

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)

5. Discussion on Everything Existing
(5. Sabbamatthītikathā)

[Kv 1.6, PTS 116-143]



PaliVerse

05. Points of Controversy

5. Discussion on Everything Existing

1. Logical Consistency of the Argument

282. Does everything exist? Yes. Does everything exist everywhere? That should not be said. Does everything exist? Yes. Does everything exist always? That should not be said. Does everything exist? Yes. Does everything exist entirely in every way? That should not be said. Does everything exist? Yes. Does everything exist in all things? That should not be said. Does everything exist? Yes. Having made a non-connection, does everything exist? That should not be said. Does everything exist? Yes. Does even what does not exist, exist? That should not be said. Does everything exist? Yes. The view that "everything exists" - that view is wrong view; the view that that view is right view - is it thus? That should not be said. (Abbreviated) Logical consistency of the argument.

2. Comparison by Time

283. Is there the past? Yes. Is not the past ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away? Yes. If the past is ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is the past."

Is there the future? Yes. Is not the future unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest? Yes. If the future is unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is the future."

Is there the present, and is the present not ceased, not disappeared, not changed, not passed away, not completely passed away? Yes. Is there the past, and is the past not ceased, not disappeared, not changed, not passed away, not completely passed away? That should not be said. Etc. Is there the present, and is the present born, come to be, produced, generated, fully generated, become manifest? Yes. Is there the future, and is the future born, come to be, produced, generated, fully generated, become manifest? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there the past, and is the past ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away? Yes. Is there the present, and is the present ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away? That should not be said. Etc. Is there the future, and is the future unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest? Yes. Is there the present, and is the present unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest? That should not be said.

284. Is there past matter? Yes. Is not past matter ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away? Yes. If past matter is ceased, etc. completely passed away, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is past matter."

Is there future matter? Yes. Is not future matter unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest? Yes. If future matter is unborn, etc. not become manifest, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is future matter."

Is there present matter, and is present matter not ceased, not disappeared, not changed, not passed away, not completely passed away? Yes. Is there past matter, and is past matter not ceased, not disappeared, not changed, not passed away, not completely passed away? That should not be said.

Is there present matter, and is present matter born, come to be, produced, generated, fully generated, become manifest? Yes. Is there future matter, and is future matter born, come to be, produced, generated, fully generated, become manifest? That should not be said.

Is there past matter, and is past matter ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away? Yes. Is there present matter, and is present matter ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away? That should not be said.

Is there future matter, and is future matter unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest? Yes. Is there present matter, and is present matter unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest? That should not be said.

There is past feeling, etc. there is perception, there are activities, is there consciousness? Yes. Is not past consciousness ceased, disappeared, changed, passed away, completely passed away? Yes. If past consciousness is ceased, etc. completely passed away, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is past consciousness."

Is there future consciousness? Yes. Is not future consciousness unborn, not become, not produced, not generated, not fully generated, not become manifest? Yes. If future consciousness is unborn, etc. not become manifest, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is future consciousness."

Is there present consciousness, and is present consciousness not ceased, etc. not completely passed away? Yes. Is there past consciousness, and is past consciousness not ceased, etc. not completely passed away? That should not be said.

Is there present consciousness, and is present consciousness born, etc. become manifest? Yes. Is there future consciousness, and is future consciousness born, etc. become manifest? That should not be said.

Is there past consciousness, and is past consciousness ceased, etc. completely passed away? Yes. Is there present consciousness, and is present consciousness ceased, etc. completely passed away? That should not be said. Is there future consciousness, and is future consciousness unborn, etc. not become manifest? Yes.

Is there present consciousness, and is present consciousness unborn, etc. not become manifest? That should not be said.

285. "Present" or "matter," or "matter" or "present," having made present matter inseparable, are these the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind? Yes. Does present matter when ceasing give up the state of being present? Yes. Does it give up the state of being matter? That should not be said. Etc.

"Present" or "matter," or "matter" or "present," having made present matter inseparable, are these the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind? Yes. Does present matter when ceasing not give up the state of being matter? Yes. Does it not give up the state of being present? That should not be said. Etc.

