was. Thus, it is helpful to spell it out.
C. ਭਾਵੇ ਭੇਟੇ ਕਿ ਹੁਣ ਕੇਸ਼ਮੁੰਦਾ ਤਲਾਸ ਹੁੰਦੇ ਹਨ। ਸਾਰੀ ਸਾਰੀ ਹੀ ਕੁਝ ਇਸਨੂੰ ਅੱਠ ਜੁੜਨ ਦੀ ਇਕੱਲੇ ਨੇ ਵੇਲਾ ਲੈਂਦੀ ਹੁੰਦੀ ਹੈ।

D. ਕੁਝ ਦੋਨੋਂ

C. ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਆਮਦਾਨ

D. ਸ੍ਰੀਸ਼ਿੰਧਾ ਦੁਆਰਾ

C. ਹੁਣ ਨਾ ਦੋਨੋਂ

D. ਸੂਰਜ ਸਾਂ ਵਾਲੀ

C. ਹੁਣ ਹੁਣ ਦੁਆਹ ਅਤੇ

D. ਸੂਰਜ ਸਾਜਾ ਅਤੇ

C. ਹੁਣ ਹੁਣ ਦੁਆਹ ਅਤੇ

D. ਸੂਰਜ ਸਾਜਾ ਅਤੇ

C. ਹੁਣ ਹੁਣ ਦੁਆਹ ਅਤੇ

D. ਸੂਰਜ ਸਾਜਾ ਅਤੇ

C. ਹੁਣ ਹੁਣ ਦੁਆਹ ਅਤੇ

D. ਸੂਰਜ ਸਾਜਾ ਅਤੇ
It would be difficult to say "the reason is not established" at this point; everyone would laugh if you did. When you reach a point at which a reason is given which is common knowledge for everyone, then it is not suitable to say "the reason is not established" and thus the only response you have to give is "there is no pervasion." (if you want to disagree)

D.

C. यदि दोनवराशी आत्तावर्गीय होतील तर त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेचे एकत्र असल्यास त्यांच्या व्यक्तीसमुदायात (तुलनात्मक व्यक्तीसमुदायात) त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेचे दोन अधिक वर्ग आवश्यक असतील। ती समस्तीकरणच्या वर्गांमध्ये दोन वर्गांचे वर्गीकरण असतात: 1) त्यांची आत्तावर्गीयता -- त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेनुसार आत्तावर्गीयतेचे एकत्र असल्यास त्यांच्या व्यक्तीसमुदायात (तुलनात्मक व्यक्तीसमुदायात) त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेचे दोन अधिक वर्ग आवश्यक असतील। ती समस्तीकरणच्या वर्गांमध्ये दोन वर्गांचे वर्गीकरण असतात: 2) व्यक्तीच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेनुसार आत्तावर्गीयतेचे एकत्र असल्यास त्यांच्या व्यक्तीसमुदायात (तुलनात्मक व्यक्तीसमुदायात) त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेचे दोन अधिक वर्ग आवश्यक असतील। ती समस्तीकरणच्या वर्गांमध्ये दोन वर्गांचे वर्गीकरण असतात: 3) त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेनुसार आत्तावर्गीयतेचे एकत्र असल्यास त्यांच्या व्यक्तीसमुदायात (तुलनात्मक व्यक्तीसमुदायात) त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेचे दोन अधिक वर्ग आवश्यक असतील। ती समस्तीकरणच्या वर्गांमध्ये दोन वर्गांचे वर्गीकरण असतात: 4) त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेनुसार आत्तावर्गीयतेचे एकत्र असल्यास त्यांच्या व्यक्तीसमुदायात (तुलनात्मक व्यक्तीसमुदायात) त्यांच्या आत्तावर्गीयतेचे दोन अधिक वर्ग आवश्यक असतील।

What is the definition of mutually inclusive? There are four parts to this definition which must be complete for two things to be mutually inclusive: 1) their being must occur -- there must be something which is both; 2) they must be different; 3) there must be the eightfold mutual pervasion; and 4) they must be phenomena. For example, the being of product and product occurs but they are not different; thus they are not mutually inclusive. The definition also specifies that for two things to be mutually inclusive they must be phenomena with respect to which there is the eightfold mutual pervasion. The reason for saying they must be phenomena is that between two non-existents such as the horns of a rabbit and the son of a barren woman, there is the mutual eightfold pervasion. This is because to the statement "whatever is the horns of a rabbit is necessarily the son of a barren woman," if one says there is no such pervasion, one has nothing to posit; there is nothing that is the horns of a rabbit but is not the son of a barren woman, because if there were some-
thing that were the horns of a rabbit, then anything would be possible.

It is not sufficient for two things to be phenomena with respect to which there is the mutual eightfold pervasion for them to be mutually inclusive—for example product and product, or the two, pot and pillar and the two, permanent phenomenon and thing.

There are different forms used in asking the defender to spell out his response. If he has said རྟན་, one says to him ་རྟན་. If he has said རྟན་, one says to him ་རྟན་. If he has said རྟན་, one says to him ་རྟན་.

