

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)

3. Third Chapter (3. Tatiyavaggo)

[Kv 3.1-12, PTS 228-266]



PaliVerse

05. Points of Controversy

3. The Third Chapter

(21) 1. Treatise on Power

354. Is the power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the power of the Truth-finder the power of a disciple, is the power of a disciple the power of the Truth-finder? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is that very power of the Truth-finder that power of a disciple, is that very power of a disciple that power of the Truth-finder? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the power of a disciple of such a kind as the power of the Truth-finder, is the power of the Truth-finder of such a kind as the power of a disciple? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the former exertion, former conduct, preaching of the Teaching, proclamation of the Teaching of a disciple of such a kind as the former exertion, former conduct, preaching of the Teaching, proclamation of the Teaching of the Truth-finder? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the Truth-finder a conqueror, a Teacher, a Perfectly Enlightened One, omniscient, all-seeing, lord of the Teaching, one who has the Teaching as refuge? Yes. Is a disciple a conqueror, a Teacher, a Perfectly Enlightened One, omniscient, all-seeing, lord of the Teaching, one who has the Teaching as refuge? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the Truth-finder the producer of the unarisen path, the generator of the unproduced path, the declarer of the undeclared path, the knower of the path, the expert in the path, skilled in the path? Yes. Is a disciple the producer of the unarisen path, the generator of the unproduced path, the declarer of the undeclared path, the knower of the path, the expert in the path, skilled in the path? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the superiority and inferiority of faculties as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, common to disciples? Yes. Is a disciple omniscient, all-seeing? That should not be said. Etc.

355. Does a disciple know the possible and impossible? Yes. If a disciple knows the possible and impossible, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Does a disciple know the result of undertakings of action past, future, and present, with reason and cause? Yes. If a disciple knows the result of undertakings of action past, future, and present, with reason and cause, then indeed sir, it should be said -

"The knowledge of the result of undertakings of action past, future, and present, with reason and cause, as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Does a disciple know the practice leading to all destinations? Yes. If a disciple knows the practice leading to all destinations, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of the practice leading to all destinations as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Does a disciple know the world with its many elements and various elements? Yes. If a disciple knows the world with its many elements and various elements, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of the world with its many elements and various elements as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Does a disciple know the various dispositions of beings? Yes. If a disciple knows the various dispositions of beings, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of the various dispositions of beings as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Does a disciple know the defilement, the cleansing, and the emergence from meditative absorptions, deliverances, concentrations, and attainments? Yes. If a disciple knows the defilement, the cleansing, and the emergence from meditative absorptions, deliverances, concentrations, and attainments, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of the defilement, the cleansing, and the emergence from meditative absorptions, deliverances, concentrations, and attainments as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Does a disciple know the recollection of past lives? Yes. If a disciple knows the recollection of past lives, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of the recollection of past lives as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Does a disciple know the death and rebirth of beings? Yes. If a disciple knows the death and rebirth of beings, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of the death and rebirth of beings as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, is common to disciples."

Is it not that the mental corruptions are eliminated for the Truth-finder and the mental corruptions are eliminated for the disciple? Yes. Is there any difference between the Truth-finder or the disciple regarding the elimination of mental corruptions with the elimination of mental corruptions, or regarding liberation with liberation? There is not. If there is no difference between the Truth-finder or the disciple regarding the elimination of mental corruptions with the elimination of mental corruptions, or regarding liberation with liberation, then indeed sir, it should be said - "The knowledge of phenomena as they really are regarding the elimination of mental corruptions is a power of the Truth-finder common to disciples."

356. Is the knowledge of phenomena as they really are regarding the elimination of mental corruptions a power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of phenomena as they really are regarding the elimination of mental corruptions a power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? Yes. Is the knowledge of phenomena as they really are regarding the elimination of mental corruptions a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? Yes. Is the knowledge of phenomena as they really are regarding the elimination of mental corruptions a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the superiority and inferiority of faculties as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? That should not be said, etc.

Is the knowledge of the superiority and inferiority of faculties as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? Yes. Etc. Is the knowledge of phenomena as they really are regarding the elimination of mental corruptions a power of the Truth-finder not common to disciples? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the knowledge of the superiority and inferiority of faculties as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, common to disciples? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of phenomena as they really are regarding the elimination of mental corruptions a power of the Truth-finder common to disciples? Yes. Is the knowledge of the superiority and inferiority of faculties as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, common to disciples? That should not be said. Etc.

The Treatise on Power is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(22) 2. The Discussion on the Noble One

357. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? 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.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? Yes. Does it have emptiness as object? That should not be said. Etc. Does it have emptiness as object? Yes. Does one attend to the possible and impossible, and attend to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc.

Does one attend to the possible and impossible, and attend to emptiness? Yes. Is there a combination of two contacts and two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? Yes. Does it have the signless as object? Etc. Does it have the desireless as object? That should not be said. Etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Does one attend to the possible and impossible, and attend to the desireless? That should not be said. Etc.

