

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)

15. Fifteenth Chapter (15. Pannarasamavaggo)

[Kv 15.1-11, PTS 508-523]



PaliVerse

05. Points of Controversy

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(145) 1. The Discussion on Conditionality

711. Is conditionality defined? Yes. Is not investigation a root, and is it also predominance? Yes. If investigation is a root, and it is also predominance, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of root condition, it is a condition by way of predominance condition."

Is not desire-predominance the predominance of conascent phenomena? Yes. If desire-predominance is the predominance of conascent phenomena, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of conascence condition."

712. Is not energy-predominance the predominance of conascent phenomena? Yes. If energy-predominance is the predominance of conascent phenomena, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of conascence condition."

Is not energy-predominance the predominance of conascent phenomena, and is that a faculty? Yes. If energy-predominance is the predominance of conascent phenomena, and that is a faculty, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of faculty condition."

Is not energy-predominance the predominance of conascent phenomena, and is that a path factor? Yes. If energy-predominance is the predominance of conascent phenomena, and that is a path factor, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of path condition."

713. Is not consciousness-predominance the predominance of conascent phenomena? Yes. If consciousness-predominance is the predominance of conascent phenomena, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of conascence condition."

Is not consciousness-predominance the predominance of conascent phenomena, and is that nutriment? Yes. If consciousness-predominance is the predominance of conascent phenomena, and that is nutriment, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of nutriment condition."

Is not consciousness-predominance the predominance of conascent phenomena, and is that a faculty? Yes. If consciousness-predominance is the predominance of conascent phenomena, and that is a faculty, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of faculty condition."

714. Is not investigation-predominance the predominance of consascent phenomena? Yes. If investigation-predominance is the predominance of consascent phenomena, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of consascent condition."

Is not investigation-predominance the predominance of consascent phenomena, and is that a faculty? Yes. If investigation-predominance is the predominance of consascent phenomena, and that is a faculty, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of faculty condition."

Is not investigation-predominance the predominance of consascent phenomena, and is that a path factor? Yes. If investigation-predominance is the predominance of consascent phenomena, and that is a path factor, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of path condition."

715. Is it not that reviewing arises having given weight to the noble teaching, and that is its object? Yes. If reviewing arises having given weight to the noble teaching, and that is its object, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of predominance condition, it is a condition by way of object condition."

716. Is it not that the former and former wholesome mental states are a condition for the latter and latter wholesome mental states by way of proximity condition, and that is repetition? Yes. If the former and former wholesome mental states are a condition for the latter and latter wholesome mental states by way of proximity condition, and that is repetition, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of proximity condition, it is a condition by way of repetition condition."

Is it not that the former and former unwholesome mental states are a condition for the latter and latter unwholesome mental states by way of proximity condition, and that is repetition? Yes. If the former and former unwholesome mental states are a condition for the latter and latter unwholesome mental states by way of proximity condition, and that is repetition, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of proximity condition, it is a condition by way of repetition condition."

Is it not that the former and former functional-indeterminate mental states are a condition for the latter and latter functional-indeterminate mental states by way of proximity condition, and that is repetition? Yes. If the former and former functional-indeterminate mental states are a condition for the latter and latter functional-indeterminate mental states by way of proximity condition, and that is repetition, then indeed sir, it should be said - "It is a condition by way of proximity condition, it is a condition by way of repetition condition."

717. Should it not be said - "Conditionality is defined"? Yes. Is it a condition by way of root condition, is it a condition by way of object condition, is it a condition by way of proximity condition, is it a condition by way of contiguity condition? That should not be said. If so, conditionality is defined.

The discussion on conditionality is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(146) 2. The Discussion on the Mutuality Condition

718. With ignorance as condition only are activities, should it not be said -"with activities as condition also is ignorance"? Yes. Is not ignorance conascent with activity? Yes. If ignorance is conascent with activity, then indeed sir, it should be said - "with ignorance as condition also are activities, and with activities as condition also is ignorance."

With craving as condition only is clinging, should it not be said -"with clinging as condition also is craving"? Yes. Is not craving conascent with clinging? Yes. If craving is conascent with clinging, then indeed sir, it should be said - "with craving as condition also is clinging, and with clinging as condition also is craving."

719. "Ageing and death is the condition for birth, birth is the condition for existence, monks" - Is there such a discourse? There is not. If so, with ignorance as condition only are activities, should it not be said - "with activities as condition also is ignorance." With craving as condition only is clinging, should it not be said -"with clinging as condition also is craving."