Returning to the debate, the challenger has just said:

D. སྣ་མ།

In general if a definiendum is in question one can establish by means of its definition. However, in this situation such is not suitable because the challenger has already indicated by his earlier རྟན་ that he does not accept that there is the mutual eightfold pervasion between the two things in question—in this case between a Bodhisattva Superior's path and a causal knower of paths. Thus to cite the definition of mutually inclusive here would be contradictory with the path of reasoning—

C. སྣ་མ།

D. སྣ་མ།
Saying "already indicates that the opponent has already accepted the reason. In this case for him to say "the reason is not established" would be denying his own statement and would be incorrect.

Thus, the defender's response here is ○. 
When the challenger cites a textual source such as Jam-yang shay-ba to establish a reason, it is not really an option for the defender to say "the reason is not established." It would be as if one were saying, "Even if he said that, I won't assert it." Thus one's choices are to say "I accept that." or to say, "There is no pervasion." If one says the latter, one's meaning is that the source quoted has a different meaning from that which the challenger is giving it and one should then go on to give a different commentary on the line.

Returning to the debate from page 6 one possible line of proof that one might follow from the defenders last line is:

C. ང་སེམས་ཅན་ཅན་མཚན་པ་དྲ་བཅོས་པ་ཅེས་ཆེན་ཅན་པོ་མེན་པར་བྱེད་པ་ཡིན་པས་མི་ཐེན་པའི་ཐོན་པའི་ཐོན་པ་ཐེན་པ་ཐེན་པ་ཆེན་པོ་ཐ་མོ་ལེ་ཐོན་པ་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི

D. ཆོས

C. ང་སེམས་ཅན་ཅན་མཚན་པ་དྲ་བཅོས་པ་ཅེས་ཆེན་ཅན་ཐམས་ཅད། བྲུག་པ་ཐེན་པ་ཐི་མོ་ལེ་ཐོན་པ་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི

D. ཆོས

C. ང་སེམས་ཅན་ཅན་མཚན་པ་དྲ་བཅོས་པ་ཅེས་ཆེན་ཅན་ཐམས་ཅད། བྲུག་པ་ཐེན་པ་ཐི་མོ་ལེ་ཐོན་པ་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི

The meaning of citing the reason "because of being one with..." is that the defender in stating the subject is already saying that it is what is being proven. In other words, the defender by stating "an exalted wisdom in the continuum of a Bodhisattva Superior directly realizing emptiness" is already saying that it is "an
exalted wisdom in the continuum of a Mahayana Superior." Thus, for the defender to say "the reason is not established" at this point would be internally contradictory.

Note: Whenever བོད་ is stated in the བོད་ or in the བོད་, it refers back to the subject.

Returning to the debate:

D. འོ་བ།
C. འོ་བ། འོ་བ།

D. འོ་བ།
C. འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ།

The defender cannot say བོད་ here because he would be contradicting what he has just accepted.

D. འོ་བ།
C. འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ། འོ་བ།

Everyone accepts this statement and this pervasion, so the defender is forced to say འོ་བ། at this point. It is not generally accepted that there is the pervasion that whatever is a knower of bases (as opposed to a Mahayana knower of bases) is necessarily that which abides in a Hinayana type of realizer because some scholars assert that there is a knower of bases in the continuum.
of a Hinayana Superior realizing emptiness—such would be a knower of bases but would not be that which abides in a Hinyana type of realizer.

There are in general, from the viewpoint of the Yogachara-Svatantrika-Madhyamikas—which are sixty-six different types of realization:...
DETERMINING POSSIBILITIES

D. अनुभव
C. उत्पत्तिभूति जलकरति ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने | जो तथाकालिक यथाश्रेष्ठता | ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने विश्वासित
D. अनुभव
C. उत्पत्तिभूति जलकरति ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने | जो तथाकालिक यथाश्रेष्ठता | ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने विश्वासित
D. अनुभव
C. उत्पत्तिभूति जलकरति ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने | जो तथाकालिक यथाश्रेष्ठता | ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने विश्वासित
D. अनुभव
C. उत्पत्तिभूति जलकरति ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने | जो तथाकालिक यथाश्रेष्ठता | ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने विश्वासित
D. अनुभव
C. उत्पत्तिभूति जलकरति ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने | जो तथाकालिक यथाश्रेष्ठता | ज्योति वर्तमान सुर रहने विश्वासित
D. अनुभव
When positing an alternative one should give an illustration, i.e. not something having in it the words of that which you are trying to prove. Thus, as जानिये तीन यात्री, यात्री अभिज्ञ हैं अब आये, जो वातावरण के लिए तीन यात्री के बारे में अवश्य सुनें; इसे मानिए, whereas जानिये तीन यात्री, तीन यात्री नहीं मानें.

There are two ways to establish a reason: either by citing a scripture or by giving a reason that is to say, establishing it with reasoning.

There are three main Perfection of Wisdom Sutras: that in 8,000 stanzas, called the तुलसिमहादर्शन सूत्र, that in 25,000 stanzas, called the तुलसिमहादर्शन उपसूत्र; and that in 100,000 stanzas called the तुलसिमहादर्शन अनुक्रम.

