

THE PALIVERSE PROJECT

The Universe of Buddha's Wisdom

Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā)

- 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching - Commentaries
(3. Abhidhamma Piṭaka - Aṭṭhakathā)
- 5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy
(5. Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā)
- 5. Fifth Chapter (5. Pañcamavaggo)



PaliVerse

5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy

5. The Fifth Chapter

1. Commentary on the Discussion of Liberation

418. Now there is the discussion called the talk on liberation. Therein, insight, path, fruition, and reviewing - the name "knowledge of liberation" is for these four knowledges. Among these, insight knowledge is knowledge of liberation because of being liberated from the sign of permanence and so on, or because of being liberated by way of substitution of opposites liberation. The path is liberation by eradication, fruition is liberation by subsiding, but reviewing knowledge knows liberation, thus it is knowledge of liberation. Thus, in the fourfold knowledge of liberation, without qualification, only fruition knowledge is liberation. The remaining ones should not be said to be either "liberated" or "unliberated." Therefore, the view of those who, without saying "this particular knowledge of liberation is liberated," hold without distinction that "knowledge of liberation is liberated," just as the Andhakans hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the opponent. Again, when asked "whatever," he rejects with reference to reviewing knowledge and so on. When asked "of one practising," he acknowledges with reference to the state of being without mental corruptions of path knowledge. But because that knowledge does not exist for a stream-enterer established in the fruition, therefore it is not called liberated - for the purpose of challenging, the proponent of one's own doctrine again said beginning with "of a stream-enterer." By this method the meaning should be understood everywhere.

Commentary on the Discussion of Liberation.

2. Commentary on the Treatise on the Knowledge of One Beyond Training

421. Now there is the discussion called "on one beyond training." Therein, because learners such as the Elder Ānanda and so on know those beyond training by the method beginning with "The Blessed One is eminent," therefore "there is knowledge of one beyond training for a learner" is the view of those, just as the Uttarāpathakas hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. "Knows and sees" - this is said by way of knowing what has been attained by oneself. Beginning with "change-of-lineage" is said for the purpose of showing the absence of successively higher knowledge for one established on a lower plane. "Did not the Venerable Ānanda, a learner, know 'The Blessed One is eminent'?" - the opponent wishes that to be knowledge of one beyond training because it occurs with regard to the Blessed One who is one beyond training, but this is not of one beyond training. Therefore, even though the view was thus established, it remains as though unestablished.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Knowledge of One Beyond Training.

3. Commentary on the Treatise on the Reversed

424. Now there is the discussion called "perverted." Therein, the view of those who hold that "one who, being percipient of earth, attains the earth kasiṇa, his knowledge is perverted knowledge," just as the Andhakans hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. For the sign that has arisen in dependence on earth is not earth itself, yet this one is percipient of earth therein. Therefore it is perverted knowledge - this is his intention. Thereupon, the proponent of one's own doctrine said: "Whether characteristic earth, earth with its constituents, sign earth, or earth deity - all are earth indeed; regarding those, the knowledge 'earth' is not perverted. But the perversion of regarding the impermanent as permanent and so on is called perverted knowledge. Is this of yours one of those?" - to accuse thus, he said beginning with "regarding the impermanent as permanent." The other rejects with reference to the absence of the characteristic of illusion, and acknowledges with reference to the earth sign.

"Wholesome" is said with reference to the knowledge of trainees and worldlings. Even in the questions "there is for a Worthy One," he rejects by the absence of the characteristic of illusion. He acknowledges with reference to the earth sign. "All is earth" - he asks whether all that earth kasiṇa is just characteristic earth. The proponent of one's own doctrine rejects because it is not actually so. "Is there not earth, and is there anyone who attains earth as earth?" - this is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Its meaning is - is there not sign earth, and is there anyone who attains that earth as earth only, not as water or as fire? "There is earth" and so on was said for the purpose of showing: "If whatever exists in whatever way, the knowledge of one attaining that accordingly is perverted, then there is Nibbāna, and for one attaining that too, even the path knowledge that uproots all perversions would be perverted for you."

Commentary on the Treatise on the Reversed.

4. Commentary on the Treatise on the Fixed Course

428-431. Now there is the discussion called the fixed course. Therein, because the Blessed One knows of whatever person will enter the fixed course of the right path, "This one is capable of fully realising the teaching," therefore "there is knowledge for one who is undetermined, being just a worldling, regarding going to the fixed course" is the view of those, just as the Uttarāpathakas hold at present; With reference to them, "for one who is undetermined" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Therein, "regarding going to the fixed course" - the fixed course is called the path; the meaning is for going to the path, for entering upon the path. But whatever knowledge, having seen which, the Blessed One knows "This one is capable," with reference to that is the acknowledgment of the opponent.