Does one attend to the possible and impossible, and attend to the desireless? Yes. Is there a combination of two contacts and two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

358. Are the establishments of mindfulness noble with the object of emptiness? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the object of emptiness? That should not be said. Etc.

Are the establishments of mindfulness noble with the signless object, etc. with the desireless object? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the desireless object? That should not be said. Etc.

Are the right strivings, bases for spiritual power, faculties, powers, factors of enlightenment noble with the object of emptiness? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the object of emptiness? That should not be said. Etc.

Are the factors of enlightenment noble with the signless object, with the desireless object? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the desireless object? That should not be said. Etc.

359. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, noble, not to be said - "to have the object of emptiness"? Yes. Are the establishments of mindfulness noble not to be said - "to have the object of emptiness"? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, noble, not to be said - to have the signless as object, etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Are the establishments of mindfulness noble not to be said - "to have the desireless as object"? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, noble, not to be said - to have the object of emptiness, etc. to have the signless as object, etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. The right strivings, etc. Are the factors of enlightenment noble not to be said - "to have the desireless as object"? That should not be said. Etc.

360. Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? 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 knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? Yes. Does it have emptiness as object? That should not be said. Etc. Does it have emptiness as object? Yes. Does one attend to the passing away and rebirth of beings, and attend to emptiness? That should not be said. Etc.

Does one attend to the passing away and rebirth of beings, and attend to emptiness? Yes. Is there a combination of two contacts and two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? Yes. Does it have the signless as object, the desireless as object? That should not be said. Etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Does one attend to the passing away and rebirth of beings, and attend to the desireless? That should not be said. Etc.

Does one attend to the passing away and rebirth of beings, and attend to the desireless? Yes. Is there a combination of two contacts and two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

361. Are the establishments of mindfulness noble with the object of emptiness, etc. with the signless object, etc. with the desireless object? Yes. Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the desireless object? That should not be said. Etc.

The right strivings, etc. Are the factors of enlightenment noble with the object of emptiness, etc. with the signless object, etc. with the desireless object? Yes. Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the desireless object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble not to be said - to have the object of emptiness, etc. to have the signless as object, etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Are the establishments of mindfulness noble not to be said - "to have the desireless as object"? That should not be said. Etc.

362. Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble not to be said - to have the object of emptiness, etc. to have the signless as object, etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Are the right strivings, etc. Are the factors of enlightenment noble not to be said - "to have the desireless as object"? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? Yes. Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not to be said - "noble"? Yes. Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not to be said - "noble"? That

should not be said, etc.

Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not to be said - "noble"? Yes. Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder not to be said - "noble"? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the object of emptiness? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the object of emptiness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the signless object... Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the desireless object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the object of emptiness, etc. to have the signless as object, etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Etc. Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble with the desireless object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, noble, not to be said - "to have the object of emptiness"? Yes. Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble not to be said - "to have the object of emptiness"? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the possible and impossible as it really is, a power of the Truth-finder, noble, not to be said - to have the signless as object... Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble not to be said - "to have the desireless as object"? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble not to be said - to have the object of emptiness, etc. to have the signless as object, etc. Does it have the desireless as object? Yes. Is the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions as it really is a power of the Truth-finder noble not to be said - "to have the desireless as object"? That should not be said. Etc.

The Discussion on the Noble One is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(23) 3. The Discussion on Liberation

363. Does a mind with lust become liberated? Yes. Does a mind accompanied by lust, conascent with lust, conjoined with lust, associated with lust, arising together with lust, following along with lust, unwholesome, mundane, with mental corruptions, subject to mental fetters, subject to mental knots, subject to mental floods, subject to mental bonds, subject to mental hindrances, adhered to, subject to clinging, subject to defilement become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a mind with contact become liberated, and do both contact and mind become liberated? Yes. Does a mind with lust become liberated, and do both lust and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

With feeling, etc. With perception, etc. With volition, etc. Does a mind with wisdom become liberated, and do both wisdom and mind become liberated? Yes. Does a mind with lust become liberated, and do both lust and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a mind with contact and with lust become liberated, and do both contact and mind become liberated? Yes. Do both lust and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

With feeling and with lust, etc. With perception and with lust, etc. With volition and with lust, etc. Does a mind with wisdom and with lust become liberated, and do both wisdom and mind become liberated? Yes. Do both lust and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

364. Does a mind with hate become liberated? Yes. Does a mind accompanied by hate, conascent with hate, conjoined with hate, associated with hate, arising together with hate, following along with hate, unwholesome, mundane, with mental corruptions, etc. subject to defilement become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a mind with contact become liberated, and do both contact and mind become liberated? Yes. Does a mind with hate become liberated, and do both hate and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

With feeling, etc. With perception, etc. With volition, etc. Does a mind with wisdom become liberated, and do both wisdom and mind become liberated? Yes. Does a mind with hate become liberated, and do both hate and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a mind with contact and with hate become liberated, and do both contact and mind become liberated? Yes. Does a mind with hate become liberated, and do both hate and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

