

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)

10. Tenth Chapter (10. Dasamavaggo)

[Kv 10.1-11, PTS 421-443]



PaliVerse

05. Points of Controversy

10. The Tenth Chapter

(95) 1. The Discussion on Cessation

571. When the rebirth-seeking five aggregates have not ceased, do the functional five aggregates arise? Yes. Is there a combination of ten aggregates, do ten aggregates come into presence? That should not be said. Etc. Is there a combination of ten aggregates, do ten aggregates come into presence? Yes. Of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

When the rebirth-seeking five aggregates have not ceased, do the functional four aggregates arise? Yes. Is there a combination of nine aggregates, do nine aggregates come into presence? That should not be said. Etc. Is there a combination of nine aggregates, do nine aggregates come into presence? Yes. Of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

When the rebirth-seeking five aggregates have not ceased, does functional knowledge arise? Yes. Is there a combination of six aggregates, do six aggregates come into presence? That should not be said. Etc. Is there a combination of six aggregates, do six aggregates come into presence? Yes. Of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

572. When the rebirth-seeking five aggregates have ceased, does the path arise? Yes. Does one who is dead develop the path, does one who is deceased develop the path? That should not be said. Etc.

The Discussion on Cessation is concluded.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(96) 2. The Discussion on Matter Being the Path

573. Is the matter of one possessing the path the path? Yes. Is it with sense-object, is there adverting, reflective attention, attentiveness, attention, volition, longing, aspiration for it? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not without sense-object, is there not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. If it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration; then indeed sir, it should not be said - "the matter of one possessing the path is the path."

Is right speech the path? Yes. Is it with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not without sense-object, is there not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. If it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration; then indeed sir, it should not be said - "right speech is the path."

Right action, etc. Is right livelihood the path? Yes. Is it with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not without sense-object, is there not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. If it is without sense-object,

there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration; then indeed sir, it should not be said - "right livelihood is the path."

574. Right view is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. Right speech is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said, etc. right view is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. Right action, etc. right livelihood is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc. right thought, etc. right effort, etc. right mindfulness, etc.

Right concentration is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. Right speech is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc. right concentration is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. Right action, etc. right livelihood is the path, and it is with sense-object, is there adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

Right speech is the path, and it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. Right view is the path, and it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc. right speech is the path, and it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. Right thought, etc. right effort, right mindfulness, right concentration is the path, and it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

Right action, etc. right livelihood is the path, and it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? Yes. Right view, right thought, right effort, right mindfulness, etc. right concentration is the path, and it is without sense-object, there is not adverting for it, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

575. Should it not be said - "the matter of one possessing the path is the path"? Yes. Is it not that right speech, right action, right livelihood are the path? Yes. If right speech, right action, right livelihood are the path, then indeed sir, it should be said - "the matter of one possessing the path is the path."

The discussion on matter being the path is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(97) 3. The Discussion on the Path for One Endowed with the Five Sense Consciousnesses

576. Is there path development for one endowed with the five sense consciousnesses? Yes. Is it not that the five sense consciousnesses have arisen sense-bases and arisen objects? Yes. If the five sense consciousnesses have arisen sense-bases and arisen objects, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is path development for one endowed with the five sense consciousnesses."

Is it not that the five sense consciousnesses have prenascent sense-bases and prenascent objects, internal sense-bases and external objects, unbroken sense-bases and unbroken objects, different sense-bases and different objects, they do not

experience each other's range and domain, they do not arise without attentiveness, they do not arise without attention, they do not arise uninterruptedly, they do not arise simultaneously, they do not arise immediately after one another, is it not that the five sense consciousnesses are without reflective attention? Yes. If the five sense consciousnesses are without reflective attention, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is path development for one endowed with the five sense consciousnesses."

577. Is there path development for one endowed with eye-consciousness? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? Yes. Dependent on the eye and emptiness, does eye-consciousness arise? That should not be said. Etc. Dependent on the eye and emptiness, does eye-consciousness arise? Yes. "Dependent on the eye and emptiness, eye-consciousness arises" - Is there such a discourse? There is not. "Dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises" -Is there such a discourse? Yes. If "dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises" -there is such a discourse, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "dependent on the eye and emptiness, eye-consciousness arises".