At this point the defender does not have to say जानिये तीन यात्री to every part of the reason, but just to that part for which he thinks a possibility does not exist. Thus one would probably not say जानिये तीन यात्री since that possibility is easily posited,-- i.e. जानिये तीन यात्री के बारे में.
One needs to specify that this is a person on the uninterrupted path of the Mahayana path of seeing who has preceded that with the realization of a Foe Destroyer rather than just the realization of a Hearer. This is because there are those who switch from the Hearer path of accumulation to the Mahayana and also from the Hearer path of preparation. Such persons would have had previously the realization of a Hearer but would not have attained previously a knower of bases, since such is attained only with the attainment of a path of seeing. It is sufficient to say just Foe Destroyer and not specify Hearer or Solitary Realizer for any realization of a Foe Destroyer that would have preceded the Mahayana path of seeing would have to have been that of a Hearer or Solitary Realizer.
It would not be correct to say the first reason is not established (its too obviously true) but if somewhat did say one could prove it by citing the 25,000 Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sutra which says that attaining a Bodhisattva's Superior path and attaining a knower of paths are simultaneous.

The meaning of the second part of the reason is When one thinks about this with reasoning, it could not mean anything but .

There is only one uninterrupted path of the path of seeing. It is just one moment and is simultaneous with the attainment of the path of seeing and with the attainment of the first ground.

When you reach this point of stating as the reason that which the defender is already saying when he says the subject, then you have reached a point where that being proved "comes forth clearly to direct perception" - .

Omitting the steps going backwards and going on to prove the second part of the reason from p. 12, 6 lines from the bottom.
Whenever one attains a Superior path one necessarily attains a knower of bases — there is no way not to.
When one says, "You have accepted the three spheres," this means that the person has accepted the reason, has accepted the pervasion, and if one accepts the predicate, one will be contradicting a statement one has already made (in this case one has already said ..). Thus, this is a . When the challenger says .., no matter what answer one gives, one has lost one's assertion and one will get ...
Erroneous subjects which one might try to posit if the opponent accepted this statement:

1) (khyod thob ma thag pa) This subject has two faults. First, in the Yogachara-Svatantrika system, from whose viewpoint the presentation of grounds and paths is made, there is no such thing. Any person realizing emptiness directly is necessarily a Mahayana Superior. This is because emptiness is the main object of meditation only of Mahayanists; the reason for this is because of a difference between the main object of abandonment in the three vehicles. Hearers take as their main object of abandonment the obstructions to liberation; Solitary Realizers take as theirs the coarse obstructions to omniscience; and Bodhisattvas take as theirs the subtle obstructions to omniscience. Each vehicle takes as its main object of meditation that which overcomes its respective object of abandonment. Since only Bodhisattvas are seeking to overcome the subtle obstructions to omniscience, only they would meditate on emptiness.

However, such is not the case in Prasangika where any Superior has necessarily realized emptiness directly. This fact is one of the eight uncommon features of Prasangika.

The second fault with the above subject is a verbal one. Due to the wording of the original statement (khyod thob ma thag pa) what one posits as khyod must be a path, a consciousness. The
addition of thob ma thag pa leaves one with a final meaning of a person who has just attained such a path. Thus, at the point such a subject is posited one could say and break off the debate.

2) (lakṣaṇācāra sangākāra)

This subject has the fault that there are not four possibilities between one who has just attained a Superior path and one who has just attained a knower of bases because anyone who has just attained a Superior path has necessarily just attained a knower of bases. The thought in positing this subject was that just attaining a Superior path did not have to necessarily mean just attaining the path of seeing but could refer also to just attaining the path of meditation or the path of no more learning. However, such is not the case; to have just attained a Superior path means to have just attained the path of seeing, just as to have just attained a path means to have just attained the path of accumulation. If one wants to talk about having just attained one of the higher paths one must specify that path by name.

Within the context of this subject, one might try to posit as an example of someone who had just attained a Superior path and who had just attained a knower of paths one on the uninterrupted path of the Mahayana path of seeing. This subject has the fault of being too general; it includes within it both Bodhisattvas who have just attained a Superior path (those definite in the Mahayana lineage) and those not just attained a Superior path, having attained
it long before as Hearers or Solitary Realizers (those who have had previously the realization of a Foe Destroyer).

Thus, to the statement that one on the uninterrupted path of the Mahayana path of seeing has just attained a Superior path one would, within the three possible answers, reply, "the reason is not established." One could also say 明知自相, indicating that the subject includes within it that which is being proved as well as that which is not and is itself, and it from the viewpoint of its self-reverse (自反) is neither.

3) 專尚與所當知是無所有不見自相

The specific fault with this subject is that what was posited as a possibility that was both

This subject is unsuitable both in terms of attaining actual irreversibility, for such a 袖善 of dull faculties attains actual irreversibility from the supreme mundane qualities path of preparation (since one passes in one unbroken session from that to the path of seeing) but does not attain the signs of irreversibility until much later (on the eighth ground).

4) 自專尚與所當知是無所有不見自相

In general this subject does not work because there are no cases of one who has just attained a Superior path in dependence on the fourth concentration who has not just attained a knower of bases.

