

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)
- 3. Discussion on Holy Life (3. Brahmacariyakathā)



PaliVerse

5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy

3. Discussion on Holy Life

1. Commentary on the Discussion on Pure Holy Life

269. Now the discussion on the holy life takes place. Therein, there are two abidings by the holy life: path development and going forth. Going forth does not exist among all the gods. Path development, setting aside the non-percipient beings, is not prohibited among the rest. Therein, with reference to those who, taking the gods who control what is created by others as the starting point, do not wish for path development even among the gods above them, just as the Sammitīyas, the question "there is not among the gods" is of the proponent of one's own doctrine. "Monks, by three states the human beings of the Indian subcontinent surpass both the human beings of Uttarakuru and the gods of the Thirty-three. With which three? They are courageous, mindful, and here is the abiding by the holy life" - relying on this discourse, the acknowledgment "both abidings by the holy life do not exist among the gods" is of the opponent by the force of an arisen view. Again, by way of things that are obstructions to both holy lives, "are all gods stupid?" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Therein, "ones who speak with hand gestures" means those who speak by hand-gesture, as if dumb. Further on, "there is among the gods" is the question of the opponent; the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, with reference to path development. Without observing the intention of the acknowledgment, the pursuit by way of going forth is of the opponent.

270. In the question "where there is no going forth," the rejecting is of that very one, with reference to the attainment of the path by laypeople and by certain gods. Being asked again, the acknowledgment is of that very one, with reference to borderland-dwellers and non-percipient beings. In the questions beginning with "whoever goes forth" too, the same method applies. Again, in the question "there is among the gods" too, the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, with reference to path development; when "among all gods" is said, the rejecting is of that very one, with reference to non-percipient beings.

271. "Among human beings" - in the two questions, the acknowledgment is with reference to the people of the Indian subcontinent. The rejecting should be understood with reference to borderland-dwellers.

"There is where there is" means "there are those gods, or there is that region, where there is" - thus the answer of the proponent of one's own doctrine is by way of the classification of beings and regions. By this method, all the alternate questions should be understood.

272. In the pursuit of the discourse, "where is the acquisition of fruition?" - the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine is "where is the acquisition of the fruition of arahantship for that non-returner?" "Right there" means in the Pure

Abodes.

"Well then, because" (handa hi) is an indeclinable particle in the sense of cause. This is what is meant - Because a non-returner person realises the fruition there in the Pure Abodes by means of the path developed here in this world, and does not develop another path there, therefore there is no abiding by the holy life among the gods.

2. Commentary on the Comparison of Holy Life

273. Now, in order to show the meaning that if there is realisation of fruition elsewhere by means of a path developed elsewhere, it might also apply to stream-enterers and so on, the comparative question beginning with "a non-returner" and so on is of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Therein, the acknowledgment is for the realisation of fruition of the non-returner, and the rejecting of the realisation of fruition of the rest is of the opponent. For a non-returner who has developed the path here is called one whose goal is having left here. Having developed the path of non-returning here, from the statement "one of spontaneous birth, attaining final nibbāna there," his view is that "without further path development, he realises the fruition of arahantship merely by way of rebirth." But stream-enterers and once-returners, having developed the path there, are called those who are reborn there, thus there is simply no coming here for them. Thus, when asked about the realisation of fruition of the non-returner, he acknowledges. He rejects for the others.

In the question "a non-returner person by means of the path developed there," he rejects by the view that "there is simply no path development there for the non-returner." "The path is developed, and mental defilements are not abandoned" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine; the acknowledgment of the other is with reference to the fine-material-sphere path. For by the fine-material-sphere path, he became one whose goal is having left here.

In the question "a non-returner person who has done what had to be done," from the statement "one of spontaneous birth, attaining final nibbāna there," he acknowledges with reference to his state of having done what had to be done and so on by way of rebirth alone. In the question "a Worthy One," he rejects by way of only the Worthy One who attains final nibbāna here. Being asked again, he acknowledges by way of one who attains final nibbāna there.

In those beginning with "is there rebirth for a Worthy One" also, the meaning should be understood by way of one who attains final nibbāna there and those who attain final nibbāna here. When asked "does he attain final nibbāna there with the unshakeable not penetrated," wishing for the unshakeable penetration of that one by means of the path developed right here, he rejects.

"Just as a deer" - the first example is of the opponent, the second is of the proponent of one's own doctrine. The remainder is of manifest meaning everywhere.

The Discussion on the Holy Life is finished.

3. Commentary on the Treatise on the Limited

274. Now there is the discussion called "limitedly." Therein, those who wish for the abandoning of mental defilements limitedly, piece by piece, by a part, by a part, through the insight into suffering and so on, by way of the different full realisations of stream-enterers and so on, just as the Sammitīyas and others do at present - to break that view of theirs, "limitedly" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the opponent. Again, the pursuit is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, and the rejecting is of the opponent because of the absence of the state of stream-enterer and so on by a part. By this method, the meaning should be understood in all instances.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Limited.



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. 3. Discussion on Holy Life 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