"White" or "cloth," or "cloth" or "white," having made white cloth inseparable, are these the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind? Yes. Does white cloth when being dyed give up the state of being white? Yes. Does it give up the state of being cloth? That should not be said.

"White" or "cloth," or "cloth" or "white," having made white cloth inseparable, are these the same in meaning, equal, of equal share, of the same kind? Yes. Does white cloth when being dyed not give up the state of being cloth? Yes. Does it not give up the state of being white? That should not be said. Etc.

286. Does matter not give up the state of being matter? Yes. Is matter permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Is it not that matter does not give up the state of being matter, and matter is impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. If matter is impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "matter does not give up the state of being matter."

Does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? Yes. Does matter not give up the state of being matter, and is matter permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc. Does matter not give up the state of being matter, and is matter impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. Does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there the past, and does the past not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is there the future, and does the future not give up the state of being future? That should not be said. Is there the past, and does the past not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is there the present, and does the present not give up the state of being present? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there the future, and does the future give up the state of being future? Yes. Is there the past, and does the past give up the state of being past? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there the present, and does the present give up the state of being present? Yes. Is there the past, and does the past give up the state of being past? That should not be said.

Is there the past, and does the past not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is the past permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc. Is not the past impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. If the

past is impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is the past, and the past does not give up the state of being past."

Is there Nibbāna, and does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? Yes. Is there the past, and does the past not give up the state of being past, and is the past permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there the past, and does the past not give up the state of being past, and is the past impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. Is there Nibbāna, and does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

287. Is there past matter, and does past matter not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is there future matter, and does future matter not give up the state of being future? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past matter, and does past matter not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is there present matter, and does present matter not give up the state of being present? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there future matter, and does future matter give up the state of being future? Yes. Is there past matter, and does past matter give up the state of being past? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there present matter, and does present matter give up the state of being present? Yes. Is there past matter, and does past matter give up the state of being past? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past matter, and does past matter not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is past matter permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc. Is not past matter impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. If past matter is impermanent, etc. subject to change, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is past matter, and past matter does not give up the state of being past."

Is there Nibbāna, and does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? Yes. Is there past matter, and does past matter not give up the state of being past, and is past matter permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past matter, and does past matter not give up the state of being past, and is past matter impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. Is there Nibbāna, and does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

There is past feeling... there is past perception... there are past activities... Is there past consciousness, and does past consciousness not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is there future consciousness, and does future consciousness not give up the state of being future? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past consciousness, and

does past consciousness not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is there present consciousness, and does present consciousness not give up the state of being present? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there future consciousness, and does future consciousness give up the state of being future? Yes. Is there past consciousness, and does past consciousness give up the state of being past? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there present consciousness, and does present consciousness give up the state of being present? Yes. Is there past consciousness, and does past consciousness give up the state of being past? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past consciousness, and does past consciousness not give up the state of being past? Yes. Is past consciousness permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc. Is not past consciousness impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. If past consciousness is impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is past consciousness, and past consciousness does not give up the state of being past."

Is there Nibbāna, and does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? Yes. Is there past consciousness, and does past consciousness not give up the state of being past, and is past consciousness permanent, stable, eternal, not subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past consciousness, and does past consciousness not give up the state of being past, and is past consciousness impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? Yes. Is there Nibbāna, and does Nibbāna not give up the state of being Nibbāna, and is Nibbāna impermanent, inconstant, non-eternal, subject to change? That should not be said. Etc.

Purification of Expression

288. Is there not the past? Yes. If there is not the past, "there is the past" is wrong. Or else if there is not the past, "there is the past" is wrong. Is there not the future? Yes. If there is not the future, "there is the future" is wrong. Or else if there is not the future, "there is the future" is wrong.