Then the proponent of one's own doctrine, in order to show his inappropriately stated position, stated the reversed pursuit "for one fixed in destination." Therein, in the first question, he rejects because there is no such thing as knowledge for one fixed in destination by the path regarding going to the unfixed course. In the second, he acknowledges by the fact of absence. In the third, because it was asked "there is not for one who is undetermined," he rejects due to contradiction with the view. Again, making the first question itself the fourth, three questions were made by way of

going to the fixed course for one fixed in destination and so on. Among those, in the first, because for one fixed in destination by the first path there is no knowledge again for that purpose, therefore he rejects. In the second, he acknowledges by the very fact of absence. In the third, he rejects by the very contradiction with the view. Again, making the first question the eighth, three questions were made by way of going to the unfixed course for one who is undetermined and so on. Their meaning should be understood in the manner already stated. Again, making the first question itself the twelfth, questions beginning with "there is a fixed course" based on that were made. Therein, because knowledge regarding going to the fixed course is indeed just path knowledge, therefore with reference to that, "there is a fixed course" was said. The other, however, when "fixed course" is said, rejects; when "knowledge" is said, acknowledges. In the establishments of mindfulness and so on too, the same method applies. The refutation is of clear meaning only. Beginning with "change-of-lineage" is said for the purpose of showing that whatever has not been attained by whomever, that does not exist for him. "The Blessed One knows" means he knows by the power of his own knowledge, not because of the existence of knowledge of going to the fixed course in that person. Therefore, by this reason, even his seemingly established view is indeed unestablished.

Commentary on the Treatise on the Fixed Course.

5. Commentary on the Treatise on Analytical Knowledge

432-433. Now there is the discussion on analytical knowledge. Therein, for those whose view is "whatever knowledge of the noble ones, all is exclusively supramundane," having taken that, "all knowledge is analytical knowledge," just as the Andhakans hold; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. In the questions on conventional knowledge, he rejects with reference to the knowledge of attainment in the conventional designation of the earth kasiṇa, and acknowledges with reference to knowledge of language. In the question "all those who know conventional designations," he rejects with reference to worldlings. In the questions on mind-reading, he rejects with reference to the knowledge of a worldling, and acknowledges with reference to the knowledge of a noble one. In the questions on all wisdom, he rejects with reference to the question on kasiṇa attainment, and acknowledges with reference to the supramundane. Beginning with "the earth kasiṇa attainment" was said for the purpose of asking "whatever wisdom there is in these many states, is all that analytical knowledge?" "If so, all knowledge" - since all supramundane wisdom is analytical knowledge, therefore the word "all" is established together with the fruit of asceticism.

Commentary on the Treatise on Analytical Knowledge.

6. Commentary on the Treatise on Conventional Knowledge

434-435. Now there is the treatise on conventional knowledge. Therein, there are two truths: conventional truth and ultimate truth. But those who, without making such a division, by the similarity of the expression "truth," say of conventional knowledge too that "it has only truth as object," just as the Andhakans; they are speakers of what is inappropriate - for the purpose of purifying their doctrine, this discussion was

begun. Therein, "should it not be said" is the question of the opponent; the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, with reference to ultimate truth. "In conventional truth" means in the truth that has entered into convention. Or it is a locative expression used in the reflexive sense; the meaning is "conventional truth." "Conventional knowledge has only truth as object" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Thereupon, in order to accuse him with "if that without distinction has only truth as object, then by that knowledge one should perform the full understanding of suffering and so on," he said beginning with "by that knowledge."

Commentary on the Treatise on Conventional Knowledge.

7. Commentary on the Treatise on Consciousness as Object

436-438. Now there is the discussion called "mind as object." Therein, having taken merely the expression "knowledge of mind-reading," those whose view is "that knowledge has only mind as object," just as the Andhakans hold at present; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, for the purpose of challenging him that "whoever knows consciousness by way of with lust and so on, for him lust and so on are also objects, therefore it should not be said that it has only mind as object," the passage beginning with "is there not someone" was begun. "With contact as object" means by way of the object termed contact. The same method applies to "with feeling as object" and so on as well. Again, when asked "it should not be said that knowledge has contact as object," he acknowledges that for one who attends to the characteristic of touching of contact, contact itself is the object. But when asked "is this then knowledge of contact-reading?" he rejects because of the absence of such a discourse passage. The same method applies to feeling and so on as well. Now, having shown that very thing in dependence on which the view arose, in order to establish the view, he said beginning with "is it not knowledge of mind-reading?" But this view, even though established by adherence to mere words, remains as though unestablished.

Commentary on the Treatise on Consciousness as Object.

8. Commentary on the Treatise on Knowledge of the Future

439-440. Now there is the treatise on knowledge of the future. Therein, the future includes both the intermediate and the proximate. Among those, regarding the proximate, there is absolutely no knowledge. And just as regarding the proximate, so too regarding what is included in a single cognitive process and a single impulsion. Therein, those who wish for knowledge of all the future, just as the Andhakans; with reference to them, the question is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, in order to accuse him with "that knowledge of yours of the future, does one by that know the proximate future by way of root and so on?" he said beginning with "the future from the root." Therein, "from the root" and so on - all are synonyms for cause only. For a cause, that which produces its own result, is rooted there and established - thus it is "root." And from that, it sends forth and sets going that - thus it is "cause." That itself delivers that, as if dispatching it saying "Come, take it!" It hands over, as it were - thus it is "source." From that, that comes