With feeling and with hate... With perception and with hate... With volition and with hate... Does a mind with wisdom and with hate become liberated, and do both wisdom and mind become liberated? Yes. And do both hate and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

365. Does a mind with delusion become liberated? Yes. Does a mind accompanied by delusion, conascent with delusion, conjoined with delusion, associated with delusion, arising together with delusion, following along with delusion, unwholesome, mundane, with mental corruptions, etc. subject to defilement become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a mind with contact become liberated, and do both contact and mind become liberated? Yes. Does a mind with delusion become liberated, and do both delusion and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

With feeling... With perception... With volition... Does a mind with wisdom become liberated, and do both wisdom and mind become liberated? Yes. Does a mind with delusion become liberated, and do both delusion and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a mind with contact and with delusion become liberated, and do both contact and mind become liberated? Yes. Do both delusion and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

With feeling and with delusion... With perception and with delusion... With volition and with delusion... Etc. Does a mind with wisdom and with delusion become liberated, and do both wisdom and mind become liberated? Yes. Do both delusion and mind become liberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Does a mind with lust, with hate, with delusion become liberated? Yes. Does a mind without lust, without hate, without delusion, free from mental defilement become liberated? That should not be said. Etc. Well then, it should not be said - "A mind with lust, with hate, with delusion becomes liberated."

The Discussion on Liberation is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(24) 4. The Discussion on Being Liberated

366. Is what is liberated being liberated? Yes. Is one in part liberated, in part unliberated? That should not be said. Etc.

Is one in part liberated, in part unliberated? Yes. Is one in part a stream-enterer, in part not a stream-enterer, in part one who has attained, obtained, achieved, realised the fruition of stream-entry, enters and dwells, dwells having touched with the body, in part does not dwell having touched with the body, in part one with seven rebirths at the utmost, a family-to-family goer, one who has sown the seed of rebirth one last time, endowed with unwavering confidence in the Buddha, in the Teaching... etc. towards the Community, etc. endowed with morality pleasing to the noble ones, in part not endowed with morality pleasing to the noble ones? That should not be said. Etc.

Is one in part liberated, in part unliberated? Yes. Is one in part a once-returner, in part not a once-returner, in part one who has attained, obtained, achieved, realised the fruition of once-returning, enters and dwells, dwells having touched with the body, in part does not dwell having touched with the body? That should not be said. Etc.

Is one in part liberated, in part unliberated? Yes. Is one in part a non-returner, in part not a non-returner, in part one who has attained, obtained, achieved, realised the fruition of non-returning, enters and dwells, dwells having touched with the body, in part does not dwell having touched with the body, in part an attainer of final nibbāna in the interval, an attainer of final nibbāna after the interval, an attainer of final nibbāna without exertion, an attainer of final nibbāna through exertion, an upstream-goer towards the divine world Akaniṭṭha, in part not an upstream-goer towards the divine world Akaniṭṭha? That should not be said. Etc.

Is one in part liberated, in part unliberated? Yes. Is one in part a Worthy One, in part not a Worthy One, in part one who has attained, obtained, achieved, realised arahantship, enters and dwells, dwells having touched with the body, in part does not dwell having touched with the body, in part without lust, without hate, without delusion... etc. in part what should be realised has been realised, in part what should be realised has not been realised? That should not be said. Etc.

Is what is liberated being liberated? Yes. Is it liberated at the moment of arising, being liberated at the moment of dissolution? That should not be said. Etc.

367. Should it not be said - "What is liberated is being liberated"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "For one knowing thus, seeing thus, the mind becomes liberated from the mental corruption of sensuality, the mind becomes liberated from the mental corruption of existence, the mind becomes liberated from the mental corruption of ignorance"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should be said - "What is liberated is being liberated."

Is what is liberated being liberated? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "When the mind is thus concentrated, pure, bright, without blemish, free from impurities, supple, wieldy, stable, and having attained imperturbability, he inclines the mind towards the knowledge of the elimination of mental corruptions"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should not be said - "What is liberated is being liberated."

Is there consciousness being liberated? Yes. Is there consciousness being lustful, being hateful, being deluded, being defiled? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is lustful and non-lustful, hateful and non-hateful, deluded and non-deluded, cut and uncut, broken and unbroken, done and undone? Yes. If there is lustful and non-lustful, hateful and non-hateful, deluded and non-deluded, cut and uncut, broken and unbroken, done and undone, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is consciousness being liberated."

The Discussion on Being Liberated is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(25) 5. The Discussion on the Eighth-Path-Attainer

368. Has prepossession by views been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person a stream-enterer who has attained, obtained, achieved, realised the fruition of stream-entry, enters and dwells, dwells having touched with the body? That should not be said. Etc.

Has prepossession by sceptical doubt been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person a stream-enterer who has attained the fruition of stream-entry, etc. dwells having touched with the body? That should not be said. Etc.