Having been future, does it become present? Yes. Is that very future that present? That should not be said. Etc. Is that very future that present? Yes. Having been, does it exist; having been, does it exist? That should not be said. Etc. Having been, does it exist; having been, does it exist? Yes. Not having been, does it not exist; not having been, does it not exist? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been present, does it become past? Yes. Is that very present that past? That should not be said. Etc. Is that very present that past? Yes. Having been, does it exist; having been, does it exist? That should not be said. Etc. Having been, does it exist; having been, does it exist? Yes. Not having been, does it not exist; not having been, does it not exist? That should not be said. Etc.

Having been future, does it become present; having been present, does it become past? Yes. Is that very same future that present, that past? That should not be said.

Etc. Is that very same future that present, that past? Yes. Having been, does it exist; having been, does it exist? That should not be said. Etc. Having been, does it exist; having been, does it exist? Yes. Not having been, does it not exist; not having been, does it not exist? That should not be said.

Discussion on Past Eye and Form and So Forth

289. Is there past eye, are there forms, is there eye-consciousness, is there light, is there attention? Yes. Does one see past form with the past eye? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past ear, are there sounds, is there ear-consciousness, is there space, is there attention? Yes. Does one hear past sound with the past ear? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past nose, are there odours, is there nose-consciousness, is there air, is there attention? Yes. Does one smell past odour with the past nose? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past tongue, are there flavours, is there tongue-consciousness, is there water, is there attention? Yes. Does one taste past flavour with the past tongue? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past body, are there tangible objects, is there body-consciousness, is there earth, is there attention? Yes. Does one touch past tangible object with the past body? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past mind, are there mental phenomena, is there mind-consciousness, is there sense-base, is there attention? Yes. Does one cognise past mental phenomenon with the past mind? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there future eye, are there forms, is there eye-consciousness, is there light, is there attention? Yes. Does one see future form with the future eye? That should not be said. Etc. Is there future ear... Is there nose... Is there tongue... there is body... Is there mind, are there mental phenomena, is there mind-consciousness, is there sense-base, is there attention? Yes. Does one cognise future mental phenomenon with the future mind? That should not be said. Etc.

There is present eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention; does one see present matter with the present eye? Yes. There is past eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention; does one see past matter with the past eye? That should not be said. Etc. There is present ear... Is there nose... Is there tongue... there is body... there is mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is sense-base, there is attention; does one cognise present mental phenomena with the present mind? Yes. There is past mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is sense-base, there is attention; does one cognise past mental phenomena with the past mind? That should not be said. Etc.

There is present eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention; does one see present matter with the present eye? Yes. There is future eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention; does one see future matter with the future eye? That should not be said. Etc. there is present ear... Is there nose... Is there tongue... there is body... there is mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is sense-base, there is attention; does one cognise present mental phenomena with the present mind? Yes. There is future mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is sense-base, there is attention; does one cognise future mental phenomena with the future mind? That should not be said. Etc.

There is past eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention, and does one not see past matter with the past eye? Yes. There is present eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention, and does one not see present matter with the present eye? That should not be said. Etc. there is past ear... Is there nose... Is there tongue... there is body... there is mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is sense-base, there is attention, and does one not cognise past mental phenomena with the past mind? Yes. There is present mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is sense-base, there is attention, and does one not cognise present mental phenomena with the present mind? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there the future eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention, and yet with the future eye one does not see future form? Yes. There is present eye, there are forms, there is eye-consciousness, there is light, there is attention, and does one not see present matter with the present eye? That should not be said. Etc. Is there future ear... Is there nose... Is there tongue... there is body... Is there the mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is the sense-base, there is attention, and yet with the future mind one does not cognise future mental phenomena? Yes. There is present mind, there are mental phenomena, there is mind-consciousness, there is sense-base, there is attention, and does one not cognise present mental phenomena with the present mind? That should not be said. Etc.

Discussion on Past Knowledge and So Forth

290. Is there past knowledge? Yes. Does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. Does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? Yes. Does one fully understand suffering, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there future knowledge? Yes. Does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. Does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? Yes. Does one fully understand suffering, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc.

