

THE PALIVERSE PROJECT

The Universe of Buddha's Wisdom

Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā)

- 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching - Commentaries
(3. Abhidhamma Piṭaka - Aṭṭhakathā)
- 5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy
(5. Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā)
- 1. Discussion on the Existence of 'Person'
(1. Puggalakathā)



PaliVerse

5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy

Canon of the Higher Teaching

Commentary on the Points of Controversy

Seated in the world of gods, honoured by a host of gods;
The Teacher without equal for the world with its gods.

Skilled in all descriptions, the illustration of descriptions;
Having spoken the designation of human types, the highest person in the world.

That which, because of being the basis for discussions beginning with the person-discussion;
The Points of Controversy treatise, he taught in brief.

By the mere establishing of the matrix, of that which was established in the abode of the gods;
Of that which was analysed by Moggaliputta on the surface of the earth.

Now since the order of the explanation of meaning has been reached;
Therefore I shall explain it - listen to that with composure.

Introduction

For at the conclusion of the Twin Miracle, the Blessed One, having entered the rains retreat in the city of the devas at the foot of the coral tree on the Paṇḍukambala stone, having made his mother a bodily witness, while teaching the higher teaching to the assembly of gods, having taught the treatises of the Compendium of Mental States, the Analysis, the Treatise on Elements, and the Designation of Human Types, when the turn for the teaching of the Points of Controversy had arrived, giving the opportunity for it thus: "In the future, my disciple of great wisdom, the Elder named Moggaliputta Tissa, having purified the arisen impurity of the Dispensation, while conducting the Third Council, seated in the midst of the community of monks, having combined a thousand discourses - five hundred discourses in his own doctrine and five hundred in the other's doctrine - will expound this treatise," beginning with the method of argumentation that is eightfold by way of two sets of five among the four questions in the person-doctrine, making that the beginning, he established the matrix with only the text of an incomplete recitation-round for all the paths of discussion. Then, having expounded the remaining higher teaching by the method of detail itself, having finished keeping the rains retreat, having descended from the world of gods to the city of Saṅkassa by the staircase made of precious stones in the

middle of the gold and silver staircases, accomplishing the welfare of beings, having stayed as long as life lasted, he attained final Nibbāna through the Nibbāna element without residue of clinging.

Then the group of masters headed by Mahākassapa, having taken King Ajātasattu as ally, established the classification of the body of the Teaching and discipline.

Thereupon, at the end of a hundred years, the Vajjiputtaka monks proclaimed ten cases. Having heard those, the Elder Yasa, son of the brahmin Kākaṇḍaka, having taken as ally the king named Kālāsoka, son of Susunāga, having selected seven hundred elders from among twelve hundred thousand monks, having crushed those ten cases, established the classification of the body of the Teaching and discipline.

But those ten thousand Vajjiputtaka monks, rebuked by those elder monks who compiled the teachings, seeking a faction, having obtained a weak faction suitable for themselves, separately established what is called the Mahāsaṅghika teacher-lineage. Having split from those, two other teacher-lineages arose - the Gokulikas and the Ekabyohārikas. Having split from the Gokulika order, two other teacher-lineages arose - the Paṇḍattivādas and the Bāhuliyas. Bahussutikas is also their very name. From among those very ones, other teacher-doctrines called the Cetiyavādas arose. Thus from the Mahāsaṅghika teacher-lineage, five teacher-lineages arose in the second century. Those together with the Mahāsaṅghikas become six.

In that very second century, having split from the Theravāda, two teacher-doctrines arose - the Mahisāsakas and the Vajjiputtakas. Therein, having split from the Vajjiputtaka doctrine, four other teacher-doctrines arose - the Dhammuttariyas, the Bhadrāyānikas, the Channāgārikas, and the Samitiyas. Again, in that very second century, having split from the Mahisāsaka doctrine, two teacher-doctrines arose - the Sabbatthivādas and the Dhammaguttikas. Again, having split from the Sabbatthivāda lineage, those called the Kassapikas arose. When the Kassapikas split, others called the Saṅkantikas arose. When the Saṅkantikas split, those called the Suttavādas arose. Thus, having split from the Theravāda, these eleven teacher-doctrines arose. Those together with the Theravāda become twelve. Thus these twelve, and the six teacher-doctrines of the Mahāsaṅghikas - all eighteen teacher-doctrines arose in the second century. Eighteen orders, or eighteen teacher-lineages - these are their very names. But among these, seventeen doctrines are schismatic; the Theravāda should be understood as unschismatic. And this too was stated in the Dīpavaṃsa -

"The evil monks, the Vajjiputtakas, were expelled by the elders;
Having obtained another faction, many people spoke what is not according to the Teaching.

"Ten thousand, having assembled together, made a compilation of the Teaching;
Therefore this recital of the Teaching is called the Great Rehearsal.

"The monks of the Great Rehearsal acted in opposition to the Dispensation;
Having broken the root compilation, they made another compilation.

"Discourses included elsewhere, they placed elsewhere;

They broke the meaning and the Teaching, in the monastic discipline and in the five collections.

"What was taught by method and also what was taught without method;
Not knowing the inferred meaning and the meaning needing to be inferred,
monks.

"What was spoken with reference to one thing, they established as another
meaning;
By the shadow of the phrasing, those monks destroyed much meaning.

"Having abandoned a portion of discourses and monastic discipline that is
profound;
They made that suitable discourse and monastic discipline into something
else.

"The Supplement, the extraction of meaning, the higher teaching in six books;
And the Analytical Knowledge, the Exposition, and a portion of the Birth
Stories.

"Having given up so much, they made others;
The name, the mark, the requisites, and the deportment and procedures.

"Having abandoned the natural state, they made that into something else;
Forerunners of dissenting views, the makers of the Great Rehearsal.

"And by imitation of them, the dissenting views became many;
Then at a later time, a schism arose among them.

"The Gokulikas and the Ekavyohāris - the monks split in two;
Two schisms of the Gokulikas arose at a later time.

"The Bahussutikā and the Paññattivādā - the monks split in two;
The Cetiavādā and the Punavādī - schismatics of the Great Rehearsal.

"All these five schools have the Great Rehearsal as their root;
They broke the meaning and the Teaching, and a portion of the compilation.

"And having abandoned a portion of the texts, they made others;
The name, the mark, the requisites, and the deportment and procedures.

"Having abandoned the natural state, they made that into something else;
In the pure Doctrine of the Elders, again a dissension arose.

The Mahiṃsāsakas and the Vajjiputtakas, the monks split in two;
In the Vajjiputtaka doctrine, a fourfold dissension arose.

The Dhammuttarikas, the Bhaddayānikas, the Channāgārikas, and the Samiti;
Two dissensions of the Mahiṃsāsakas arose at a later time.

The Sabbatthivādins and the Dhammaguttas, the monks split in two;

From the Sabbatthivādins, the Kassapikas, and by the Saṅkantika-Kassapikas.

From the Saṅkantikas, the Suttavādins gradually split off;
These eleven doctrines were broken off from the Doctrine of the Elders.

They broke the meaning and the Teaching, and a part of the classification;
And having discarded a part of the texts, they made something else.

The name, the mark, the requisites, and the deportment and practices;
Having abandoned the natural state, they made that into something else.

Seventeen are dissenting doctrines, one doctrine is undivided;
All together they are eighteen, together with the dissenting doctrines.

Like a banyan, a great tree, the Doctrine of the Elders is the highest;
Neither deficient nor excessive, the entire Conqueror's Dispensation.

Like parasites on a tree, the remaining doctrines arose;
In the first century they do not exist, in the interval of the second century;
The seventeen dissenting doctrines arose in the Conqueror's Dispensation.

Furthermore, the Hemavatikas, the Rājagirikas, the Siddhatthikas, the Pubbaseliyās, the Aparaseliyās, and the Vājiriyās - six other traditional teachings also arose. They are not intended here. Now, while the Dispensation was proceeding under the authority of the former eighteen traditional teachings, Asoka, the righteous king, who had gained faith, bestowing day after day one hundred thousand for the veneration of the Buddha, one hundred thousand for the veneration of the Dhamma, one hundred thousand for the veneration of the Community, one hundred thousand for his own teacher the Elder Nigrodha, and one hundred thousand for the purpose of medicine at the four gates - thus five hundred thousand - set in motion abundant material gain and honour in the Dispensation.

