

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)

9. Ninth Chapter (9. Navamavaggo)

[Kv 9.1-11, PTS 400-420]



PaliVerse

05. Points of Controversy

9. The Ninth Chapter

(84) 1. Discussion on One Who Sees the Benefit

547. Is there abandoning of mental fetters for one who sees the benefit? Yes. Is it not that for one attending to activities as impermanent, mental fetters are abandoned? Yes. If for one attending to activities as impermanent, mental fetters are abandoned, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Abandoning of mental fetters for one who sees the benefit."

Is it not that for one attending to activities as suffering... etc. as a disease... as a boil... as a dart... as misery... as an affliction... as alien... as disintegrating... as a calamity... as a danger... as peril... as an obstacle... as unstable... as perishable... as not lasting... as without shelter... as without refuge... as without protection... as having become without protection... as empty... as hollow... as void... as non-self... as dangerous... etc. for one attending as subject to change, mental fetters are abandoned? Yes. If for one attending to activities as subject to change, mental fetters are abandoned, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Abandoning of mental fetters for one who sees the benefit."

Does one attend to activities as impermanent and is one who sees the benefit in Nibbāna? That should not be said. Etc. Does one attend to activities as impermanent and is one who sees the benefit in Nibbāna? Yes. Of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc. activities as suffering... etc. Does one attend as subject to change and is one who sees the benefit in Nibbāna? That should not be said. Etc. Does one attend to activities as subject to change and is one who sees the benefit in Nibbāna? Yes. Of two contacts... etc. is there a combination of two consciousnesses? That should not be said. Etc.

548. Should it not be said - "Abandoning of mental fetters for one who sees the benefit"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "Here, monks, a monk dwells observing happiness in Nibbāna, perceiving happiness, experiencing happiness, constantly, continuously, uninterruptedly, resolving with the mind, penetrating with wisdom"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, there is abandoning of mental fetters for one who sees the benefit.

The discussion on one who sees the benefit is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(85) 2. Discussion on the Deathless as Object

549. Is that which has the Deathless as object a mental fetter? Yes. Is the Deathless 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? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the Deathless is not subject to mental fetters, not subject to mental knots, etc. not subject to defilement? Yes. If

the Deathless is not subject to mental fetters, etc. not subject to defilement, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "that which has the Deathless as object is a mental fetter".

Does lust arise referring to the Deathless? Yes. Is the Deathless a basis for lust, enticing, desirable, intoxicating, binding, infatuating? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the Deathless is not a basis for lust, not enticing, not desirable, not intoxicating, not binding, not infatuating? Yes. If the Deathless is not a basis for lust, not enticing, not desirable, not intoxicating, not binding, not infatuating, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "lust arises referring to the Deathless".

Does hate arise referring to the Deathless? Yes. Is the Deathless a basis for hate, a basis for irritation, a basis for aversion? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the Deathless is not a basis for hate, not a basis for irritation, not a basis for aversion? Yes. If the Deathless is not a basis for hate, not a basis for irritation, not a basis for aversion, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "hate arises referring to the Deathless".

Does delusion arise referring to the Deathless? Yes. Is the Deathless a basis for delusion, causing not knowing, removing vision, suppressing wisdom, connected with vexation, not leading to Nibbāna? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the Deathless is not a basis for delusion, not causing not knowing, not removing vision, conducive to wisdom, not connected with vexation, leading to Nibbāna? Yes. If the Deathless is not a basis for delusion, not causing not knowing, etc. leading to Nibbāna, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "delusion arises referring to the Deathless".

550. Mental fetters arise referring to matter, matter is subject to mental fetters, subject to mental knots, etc. subject to defilement? Yes. Mental fetters arise referring to the Deathless, the Deathless is subject to mental fetters, etc. subject to defilement? That should not be said. Etc.

Lust arises referring to matter, matter is a basis for lust, enticing, desirable, intoxicating, binding, infatuating? Yes. Lust arises referring to the Deathless, the Deathless is a basis for lust, etc. infatuating? That should not be said. Etc.

Hate arises referring to matter, matter is a basis for hate, a basis for irritation, a basis for aversion? Yes. Hate arises referring to the Deathless, the Deathless is a basis for hate, a basis for irritation, a basis for aversion? That should not be said. Etc.

Delusion arises referring to matter, matter is a basis for delusion, causing not knowing, etc. not leading to Nibbāna? Yes. Delusion arises referring to the Deathless, the Deathless is a basis for delusion, causing not knowing, etc. not leading to Nibbāna? That should not be said. Etc.