A Bodhisattva who has had previously the realization of a Foe Destroyer has necessarily attained all eight concentrations.

A Bodhisattva who is definite in the Mahayana lineage,
could attain the Mahayana path of seeing either in dependence on an actual concentration or in dependence on a preparation for a concentration.

When discussing the eight enterers and abiders, stream enterers and once returners have necessarily not attained an actual concentration, whereas never returners and Foe Destroyers have necessarily attained an actual concentration.
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This subject does not work because there are not four possibilities between one who has just attained it and one who has just attained a knower of paths, for there is nothing which is both and . This is because that which gets rid of the six coarse afflictions with regard to a particular level is the mental contemplation of either withdrawal or joy ; the path of seeing must be attained either from within an actual concentration (in which case one would have long before gotten rid of the coarse afflictions with regard to the lower level and would not have gotten rid of them with regard to one's present level) or from within a preparation for a concentration. In this latter case the preparation would be the mental contemplation of thorough isolation at which time one would not have gotten rid of the coarse afflictions with regard to that level since they are only gotten rid of with the next, higher mental contemplation, that of either withdrawal or joy.
However, there is a more basic fault to this subject. The coarse afflictions with respect to the first concentration are objects to be abandoned by a path of meditation. The uninterrupted path of the path of seeing (the only thing that one can posit as a time of just attaining a knower of paths) is an actual antidote to that which is to be abandoned by a path of seeing. Thus, there are two types of obstructions, those to be abandoned by a path of meditation and those to be abandoned by a path of seeing, and for any one thing to be a possibility which is both, it would have to be at one time both a path of seeing and a path of meditation—which is impossible. One must abandon these coarse afflictions to be abandoned by a path of meditation either prior to or subsequent to the path of seeing—but not at the same time.

This subject is subject to the same faults as the previous one. In addition it has the fault that by saying "one who has just attained a path which has abandoned the six afflictions with regard to the desire realm," one has limited oneself to a path of release; however one who has just attained either a knower of bases or a knower of paths must be one on an uninterrupted path and thus there can be no common locus of the two.

The subject is based on the thought that there are some who enter the path of meditation after the path of seeing and some who do not. However, such is not the case; one necessarily
enters the path of meditation after the path of seeing. Even if one enters the tantric path one is still on the path of meditation.

One on the Mahayana path of seeing who has had previously the realization of a Foe Destroyer is both a Mahayanist and a Foe Destroyer. He is not either a Hearer Foe Destroyer or a Solitary Realizer Foe Destroyer but is a third category of Foe Destroyer.

There would be no case of one who had just attained a path cultivating the four establishments in mindfulness and a knower of paths, for a Bodhisattva necessarily attains the establishments in mindfulness on the path of accumulation.

The thought in positing this subject was that one could attain an uninterrupted path at the time of attaining the mental contemplation of thorough isolation with regard to the first concentration. However, this is incorrect, for although uninterrupted paths are posited with regard to worldly paths of meditation, they are not actual uninterrupted paths. Whatever is an uninterrupted path or a path of release must be an exalted wisdom of meditative equipoise; whatever is an exalted wisdom of meditative equipoise must be non-contaminated (that is, must be non-conceptual). Worldly paths of meditation, because they possess an aspect of coarseness and subtleness, are not such.
The right answer:

That which is one who has just attained it and has not just attained a knower of bases is:

That which is one who has just attained a knower of bases and has not just attained it is:

That which is both is:

That which is one who has just attained a knower of paths is:

That which is one who has just attained a knower of paths and has not just attained it is:

That which is both is:

One definite in the Mahayana realizes the selflessness of persons and the coarse selflessness of phenomena at the same time as he realizes the subtle selflessness of phenomena—emptiness. This position is supported by a statement in Jam-yang-shay-ba's Root Text of the Great Exposition of Tenets (Grub mtha' rtsa ba) which says that one definite in the Mahayana lineage extinguishes the two afflictions and attains unsurpassed enlightenment simultaneously. At the time of the higher realizations, the lower ones come automatically. However, for the sake of trainees a Bodhisattva still has to actualize knowers of Hearer paths and knowers of Solitary Realizer paths.
A wrong answer: A. Only B and C are true.
Thus one can say back to the challenger:

However, the major fault with this subject is that one definite in the Mahayana lineage who is on the path of release of the path of seeing has abandoned only the artificial form of the apprehension of a self of persons, not the innate forms. Since that of which...
this is supposed to be an example (an awareness which has just abandoned the apprehension of a self of persons) was stated in general terms, one has to consider both the innate and artificial forms of the apprehension of a self of persons. In the Yogachara-Svatantrika system, the attainment of a state of having abandoned the innate conception of a self of persons is attained by one definite in the Mahayana simultaneously with the attainment of Buddhahood. The actual antidote to the apprehension of a self of persons is the final uninterrupted path of the tenth ground.

In the Prasangika system, the attainment of a state of having abandoned the apprehension of a self of persons is simultaneous with the attainment of the eighth ground, for simultaneous with the attainment of the eighth ground one gets rid of all the afflictive obstructions.