The sectarians, having lost their material gain and honour, not obtaining even so much as food and clothing, desiring material gain and honour, having gone forth among the monks, explained their own various views - "This is the Teaching, this is the monastic discipline, this is the Teacher's instruction." Even those who did not obtain the going forth, having cut their own hair and donned ochre robes, wandering about in the monasteries, entered into the midst of the Community at the time of performing the Observance ceremony and other acts. They, though being censured by the community of monks through the Teaching, through the monastic discipline, and through the Teacher's instruction, not being established in practice conforming to the Teaching and monastic discipline, raised up manifold tumours, impurities, and thorns for the Dispensation. Some tended the fire, some scorched themselves with the fivefold heat, some revolved following the sun, and some undertook thus and thus: "We shall split the Teaching and the monastic discipline." Then the community of monks did not perform the Uposatha or the Pavāraṇā together with them. In the Asoka monastery, the Observance was interrupted for seven years.

The king, even though striving "I shall have it done by command," was unable to have it done; on the contrary, when many monks had been deprived of life by the foolish minister who had misapprehended the order, he was remorseful. He, wishing to appease both that remorse and that tumour arisen in the dispensation, having asked the Community "Who is competent in this matter?" and having heard "The Elder Moggaliputta Tissa, great king," having had the elder summoned from the Ahogaṅgā mountain by the word of the Community, being free from doubt through the seeing of the miracle of supernormal power and the power of the elder, having asked about his own scruple, appeased his remorse. The elder too, dwelling right there in the royal garden, made him learn the doctrine for seven days. He, having learned the doctrine, on the seventh day, having had the community of monks assembled at the Asoka monastery, having had a screen-wall set up around, seated within the screen-wall, having had the monks of each sect come one by one, having summoned each group of monks, asked - "Venerable sir, what is the doctrine of the Perfectly Enlightened One?" Thereupon the eternalists - "He is an eternalist," they said. The partial-eternalists, the finitude-and-infinitude-doctrinists, the eel-wrigglers, the fortuitous-originists, the conscious-existence-doctrinists, the unconscious-existence-doctrinists, the neither-conscious-nor-unconscious-existence-doctrinists, the annihilationists, the present-life-nibbāna-doctrinists - "He is a present-life-nibbāna-doctrinalist," they said. The king, having already learned the doctrine beforehand, knowing "These are not monks, these are adherents of other sects," gave them white garments and expelled them from the Order. They were altogether sixty thousand.

Then, having summoned other monks, he asked - "What doctrine does the Perfectly Enlightened One hold, venerable sir?" "The Perfectly Enlightened One is an analyst, great king." When this was said, the king asked the elder - "Is the Perfectly Enlightened One an analyst, venerable sir?" "Yes, great king." Then the king said: "Now, venerable sir, the dispensation is purified; let the community of monks perform the Observance." Having assigned a guard, he entered the city. The united Community, having assembled together, performed the Uposatha. At that assembly there were six hundred thousand monks. At that gathering, the Elder Moggaliputta Tissa, analysing the matrix established by the Truth-finder by means of the method given by the Teacher, for the purpose of warding off all those matters that had arisen then and those that would arise in the future, having brought together one thousand discourses - five hundred discourses in his own doctrine and five hundred in the other's doctrine - expounded this Kathāvatthu treatise, which is a crushing of the doctrines of others and bears the characteristic of the future.

Then, having selected from among the sixty hundred thousand monks, taking one thousand monks who were bearers of the learning of the three Piṭakas and who had attained analytical knowledge, just as the Elder Mahākassapa and the Elder Yasa rehearsed the Dhamma and the Vinaya; even so, rehearsing, having purified the impurities of the dispensation, he conducted the Third Council. Therein, rehearsing the higher teaching, he established this treatise as spoken in the classification. Therefore it was said -

"That which, because of being the basis of discussions beginning with the person-discussion,
The Points of Controversy treatise, he taught in brief.

"By the mere setting up of the matrix, of that which was established in the abode of the gods;
Of that which was analysed by Moggaliputta on the surface of the earth.

"Now, since the order of the explanation of meaning has been reached;
Therefore I shall praise it - listen to that with composure.

The origin treatise is finished.

The Great Chapter

1. Discussion on the Existence of 'Person'

1. Pure Highest Truth

1. Explanation of Conformity-Reverse

1. Therein, "Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality?" - this is the question. "Yes" - this is the acknowledgement. But whose is this question, whose is the acknowledgement? It should not be said "of such and such a person." For by the Blessed One, in this treatise, for the purpose of purifying views of various kinds, a matrix was established according to the authoritative texts. That was analysed by the Elder, standing on the method given by the Teacher, according to the authoritative texts. For the Elder did not engage in argumentative talk by way of debate with as many debaters as the lines of argument shown herein. Even this being so, however, for the purpose of easy ascertainment of the meaning of those various discussions, having shown the division thus - the own-side advocate's question, the other-side advocate's question, the own-side advocate's acknowledgement, the other-side advocate's acknowledgement - we shall give the explanation of meaning.

"Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality?" - this indeed is the own-side advocate's question. By that it makes clear: "Those who hold the view 'there is a person,' those personalist advocates, should be questioned thus." But who are the personalist advocates? In the Dispensation, the Vajjiputtakas and the Samitīyas, and outside, many heterodox sectarians. Therein, "person" means self, being, soul. "Is found" means having approached by wisdom, it is obtained; the meaning is "it is known." "In the highest truth and ultimate reality" - here, "highest truth" means the factual meaning that is not to be grasped by an unreal appearance like illusions, mirages, and so on. "Ultimate reality" means the highest meaning that is not to be grasped by way of oral tradition and so on. By both, that which is further on shown as a fifty-seven-fold classification of phenomena by way of aggregates, sense bases, elements, and faculties, beginning with "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found." Just as that is found in a factual intrinsic-nature meaning, so he asks: "Is your person found thus?" The other-side advocate acknowledges "Yes." For the acknowledgement comes in some places as "Yes, venerable sir," and in some places the acknowledgement comes as "Yes." But here "Yes" has come. Therein this is the intention - For he, that which was stated further on by the Blessed One - The discourse "There is a person practising for personal welfare" has come; having taken that, since the Blessed One is a truth-speaker, does not speak words with the intention of deceiving, nor does he expound the Teaching

by way of oral tradition and so on, but having realised by direct knowledge himself the world with its gods, he proclaims it; therefore, whoever was spoken of by him as "There is a person practising for personal welfare," having taken up the view that he exists in the highest truth and ultimate reality only, he acknowledges "Yes."

Then, not giving opportunity to such a pretext-statement, such a fallacious argument, the own-side advocate said beginning with "That which is the highest truth" and so on. Therein this is the intention - That which further on, thus illustrated as "with condition, without condition, conditioned, unconditioned, eternal, non-eternal, with sign, signless" - the fifty-seven-fold classification of phenomena beginning with materiality has come; It is not to be grasped by way of conventional truth, nor by way of oral tradition and so on. But by its own factuality it is the highest truth, and by being self-witnessed it is the ultimate reality. With reference to that he said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

"Tato" is an instrumental expression; therefore the meaning here is: by that highest truth and ultimate reality that person is found. This is what is meant - That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality found by way of the mode of constant change and so on or by way of with condition and so on - is your person too found by that mode? "That should not be said" is the denial of the opponent. For he, not wishing for such a person, denies. Therein, this is the word analysis - "Na hi evaṃ vattabbe" - "na hi evan" too is fitting. The meaning is: for both it should not be said thus.

"Acknowledge the refutation" is the statement of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Because your latter acknowledgment of "should not be said" does not connect with the former acknowledgment of "should be said," and the former does not connect with the latter, therefore too he has incurred a refutation. The meaning is: accept that refutation, that fault, that offence. Having thus made the refutation known, now making it evident by means of the placing and the applications and impositions in forward and reverse order, he said beginning with "if a person." Therein, "if a person is found" means if a person is found, if a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality - this is the meaning. This, being the characteristic of the applications and impositions of the refutation through the placing of the opponent's position, is called the forward-order placing. "Then indeed sir" and so on, because of the refutation being applied in the forward-order position, is called the forward-order application. Therein, "tena" is a word expressing reason. "Vata" is a word expressing certainty. "Re" is a word of address. This is what is meant - Therefore, sir, it should indeed be said, sir, ho, dear one, for that reason it should indeed be said. "What you say there" and so on, because of the refutation being imposed in the forward-order position, is called the forward-order imposition. The term "wrong" at the end of that should be brought before it as "this is of you." "This is wrong of you" - this indeed is the meaning here. And in what follows in the canonical text, this has come just so.