"With consciousness as condition, monks, is mentality-materiality, and with mentality-materiality as condition also is consciousness" - Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, with ignorance as condition also are activities, and with activities as condition also is ignorance; with craving as condition also is clinging, and with clinging as condition also is craving.

The discussion on the mutuality condition is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(147) 3. The Discussion on the Period of Time

720. Is the period of time predetermined? Yes. Is it matter? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... etc. perception... etc. activities... etc. Is it consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is the past period of time predetermined? Yes. Is it matter? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... etc. perception... etc. activities... etc. Is it consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is the future period of time predetermined? Yes. Is it matter? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... etc. perception... etc. activities... etc. Is it consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is the present period of time predetermined? Yes. Is it matter? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... etc. perception... etc. activities... etc. Is it consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is past matter, feeling, perception, activities, consciousness the past period? Yes. Are there five past periods? That should not be said. Etc. Is future matter, feeling, perception, activities, consciousness the future period? Yes. Are there five future periods? That should not be said. Etc. Is present matter, feeling, perception, activities, consciousness the present period? Yes. Are there five present periods? That should not be said. Etc.

Are the past five aggregates the past period, the future five aggregates the future period, the present five aggregates the present period? Yes. Are there fifteen periods? That should not be said. Etc.

Are the past twelve sense bases the past period, the future twelve sense bases the future period, the present twelve sense bases the present period? Yes. Are there thirty-six periods? That should not be said. Etc.

Are the past eighteen elements the past period, the future eighteen elements the future period, the present eighteen elements the present period? Yes. Are there fifty-four periods? That should not be said. Etc.

Are the past twenty-two faculties the past period, the future twenty-two faculties the future period, the present twenty-two faculties the present period? Yes. Are there sixty-six periods? That should not be said. Etc.

721. Should it not be said - "Is the period of time predetermined?" Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these three topics of discussion. What three? One might discuss referring to the past period of time - 'Thus it was in the past period of time'; Or one might discuss referring to the future period of time - 'Thus it will be in the future period of time'; Or one might discuss referring to the present period of time now - 'Thus it is in the present now.' These, monks, are the three topics of discussion." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, the period of time is predetermined.

The discussion on the period of time is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(148) 4. Discussion on Moment, Brief Measure of Time and Minute

722. Is a moment predetermined, is an instant predetermined, is a second predetermined? Yes. Is it matter? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... perception... activities... Is it consciousness? That should not be said. Etc.

723. Should it not be said - "Is a second predetermined?" Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these three topics of discussion. What three? One might discuss referring to the past period of time - 'Thus it was in the past period of time'; Or one might discuss referring to the future period of time - 'Thus it will be in the future period of time'; Or one might discuss referring to the present period of time now - 'Thus it is in the present now.' These, monks, are the three topics of discussion." Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, a second is predetermined.

The discussion on moment, brief measure of time and minute is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(149) 5. Discussion on Mental Corruptions

724. Are the four mental corruptions without mental corruptions? Yes. Is the path, the fruit, Nibbāna, the path of stream-entry, the fruition of stream-entry, etc. the factor of enlightenment? That should not be said. Etc.

725. Should it not be said - "Are the four mental corruptions without mental corruptions?" Yes. "Are there then other mental corruptions by which mental corruptions those mental corruptions are with mental corruptions?" That should not be said. If so, the four mental corruptions are without mental corruptions.

The discussion on mental corruptions is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(150) 6. Discussion on Ageing and Death

726. Is the ageing and death of supramundane states supramundane? Yes. Is the path, the fruit, Nibbāna, the path of stream-entry, the fruition of stream-entry, etc. the factor of enlightenment? That should not be said. Etc. Is the ageing and death of the path of stream-entry the path of stream-entry? That should not be said. Etc. Is the ageing and death of the path of stream-entry the path of stream-entry? Yes. Is the ageing and death of the fruition of stream-entry the fruition of stream-entry? That should not be said, etc. Of the path of once-returning, etc. Of the fruition of once-returning, etc. Of the path of non-returning, etc. Of the fruition of non-returning, etc. Is the ageing and death of the path of arahantship the path of arahantship? That should not be said. Etc. Is the ageing and death of the path of arahantship the path of arahantship? Yes. Is the ageing and death of the fruition of arahantship the fruition of arahantship? That should not be said. Etc. Of the establishments of mindfulness... Of the right strivings... Of the bases for spiritual power... Of the faculties... Of the powers... Is the ageing and death of the factors of enlightenment the factor of enlightenment? That should not be said. Etc.