578. Is there path development for one endowed with eye-consciousness? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? That should not be said. Etc. Is there path development for one endowed with eye-consciousness? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to contact? Etc. Referring to feeling... Referring to perception... Referring to volition... Referring to consciousness... Referring to the eye... Referring to the body... etc. Referring to sound... etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there path development for one endowed with mind-consciousness, does mind-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? Yes. Is there path development for one endowed with eye-consciousness, does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc. Is there path development for one endowed with mind-consciousness, does mind-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? Yes. Is there path development for one endowed with eye-consciousness, does eye-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? That should not be said. Etc. Is there path development for one endowed with mind-consciousness, does mind-consciousness arise referring to contact... Referring to feeling... etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? Yes. Is there path development for one endowed with eye-consciousness, does eye-consciousness arise referring to contact... Referring to feeling... etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? That should not be said. Etc.

579. Should it not be said - "There is path development for one endowed with the five sense consciousnesses"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Here, monks, a monk, having seen a form with the eye, is not one who grasps at signs, nor one who grasps at features... etc... Having heard a sound with the ear... etc... Having smelled an odour with the nose... etc... Having tasted a flavour with the tongue... etc. Having touched a tangible object with the body, is not one who grasps at signs, nor one who grasps at features"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, there is path development for one endowed with the five sense consciousnesses.

The discussion on the path for one endowed with the five sense consciousnesses is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(98) 4. The Discussion on the Five Sense Consciousnesses Being Both Wholesome and Unwholesome

580. Are the five sense consciousnesses both wholesome and unwholesome? Yes. Is it not that the five sense consciousnesses have arisen sense-bases and arisen objects? Yes. If the five sense consciousnesses have arisen sense-bases and arisen objects, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The five sense consciousnesses are both wholesome and unwholesome." Is it not that the five sense consciousnesses have prenascent sense-bases and prenascent objects, internal sense-bases and external objects, unbroken sense-bases and unbroken objects, different sense-bases and different objects, they do not experience each other's range and domain, they do not arise without attentiveness, they do not arise without attention, they do not arise uninterruptedly, they do not arise simultaneously, they do not arise immediately after one another, is it not that the five sense consciousnesses are without reflective attention? Yes. If the five sense consciousnesses are without reflective attention, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The five sense consciousnesses are both wholesome and unwholesome."

581. Is eye-consciousness wholesome? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? Yes. Dependent on the eye and emptiness, does eye-consciousness arise? That should not be said. Dependent on the eye and emptiness, does eye-consciousness arise? Yes. "Dependent on the eye and emptiness, eye-consciousness arises" - Is there such a discourse? There is not. "Dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises" - Is there such a discourse? Yes. If "dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises" - there is such a discourse, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "dependent on the eye and emptiness, eye-consciousness arises".

582. Is eye-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? That should not be said. Etc. Is eye-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to contact? Etc. Referring to consciousness... Referring to the eye... etc. Referring to the body... Referring to sound... etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is mind-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome, does mind-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? Yes. Is eye-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome, does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc. Is mind-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome, does mind-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? Yes. Is eye-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome, does eye-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? That should not be said. Etc. Is mind-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome, does mind-consciousness arise referring to contact? Etc. Referring to consciousness... etc. Referring to the body... Referring to sound... etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? Yes. Is eye-consciousness both wholesome and unwholesome, does eye-consciousness arise referring to contact? Etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? That should not be said. Etc.

583. Should it not be said - "The five sense consciousnesses are both wholesome and unwholesome"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Here, monks, a monk, having seen a form with the eye, is one who grasps at signs... etc... is not one who grasps at signs... etc... Having heard a sound with the ear... etc... Having touched a tangible object with the body, is one who grasps at signs... etc... is not one who grasps at signs"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, the five sense consciousnesses are both wholesome and unwholesome.

The discussion on the five sense consciousnesses being both wholesome and unwholesome is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(99) 5. The Discussion on Having Reflective Attention

584. Do the five sense consciousnesses have reflective attention? Yes. Is it not that the five sense consciousnesses have arisen sense-bases and arisen objects? Yes. If the five sense consciousnesses have arisen sense-bases and arisen objects, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The five sense consciousnesses have reflective attention." Is it not that the five sense consciousnesses have prenascent sense-bases and prenascent objects, internal sense-bases and external objects, unbroken sense-bases and unbroken objects, different sense-bases and different objects, they do not experience each other's range and domain, they do not arise without attentiveness, they do not arise without attention, they do not arise uninterruptedly, they do not arise simultaneously, is it not that the five sense consciousnesses do not arise immediately after one another? Yes. If the five sense consciousnesses do not arise immediately after one another, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The five sense consciousnesses have reflective attention."