"But if it should not be said" and so on, because of the placing of the rejected position as "that should not be said," being the characteristic of the applications and impositions of the refutation in reverse order, is called the reverse-order placing. "Then indeed sir not" and so on, because of the refutation being applied in the reverse-order position, is called the reverse-order application. Again, "what you say

there" and so on, because of the refutation being imposed in the reverse-order position, is called the reverse-order imposition. Here too, at the end, before the term "wrong," "this is of you" should be brought in just so. In what follows too, in such states, the same method applies.

Therein, this is the summary meaning from the beginning - If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed, sir, it should be said that he is found thus. But what you say there - "It should indeed be said in the first question 'he is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said in the second question 'from that is that person found'" - this is wrong of you. Thus, for now, the placing, application and imposition in forward order are. Then, if it should not be said in the second question "from that he is found," it should not be said in the first question either. But what you say here - "It should indeed be said in the first question 'he is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said in the second question 'from that is that person found'" - this is wrong of you. Thus the placing, application and imposition in reverse order are. Thus, because of the refutation and the four applications and impositions in forward and reverse order being stated, the passage beginning with "is found" is called the forward-order pentad. And here, although two refutations were made - one by the application and imposition in forward order, and one by the application and imposition in reverse order - However, here, based on the first argument "a person is found," because of the first refutation of "acknowledge the refutation" being imposed in two ways, this is but one refutation - the first refutation.

2. Now the counter-method follows. Therein, the question is of the opponent. For he, because of having grasped "there is a person practising for personal welfare," not accepting "is not found," asks thus. The proponent of one's own doctrine acknowledges "Yes" because of not being found in the way that phenomena such as materiality and so on are found. Again the other, with reference to the highest truth intended by himself, said beginning with "That which is the highest truth." Or he said thus having combined together conventional truth and ultimate truth. The proponent of one's own doctrine rejects saying "That should not be said" both because of the existence of a person as a concept derived from the substrata and because of the question being asked having combined the two truths together.

Now, although the state of not being found was first accepted by him by way of ultimate truth, afterwards it was rejected by way of conventional truth or by way of a mixture. But the opponent, relying on the mere similarity of the expression "is not found" as a fallacious argument, as if making a counter-quarrel to a quarrel, making a counter-argument to the act of refutation done against himself - "what was first acknowledged by you, that was afterwards rejected" - said "Acknowledge the counter-argument." Now, just as in the forward-order pentad the refutation was made evident by the proponent of one's own doctrine having placed the argument and through the applications and impositions in forward and reverse order, so making the counter-argument evident, he said beginning with "If a person." That should be understood in meaning by the very method stated above. Because here the placing, being the placing of the opponent's position, is merely a placing to show "this is your fault," not the making evident of the refutation or the counter-argument; but the making evident of it is through the applications and impositions. Therefore this, by

way of the applications and impositions in forward and reverse order, in four ways. Because of the counter-argument being made, it is called the counter-argument tetrad - this should be understood as one tetrad.

3. Having thus made the counter-argument, now showing the wrong-doing nature of that very fallacious argument on which the refutation was made by the proponent of one's own doctrine in the forward-order pentad, he said beginning with "But if you think." Therein, "but if you think" means if you think. "It should be said indeed" - this is said with reference to the acknowledgment "Yes" in the opposing side. "But it should not be said" - this however is said with reference to the denial "indeed not." "By that, for you there" means by that reason, you yourself, in that position of "is not found" - "One acknowledging thus" means acknowledging thus as "Yes." "Should be refuted thus" means one who again denies "indeed not" should be refuted thus. "Then we refute you" means then we refute you who are thus deserving of refutation. "And you are well refuted" means and you are well refuted because of being refuted by one's own view.

Having thus shown his state of being fit to be refuted, now refuting him, he said beginning with "If." Therein, the placing, application and imposition should be understood by the very method stated above. But at the conclusion, "this is wrong of you" means this word of yours is wrong - this is the meaning. This, because of the refutation being made in four ways by means of a fallacious argument, is called the refutation tetrad.

4. Having thus made the refutation, now showing "if this refutation made by me according to your view is a wrong refutation, the refutation made by you against me below in the forward-order pentad is also a wrong refutation," he said beginning with "if this is wrongly refuted." Therein, "if this is wrongly refuted" means if this argument of yours is wrongly refuted by me. Or, if this refutation made by me against you is a wrong refutation. "Then just so see there" means see just so in the refutation made by you against me below. Now, having shown by the words beginning with "it should be said indeed" that which was the refutation made below by the proponent of one's own doctrine, and again bringing that refutation to the state of non-refutation, he said beginning with "and we, by you." Therein, in "and we, by you, there, by this acknowledgment" and so on, this is the meaning: Because that refutation made by you against me is a wrong refutation, therefore we, acknowledging thus by this acknowledgment of "Yes" by you there in the forward-order pentad, even when the rejection "indeed not" is made again, should not be refuted thus as "understand the refutation" - should not be refuted at all. Thus you refute me who should not be refuted, but by such a refutation we are wrongly refuted.

Now, with reference to the refutation regarding which he said "and we are wrongly refuted," to show that, "if a person" etc. he said "this is wrong of you." Thus, because the refutation was brought by four applications and impositions in forward and reverse order, this is called the tetrad of application.

5. Now the passage beginning with "that should not be refuted thus" is called the conclusion tetrad. Therein, "that should not be refuted thus" means: as I was refuted by you, indeed one should not be refuted thus. For the nature of this refutation as a wrong refutation has been established by me. "If so" means for that reason; because

this refutation is a wrong refutation, therefore what you refute me with - "if a person" etc. "This is wrong of you" means this refuting of yours is wrong - this is the meaning. "If so, whatever refutation was made" means for whatever reason this is wrong, for that reason whatever refutation was made by you, that was wrongly done. Whatever counter-argument was made by me, that itself was well done. And whatever guidance along the path of discussion was made by means of the counter-argument tetrad and so on, that too was well done. Thus it should be understood that the forward-order and reverse-order pentad has been expounded by means of the tetrads of counter-argument, refutation, application, and conclusion for the forward-order pentad beginning with "a person is found" and for those beginning with "is not found." To this extent, when the proponent of one's own doctrine holds the prior position, there is victory over the opponent by means of a fallacious argument through the mere similarity of expression.

2. Explanation of Reverse-Conformity

6. Now, just as when the opponent holds the prior position, the proponent of one's own doctrine is easily defeated by the Teaching alone, by what is true, so to show the arising of the argument, the pentad of opposing-conformity beginning with "a person is not found" was begun. Therein, the question in the opposing side is of the opponent; the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, with reference to the highest truth and ultimate reality as classified into materiality and so on. With reference to either pure conventional truth or conventional truth mixed with ultimate reality, "that which is the highest truth" is again the pursuit of the opponent; the rejecting "that should not be said" is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, because it should not be said that it is not found by way of convention, or because of the pursuit being confused by way of the mixed. "He rejects what was acknowledged" - by the mere similarity of expression, the statement beginning with "acknowledge the refutation" is of the opponent. Thus, it should be understood that in dependence on the second argument "a person is not found," there is the second refutation. Thus the refutation was imposed by means of that fallacy.

