

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)

14. Fourteenth Chapter (14. Cuddasamavaggo)

[Kv 14.1-9, PTS 491-507]



PaliVerse

05. Points of Controversy

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(136) 1. Discussion on Wholesome-Unwholesome Uniting

686. Does the unwholesome root reunite with the wholesome root? Yes. Whatever adverting for the arising of the unwholesome, etc. aspiration, is that same adverting for the arising of the wholesome, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

The unwholesome root reunites with the wholesome root, should it not be said - "Whatever adverting for the arising of the unwholesome, etc. aspiration, is that same adverting for the arising of the wholesome, etc. aspiration"? Yes. Does the wholesome arise for one not adverting, etc. arise for one not directing? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the wholesome arises for one adverting, etc. arises for one directing? Yes. If the wholesome arises for one adverting, etc. arises for one directing, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The unwholesome root reunites with the wholesome root."

687. Does the unwholesome root reunite with the wholesome root? Yes. Does the unwholesome root arise for one attending unwisely? Yes. Does the wholesome arise for one attending unwisely? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the wholesome arises for one attending wisely? Yes. If the wholesome arises for one attending wisely, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The unwholesome root reunites with the wholesome root."

Does the unwholesome root reunite with the wholesome root? Yes. Does the perception of renunciation arise immediately after the perception of sensuality, does the perception of non-anger arise immediately after the perception of anger, does the perception of non-violence arise immediately after the perception of violence, does friendliness arise immediately after anger, does compassion arise immediately after violence, does altruistic joy arise immediately after discontent, does equanimity arise immediately after aversion? That should not be said. Etc.

688. Does the wholesome root reunite with the unwholesome root? Yes. Whatever adverting for the arising of the wholesome, etc. aspiration, is that same adverting for the arising of the unwholesome, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

The wholesome root reunites with the unwholesome root, should it not be said - "Whatever adverting for the arising of the wholesome, etc. aspiration, is that same adverting for the arising of the unwholesome, etc. aspiration"? Yes. Does the unwholesome arise for one not adverting, etc. arise for one not directing? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the unwholesome arises for one adverting, etc. arises for one directing? Yes. If the unwholesome arises for one adverting, etc. arises for one directing, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The wholesome root reunites with the unwholesome root."

689. Does the wholesome root reunite with the unwholesome root? Yes. Does the wholesome arise for one attending wisely? Yes. Does the unwholesome arise for one attending wisely? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the unwholesome arises for one attending unwisely? Yes. If the unwholesome arises for one attending unwisely, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The wholesome root reunites with the unwholesome root."

Does the wholesome root reunite with the unwholesome root? Yes. Does perception of sensuality arise immediately after perception of renunciation, does perception of anger arise immediately after perception of non-anger, does perception of violence arise immediately after perception of non-violence, does anger arise immediately after friendliness, does violence arise immediately after compassion, does discontent arise immediately after altruistic joy, does aversion arise immediately after equanimity? That should not be said. Etc.

690. Should it not be said - "The unwholesome root reunites with the wholesome root, the wholesome root reunites with the unwholesome root"? Yes. Is it not that in whatever object one finds pleasure, in that very object one detaches oneself; in whatever object one detaches oneself, in that very object one finds pleasure? Yes. If in whatever object one finds pleasure, in that very object one detaches oneself; in whatever object one detaches oneself, in that very object one finds pleasure, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The unwholesome root reunites with the wholesome root, the wholesome root reunites with the unwholesome root."

The discussion on wholesome-unwholesome uniting is finished.

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(137) 2. Discussion on the Arising of the Six Sense Bases

691. Do the six sense bases become established simultaneously in the mother's womb? Yes. Does one with all major and minor parts, with complete faculties, descend into the mother's womb? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the eye sense base become established by rebirth-seeking consciousness? Yes. Do hands become established by rebirth-seeking consciousness, do feet become established, does the head become established, does the ear become established, does the nose become established, does the mouth become established, do teeth become established? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the ear sense base become established by rebirth-seeking consciousness? Etc. nose sense base... etc. Does the tongue sense base become established? Yes. Do hands become established by rebirth-seeking consciousness, do feet become established, does the head become established, does the ear become established, does the nose become established, does the mouth become established, do teeth become established? That should not be said. Etc.

