

THE PALIVERSE PROJECT

The Universe of Buddha's Wisdom

Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā)

- 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching - Commentaries
(3. Abhidhamma Piṭaka - Aṭṭhakathā)
- 5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy
(5. Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā)
- 12. Twelfth Chapter (12. Dvādasamavaggo)



PaliVerse

5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy

12. The Twelfth Chapter

1. Commentary on the Treatise on Restraint as Action

630-632. Now comes the discussion called restraint being action. Therein, for those whose view is "both restraint and non-restraint are action," in dependence on the discourse "having seen a form with the eye, he is one who grasps at signs, he is not one who grasps at signs," just as the Mahāsaṃghikas hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other.

Then, in order to accuse him with "just as the volition which in one's own doctrine was called 'action,' operating in the body-door, verbal-door, and mind-door, obtains the name of bodily action and so on, so too if restraint is action for you, that too, operating in the eye-faculty and so on, should obtain the name of eye-action and so on," he said beginning with "Is eye-faculty restraint eye-action?" The other, not seeing such a discourse passage, having rejected regarding the four doors, at the fifth, the body-door, rejects with reference to the sensitive body, and acknowledges with reference to the intimation body. For he wishes both the sensitive body and the intimation body to be just the body faculty. In the mind-door too, he rejects with reference to the resultant door, and acknowledges with reference to the action door. In the case of non-restraint too, the same method applies. The discourse "having seen a form with the eye" explains only restraint and non-restraint at those doors, not its being action; therefore it is not a proof.

Commentary on the Treatise on Restraint as Action.

2. Commentary on the Treatise on Action

633-635. Now there is the discussion on action. Therein, relying on the discourse passage "I, monks, do not of intentional actions," for those whose view is "all action is with result," just as of the Mahāsaṃghikas; for them, since volition was called "action" by the Teacher without distinction, saying "Volition, monks, I call action"; and that only the wholesome and unwholesome is with result, while the indeterminate is resultless - in order to show this classification, "all action" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Again, in the questions "all volition," the rejecting should be understood with reference to the indeterminate, and the acknowledgment with reference to the wholesome and unwholesome. "Resultant indeterminate" and so on was said in order to show the volition that is with result and resultless in its own form. The remainder here is clear in meaning. The discourse "I do not, monks" was said with reference to the experiencing of results in the present life and so on when there is a condition, therefore it is not a proof.

Commentary on the Treatise on Action.

636-637. Now the treatise called "Sound is Resultant" follows. Therein, having unwisely taken passages beginning with "Because of the doing of that action, its accumulation, its abundance, its extensiveness, he has a voice like Brahmā," for those whose view is "sound is resultant," just as the Mahāsaṃghikas hold; for them, "only immaterial phenomena that are kamma-originated obtain the name 'resultant.' But this conventional expression does not exist for material phenomena" - to show this, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. "Experienced as pleasant" and so on was said for the purpose of showing "what is called resultant is of such a nature." The discourse "Because of the doing of that action" was said for the purpose of showing the acquisition of characteristics. Because a great man, due to action having been done, also has a pure retinue, but the retinue is not resultant; therefore this is not effective in establishing that.

Commentary on the Treatise on Sound as Result.

4. Commentary on the Treatise on the Six Sense Bases

638-640. Now the discussion called the six sense bases talk takes place. Therein, because the six sense bases have arisen due to action having been done, therefore for those whose view is "it is resultant," just as the Mahāsaṃghikas hold; with reference to them, the question "is the eye sense base resultant?" is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. The remainder is the same as the method stated below. Regarding "the six sense bases are resultant," here the mind sense base may be resultant. The remaining ones are only kamma-originated, not resultant. Therefore this is not a proof.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Six Sense Bases.

5. Commentary on the Treatise on One with Seven Rebirths at the Utmost

641-645. Now there is the discussion called "one with seven rebirths at the utmost." Therein, because "one with seven rebirths at the utmost" was stated, therefore "a person with seven rebirths at the utmost is fixed in having seven rebirths at the utmost" is the view of those, just as of the Uttarāpathakas; setting aside them, in order to show this distinction that "apart from the noble path, there is no other fixed course for him by which he would be fixed in having seven rebirths at the utmost," the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other.