7-10. Now, in the conformity method, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine to show victory in his own argument by the rule and impartially, and the acknowledgment is of the opponent in dependence on his own view. Without giving opportunity to the view, the pursuit is again of the proponent of one's own doctrine by way of ultimate reality, and the rejection is of the opponent because of the absence of a person by way of ultimate reality. Beyond that, for the purpose of showing one's own victory by the rule and impartially, all beginning with "Acknowledge the counter-argument" is only the statement of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Therein, the meaning of all the tetrads of counter-argument, refutation, application, and conclusion should be understood by the very method stated above. Thus, by means of the reverse-order pentad beginning with "a person is not found" and the tetrads of counter-argument, refutation, application, and conclusion for those beginning with "is found," what is called the reverse-order and forward-order pentad has been expounded. Thus these two pentads in the first highest truth have been expounded. Therein, in the first pentad, the refutation of the opponent made by the proponent of one's own doctrine is a proper refutation. But the victory accomplished by the opponent by himself, having made a counter-argument in dependence on a fallacious

argument against the proponent of one's own doctrine, is a wrongly-won victory. In the second pentad, the refutation of the proponent of one's own doctrine made by the opponent is a wrong refutation. But the victory accomplished by the proponent of one's own doctrine by himself, having made a counter-argument in dependence on a righteous argument against the opponent, is a rightly-won victory. This is the first highest truth. Herein this is said -

"The refutation of the opponent is pure in the first pentad;
But impure is his counter-argument victory there.

"The refutation of the proponent of one's own doctrine is impure in the second pentad;
But pure is his counter-argument victory there.

"Therefore in both cases, victory belongs only to the proponent of one's own doctrine;
For victory is indeed by the rule; by what is not the rule, whence is victory?

"Just as here in the highest truth, adorned by the dyad of pentads;
Victory and defeat are stated by way of the rule and what is not the rule only.

"In all the remaining highest truths beyond this, the wise one
Should discern in just the same way both victory and defeat."

2. Highest Truth with Permission

1. Explanation of Conformity-Reverse

11. Having thus expanded the pure highest truth, now to expand that very same by further methods such as occasion and so on, "Again, is a person found" and so on was begun. Therein, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the opponent. Again, "everywhere" - the pursuit is of the proponent of one's own doctrine with reference to the body, and having seen the fault of regarding self as in matter and the fault of committing to "the soul is one thing and the body another," the rejecting is of the opponent. The remainder here in the conformity-opposing pentad should be understood by the very method stated above. But the text is abbreviated. Therein, because when it is said "is not found everywhere" with reference to the body, it commits to being found outside the body. Therefore, in the opposing side, the rejecting is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the counter-argument is of the opponent by way of the fallacious argument that he first allowed and afterwards denied. The remainder is well-known.

3. Highest Truth with Time

1. Explanation of Conformity-Reverse

12. In the second method, "always" - the pursuit is of the proponent of one's own doctrine with reference to the time of former and later births and the time of living and having attained final Nibbāna, and having seen the fault of offence in "that same warrior is that brahmin" and so on, and the fault of absence of distinction between those living and those having attained final Nibbāna, the rejecting is of the opponent. The remainder is exactly the same as what was said in the first method.

4. Highest Truth with Constituent

1. Explanation of Conformity-Reverse

13. In the third method, "all" - the pursuit is of the proponent of one's own doctrine with reference to the aggregates, sense bases and so on, and the rejecting is of the opponent through fear of the fault beginning with "self is in matter, self is in the eye." The remainder is just the same.

Highest Truth with Permission and so on

2. Explanation of Reverse-Conformity

14. Thus, having analysed these three in the conformity-opposing pentad in succession by way of conformity alone first, then to analyse in the opposing-conformity pentad by way of the opposing alone, "a person is not found" and so on was begun. Therein, the meaning of the opposing that has come in abbreviated form in the canonical text of the conformity pentad should be understood by the very method stated, and the meaning of the conformity that has come in abbreviated form in the canonical text of the opposing should be understood by the very method stated. To this extent, it should be understood that this method of argumentation called eightfold has been expounded by way of two by two opposing sets - namely, the conformity-opposing and the opposing-conformity - in each highest truth among the four highest truths, that is, the pure one and these three. Which is written in the canonical text as a group of eight refutations by way of each refutation in each face. Herein this is said -

"Thus in the fourfold question, by the division of the dyad of pentads;
This method of argumentation called eightfold is made known.

"There are just eight refutations therein, four of them are legally valid;
And four are not legally valid, everywhere for the proponent of one's own doctrine;
Victory and defeat, everywhere for the opponent."

The commentary on the highest truth is finished.

5. Commentary on the Pure Comparison

17-27. Now there is the comparison of the highest truth with materiality and so on. Therein, "and materiality" - the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine with reference to: "Just as materiality is found in the ultimate sense, is your person too found in the same way?" The acknowledgment is of the opponent, having taken merely the expression "there is a person." "If for you a person exists in the ultimate sense like materiality, then the otherness of the person too would follow, just as the otherness of feeling and so on from materiality" - this is the pursuit of the proponent of one's own doctrine; having seen the contradiction with the doctrine and the discourses, the rejecting is of the opponent. The remainder is obvious in meaning. But here, from the text, in the conformity-negative rooted in the proponent of one's own doctrine's side, by way of the highest truth and ultimate reality with its fifty-seven-fold classification, fifty-seven conformity pentads have been shown. The redress

tetrads and so on are abbreviated. Also in the negative-conformity rooted in the opponent's side, fifty-seven reverse pentads have been shown. The redress tetrads and so on are abbreviated. Therein, having shown by the mere expression "it was said by the Blessed One" the existence of a person and the findability of materiality by way of highest truth and ultimate reality, "it was said by the Blessed One" is the pursuit of the opponent for the purpose of making both acknowledge their otherness; the rejecting is of the proponent of one's own doctrine because the question of unity and diversity of conventional and ultimate reality is to be set aside. The remainder here also is obvious in meaning.

Commentary on the Pure Comparison.

6. Explanation of Simile Comparison

28-36. Now there is the comparison of the highest truth with materiality and so on by way of simile. Therein, both the question of otherness by the similarity of being found of materiality and feeling, and the question of similarity of being found of person and materiality - both questions are of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and both acknowledgments are of the opponent. By the similarity of being found that was sanctioned by the opponent, the pursuit of otherness of materiality and person, just as of materiality and feeling, is of the proponent of one's own doctrine; the rejecting is of the other. The remainder here also is obvious in meaning. But here, from the text, by way of the wheels beginning with the materiality-rooted and so on, nine hundred pentads of refutation plus twenty have been shown on the side of the proponent of one's own doctrine. How? Among the aggregates, first, in the materiality-rooted wheel there are four, and likewise in those rooted in feeling and so on - thus twenty. Among the sense bases, in the eye sense base-rooted wheel there are eleven, and likewise in the remaining ones - thus one thousand three hundred and twenty. Among the elements, in the eye-element-rooted wheel there are seventeen, and likewise in the remaining ones - thus three hundred and six. Among the faculties, in the eye-faculty-rooted wheel there are twenty-one, and likewise in the remaining ones - thus four hundred and sixty-two. Thus altogether there are nine hundred pentads of refutation plus twenty.

37-45. On the side of the opponent also, having obtained the acknowledgment of otherness of materiality, feeling, and so on by way of conformity itself through "materiality is found," then again, relying on the discourse "there is a person," having imposed the similarity of being found of the person with materiality and so on by way of sophistry, the pursuit of otherness was made. The remainder here also is clear in meaning itself. From the text also, nine hundred pentads of counter-argument plus twenty have been shown in the manner stated on the side of the proponent of one's own doctrine.

The comparison of the highest truth with materiality and so on by way of simile.

7. Explanation of Fourfold Method Comparison

46-52. Now, that which is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, by that, since it must be one or another among the fifty-seven highest truths and ultimate realities beginning with materiality and so on; or dependent on materiality and so on, or apart from materiality and so on, or by way of the support of materiality and so on,

therefore by this fourfold method the comparison with the highest truth was begun. Therein, "materiality is the person" is the pursuit of the proponent of one's own doctrine; "indeed not" is the rejecting of the opponent through fear of the annihilationist view; the imposing of the refutation is of the proponent of one's own doctrine. But is this proper? Is it not that even the statement "materiality is feeling" should be rejected? Yes, it should be rejected. But that is because of the existence of a different intrinsic nature of feeling from materiality, not because of the absence of otherness. And this one does not wish for the otherness of the person from even a single phenomenon among materiality and so on; therefore it is proper. And this pursuit - "materiality is the person" etc. "the faculty of one who has final knowledge is the person" - was begun with reference to the whole of ultimate truth. But since the whole cannot be stated together by way of separate characteristics, this was established merely as the characteristic of the pursuit according to the authoritative texts. By that the wise make clear the meaning. But one desirous of disputation, having taken this characteristic, should state it in whatever way there is no opportunity for the opponent. Thus, even though the characteristic of the pursuit was established according to the authoritative texts, it is indeed proper. By this method the meaning should be understood in all the pursuits.