Mental fetters arise referring to the Deathless, the Deathless is not subject to mental fetters, not subject to mental knots, not subject to mental floods, not subject to mental bonds, not subject to mental hindrances, not adhered to, not subject to clinging, not subject to defilement? Yes. Mental fetters arise referring to matter, matter is not subject to mental fetters, not subject to mental knots, etc. not subject to defilement? That should not be said. Etc.

Lust arises referring to the Deathless, the Deathless is not a basis for lust, not enticing, not desirable, not intoxicating, not binding, not infatuating? Yes. Lust arises referring to matter, matter is not a basis for lust, etc. not infatuating? That should not be said. Etc.

Does hate arise referring to the Deathless, is the Deathless not a basis for hate, not a basis for irritation, not a basis for aversion? Yes. Does hate arise referring to materiality, is materiality not a basis for hate, not a basis for irritation, not a basis for aversion? That should not be said. Etc.

Does delusion arise referring to the Deathless, is the Deathless not a basis for delusion, not causing not knowing, etc. leading to Nibbāna? Yes. Does delusion arise referring to materiality, is materiality not a basis for delusion, not causing not knowing, etc. leading to Nibbāna? That should not be said. Etc.

551. Should it not be said - "that which has the Deathless as object is a mental fetter"? Yes. Was it not said by the Blessed One - "He perceives Nibbāna as Nibbāna, having perceived Nibbāna as Nibbāna, he imagines Nibbāna, he imagines in Nibbāna, he imagines from Nibbāna, he imagines 'Nibbāna is mine', he delights in Nibbāna"! Is there such a discourse? Yes. Well then, that which has the Deathless as object is a mental fetter.

The discussion on the deathless as object is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(86) 3. Discussion on Matter Having an Object

552. Is materiality with sense-object? Yes. Is there advertent, reflective attention, attentiveness, attention, volition, longing, aspiration for it? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is not advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? Yes. If there is not advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "materiality is with sense-object."

Contact is with sense-object, is there advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? Yes. Materiality is with sense-object, is there advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

Feeling... etc. perception, volition, consciousness, faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, wisdom, lust, hate, delusion, conceit, wrong view, sceptical doubt, sloth, restlessness, shamelessness... etc. moral fearlessness is with sense-object, is there advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? Yes. Materiality is with sense-object, is there advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

Materiality is with sense-object, there is not advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? Yes. Contact is with sense-object, there is not advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

Materiality is with sense-object, there is not advertent, reflective attention, etc. aspiration? Yes. Feeling... etc. moral fearlessness is with sense-object, there is not advertent, reflective attention for it... etc. aspiration? That should not be said. Etc.

553. Should it not be said - "materiality is with sense-object"? Yes. Is not materiality with condition? Yes. If materiality is with condition, then indeed sir, it should be said - "materiality is with sense-object."

The discussion on matter having an object is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(87) 4. Discussion on Underlying Tendencies Being Without Object

554. Are the underlying tendencies without sense-object? Yes. Matter, Nibbāna, the eye sense base, etc. the touch sense base? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to sensual lust without sense-object? Yes. Are sensual lust, prepossession by sensual lust, mental fetter of sensual lust, mental flood of sensuality, mental bond of sensuality, mental hindrance of sensual desire without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Are sensual lust, prepossession by sensual lust, mental fetter of sensual lust, mental flood of sensuality, mental bond of sensuality, mental hindrance of sensual desire with sense-object? Yes. Is the underlying tendency to sensual lust with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to sensual lust without sense-object? Yes. Included in which aggregate? Included in the aggregate of mental activities. Is the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? Yes. Are the aggregate of feeling, the aggregate of perception, the aggregate of consciousness without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to sensual lust included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? Yes. Is sensual lust included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is sensual lust included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? Yes. Is the underlying tendency to sensual lust included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to sensual lust included in the aggregate of mental activities, without sense-object, and is sensual lust included in the aggregate of mental activities, with sense-object? Yes. Is the aggregate of mental activities in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the aggregate of mental activities in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? Yes. Are the aggregate of feeling, the aggregate of perception, and the aggregate of consciousness in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

