

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)
- 20. Twentieth Chapter (20. Vīsativavaggo)



PaliVerse

5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy

20. Twentieth Chapter

1. Commentary on the Treatise on the Unintentional

857-862. Now there is the discussion called the unintentional talk. Therein, "the cases of immediate result are grave and weighty, therefore even unintentionally, when those cases are violated, one becomes one with immediate result" - this is the view of those, just as of certain Uttarāpathakas; with reference to them, "unintentionally" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the acknowledgment of the other is by the influence of his view. Then, to him, "because a heinous action with immediate bad destination has reached the course of action. And if there were a completion of the course of action unintentionally, the remaining killing of living beings and so on too would be unintentional" - for the purpose of challenging, he said beginning with "having unintentionally killed a living being." The other rejects because of the absence of such a view. The remainder proceeds according to the canonical text itself. "It should not be said that he is a matricide" is the question of the opponent; the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, with reference to killing unintentionally at the time of treating a disease and so on. In the question "Is it not that a mother has been deprived of life?" too, the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine alone, with reference to having been unintentionally deprived. But without grasping this intention, "if" is the establishment of the view of the other. Because that was unwisely established, it is as if not established at all. In the case of patricide and so on too, the same method applies. But regarding the schismatic, with reference to one who perceives the Teaching, "schism in the Community is with immediate result" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine; having unwisely taken the statement "Having split a united Community, he is tormented in hell for a cosmic cycle," the acknowledgment is of the opponent. Again, when asked "all," he rejects with reference to one who perceives the Teaching on his own side, and acknowledges with reference to one who perceives the Teaching on the other's side. "One who perceives the Teaching" - the same method applies to both questions. "Was it not said by the Blessed One" - the discourse was said absolutely for the purpose of showing the state of immediate result of one who speaks what is the Teaching. In the verse "bound for the realm of misery, doomed to hell" too, only one who speaks what is not according to the Teaching is intended. The other, however, without grasping the intention, establishes his view. Because that was unwisely established, it is as if not established at all.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Unintentional.

2. Explanation of the treatise on knowledge

863-865. Now there is the treatise on knowledge. Therein, knowledge is twofold - both mundane and supramundane. The mundane is attainment knowledge and also knowledge of the ownership of actions proceeding by way of giving and so on; the

supramundane is truth-discerning path knowledge and also fruition knowledge. But without making this division, the view of those who hold that "only truth-discerning knowledge is knowledge, not the other, therefore there is no knowledge for a worldling," just as the Hetuvādins hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Beginning with "wisdom" was said for the purpose of showing synonyms of knowledge. By this it explains - if there is no knowledge for him, there is no wisdom and so on either. Then if there is wisdom and so on, there is knowledge also. Why? Because wisdom and so on are not different from knowledge. Beginning with "the first meditative absorption" was said for the purpose of showing attainment knowledge. Beginning with "one would give a gift" is for the knowledge of the ownership of actions. "He fully understands suffering" explains only supramundane path knowledge, but knowledge is not only supramundane.

Explanation of the treatise on knowledge.

3. Commentary on the Treatise on the Guardians of Hell

866. Now there is the discussion called the guardians of hell. Therein, "In hell, the actions of those doomed to hell themselves kill in the form of guardians of hell; there are no beings called guardians of hell" - this is the view of those, just as of the Andhakans; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, "if there were no guardians of hell there, there would be no bodily punishment either. For indeed, when there are torturers there is torture" - in order to accuse him, he said beginning with "there are not in hell."

867-868. "There are among human beings" is for the purpose of making known by what is evident. For just as among human beings, when there are torturers there is torture, so too there - this is the intention here. "There are in hell" is the question of the opponent, the acknowledgment of the other. "Neither Vessabhū nor the king of the departed" - the discourse was brought forth by the opponent from his own doctrine. But that was sanctioned by the proponent of one's own doctrine as being within the scope of the Dispensation. Therein, "Vessabhū" is a certain god. "King of the departed" is a ghost of great supernormal power in the sphere of ghosts. Soma and so on are well-known indeed. This is what is meant - these Vessabhū and so on do not strike a person driven from here by one's own actions, arrived at the world beyond. But by whatever actions he was driven there, those one's own actions alone strike him there - thus it makes clear the ownership of actions, not the absence of guardians in hell. But by the proponent of one's own doctrine, the discourse passages brought forth beginning with "monks" are of inferred meaning only.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Guardians of Hell.

4. Commentary on the Treatise on Animals

869-871. Now there is the talk about animals. Therein, among the gods, young gods such as Erāvaṇa and others transform into the appearance of elephants and the appearance of horses; there are no animals there. But for those whose view, having seen young gods with the appearance of animals, is "there are animals among the

gods," just as the Andhakans hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, to accuse him "if there were animals in the heavenly realm, there would also be gods in the animal realm," he said beginning with "are there among the animals." "Insects" and so on was said to show those whose non-existence he wishes. In the question about "Erāvaṇa," the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine because of its existence, not of an animal. "Elephant keepers" and so on was said for the purpose of accusation: "if there were elephants and so on there, there would also be elephant keepers and so on." Therein, "barley-givers" means donors of barley. "Torturers" means elephant trainers and others, by whom they would inflict various kinds of bodily punishment. "Cooks" means those who cook food for elephants and so on. "That should not be said" - not wishing for that, he rejects.

Commentary on the Treatise on Pointless Talk.

5. Commentary on the Treatise on the Path

872-875. Now there is the discussion on the path. Therein, for those whose view is "the path is without qualification only fivefold," in dependence on this very discourse "his bodily action, verbal action, and livelihood are already well purified beforehand" and on the dissociation from consciousness of right speech, right action, and right livelihood, just as the Mahiṃsāsakas hold, with reference to them, "fivefold" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the acknowledgment is of the other. "Right speech is a path factor, and that is not the path" and so on was said by way of the other school's doctrine. For in the other school's doctrine, right speech and so on have come as path factors. But because of being matter, they are described as not being the path. Beginning with "right view is a path factor" was said for the purpose of showing that there is no such thing as a path factor not being the path. In the discourse "but already his," path development is for one of pure morality, not for the other; thus "his bodily action, verbal action, and livelihood are well purified" was said for the purpose of showing the state of purification of the preliminary practice to be approached, not for the purpose of showing the fivefold state without these. Therefore he said: "Thus this noble eightfold path goes to fulfilment through development." The discourse brought by the proponent of one's own doctrine is of inferred meaning only.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Path.

6. Explanation of the treatise on knowledge

876-877. Now there is the treatise on knowledge. Therein, for those whose view is "knowledge with twelve bases is supramundane," with reference to the knowledge of twelve aspects in the setting in motion of the wheel of the Teaching, just as the Pubbaselīyas 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 thus: "if that has twelve bases, there must be twelve path-knowledges," he said beginning with "twelve." The other rejects with reference to the unity of the path, and acknowledges with reference to the diversity of knowledge by way of truth-knowledge, function-knowledge, and done-knowledge in each truth. In those beginning with "twelve paths of stream-entry" too, the same method applies. "Was it

not said by the Blessed One" - the discourse together with the preceding and subsequent portions explains the diversity of knowledge, not the twelvefold nature of knowledge of the noble path. Therefore it is not a proof.

Explanation of the treatise on knowledge.

The twentieth chapter.

The fourth fifty is complete.



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. 20. Twentieth 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