

THE PALIVERSE PROJECT

The Universe of Buddha's Wisdom

The Triple Canon (Tipiṭaka)

3. The Canon of Higher Teaching (3. Abhidhamma Piṭaka)

05. Points of Controversy (05. Kathāvatthupāḷi)

1. Discussion on the Existence of 'Person' (1. Puggalakathā)

[Kv 1.1, PTS 1-69]



PaliVerse

05. Points of Controversy

Canon of the Higher Teaching

Points of Controversy

1. Discussion on the Existence of 'Person'

1. Pure Highest Truth

1. Conformity and Reverse

1. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

The Pentad of Conformity.

2. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed

sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

The Tetrad of Counter-argument.

3. But if you think - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,'" by that, for you there, by this acknowledgment, one acknowledging thus should be refuted thus. Then we refute you. And you are well refuted.

If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - this is wrong of you.

The Tetrad of Refutation.

4. If this is wrongly refuted, then just so see there. It should be said indeed - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," but it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." And we, by you there, by this acknowledgment, acknowledging thus, should not be refuted thus. Yet you refute me. And we are wrongly refuted.

If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and

ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - this is wrong of you.

The Tetrad of Application.

5. That should not be refuted thus. If so, what you refute - "If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality.' What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - this is wrong of you. If so, whatever refutation was made, that refutation was wrongly done. The atonement was well done. The guidance was well done.

The Tetrad of Conclusion.

The First Refutation.

1. Pure Highest Truth

2. Reverse and Conformity

6. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

The Pentad of Opposition.

7. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

The Tetrad of Counter-argument.

8. But if you think - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,'" by that, for you there, by this acknowledgment, one acknowledging thus should be refuted thus. Then we refute you. And you are well refuted.

If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - this is wrong of you.

9. If this is wrongly refuted, then just so see there. It should be said indeed - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," but it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." And we, by you there, by this acknowledgment, acknowledging thus, should not be refuted thus. Yet you refute me. And we are wrongly refuted.

If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - this is wrong of you.

The Tetrad of Application.

10. That should not be refuted thus. If so, what you refute - "If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality.' What you say there - 'It should be said indeed - a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, but it should not be said - that which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'That which is the highest truth and ultimate reality, from that is that person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - this is wrong of you. If so, whatever refutation was made, that refutation was wrongly done. The atonement was well done. The guidance was well done.

The Tetrad of Conclusion.

The Second Refutation.

2. Highest Truth with Permission

1. Conformity and Reverse

11. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "A person is found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Third Refutation.

3. Highest Truth with Time

1. Conformity and Reverse

12. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person always found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is always found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is always found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "A person is always found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is always found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Fourth Refutation.

4. Highest Truth with Constituent

1. Conformity and Reverse

13. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "A person is found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Fifth Refutation.

2. Highest Truth with Permission

2. Reverse and Conformity

14. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person not found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is not found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is not found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "A person is not found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is not found everywhere in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Sixth Refutation.

3. Highest Truth with Time

2. Reverse and Conformity

15. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person always not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is always not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is always not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "A person is always not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is always not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Seventh Refutation.

4. Highest Truth with Constituent

2. Reverse and Conformity

16. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person not found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is not found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person

is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is not found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "A person is not found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'A person is not found in all in the highest truth and ultimate reality'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Eighth Refutation.

5. The Pure Comparison

17. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is materiality found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is materiality one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

18. A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. and perception is found, etc. and activities are found, etc. and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is consciousness one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Consciousness is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Consciousness is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

19. A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the eye sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. and the ear sense base is found... and the nose sense base is found... and the tongue sense base is found... and the body sense base is found... and the visible form sense base is found... and the sound sense base is found... and the odour sense base is found... and the flavour sense base is found... and the touch sense base is found... and the mind sense base is found... and the mind-object sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

20. And the eye-element is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. And the ear-element is found... And the nose-element is found... And the tongue-element is found... And the body-element is found... And the material element is found... And the sound-element is found... And the odour-element is found... And the flavour-element is found... And the touch-element is found... And the eye-consciousness element is found... And the ear-consciousness element is found... And the nose-consciousness element is found... And the tongue-consciousness element is found... And the body-consciousness element is found... And the mind-element is found... And the mind-consciousness element is found... And the element of phenomena is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

21. And the eye-faculty is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. and the ear-faculty is found... and the nose-faculty is found... and the tongue-faculty is found... and the body faculty is found... and the mind faculty is found... and the life faculty is found... and the femininity faculty is found... and the masculinity faculty is found... and the faculty of pleasantness is found... and the faculty of pain is found... and the pleasure faculty is found... and the faculty of displeasure is found... and the equanimity faculty is found... and the faith faculty is found... and the energy faculty is found... and the mindfulness faculty is found... and the concentration faculty is found... and the wisdom faculty is found... and the faculty of "I shall know the unknown" is found... and the faculty of final knowledge is found... and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final

knowledge is one thing and the person is another" - is wrong. Etc.

22. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and is materiality found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is materiality one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "It was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare,' and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

23. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and feeling is found, etc. and perception is found, etc. and activities are found, etc. and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is consciousness one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Consciousness is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Consciousness is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "It was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare,' and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare,' and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

24. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and the eye sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. and the ear sense base is found, etc. and the mind-object sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

25. And the eye-element is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. And the body-element is found, etc. And the material element is found, etc. And the touch-element is found, etc. And the eye-consciousness element is found, etc. And the mind-consciousness element is found, etc. And the element of phenomena is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

26. And the eye-faculty is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. And the ear-faculty is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. And the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

27. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "It was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare,' and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Simple Comparison.

6. The Comparison by Simile

28. Is materiality found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is feeling found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is materiality one thing and feeling another? Yes. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is materiality found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is materiality one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality; then indeed sir, it should be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another."

What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

29. Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and perception is found, etc. and activities are found, etc. and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, is materiality one thing and consciousness another? Yes. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is materiality found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is materiality one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and consciousness is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality; then indeed sir, it should be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and consciousness is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and consciousness is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and consciousness is another, and a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

30. Feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and perception is found, etc. and activities are found, etc. and consciousness is found, etc. and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

31. Perception is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and activities are found, etc. and consciousness is found, etc. and materiality is found, etc. and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

32. Activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found, etc. and materiality is found, etc. and feeling is found, etc. and perception is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

33. Consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found, etc. and feeling is found, etc. and perception is found, etc. and activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, consciousness is one thing and activities are another? Yes. A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is consciousness one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, consciousness is one thing and activities are another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality; then indeed sir, it should be said - "Consciousness is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, consciousness is one thing and activities are another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Consciousness is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, consciousness is one thing and activities are another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, consciousness is one thing and activities are another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

34. The eye sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the ear sense base is found, etc. and the mind-object sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. The ear sense base is found, etc. The mind-object sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the eye sense base is found, etc. and the mind sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

35. The eye-element is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the ear-element is found, etc. And the element of phenomena is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. The ear-element is found, etc. The element of phenomena is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the eye-element is found, etc. And the mind-consciousness element is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

36. The eye-faculty is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the ear-faculty is found, etc. And the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. The ear-faculty is found, etc. The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. And the eye-faculty is found, etc. And the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, is the faculty of one who has final knowledge one thing and the faculty of final knowledge another? Yes. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is the faculty of one who has final knowledge found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality; then indeed sir, it should be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

37. Is materiality found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is feeling found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and is materiality one thing and feeling another? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and is materiality found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is materiality one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality; then indeed sir, it should be said - materiality is one thing and the person is another. What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, it was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Materiality is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, it was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare,' and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is one thing and feeling is another, it was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

38. Materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and perception is found... and activities are found... and consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality... etc.

39. Feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and perception is found... and activities are found... and consciousness is found... and materiality is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

40. Perception is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and activities are found... and consciousness is found... and materiality is found... and feeling is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

41. Activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and consciousness is found... and materiality is found... and feeling is found... and perception is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

42. Consciousness is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and materiality is found... and feeling is found... and perception is found... and activities are found in the highest truth and ultimate reality... etc.

43. The eye sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the ear sense base is found, etc. and the mind-object sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. The ear sense base is found, etc. The mind-object sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the eye sense base is found, etc. and the mind sense base is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

44. The eye-element is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the ear-element is found, etc. And the element of phenomena is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. The ear-element is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. The element of phenomena is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the eye-element is found, etc. And the mind-consciousness element is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc.

45. The eye-faculty is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the ear-faculty is found, etc. And the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, etc. The ear-faculty is found, etc. The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the eye-faculty is found, etc. And the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge one thing and the faculty of final knowledge another? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality; then indeed sir, it should be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, it was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, it was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare,' and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, and the

faculty of final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, the faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the faculty of final knowledge is another, it was said by the Blessed One - There is a person practising for personal welfare, and the faculty of one who has final knowledge is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Comparison by Simile.

7. The Comparison by the Tetrad Method

46. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is materiality the person? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Materiality is the person." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is the person'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Materiality is the person," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is the person'" - is wrong. Etc.

47. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person in matter? Etc. Is a person apart from matter? Etc. Is matter in a person? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Matter is in a person." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Matter is in a person'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Matter is in a person," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Matter is in a person'" - is wrong. Etc.

48. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is feeling a person? Etc. Is a person in feeling? Etc. Is a person apart from feeling? Etc. Is feeling in a person? Etc.

Is perception a person? Etc. Is a person in perception? Etc. Is a person apart from perception? Etc. Is perception in a person? Etc.

Are activities a person? Etc. Is a person in activities? Etc. Is a person apart from activities? Etc. Are activities in a person? Etc.

Is consciousness a person? Etc. Is a person in consciousness? Etc. Is a person apart from consciousness? Etc. Is consciousness in a person? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Consciousness is in a person." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and

ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is in a person'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Consciousness is in a person," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is in a person'" - is wrong. Etc.

49. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is the eye sense base a person? Etc. Is a person in the eye sense base? Etc. Is a person apart from the eye sense base? Etc. Is the eye sense base in a person? Etc. Is the mind-object sense base a person? Etc. Is a person in the mind-object sense base? Etc. Is a person apart from the mind-object sense base? Etc. Is the mind-object sense base in a person? Etc.

Is the eye-element a person? Etc. Is a person in the eye-element? Etc. Is a person apart from the eye-element? Etc. Is the eye-element in a person? Etc. Is the element of phenomena a person? Etc. Is a person in the element of phenomena? Etc. Is a person apart from the element of phenomena? Etc. Is the element of phenomena in a person? Etc.

Is the eye-faculty a person? Etc. Is a person in the eye-faculty? Etc. Is a person apart from the eye-faculty? Etc. Is the eye-faculty in a person? Etc. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge a person? Etc. Is a person in the faculty of one who has final knowledge? Etc. Is a person apart from the faculty of one who has final knowledge? Etc. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge in a person? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person'" - is wrong. Etc.

50. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare"? Yes. Is materiality the person? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," then indeed sir, it should be said - "Materiality is the person." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is the person'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Materiality is the person," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "It was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed

One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'Materiality is the person'" - is wrong. Etc.

51. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare"? Yes. Is a person in matter? Etc. Is a person apart from matter? Etc. Is matter in a person? Etc.

Is feeling a person? Etc. Is a person in feeling? Etc. Is a person apart from feeling? Etc. Is feeling in a person? Etc.

Is perception a person? Etc. Is a person in perception? Etc. Is a person apart from perception? Etc. Is perception in a person? Etc.

Are activities a person? Etc. Is a person in activities? Etc. Is a person apart from activities? Etc. Are activities in a person? Etc.

Is consciousness a person? Etc. Is a person in consciousness? Etc. Is a person apart from consciousness? Etc. Is consciousness in a person? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," then indeed sir, it should be said - "Consciousness is in a person." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is in a person'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "Consciousness is in a person," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "It was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'Consciousness is in a person'" - is wrong. Etc.

52. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare"? Yes. Is the eye sense base a person? Etc. Is a person in the eye sense base? Etc. Is a person apart from the eye sense base? Etc. Is the eye sense base in a person? Etc. Is the mind-object sense base a person? Etc. Is a person in the mind-object sense base? Etc. Is a person apart from the mind-object sense base? Etc. Is the mind-object sense base in a person? Etc.

Is the eye-element a person? Etc. Is a person in the eye-element? Etc. Is a person apart from the eye-element? Etc. Is the eye-element in a person? Etc. Is the element of phenomena a person? Etc. Is a person in the element of phenomena? Etc. Is a person apart from the element of phenomena? Etc. Is the element of phenomena in a person? Etc.

Is the eye-faculty a person? Etc. Is a person in the eye-faculty? Etc. Is a person apart from the eye-faculty? Etc. Is the eye-faculty in a person? Etc. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge a person? Etc. Is a person in the faculty of one who has final knowledge? Etc. Is a person apart from the faculty of one who has final knowledge? Etc. Is the faculty of one who has final knowledge in a person? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," then indeed sir, it should be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "It was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'It was said by the Blessed One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'The faculty of one who has final knowledge is in a person'" - is wrong. Etc.

The Comparison by the Tetrad Method.

8. The Discussion on Characteristic and Reasoning

53. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is a person with condition? Etc. Is a person without condition? Is a person conditioned? Is a person unconditioned? Is a person eternal? Is a person non-eternal? Is a person with sign? Is a person signless? That should not be said. (Abbreviated)

54. Is a person not found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare"? Yes. Is a person with condition? Etc. Is a person without condition? Is a person conditioned? Is a person unconditioned? Is a person eternal? Is a person non-eternal? Is a person with sign? Is a person signless? That should not be said. (Abbreviated)

The Discussion on Characteristic and Reasoning.

9. The Purification of Expression

55. A person is found, what is found is a person? A person is found, what is found is in some cases a person, in some cases not a person. A person is in some cases found, in some cases not found? That should not be said. Etc.

56. A person is the highest truth, the highest truth is a person? A person is the highest truth, the highest truth is in some cases a person, in some cases not a person. A person is in some cases the highest truth, in some cases not the highest truth? That should not be said. Etc.

57. A person is existing, what is existing is a person? A person is existing, what is existing is in some cases a person, in some cases not a person. A person is in some cases existing, in some cases not existing? That should not be said. Etc.

58. A person is existing, what is existing is a person? A person is existing, what is existing is in some cases a person, in some cases not a person. A person is in some cases existing, in some cases not existing? That should not be said. Etc.

59. A person exists, there is a person? A person exists, what exists is in some cases a person, in some cases not a person. A person in some cases exists, in some cases does not exist? That should not be said. Etc.

60. A person exists, what exists is not every person? Yes. Etc. A person does not exist, what does not exist is not every person? That should not be said. (Abbreviated)

The Purification of Expression.

10. The Pursuit of Designation

61. Is a person in the material element a material person? Yes. Is a person in the sensual element a sensual person? That should not be said. Etc.