585. Is eye-consciousness with reflective attention? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? Yes. Dependent on the eye and emptiness, does eye-consciousness arise? That should not be said. Etc. Dependent on the eye and emptiness, does eye-consciousness arise? Yes. "Dependent on the eye and emptiness, eye-consciousness arises" - Is there such a discourse? There is not. Etc. "Dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises" - Is there such a discourse? Yes. If "dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises" - there is such a discourse, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "dependent on the eye and emptiness, eye-consciousness arises".

Is eye-consciousness with reflective attention? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? That should not be said. Etc. Is eye-consciousness with reflective attention? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise referring to contact? Etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? That should not be said. Etc. Is mind-consciousness with reflective attention, does mind-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? Yes. Is eye-consciousness with reflective attention, does eye-consciousness arise referring to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc. Is mind-consciousness with reflective attention, does mind-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? Yes. Is eye-consciousness with reflective attention, does eye-consciousness arise referring to the past and future? That should not be said. Etc. Is mind-consciousness with reflective attention, does mind-consciousness arise referring

to contact? Etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? Yes. Is eye-consciousness with reflective attention, does eye-consciousness arise referring to contact? Etc. Does it arise referring to tangible object? That should not be said. Etc.

586. Should it not be said - "The five sense consciousnesses have reflective attention"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Here, monks, a monk, having seen a form with the eye, is one who grasps at signs... etc... is not one who grasps at signs... etc... Having touched a tangible object with the body, is one who grasps at signs... etc... is not one who grasps at signs"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, the five sense consciousnesses have reflective attention... etc...

The discussion on having reflective attention is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(100) 6. The Discussion on the Two Kinds of Morality

587. Is a possessor of the path endowed with two moralities? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with two contacts, two feelings, two perceptions, two volitions, two consciousnesses, two faiths, two energies, two mindfulnesses, two concentrations, two wisdoms? That should not be said. Etc.

Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane morality? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane contact, mundane feeling, mundane wisdom, mundane volition, mundane consciousness, mundane faith, mundane energy, mundane mindfulness, mundane concentration, mundane wisdom? That should not be said. Etc.

Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane morality? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane contact? Etc. Endowed with both mundane and supramundane wisdom? That should not be said. Etc. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane morality? Yes. Is a possessor of the path a worldling? That should not be said. Etc.

588. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane right speech? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane right view? That should not be said. Etc. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane right speech? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane right thought? Etc. With mundane right effort? Etc. With mundane right mindfulness? Etc. Endowed with mundane right concentration? That should not be said. Etc. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane right action? Etc. Endowed with mundane right livelihood? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with mundane right view? Etc. Endowed with mundane right concentration? That should not be said. Etc.

Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right speech? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right view? That should not be said. Etc. Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right speech? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right thought? Etc. With both mundane and supramundane right effort? Etc. With both mundane and supramundane right mindfulness? Etc. Endowed with both mundane and supramundane right concentration? That should not be said. Etc.

Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right action? Etc. Endowed with right livelihood? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right view? That should not be said. Etc. Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right livelihood? Yes. Is a possessor of the path endowed with both mundane and supramundane right thought? Etc. Endowed with both mundane and supramundane right concentration? That should not be said. Etc.

589. Should it not be said - "A possessor of the path is endowed with two moralities"? Yes. When mundane morality has ceased, does the path arise? Yes. Does one who is immoral, of broken morality, of cut morality, develop the path? That should not be said, etc. If so, a possessor of the path is endowed with two moralities.

The discussion on the two kinds of morality is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(101) 7. The Discussion on Morality Being Not a Mental Factor

590. Is morality not a mental factor? Yes. Matter... etc. Nibbāna... etc. the eye sense base... etc. the body sense base... the visible form sense base... etc. the touch sense base? That should not be said. Etc. Is morality not a mental factor? Yes. Is contact not a mental factor? That should not be said, etc. Is morality not a mental factor? Yes. Feeling... etc. perception... etc. volition... etc. faith, etc. Energy... etc. Mindfulness... etc. concentration, etc. Is wisdom not a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc.