into being - thus it is "coming into being." It originates - thus it is "production." And therein, that arises, or that causes it to arise - thus it is "origination." That itself brings it about - thus it is "nutriment." And that is its object in the sense of not being abandonable. And that itself - dependent on this, it comes - thus it is "condition." From that, it arises - thus it is called "origin." But since the proximate consciousness cannot be known by these modes, therefore he rejects saying "that should not be said." "The future's root conditionality" means whatever root conditionality there is in the consciousness of the proximate future, that one knows. Whatever mental states therein are root conditions, one knows those - this is the meaning. The same method applies to the remaining terms as well. Beginning with "change-of-lineage" was said to show in its own form that future in which knowledge does not arise. The discourse "of Pāṭaliputta" was brought to show that future in which knowledge arises. But since this is not a proof of knowledge regarding all the future; therefore it is as if not brought.

Commentary on the Treatise on Knowledge of the Future.

9. Commentary on the Treatise on Knowledge of the Present

441-442. Now there is the treatise on knowledge in the present. Therein, for those whose view, in dependence on the statement "when all activities are seen as impermanent, that knowledge too is seen as impermanent," is that "without distinction there is knowledge in all that is present," just as the Andhakans hold; with reference to them, "in the present" is the question of the proponent of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, "if without distinction there is knowledge in the present, it must also be so in the momentarily present. This being so, due to the absence of two knowledges together, that should be known by that very knowledge" - for the purpose of this accusation, "by that" is the pursuit of the proponent of one's own doctrine. Therein, in the first question, the rejecting of the other is that one cannot know that by that very knowledge. In the second question, the acknowledgment is his alone with reference to continuity. The intention is that one seeing dissolution in succession sees the knowledge of the observation of dissolution by the observation of dissolution itself. In "does one know that knowledge by that knowledge" and so on too, the same method applies. "Does one touch that contact by that contact" and so on are stated for the purpose of preventing even a pretext of opportunity. But what was stated by him for the purpose of establishing the view, beginning with "is it not that all activities" and so on. Therein, the acknowledgment is of the proponent of one's own doctrine, with the intention that knowledge is seen by the method, not by way of object. Therefore, even his seemingly established view is indeed unestablished.

Commentary on the Treatise on Knowledge of the Present.

10. Commentary on the Treatise on Knowledge of Fruition

443-444. Now there is the treatise on knowledge of fruition. Therein, "Buddhas too expound the Teaching for beings' attainment of noble fruition, and disciples too; thus by this similarity, just as for Buddhas, for disciples too there is knowledge of fruition to be attained by each and every being" - this is the view of those, just as of the Andhakans; with reference to them, "for a disciple" is the question of the proponent

of one's own doctrine, the acknowledgment is of the other. Then, in order to accuse him with "if there is knowledge of fruition for a disciple, just as Buddhas, even being in the fruition of stream-entry, by the power of their own knowledge declare what has been done regarding fruition thus: 'this one is one who has sown the seed of rebirth one last time, this one is a family-to-family goer, this one is one with seven rebirths at the utmost,' do you hold thus of a disciple too?" - he said "Does a disciple declare what has been done regarding fruition?" The other rejects.

"Is there for a disciple discernment of higher and lower fruitions" and so on was said for the purpose of questioning about the reason for the existence of knowledge of fruition. For this is the intention here: For Buddhas there is what is called discernment of higher and lower fruitions, reckoned as the knowing of the high and low nature of fruitions thus: "this fruition is higher, this is lower." Likewise the discernments of higher and lower faculties and persons; because of the existence of those, they know each and every fruition by means of each and every faculty of each and every person - do those discernments exist for a disciple too?

"Is there for a disciple the description of aggregates" and so on too were said for the purpose of accusation: "if for you there is knowledge of fruition for a disciple as for Buddhas, then he should also possess these descriptions. Does he have those? Is he able to know or declare those descriptions by his own power?" "A disciple is a conqueror" and so on was said for the purpose of accusation: "if there is knowledge of fruition for a disciple as for Buddhas, this being so, he himself would be a conqueror." In the question "a disciple of the unarisen" too, the same method applies. In the question "one who does not know," it is rejected because of the destruction of not-knowing reckoned as ignorance; but he does not have knowledge of fruition as Buddhas do. Therefore the doctrine of the opponent is simply unestablished.

Commentary on the Treatise on Knowledge of Fruition.

The fifth chapter.

The Greater Fifty is complete.



ABOUT THIS TRANSLATION

This translation is part of the PaliVerse Project - the first complete, unified English translation of the Pāli Canon together with its Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā) and Subcommentaries (Ṭīkā), accompanied by interactive study tools. PaliVerse is an ongoing project. The AI translations are continuously improved through experts' revisions and feedback. This text is the latest translation as of the date of download.

PDF Creation Date: 14 September 2026

HOW TO CITE

PaliVerse (2026). Commentaries. 3. The Canon of Higher Teaching - Commentaries. 5. Commentary on the Points of Controversy. 5. Fifth 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