But this is the distinction - In "a person in matter" and so on, just as in dependence on one primary element three primary elements, and in dependence on the materiality of the sense-organ consciousness, it is fitting to say "in matter" - do you hold thus that a person is in matter? And just as by way of separation from what is of the same kind, all phenomena beginning with feeling, or the four immaterial aggregates, or Nibbāna itself, it is fitting to say "apart from matter" - do you hold thus regarding the person? And just as by way of the support of consciousness-originated materiality, "materiality is in feeling" etc. "materiality is in consciousness" - it is fitting to say, do you hold thus regarding the person? But in all the pursuits, the rejecting of the opponent is through fear of the annihilationist view and through contradiction with the doctrine. The remainder here is obvious in meaning. But here, from the text, having made four for each one of the fifty-seven highest truths, by way of refutation, one thousand and twenty-eight have been shown. On the side of the opponent also, by way of counter-argument, just as many. But whatever acknowledgment of the proponent of one's own doctrine here when it is said "there is a person," that is by way of convention as come in the discourse. Whatever rejecting in "materiality is the person" and so on, that is because the question of identity view is to be set aside. The counter-argument of the opponent is merely by way of sophistry.

The Comparison by the Tetrad Method.

And the comparison treatise is finished.

8. Commentary on the Fitness of Characteristics

53. Now this is called the fitness of characteristics. Therein, because, setting aside Nibbāna, the remaining highest truth and ultimate reality is with condition due to being bound to conditions, conditioned because of being made by conditions coming together, non-eternal because of ceasing after having arisen and because of always being absent, with sign because of the existence of the sign reckoned as the cause of

arising, and Nibbāna is without condition, unconditioned, eternal, and signless because of the absence of the aforementioned qualities - this is the characteristic of the highest truth. Therefore, with reference to the fact that if a person too is the highest truth and ultimate reality only, he too must possess this characteristic, the eight pursuits beginning with "a person is with condition" are of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the rejecting is of the opponent. But here "Understand the refutation" and so on is abbreviated. Thus these should be understood as eight pentads on the side of the proponent of one's own doctrine in the conformity-negative by way of conformity alone.

54. On the side of the opponent also, in the negative-conformity, there are just eight by way of the negative alone. Therein, because conventional truth has been established by the opponent by means of the discourse, and because there is no state of being with condition and so on in convention, therefore the rejecting is of the proponent of one's own doctrine as it really is. But by way of sophistry, all beginning with "Acknowledge the counter-argument" should be stated, and here too it is only abbreviated.

The commentary on the treatise on the fitness of characteristics is finished.

9. Commentary on the Correcting of Expression

55-59. Now there is the correcting of the expression. Therein, that expression "a person is found" - to correct it: "A person is found, what is found is a person?" This is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Its meaning is - that pair of terms "a person is found" - that would be either one in meaning or different in meaning. If, to begin with, they are different in meaning, just as materiality is one thing and feeling is another, so it commits to the person being one thing and what is found being another. But if they are one in meaning, just as whatever is consciousness, that is mind, so that very person is what is found - it commits to this. Therefore I say to you: "If for you whoever is a person, he is found, this being so, it commits to whoever is found, he is a person - do you accept this?" Thereupon the personalist, since he wishes for the person to be found, but not for the personhood of materiality and so on even though they are found, therefore said beginning with "A person is found, what is found is in some cases a person, in some cases not a person." Its meaning is - my person exists; a person is found from the Teacher's word. But whatever is found, not all of that is a person; rather, in some cases a person, in some cases not a person. Therein, the syllable "ke" is in the meaning of the syllable "ko," and the syllable "hi" is merely an indeclinable particle. "Some are a person, some are not a person" - but this is the meaning here. This is what is meant - For both a person and also whatever phenomenon among materiality and so on is indeed found; therein, only a person is a person. But among materiality and so on, none whatsoever is a person. Then the proponent of one's own doctrine said to him - "A person is in some cases found, in some cases not found." Its meaning is - if, when the pair of terms "a person is found" are one in meaning, the phenomenon permitted as "is found" is not different from the person, yet some are a person and some are not a person, then it commits to your person too being in some cases found and in some cases not found - do you accept this? He, not wishing for the non-finding of the person, rejects saying "That should not be said." From here onwards, all beginning

with "Acknowledge the refutation" is abbreviated. But it should be understood in detail. The same method applies also to "A person is the highest truth" and so on. For all of these are merely expressions of "is found"; but furthermore, since "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality" is the acknowledgment of the personalist, therefore just as the view that a person is found, exactly so it also commits to a person being the highest truth. But whatever view of his that "a person exists," "existing" is merely a synonym of that; therefore all these expressions have been corrected.

60. Therein, as to what was said at the end beginning with "A person exists, what exists is not every person," the intention here is as follows - That which was said by the opponent "A person exists, what exists is in some cases a person, in some cases not a person," since in meaning it amounts to just this much: "A person exists, what exists is not every person," therefore the proponent of one's own doctrine, having made him accept this, now questions him thus. For by you, relying on merely the expression "There is a person practising for personal welfare," the view "A person exists" was grasped; and just as this was said by the Blessed One, so too by the method beginning with "Regard the world as empty, Mogharāja, ever mindful," "does not exist" was also said; therefore, just as your view is "A person exists, what exists is not every person," so too it commits to "A person does not exist, what does not exist is not every person" - do you accept this? Then, not accepting this, he rejects it saying "That should not be said." The remainder here regarding the procedure of refutation and so on should be understood by the very method already stated.

The commentary on the correcting of expression is finished.

10. Commentary on the Pursuit of Description

61-66. Now there is what is called the pursuit of concepts. For the personalist designates a material person in the material element, and likewise an immaterial one in the immaterial element. To break that view of his, all the questions are of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the acknowledgment and the rejecting are of the other. For when "material" is said, he acknowledges because of the existence of the material body and because of the existence of such a concept. When "sensual" is said, he rejects because of the existence of those without lust and because of the absence of such a concept. Even when "immaterial" is said, he acknowledges because of the existence of the immaterial aggregates and because of the existence of such a concept. In both methods, "a being" is said by way of a synonym for person.

67. Now, because he wishes that at the place where "observing the body in the body" has come, the body is one thing and the person is another, therefore to break that view, the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine beginning with "'body' or 'physical body'" arises. Therein, "having made the body inseparable" means: having made the body to be joined, to be made to cling together, to be brought to oneness, to be undivided, I ask - this is the meaning. "Ese" means this is that very one. "Ese ese" is also a reading. The meaning is: this is this very one. "Ekaṭṭhe" means of one meaning. "Same samabhāge tājāte" means equal, of equal share, of the same kind. Here the difference is merely in expression. But in meaning, he asks whether this is just the body. The other-side advocate, not seeing any diversity, acknowledges "Yes." In the question "'person' or 'soul'" too, the same method applies. But when asked "Is

the body one thing?" he acknowledges because of holding such a view on account of the observation of the body. But when asked "Is the soul one thing?" being unable to reject the directly spoken discourse, he denies. From there onwards, beginning with "Acknowledge the refutation," the meaning is clear.

68. On the side of the opponent, however, when asked "Is the body one thing and the person another?" the proponent of one's own doctrine rejects because it is a question that should be set aside, and the opponent makes a counter-argument by way of sophistry. That too is of manifest meaning.

The commentary on the pursuit of description is finished.

11. Commentary on the Pursuit of Destination

69-72. Now there is the pursuit of death and conception by way of the change of destination. Therein, since the personalist, relying on discourses beginning with "That person, having transmigrated seven times at most," having taken up the view that a person transmigrates, speaks accordingly, therefore to break that view of his, the question "transmigrates" is of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Therein, "transmigrates" means wanders in the round of rebirths, makes going and coming. The acknowledgment is of the opponent by the influence of his own view. The pursuit beginning with "that person" is also of the proponent of one's own doctrine; the rejecting is of the other. Therein, "he" means that very same one - this is the meaning. But when thus pursued, he rejects through fear of the eternalist view. When asked "another," through fear of the annihilationist view. When asked "he and another," through fear of the partial-eternalist view. When asked "neither he nor another," through fear of the eel-wriggling view. Again, when asked all four questions together, having rejected through fear of all four views, then showing those discourses in dependence on which his view arose, he said beginning with "if so, a person transmigrates."