A correct answer to the set forth on p. 24: अर्थच्या जड़स्थिति संसार
One who has just attained it and has not just attained a true cessation which is a state of having abandoned the artificial form of the subtle obstructions to omniscience is: जिसको अर्थस्थिति संसार
One who has just attained a true cessation which is a state of having abandoned the artificial form of the subtle obstructions to omniscience but has not just attained a path of release of a path of seeing is: जिसको अर्थस्थिति संसार अर्थस्थिति संसार
One who has just attained both is: जिसको अर्थस्थिति संसार अर्थस्थिति संसार
And so forth.

Another correct answer: अर्थच्या जड़स्थिति संसार
A wrong answer: นุ่ง วัทคาคิ วัติวินา

There are four possibilities between one who has just attained a Foe Destroyer's exalted knower and one who has just attained a path of release which is a state of having abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the desire realm. However there are not four possibilities between this subject and one who has just attained a path of release which is a state of having abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the peak of cyclic existence. The nine afflictions with respect to the peak of cyclic existence are the most subtle of the afflictions; among these nine, the ninth is the most subtle. When one has abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the peak of cyclic existence one has attained a state of Foe Destroyership. Thus in terms of the four possibilities, there is no case of one who has just attained a path of release which is a state of having abandoned the ninth of the afflictions with respect to the peak of cyclic existence who has not just attained the exalted knower of a Foe Destroyer. There is also no case of one who has just attained an exalted knower of a Foe Destroyer who has not just attained a path of release which is a state of having abandoned the ninth of the afflictions with respect to the peak of cyclic existence.
With respect to the eight enterers and abiders, there are four types of abiders in the fruit, distinguished by what they have abandoned. An abider in the fruit of stream enterer has abandoned the artificial afflictions which are to be abandoned by a path of seeing. An abider in the fruit of once returner has abandoned the first six afflictions with respect to the desire realm. An abider in the fruit of never returner has abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the desire realm (i.e. has abandoned all nine afflictions). An abider in the fruit of Foe Destroyer has abandoned the eighty-first affliction, that is, the ninth affliction with respect to the peak of cyclic existence.

There are two types of Hearers: those whose mode of abandonment of afflictions is serial and those whose mode is simultaneous. Those whose mode of abandonment is serial abandon the eighty-one afflictions serially, one after the other. Thus, they have
eighty-one uninterrupted paths, eighty-one paths of release, and eighty-one true cessations. Hearers having a simultaneous mode of abandonment get rid of the eighty-one objects of abandonment by way of nine cycles of nine. Thus they get rid of the big of the big afflictions with respect to each of the nine realms at one time, and so forth. The simultaneous mode of abandonment is followed by those of sharper faculties because the antidote is of greater force.

Those definite in the Solitary Realizer and Mahayana lineages get rid of their objects of abandonment in a manner like that of Hearers having a simultaneous mode of procedure—that is, they get rid of the big of the big with respect to all nine realms at one time and so forth. It is logical that these mode of procedure would be such since among Hearers the simultaneous mode of procedure is for those of sharper faculties and since Solitary Realizers and Bodhisattvas have respectively even sharper faculties and generate even stronger antidotes.

A wrong answer: This subject has two verbal faults. First, the terms big of the big and so forth are used in reference to the afflictions, not for the uninterrupted paths and paths of release that are respective the actual antidotes to and states of being released from those
afflictions. Rather, one would say अनुमयत्व संबंधित है or वर्तमान अनुमयत्व or, to give a specific example अनुमयत्व संबंधित है. However, even if one were to fix up the wording to अनुमयत्व संबंधित है --there is no such thing. The path of release that is the state of having abandoned the small of the small afflictions is not a path of meditation but the first moment of an omniscient consciousness. If it were the path of release that is the state of having abandoned the small of the small afflictive obstructions, it would be the first moment of a Hearer Foe Destroyer and if it were the path of release which is the state of having abandoned the small of the small coarse obstructions to omniscience it would be the first moment of a Solitary Realizer Foe Destroyer. Removed of all verbal faults the above subject could be phrased अनुमयत्व संबंधित है in which case would be a correct subject. Other right answers: अनुमयत्व संबंधित है अनुमयत्व संबंधित है।

A wrong answer: अनुमयत्व संबंधित है।

The thought in positing this subject was that one could give as a possibility which was both one who has just attained abiding in the fruit of once returner and one who has just attained a path of release which is a state of having abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the peak of cyclic existence --thinking that if one is अनुमयत्व संबंधित है, all the fruits will come at once. However, it is not thus. अनुमयत्व संबंधित है अनुमयत्व संबंधित है। अनुमयत्व संबंधित है। अनुमयत्व संबंधित है अनुमयत्व संबंधित है। अनुमयत्व संबंधित है अनुमयत्व संबंधित है। अनुमयत्व संबंधित है अनुमयत्व संबंधित है। अनुमयत्व संबंधित है अनुमयत्व संबंधित है।

The designations "serial" and "simultaneous" are made with respect to the mode of abandoning the objects of abandonment, not
with respect to that of attaining the fruit. One whose mode of procedure is serial abandons the eighty-one afflictions in series; one whose mode of procedure is simultaneous abandons the afflictions in nine cycles—getting rid of an affliction with respect to all nine realms simultaneously. There is no such simultaneity with regards to attaining the fruit—for example, one must go through all five paths serially; there is no way to attain them simultaneously. Thus, for those whose mode of procedure is simultaneous, the terms once returner and never returner do not apply. A Hearer whose mode of procedure is simultaneous is an abider in the fruit of stream enterer with the attainment of the path of release of the path of seeing. He remains such as he abandons the nine cycles of afflictions until with the attainment of the final path of release which is the state of having abandoned the nine small of the small afflictions he becomes an abider in the fruit of Foe Destroyer.