62. Is a being in the material element a material being? Yes. Is a being in the sensual element a sensual being? That should not be said. Etc.

63. Is a person in the immaterial element a formless person? Yes. Is a person in the sensual element a sensual person? That should not be said. Etc.

64. Is a being in the immaterial element an immaterial being? Yes. Is a being in the sensual element a sensual being? That should not be said. Etc.

65. Is a person in the material element a material person, and is a person in the immaterial element a formless person, and is there anyone who, having passed away from the material element, is reborn in the immaterial element? Yes. Is the material person cut off, and the formless person born? That should not be said. Etc.

66. Is a being in the material element a material being, and is a being in the immaterial element an immaterial being, and is there anyone who, having passed away from the material element, is reborn in the immaterial element? Yes. Is the material being cut off, and the immaterial being born? That should not be said. Etc.

67. "Body" or "physical body," or "physical body" or "body," having made the body inseparable, are these the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind? Yes. "Person" or "soul," or "soul" or "person," having made the person inseparable, are these the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind? Yes. Is the body one thing and the person another? Yes. Is the soul one thing and the body another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If "body" or "physical body," or "physical body" or "body," having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; "person" or "soul," or "soul" or "person," having made the person inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; the body is one thing and the person is another; then indeed sir, it should be said - "The soul is one thing and the body is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Body' or 'physical body,' or 'physical body' or 'body,' having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; 'person' or 'soul,' or 'soul' or 'person,' having made the person inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; the body is one thing and the person is another," but it should not be said - "The soul is one thing and the body is another" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The soul is one thing and the body is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "'Body' or 'physical body,' or 'physical body' or 'body,' having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; 'person' or 'soul,' or 'soul' or 'person,' having made the

person inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; the body is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Body' or 'physical body,' or 'physical body' or 'body,' having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; 'person' or 'soul,' or 'soul' or 'person,' having made the person inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind; the body is one thing and the person is another," but it should not be said - "The soul is one thing and the body is another" - is wrong. Etc.

68. "Body" or "physical body," or "physical body" or "body," having made the body inseparable, are these the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare"? Yes. Is the body one thing and the person another? That should not be said.

Acknowledge the counter-argument. If "body" or "physical body," or "physical body" or "body," having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind, it was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare," then indeed sir, it should be said - "The body is one thing and the person is another." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Body' or 'physical body,' or 'physical body' or 'body,' having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind, it was said by the Blessed One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'The body is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "The body is one thing and the person is another," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "'Body' or 'physical body,' or 'physical body' or 'body,' having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind, it was said by the Blessed One - 'There is a person practising for personal welfare.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Body' or 'physical body,' or 'physical body' or 'body,' having made the body inseparable, are the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind, it was said by the Blessed One - there is a person practising for personal welfare,' but it should not be said - 'The body is one thing and the person is another'" - is wrong. (Abbreviated)

The Pursuit of Designation.

11. The Pursuit of Destination

69. Does a person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does that person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? That should not be said, etc.

70. Does a person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does another person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? That should not be said. Etc.

71. Does a person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does he and another transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? That should not be said. Etc.

72. Does a person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does neither he transmigrate, nor another transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? That should not be said. Etc.

73. Does a person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does that person transmigrate, does another person transmigrate, do he and another transmigrate, does neither he transmigrate nor another transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? That should not be said. Etc.

74. Should it not be said - "A person transmigrates from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One

-

"That person, having transmigrated seven times at most;
Becomes one who makes an end of suffering, through the destruction of all fetters."

Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, a person transmigrates from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world.

75. Should it not be said - "A person transmigrates from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "This wandering in the round of rebirths, monks, is without discernible beginning. A first point is not discerned of beings hindered by ignorance, fettered by craving, transmigrating and wandering in the round of rebirths"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, a person transmigrates from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world.

76. Does a person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? That should not be said. Etc.

77. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a human being, becomes a god? Yes. Is that same human being that god? That should not be said. Etc.

78. Is that same human being that god? Yes. Having been a human being, one becomes a god; having been a god, one becomes a human being; the one who was a human being is one, the god is another; the one who was a human being, that same one transmigrates - is wrong. Etc.

For if that same person transmigrates from here, having passed away, to the world beyond, not another, then in this way death will not exist, and killing living beings is not found. There is action, there is result of action, there is result of actions done, when wholesome and unwholesome are ripening, that same one transmigrates - is wrong.

79. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a human being, becomes a demon, becomes a ghost, becomes one doomed to Niraya Hell, becomes an animal, becomes a camel, becomes an ox, becomes a donkey, becomes a pig, becomes a buffalo? Yes. Is that same human being that buffalo? That should not be said. Etc.

80. Is that same human being that buffalo? Yes. Having been a human being, one becomes a buffalo; having been a buffalo, one becomes a human being; the one who was a human being is one, the buffalo is another; the one who was a human being, that same one transmigrates - is wrong. Etc.

For if that same person transmigrates from here, having passed away, to the world beyond, not another, then in this way death will not exist, and killing living beings is not found. There is action, there is result of action, there is result of actions done, when wholesome and unwholesome are ripening, that same one transmigrates - is wrong.

81. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a warrior, becomes a brahmin? Yes. Is that same warrior that brahmin? That should not be said. Etc.

82. Is there anyone who, having been a warrior, becomes a merchant, becomes a worker? Yes. Is that same warrior that worker? That should not be said. Etc.

83. Is there anyone who, having been a brahmin, becomes a merchant, becomes a worker, becomes a warrior? Yes. Is that same brahmin that warrior? That should not be said. Etc.

84. Is there anyone who, having been a merchant, becomes a worker, becomes a warrior, becomes a brahmin? Yes. Is that same merchant that brahmin? That should not be said. Etc.

85. Is there anyone who, having been a worker, becomes a warrior, becomes a brahmin, becomes a merchant? Yes. Is that same worker that merchant? That should not be said. Etc.

86. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does one with a cut off hand remain one with a cut off hand, does one with a cut off foot remain one with a cut off foot, does one with cut off hands and feet remain one with cut off hands and feet, does one with cut off ears... one with a cut off nose... one with cut off ears and nose... one with cut off fingers... one with cut off thumbs... one with cut tendons... one with crooked hands... one with webbed hands... a leper... one with boils... one with skin disease... one with consumption... one with epilepsy... a camel... an ox... a donkey... a pig... does a buffalo remain a buffalo? That should not be said. Etc.

87. Should it not be said - "That same person transmigrates from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world"? Yes. Is it not that a stream-enterer person, having passed away from the human world and been reborn in the heavenly world, is still a stream-enterer there? Yes.

If a stream-enterer person, having passed away from the human world and been reborn in the heavenly world, is still a stream-enterer there, then indeed sir, it should be said - "That same person transmigrates from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world."

88. A stream-enterer person, having passed away from the human world and been reborn in the heavenly world, is still a stream-enterer there - and by that reason does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. A stream-enterer person, having passed away from the human world and been reborn in the heavenly world, is a human being there? That should not be said. Etc.

89. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does one who is not another, by way of non-disappearance, transmigrate? That should not be said. Etc.

90. Does one who is not another, by way of non-disappearance, transmigrate? Yes. Does one with a cut off hand remain one with a cut off hand, does one with a cut off foot remain one with a cut off foot, does one with cut off hands and feet remain one with cut off hands and feet, does one with cut off ears... one with a cut off nose... one with cut off ears and nose... one with cut off fingers... one with cut off thumbs... one with cut tendons... one with crooked hands... one with webbed hands... a leper... one with boils... one with skin disease... one with consumption... one with epilepsy... a camel... an ox... a donkey... a pig... does a buffalo remain a buffalo? That should not be said. Etc.

91. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does one transmigrate having a form? That should not be said. Etc. Does one transmigrate having a form? Yes. Is the soul the same as the body? That should not be said. Etc.

Having feeling, etc. Having perception, etc. Having activities, etc. Does one transmigrate having consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Does one transmigrate having consciousness? Yes. Is the soul the same as the body? That should not be said. Etc.

92. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does one transmigrate being immaterial? That should not be said. Etc. Does one transmigrate being immaterial? Yes. Is the soul one thing and the body another? That should not be said. Etc.

Without feeling, etc. Without perception, etc. Without activities, etc. Does one transmigrate being without consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Does one transmigrate being without consciousness? Yes. Is the soul one thing and the body another? That should not be said. Etc.

93. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does materiality transmigrate? That should not be said. Etc. Does materiality transmigrate? Yes. Is the soul the same as the body? That should not be said. Etc.

Feeling etc. perception... etc. activities... etc. Does consciousness transmigrate? That should not be said. Etc. Does consciousness transmigrate? Yes. Is the soul the same as the body? That should not be said. Etc.

94. Does that same person transmigrate from this world to the world beyond, from the world beyond to this world? Yes. Does materiality not transmigrate? That should not be said. Etc. Does materiality not transmigrate? Yes. Is the soul one thing and the body another? That should not be said. Etc.

Feeling etc. perception... etc. activities... etc. Does consciousness not transmigrate? That should not be said. Etc. Does consciousness not transmigrate? Yes. Is the soul one thing and the body another? That should not be said. (Abbreviated)

When the aggregates are breaking up, if that person breaks up;
It becomes the view of annihilation, which was avoided by the Buddha.

When the aggregates are breaking up, if that person does not break up;
The person becomes eternal, equal to Nibbāna.

The Pursuit of Destination.

12. The Pursuit of Derived Designation

95. Is the person described with reference to matter? Yes. Is matter impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? Yes. Is the person also impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

96. Is the person described with reference to feeling? Is the person described with reference to perception? Is the person described with reference to activities? Is the person described with reference to consciousness? Yes. Is consciousness impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? Yes. Is the person also impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

97. Is the person described with reference to matter? Yes. Is a blue person described with reference to blue matter? That should not be said. Etc. With reference to yellow matter... With reference to red matter... With reference to white matter... With reference to manifest matter... With reference to non-manifest matter... With reference to impinging matter... Is a non-impinging person described with reference to non-impinging matter? That should not be said. Etc.

98. Is the person described with reference to feeling? Yes. Is the wholesome person described with reference to wholesome feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Is the wholesome person described with reference to wholesome feeling? Yes. Is wholesome feeling fruitful, with result, having desirable result, having pleasing result, having delightful result, having full and delicious result, yielding happiness, resulting in

happiness? Yes. Is a wholesome person also fruitful, with result, having desirable result, having pleasing result, having delightful result, having full and delicious result, yielding happiness, resulting in happiness? That should not be said. Etc.

99. Is the person described with reference to feeling? Yes. Is an unwholesome person described with reference to unwholesome feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Is an unwholesome person described with reference to unwholesome feeling? Yes. Is unwholesome feeling fruitful, with result, having undesirable result, having unpleasant result, having undelightful result, having incomplete and undelicious result, with painful consequences, resulting in pain? Yes. Is an unwholesome person also fruitful, with result, having undesirable result, having unpleasant result, having undelightful result, having incomplete and undelicious result, with painful consequences, resulting in pain? That should not be said. Etc.

100. Is the person described with reference to feeling? Yes. Is the indeterminate person described with reference to indeterminate feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Is the indeterminate person described with reference to indeterminate feeling? Yes. Is indeterminate feeling impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? Yes. Is the indeterminate person also impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

101. Is the person described with reference to perception? Is the person described with reference to activities? Is the person described with reference to consciousness? Yes. Is the wholesome person described with reference to wholesome consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is the wholesome person described with reference to wholesome consciousness? Yes. Is wholesome consciousness fruitful, with result, having desirable result, having pleasing result, having delightful result, having full and delicious result, yielding happiness, resulting in happiness? Yes. Is a wholesome person also fruitful, with result, having desirable result, having pleasing result, having delightful result, having full and delicious result, yielding happiness, resulting in happiness? That should not be said. Etc.

102. Is the person described with reference to consciousness? Yes. Is an unwholesome person described with reference to unwholesome consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is an unwholesome person described with reference to unwholesome consciousness? Yes. Is unwholesome consciousness fruitful, with result, having undesirable result, having unpleasant result, having undelightful result, having incomplete and undelicious result, with painful consequences, resulting in pain? Yes. Is an unwholesome person also fruitful, with result, having undesirable result, having unpleasant result, having undelightful result, having incomplete and undelicious result, with painful consequences, resulting in pain? That should not be said. Etc.

103. Is the person described with reference to consciousness? Yes. Is the indeterminate person described with reference to indeterminate consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is the indeterminate person described with reference to indeterminate consciousness? Yes. Is indeterminate consciousness impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling,

subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? Yes. Is the indeterminate person also impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

104. With reference to the eye, should it be said "a person endowed with eyes"? Yes. When the eye has ceased, should it be said "the person endowed with eyes has ceased"? That should not be said. Etc. With reference to the ear... With reference to the nose... With reference to the tongue... With reference to the body... With reference to the mind, should it be said "a person endowed with mind"? Yes. When the mind has ceased, should it be said "the person endowed with mind has ceased"? That should not be said.

105. With reference to wrong view, should it be said "a person with wrong view"? Yes. When wrong view has ceased, should it be said "the person with wrong view has ceased"? That should not be said. With reference to wrong thought, etc. With reference to wrong speech, etc. With reference to wrong action, etc. With reference to wrong livelihood, etc. With reference to wrong effort, etc. With reference to wrong mindfulness, etc. With reference to wrong concentration, should it be said "a person with wrong concentration"? Yes. When wrong concentration has ceased, should it be said "the person with wrong concentration has ceased"? That should not be said.

106. With reference to right view, should it be said "a person with right view"? Yes. When right view has ceased, should it be said "the person with right view has ceased"? That should not be said. Etc. With reference to right thought... With reference to right speech... With reference to right action... With reference to right livelihood... With reference to right effort... With reference to right mindfulness... With reference to right concentration, should it be said "a person with right concentration"? Yes. When right concentration has ceased, should it be said "the person with right concentration has ceased"? That should not be said. Etc.

107. Is the person described with reference to matter, with reference to feeling? Yes. Are two persons described with reference to two aggregates? That should not be said. Etc. Is the person described with reference to matter, with reference to feeling, with reference to perception, with reference to activities, with reference to consciousness? Yes. Are five persons described with reference to five aggregates? That should not be said. Etc.

108. Is the person described with reference to the eye sense base and the ear sense base? Yes. Are two persons described with reference to two sense bases? That should not be said. Etc. With reference to the eye sense base, the ear sense base, etc. Is the person described with reference to the mind-object sense base? Yes. Are twelve persons described with reference to twelve sense bases? That should not be said. Etc.

109. Is the person described with reference to the eye-element, with reference to the ear-element? Yes. Are two persons described with reference to two elements? That should not be said. Etc. With reference to the eye-element, with reference to the ear-element, etc. Is the person described with reference to the element of phenomena? Yes. Are eighteen persons described with reference to eighteen elements? That should not be said. Etc.