Has prepossession by views been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has the underlying tendency to wrong view been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc. Has prepossession by views been

abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has the underlying tendency to sceptical doubt for the eighth-path-attainer person... has adherence to moral rules and austerities been abandoned? That should not be said. Etc.

Has prepossession by sceptical doubt been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has the underlying tendency to sceptical doubt been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc. Has prepossession by sceptical doubt been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has the underlying tendency to wrong view for the eighth-path-attainer person... has adherence to moral rules and austerities been abandoned? That should not be said. Etc.

Has the underlying tendency to wrong view not been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has prepossession by views not been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc. Has the underlying tendency to wrong view not been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has prepossession by sceptical doubt not been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc.

Has the underlying tendency to sceptical doubt for the eighth-path-attainer person... adherence to moral rules and austerities has not been abandoned? Yes. Has prepossession by views not been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc. For an eighth-path-attainer, adherence to moral rules and austerities has not been abandoned? Yes. Has prepossession by sceptical doubt not been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc.

369. Has prepossession by views been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has the path been developed for the abandoning of prepossession by views for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc. Has prepossession by views been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Have the establishments of mindfulness been developed for the abandoning of prepossession by views for the eighth-path-attainer person? Etc. The right strivings, etc. the factors of enlightenment have been developed? That should not be said.

Has prepossession by sceptical doubt been abandoned for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Has the path been developed for the abandoning of prepossession by sceptical doubt for the eighth-path-attainer person? Etc. the factors of enlightenment have been developed? That should not be said. Etc.

Has the path not been developed for the abandoning of prepossession by views for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Was it abandoned by a non-path, by what is mundane, with mental corruptions, etc. By what is defiling? That should not be said. Etc. Have the establishments of mindfulness not been developed for the abandoning of prepossession by views for the eighth-path-attainer person? Etc. Have the factors of enlightenment not been developed? Yes. Was it abandoned by a non-path, by what is mundane, with mental corruptions, etc. By what is defiling? That should not be said. Etc.

Has the path not been developed for the abandoning of prepossession by sceptical doubt for the eighth-path-attainer person? Etc. The establishments of mindfulness, etc. Have the factors of enlightenment not been developed? Yes. Was it abandoned by a non-path, by what is mundane, with mental corruptions, etc. By what is defiling? That should not be said. Etc.

370. Should it not be said - "For an eighth-path-attainer, prepossession by views has been abandoned"? Yes. Will it arise? It will not arise. If it will not arise, then indeed sir, it should be said - "For an eighth-path-attainer, prepossession by views has been abandoned."

Should it not be said - "For an eighth-path-attainer, prepossession by sceptical doubt has been abandoned"? Yes. Will it arise? It will not arise. If it will not arise, then indeed sir, it should be said - "For an eighth-path-attainer, prepossession by sceptical doubt has been abandoned."

Is prepossession by views abandoned for an eighth-path-attainer because it will not arise? Yes. Is the underlying tendency to wrong view abandoned for an eighth-path-attainer because it will not arise? That should not be said. Etc.

Is prepossession by views abandoned for an eighth-path-attainer because it will not arise? Yes. Has the underlying tendency to sceptical doubt for the eighth-path-attainer person... is adherence to moral rules and austerities abandoned because it will not arise? That should not be said. Etc.

Is prepossession by sceptical doubt abandoned for an eighth-path-attainer because it will not arise? Yes. Has the underlying tendency to sceptical doubt for the eighth-path-attainer person... is adherence to moral rules and austerities abandoned because it will not arise? That should not be said. Etc.

Is prepossession by views abandoned for an eighth-path-attainer because it will not arise? Yes. Is prepossession by views abandoned for a change-of-lineage person because it will not arise? That should not be said. Etc. Is prepossession by sceptical doubt abandoned for an eighth-path-attainer because it will not arise? Yes. Is prepossession by sceptical doubt abandoned for a change-of-lineage person because it will not arise? That should not be said. Etc.

The Discussion on the Eighth-Path-Attainer is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(26) 6. The Discussion on the Faculties of the Eighth-Path-Attainer

371. Is there no faith faculty for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Is there no faith for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Is there no energy faculty for the eighth-path-attainer person? Etc. Is there no mindfulness faculty? Etc. Is there no concentration faculty? Etc. Is there no wisdom faculty? Yes. Is there no wisdom for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there faith for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Is there faith faculty for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc. Is there energy for the eighth-path-attainer person? Etc. Is there mindfulness? Is there concentration? Is