There is present knowledge; does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? Yes. There is past knowledge; does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. There is present knowledge; does one fully understand suffering, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path by that knowledge? Yes. There is past knowledge; does one fully understand suffering, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. There is present knowledge; does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? Yes. There is future knowledge; does one perform the function of knowledge by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. There is present knowledge; does one fully understand suffering, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path by that knowledge? Yes. There is future knowledge; does one fully understand suffering, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path by that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc.

There is past knowledge, and does one not perform the function of knowledge with

that knowledge? Yes. There is present knowledge, and does one not perform the function of knowledge with that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. There is past knowledge, and does one not fully understand suffering with that knowledge, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path? Yes. There is present knowledge, and does one not fully understand suffering with that knowledge, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path? That should not be said. Etc.

There is future knowledge, and does one not perform the function of knowledge with that knowledge? Yes. There is present knowledge, and does one not perform the function of knowledge with that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. There is future knowledge, and does one not fully understand suffering with that knowledge, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path? Yes. There is present knowledge, and does one not fully understand suffering with that knowledge, abandon origin, realise cessation, develop the path? That should not be said. Etc.

Discussion on Worthy Ones and So Forth

291. Is there past lust of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with lust on account of that lust? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past hate of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with hate on account of that hate? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past delusion of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with delusion on account of that delusion? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past conceit of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with conceit on account of that conceit? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past wrong view of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with wrong view on account of that wrong view? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past sceptical doubt of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with sceptical doubt on account of that sceptical doubt? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past sloth of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with sloth on account of that sloth? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past restlessness of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with restlessness on account of that restlessness? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past shamelessness of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with shamelessness on account of that shamelessness? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past moral fearlessness of a Worthy One? Yes. Is the Worthy One with moral fearlessness on account of that moral fearlessness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a non-returner? Yes. Is a non-returner one with that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a non-returner, there is past adherence to moral rules and austerities, there is past residual sensual lust, is there past residual anger? Yes. Is a non-returner one with corrupted mind due to that anger? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a once-returner? Yes. Is a once-returner one with that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a once-returner, there is past adherence to moral rules and austerities, there is past gross sensual lust, is there past gross anger? Yes. Is a once-returner one with corrupted mind due to that anger? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a stream-enterer? Yes. Is a stream-enterer one with that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a stream-enterer, there is past adherence to moral rules and austerities, there is past lust

leading to the realms of misery, there is past hate leading to the realms of misery, is there past delusion leading to the realms of misery? Yes. Is a stream-enterer one with delusion due to that delusion? That should not be said. Etc.

292. Is there past lust for a worldling, is the worldling with lust on account of that lust? Yes. Is there past lust for a Worthy One, is the Worthy One with lust on account of that lust? That should not be said. Etc. there is past hate for a worldling, etc. is there past moral fearlessness, is the worldling without moral fear on account of that moral fearlessness? Yes. Is there past moral fearlessness for a Worthy One, is the Worthy One without moral fear on account of that moral fearlessness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a worldling, is the worldling one with that view on account of that view? Yes. Is there past identity view for a non-returner, is the non-returner one with that view on account of that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a worldling, etc. is there past subtle anger, is the worldling one with corrupted mind on account of that anger? Yes. Is there past subtle anger for a non-returner, is the non-returner one with corrupted mind on account of that anger? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a worldling, is the worldling one with that view on account of that view? Yes. Is there past identity view for a once-returner, is the once-returner one with that view on account of that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a worldling, is there past gross anger, is the worldling one with corrupted mind on account of that anger? Yes. Is there past gross anger for a once-returner, is the once-returner one with corrupted mind on account of that anger? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a worldling, is the worldling one with that view on account of that view? Yes. Is there past identity view for a stream-enterer, is the stream-enterer one with that view on account of that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a worldling, etc. is there past delusion leading to the realms of misery, is the worldling with delusion on account of that delusion? Yes. Is there past delusion leading to the realms of misery for a stream-enterer, is the stream-enterer with delusion on account of that delusion? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past lust of a Worthy One, and is the Worthy One not with lust on account of that lust? Yes. Is there past lust of a worldling, and is the worldling not with lust on account of that lust? That should not be said. Etc. there is past hate of a Worthy One, etc. there is past moral fearlessness, and is the Worthy One not with moral fearlessness on account of that moral fearlessness? Yes. Is there past moral fearlessness of a worldling, and is the worldling not with moral fearlessness on account of that moral fearlessness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a non-returner, and is the non-returner not one with that view on account of that view? Yes. Is there past identity view of a worldling, and is the worldling not one with that view on account of that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a non-returner, etc. there is past residual anger, and is the non-returner not one with corrupted mind due to that anger? Yes. Is there past residual anger of a worldling, and is the worldling not one with corrupted