In those beginning with "a mother has been deprived of life," this is the intention - there are two fixed courses: the fixed course of the right path and the fixed course of the wrong path. The fixed course of the right path is the noble path. That fixes both the state of being no longer subject to fall into lower realms and the acquisition of fruition. The fixed course of the wrong path is heinous action with immediate bad destination. That fixes rebirth in hell immediately after. Therein, one with seven rebirths at the utmost is fixed by the path of stream-entry in the state of being no longer subject to fall into lower realms and in the acquisition of fruition. But the fixed course of the remaining paths does not exist for him because of not having attained

them, and he is also incapable of committing a heinous action with immediate bad destination. But you wish a fixed course for him; therefore we say to you -"Is he fixed by this fixed course of the wrong path?"

In the questions beginning with "incapable in between," he rejects with reference to the absence of heinous action with immediate bad destination, and acknowledges with reference to one with seven rebirths at the utmost. In the question "Is there that fixed course?" not seeing a fixed course for having seven rebirths at the utmost, he rejects. "Are there for you establishments of mindfulness?" and so on was said in order to show the path factors reckoned as the fixed course. But since for him, again because of not having attained the first path, even those do not exist, therefore he rejects. The remainder here is clear in meaning. "Is he not one with seven rebirths at the utmost?" - here the Blessed One declares by the power of his own knowledge that "this person, having transmigrated through so many existences, will attain final nibbāna; this one through so many." It was said that there is nothing called a fixed course of existences by which one is one with seven rebirths at the utmost, or a family-to-family goer, or one who has sown the seed of rebirth one last time; therefore this is not effective as a proof.

Commentary on the Treatise on One with Seven Rebirths at the Utmost.

646-647. The discussion on the family-to-family goer and the one-seed attainer too should be understood by this same method.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Family-to-Family Goer and the One-Seeder.

8. Commentary on the Treatise on Depriving of Life

648-649. Now there is the discussion called the deprivation of life. Therein, because killing living beings occurs with a consciousness associated with hate, and hate is not abandoned by one accomplished in right view, therefore "a person accomplished in right view would intentionally deprive a living being of life" is the view of those, just as the Pubbaseliyas and Aparaseliyas hold; with reference to them, "accomplished in right view" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. But in the questions beginning with "intentionally his mother," he rejects through fear of the discourse "this is impossible, there is no chance." "Disrespectful towards the Teacher" and so on was stated for the purpose of showing the absence of transgression of the training rule of being respectful towards the Teacher and so on. The other, however, having rejected that there is no such thing as disrespect towards him by way of the unwholesome, and having accepted the state of being respectful, when again asked "disrespectful," he acknowledges with reference to the absence of paying respect and circumambulating at a shrine, due to lack of mindfulness and inattention of those who are distracted through being engaged in those various duties. When again asked by the method beginning with "would he put down," he rejects because of the intentional non-performance of such an action. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

Commentary on the Treatise on Depriving of Life.

9. Commentary on the Treatise on Unfortunate Realms

650-652. Now there is the discussion on the unfortunate realms. Therein, those who, having taken both the unfortunate realm and the craving with objects beginning with matter of beings in the unfortunate realms as "unfortunate realm," without again dividing them accordingly, say without distinction "the unfortunate realms are abandoned by one accomplished in right view," just as the Uttarāpathakans; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. "Would find pleasure in forms bound for the realm of misery" and so on was said in order to accuse by virtue of the view of the opponent that the unfortunate realm is not abandoned by one accomplished in right view. The remainder here is clear in meaning. "Would be reborn in hell" and so on illustrates only the abandoning of the unfortunate realm, or the abandoning of craving leading to the unfortunate realm, not the abandoning of craving with objects beginning with matter of beings in the unfortunate realms; therefore it is not a proof.

Commentary on the Discussion of Unfortunate Realms.

653. In the discussion on one of seven-lives maximum too, the same method applies.

The twelfth chapter.



ABOUT THIS TRANSLATION

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

PDF Creation Date: 14 September 2026

HOW TO CITE

PaliVerse (2026). Commentaries. 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching - Commentaries. 5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy. 12. Twelfth 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