76. Again, when asked by the proponent of one's own doctrine, having specified "that same" with the intention "this one who, according to your theory, transmigrates - is he one and the same in this world and the world beyond?", having rejected through fear of eternalism, and when asked again in the same way having made it firm, since it is that very person and not another being, and since there is also a discourse beginning with "having passed away from there, he arose here," therefore he acknowledges. When asked "that same human being," he rejects because of the absence of divinity for a human being.

77. Being asked again, he acknowledges by way of the discourse beginning with "I was at that time a Teacher named Sunetta." Then the own-side advocate, making known that his statement is wrong on account of the diversity of rebirths as gods and human beings, said beginning with "having been a human being."

78. Therein, "in this way death will not exist" means this being so, death will not exist - this is the meaning. From here onwards, "demon," "ghost," etc. - the diversity of pursuit should be understood by way of the diversity of individual existence.

82. "Of the warrior caste" and so on are stated by reason of birth and by reason of deficiency of limbs and so on.

87. "Again, should it not be said" - when questioned by the opponent, the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, because of the absence of going to the world beyond by way of rebirth of the one here in the eighth; again, because a stream-enterer does not give up the state of being a stream-enterer even in another existence, the second acknowledgment is also his alone. The statement beginning with "If" is of the opponent.

88. Again, the pursuit of the proponent of one's own doctrine by showing the absence of human existence for one reborn in the heavenly world.

89. Beyond that, regarding "not another, by way of non-disappearance," here "not another" means identical in every way. "By way of non-disappearance" means the meaning is not disappeared in even one way. "That should not be said" - he said thus because of the absence of human existence for one reborn in the heavenly world.

90. Again, having made it firm, when pursued, he acknowledges by the view that "that same person transmigrates." "One with a cut off hand" and so on was stated for the purpose of breaking the view that one transmigrates by way of non-disappearance, by showing the departure of characteristics. Therein, "one with cut off thumbs" means one whose thumbs have been cut off. "One with cut tendons" means one whose great sinews have been cut off.

91. In the first question beginning with "having a form," he rejects with reference to not going together with this material body. In the second, he acknowledges with reference to the intermediate-existence person. For according to his view, having gone with the same form, he enters the mother's womb. Then that matter of his is destroyed. "The soul" - since he goes together with the body reckoned as matter, he asks "Is the soul of this the same as the body?" The opponent rejects here because of the laying down of the body and because of contradiction with the discourses.

In those beginning with "having feeling," he rejects with reference to rebirth without perception, and acknowledges with reference to rebirth other than that. "The soul" - since he goes together with the body reckoned as feeling and so on. He asks "Is the soul of this the same as the body?" "The soul is the same as the body, the soul is one thing and the body another" - for according to this view, all five aggregates are intended as "body." The opponent rejects because of contradiction with the discourses.

92. In the first question beginning with "immaterial," he rejects with reference to intermediate existence. In the second, he acknowledges with reference to one from the immaterial realm being reborn in the material realm. "The soul is one thing" - having abandoned the body reckoned as materiality, one transmigrates as immaterial; is that body of yours one thing, and the soul another - thus he asks. The other rejects because of contradiction with the discourses.

In those beginning with "without feeling," he rejects with reference to the percipient existence, and acknowledges with reference to rebirth other than that. "The soul is one thing" - having abandoned the body reckoned as feeling and so on, one transmigrates without feeling and without consciousness; is that body of yours another, and the soul another - thus he asks. The other rejects because of contradiction with the discourses.

93. In the passage beginning with "Does materiality transmigrate," he asks: those who designate a person with reference to the aggregates such as materiality and so on, when that person transmigrates, does that materiality also transmigrate? The opponent rejects this because of the statement about transmigration being spoken of beings only, as "of beings hindered by ignorance, fettered by craving, transmigrating and wandering in the round of rebirths." Being asked again, he acknowledges with the perception that since without phenomena such as materiality and so on a person does not exist, therefore when that person transmigrates, he must transmigrate with that materiality as well. The same method applies to feeling and so on as well.

94. In the passage beginning with "Does materiality not transmigrate," because for you materiality is not the person, yet you say that same one transmigrates, therefore I ask you, does your materiality not transmigrate - this is the meaning. The other rejects with the perception that when the person transmigrates, it is not possible to transmigrate with the materiality that has become the basis of clinging. Being asked again, he acknowledges because of the statement about transmigration being spoken of beings only. The remainder here is clear in itself.

Now the meaning of the verses is this - According to the venerable one's view, just as a shadow with reference to a tree, and just as fire with reference to fuel, so is the person with reference to the aggregates; When materiality and so on do not transmigrate, if those aggregates are breaking up and your person breaks up, this being so, it becomes the view of annihilation, the annihilationist view commits to you. Which is the unwholesome view that was avoided by the Buddha. But that which was spoken of indirectly as "the ascetic Gotama is an annihilationist" - he shows that we do not say that. But also if when those aggregates are breaking up that person does not break up, this being so, the person becomes eternal. Thereupon he commits to being equal to Nibbāna. "Equal" means exceedingly similar, or similar by way of similarity, or similar by the very state of equality. Just as Nibbāna does not arise and is not destroyed, so too your person is by that equal to it.

The pursuit of death and conception by way of the change of destination is finished.

Commentary on the Pursuit.

12. Commentary on the Pursuit of Derived Description

95. Now there is the pursuit of the derived description. Therein, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the rejecting of the acknowledgment is of the opponent. For he wishes for the description, the describing, the understanding of the person with reference to matter and so on, just as a shadow with reference to a tree, and just as fire with reference to fuel; therefore, when asked "with reference to matter," he acknowledges. Again, just as a shadow derived from a tree is subject to impermanence and so on like the tree, and fire derived from fuel is subject to impermanence and so on like the fuel, so too when asked this meaning - that your person derived from matter and so on is impermanent like matter and so on - he, standing on his own view, rejects.

97. In the passage beginning with "blue, with reference to blue matter," he rejects the unity of the person together with blue matter, and the plurality by virtue of the many such as blue and so on in one body, being unwilling for both.

98. In the passage "wholesome feeling," here too, being unwilling for the unity of the person together with feeling and for the plurality by virtue of the many wholesome feelings in one continuity, he rejects. In the second method, because of the actual existence of such expressions as "one skilled in the path" and so on, he acknowledges with reference to the meaning of skilful. When asked about "fruitful" and so on, he rejects because of the absence of such a conventional expression.

99. He acknowledges with reference to the unskilful meaning on the unwholesome side.

100. In the indeterminate side, he acknowledges with reference to the indeterminate nature by way of eternalism and so on. The remainder here should be understood by the method already stated above.

104. In the passage beginning with "with reference to the eye," because of the existence of conventional expressions beginning with "just as one with eyes avoids uneven ground" etc. he acknowledges. Being unwilling for the cessation of the person through the cessation of the eye and so on, he rejects.

107. "With reference to matter, with reference to feeling": here the other dyads, triads, and tetrads rooted in matter should also be understood. But since the person is described with reference to the aggregates, therefore he acknowledges the description with reference to even two, or three, or four, or five. But he rejects because of the absence of two or five in one continuity. In the case of sense bases and so on too, the same method applies.

112. Now, in order to show that whatever is described with reference to something, just as by the impermanence of that, there is also impermanence of that which is described, and from that otherness is established, so too this applies to that person as well, he said beginning with "Just as a tree." Therein, "with reference to" means dependent on, having come to, not without that - this is the meaning. But the opponent, not wishing for that, standing on his view, rejects.

115. "Chain" means a fetter bondage. "One who has a chain" means one bound by that. "He who has matter is one who has matter" - since he who has matter is one who has matter, therefore just as a chain is not etc. "another is one who has matter" is the meaning.