mind due to that anger? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a once-returner, and is the once-returner not one with that view on account of that view? Yes. Is there past identity view of a worldling, and is the worldling not one with that view on account of that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a once-returner, etc. there is past gross anger, and is the once-returner not one with corrupted mind due to that anger? Yes. Is there past gross anger of a worldling, and is the worldling not one with corrupted mind due to that anger? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past identity view for a stream-enterer, and is the stream-enterer not one with that view on account of that view? Yes. Is there past identity view of a worldling, and is the worldling not one with that view on account of that view? That should not be said. Etc. there is past sceptical doubt for a stream-enterer, etc. there is past delusion leading to the realms of misery, and is the stream-enterer not one with delusion on account of that delusion? Yes. Is there past delusion leading to the realms of misery of a worldling, and is the worldling not one with delusion on account of that delusion? That should not be said. Etc.

Discussion on Past Hands and So Forth

293. Are there past hands? Yes. When there are past hands, is picking up and putting down discerned? That should not be said. Etc. Are there past feet? Yes. When there are past feet, is going forward and going back discerned? That should not be said. Etc. Are there past joints? Yes. When there are past joints, is bending and stretching discerned? That should not be said. Etc. Is there a past belly? Yes. When there is a past belly, is hunger and thirst discerned? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there a past body? Yes. Is the past body subject to lifting up and putting down, subject to cutting and breaking, common to crows, vultures, and hawks? That should not be said. Etc. Would poison penetrate the past body, would a knife penetrate, would fire penetrate? That should not be said. Etc. Is it possible to bind the past body with bondage by fetters, to bind with bondage by ropes, to bind with bondage by chains, to bind with bondage to a village, to bind with bondage to a market town, to bind with bondage to a city, to bind with bondage to a province, to bind with the five bonds including the neck? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past water? Yes. Does one do with that water what is to be done with water? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past fire? Yes. Does one do with that fire what is to be done with fire? That should not be said. Etc. Is there past air? Yes. Does one do with that air what is to be done with air? That should not be said. Etc.

Discussion on Combination of Past Aggregates and So Forth

294. Is there past aggregate of matter, is there future aggregate of matter, is there present aggregate of matter? Yes. Are there three aggregates of matter? That should not be said, etc. Are there past five aggregates, are there future five aggregates, are there present five aggregates? Yes. Are there fifteen aggregates? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past eye sense base, is there future eye sense base, is there present eye sense base? Yes. Are there three eye sense bases? That should not be said. Etc. Are there past twelve sense bases, are there future twelve sense bases, are there present twelve sense bases? Yes. Are there thirty-six sense bases? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past eye-element, is there future eye-element, is there present eye-element? Yes. Are there three eye-elements? That should not be said. Etc. Are there past eighteen elements, are there future eighteen elements, are there present eighteen elements? Yes. Are there fifty-four elements? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there past eye-faculty, is there future eye-faculty, is there present eye-faculty? Yes. Are there three eye-faculties? That should not be said. Etc. Are there past twenty-two faculties, are there future twenty-two faculties, are there present twenty-two faculties? Yes. Are there sixty-six faculties? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there a past universal monarch, is there a future universal monarch, is there a present universal monarch? Yes. Is there a simultaneous presence of three universal monarchs? That should not be said. Etc.