555. Are the underlying tendency to aversion, the underlying tendency to conceit, the underlying tendency to wrong view, the underlying tendency to sceptical doubt, the underlying tendency to lust for existence, the underlying tendency to ignorance without sense-object? Yes. Are ignorance, mental flood of ignorance, mental bond of ignorance, underlying tendency to ignorance, prepossession by ignorance, mental fetter of ignorance, mental hindrance of ignorance without sense-object? That should

not be said. Etc. ignorance, mental flood of ignorance, etc. mental hindrance of ignorance with sense-object? Yes. Is the underlying tendency to ignorance with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to ignorance without sense-object? Yes. Included in which aggregate? Included in the aggregate of mental activities. Is the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? Yes. Are the aggregate of feeling, the aggregate of perception, the aggregate of consciousness without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to ignorance included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? Yes. Is ignorance included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is ignorance included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? Yes. Is the underlying tendency to ignorance included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the underlying tendency to ignorance included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object, and is ignorance included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? Yes. Is the aggregate of mental activities in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the aggregate of mental activities in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? Yes. Are the aggregate of feeling, the aggregate of perception, and the aggregate of consciousness in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

556. Should it not be said - "underlying tendencies are without object"? Yes. When wholesome and indeterminate consciousness is occurring for a worldling, should it be said "with underlying tendencies"? Yes. Is there an object of those underlying tendencies? That should not be said. Etc. Well then, underlying tendencies are without object. When wholesome and indeterminate consciousness is occurring for a worldling, should it be said "with lust"? Yes. Is there an object of that lust? That should not be said. Etc. Well then, lust is without object.

The discussion on underlying tendencies being without object is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(88) 5. Discussion on Knowledge Being Without Object

557. Is knowledge without sense-object? Yes. Matter, Nibbāna, the eye sense base, etc. the touch sense base? That should not be said. Etc. Is knowledge without sense-object? Yes. Are wisdom, the wisdom faculty, the power of wisdom, right view, the enlightenment factor of investigation of phenomena without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Are wisdom, the wisdom faculty, the power of wisdom, right view, the enlightenment factor of investigation of phenomena with sense-object? Yes. Is knowledge with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is knowledge without sense-object? Yes. Included in which aggregate? Included in the aggregate of mental activities. Is the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the aggregate of mental activities without

sense-object? Yes. Are the aggregate of feeling, the aggregate of perception, the aggregate of consciousness without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is knowledge included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? Yes. Is wisdom included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is wisdom included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? Yes. Is knowledge included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Is knowledge included in the aggregate of mental activities without sense-object, and is wisdom included in the aggregate of mental activities with sense-object? Yes. Is the aggregate of mental activities in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Is the aggregate of mental activities in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? Yes. Are the aggregate of feeling, the aggregate of perception, and the aggregate of consciousness in part with sense-object and in part without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

558. Should it not be said - "Knowledge is without sense-object"? Yes. Should it be said that a Worthy One possessing eye-consciousness is one with knowledge? Yes. Is there an object of that knowledge? That should not be said. Etc. Well then, knowledge is without sense-object. Should it be said that a Worthy One possessing eye-consciousness is wise? Yes. Is there an object of that wisdom? That should not be said. Etc. Well then, wisdom is without sense-object.

The discussion on knowledge being without object is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(89) 6. Discussion on Past and Future as Object

559. Is consciousness with a past object without sense-object? Yes. Is it not with a past object? Yes. If it has a past object, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Consciousness with a past object is without sense-object." "Consciousness with a past object is without sense-object" - is wrong. Or else if it is without sense-object, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "With a past object." "Without sense-object has a past object" - is wrong.

Is consciousness with a past object without sense-object? Yes. Is it not that referring to the past there is adverting, etc. aspiration? Yes. If referring to the past there is adverting, etc. aspiration, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Consciousness with a past object is without sense-object."

560. Is consciousness with a future object without sense-object? Yes. Is it not with a future object? Yes. If it has a future object, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Consciousness with a future object is without sense-object." "Consciousness with a future object is without sense-object" - is wrong. Or else if it is without sense-object, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "With a future object." "Without sense-object has a future object" - is wrong.

Is consciousness with a future object without sense-object? Yes. Is it not that referring to the future there is adverting, etc. aspiration? Yes. If referring to the future there is adverting, etc. aspiration, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Consciousness with a future object is without sense-object."

Referring to the present there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a present object with sense-object? Yes. Referring to the past there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a past object with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc. Referring to the present there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a present object with sense-object? Yes. Referring to the future there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a future object with sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Referring to the past there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a past object without sense-object? Yes. Referring to the present there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a present object without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

Referring to the future there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a future object without sense-object? Yes. Referring to the present there is advertizing, etc. aspiration, is consciousness with a present object without sense-object? That should not be said. Etc.