These designations of the eight enterers and abiders are used only with reference to the Hinayana and not with reference to the Mahayana. This is because these eight refer mainly to progress in abandoning the afflictions. Since the abandonment of the afflictions is not the main object of abandonment of Mahayanists, this terminology does not apply to them. This terminology is also not suitable to use for Solitary Realizers from the viewpoint of the Yogachara-Svatantrika systems since, according to it, Solitary Realizers get rid of the coarse obstructions to omniscience. However, in systems where Solitary Realizers are asserted to only
get rid of the afflictive obstructions, the use of the terminology of the eight enterers and abiders would be suitable, since the mode of abandonment of Hearers and Solitary Realizers is mostly the same. Since the only tenet in which the type of realization of Hearers and Solitary Realizers is asserted to be substantially different is Yojachara and Vantanka, this is the only one in which the terminology of enterers and abiders cannot be used for Solitary Realizers.
Some right answers: 

An example of someone who has just attained a path of release that is a state of having abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the desire realm but has not just attained any of the three above subjects is: 

In general, this person is one who has just attained the path of release that is the state of having abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the desire realm. However, if one wanted to state a very pure subject avoiding any possible verbal fault one would say: 

A wrong answer: This is the same as saying because there is no Bodhisattva who has previously attained the state of a never returner who has not previously attained the state of a Foe Destroyer. This is because at the time one attains the state of a never returner one has already attained the path of meditation; once one has attained a path of meditation one will necessarily...
attain a path of no more learning—i.e., in the Hinayana systems, Foe Destroyership. Thus, the subject posited above gets amended to: \[\text{one who has just attained it (a Mahayana path of no more learning of one who has had previously the realization of a Foe Destroyer) and one who has just attained a path of release that is a state of having abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the peak of cyclic existence.}

The existence of such is made impossible by the very words of the subject for to have just attained a path of release means to have in that very moment attained it whereas one who has had previous realization as a Foe Destroyer has necessarily attained such long before.

A right answer:

It would also be correct just to say: \[\text{(The \text{Foe Destroyer}) would be individuals who have just attained a path of no more learning.}}\]

A wrong answer:

There is nothing which abandons both \[\text{and }\]
Another wrong answer: तेजस्वी भविष्य में नामकरण

This subject is unsuitable because there is no presentation of the eight enterers and abiders made for Solitary Realizers in the Yoga-chara-Svatantrika system. When such a subject is posited one would not say तिन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त—such a response being reserved for those in which there is a verbal fault (i.e. not such as basic fault as its not existing)—but would instead just keep saying तिन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त.

Another wrong answer: तिन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त

There is no such thing as तिन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त for the three fold cycle of afflictions must be abandoned serially and the three uninterrupted paths abandoning those afflictions must be attained serially. Thus it is necessary to single out one of these as the subject, rather than using all three.

A correct answer: तिन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त

(तिन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त)

A wrong answer: तिन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त तन्द्रास्त

The thought in positing this subject was that just as for one definite in the Mahayana the first moment of an omniscient consciousness is the path of release that is induced by the actual antidote to the ninth affliction with respect to the peak of cyclic existence, so the path of release induced by the actual antidote to the sixth affliction with respect to either the desire realm or the peak of cyclic existence would be one level higher than the uninterrupted path that induced it. Thus the thought was that since the actual antidote
to the sixth affliction is the seventh ground, the path of release that is the state of having abandoned the sixth affliction would be the eighth ground. However, such is not the case. In fact, the uninterrupted path of the seventh ground induces the path of release and at the time of attaining the 8th ground one attains the uninterrupted path of the 8th ground of the seventh ground. There is no parallel with the first moment of an omniscient consciousness because that is an exception to the general principle. The reason it is an exception is that the final uninterrupted path at the end of the continuum has gotten rid of the final, most subtle affliction and it is not suitable that the path of release it induces be in the continuum of a sentient being since that path of release is a state of having abandoned all afflictions. Thus that path of release is the first moment of an omniscient consciousness.

The above subject could be rephrased to in which case it would be a correct subject.

Another correct subject:
DETERMINING POSSIBILITIES

D. (An incorrect mode of proof one might try to pursue:

C. \[\text{Commentary on incorrect mode of\ndetermination of possibilities.}\]

D. \[\text{Further commentary on incorrect mode of\ndetermination of possibilities.}\]
This final reason is unsuitable because the person has already in the immediately preceding statement said "attain (thob pa) is a generality" (jal bzhin) and "having attained it a long time has passed" (lha'i bzhin). Thus it is unsuitable to try to prove the generality by stating the particularity.