692. Does the eye sense base arise afterwards for one gone into the mother's womb? Yes. Does one perform action in the mother's womb for the acquisition of the eye? That should not be said. Etc. Does the ear sense base arise afterwards for one

gone into the mother's womb? Etc. nose sense base... etc. Does the tongue sense base arise? Yes. Does one perform action in the mother's womb for the acquisition of the tongue? That should not be said. Etc.

Do head hairs, body hairs, nails, teeth, and bones arise afterwards for one gone into the mother's womb? Yes. Does one perform action in the mother's womb for the acquisition of bones? That should not be said. Etc.

Should it not be said - "Head hairs, body hairs, nails, teeth, and bones arise afterwards for one gone into the mother's womb"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One -

"First there is a drop of fluid, from the drop of fluid comes a bubble;
From the bubble arises a lump of flesh, the lump of flesh produces a solid mass;
From the solid mass limbs arise, head hairs, body hairs, and nails too.

"And whatever the mother eats, food and drink and nourishment;
By that he sustains himself there, the man gone into the mother's womb."

Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, head hairs, body hairs, nails, teeth, and bones arise afterwards for one gone into the mother's womb.

The discussion on the arising of the six sense bases is finished.

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(138) 3. Discussion on the Proximity Condition

693. Does ear-consciousness arise immediately after eye-consciousness? Yes. Whatever adverting for the arising of eye-consciousness, etc. aspiration, is that same adverting for the arising of ear-consciousness, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

Ear-consciousness arises immediately after eye-consciousness, it should not be said - "Whatever adverting for the arising of eye-consciousness, etc. aspiration, is that same adverting for the arising of ear-consciousness, etc. aspiration? Yes. Does ear-consciousness arise for one not adverting, etc. arise for one not directing? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that ear-consciousness arises for one adverting, etc. arises for one directing? Yes. If ear-consciousness arises for one adverting, etc. arises for one directing, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Ear-consciousness arises immediately after eye-consciousness."

694. Does ear-consciousness arise immediately after eye-consciousness? Yes. Does eye-consciousness arise for one attending to the sign of matter? Yes. Does ear-consciousness arise for one attending to the sign of matter? That should not be said. Etc.

Does eye-consciousness have only matter as object, not another object? Yes. Does ear-consciousness have only matter as object, not another object? That should not be said. Etc.

Dependent on the eye and forms, does eye-consciousness arise? Yes. Dependent on the eye and forms, does ear-consciousness arise? That should not be said. Etc.

Dependent on the eye and forms, does ear-consciousness arise? Yes. "Dependent on the eye and forms, ear-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 forms, ear-consciousness arises."

Does ear-consciousness arise immediately after eye-consciousness? Yes. Is that very eye-consciousness that ear-consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

695. Nose-consciousness arises immediately after ear-consciousness, etc. Tongue-consciousness arises immediately after nose-consciousness, etc. Does body-consciousness arise immediately after tongue-consciousness? Yes. Whatever advertent for the arising of tongue-consciousness, etc. aspiration, is that same advertent for the arising of body-consciousness, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc. Body-consciousness arises immediately after tongue-consciousness, it should not be said - "Whatever advertent for the arising of tongue-consciousness, etc. aspiration, is that same advertent for the arising of body-consciousness, etc. aspiration"? Yes. Does body-consciousness arise for one not advertent, etc. arise for one not directing? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that body-consciousness arises for one advertent, etc. arises for one directing? Yes. If body-consciousness arises for one advertent, etc. arises for one directing, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Body-consciousness arises immediately after tongue-consciousness."

696. Does body-consciousness arise immediately after tongue-consciousness? Yes. Does tongue-consciousness arise for one attending to the sign of flavour? Yes. Does body-consciousness arise for one attending to the sign of flavour? That should not be said. Etc.

Does tongue-consciousness have only flavour as object, not another object? Yes. Does body-consciousness have only flavour as object, not another object? That should not be said. Etc.

Dependent on the tongue and flavours, does tongue-consciousness arise? Yes. Dependent on the tongue and flavours, does body-consciousness arise? That should not be said. Etc.