Is contact a mental factor? Yes. Is morality a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... etc. perception... etc. volition... etc. faith, etc. Energy... etc. Mindfulness... etc. concentration, etc. Is wisdom a mental factor? Yes. Is morality a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc.

591. Is morality not a mental factor? Yes. Does it have undesirable result? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that it has desirable result? Yes. If it has desirable result, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Morality is not a mental factor."

Does faith have desirable result, is faith a mental factor? Yes. Does morality have desirable result, is morality a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. Energy... etc. Mindfulness... etc. concentration, etc. Does wisdom have desirable result, is wisdom a mental factor? Yes. Does morality have desirable result, is morality a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc.

Does morality have desirable result, is morality not a mental factor? Yes. Does faith have desirable result, is faith not a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. Does morality have desirable result, is morality not a mental factor? Yes. Energy... etc. Mindfulness... etc. concentration, etc. Does wisdom have desirable result, is wisdom not a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc.

592. Is morality not a mental factor? Yes. Is it fruitless and resultless? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not fruitful and with result? Yes. If it is fruitful and with result, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Morality is not a mental factor." Etc.

Is the eye sense base not a mental factor and resultless? Yes. Is morality not a mental factor and resultless? That should not be said. Etc. the ear sense base... etc. the body sense base... etc. the visible form sense base... etc. Is the touch sense base not a mental factor and resultless? Yes. Is morality not a mental factor and resultless? That should not be said. Etc.

Is morality not a mental factor and with result? Yes. Is the eye sense base not a mental factor and with result? That should not be said. Etc. Is morality not a mental factor and with result? Yes. The ear sense base... etc. the body sense base... the visible form sense base... etc. Is the touch sense base not a mental factor and with result? That should not be said. Etc.

593. Is right speech not a mental factor? Yes. Is right view not a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. Is right speech not a mental factor? Yes. Right thought, etc. right effort, etc. right mindfulness, etc. Is right concentration not a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. right action, etc. Is right livelihood not a mental factor? Yes. Is right view not a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. Is right livelihood not a mental factor? Yes. Right thought, right effort, right mindfulness, is right concentration not a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc.

Is right view a mental factor? Yes. Is right speech a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. Is right view a mental factor? Yes. Right action, etc. Is right livelihood a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. right thought, etc. right effort, etc. right mindfulness, etc. Is right concentration a mental factor? Yes. Is right speech a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc. Is right concentration a mental factor? Yes. Right action, etc. Is right livelihood a mental factor? That should not be said. Etc.

594. Should it not be said - "Morality is not a mental factor"? Yes. When morality, having arisen, has ceased, is one immoral? That should not be said. If so, morality is not a mental factor.

The discussion on morality being not a mental factor is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(102) 8. The Discussion on Morality Not Being Consecutive to Consciousness

595. Is morality not consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Matter... Nibbāna... The eye sense base... etc. the touch sense base? That should not be said. Etc. Is morality not consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Is contact not consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is morality not consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Feeling... etc. perception... volition... faith... energy... mindfulness, concentration, etc. Is wisdom not consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is contact consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Is morality consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... etc. perception... volition... faith... energy... mindfulness, concentration, etc. Is wisdom consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Is morality consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

596. Is right speech not consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Is right view not consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is right speech not consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Right thought, right effort, right mindfulness, etc. Is right concentration not consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

Right action, etc. Is right livelihood not consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Is right view not consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is right livelihood not consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Right thought, right effort, right mindfulness, etc. Is right concentration not consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is right view consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Is right speech consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is right view consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Right action, etc. Is right livelihood consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

Right thought, right effort, right mindfulness, etc. Is right concentration consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Is right speech consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is right concentration consecutive to consciousness? Yes. Right action, etc. Is right livelihood consecutive to consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

597. Should it not be said - "Morality is not consecutive to consciousness"? Yes. When morality, having arisen, has ceased, is one immoral? That should not be said. If so, morality is not consecutive to consciousness.