110. Is the person described with reference to the eye-faculty and the ear-faculty? Yes. Are two persons described with reference to two faculties? That should not be said. Etc. With reference to the eye-faculty, the ear-faculty, etc. Is the person described with reference to the faculty of one who has final knowledge? Yes. Are twenty-two persons described with reference to twenty-two faculties? That should not be said. Etc.

111. Is the person described with reference to single-aggregate constituent existence? Yes. Are four persons described with reference to four-aggregate constituent existence? That should not be said. Etc. Is the person described with reference to single-aggregate constituent existence? Yes. Are five persons described with reference to five-aggregate constituent existence? That should not be said. Etc. Is there only one person in single-aggregate constituent existence? Yes. Are there only four persons in four-aggregate constituent existence? That should not be said. Etc. Is there only one person in single-aggregate constituent existence? Yes. Are there only five persons in five-aggregate constituent existence? That should not be said. Etc.

112. Just as the shadow is described with reference to a tree, so too is the person described with reference to matter? Just as the shadow is described with reference to a tree, and the tree is impermanent and the shadow is impermanent, so too is the person described with reference to matter, and matter is impermanent and the person is impermanent? That should not be said. Etc. Just as the shadow is described with reference to a tree, and the tree is one thing and the shadow is another, so too is the person described with reference to matter, and matter is one thing and the person is another? That should not be said. Etc.

113. Just as the villager is described with reference to a village, so too is the person described with reference to matter? Just as the villager is described with reference to a village, and the village is one thing and the villager is another, so too is the person described with reference to matter, and matter is one thing and the person is another? That should not be said. Etc.

114. Just as the king is described with reference to a country, so too is the person described with reference to matter? Just as the king is described with reference to a country, and the country is one thing and the king is another, so too is the person described with reference to matter, and matter is one thing and the person is another? That should not be said. Etc.

115. Just as a chain is not one who has a chain, he who has a chain is one who has a chain, so too is matter not one who has matter, he who has matter is one who has matter? Just as a chain is not one who has a chain, he who has a chain is one who has a chain, the chain is one thing and one who has a chain is another, so too is matter not one who has matter, he who has matter is one who has matter, matter is one thing and one who has matter is another? That should not be said. Etc.

116. Is the person described with reference to each consciousness? Yes. Does the person with each consciousness get born, decay, die, pass away, and get reborn? That should not be said. Etc. When the second consciousness has arisen, should it not be said "he is the same" or "he is another"? Yes. When the second consciousness has arisen, should it not be said "a boy" or "a girl"? It should be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - "he is the same or he is another," then indeed sir, it should be said - "when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - 'a boy or a girl.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - he is the same or he is another, when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - a boy or a girl'" - is wrong.

Or else if when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - "a boy or a girl," then indeed sir, it should be said - "when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - 'he is the same or he is another.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - he is the same or he is another, when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - a boy or a girl'" - is wrong.

117. When the second consciousness has arisen, should it not be said - "he is the same or he is another"? Yes. When the second consciousness has arisen, should it not be said - "a woman or a man or a householder or one gone forth or a god or a human being"? It should be said.

Acknowledge the refutation. If when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - "he is the same or he is another," then indeed sir, it should be said - "when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - 'a god or a human being.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - he is the same or he is another, when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - a god or a human being'" - is wrong.

Or else if when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - "a god or a human being," then indeed sir, it should be said - "when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - 'he is the same or he is another.'" What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'when the second consciousness has arisen it should not be said - he is the same or he is another, when the second consciousness has arisen it should be said - a god or a human being'" - is wrong. Etc.

118. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is it not that whoever sees, whatever he sees, by whatever he sees, he sees, that he sees, by that he sees? Yes. If whoever sees, whatever he sees, by whatever he sees, he sees, that he sees, by that he sees; then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

119. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is it not that whoever hears... etc. whoever smells... whoever tastes... whoever touches... whoever cognises, whatever he cognises, by whatever he cognises, he cognises, that he cognises, by that he cognises? Yes. If whoever cognises, whatever he cognises, by whatever he cognises, he cognises, that he cognises, by that he cognises; then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

120. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is it not that whoever does not see, whatever he does not see, by whatever he does not see, he does not see, that he does not see, by that he does not see? Yes. If whoever does not see, whatever he does not see, by whatever he does not see, he does not see, that he does not see, by that he does not see; then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is it not that whoever does not hear... etc. whoever does not smell... whoever does not taste... whoever does not touch... whoever does not cognise, whatever he does not cognise, by whatever he does not cognise, he does not cognise, that he does not cognise, by that he does not cognise? Yes. If whoever does not cognise, whatever he does not cognise, by whatever he does not cognise, he does not cognise, that he does not cognise, by that he does not cognise; then indeed sir, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

121. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "I see, monks, with the divine eye, which is pure and surpasses the human, beings passing away and arising, inferior and superior, beautiful and ugly, fortunate and unfortunate, I understand beings according to their actions"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality.

122. It was said by the Blessed One - "I see, monks, with the divine eye, which is pure and surpasses the human, beings passing away and arising, inferior and superior, beautiful and ugly, fortunate and unfortunate, I understand beings according to their actions" - having made this, by that very reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Does the Blessed One with the divine eye, which is pure and surpasses the human, see materiality, see a person? He sees materiality. Is materiality the person, does materiality pass away, is materiality reborn, is materiality subject to rebirth according to actions? That should not be said.

Does the Blessed One with the divine eye, which is pure and surpasses the human, see materiality, see a person? He sees a person. Is the person materiality, the visible form sense base, the material element, blue, yellow, red, white, cognisable by eye, does it strike against the eye, does it come into the range of the eye? That should not be said.

Does the Blessed One with the divine eye, which is pure and surpasses the human, see materiality, see a person? He sees both. Are both materiality, the visible form sense base, the material element, are both blue, are both yellow, are both red, are both white, are both cognisable by eye, do both strike against the eye, do both come into the range of the eye, do both pass away, are both reborn, are both subject to rebirth according to actions? That should not be said.

The Pursuit of Derived Designation.

13. The Pursuit of Personal Effort

123. Are good and evil actions found? Yes. Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? That should not be said. Etc.

124. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is a doer and causer of that found? That should not be said. Etc.

125. Is a doer and causer of that found? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc.

126. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is a person found? Is a doer and causer of a person found? That should not be said. Etc.

127. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is Nibbāna found? Is a doer and causer of Nibbāna found? That should not be said. Etc.

128. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is the great earth found? Is a doer and causer of the great earth found? That should not be said. Etc.

129. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is the ocean found? Is a doer and causer of the ocean found? That should not be said. Etc.

130. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is Sineru, the king of mountains, found? Is a doer and causer of Sineru, the king of mountains, found? That should not be said. Etc.

131. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is water found? Is a doer and causer of water found? That should not be said. Etc.

132. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is fire found? Is a doer and causer of fire found? That should not be said. Etc.

133. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is air found? Is a doer and causer of air found? That should not be said. Etc.

134. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Are grass, wood, and trees found? Is a doer and causer of grass, wood, and trees found? That should not be said. Etc.

135. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer and causer of good and evil actions found? Yes. Are good and evil actions one thing and the doer and causer of good and evil actions another? That should not be said. Etc.

136. Is the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is an experiencer of the result of good and evil actions found? That should not be said. Etc.

137. Is the result of good and evil actions found? Is an experiencer of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is one who experiences that found? That should not be said. Etc.

