

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)
- 21. Twenty-first Chapter (21. Ekavīsativavaggo)



PaliVerse

5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy

21. Twenty-first Chapter

1. Commentary on the Treatise on the Dispensation

878. Now there is the discussion on the Dispensation. Therein, with reference to the three councils, "the Dispensation has been made new" and "there is someone who makes the Truth-finder's Dispensation new" and "it is possible to make the Truth-finder's Dispensation new" - this is the view of those, just as of certain Uttarāpathakas; With reference to them, in all three discussions the questions are of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the acknowledgment is of the other. "Establishments of mindfulness" and so on - the Dispensation means the noble teachings beginning with the establishments of mindfulness, and the teaching of the wholesome and so on. Therein, setting aside those to whom the Blessed One taught the establishments of mindfulness and so on, the Dispensation could be called made new either by others' making of establishments of mindfulness and so on, or by making the unwholesome and so on into the wholesome and so on - has that been so done by anyone, or is there anyone who so does, or is it possible to so do - in all three questions this was stated for the purpose of challenging. The remainder everywhere proceeds according to the canonical text itself.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Dispensation.

2. Commentary on the Treatise on the Non-Secluded

879-880. Now there is the discussion on non-seclusion. Therein, whatever mental state is present for whatever person, he is called not secluded from that - this is the conclusion in one's own doctrine. But since mental states of the three elements are not fully understood by a worldling, therefore "he is not secluded from all mental states of the three elements at a single moment" is the view of those, just as of those very same ones; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. "From contacts" and so on was said for the purpose of showing the fault of all contacts and so on occurring at one moment. The remainder is of manifest meaning everywhere.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Non-Secluded.

3. Commentary on the Treatise on Mental Fetters

881-882. Now there is the treatise called the talk on mental fetters. Therein, because a Worthy One does not know the entire domain of a Buddha, therefore for those whose view is "there is attainment of arahantship without abandoning any mental fetter," with the perception that he must have ignorance and sceptical doubt not abandoned therein, just as the Mahāsaṅghikas hold, with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. "Is there any identity view" and so on was stated for the purpose of showing

the abandoning of all mental fetters by a Worthy One. "The entire domain of a Buddha" - in the two questions, the negation was made by the absence of omniscient knowledge in a Worthy One, not by the non-abandoning of ignorance and sceptical doubt. The other, however, with reference to the non-abandoning of those, establishes his view by "because of that indeed." Because that was unwisely established, it is as if not established at all.

Commentary on the Treatise on Mental Fetters.

4. Commentary on the Treatise on Supernormal Power

883-884. Now there is the discussion called the discussion on supernormal power. Therein, this supernormal power succeeds somewhere and does not succeed somewhere; in making impermanent things and so on into permanent things and so on, it definitely does not succeed. But in transforming a similar continuity and producing a dissimilar continuity, or in making a similar continuity itself continue for a further long time, for whose purpose it is done, in dependence on causes such as merit and so on, it succeeds somewhere - as in the case of transforming drinking water into ghee, milk, and so on for the sake of monks, and as in the case of the long continuity of lamps and so on at the Great Relic Enshrinement - this is the conclusion in one's own doctrine. But that the Venerable Pilindavaccha resolved upon the king's mansion as gold, in dependence on that, for those whose view is "there is supernormal power of intention," just as the Andhakans hold; with reference to them, "there is supernormal power of intention" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Therein, "supernormal power of intention" means supernormal power of intention, the meaning is supernormal power that succeeds according to intention. "Yes" is the acknowledgment of the opponent, standing merely on the view. Then, in order to question him about making impermanent things and so on into permanent things and so on, he said beginning with "let trees have permanent leaves." The remainder here is clear in meaning. In establishing the view, "and it became gold" - it was by the decisive support of the king's merit, not merely by the elder monk's intention alone. Therefore this is not a proof.

Commentary on the Treatise on Supernormal Power.