Dependent on the tongue and flavours, does body-consciousness arise? Yes. "Dependent on the tongue and flavours, body-consciousness arises" - Is there such a discourse? There is not. "Dependent on the tongue and flavours, tongue-consciousness arises" - Is there such a discourse? Yes. If "dependent on the tongue and flavours, tongue-consciousness arises" - there is such a discourse, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "dependent on the tongue and flavours, body-consciousness arises."

Does body-consciousness arise immediately after tongue-consciousness? Yes. Is that very tongue-consciousness that body-consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

697. Should it not be said - "The five sense consciousnesses arise immediately after one another"? Yes. Is there not someone who dances, sings, and plays music, and sees materiality, and hears sounds, and smells odours, and tastes flavours, and touches tangible objects? Yes. If there is someone who dances, sings, and plays music, and sees materiality, and hears sounds, and smells odours, and tastes flavours, and touches tangible objects, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The five sense consciousnesses arise immediately after one another."

The discussion on the proximity condition is finished.

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(139) 4. Discussion on Noble Form

698. Is noble form derived from the primary elements? Yes. Is noble form wholesome? Yes. Are the primary elements wholesome? That should not be said, etc. Are the primary elements indeterminate? Yes. Is noble form indeterminate? That should not be said. Etc. Is noble form derived from the primary elements? Yes. Is noble form without mental corruptions, not subject to mental fetters, not subject to mental knots, not subject to mental floods, not subject to mental bonds, not subject to mental hindrances, not adhered to, not subject to clinging, not subject to defilement? Yes. Are the primary elements without mental corruptions, etc. not subject to defilement? That should not be said. Etc. Are the primary elements with mental corruptions, subject to mental fetters, etc. subject to defilement? Yes. Is noble form with mental corruptions, subject to mental fetters, etc. subject to defilement? That should not be said. Etc.

699. Should it not be said - "Noble form is derived from the primary elements"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Whatever materiality, monks, is the four primary elements and the materiality derived from the four primary elements"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, noble form is derived from the primary elements.

The discussion on noble form is finished.

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(140) 5. The Discussion on the Underlying Tendency Being Another

700. Is the underlying tendency to sensual lust one thing and prepossession by sensual lust another? Yes. Is sensual lust one thing and prepossession by sensual lust another? That should not be said. Etc. Is that same sensual lust that prepossession by sensual lust? Yes. Is that same underlying tendency to sensual lust that prepossession by sensual lust? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to aversion one thing and prepossession by aversion another? Yes. Is aversion one thing and prepossession by aversion another? That should not be said. Etc. Is that very aversion that prepossession by aversion? Yes. Is that same underlying tendency to aversion that prepossession by aversion? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to conceit one thing and prepossession by conceit another? Yes. Is conceit one thing and prepossession by conceit another? That should not be said. Etc. Is that same conceit that prepossession by conceit? Yes. Is that same

underlying tendency to conceit that prepossession by conceit? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to wrong view one thing and prepossession by views another? Yes. Is wrong view one thing and prepossession by views another? That should not be said. Etc. Is that very wrong view that prepossession by views? Yes. Is that same underlying tendency to wrong view that prepossession by views? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to sceptical doubt one thing and prepossession by sceptical doubt another? Yes. Is sceptical doubt one thing and prepossession by sceptical doubt another? That should not be said. Etc. Is that same sceptical doubt that prepossession by sceptical doubt? Yes. Is that same underlying tendency to sceptical doubt that prepossession by sceptical doubt? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to lust for existence one thing and prepossession by lust for existence another? Yes. Is lust for existence one thing and prepossession by lust for existence another? That should not be said. Etc. Is that same lust for existence that prepossession by lust for existence? Yes. Is that same underlying tendency to lust for existence that prepossession by lust for existence? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to ignorance one thing and prepossession by ignorance another? Yes. Is ignorance one thing and prepossession by ignorance another? That should not be said. Etc. Is that same ignorance that prepossession by ignorance? Yes. Is that same underlying tendency to ignorance that prepossession by ignorance? That should not be said. Etc.

701. Should it not be said - "Underlying tendency is one thing and prepossession is another"? Yes. When wholesome and indeterminate consciousness is occurring for a worldling, should it be said "with underlying tendencies"? Yes. Should it be said "obsessed"? That should not be said. If so, underlying tendency is one thing and prepossession is another. When wholesome and indeterminate consciousness is occurring for a worldling, should it be said "with lust"? Yes. Should it be said "obsessed"? That should not be said. If so, lust is one thing and prepossession is another.