138. Is one who experiences that found? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc.

139. Is the result of good and evil actions found? Is an experienter of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is a person found? Is one who experiences a person found? That should not be said. Etc.

140. Is the result of good and evil actions found? Is an experienter of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is Nibbāna found? Is one who experiences Nibbāna found? That should not be said. Etc.

141. Is the result of good and evil actions found? Is an experienter of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is the great earth found? Etc. Is the ocean found? Is Sineru, the king of mountains, found? Is water found? Is fire found? Is air found? Etc. Are grass, wood, and trees found? Is one who experiences grass, wood, and trees found? That should not be said. Etc.

142. Is the result of good and evil actions found? Is an experienter of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Is the result of good and evil actions one thing and the experienter of the result of good and evil actions another? That should not be said. Etc.

143. Is divine happiness found? Yes. Is one who experiences divine happiness found? That should not be said. Etc.

144. Is divine happiness found? Is one who experiences divine happiness found? Yes. Is one who experiences that found? That should not be said. Etc.

145. Is one who experiences that found? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc.

146. Is divine happiness found? Is one who experiences divine happiness found? Yes. Is a person found? Is one who experiences a person found? That should not be said. Etc.

147. Is divine happiness found? Is one who experiences divine happiness found? Yes. Is Nibbāna found? Is one who experiences Nibbāna found? That should not be said. Etc.

148. Is divine happiness found? Is one who experiences divine happiness found? Yes. Is the great earth found? Is the ocean found? Is Sineru, the king of mountains, found? Is water found? Is fire found? Is air found? Etc. Are grass, wood, and trees found? Is one who experiences grass, wood, and trees found? That should not be said. Etc.

149. Is divine happiness found? Is one who experiences divine happiness found? Yes. Is divine happiness one thing and one who experiences divine happiness another? That should not be said. Etc.

150. Is human happiness found? Yes. Is one who experiences human happiness found? That should not be said. Etc.

151. Is human happiness found? Is one who experiences human happiness found? Yes. Is one who experiences that found? That should not be said. Etc.

152. Is one who experiences that found? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc.

153. Is human happiness found? Is one who experiences human happiness found? Yes. Is a person found? Is one who experiences a person found? That should not be said. Etc.

154. Is human happiness found? Is one who experiences human happiness found? Yes. Is Nibbāna found? Is one who experiences Nibbāna found? That should not be said. Etc.

155. Is human happiness found? Is one who experiences human happiness found? Yes. Is the great earth found? Etc. Is the ocean found? Is Sineru, the king of mountains, found? Is water found? Is fire found? Is air found? Are grass, wood, and trees found? Is one who experiences grass, wood, and trees found? That should not be said. Etc.

156. Is human happiness found? Is one who experiences human happiness found? Yes. Is human happiness one thing and one who experiences human happiness another? That should not be said. Etc.

157. Is suffering in the realm of misery found? Yes. Is one who experiences suffering in the realm of misery found? That should not be said. Etc.

158. Is suffering in the realm of misery found? Is one who experiences suffering in the realm of misery found? Yes. Is one who experiences that found? That should not be said. Etc.

159. Is one who experiences that found? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc.

160. Is suffering in the realm of misery found? Is one who experiences suffering in the realm of misery found? Yes. Is a person found? Is one who experiences a person found? That should not be said. Etc.

161. Is suffering in the realm of misery found? Is one who experiences suffering in the realm of misery found? Yes. Is Nibbāna found? Is one who experiences Nibbāna found? That should not be said. Etc.

162. Is suffering in the realm of misery found? Is one who experiences suffering in the realm of misery found? Yes. Is the great earth found? Etc. Is the ocean found? Is Sineru, the king of mountains, found? Is water found? Is fire found? Is air found? Are grass, wood, and trees found? Is one who experiences grass, wood, and trees found? That should not be said. Etc.

163. Is suffering in the realm of misery found? Is one who experiences suffering in the realm of misery found? Yes. Is suffering in the realm of misery one thing and one who experiences suffering in the realm of misery another? That should not be said.

Etc.

164. Is hell suffering found? Yes. Is one who experiences hell suffering found? That should not be said.

Is hell suffering found, is one who experiences hell suffering found? Yes. Is one who experiences that found? That should not be said. Etc.

165. Is one who experiences that found? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc.

166. Is hell suffering found, is one who experiences hell suffering found? Yes. Is a person found? Is one who experiences a person found? That should not be said. Etc.

167. Is hell suffering found, is one who experiences hell suffering found? Yes. Is Nibbāna found? Is one who experiences Nibbāna found? That should not be said. Etc.

168. Is hell suffering found, is one who experiences hell suffering found? Yes. Is the great earth found? Etc. Is the ocean found? Is Sineru, the king of mountains, found? Is water found? Is fire found? Is air found? Are grass, wood, and trees found? Is one who experiences grass, wood, and trees found? That should not be said. Etc.

169. Is hell suffering found, is one who experiences hell suffering found? Yes. Is hell suffering one thing and one who experiences hell suffering another? That should not be said. Etc.

170. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer, causer, and experiencer of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. The one who acts is the one who experiences? That should not be said. Etc.

171. The one who acts is the one who experiences? Yes. Pleasure and pain are self-made? That should not be said. Etc.

172. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer, causer, and experiencer of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. One acts, another experiences? That should not be said. Etc.

173. One acts, another experiences? Yes. Pleasure and pain are made by another? That should not be said. Etc.

174. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer, causer, and experiencer of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Do he and another perform actions, and do he and another experience the results? That should not be said. Etc.

175. Do he and another perform actions, and do he and another experience the results? Yes. Is pleasure and pain both self-made and made by another? That should not be said. Etc.

176. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer, causer, and experiencer of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. Does neither he act nor he experience, nor another act nor another experience? That should not be said. Etc.

177. Does neither he act nor he experience, nor another act nor another experience? Yes. Is pleasure and pain neither self-made nor made by another but fortuitously arisen? That should not be said. Etc.

178. Are good and evil actions found? Is a doer, causer, and experiencer of the result of good and evil actions found? Yes. The one who acts is the one who experiences, one acts another experiences, he and another act he and another experience, neither he acts nor he experiences, nor another acts nor another experiences? That should not be said. Etc.

179. The one who acts is the one who experiences, one acts another experiences, he and another act he and another experience, neither he acts nor he experiences, nor another acts nor another experiences? Yes. Is pleasure and pain self-made, is pleasure and pain made by another, is pleasure and pain both self-made and made by another, is pleasure and pain neither self-made nor made by another but fortuitously arisen? That should not be said. Etc.

180. Is there action? Yes. Is there a doer of action? That should not be said. Etc.

181. Is there action, is there a doer of action? Yes. Is there a doer of that? That should not be said. Etc.

182. Is there a doer of that? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc.

183. Is there action, is there a doer of action? Yes. Is there a person, is there a doer of the person? That should not be said. Etc.

184. Is there action, is there a doer of action? Yes. Is there Nibbāna, is there a doer of Nibbāna? That should not be said. Etc.

185. Is there action, is there a doer of action? Yes. Is there the great earth? Etc. Is there the great ocean? Is there Sineru, the king of mountains? Is there water? Is there fire? Is there air? Is there grass, wood, and trees, is there a doer of grass, wood, and trees? That should not be said. Etc.

186. Is there action, is there a doer of action? Yes. Is action one thing and the doer of action another? That should not be said. Etc.

187. Is there result? Yes. Is there an experiencer of result? That should not be said. Etc.

188. Is there result, is there an experiencer of result? Yes. Is there one who experiences that? That should not be said. Etc.