727. Should it not be said - "Is the ageing and death of supramundane states supramundane?" Yes. "Is it mundane?" That should not be said. If so, it is supramundane.

The discussion on ageing and death is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(151) 7. Discussion on Perception and Feeling

728. Is the attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling supramundane? Yes. Is the path, the fruit, Nibbāna, the path of stream-entry, the fruition of stream-entry, etc. the factor of enlightenment? That should not be said. Etc.

729. Should it not be said - "Is the attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling supramundane?" Yes. "Is it mundane?" That should not be said. If so, it is supramundane.

The discussion on perception and feeling is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(152) 8. Second Discussion on Perception and Feeling

730. Is the attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling mundane? Yes. Is it matter? That should not be said. Etc. feeling... perception... activities... Is it consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is it of the sensual-sphere of existence? That should not be said. Etc. Is it of the fine-material-sphere of existence? That should not be said. Etc. Is it of the immaterial-sphere of existence? That should not be said. Etc.

731. Should it not be said - "Is the attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling mundane?" Yes. "Is it supramundane?" That should not be said. If so, it is mundane.

The second discussion on perception and feeling is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(153) 9. Third Discussion on Perception and Feeling

732. Could one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling die? Yes. Is there contact at the time of death, feeling at the time of death, perception at the time of death, volition at the time of death, consciousness at the time of death for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Is there not contact at the time of death, feeling at the time of death, perception at the time of death, volition at the time of death, consciousness at the time of death for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? Yes. If there is not contact at the time of death, feeling at the time of death, perception at the time of death, volition at the time of death, consciousness at the time of death for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "One who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling could die."

Could one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling die? Yes. Is there contact, feeling, perception, volition, consciousness for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Is there not contact, feeling, perception, volition, consciousness for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? Yes. Is there death for one without contact, death for one without feeling, etc. death for one without consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is death for one with contact, etc. death for one with consciousness? Yes. If there is death for one with contact, etc. death for one with consciousness, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "One who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling could die."

Could one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling die? Yes. Would poison penetrate the body, would a knife penetrate, would fire penetrate for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Would poison not penetrate the body, would a knife not penetrate, would fire not penetrate for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? Yes. If poison would not penetrate the body, a knife would not penetrate, fire would not penetrate for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "One who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling could die."

Could one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling die? Yes. Would poison penetrate the body, would a knife penetrate, would fire penetrate for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? Yes. Not attained to cessation? That should not be said. Etc.

733. Could one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling not die? Yes. Is there that fixed course by which fixed course one fixed in destination who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling would not die? There is not. If there is

not that fixed course by which fixed course one fixed in destination who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling would not die, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "One who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling would not die."

734. Could one possessing eye-consciousness not die? Yes. Is there that fixed course by which fixed course one fixed in destination possessing eye-consciousness would not die? There is not. If there is not that fixed course by which fixed course one fixed in destination possessing eye-consciousness would not die, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "One possessing eye-consciousness would not die."

The third discussion on perception and feeling is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(154) 10. Discussion on Non-Percipient Beings

735. Is the attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling conducive to rebirth as a non-percipient being? Yes. Is there non-greed as a wholesome root, non-hate as a wholesome root, non-delusion as a wholesome root, faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, wisdom for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Is there not non-greed as a wholesome root, non-hate as a wholesome root, etc. wisdom for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? Yes. If there is not non-greed as a wholesome root, non-hate as a wholesome root, non-delusion as a wholesome root, faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, wisdom for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling is conducive to rebirth as a non-percipient being."

Is the attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling conducive to rebirth as a non-percipient being? Yes. Is there contact, feeling, perception, volition, consciousness for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? That should not be said. Etc. Is there not contact, feeling, perception, volition, consciousness for one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling? Yes. Is there path development for one without contact? Etc. Is there path development for one without consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is path development for one with contact? Etc. Is there path development for one with consciousness? Yes. If there is path development for one with contact, etc. path development for one with consciousness, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling is conducive to rebirth as a non-percipient being."

Is the attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling conducive to rebirth as a non-percipient being? Yes. Do all those who attain the cessation of perception and feeling, are all of them destined for rebirth as non-percipient beings? That should not be said. Etc.