561. Should it not be said - "Consciousness with a past or future object is without sense-object"? Yes. Is it not that the past and future do not exist? Yes. If the past and future do not exist, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Consciousness with a past or future object is without sense-object." Etc.

The discussion on past and future as object is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(90) 7. Discussion on Being Affected with Applied Thought

562. Is all consciousness affected with applied thought? Yes. Is all consciousness affected with sustained thought, affected with rapture, affected with pleasure, affected with pain, affected with pleasure, affected with displeasure, affected with equanimity, affected with faith, affected with energy, affected with mindfulness, affected with concentration, affected with wisdom, affected with lust, affected with hate, etc. affected with moral fearlessness? That should not be said. Etc.

Is all consciousness affected with applied thought? Yes. Is there not concentration without applied but with sustained thought only? Yes. If there is concentration without applied but with sustained thought only, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "all consciousness is affected with applied thought."

Is all consciousness affected with applied thought? Yes. Is there not concentration without applied and sustained thought? Yes. If there is concentration without applied and sustained thought, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "all consciousness is affected with applied thought." Is all consciousness affected with applied thought? Yes. Were not three concentrations said by the Blessed One - concentration with applied and sustained thought, concentration without applied but with sustained thought only, concentration without applied and sustained thought? Yes. If three concentrations were said by the Blessed One - concentration with applied and sustained thought, concentration without applied but with sustained thought only, concentration without applied and sustained thought, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "all consciousness is affected with applied thought."

9. The Ninth Chapter

(91) 8. Discussion on Sound Being the Diffusion of Applied Thought

563. Is the diffusion of applied thought sound in every respect for one applying thought and examining? Yes. Is the diffusion of contact sound in every respect for one touching, is the diffusion of feeling sound in every respect for one feeling, is the diffusion of perception sound in every respect for one perceiving, is the diffusion of volition sound in every respect for one willing, is the diffusion of consciousness sound in every respect for one thinking, is the diffusion of mindfulness sound in every respect for one remembering, is the diffusion of wisdom sound in every respect for one understanding? That should not be said. Etc.

Is the diffusion of applied thought sound in every respect for one applying thought and examining? Yes. Is the diffusion of applied thought sound cognisable by ear, does it strike against the ear, does it come into the range of the ear? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that the diffusion of applied thought sound is not cognisable by ear, does not strike against the ear, does not come into the range of the ear? Yes. If the diffusion of applied thought sound is not cognisable by ear, does not strike against the ear, does not come into the range of the ear, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "The diffusion of applied thought is sound in every respect for one applying thought and examining."

The discussion on sound being the diffusion of applied thought is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(92) 9. Discussion on Speech Not Being According to Consciousness

564. Is speech not according to consciousness? Yes. Is there speech of one without contact, speech of one without feeling, speech of one without perception, speech of one without volition, speech of one without consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is speech of one with contact, speech of one with feeling, speech of one with perception, speech of one with volition, speech of one with consciousness? Yes. If there is speech of one with contact, etc. speech of one with consciousness, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Speech is not according to consciousness."

Is speech not according to consciousness? Yes. Is there speech of one not turning back, etc. speech of one without reflective attention, etc. speech of one not directing? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is speech of one turning back, speech of one with reflective attention, etc. speech of one directing? Yes. If there is speech of one turning back, speech of one with reflective attention, speech of one directing, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Speech is not according to consciousness."

Is speech not according to consciousness? Yes. Is it not that speech is consciousness-originated, conascent with consciousness, having simultaneous arising with consciousness? Yes. If speech is consciousness-originated, conascent with consciousness, having simultaneous arising with consciousness, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Speech is not according to consciousness."

Is speech not according to consciousness? Yes. Does one not wishing to speak speak, does one not wishing to say say, does one not wishing to address address, does one not wishing to express express? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that one wishing to speak speaks, one wishing to say says, one wishing to address addresses, one wishing to express expresses? Yes. If one wishing to speak speaks, one wishing to say says, one wishing to address addresses, one wishing to express expresses, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Speech is not according to consciousness."

565. Should it not be said - "Speech is not according to consciousness"? Yes. Is there not someone who thinking 'I will say one thing' says another, thinking 'I will speak one thing' speaks another, thinking 'I will address one thing' addresses another, thinking 'I will express one thing' expresses another? Yes. If there is someone who thinking 'I will say one thing' says another, etc. thinking 'I will express one thing' expresses another, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Speech is not according to consciousness."