there wisdom? Yes. Is there wisdom faculty for the eighth-path-attainer person? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there mind for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there mind faculty? Yes. Is there faith for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there faith faculty? That should not be said. Etc. Is there mind for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there mind faculty? Yes. Is there wisdom for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there wisdom faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the eighth-path-attainer person have pleasure, have the pleasure faculty, have life, have the life faculty? Yes. Is there faith for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there faith faculty? That should not be said. Etc. Does the eighth-path-attainer person have life, have the life faculty? Yes. For the eighth-path-attainer person, etc. Is there wisdom, is there the wisdom faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the eighth-path-attainer person have faith, not have the faith faculty? Yes. Does the eighth-path-attainer person have mind, not have the mind faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the eighth-path-attainer person have faith, not have the faith faculty? Yes. Does the eighth-path-attainer person have pleasure, not have the pleasure faculty? Etc. Is there life, is there not the life faculty? That should not be said. Etc. Does the eighth-path-attainer person have wisdom, not have the wisdom faculty? Yes. Does the eighth-path-attainer person have mind, not have the mind faculty? Is there pleasure, is there not the pleasure faculty? Is there life, is there not the life faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there no faith faculty for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person faithless? That should not be said. Etc. Does the eighth-path-attainer person not have the energy faculty? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person lazy, lacking in energy? That should not be said. Etc. Does the eighth-path-attainer person not have the mindfulness faculty? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person unmindful, not fully aware? That should not be said. Etc. Does the eighth-path-attainer person not have the concentration faculty? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person unconcentrated, with a wandering mind? That should not be said. Etc. Does the eighth-path-attainer person not have the wisdom faculty? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person unwise, an idiot? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the eighth-path-attainer person have faith, and is that faith leading to liberation? Yes. If the eighth-path-attainer person has faith, and that faith is leading to liberation, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The eighth-path-attainer person does not have the faith faculty." The eighth-path-attainer person has energy, and that energy is leading to liberation; there is mindfulness, and that mindfulness is leading to liberation; there is concentration, and that concentration is leading to liberation; there is wisdom, and is that wisdom leading to liberation? Yes. If the eighth-path-attainer person has wisdom, and that wisdom is leading to liberation, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The eighth-path-attainer person does not have the wisdom faculty."

372. Is there faith for a person practising for the realisation of the fruition of once-returning, is there faith faculty? Yes. Is there faith for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there faith faculty? That should not be said. Etc. Is there wisdom for a person practising for the realisation of the fruition of once-returning, is there wisdom faculty? Yes. Is there wisdom for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there wisdom faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

For a person practising for the realisation of the fruition of non-returning...For a person practising for the realisation of arahantship, is there faith, is there faith faculty? Etc. Is there wisdom, is there the wisdom faculty? Yes. Is there wisdom for the eighth-path-attainer person, is there wisdom faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the eighth-path-attainer person have faith, not have the faith faculty? Yes. Does a person practising for the realisation of the fruition of once-returning have faith, not have the faith faculty? That should not be said. Etc. Does the eighth-path-attainer person have wisdom, not have the wisdom faculty? Yes. Does a person practising for the realisation of the fruition of once-returning have wisdom, not have the wisdom faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the eighth-path-attainer person have faith, not have the faith faculty? Etc. Is there wisdom, not the wisdom faculty? Yes. For a person practising for the realisation of the fruition of non-returning... Does a person practising for the realisation of arahantship have wisdom, not have the wisdom faculty? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there no five spiritual faculties for the eighth-path-attainer person? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these five faculties! Which five? The faith faculty, the energy faculty, the mindfulness faculty, the concentration faculty, the wisdom faculty - these, monks, are the five faculties. Through the completeness and fulfilment of these five faculties, monks, one becomes a Worthy One. With those softer than that, one becomes one practising for the realisation of arahantship; with those softer than that, one becomes a non-returner; with those softer than that, one becomes one practising for the realisation of the fruition of non-returning; with those softer than that, one becomes a once-returner; with those softer than that, one becomes one practising for the realisation of the fruition of once-returning; with those softer than that, one becomes a stream-enterer; with those softer than that, one becomes one practising for the realisation of the fruition of stream-entry. For whom, monks, these five faculties are entirely, in every way, absent, that one I call 'an outsider, standing in the faction of worldlings'." Is there such a discourse? Yes. Is the eighth-path-attainer person an outsider, standing in the faction of worldlings? That should not be said. Etc. Well then, there are five spiritual faculties for the eighth-path-attainer person.

The Discussion on the Faculties of the Eighth-Path-Attainer is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(27) 7. The Discussion on the Divine Eye

373. Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Is the physical eye the divine eye, is the divine eye the physical eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Is the divine eye of such a kind as the physical eye, is the physical eye of such a kind as the divine eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Is that very physical eye that divine eye, is that divine eye that physical eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Is the domain, power and range of the divine eye of such a kind as the domain, power and range of the physical eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Having been clung-to, does it become not clung-to? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been clung-to, does it become not clung-to? Yes. Having been sensual-sphere, does it become fine-material-sphere? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been sensual-sphere, does it become fine-material-sphere? Yes. Having been fine-material-sphere, does it become immaterial-sphere? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been fine-material-sphere, does it become immaterial-sphere? Yes. Having been included, does it become not included? That should not be said. Etc.

374. Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Does the divine eye supported by mental states become the physical eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Does the divine eye supported by mental states become the eye of wisdom? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Does the divine eye supported by mental states become the physical eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical eye supported by mental states become the divine eye? Yes. Are there only two eyes? That should not be said. Etc. Are there only two eyes? Yes. Were not three eyes spoken of by the Blessed One - the physical eye, the divine eye, the eye of wisdom? Yes. If three eyes were spoken of by the Blessed One - the physical eye, the divine eye, the eye of wisdom, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "there are only two eyes."

Are there only two eyes? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are, monks, these three eyes! What three? The physical eye, the divine eye, the eye of wisdom - these, monks, are the three eyes."

"The physical eye, the divine eye, the unsurpassed eye of wisdom;
These three eyes, the highest of men declared.

"The arising of the physical eye is the path to the divine eye;
And when knowledge arose, the unsurpassed eye of wisdom;
By the attainment of that eye, one is freed from all suffering."

Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should not be said - "there are only two eyes."

The Discussion on the Divine Eye is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(28) 8. The Discussion on the Divine Ear

375. Does the physical ear supported by mental states become the divine ear? Yes. Is the physical ear the divine ear, is the divine ear the physical ear? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical ear supported by mental states become the divine ear? Yes. Is the divine ear of such a kind as the physical ear, is the physical ear of such a kind as the divine ear? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical ear supported by mental states become the divine ear? Yes. Is that very physical ear that divine ear, is that divine ear that physical ear? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical ear supported by mental states become the divine ear? Yes. Is the domain, power and range of the divine ear of such a kind as the domain, power and range of the physical ear? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical ear supported by mental states become the divine ear? Yes. Having been clung-to, does it become not clung-to? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been clung-to, does it become not clung-to? Yes. Having been sensual-sphere, does it become fine-material-sphere? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been sensual-sphere, does it become fine-material-sphere? Yes. Having been fine-material-sphere, does it become immaterial-sphere? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been fine-material-sphere, does it become immaterial-sphere? Yes. Having been included, does it become not included? That should not be said. Etc.

376. Does the physical ear supported by mental states become the divine ear? Yes. Does the divine ear supported by mental states become the physical ear? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the physical ear supported by mental states become the divine ear? Yes. Is it just one ear? That should not be said. Etc.

Is it just one ear? Yes. Were not two ears spoken of by the Blessed One - "the physical ear, the divine ear"? Yes. If two ears were spoken of by the Blessed One - the physical ear, the divine ear, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "it is just one ear."

The Discussion on the Divine Ear is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(29) 9. The Discussion on Knowledge of Rebirth According to Beings' Actions

377. Is the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions the divine eye? Yes. Does one attend to rebirth according to beings' actions and see materiality with the divine eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does one attend to rebirth according to beings' actions and see materiality with the divine eye? Yes. Is there a combination of two contacts and two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions the divine eye? Yes. Does one attend "These beings indeed, sirs" and attend "endowed with bodily misconduct" and attend "endowed with verbal misconduct" and attend "endowed with mental misconduct" and attend "revilers of the noble ones" and attend "holding wrong views" and attend "undertaking actions based on wrong views" and attend "upon the body's collapse at death, they have arisen in a realm of misery, an unfortunate realm, a nether world, in hell" and attend "but these beings, sirs" and attend "endowed with bodily good conduct" and attend "endowed with verbal good conduct" and attend "endowed with mental good conduct" and attend "not revilers of the noble ones" and attend "holding right views" and attend "undertaking actions based on right views" and attend "upon the body's collapse at death, they have arisen in a fortunate realm, in a heavenly world," and see materiality with the divine eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does one attend "upon the body's collapse at death, they have arisen in a fortunate realm, in a heavenly world" and see materiality with the divine eye? Yes. Is there a combination of two contacts and two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

378. Is the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions the divine eye? Yes. Is there anyone without the divine eye, who has not attained, not reached, not realised the divine eye, who knows rebirth according to beings' actions? Yes. If there is anyone without the divine eye, who has not attained, not reached, not realised the divine eye, who knows rebirth according to beings' actions, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions is the divine eye."

Is the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions the divine eye? Yes. Does the Venerable Sāriputta know the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions? Yes. If the Venerable Sāriputta knows the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions is the divine eye."

Is the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions the divine eye? Yes. Does the Venerable Sāriputta know the knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions? Yes. Does the Venerable Sāriputta have the divine eye? That should not be said. Etc.

Does the Venerable Sāriputta have the divine eye? Yes. Did not the Venerable Sāriputta say this -

"Neither for the knowledge of past lives, nor for the divine eye;
For the knowledge of others' minds, for supernormal power, for the purification
of the ear-element;
For death and rebirth, I have no aspiration."

Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should not be said - "The knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions is the divine eye."

The Discussion on Knowledge of Rebirth According to Beings' Actions is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(30) 10. The Discussion on Restraint

379. Is there restraint among the gods? Yes. Is there non-restraint among the gods? That should not be said. Etc.

There is no non-restraint among the gods? Yes. There is no restraint among the gods? That should not be said. Etc.