The above line of reasoning is in general unfruitful because the opponent is just going to continue to say the reason is not established to whatever one posits.

C.

The meaning of this scripture is that for those of simultaneous abandonment, the two middle terms—one returner and never returner—do not apply. For the first and the last—for stream enterers having abandoned the small of the middling affictions with respect to the desire realm, "attain (thob pa) is a generality" (jal bzhin) and "having attained it a long time has passed" (lha'i bzhin). Once one has rejected the generality one has also rejected the particularities. Thus it is unsuitable to try to prove the generality by stating the particularity.

C.

This final reason is unsuitable because the person has already in the immediately preceding statement said "attain (thob pa) is a generality" (jal bzhin) and "having attained it a long time has passed" (lha'i bzhin). Thus it is unsuitable to try to prove the generality by stating the particularity.

The meaning of this scripture is that for those of simultaneous abandonment, the two middle terms—one returner and never returner—do not apply. For the first and the last—for stream enterers having abandoned the small of the middling affictions with respect to the desire realm, "attain (thob pa) is a generality" (jal bzhin) and "having attained it a long time has passed" (lha'i bzhin). Once one has rejected the generality one has also rejected the particularities. Thus it is unsuitable to try to prove the generality by stating the particularity.
and Foe Destroyers—there is no leap-over, that is, no prior separation from attachment to the desire realm (කාල්පණයෙන නැවේ) before attaining the path of seeing. (See Grounds and Paths transcript, pp. 109-110)
DETERMINING POSSIBILITIES

D. "Determining possibilities is crucial for our work."

C. "I believe that technology will play a significant role in the future."
At this point is in fact the correct answer for there are not four possibilities between that subject and one who has just attained the path of release that is the state of having abandoned the sixth affliction with respect to the desire realm. Neither of the first two possibilities exists.

A procedural point to note: If one's subject is a person and one wants to say something exists in his continuum that something must be either a consciousness, such as a path, or a quality. It cannot be another person. Thus one would not say that something must be either a consciousness, such as a path, or a quality. It cannot be another person. Thus one would not say

An alternate mode of procedure in the above debate, continuing from the * on p. 38:
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A wrong answer: \( \text{\textit{changdang laa \text{\textit{shaung}} \text{\textit{dang}}}} \) (which is just the same as \( \text{\textit{bhuqo laa \text{\textit{bhuqo}}}} \))

This subject does not work because there is no difference between it and \( \text{\textit{bhuqo laa \text{\textit{bhuqo}}}} \). One would never have just attained both the state of a Hearer Foe Destroyer and a Mahayana path of no more learning.

A wrong answer: \( \text{\textit{bhuqo laa \text{\textit{bhuqo}}}} \)

This subject does not work because it is \( \text{\textit{shaung}} \) with both one who has just attained Hearer Foe Destroyership and one who has just attained Mahayana Foe Destroyership.

One might debate about this subject as follows:

C. \( \text{\textit{sangdarg chenmo \text{\textit{bhuqo laa \text{\textit{bhuqo}}}}} \)

D. \( \text{\textit{dawo laa \text{\textit{bhuqo}}}} \)

D. \( \text{\textit{bhuqo}} \)
Note: One could at this juncture also have said: Although the mode of procedure is different, there is no difference in the meaning of what is being proved.

A wrong reason:

This reason is not established; there is also no pervasion. The reason is not established because there exists Such a person has attained the fruit of a never returner but has not attained the path of release which is the state of having abandoned the ninth affliction with respect to the desire realm.

There is no pervasion because this reason has no relationship to the subject that preceded it; one could
say to a person positing such a reason: 

The above reason would be an acceptable one if amended to:

However, a preferable reason is:

A right answer:
A wrong answer: এটি অবশ্যই সঠিক দৃষ্টিকোণ।

There is no one who has just attained Hearer Foe Destroyership who has not just attained the state of having abandoned the afflictions, for the attainment of the path of release that is the state of having abandoned the afflictive obstructions and the attainment of Foe Destroyership are simultaneous for a Hearer.

Another wrong answer: এটি অবশ্যই মিথ্যা ধারণা।

This has exactly the same faults as the one just posited above.

A right answer: এটি সঠিক।

Another right answer: এটি সঠিক।

Note: it is not necessary to specify কোন অলাঘো নিজেকে কাছে থাকা যেতে পারে। because a person having simultaneous abandonment is necessarily a concentration a who has not previously attained.

0. টিন নির্দেশনা।
A wrong answer: 'The subject is incorrect because what one would posit as the possibility that was one who has just attained it and is not one who has just attained Hearer Foe Destroyership is one definite in the Solitary Realizer lineage who has just attained Foe Destroyership. This is unsuitable because the designations "simultaneous" and "serial" are made only with respect to Hearers in tenet systems in which Hearers and Solitary Realizers have different types of realization (i.e. in Yogachara-Svatantrika). The above subject can be amended to in which case it is a correct subject.}'
It should be noted that although both 'abandonment of all eight concentrations and absorptions' and 'simultaneous abandonment' are correct designations, the more widely used is 'abandonment of all eight concentrations and absorptions' since what is really being referred to by the term "simultaneous" is the mode of abandoning the objects of abandonment. Also, with respect to those whose mode of procedure is serial, the preferred designation is 'serial attainment' since the primary referent of the term "serial" is the mode of attaining the fruits.