116. In the passage beginning with "with reference to each consciousness," he acknowledges by way of the observation of mind, with reference to the state of having lust and so on, by virtue of consciousness with lust and so on. When asked by the method beginning with "is born," being unwilling for the momentary nature of the person, he rejects. When asked "he is the same" or "he is another," he rejects out of fear of eternalism and annihilationism. Again, when asked whether it should not be said "a boy" or "a girl," he acknowledges that it should be said, out of fear of the eradication of conventional expression of the world. The remainder here is obvious.

118. Now the opponent, wishing to establish his view by another manner, said beginning with "Should it not be said - 'A person is found.'" Therein, "should it not be said" means: what is there for you in this such extensive pursuit of derived concepts? Say this for now - should it not be said "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Thereupon, when the proponent of one's own doctrine said "Yes," he said beginning with "Is it not that whoever sees." Therein, "whoever" means the person. "Whatever" means matter. "By whatever" means by the eye. "He" means the person. "That" means matter. "By that" means by the eye. This is what is meant - Is it not that whoever sees whatever matter with whatever eye, he, seeing that matter with that eye, is a person? The own-side advocate, although it is the eye itself that sees matter, going to the state of being the support of eye-consciousness, likewise it is the ear itself that hears sound, etc. It is consciousness itself that cognises mental phenomena, but by way of convention beginning with "The Worthy One has an eye, the Worthy One sees forms with the eye," he acknowledges "Yes."

120. Thereupon, in dependence on the fallacious argument, when the opponent had accomplished the assertability of a person, having turned that very argument around, he said beginning with "A person is found." Therein, "whoever does not see" means one who is blind, a non-percipient being, one reborn in the immaterial realm, one attained to cessation, and even one who is not blind, apart from the time of seeing, is said not to see. In the remaining cases too, the same method applies. The remainder should be understood in meaning by the Pāṭi text itself.

122. In the comparison with the discourse, because the divine eye has materiality as its object, he said "he sees materiality." In the second section, from the statement "I see beings," he said "he sees a person." In the third section, from the view that "having seen materiality, he discerns the person," he said "he sees both." But because what is called "to be seen," namely seen, heard, sensed, and cognised, in the fourfold classification of matter, only the visible form sense base is included, therefore the proponent of one's own doctrine pursues with "materiality is the person, the person is materiality, both are materiality." The meaning of that is obvious indeed.

Commentary on the Pursuit of Derived Description.

13. Commentary on the Pursuit of Personal Effort

123. Now there is the pursuit of human effort. Therein, the question is of the opponent according to the view that when there is action, there must necessarily be a doer of it as well; the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, because of the existence of such actions. Again, "a doer and causer" is the question of the opponent. Therein, "a doer" means the doer of those actions. "A causer" means one who causes others to do by means such as command, instruction, and so on. Now, because the opponent asks "a doer" with reference to a person, not merely an act of doing, therefore the rejecting is of the proponent of one's own doctrine.

124. "Is a doer and causer of that" - here, the meaning is: if whatever is found, a person as the doer of each of those is found, is another person who is the doer and the one who causes to do of that also found? The opponent, not wishing for that, rejects through fear of the doctrine of creation by a supreme lord. Being asked again,

since mother and father generate a person, give a name, and nourish, therefore they are the doers of that person. And those good friends or teachers who train him in the various branches of knowledge and fields of craft, they are called the causers - with reference to this meaning, he acknowledges. The intended meaning is that former action itself is the doer and the causer of that person.

125. "For that very one" - by this, this is asked: If there is indeed a maker of the doer of actions, and a maker of that one too, and a maker of that one too, this being so, by each former one inevitably a later and later person must be made - by this too, by the person who is the doer of actions, another person must be made in the future, and by that one yet another - thus there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of rebirths, there is no final nibbāna without condition. That Nibbāna which is spoken of as the absence of suffering bound to conditions through the absence of conditions, there is not that for you. Or, "for that very one" means if action is not merely action, but there is a person as the doer of that, and a doer of that one too, and a doer of that one too - thus there is a succession of persons. This being so, that ending of suffering which is spoken of through the causing of non-occurrence of the round of action, that is not - this is the meaning. The opponent, not wishing that, rejects it. In the other questions too hereafter, it is found that in the questions about the doer, in general, with reference to a person only, "a doer and causer" is said, not with reference to conditions. For indeed the conditions of the great earth and so on are not absent.

135. The question "the doer of good and evil actions is another" was rejected due to the fear of the view beginning with "or self as possessing activities."

136. "Result is found" and so on was stated for the purpose of breaking the view of one who shows a person by way of an experiencer of result. Therein, "experiencer of result" is the pursuit of the opponent; the rejecting is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, because of the absence of another experiencer apart from the occurrence of result. Again, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other.

138. "One who experiences that" means one who experiences that which is the experiencer of result. But since what is to be experienced is called result, and a person is not result, therefore this is the rejecting of the opponent's position. Being asked again, since while established in meritorious result, the experiencer of result - whether a mother or a wife - covers with kisses and clings to a son or a husband, therefore with reference to such an experience, the opponent acknowledges.

"For that very one" means if result is not merely result, but there is a person who experiences that, and one who experiences that one too, and one who experiences that one too - thus there is a succession of persons. This being so, that ending of suffering which is spoken of through the causing of non-occurrence of the round of results, that is not - this is the meaning. From here onwards, the meaning in the questions about one who experiences, by the similarity of "is found," should be understood by the very method stated above.

142. The question "the experiencer of the result of good and evil actions is another" was rejected due to the fear of the view beginning with "or self as possessing feeling."

143. "Divine happiness" and so on was begun by means of seeing, having divided the result of good and bad actions. All that should be understood by the very method stated above. And here, the rejection of one who experiences should be understood for the proponent of one's own doctrine by way of person only, not by way of feeling.

148. For the arising of feelings having made the great earth and so on as object is not prohibited.

170. "A doer, causer, experiencer of result" and so on was begun by way of the mixed method. Therein, "the one who acts" means that which you call "a doer" and "one who experiences" - does that very one act, does he experience? This is the pursuit of the proponent of one's own doctrine; the rejecting of the opponent is through fear of contradiction with the discourses.

171. Being asked again, the acknowledgment is his alone by way of the discourse beginning with "Here he rejoices, after death he rejoices." Then, warding off the opportunity for his statement, the own-side advocate said "Pleasure and pain are self-made."

172. Therein, "one acts, another" is said by way of a question about the otherness of the doer and the experiencer. Thereupon, the opponent, having rejected through fear of contradiction with the discourses, when asked again, thinking "having acted as one who has become a human being, one who has become a god experiences," acknowledges. But for one holding such a doctrine, "one commits pleasure and pain made by another" - when asked by virtue of that, he again rejects.

174. "He and another" is said by way of a question about the unity and otherness of the doer and the experiencer. Thereupon, the opponent, having rejected through fear of contradiction with the discourses, when asked again, having combined the former two methods together, acknowledges. But for one holding such a doctrine, "one commits pleasure and pain both self-made and made by another" - when asked by virtue of that, he again rejects.

176. "Neither he acts" is said by way of rejecting the unity and otherness of the doer and the experiencer. Thereupon, the opponent, having rejected only by way of contradiction with the discourses, when asked again, thinking "because a human being, having done action for rebirth in the world of the gods, does not experience it as one who has become a human being, nor does someone other than the one by whom the action was done experience it, therefore the experiencer in relation to the doer is neither he nor another," acknowledges. Is this merely a view? But for one holding such a doctrine, "one commits pleasure and pain that is neither self-made nor made by another but fortuitously arisen" - when asked by virtue of that, he again rejects. Furthermore, in this mixed method, from the beginning, the meaning should be understood by this method too. For since this personalist wishes for both a doer and an experiencer of actions, therefore it is committed that whoever is the doer, the experiencer must be either that very one, or another, or both, or neither of the two. Pursuing the pursuit thus committed, the proponent of one's own doctrine stated all four alternatives beginning with "he acts." The remainder is of the very method already stated.

But at the conclusion, all four questions were asked together. Therein, the rejecting, the acknowledging, and the committing to the fault of self-made and so on should be understood by the very former method. From here onwards, without saying "good and evil," they are shown by the alternative beginning with "there is action," according to the very method stated above. The meaning of those too should be understood by the very method stated above.

Commentary on the Pursuit of Personal Effort.

"The Good Chapter" is also a name for this very same.