Is it not that restraint from non-restraint is morality, and there is restraint among the gods? Yes. Is there non-restraint among the gods, from which non-restraint restraint is morality? That should not be said. Etc.

Acknowledge the refutation. If restraint from non-restraint is morality, and there is restraint among the gods, then indeed sir, it should be said - "There is non-restraint among the gods, from which non-restraint restraint is morality." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'Restraint from non-restraint is morality, there is restraint among the gods,' but it should not be said - 'There is non-restraint among the gods, from which non-restraint restraint is morality'" - is wrong.

But if it should not be said - "There is non-restraint among the gods, from which non-restraint restraint is morality," then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Restraint from non-restraint is morality, there is restraint among the gods." What you say there - "It should be said indeed 'Restraint from non-restraint is morality, there is restraint among the gods,' but it should not be said - 'There is non-restraint among the gods, from which non-restraint restraint is morality'" - is wrong.

Is there restraint among human beings, and is there non-restraint there? Yes. Is there restraint among the gods, and is there non-restraint there? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there restraint among the gods, and there is no non-restraint there? Yes. Is there restraint among human beings, and there is no non-restraint there? That should not be said. Etc.

380. Is there abstention from killing living beings among the gods? Yes. Is there killing living beings among the gods? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among the gods? Yes. Is there spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among the gods? That should not be said. Etc.

There is no killing living beings among the gods? Yes. There is no abstention from killing living beings among the gods? That should not be said. Etc.

There is no spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among the gods? Yes. There is no abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among the gods? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there abstention from killing living beings among human beings, is there killing living beings there? Yes. Is there abstention from killing living beings among the gods, is there killing living beings there? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among human beings, is there spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence there? Yes. Is there abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among the gods, is there spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence there? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there abstention from killing living beings among the gods, there is no killing living beings there? Yes. Is there abstention from killing living beings among human beings, there is no killing living beings there? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among the gods, there is no spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence there? Yes. Is there abstention from spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence among human beings, there is no spirits, liquor and intoxicants that cause negligence there? That should not be said. Etc.

There is no restraint among the gods? Yes. Are all gods killers of living beings, takers of what is not given, those who engage in sexual misconduct, liars, those who indulge in spirits, liquor, and intoxicants causing heedlessness? That should not be said. Etc. Well then, there is restraint among the gods.

The Discussion on Restraint is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(31) 11. The Discussion on Non-Perception

381. Is there perception among non-percipient beings? Yes. Is it percipient existence, percipient destination, percipient abode of beings, percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, percipient mode of generation, acquisition of percipient individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

Is it not non-percipient existence, non-percipient destination, non-percipient abode of beings, non-percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, non-percipient mode of generation, acquisition of non-percipient individual existence? Yes. If it is non-percipient existence, non-percipient destination, non-percipient abode of beings, non-percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, non-percipient mode of generation, acquisition of non-percipient individual existence, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is perception among non-percipient beings."

Is there perception among non-percipient beings? Yes. Is it five-aggregate constituent existence, destination, abode of beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

Is it not single-aggregate constituent existence, destination, abode of beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence? Yes. If it is single-aggregate constituent existence, destination, abode of

beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is perception among non-percipient beings."

Is there perception among non-percipient beings? Yes. Does one perform what is to be done by perception with that perception? That should not be said. Etc.

382. There is perception among human beings, and is it percipient existence, percipient destination, percipient abode of beings, percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, percipient mode of generation, acquisition of percipient individual existence? Yes. There is perception among non-percipient beings, and is it percipient existence, percipient destination, abode of beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

There is perception among human beings, and is it five-aggregate constituent existence, destination, abode of beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence? Yes. There is perception among non-percipient beings, and is it five-aggregate constituent existence, destination, abode of beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

There is perception among human beings, does one perform what is to be done by perception with that perception? Yes. There is perception among non-percipient beings, does one perform what is to be done by perception with that perception? That should not be said. Etc.

There is perception among non-percipient beings, and is it non-percipient existence, non-percipient destination, non-percipient abode of beings, non-percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, non-percipient mode of generation, acquisition of non-percipient individual existence? Yes. There is perception among human beings, and is it non-percipient existence, non-percipient destination, etc. acquisition of non-percipient individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

There is perception among non-percipient beings, and is it single-aggregate constituent existence, destination, abode of beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence? Yes. There is perception among human beings, and is it single-aggregate constituent existence, destination, etc. acquisition of individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

There is perception among non-percipient beings, and does one not perform what is to be done by perception with that perception? Yes. There is perception among human beings, and does one not perform what is to be done by perception with that perception? That should not be said. Etc.

383. Should it not be said - "There is perception among non-percipient beings"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Monks, there are gods called 'non-percipient beings'; and when perception arises, those gods pass away from that realm"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, there is perception among non-percipient beings.