The discussion on speech not being according to consciousness is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(93) 10. The Discussion on Bodily Action Not Being According to Consciousness

566. Is bodily action not according to consciousness? Yes. Is there bodily action of one without contact? Etc. Is there bodily action of one without consciousness? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is bodily action of one with contact? Etc. Is there bodily action of one with consciousness? Yes. If there is bodily action of one with contact, etc. bodily action of one with consciousness, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Bodily action is not according to consciousness."

Is bodily action not according to consciousness? Yes. Is there bodily action of one not turning back? Etc. Is there bodily action of one not directing? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that there is bodily action of one turning back? Etc. Is there bodily action of one directing? Yes. If there is bodily action of one turning back, etc. bodily action of one directing, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Bodily action is not according to consciousness."

Is bodily action not according to consciousness? Yes. Is it not that bodily action is consciousness-originated, conascent with consciousness, having simultaneous arising with consciousness? Yes. If bodily action is consciousness-originated, conascent with consciousness, having simultaneous arising with consciousness, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Bodily action is not according to consciousness."

Is bodily action not according to consciousness? Yes. Does one wishing to go forward not go forward, does one wishing to go back not go back, does one wishing to look before not look before, does one wishing to look around not look around, does one wishing to bend not bend, does one wishing to stretch not stretch? That should not be said. Etc. Is it not that one wishing to go forward goes forward, one wishing to go back goes back, one wishing to look before looks before, one wishing to look around looks around, one wishing to bend bends, one wishing to stretch stretches? Yes. If one wishing to go forward goes forward, etc. one wishing to stretch stretches, then indeed sir, it should not be said - "Bodily action is not according to consciousness."

567. Should it not be said - "Bodily action is not according to consciousness"? Yes. Is there not someone who thinking "I will go elsewhere" goes elsewhere? Etc. Thinking "I will stretch another" stretches another? Yes. If there is someone who thinking "I will go elsewhere" goes elsewhere, etc. thinking "I will stretch another" stretches another, then indeed sir, it should be said - "Bodily action is not according to consciousness."

The discussion on bodily action not being according to consciousness is finished.

9. The Ninth Chapter

(94) 11. The Discussion on Being Possessed of Past and Future

568. Possessed of 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 - "possessed of the past."

Possessed of 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 - "possessed of the future."

569. Is one possessed of the past aggregate of matter, possessed of the future aggregate of matter, possessed of the present aggregate of matter? Yes. Is one possessed of three aggregates of matter? That should not be said. Etc. Is one possessed of the past five aggregates, possessed of the future five aggregates, possessed of the present five aggregates? Yes. Is one possessed of fifteen aggregates? That should not be said. Etc.

Is one possessed of the past eye sense base, possessed of the future eye sense base, possessed of the present eye sense base? Yes. Is one possessed of three eye sense bases? That should not be said. Etc. Is one possessed of the past twelve sense bases, possessed of the future twelve sense bases, possessed of the present twelve sense bases? Yes. Is one possessed of thirty-six sense bases? That should not be said. Etc.

Is one possessed of the past eye-element, possessed of the future eye-element, possessed of the present eye-element? Yes. Is one possessed of three eye-elements? That should not be said. Etc. Is one possessed of the past eighteen elements, possessed of the future eighteen elements, possessed of the present eighteen elements? Yes. Is one possessed of fifty-four elements? That should not be said. Etc.

Is one possessed of the past eye-faculty, possessed of the future eye-faculty, possessed of the present eye-faculty? Yes. Is one possessed of three eye-faculties? That should not be said. Etc. Is one possessed of the past twenty-two faculties, possessed of the future twenty-two faculties, possessed of the present twenty-two faculties? Yes. Is one possessed of sixty-six faculties? That should not be said. Etc.

570. Should it not be said - "one is possessed of the past and future"? Yes. Is there not one who meditates on the eight deliverances, who obtains the four meditative absorptions at will, who is an obtainer of the nine progressive abiding attainments? Yes. If there is one who meditates on the eight deliverances, who obtains the four

meditative absorptions at will, who is an obtainer of the nine progressive abiding attainments, then indeed sir, it should be said - "one is possessed of the past and future".

The discussion on being possessed of past and future is finished.

The Ninth Chapter.

Its summary:

Abandoning of mental fetters for one who sees the benefit, the Deathless as object is a mental fetter, matter is with sense-object, underlying tendencies are without object, just so knowledge, consciousness with a past or future object, all consciousness is affected with applied thought, the diffusion of applied thought is sound in every respect for one applying thought and examining, speech is not according to consciousness, likewise bodily action, possessed of the past and future.



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. 9. Ninth 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