14. Commentary on the Pursuit of Direct Knowledge

193. From here onwards, the establishment of arahantship is by way of the pursuit of direct knowledge and so on. Therein, when "Yes" was acknowledged by the proponent of one's own doctrine, the opponent, imagining "there is no achievement of the distinction of various kinds of supernormal power and so on in external matter not bound by the senses, but there is internally, therefore there must be a person who produces supernormal power and so on," said beginning with "Is there not someone who performs supernormal power?" All that is of clear meaning.

Commentary on the Pursuit of Direct Knowledge.

15-18. Commentary on the Pursuit of Relatives and So On

197. Now, that beginning with "mother" is the pursuit concerning relatives. That beginning with "warrior caste" is the pursuit concerning birth. "A householder" or "one gone forth" is the pursuit concerning practice. "A god" or "a human being" is the pursuit concerning rebirth. That beginning with "stream-enterer" is the pursuit concerning penetration; it is also called the pursuit concerning noble ones. All of those are of manifest meaning only. But here "having been a Worthy One, not a Worthy One" is not stated because it would be a pointless question.

206. "Four pairs of persons" and so on is the pursuit regarding the Community, and that too is clear in meaning.

209. "Conditioned" and so on is the pursuit of the intrinsic nature of the highest truth. Therein, "a third point" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine. The rejecting is of the opponent because of the absence of such a highest truth. Being asked again, the acknowledgment is his alone with reference to a person.

211. In the question "Is the person another?" too, the rejecting is of that very one, being unwilling for the otherness from the conditioned aggregates.

212. Beginning with "The aggregates are conditioned" - having shown the conditioned and unconditioned in their own form, this was said for the purpose of questioning about otherness.

213. Beginning with "Matter is conditioned" - having shown the aggregates by way of classification, this was said for the purpose of questioning about otherness.

214. "The arising of a person" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the acknowledgment is of the opponent by way of the discourse beginning with "Subject to birth, subject to ageing, and also subject to death." But he does not wish for its conditioned nature, therefore he rejects.

215. Again, when asked by the method beginning with "no arising is evident," because of the statement beginning with "for only suffering comes into being, suffering remains and disappears," he acknowledges that arising and so on of a person do not apply.

216. "Exists in the good" - "good" is called Nibbāna. He asks whether there is existence therein. By its existence, eternalism; by its nonexistence, annihilation commits. Being unwilling for both of those, he afterwards rejects.

Commentary on the Pursuit of Relatives and So On.

19. Commentary on the Pursuit of Penetration and So On

217. In the questions based on existence, it is the becoming of rebirth.

218. In the question about one who is experiencing feeling, one who is experiencing feeling understands only if he is a meditator whose feelings have been comprehended; a foolish worldling does not understand.

224. The questions beginning with observation of the body are of manifest meaning only.

226. In the verse of the Pārāyana, "regard the world as empty" means: look upon the world of aggregates by way of the emptiness of a being - this is the meaning.

228. "A person looks at" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine. For the opponent's view is that whoever looks at in the verse "Regard the world as empty," that one is a person; therefore he asks him thus. "Together with matter" means together with the material body. The meaning is having been not departed from that. This, having allowed by way of the five-aggregate constituent existence, when again asked "Is the soul the same?" he rejects through fear of contradiction with the discourses. "Without matter" - this, having allowed by way of the four-aggregate constituent existence, when again asked "Is the soul one thing?" he rejects through fear of contradiction with the discourses. "Having gone inside" and "having gone out externally" - this is a statement of characteristic of what was stated below as "together with matter, without matter." Therein, "having gone inside" means gone inside matter, having not gone out from here or from there, having remained by way of the limit of matter alone - this is the meaning. "Having gone out" means having passed beyond the limit of matter. The meaning is having been independent of matter.

231. "Non-self" means devoid of a self, a soul, a person. The meaning is that a person is not found even in a single phenomenon. Thus the meaning of all the discourses should be understood by the very method stated in the Tradition Commentaries. Here, however, we shall explain only what is spoken with reference to this.

237. The passage beginning with "It was said by the Blessed One - 'a pot of ghee'" was brought for the purpose of showing that "not all teachings should be taken in meaning according to their literal expression alone." For just as a pot made by taking gold, being an alteration of gold, is called a golden pot, there is not in the same way a thing called a ghee pot that is an alteration of ghee made by taking ghee. But whatever pot into which ghee has been put, that is called a ghee pot - this is the meaning here. In the case of an oil pot and so on too, the same method applies. And just as Nibbāna is permanent and stable, food or rice gruel is not so. But without making a delimitation of time, by way of the designation "I shall give day after day," it is called "regular meal" and "regular rice gruel" - this is the meaning here.

In the passage beginning with "There is a person practising for personal welfare" and so on too, just as phenomena such as materiality and so on exist by way of separate characteristics and common characteristics, a person does not exist in the same way. But when materiality and so on are present, the conventional expression "of such a name" and "of such a clan" comes about. Thus, by this popular expression, by worldly convention, by popular language, there is a person - this is the meaning here. And this too was said by the Blessed One - "These, Citta, are popular names, popular language, popular expressions, popular designations." But phenomena such as materiality and so on, even without worldly convention, exist because of being describable by way of separate and common characteristics - this is the meaning here.

But the Buddhas have two kinds of talk: conventional talk and ultimate reality talk. Therein, that beginning with "a being, a person, a god, a Brahmā" is called conventional talk. That beginning with "impermanent, suffering, non-self, aggregates, elements, sense bases, establishments of mindfulness, right strivings" is called ultimate reality talk.

Therein, whoever, by way of conventional teaching, when "a being" or etc. "a Brahmā" is spoken, is able to know, to penetrate, to go forth, and to seize the victory-grip of arahantship, to him the Blessed One speaks from the very beginning with "a being" or "a person" or "a man" or "a god" or "a Brahmā." Whoever, by way of the teaching of the ultimate reality, having heard a certain one among "impermanent" or "suffering" and so on, is able to know, to penetrate, to go forth, and to seize the victory-grip of arahantship. To him he speaks of a certain one among "impermanent" and so on. Likewise, even for a being who can awaken through conventional talk, he does not first speak ultimate reality talk. But having awakened him through conventional talk, he afterwards speaks ultimate reality talk. Even for a being who can awaken through ultimate reality talk, he does not first speak conventional talk. But having awakened him through ultimate reality talk, he afterwards speaks conventional talk. But ordinarily, for one who speaks ultimate reality talk first, the teaching is of a rough appearance. Therefore the Buddhas, having first spoken conventional talk, afterwards speak ultimate reality talk. Even when speaking conventional talk, they speak only what is true, only what is of intrinsic nature, only without falsehood. Even when speaking ultimate reality talk, they speak only what is true, only what is of intrinsic nature, only without falsehood. For this one -

"Two truths the Perfectly Enlightened One declared, the best of speakers;
Conventional and ultimate reality, a third is not found."

Therein -

"Agreed-upon speech is true, by reason of worldly convention;
Ultimate reality speech is true, being the actual characteristic of phenomena."

Another method - The Blessed One's teachings are twofold: the teaching of the ultimate reality by way of the aggregates and so on, and the conventional teaching by way of the pot of ghee and so on. For the Blessed One does not override common usage. Therefore, adherence should not be made merely from the words "there is a person." For by the Teacher -

"Without going beyond concept, the ultimate reality was made known;
One should not override common usage, therefore another wise one too;
When making known the ultimate reality, should not override common usage."

The remainder is of manifest meaning everywhere.

The Discussion on Persons is finished.



ABOUT THIS TRANSLATION

This translation is part of the PaliVerse Project - the first complete, unified English translation of the Pāli Canon together with its Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā) and Subcommentaries (Tīkā), accompanied by interactive study tools. PaliVerse is an ongoing project. The AI translations are continuously improved through experts' revisions and feedback. This text is the latest translation as of the date of download.

PDF Creation Date: 14 September 2026

HOW TO CITE

PaliVerse (2026). Commentaries. 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching - Commentaries. 5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy. 1. Discussion on the Existence of 'Person'
Retrieved from paliverse.org

© 2026 The PaliVerse Project · All Rights Reserved
Centre for Study and Practice of Theravāda Buddhism
Civic Non-Profit Company registered in Greece
This PDF may be freely distributed for study and practice.

PaliVerse.org