Is there perception among non-percipient beings? At some time there is, at some time there is not. At some time percipient beings, at some time non-percipient beings; at some time percipient existence, at some time non-percipient existence; at

some time five-aggregate constituent existence, at some time single-aggregate constituent existence? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there perception among non-percipient beings at some time, and at some time there is not? Yes. At what time is there, at what time is there not? At the time of death and at the time of rebirth there is, at the time of duration there is not. At the time of death and at the time of rebirth percipient beings, at the time of duration non-percipient beings; at the time of death and at the time of rebirth percipient existence, at the time of duration non-percipient existence; at the time of death and at the time of rebirth five-aggregate constituent existence, at the time of duration single-aggregate constituent existence? That should not be said. Etc.

The Discussion on Non-Perception is concluded.

3. The Third Chapter

(32) 12. The Discussion on the Plane of Neither-Perception-Nor-Non-Perception

384. In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception"? Yes. Is it non-percipient existence, non-percipient destination, non-percipient abode of beings, non-percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, non-percipient mode of generation, acquisition of non-percipient individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

Is it not percipient existence, percipient destination, percipient abode of beings, percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, percipient mode of generation, acquisition of percipient individual existence? Yes. If it is percipient existence, percipient destination, etc. acquisition of percipient individual existence, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - 'there is perception'".

In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception"? Yes. Is it single-aggregate constituent existence, destination, etc. acquisition of individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

Is it not four-aggregate constituent existence, destination, etc. acquisition of individual existence? Yes. If it is four-aggregate constituent existence, destination, etc. acquisition of individual existence, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - 'there is perception'".

385. Among non-percipient beings it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it non-percipient existence, non-percipient destination, non-percipient abode of beings, non-percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, non-percipient mode of generation, acquisition of non-percipient individual existence? Yes. In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it non-percipient existence, non-percipient destination, non-percipient abode of beings, non-percipient wandering in the round of rebirths, non-percipient mode of generation, acquisition of non-percipient individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

Among non-percipient beings it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it single-aggregate constituent existence, destination, etc. acquisition of individual existence? Yes. In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it single-aggregate constituent existence, destination, abode of beings, wandering in the round of rebirths, mode of generation, acquisition of individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it percipient existence, percipient destination, etc. acquisition of percipient individual existence? Yes. Among non-percipient beings it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it percipient existence, percipient destination, etc. acquisition of percipient individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it four-aggregate constituent existence, destination, etc. acquisition of individual existence? Yes. Among non-percipient beings it should not be said - "there is perception," and is it four-aggregate constituent existence, destination, etc. acquisition of individual existence? That should not be said. Etc.

In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception"? Yes. Is it not that the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence? Yes. If the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - 'there is perception'".

386. The plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception"? Yes. The plane of infinite space is four-aggregate constituent existence, in the plane of infinite space it should not be said - "there is perception"? That should not be said. Etc.

The plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception"? Yes. The plane of infinite consciousness, etc. the plane of nothingness is four-aggregate constituent existence, in the plane of nothingness it should not be said - "there is perception"? That should not be said. Etc.

The plane of infinite space is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? Yes. The plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? That should not be said. Etc.

The plane of infinite consciousness, etc. the plane of nothingness is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? Yes. The plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? That should not be said. Etc.

In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception" or "there is not"? Yes. Is it not that the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence? Yes. If the plane of neither-

perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - 'there is perception' or 'there is not.'"

The plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception" or "there is not"? Yes. The plane of infinite space, etc. The plane of infinite consciousness, etc. the plane of nothingness is four-aggregate constituent existence, in the plane of nothingness it should not be said - "there is perception" or "there is not"? That should not be said. Etc.

The plane of infinite space is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? Yes. The plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? That should not be said. Etc.

The plane of infinite consciousness, etc. the plane of nothingness is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? Yes. The plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception is four-aggregate constituent existence, is there perception there? That should not be said. Etc.

In the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception" or "there is not"? Yes. Is it not the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception? Yes. If it is the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, then indeed sir, it should be said - "in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - 'there is perception' or 'there is not.'"

Having made it the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, in the plane of neither-perception-nor-non-perception it should not be said - "there is perception" or "there is not"? Yes. Having made it neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling, regarding neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant feeling it should not be said - "feeling" or "non-feeling"? That should not be said. Etc.

The Discussion on the Plane of Neither-Perception-Nor-Non-Perception is concluded.

The Third Chapter.

Its summary:

Power, common, noble, a mind with lust becomes liberated;
Liberated, being liberated, there is consciousness being liberated.

For an eighth-path-attainer, prepossession by views has been abandoned;
For an eighth-path-attainer, there are no five faculties, eye.

Ear, supported by mental states, knowledge of rebirth according to beings' actions;

Restraint among the gods, perception among non-percipient beings, just so the peak of existence.



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). The Triple Canon. 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching. 05. Points of Controversy. 3. Third 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