The discussion on the underlying tendency being another is finished.

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(141) 6. The Discussion on Prepossession Being Dissociated from Consciousness

702. Is prepossession dissociated from consciousness? Yes. Matter, Nibbāna, the eye sense base, etc. the touch sense base? That should not be said. Etc. Is prepossession dissociated from consciousness? Yes. There is no mind with lust, mind with hate, mind with delusion, etc. unwholesome consciousness, defiled consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is there not a mind with lust, mind with hate, mind with delusion, etc. unwholesome consciousness, defiled consciousness? Yes. If there is a mind with lust, mind with hate, mind with delusion, etc. unwholesome consciousness, defiled consciousness, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Prepossession is dissociated from consciousness."

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(142) 7. The Discussion on Being Included

703. Does lust for fine-material existence underlie the fine-material element, is it included in the fine-material element? Yes. Is it attainment-seeking, rebirth-seeking, a pleasant abiding in the present life, accompanied by attainment-seeking consciousness, rebirth-seeking consciousness, consciousness of pleasant abiding in the present life, arisen together, conjoined, associated, arising together, ceasing together, having the same sense-organ, having the same object? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not the case that it is not attainment-seeking, not rebirth-seeking, not a pleasant abiding in the present life, not accompanied by attainment-seeking consciousness, not by rebirth-seeking consciousness, not by consciousness of pleasant abiding in the present life, arisen together, conjoined, associated, arising together, ceasing together, having the same sense-organ, having the same object? Yes. If it is not attainment-seeking, not rebirth-seeking, not a pleasant abiding in the present life, etc. having the same object, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Lust for fine-material existence underlies the fine-material element, is included in the fine-material element." Etc.

Does lust for fine-material existence underlie the fine-material element, is it included in the fine-material element? Yes. Does lust for sound underlie the sound element, is it included in the sound element? That should not be said. Etc. Does lust for fine-material existence underlie the fine-material element, is it included in the fine-material element? Yes. Lust for odour, etc. Lust for flavour, etc. Does lust for touch underlie the touch element, is it included in the touch element? That should not be said. Etc.

Lust for sound underlies the sound element, should it not be said - "It is included in the sound element"? Yes. Lust for fine-material existence underlies the fine-material element, should it not be said - "It is included in the fine-material element"? That should not be said. Etc. Lust for odour, etc. Lust for flavour, etc. Lust for touch underlies the touch element, should it not be said - "It is included in the touch element"? Yes. Lust for fine-material existence underlies the fine-material element, should it not be said - "It is included in the fine-material element"? That should not be said. Etc.

704. Does lust for immaterial existence underlie the immaterial sphere element, is it included in the immaterial sphere element? Yes. Is it attainment-seeking, rebirth-seeking, a pleasant abiding in the present life, accompanied by attainment-seeking consciousness, rebirth-seeking consciousness, consciousness of pleasant abiding in the present life, arisen together, conjoined, associated, arising together, ceasing together, having the same sense-organ, having the same object? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not the case that it is not attainment-seeking, not rebirth-seeking, not a pleasant abiding in the present life, not accompanied by attainment-seeking consciousness, etc. having the same object? Yes. If it is not attainment-seeking, not

rebirth-seeking, etc. having the same object, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Lust for immaterial existence underlies the immaterial sphere element, it is included in the immaterial sphere element."

Does lust for immaterial existence underlie the immaterial sphere element, is it included in the immaterial sphere element? Yes. Does lust for sound underlie the sound element, is it included in the sound element? That should not be said. Etc. Does lust for immaterial existence underlie the immaterial sphere element, is it included in the immaterial sphere element? Yes. Lust for odour, etc. Lust for flavour, etc. Does lust for touch underlie the touch element, is it included in the touch element? That should not be said. Etc.

Lust for sound underlies the sound element, should it not be said - "It is included in the sound element"? Yes. Lust for immaterial existence underlies the immaterial sphere element, should it not be said - "It is included in the immaterial sphere element"? That should not be said. Etc. Lust for odour, etc. Lust for flavour, etc. Lust for touch underlies the touch element, should it not be said - "It is included in the touch element"? Yes. Lust for immaterial existence underlies the immaterial sphere element, should it not be said - "It is included in the immaterial sphere element"? That should not be said. Etc.

705. Should it not be said - "Lust for fine-material existence underlies the fine-material element, is included in the fine-material element; lust for immaterial existence underlies the immaterial sphere element, is included in the immaterial sphere element"? Yes. Is it not that sensual lust underlies the sensual element, is included in the sensual element? Yes. If sensual lust underlies the sensual element, is included in the sensual element, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Lust for fine-material existence underlies the fine-material element, is included in the fine-material element; lust for immaterial existence underlies the immaterial sphere element, is included in the immaterial sphere element."

The discussion on being included is finished.

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(143) 8. The Discussion on the Indeterminate

706. Is wrong view indeterminate? Yes. Resultant indeterminate, functional indeterminate, matter, Nibbāna, the eye sense base, etc. the touch sense base? That should not be said. Etc. Is wrong view indeterminate? Yes. Is contact associated with wrong view indeterminate? That should not be said. Etc. Is wrong view indeterminate? Yes. Is feeling associated with wrong view... etc. perception... etc. volition... etc. consciousness indeterminate? That should not be said. Etc.

Is contact associated with wrong view unwholesome? Yes. Is wrong view unwholesome? That should not be said. Etc. Are feeling, perception, volition, consciousness associated with wrong view unwholesome? Yes. Is wrong view unwholesome? That should not be said. Etc.

707. Is wrong view indeterminate? 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 - "wrong view is indeterminate."

Is wrong view indeterminate? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One that faults with wrong view as paramount? Yes. If faults with wrong view as paramount were said by the Blessed One, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "wrong view is indeterminate."

Is wrong view indeterminate? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Wrong view, Vaccha, is unwholesome, right view is wholesome"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "wrong view is indeterminate."

Is wrong view indeterminate? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "For one of wrong view, Puṇṇa, I declare one of two destinations - either hell or the animal realm"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "wrong view is indeterminate."

708. Should it not be said - "wrong view is undeclared"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "'The world is eternal,' Vaccha, this is undeclared, 'the world is non-eternal,' Vaccha, this is undeclared, 'the world is finite,' Vaccha, this is undeclared, 'the world is infinite,' Vaccha, etc. 'The soul is the same as the body,' Vaccha, etc. 'The soul is one thing and the body another,' Vaccha, etc. 'The Truth-finder exists after death,' Vaccha, etc. 'The Truth-finder does not exist after death,' Vaccha, etc. 'The Truth-finder both exists and does not exist after death,' Vaccha, etc. 'The Truth-finder neither exists nor does not exist after death,' Vaccha, this is undeclared"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, wrong view is undeclared.

Is wrong view indeterminate? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "For a person of wrong view, monks, whatever bodily action is complete and taken upon oneself according to that view, and whatever verbal action, etc. and whatever mental action, and whatever volition, and whatever longing, and whatever aspiration, and whatever activities - all those mental states lead to the undesirable, to the unpleasant, to the disagreeable, to harm, to suffering"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "wrong view is indeterminate."

The discussion on the indeterminate is finished.

14. Fourteenth Chapter

(144) 9. The Discussion on Not Being Included

709. Is wrong view not included? Yes. Is the path, the fruit, Nibbāna, the path of stream-entry, the fruition of stream-entry, the path of once-returning, the fruition of once-returning, the path of non-returning, the fruition of non-returning, the path of arahantship, the fruition of arahantship, the establishment of mindfulness, the right striving, the basis for spiritual power, the faculty, the power, the factor of enlightenment? That should not be said. Etc.

710. Should it not be said - "Wrong view is not included"? Yes. Should it be said that a worldling is "without lust towards sensual pleasures"? Yes. Should it be said "one whose wrong views have disappeared"? That should not be said. If so, wrong view is not included.

The discussion on not being included is finished.

Fourteenth Chapter.

Its summary:

The unwholesome root reunites with the wholesome root, the wholesome root reunites with the unwholesome root, the six sense bases from the six classes of consciousness, noble form derived from the primary elements, that same underlying tendency is that prepossession, prepossession is dissociated from consciousness, according to element that very thing underlies, wrong view is indeterminate, wrong view is not included.



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. 14. Fourteenth 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