189. Is there one who experiences that? Yes. For that very one there is no ending of suffering, there is no cutting off of the round of existence, there is no final nibbāna without clinging? That should not be said. Etc. Is there result, is there an experiencer of result? Yes. Is there a person, is there one who experiences the person? That should not be said. Etc.

190. Is there result, is there an experiencer of result? Yes. Is there Nibbāna, is there one who experiences Nibbāna? That should not be said. Etc.

191. Is there result, is there an experiencer of result? Yes. Is there the great earth? Etc. Is there the great ocean? Is there Sineru, the king of mountains? Is there water? Is there fire? Is there air? Is there grass, wood, and trees, is there one who experiences grass, wood, and trees? That should not be said. Etc.

192. Is there result, is there an experiencer of result? Yes. Is the result one thing and the experiencer of result another? That should not be said. (Abbreviated)

The Pursuit of Personal Effort.

The First Chapter on the Good.

14. The Pursuit of Direct Knowledge

193. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not someone who performs supernormal power? Yes. If there is someone who performs supernormal power, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

194. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not someone who hears sound with the divine ear element... etc. cognises others' minds... recollects past lives... sees materiality with the divine eye... realises the elimination of mental corruptions? Yes. If there is someone who realises the elimination of mental corruptions, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

195. Is there someone who performs supernormal power, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Whoever performs supernormal power, is that same person? Whoever does not perform supernormal power, is he not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

196. Whoever hears sound with the divine ear element, etc. whoever cognises others' minds... whoever recollects past lives... whoever sees materiality with the divine eye... whoever realises the elimination of mental corruptions, is that same person? Whoever does not realise the elimination of mental corruptions, is he not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

The Pursuit of Direct Knowledge.

15-18. The Pursuit of Relatives and so on

197. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not a mother? Yes. If there is a mother, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

198. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not a father? Etc. Is there a brother? Is there a sister? Is there one of the warrior caste? Is there a brahmin? Is there a merchant? Is there a worker? Is there a householder? Is there one gone forth? Is there a god? Is there a human being? Yes. If there is a human being, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

199. Having established that there is a mother, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is there anyone who, not having been a mother, becomes a mother? Yes. Is there anyone who, not having been a person, becomes a person? That should not be said. Etc. Is there anyone who, not having been a father, etc. not having been a brother, not having been a sister, not having been a warrior, not having been a brahmin, not having been a merchant, not having been a worker, not having been a householder, not having been one gone forth, not having been a god, not having been a human being, becomes a human being? Yes. Is there anyone who, not having been a person, becomes a person? That should not be said. Etc.

200. Having established that there is a mother, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a mother, is not a mother? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a person, is not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there anyone who, having been a father, having been a brother, having been a sister, having been a warrior, having been a brahmin, having been a merchant, having been a worker, having been a householder, having been one gone forth, having been a god, having been a human being, is not a human being? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a person, is not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

19. The Pursuit of Penetration

201. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not a stream-enterer? Yes. If there is a stream-enterer, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

202. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not a once-returner? Etc. Is there a non-returner? Is there a Worthy One? Is there one liberated in both ways? Is there one liberated by wisdom? Is there a body-witness? Is there one attained to right view? Is there one liberated by faith? Is there a follower of the Teaching? Is there a faith-follower? Yes.

If there is a faith-follower, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

203. Having established that there is a stream-enterer, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is there anyone who, not having been a stream-enterer, becomes a stream-enterer? Yes. Is there anyone who, not having been a person, becomes a person? That should not be said. Etc.

204. Is there anyone who, not having been a once-returner...not having been a non-returner... not having been a Worthy One...not having been one liberated in both ways... not having been one liberated by wisdom...not having been a body-witness... not having been one attained to right view...not having been one liberated by faith... not having been a follower of the Teaching...not having been a faith-follower, becomes a faith-follower? Yes. Is there anyone who, not having been a person, becomes a person? That should not be said. Etc.

205. Having established that there is a stream-enterer, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a stream-enterer, is not a stream-enterer? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a person, is not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there anyone who, having been a once-returner...having been a non-returner, is not a non-returner? Yes. Is there anyone who, having been a person, is not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

The Pursuit of Penetration.

20. Pursuit of the Community

206. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Are there not four pairs of persons, eight types of individuals? Yes. If there are four pairs of persons, eight types of individuals, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

207. Having established that there are four pairs of persons, eight types of individuals, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Do the four pairs of persons, eight types of individuals, become manifest through the manifestation of a Buddha? Yes. Does a person become manifest through the manifestation of a Buddha? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a person become manifest through the manifestation of a Buddha? Yes. When the Buddha, the Blessed One, attained final Nibbāna, was the person destroyed, does the person not exist? That should not be said. Etc.

Pursuit of the Community.

21. Pursuit of the Common Highest Truth

208. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is the person conditioned? That should not be said. Etc. Is the person unconditioned? That should not be said. Etc. Is the person neither conditioned nor unconditioned? That should not be said.

209. Is the person neither conditioned nor unconditioned? Yes. Setting aside the conditioned and the unconditioned, is there another third point? That should not be said. Etc.

210. Setting aside the conditioned and the unconditioned, is there another third point? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are these two elements, monks. Which two? The conditioned element and the unconditioned element. These, monks, are the two elements"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "Setting aside the conditioned and the unconditioned, there is another third point."

211. Is the person neither conditioned nor unconditioned? Yes. Is the conditioned one thing, the unconditioned another, and the person another? That should not be said. Etc.

212. Are the aggregates conditioned, Nibbāna unconditioned, and the person neither conditioned nor unconditioned? Yes. Are the aggregates one thing, Nibbāna another, and the person another? That should not be said. Etc.

213. Is matter conditioned, Nibbāna unconditioned, and the person neither conditioned nor unconditioned? Yes. Is matter one thing, Nibbāna another, and the person another? That should not be said. Feeling... perception... activities... Is consciousness conditioned, Nibbāna unconditioned, and the person neither conditioned nor unconditioned? Yes. Is consciousness one thing, Nibbāna another, and the person another? That should not be said. Etc.

214. Is the arising of a person evident, is the passing away evident, is the change in its duration evident? Yes. Is the person conditioned? That should not be said. Etc. It was said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these three characteristics of the conditioned phenomenon. Of conditioned phenomena, monks, arising is evident, passing away is evident, change in their duration is evident." The arising of a person is evident, the passing away is evident, the change in its duration is evident; if so, the person is conditioned.

215. Is the arising of a person not evident, is the passing away not evident, is the change in its duration not evident? Yes. Is the person unconditioned? That should not be said. Etc. It was said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these three characteristics of the unconditioned of the unconditioned. Of unconditioned phenomena, monks, no arising is evident, no passing away is evident, no change in their duration is evident." The arising of a person is not evident, the passing away is not evident, the change in its duration is not evident; if so, the person is unconditioned.

216. Does a person who has attained final Nibbāna exist in the good, or does he not exist in the good? He exists in the good. Is a person who has attained final Nibbāna eternal? That should not be said. Etc. He does not exist in the good. Is a person who has attained final Nibbāna annihilated? That should not be said. Etc.