Is there a past Perfectly Enlightened One, is there a future Perfectly Enlightened One, is there a present Perfectly Enlightened One? Yes. Is there a simultaneous presence of three Perfectly Enlightened Ones? That should not be said. Etc.

Discussion on Purification of Terms

295. Is there the past? Yes. Is there the past? There is what may be past, what may not be past.

Acknowledge the refutation. If there is the past, there is what may be past, what may not be past, therefore the past is not the past, not the past is the past. What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is the past, there is what may be past, what may not be past, therefore the past is not the past, not the past is the past'" - is wrong.

But if the past is not not the past, not the past is not the past, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is the past, there is what may be past, what may not be past." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is the past, there is what may be past, what may not be past, therefore the past is not the past, not the past is the past'" - is wrong.

Is there the future? Yes. Is there the future? There is what may be future, what may not be future.

Acknowledge the refutation. If there is the future, there is what may be future, what may not be future, therefore the future is not the future, not the future is the future. What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is the future, there is what may be future, what may not be future, therefore the future is not the future, not the future is the future'" - is wrong.

But if the future is not not the future, not the future is not the future, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is the future, there is what may be future, what may not be future." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is the future, there

is what may be future, what may not be future, therefore the future is not the future, not the future is the future" - is wrong.

Is there the present? Yes. Is there the present? There is what may be present, what may not be present.

Acknowledge the refutation. If there is the present, there is, may be the present, may not be the present, on account of it the present is not the present, not the present is the present. What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is the present, there is, may be the present, may not be the present, on account of it the present is not the present, not the present is the present'" - is wrong.

But if the present is not not the present, not the present is not the present, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is the present, there is, may be the present, may not be the present." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is the present, there is, may be the present, may not be the present, on account of it the present is not the present, not the present is the present'" - is wrong.

Is there Nibbāna? Yes. Is there Nibbāna? There is, may be Nibbāna, may not be Nibbāna.

Acknowledge the refutation. If there is Nibbāna, there is, may be Nibbāna, may not be Nibbāna, on account of it Nibbāna is not Nibbāna, not Nibbāna is Nibbāna. What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is Nibbāna, there is, may be Nibbāna, may not be Nibbāna, on account of it Nibbāna is not Nibbāna, not Nibbāna is Nibbāna'" - is wrong.

But if Nibbāna is not not Nibbāna, not Nibbāna is not Nibbāna, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "There is Nibbāna, there is, may be Nibbāna, may not be Nibbāna." What you say there - "It should be said indeed - 'There is Nibbāna, there is, may be Nibbāna, may not be Nibbāna, on account of it Nibbāna is not Nibbāna, not Nibbāna is Nibbāna'" - is wrong.

Establishment by Discourse

296. Should it not be said - "There is the past, there is the future"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Whatever materiality, monks, past, future, or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, whether far or near - this is called the aggregate of matter. Whatever feeling... whatever perception... whatever activities... whatever consciousness, past, future, or present, internal or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, whether far or near - this is called the aggregate of consciousness." Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, there is the past, there is the future.

There is the past, there is the future? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "There are these three, monks, ranges of language, ranges of designation, ranges of concepts, unmixed, unmixed before, are not being mixed, will not be mixed, not rejected by ascetics, brahmins, and the wise. Which three? Whatever matter, monks, is past, ceased, disappeared, changed - 'it was' is its term, 'it was' is its designation, 'it was' is its concept; not its term 'it is', not its term 'it will be'. Whatever feeling...

etc. whatever perception... whatever activities... whatever consciousness is past, ceased, disappeared, changed - 'it was' is its term, 'it was' is its designation, 'it was' is its concept; not its term 'it is', not its term 'it will be'.

Whatever matter, monks, is unborn, not yet manifest - 'it will be' is its term, 'it will be' is its designation, 'it will be' is its concept; not its term 'it is', not its term 'it was'.

Whatever feeling... etc. whatever perception... whatever activities... whatever consciousness is unborn, not yet manifest - 'it will be' is its term, 'it will be' is its designation, 'it will be' is its concept; not its term 'it is', not its term 'it was'.