5. Commentary on the Treatise on the Buddha

885. Now there is the treatise called the Buddha discussion. Therein, setting aside the difference in body, the difference in life span, and the difference in power at each and every time, there is no inferiority or superiority among Buddhas compared to Buddhas with respect to the remaining qualities of a Buddha. But for those whose view is that there is without any distinction, just as the Andhakans hold; with reference to them, "is there among Buddhas" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, in order to question him by means of the qualities of a Buddha, he said beginning with "with respect to the establishments of mindfulness." The other, not seeing inferiority or superiority by virtue of those, certainly rejects altogether.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Buddha.

6. Commentary on the Treatise on All Directions

886. Now comes the treatise called the discussion on all directions. Therein, the dwelling in world systems all around - in the four directions, below, and above - and having generated their own speculative craft that there are Buddhas in all world systems, the view of those who hold "Buddhas remain in all directions," just as the Mahāsaṅghikas hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. When asked "in the eastern direction," he rejects with reference to the Sakyan Sage. Being asked again, he acknowledges with reference to one standing in another world system by the influence of his view. "What is the name of that Blessed One" and so on was said for the purpose of accusation: "if you know, tell about him by way of name and so on." By this method the meaning should be understood everywhere.

Commentary on the Treatise on All Directions.

7. Commentary on the Treatise on the Dhamma

887-888. Now there is the discussion on phenomena. Therein, because materiality and so on, being fixed in destination by the intrinsic nature of materiality and so on, do not abandon that intrinsic nature, therefore the view of those who hold that all phenomena are fixed in destination, just as the Andhakas and certain Uttarāpathakas; with reference to them, "all phenomena" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, to accuse him thus: "If they are fixed in destination, they would be either with fixed course of the wrong path or with fixed course of the right path, there is no other fixed course apart from these," he said beginning with "with fixed course of the wrong path." Therein, the rejecting and the acknowledgment are of the opponent. "Materiality in the meaning of materiality" and so on was said in order to accuse by virtue of the meaning by which he says they are fixed in destination. Therein this is the intention - "Materiality is fixed in destination in the meaning of materiality" should be said with the intention that materiality is materiality only, not of the intrinsic nature of feeling and so on; it should not be said otherwise than this. Why? Because of the absence of materiality other than the meaning of materiality. For the intrinsic nature of materiality is the meaning of materiality, and the intrinsic nature of materiality is materiality only, not other than materiality. But this conventional expression exists for the purpose of describing its diversity from feeling and so on. Therefore, by one saying "materiality is fixed in destination in the meaning of materiality," it is as if materiality is fixed in destination has been said. And what is fixed in destination would be either with fixed course of the wrong path or with fixed course of the right path; there is no other fixed course apart from these. Then why does he acknowledge? By virtue of a different meaning. In "materiality is fixed in destination in the meaning of materiality," here the meaning is that materiality is materiality only, not of the intrinsic nature of feeling and so on. Therefore he acknowledges. But apart from this there is no fixedness for it, and to accuse again by that same method, he said beginning with "with fixed course of the wrong path." All that is of clear meaning. Thus the view "materiality" too, because of being unwisely established, is as if not established at all.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Dhamma.

8. Commentary on the Treatise on Action

889-891. Now there is the discussion on action. Therein, "because those experienced in present life and so on are fixed in destination by the purpose of being experienced in present life and so on, therefore all actions are fixed in destination" - this is the view of those, just as of those very same ones; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. In "fixed in destination in the meaning of experienced in present life," here that which is experienced in present life is just the meaning of experienced in present life. If it is able to give the result in this very life it gives it, if not it is called defunct kamma - with reference to this meaning, the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine. But by the power of the fixed course of the wrong path and the fixed course of the right path, this is indeed undetermined - all should be understood by the very method stated above.

Commentary on the Treatise on Action.

The twenty-first 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. 21. Twenty-first 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