736. Should it not be said - "The attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling is conducive to rebirth as a non-percipient being"? Yes. Is it not that here too one is non-percipient and there too one is non-percipient? Yes. If here too one is non-

percipient and there too one is non-percipient, then indeed sir, it should be said -
"The attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling is conducive to rebirth as a non-percipient being."

The discussion on non-percipient beings is finished.

15. Fifteenth Chapter

(155) 11. Discussion on the Accumulation of Action

737. Is action one thing and the production of action another? Yes. Is contact one thing and the production of contact another; is feeling one thing and the production of feeling another; is perception one thing and the production of perception another; is volition one thing and the production of volition another; is consciousness one thing and the production of consciousness another; is faith one thing and the production of faith another; is energy one thing and the production of energy another; is mindfulness one thing and the production of mindfulness another; is concentration one thing and the production of concentration another; is wisdom one thing and the production of wisdom another; is lust one thing and the production of lust another? Etc. Is moral fearlessness one thing and the production of moral fearlessness another? That should not be said. Etc.

738. Is action one thing and the production of action another? Yes. Is the production of action consascent with action? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the production of action consascent with action? Yes. Is the production of action consascent with wholesome action wholesome? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the production of action consascent with wholesome action wholesome? Yes. Is the production of action consascent with action associated with pleasant feeling associated with pleasant feeling? That should not be said. Etc. with unpleasant feeling, etc. Is the production of action consascent with action associated with neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling associated with neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling? That should not be said. Etc.

739. Is the production of action consascent with action? Yes. Is the production of action consascent with unwholesome action unwholesome? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the production of action consascent with unwholesome action unwholesome? Yes. Is the production of action consascent with action associated with pleasant feeling associated with pleasant feeling? That should not be said. Etc. with unpleasant feeling, etc. Is the production of action consascent with action associated with neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling associated with neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling? That should not be said. Etc.

740. Is action consascent with consciousness, is action with sense-object? Yes. Is the production of action consascent with consciousness, is the production of action with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the production of action consascent with consciousness, is the production of action without sense-object? Yes. Is action consascent with consciousness, is action without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is action conascent with consciousness, when consciousness is destroyed is action destroyed? Yes. Is the production of action conascent with consciousness, when consciousness is destroyed is the production of action destroyed? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the production of action conascent with consciousness, when consciousness is destroyed is the production of action not destroyed? Yes. Is action conascent with consciousness, when consciousness is destroyed is action not destroyed? That should not be said. Etc.

741. Is there production of action in action? Yes. Is that very action that production of action? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there production of action in action, does result arise from the production of action? Yes. Is that very action that production of action, that result of action? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there production of action in action, does result arise from the production of action, is result with sense-object? Yes. Is the production of action with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the production of action without sense-object? Yes. Is result without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

742. Is action one thing and the production of action another? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Here, Puṇṇa, a certain one generates bodily activity that is both afflictive and non-afflictive, generates verbal activity that is both afflictive and non-afflictive, etc. generates mental activity, he, having generated bodily activity that is both afflictive and non-afflictive, having generated verbal activity that is both afflictive and non-afflictive, etc. having generated mental activity, is reborn in a world that is both afflictive and non-afflictive. When he has been reborn in a world that is both afflictive and non-afflictive, contacts that are both afflictive and non-afflictive touch him. He, being touched by contacts that are both afflictive and non-afflictive, feels feeling that is both afflictive and non-afflictive, mingled pleasure and pain, just as human beings, some gods, and some beings in states of misfortune. Thus indeed, Puṇṇa, rebirth of a being comes from what has come to be; by what one does, by that one is reborn; contacts touch the one who has been reborn. Thus I say, Puṇṇa, 'beings are heirs to their actions.'" Is there such a discourse? Yes. If so, it should not be said - "Action is one thing, the production of action is another."

The discussion on the accumulation of action is finished.

Fifteenth Chapter.

Its summary:

Conditionality is defined, dependent origination, period of time, moment, instant, second, four mental corruptions, without mental corruptions, ageing and death of supramundane states is supramundane, attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling is supramundane, attainment of the cessation of perception and feeling is mundane, one who has attained the cessation of perception and feeling could die, that same path for rebirth as a non-percipient being, action is one thing and the production of action is another.

The third fifty.

Its summary:

Underlying tendencies, restraint, cosmic cycle, and root is defined.



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. 15. Fifteenth 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