"Whatever matter, monks, has arisen, has become manifest - 'it is' is its term, 'it is' is its designation, 'it is' is its concept; not its term 'it was', not its term 'it will be'.

Whatever feeling... etc. whatever perception... whatever activities... whatever consciousness has arisen, has become manifest - 'it is' is its term, 'it is' is its designation, 'it is' is its concept; not its term 'it was', not its term 'it will be'. These, monks, are the three ranges of language, ranges of designation, ranges of concepts, unmixed, unmixed before, are not being mixed, will not be mixed, not rejected by ascetics, brahmins, and the wise.

Even those, monks, who were the Ukkalā and Vassabhaññā, proponents of noncausality, proponents of the inefficacy of action, proponents of nihilism, even they did not think these three ranges of language, ranges of designation, ranges of concepts should be censured and protested against. What is the reason for this? Because of fear of blame, anger, and reproof." Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should not be said - "there is the past, there is the future."

Is there the past? Yes. Did not the Venerable Phagga say this to the Blessed One - "Is there indeed, venerable sir, that eye, by which eye one describing the Buddhas of the past who have attained final Nibbāna, who have cut off obsession, who have cut off the path, who have exhausted the round of rebirths, who have transcended all suffering, might describe them?" Is there indeed, venerable sir, that tongue... etc. Is there indeed, venerable sir, that mind, by which mind one describing the Buddhas of the past who have attained final Nibbāna, who have cut off obsession, who have cut off the path, who have exhausted the round of rebirths, who have transcended all suffering, might describe them?"

"There is not indeed, Phagga, that eye, by which eye one describing the Buddhas of the past who have attained final Nibbāna, who have cut off obsession, who have cut off the path, who have exhausted the round of rebirths, who have transcended all suffering, might describe them. There is not indeed, Phagga, that tongue... etc. There is not indeed, Phagga, that mind, by which mind one describing the Buddhas of the past who have attained final Nibbāna, who have cut off obsession, who have cut off the path, who have exhausted the round of rebirths, who have transcended all suffering, might describe them." Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should not be said - "There is the past."

Is there the past? Yes. Did not the Venerable Nandaka say this - "Formerly there was greed, that was unwholesome, that now does not exist, thus this is wholesome. Formerly there was hate... formerly there was delusion, that was unwholesome, that now does not exist, thus this is wholesome." Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should not be said - "There is the past."

Should it not be said - "There is the future"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "If, monks, regarding edible food there is lust, there is delight, there is craving; consciousness is established there and has grown. Where consciousness is established and has grown, there is a descent of mentality-materiality. Where there is a descent of mentality-materiality, there is growth of activities. Where there is growth of activities, there is the production of rebirth in the future. Where there is the production of rebirth in the future, there is birth, ageing and death in the future. Where there is birth, ageing and death in the future, that, monks, I say is with sorrow, with defilement, with anguish.

"If, monks, regarding contact as nutriment... if, monks, regarding mental volition as nutriment, if, monks, regarding consciousness as nutriment there is lust, there is delight... etc. with defilement, with anguish, I say." Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, there is the future.

Is there the future? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "If, monks, regarding edible food there is no lust, there is no delight, there is no craving; consciousness there is unestablished, not grown. Where consciousness is unestablished, not grown, there is no descent of mentality-materiality. Where there is no descent of mentality-materiality, there is no growth of activities. Where there is no growth of activities, there is no production of rebirth in the future. Where there is no production of rebirth in the future, there is no birth, ageing, and death in the future. Where there is no birth, ageing and death in the future, that, monks, I say is without sorrow, without defilement, without anguish.

"If, monks, regarding contact as nutriment... if, monks, regarding mental volition as nutriment, if, monks, regarding consciousness as nutriment there is no lust, there is no delight... etc. without defilement, without anguish, I say." Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, it should not be said - "There is the future."

The Discussion on All Exists is finished.



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. 5. Discussion on Everything Existing 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