The discussion on morality not being consecutive to consciousness is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(103) 9. The Discussion on the Cause of Undertaking

598. Does morality rooted in observance grow? Yes. Does contact rooted in observance grow, does feeling grow, does perception grow, does volition grow, does consciousness grow, does faith grow, does energy grow, does mindfulness grow, does concentration grow, does wisdom grow? That should not be said. Etc.

Does morality rooted in observance grow? Yes. Does it grow like a creeper, does it grow like a parasitic vine, does it grow like a tree, does it grow like grass, does it grow like a heap of muñja grass? That should not be said. Etc.

599. Does morality rooted in observance grow? Yes. For one who, having taken upon oneself morality, thinks sensual thoughts, thinks thoughts of anger, thinks thoughts of violence - does morality grow? Yes. Of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc. of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? Yes. Do wholesome and unwholesome, blameable and unblameable, inferior and superior, mental states with dark and bright counterparts come into presence? That should not be said. Etc.

Do wholesome and unwholesome, blameable and unblameable, inferior and superior, mental states with dark and bright counterparts come into presence? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these four things very far apart! What are the four? The sky, monks, and the earth - this is the first thing very far apart. Etc. Therefore the principle of the good is far from the unvirtuous." Is there such a

discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "Wholesome and unwholesome, blameable and unblameable, inferior and superior, mental states with dark and bright counterparts come into presence."

600. Should it not be said - "Does morality rooted in observance grow?" Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Planters of parks, planters of groves, etc. Righteous, accomplished in morality, those people are heaven-bound." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, morality rooted in observance grows.

The discussion on the cause of undertaking is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(104) 10. The Discussion on Intimation Being Morality

601. Is intimation morality? Yes. Is it abstention from killing living beings? That should not be said. Etc. Is it abstention from taking what is not given? That should not be said. Etc. Is it abstention from sexual misconduct? That should not be said, etc. Is it abstention from lying? That should not be said. Etc. Is it abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence? That should not be said. Etc.

Is paying respect morality, is rising up in respect morality, is salutation with joined palms morality, is doing the proper duties morality, is offering of seat morality, is offering sleeping place morality, is offering water for washing the feet morality, is offering a footstand morality, is back-rubbing at bathing morality? Yes. Is it abstention from killing living beings? That should not be said. Etc. Is it abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence? That should not be said. Etc.

602. Should it not be said - "Intimation is morality"? Yes. Is it immorality? That should not be said. Etc. If so, intimation is morality.

The discussion on intimation being morality is finished.

10. The Tenth Chapter

(105) 11. The Discussion on Non-Intimation Being Immorality

603. Is non-intimation immorality? Yes. Is it killing living beings? That should not be said. Etc. Is it taking what is not given? That should not be said. Etc. Is it sexual misconduct? That should not be said. Etc. Is it lying? That should not be said. Etc. Is it spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence? That should not be said. Etc.

For one who, having taken upon oneself an evil deed, gives a gift - do both merit and demerit grow? That should not be said. Etc. Do both merit and demerit grow? Yes. Of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc. of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? Yes. Do wholesome and unwholesome, blameable and unblameable, inferior and superior, mental states with dark and bright counterparts come into presence? That should not be said. Etc.

Do wholesome and unwholesome, blameable and unblameable, inferior and superior, mental states with dark and bright counterparts come into presence? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these four things very far apart! What are the four? The sky, monks, and the earth - this is the first thing very far apart. Etc.

Therefore the principle of the good is far from the unvirtuous."Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "Wholesome and unwholesome, blameable and unblameable, inferior and superior, mental states with dark and bright counterparts come into presence."

604. Should it not be said - "Non-intimation is immorality"? Yes. Was not an evil deed taken upon oneself? Yes. If an evil deed was taken upon oneself, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Non-intimation is immorality."

The discussion on non-intimation being immorality is finished.

The Tenth Chapter.

Its summary:

When the rebirth-seeking five aggregates have not ceased, the functional five aggregates arise; the matter of one possessing the path is the path; there is path development for one endowed with the five sense consciousnesses; the five sense consciousnesses are both wholesome and unwholesome; the five sense consciousnesses have reflective attention; a possessor of the path is endowed with two moralities; morality is not a mental factor; morality is not consecutive to consciousness; morality rooted in observance grows; intimation-morality, non-intimation is immorality.

The Second Fifty.

Its summary:

Fixed course, inclusion, gone, benefit, and cessation.



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. 10. Tenth Chapter
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