217. In dependence on what does a person stand? He stands in dependence on existence. Is existence impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? Yes. Is the person also impermanent, conditioned, dependently arisen, subject to destruction, having the nature of falling, subject to fading away, having the nature of cessation, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

218. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not someone who, experiencing pleasant feeling, understands "I experience pleasant feeling"? Yes. If there is someone who, experiencing pleasant feeling, understands "I experience pleasant feeling", then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

219. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not someone who, experiencing unpleasant feeling, etc. experiencing neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling, understands "I experience neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling"? Yes. If there is someone who, experiencing

neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling, understands "I experience neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling", then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

220. Is there someone who, experiencing pleasant feeling, understands "I experience pleasant feeling", and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Whoever, experiencing pleasant feeling, understands "I experience pleasant feeling", is that same person; whoever, experiencing pleasant feeling, does not understand "I experience pleasant feeling", is he not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

Whoever, experiencing unpleasant feeling, etc. whoever, experiencing neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling, understands "I experience neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling", is that same person; whoever, experiencing neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling, does not understand "I experience neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling", is he not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

221. Is there someone who, experiencing pleasant feeling, understands "I experience pleasant feeling", and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is pleasant feeling one thing, and the one experiencing pleasant feeling who understands "I experience pleasant feeling" another? That should not be said. Etc. Is unpleasant feeling one thing... etc. Is neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling one thing, and the one experiencing neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling who understands "I experience neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling" another? That should not be said, etc.

222. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not someone who dwells observing the body in the body? Yes. If there is someone who dwells observing the body in the body, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

223. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is there not someone who dwells observing feelings in feelings? Etc. In mind... who dwells observing mental phenomena in mental phenomena? Yes. If there is someone who dwells observing mental phenomena in mental phenomena, then indeed sir, it should be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

224. Is there someone who dwells observing the body in the body, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Whoever dwells observing the body in the body, that same one is a person; whoever does not dwell observing the body in the body, is he not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

Whoever in feelings... etc. In mind... dwells observing mental phenomena in mental phenomena, that same one is a person; whoever does not dwell observing mental phenomena in mental phenomena, is he not a person? That should not be said. Etc.

225. Is there someone who dwells observing the body in the body, and by that reason is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is the body one thing, and the one who dwells observing the body in the body another? That should not be said. Etc. feeling is another... mind is another... Are mental phenomena

one thing, and the one who dwells observing mental phenomena in mental phenomena another? That should not be said. Etc.

226. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One -

"Regard the world as empty, Mogharāja, always mindful;
Having uprooted the view of self, thus one would be a crosser over death;
One who thus regards the world, the King of Death does not see."

Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

227. Does a person look at? Yes. Does one look at together with matter, or does one look at without matter? One looks at together with matter. Is the soul the same as the body? That should not be said. Etc. Does one look at without matter? Is the soul one thing and the body another? That should not be said. Etc.

228. Does a person look at? Yes. Does one look at having gone inside, or does one look at having gone out externally? One looks at having gone inside. Is the soul the same as the body? That should not be said. Etc. Does one look at having gone out externally? Is the soul one thing and the body another? That should not be said. Etc.

229. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There is a person practising for personal welfare." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality.

230. Should it not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality"? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "One person, monks, arising in the world arises for the welfare of many people, for the happiness of many people, out of compassion for the world, for the good, welfare, and happiness of gods and humans." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, a person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality.

231. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "All phenomena are non-self." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

232. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "It is only suffering that arises when arising, it is only suffering that ceases when ceasing - he is not uncertain, he does not doubt sceptically; his knowledge here is not dependent on others. To this

extent, Kaccāna, there is right view." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

233. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Was it not said by the nun Vajirā to Māra the Evil One -

"Why do you assume 'a being', Māra, is that your wrong view;
This is a mere heap of sheer activities, no being is found here.

"Just as indeed from an assemblage of parts, there is the word 'chariot';
So when the aggregates exist, there is the convention 'a being'.

"For only suffering comes into being, suffering remains and disappears;
Nothing other than suffering comes into being, nothing other than suffering ceases."

Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

234. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Did not the Venerable Ānanda say this to the Blessed One - "Empty is the world, empty is the world', venerable sir, is said. In what respect, venerable sir, is it said 'the world is empty'?" "Because, Ānanda, it is empty of a self or of what belongs to a self, therefore it is said 'the world is empty'. And what, Ānanda, is empty of a self or of what belongs to a self? The eye, Ānanda, is empty of a self or of what belongs to a self, forms are empty... etc. eye-consciousness is empty... eye-contact is empty... whatever feeling arises with eye-contact as condition - whether pleasant or unpleasant or neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant - that too is empty of a self or of what belongs to a self, the ear is empty... etc. sounds are empty... the nose is empty... odours are empty... the tongue is empty... flavours are empty... the body is empty... tangible objects are empty... the mind is empty... mental phenomena are empty... mind-consciousness is empty... mind-contact is empty... whatever feeling arises with mind-contact as condition - whether pleasant or unpleasant or neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant - that too is empty of a self or of what belongs to a self. Because, Ānanda, it is empty of a self or of what belongs to a self, therefore it is said 'the world is empty'." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

235. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "Monks, if there were a self, would there be for me what belongs to a self?" "Yes, venerable sir." "Monks, if there were what belongs to a self, would there be for me a self?" "Yes, venerable sir." "Monks, when a self and what belongs to a self are not found as true and reliable, then that standpoint for views - 'That is the world, that is the self, after death I shall be permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change, I shall remain the same for eternity' - is this not, monks, an entirely complete foolish teaching?" "How could it not

be, venerable sir? It is indeed, venerable sir, an entirely complete foolish teaching." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

236. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "There are, Seniyo, these three teachers existing and found in the world. Which three? Here, Seniyo, a certain teacher declares a self as true and reliable in this very life, and declares a self as true and reliable in the future life.

"But here, Seniyo, a certain teacher declares a self as true and reliable in this very life, but does not declare a self as true and reliable in the future life.

"But here, Seniyo, a certain teacher does not declare a self as true and reliable in this very life, and does not declare a self as true and reliable in the future life.

"Therein, Seniyo, that teacher who declares a self as true and reliable in this very life, and declares a self as true and reliable in the future life - this one is called, Seniyo, a teacher who holds the doctrine of eternalism.

"Therein, Seniyo, that teacher who declares a self as true and reliable in this very life, but does not declare a self as true and reliable in the future life - this one is called, Seniyo, a teacher who holds the doctrine of annihilationism.

"Therein, Seniyo, that teacher who does not declare a self as true and reliable in this very life, and does not declare a self as true and reliable in the future life - this one is called, Seniyo, a teacher who is the Perfectly Enlightened One. These, Seniyo, are the three teachers existing and found in the world." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

237. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "A pot of ghee"? Yes. Is there anyone who makes a pot of ghee? That should not be said. Etc. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality."

238. Is a person found in the highest truth and ultimate reality? Yes. Is not the Blessed One a speaker of truth, a speaker at the right time, a speaker of what is factual, a speaker of what is actual, a speaker of what is unerring, a speaker of what is not otherwise? Yes. It was said by the Blessed One - "A pot of oil... a pot of honey... a pot of molasses... a pot of milk... a pot of water... a water vessel... a drinking cup... a drinking bowl... a regular meal... regular rice gruel"? Yes. Is there any rice gruel that is permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc. If so, it should not be said - "A person is found in the highest truth and ultimate reality." (Abbreviated)

The eight refutation repetitions, with reference to the running;
The fifth is good with consciousness, the eighth with the bringing of the discourse on supernormal power.

Pursuit of the Common Highest Truth.

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: 16 August 2026

HOW TO CITE

PaliVerse (2026). The Triple Canon. 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching. 05. 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