Another right answer: अन्याय ज्ञात्यानं गोविन्दवमी

This subject has four possibilities with one who has just attained Hearer Foe Destroyership (subjects would be the same as those posited on p. 46 for बुद्धवा नागर्विकुलि ओलगृह अधिक अन्याय परम नवम्भोति) but does not have four possibilities with one who has just attained Mahayana Foe Destroyership (this being synonymous with the attainment of Buddhahood in the Yogachara-Svatantrika system) because there is no possibility which is one who has just attained an actual concentration and has just attained Mahayana Foe Destroyership. A Bodhisattva has necessarily attained all eight concentrations and absorptions prior to attaining Buddhahood. One can infer this because he has necessarily attained an equipoise of cessation (संरक्षण यशवाक्षत्व) which must be preceded by the attainment of all eight concentrations and absorptions.

Note: अन्याय ज्ञात्यानं गोविन्दवमी

For example अन्याय ज्ञात्यानं गोविन्दवमी

There are non-Buddhists who have attained all eight actual concentrations and formless absorptions.
A wrong answer: 

This subject does not work because there is no possibility which is both one who has just attained it and one who has just attained Hearer Foe Destroyership. It can be attained by Hearers prior to attaining Foe Destroyership (Adorned Foe Destroyers, or subsequent to that attainment, but is not attained just at the time of attaining Foe Destroyership.

There are two subjects one could posit as someone who has just attained an equipoise of cessation but has not just attained Hearer Foe Destroyership:

1) The subject is posited thus because Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" (Madhyamakavatara) says that at the time of attaining a surpassing perfection of wisdom a Bodhisattva attains an equipoise of cessation.

2) Among the twenty spiritual aspirants (see 70 Topics transcripts, 39-41 and Topics of Enlightenment, pp. 14-14) such a Never Returner would be the eighteenth, a Never Returner who has actualized the corpus of meditative stabilizations.

One could not attain an equipoise of cessation prior to attaining the state of a Never Returner because in order to
to attain such a cessation one must have previously attained all eight concentrations and formless absorptions, such being of the entity of supramundane paths. Within the Hearer lineage there is no case of attaining a supramundane path that is of the entity of an actual concentration prior to attaining the state of a Never Returner.

This subject does not have four possibilities with one who has just attained Mahayana Foe Destroyership because there is no . Since the Mahayana path of meditation has eleven uninterrupted paths and eleven paths of release, one who has just attained the ninth path of release has only attained the tenth ground, not Buddhahood.

The thought in positing this subject is that one could have attained this thought—which is half of the definition of a being of
DETERMINING POSSIBILITIES

middling capacity—but not have attained a mind of renunciation which turns away from the marvels of cyclic existence—the other half of the definition. In general the two parts of the definition are not separated in this way but are considered to be two ways of stating the same thing, one from the viewpoint of the path and the other from that of the object of abandonment. Even if one were to posit a serial attainment of these two, positing for example, a being of small capacity who first attains a thought seeking liberation for his own sake but has not yet attained a mind of renunciation, this subject would not work, for then there would be no possibility which was both it and one who has just attained a Hearer or Solitary Realizer path of accumulation. This is because posited in this way one would have to first attain the thought seeking liberation and only subsequently through training in it develop the mind of renunciation and a Hinayana path of accumulation.

(Note: If this subject were instead understood as a fully qualified mind of renunciation, it would be a correct answer, similar to that which will be explained below.)

Another wrong answer: ภควิจัย ภควิจัย ภควิจัย ภควิจัย
This subject does have four possibilities with one who has just attained a Hearer path of accumulation and one who has just attained a Solitary Realizer path of accumulation.

Note: If this subject were instead understood as a fully qualified mind of renunciation, it would be a correct answer, similar to that which will be explained below.)
An example of someone who originally entered the Mahayana and then fell from it to the Hearer vehicle is Shariputra. The fault with this subject is that it also has four possibilities with one who has just attained the Mahayana path of accumulation.

A right answer:

Whether there actually exists a person who falls from the Solitary Realizer path to that of a Hearer is not certain since such is not set forth clearly in scripture. However, there are reasons for thinking such could exist, especially in the Yogachara-Svatantrika system where Hearers and Solitary Realizers are differentiated not only in terms of the collection of merit but also of the collection of wisdom. In this system Solitary Realizers are superior to Hearers both in terms of their object of abandonment—the coarse obstructions to omniscience vs. the afflictive obstructions—and their object of realization—the emptiness of external objects vs. the four noble truths. Thus it seems reasonable that someone might originally enter the Solitary Realizer vehicle and finding it above his capacities switch to that of a Hearer. In that the existence or non-existence of such is not clear in scripture, it seems better to decide that such does exist since there are reasons why it would exist but no reasons why it could not.
Some right answers:  

Some right answers:

Some right answers: