

6. Vasubandhu makes a clear contrast between those events which serve as conditions for a consciousness-moment inasmuch as they are its objects-of-consciousness, and those which are its truly generative conditions. (cf. *Kośa* V, ad 27),

7. The *śirīṣa* tree, *Acacia speciosa* Willd., or *Acacia sirissa* Buch., has leaves which close at night. Thus it is said to "sleep". The objector is saying that just as one cannot infer the necessity of conscious activity for trees from the sole example of the *śirīṣa*'s sleeping, one cannot infer the non-eternality of sounds of speech from their state-of-arising-immediately-upon-an-effort, because a flash of lightning is non-eternal and there is no effort involved.

A DISCUSSION OF THE FIVE AGGREGATES (PAÑCASKANDHAKA-PRAKARAṆA)

INTRODUCTION

This work is an analysis of those aggregations of events that constitute a living organism. The method for describing "personality" as aggregates of events of five different basic types goes back to the Buddha himself.* According to this analysis, what is called an "individual" or "personality" is a complex array of always-changing interdependent events. The analysis (and the meditation in which it is rooted) focuses on complex successions of aggregates of particular momentary phenomena, and, while treating them genetically, refuses to comprise them into hypothetical wholes. That is, an "individual" is really all of the changing states "which make him up", and there is no central entity underlying the organism. It is only the close interdependence of aggregations of moment-events which makes for their relationship.

The basic types of aggregates are : materialities, feelings, cognitions, motivating dispositions, and consciousnesses. Unlike the earlier Upaniṣadic view**, and the at least somewhat anterior Sāṅkhya and Jain theories***, the Buddha recognizes the body as a basic part of "individuality", and physiological differences as "personality" differences. But unlike Western physiological psychology, which attempts to reduce all personality factors to physiological causes, the Buddha sees other factors in "personality" which are not identical with physiological functions. Feelings are the mood-tones of the moment : these may have purely "psychological" causes apart from physiological ones. "Cognitions" are the mental seizings of characteristics

*cf. *Majjhima* I, 140-141, 145, 185, etc.

**cf. *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* II, 1, where the subtle "self-body" is distinguished from the material body, and "the seven hostile kinsmen" are the organs of the body, which hinder the perception of the inner self. *Kāṭha-Upaniṣad* I, 3, 3, where the self is lord of the chariot and the body is the chariot.

***In Sāṅkhya, *prakṛti* (primal material nature) and *puruṣa* (the soul) are divided; in Jainism *pudgala* (matter) impinges on the separate personality-soul (*ātma*).

or "signs" : each aggregate-complex will have its own way of cognizing. "Motivational dispositions" are all the various events that impel the "organism" : these include various emotions, intellectual views, etc. "A person with anger" is not the same "individual" as "a person with tranquility" several moments later : too much in the entire psychophysical complex has changed. That views should be part of a "personality" is also not surprising, since they can totally color experience. Consciousnesses, finally, are the complex of sense and mental awarenesses.

Beginning about 380 B.C., Buddhist meditators/theorists began isolating, listing, defining, and treating genetically all those basic "personality" event-aggregate types talked about by the Buddha, in books now collected in the various *Abhidharma-Piṭakas* of the Canon.* This is a new very stark unadorned way of writing, which admits only those elements which have meditational provisional existence. Only successions of particular moment-phenomena are admitted, and their causal connections with succeeding moments are discussed. Since there are no hypothetical wholes, but only streams of constantly-changing inter-related moments, concepts such as "self", "individual", or "personality" have no validity. Neither do expressions such as "mind", since what is so designated is a complex array of always changing moment-events.

To give some idea of the methodology of early Abhidharma works, it may be useful to quote from the beginning of the *Dhammasaṅgāṇi*, first book of the Theravāda Abhidhamma (c. 380 B.C.). It begins as follows : "Which events are beneficial? At the time when a beneficial consciousness-moment belonging to the realm of desires† arises, connected with satisfaction, joined with knowledge, with a visible as its object-of-consciousness, a sound as its object-of-consciousness, a smell as its object-of-consciousness, a taste as its object-of-consciousness, a tactile

*Two survive in their entirety : the Theravāda *Abhidhamma*, in Pāli, which has been entirely translated into English, and the Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma*, now extant only in Chinese translation, from which translations of some portions only have been made into French. (See the bibliography.)

†i.e. ordinary sensory realm outside of meditational states, see note 12 to text.

sensation as its object-of-consciousness, a mentally cognizable as its object-of-consciousness, or any other event that there might be as its object-of-consciousness, at that time there is a contact, there is a feeling, there is a cognition, there is a volition, there is a consciousness-moment, there is a mental application, there is a joy, there is a pleasure, there is a one-pointedness of consciousness, there is a faculty for faith, a faculty for energy, a faculty for memory, a faculty for meditational concentration, a faculty for insight, a mental faculty, a faculty of satisfaction, a faculty for life-continuance, a right view, a right intention, a right effort, a right undertaking, a right mindfulness, a right concentration, a power of faith, a power of energy, a power of mindfulness, a power of meditational concentration, a power of insight, a power of shame, a power of dread of blame, a lack of greed, a lack of hostility, a lack of confusion, a lack of harmful thinking, a tranquillity of body, a tranquillity of consciousness-moment, a lightness in body, a lightness of consciousness-moment, a pleasantness in body, a pleasantness in consciousness-moment, a fitness in body, a fitness in consciousness-moment, a recognition, a calm, an insight, a grasp, an absence of distraction; these and all the other events which have arisen dependent on conditions at that time—all these events are beneficial."*

Then follow definitions of every type of event enumerated above, but these "definitions" are often linguistic variants of the key term : "What at that time is contact? Whatever at that time is a contacting, a contacting-together, a state-of-having-contacted-together, that at that time is contact. What at that time is feeling? Whatever at that time is a perceived agreeableness arising from contact from a consciousness, an agreeable perceived pleasure, an agreeable pleasure arising from contact with consciousness, that at that time is called feeling."** Thus, each of these enumerated events, plus others which occur at the same time, arise in one moment along with a beneficial consciousness. The list is open-ended : the phrase "and all the other events which have arisen dependent on conditions at

**Dhammasaṅgāṇi* 1. The translations are "mine".

***Dhammasaṅgāṇi* 2-3.

that time" suggests that any enumeration is incomplete. Later Abhidharma lists tend to be closed-ended, and to imply that the enumerated events, and those enumerated events only, have existence in a moment. On the other hand, later Abhidharma works mark an improvement in definitions: in the treatment of a second-century Abhidharma master such as Ghosaka, they become more clearly true definitions, rather than, as is often the case in the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, lists of nearly equivalent terms derived from the same linguistic root. Thus Ghosaka defines "feelings" as follows in his *Abhidharmāmṛta*: "What are feelings? They are experiences, arising from contact with any of the six consciousnesses."*

But throughout its long and varied development, Abhidharma is true to the spirit of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* in admitting only particular moment-events. As such it is markedly different from Occidental theoretical psychology of the twentieth century, which always seems to deal with hypothetical wholes and categories. Abhidharma is perhaps more akin to twentieth-century physics. It of course experiments "internally" rather than "externally", as a good deal of it is concerned with investigating which moment-types remain in different meditational states.

Occidental theoretical psychology, on the other hand, usually does not arrive at anything which twentieth-century physics, or fourth-century B.C. Abhidharma, would consider elemental. There is a proliferation of categories and hypothetical wholes unrelated to any experienced moments. In some subtle way, this may be a legacy of Aristotle's *On the Soul*, the *a priori* constructions of which would have been totally rejected by the contemporaneous *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*.** Twentieth-century Occidental psychology, in spite of its attempts to be empirically experimental, often falls into similar traps, by inventing words ("Temperament type", "defense mechanism", etc.) which are at most hypostatized from existing psychophysiological moments, and are sometimes metaphors of dubious validity. The very

*Ghosaka, *Abhidharmāmṛta* 5, 3.

**On the contrast between the psychology of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* and Aristotle, Carolyn Rhys-Davids has already written an admirable essay, in her introduction to *A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics*, p XXXVII.

Occidental psychological emphasis on "tendencies" would be impossible in Abhidharma, since the psychophysical complex in Abhidharma is always changing. To demonstrate to what an extent this category-invention can go in Occidental psychology, two sentences from a standard text are given: "A person with a high degree of cerebropenia might be expected to show delinquent or manic-depressive tendencies, since he would lack the control and inhibition that normally keep such tendencies in check. The somatopenic individual, on the other hand, would be susceptible to hebephrenia, because he lacked the drive and energy necessary to carry on a normal life."* These two sentences bristle with hypothetical assumptions and categories which the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* would never admit to have any real existence, i.e. existence as experienced moments, and also suggest that Occidental psychology is much interested in straight-jacketing "individuals" into set pre-conceived patterns. From an Abhidharma point of view, they do not even indicate a very great familiarity with causal processes. For instance, is there really a "lack" in an "individual" categorized as "hebephrenic", or are there not rather visions "lacking" in others? In India, an "individual categorized hebephrenic" by Occidental psychological terminology, might be called a saint.

Buddhist psychology, on the other hand, is most interested in which psychological moments give rise to suffering, which to the cessation of suffering, and which to neither. Moment-events giving rise to suffering are termed "unbeneficial" (*akuśala*), those giving rise to the cessation of suffering are called "beneficial" (*Kuśala*), and those which give rise to neither suffering nor the cessation of suffering are called "indeterminate" (*avyākṛta*). In the quest for the alleviation of suffering, certain extraordinary mental states were recognized as beneficial; thus there is the enumeration of "right meditational concentration" in the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* passage quoted above. This as well as "the faculty for meditational concentration" and "one-pointedness of consciousness-moment", is defined as follows: "Whatever at that time is a stabilizing of consciousness-moment, a settling, a balance, an absence of distractedness, an

*Leona E. Tyler, *The Psychology of Human Differences*.

unperturbed state of consciousness-moment, and a right meditational concentration, that at that time is a right meditational concentration.”*

The first experiences of meditational concentration are described as the four meditations (*jhāna*, *dhyāna*), and these already take the consciousness-complex outside of “normal” ratiocinative functioning. In the first meditation, consciousness is still ratiocinative, with mental application and discursive thought, and filled with joy and pleasure. In the second, which is an inward tranquilization, mental application and discursive thought have ceased (thus there is no more ratiocination), and joy and pleasure still exist. In the third meditational state, the experience of joy fades out. In the fourth, finally, pleasure fades, and there is only “that utterly pure lucidity and indifference of consciousness, wherein there is neither happiness nor unhappiness.”**

Additional meditational practices are enumerated as “the imageless attainments”, which are described by the Buddha as follows: “When one has attained the stage of infinite space, the cognition of objects has ceased. When one has attained the stage of infinite consciousness, the cognition of the stage of infinite space has ceased. When one has attained the stage of nothing whatever, the cognition of the stage of infinite consciousness has ceased. When one has attained the stage which is neither cognitional nor non-cognitional, the cognition of the stage of nothing whatever has ceased. But cognition and feeling have ceased when one has attained the cessation of cognition and feeling.”*** The deeper workings of consciousnesses, and their potentials for shattering previous constrictions totally, are thus recognized throughout Buddhism (as well as in non-Buddhist meditational systems such as Yoga). Thus Buddhist therapeutic techniques use only categories relating to experienced moment-events, and antidotes are applied to those of them which are seen to be unbeneficial, through meditational methods by which previous ways of cognizing are suspended or entirely discarded. This is the root of the Buddhist sceptical

**Dhammasaṅgani* 24, cf. 15, 11.

**as described in *Saṃyutta* II, 210 ff.

****Saṃyutta* IV, 217.

attitude towards “normal consciousness”—an attitude which is to play a profound role in Mahāyāna.

Particular methods of doing Abhidharma evolved as Buddhist communities became isolated from one another with Buddhism's spread: these differences are reflected in the Abhidharma books of the Theravādins and those of the Sarvāstivādins. The second century A.D. saw a great resurgence of Abhidharma writing: it is the time of the *Vibhāṣā**, and of writers such as the Bhaddanta Vasumitra, his uncle Dharmatrāta, Ghoṣaka, the Bhaddanta Dharmatrāta, and Buddhadeva—all espousing quite different theories on points left unclear by the old Abhidharma manuals. The strongest divergences came on the subject of the “motivating dispositions”. This is not surprising, inasmuch as these include what Western psychology would call “emotions”, though the Abhidharma category is much more inclusive. It's not surprising that there should be sharply divergent views as to how many different types of motivating dispositions there are, which may arise together, which are unbeneficial, beneficial, and indeterminate. Buddhadeva, who perhaps gives the most radical theory on the subject, denied that they existed at all as definitely recognizable events, and said that all such “motivating dispositions” are really consciousness-moments.** The Bhaddanta Dharmatrāta, on the other hand, asserted that all consciousness-moments and motivating-disposition-moments are only forms of volition-moments.*** On the question as to which motivating dispositions are themselves afflictions, there was much debate.

To turn to our text itself, at first sight it appears to be another of the numerous definitional Abhidharma works that have been written since the *Dhammasaṅgani*. But Vasubandhu's approach

*see page 12.

**cf. *Kośa* I, 35, n. 2; II, p 150, n. 2 (La Vallée Poussin), Lin Li-Kuang, *L'Aide-Mémoire de la Vraie Loi*, p 47.

***Lin Li-kuang, pp 47-48.

to Abhidharma is always iconoclastic*, and this work was clearly written after his conversion to Mahāyāna. The invocation to the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, who with his sword of awareness cuts through all mental discriminations, affirms this—so does the therapeutic concern for “antidotes” that so often marks Vasubandhu’s Mahāyāna writing, so does the introduction of the Yogācāra store-consciousness.

The particular Abhidharma scheme adopted and criticized here seems to be most kin to that of the Mahīśāsakas.** The Mahīśāsakas adopted a list of nine uncompound events (*asam-skṛta-dharma*).** *A Discussion of the Five Aggregates* has only four, which is however more than most Abhidharmikas list, and includes some of the Mahīśāsaka elements. The reason for adopting a Mahīśāsaka-like framework for elucidation and criticism comes from the fact that *A Discussion of the Five Aggregates* is a re-working of Asaṅga’s *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. Asaṅga, having been originally trained by the Mahīśāsakas, retains many features of their approach to Abhidharma.

In Vasubandhu’s work, the lists of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* are subjected to close scrutiny. The entire list of “motivating dispositions disassociated from consciousness” is called here mere designations for situations in the other aggregates. The Mahīśāsaka-like list of “uncompound events” is also reduced to events explainable through the other aggregates. Vasubandhu had already in his *Kośa-bhāṣya* subjected Vaibhāṣika Abhidharma to sharp attack, in which many Vaibhāṣika “entities” were discarded. He is doing a similar thing here with Mahīśāsaka categories. He also reduces the somewhat prolix definitions of Asaṅga, by looking at the fundamental feature of the moment-event-type, and by never wasting a word.

In this translation, some terms have been translated differently than is usual. One of these is “*rūpa*”. It is used both for the first aggregate and for the object of the first consciousness. As the object of the first consciousness, “*rūpa*” is defined as a “visible”. But when treated as an aggregate the definitions focus on its dimensionality in a special locus, and its physical

*or, more exactly, “categorioclastic”.

**cf. Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, pp 180-189.

***Ibid, p 185, Mahīśāsaka thesis no. 19

resistance (i.e. the space occupied by one *rūpa* cannot be simultaneously occupied by another).^{*} Already in the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, it is stated that not all *rūpa* is visible.^{**} As an aggregate, *rūpa* need not belong to the field of any one consciousness, and different aspects of it are perceived by consciousnesses I-V. In fact, according to the *Yamaka*, an early book of the Theravāda Abhidhamma, the *rūpa*-aggregate and the *rūpa* seen as “attractive”, etc., are mutually exclusive.^{***} Presumably this is said because the primary characteristics of the *rūpa*-aggregate are perceived by a tactile consciousness. Good translations of “*rūpa*” as an aggregate are “matter”, “materiality”, “material forms”, whereas as an object of the first consciousness, it must be rendered simply as “visible”. The Chinese often translate “*rūpa*” as the object of the visual consciousness by “color”, but in the Vaibhāṣika system at least, color is only one aspect of the visible. The reason for the somewhat clumsy “materiality” adopted here for “*rūpa*” as an aggregate, rests on a wish to avoid a radical mind/matter duality. There are in Abhidharma terminology compounds such as “*nāma-rūpa*”, which seem to divide the “individual” into material and non-material aggregates, but, similarly, there is the category “*kāyaka*”, “bodily”, which includes all the aggregates except consciousness.[†] The researches of Maryla Falk have revealed that the aggregates subsumed under “*nāma*” also have spatial existence. She also says that the dimensionality of *rūpa* does not rule against its genetic connection with *nāma*.^{††} Besides, “*nāma*” and “*rūpa*” almost always occur together in a compound, which indicates a psychophysical complex not clearly divisible into the two aspects.

Some key terms in this treatise have also been left untranslated here. Of these the most important is “*citta*”. This term has usually been rendered as “thought”. This seems very

*cf. Asaṅga, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, p 2, p 12.

**“Atthi rūpaṃ cakkhuvīññāpassa vatthu; atthi rūpaṃ cakkhuvīññāpassa na vatthu.” *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* 585.

***“Piyarūpaṃ sātārūpaṃ rūpaṃ, na rūpakkhando.” *Yamaka* II, 1, 4, 26.

†cf. Carolyn Rhys-Davids’ *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* introduction, *A Manual of Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, p LXXV.

††Maryla Falk, *Nāmarūpa and dharmarūpa*, passim.

inadequate, inasmuch as the connotation of "thought" in English is ratiocinative, whereas *citta* exists in all the four meditational stages mentioned above. *Citta* is in fact the basic consciousness-moment. In order to demonstrate the inadequacy of the translation "thought", it may be useful to turn to the discussion of "*citta*" by two of the foremost second-century Abhidharmikas, the Bhadanta Vasumitra and Ghosaka.

According to the Bhadanta Vasumitra, the meditational experience of states where there are neither cognitions nor feelings can be reduced to *cittas*.^{*} But according to Ghosaka, this is impossible, as *citta* always involves certain concomitant events, two of which are invariably cognitions and feelings.^{**} Being thus according to Ghosaka always imbued with at least a basic intellectual and emotive side, and according to the Bhadanta Vasumitra separable from both, "*citta*" is not rendered very well by "thought" in either case. What the Westerner is most apt to designate by that term are really streams of those moments subsumed in this treatise under the general heading "initial mental application" and "subsequent discursive thought". Both of these types of mental activity are eliminated fairly early in meditation, and in fact the second meditational concentration is already free of both of them.^{***} When meditation manuals speak of "watching the flow of *cittas*", they mean something much more fundamental than witnessing an internal discursiveness: they are talking about unattached observation of consciousness-moments of whatever sort that may arise. Similarly, when Padmasambhava speaks of "Eka-Citta"[†], it is One Moment of Consciousness that includes them all, and renderings like "One Thought" or "One Mind" may be quite misleading.

Another term which has been left untranslated is "*manas*". It is employed for any consciousness which serves as a direct condition for a consciousness of the sixth, or "mental", variety. As such, it can be used for any occurrence of any of the six varieties of consciousness-moments which help give rise to an

^{*}cf. *Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*, 34.

^{**}Ghosaka, *Abhidharmāmṛta* 66, 12, cf. *Kośa* II, ad 44 c.

^{***}*Dīgha* I, 73 ff; *Majjhima* I 276 ff, 336 ff, 454 ff; *Vibhanga* 257 ff.

[†]cf. *The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation*.

immediately subsequent mental consciousness-moment. "Consciousness", "*citta*", and "*Manas*" are regarded as synonyms in ancient Buddhism^{*}, and Vasubandhu frequently makes mention of their fundamental equivalence.^{**} However, strictly speaking, some instances of *citta* or consciousness-moments are not *manas*, since they don't give rise to a mental consciousness.

The writings of Asaṅga introduce a new meaning for "*manas*", which is sometimes used by Vasubandhu also.^{***} The term is there employed for a seventh type of consciousness, a witness-stream of moment-events responsible for the sense of ego^{****}. It is basically an afflicted object-of-consciousness of the underlying store-consciousness, and can be eliminated fairly early in a Buddhist path[†].

Residual impressions from past aggregate-moments in the present consciousness-moment have been given the metaphorical designation "seeds". The metaphor is in some ways a very apt one. A "seed" is actually a constantly changing series of interrelated energy-events which gradually, if conditions allow^{††}, will give rise to a sprout. Similarly, a "latent impression" is a constantly changing series of moment-events which will gradually, if conditions allow, give rise to a memory, or a "reverberation" in the consciousness-series. In some ways, however, the metaphor is not so good, inasmuch as that series of moment-events called "a plant seed" only goes through the entire sequence once, whereas that series of moment-events called "a latent impression" may give rise to repeated transformations in the consciousness-series. The relationship between consciousness-moments and "seeds" is symmetrical, since each consciousness-moment leaves an impression in the consciousness-series, and this "seed"-series colors all future consciousnesses. This is true at least until consciousness undergoes

^{*}cf. *Saṃyutta* II, 54.

^{**}*Kośa* I, ad 16 c-d; II 34 a-b; *Twenty Verses*, Introduction.

^{***}*Discussion of Five Aggregates*, end; *Thirty Verses* 5-6.

^{****}Asaṅga, *Mahāyānasāṅgraha* I, 7. (Lamotte, p 18).

[†]*Thirty Verses*, 5.

^{††}The Buddhist scheme of causality, dependent origination, assumes that there are always plural causes and conditions for any moment-situation, cf. *Commentary on the Separation of the Middle from Extremes*, I, 10, 11 a.

that enlightening transformation called in Yogācāra texts "revolution at the basis", where past "seeds" lose their influence, and a completely unfiltered perception results.

The Mahāyāna *Sandhinirmocana* and *Laṅkāvatāra* sūtras speak of a "store" or "root" consciousness which is the conditional ground for all the other, "evolving" consciousnesses. Asaṅga and Vasubandhu introduce it into their consciousness-systems partially to meet objections which will be given in the treatise following this one, partially to hint at constriction and liberation in the consciousness-series. The store-consciousness is a stream of moment-events which underlies all the other consciousness-moments : It is the "store-house" or "support" of the "seeds". In Vasubandhu's most category-cutting moments, it is seen to be totally equivalent to the consciousness-"seeds" themselves.*

Though having some affinities with the "unconscious" of post-Freudian Occidental theorists, particularly Jung's "collective unconscious" which includes all the "archetypes" of experience, the store-consciousness is in Vasubandhu's writings the only reason for a feeling of identity or continuity in the consciousness-series, though it is "itself" not an entity at all. The dualistic divisions that Freud and even Jung make for the unconscious can have no place in Vasubandhu's theories. It is recognized by Vasubandhu that a mental consciousness' attempted determinations in reference to that which is basically sub-conscious are nothing more than a type of mental-consciousness construction which cannot be a real description of that which is fundamentally indeterminate. It seems from a Yogācāra perspective a tragic error that Western psychological theorists have pushed "good-and-evil" dualisms down into the depths of the subconscious, thereby introducing an element of deterministic despair. To Vasubandhu, there is beneficiality and unbeneficiality of events only where there has been a conscious discrimination, and a volition.**

Certain omissions in those groupings of events called "motivating dispositions" may be on first sight puzzling. For instance, where is fear? Fear may usually result from a misunderstanding,

*cf. *A Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*, 32.

***Kośa* IX (Pradhan, p. 477, 1-2, CVP, p. 274, 294.)

but so do any of the afflictions. No Abhidharma list seems to include it, though something is said about it in Vasubandhu's Mahāyāna works.*

The particular definitions Vasubandhu here gives are often deeply illuminating. There is in fact an entire Mahāyāna Buddhist way of experiencing and transmuting emotional energies inherent in this book. Particularly penetrating is the definition of "pride". It is seen there that a gloating about "one's superiority" and a brooding over "one's inferiority" both stem from a similar exaggerated and erroneous viewpoint.** Deeply interesting also is the definition of "meditational concentration". It is defined as any complete attention of a *citta*, or series of *cittas*, on any range of events. Thus, being completely absorbed in the sensations of the toes is as much meditational concentration as is a totally formless meditational experience. As the Bodhisattva Vimalakīrti said, "The way you are sitting here is not necessarily the only way of meditating."*** Any type of consciousness-moment may be meditatively concentrated. This also explains how all types of consciousness-moments "conform to understanding", since consciousnesses of any type may be non-dual experiences.

Since Abhidharma regards "personalities" as complexes of ever-changing interdependent streams of moment-events, therapeutic methods based on it are going to be very different from those usually adopted in the West. Western psychology and psychiatry usually operates from categorizations of the "individual". An entire ever-changing psychophysical complex may be boxed into an arbitrary category, and then equally arbitrarily "treated". More often than not this is done without any curiosity, awareness, or tolerance for what the psychophysical complex is actually experiencing. Instead, there is a proliferation of categories like "psychotic", "neurotic", etc. It is indeed unfortunate that the deeper workings of consciousness and "its" own potentials to shatter previous constrictions totally, do not seem to have been noticed : the self-styled observers

*See *Commentary on the Separation of the Middle from Extremes*, ad II, 9.

**This insight is traceable to some of the earliest Abhidharma books, see *Dhammasaṅgāṇī* 1116.

****Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*, III, beginning.

of consciousness in the West often seem extremely constricted by their own excluding categories. This is why in psychiatric institutions, the "patients" often see that their jailers—and this is what it amounts to—are stuck in much more confused levels of consciousness than they are themselves, for it takes a certain openness and deep sensitivity to arrive at those special states of perception called "psychotic", and "someone" who is stuck in categories of a most dualistic kind is not likely to be nearly as tolerant or understanding. Much incredible suffering has been inflicted by Western psychiatric categorizations of people : there have been sad epics of lobotomies, electroshock, poison drugs, ruined lives—even breaking the bones of "retarded" children may be defended as "behavior modification" !

What if instead the troubled "individuals" were treated in a manner of which Vasubandhu would approve, with the only categories used relating to psychophysical moment-events, and antidotes being applied to *those*, in such a way that all forms of perception and communication are equally valid and invalid, and where everyone's innate Buddha-nature is recognized?

Concerning the Text :

A Discussion of the Five Aggregates is lost in the original Sanskrit. The rendering into English which follows is based on the Tibetan translation of Jinamitra, Śilendrabodhi, Dānaśīla, and Yeśes-sde. (Peking/Tokyo Tibetan Canon, vol. 113, pp 231-239.)

A DISCUSSION OF THE FIVE AGGREGATES (PAÑCASKANDHAKA-PRAKARAṆA)

Homage to Mañjuśrī-kumāra-bhūta¹

1. The five aggregates are the aggregate of materialities, the aggregate of feelings, the aggregate of cognitions, the aggregate of motivational dispositions, and the aggregate of consciousnesses.

What is *materiality*? Materiality is whatever has dimensionality, and consists of all of the four great elements, and everything that is derived from the four great elements. And what are the four great elements? The earth-element, water-element, fire-element, and wind-element. Among these, what is the earth-element? It is solidity. What is the water-element? It is liquidity. What is the fire-element? It is heat. What is the wind-element? It is gaseousness.² What is derived from them? The sense-organ of the eye, the sense-organ of the ear, the sense-organ of the nose, the sense-organ of the tongue, the sense-organ of the body, visibles, sounds, smells, tastes, everything that can be subsumed under tactile sensations, and unmanifest action.³ And among these, what is the sense-organ of the eye? It is sentient materiality which has color as its sense-object. What is the sense-organ of the ear? It is sentient materiality which has sounds as its sense-object. What is the sense-organ of the nose? It is sentient materiality which has smells as its sense-object. What is the sense-organ of the tongue? It is sentient materiality which has tastes as its sense-object. What is the sense-organ of the body? It is sentient materiality which has tactile sensations as its sense-object. And what are visibles? They are the sense-objects of the eye: color, configuration, and manifest action.⁴ And what are sounds? They are the sense-objects of the ear, having as their causes great elements appropriated by the body, or great elements unappropriated. And what are smells? They are the sense-objects of the nose: pleasant smells, unpleasant smells, and those which are neither. And what are tastes? They are the sense-objects of the tongue: sweet, sour, salty, sharp, bitter,

and astringent. What is everything that can be subsumed under tactile sensations? They are the sense-objects of the body : the great elements themselves, softness, hardness, heaviness, lightness, coldness, hunger, and thirst. What is unmanifest action? It is materiality which has arisen from manifest action or meditational concentration: it is invisible and exercises no resistance.⁵

2. And what are *feelings*? They are experiences, and are of three kinds: pleasure, suffering, and that which is neither pleasure nor suffering. Pleasure is whatever there arises a desire to be connected with again, once it has stopped. Suffering is whatever there arises a desire to be separated from, once it has arisen. That which is neither pleasure nor suffering is whatever towards which neither desire arises, once it has arisen.

3. And what are *cognitions*? They are the grasping of signs in a sense-object.⁶ They are of three kinds : indefinite, definite, and immeasurable. Guṇaprabha in his *Pañcaskandha-vivaraṇa* explains "immeasurable cognitions" as follows: one can have a cognition of immeasurability, of space, of the ocean, etc.

4. And what are *motivational dispositions*? They are events associated with cittas,⁷ other than feelings and cognitions, and those that are disassociated from cittas. Among these, what are the events associated with cittas? They are whatever events are associated with cittas. And what are they? They are contact, mental attention, feelings, cognitions, volitions, zest, confidence, memory or mindfulness, meditational concentration, insight, faith, inner shame, dread of blame, the root-of-the-beneficial of lack of greed, the root-of-the-beneficial of lack of hostility, the root-of-the-beneficial of lack of confusion, vigor, tranquility, carefulness, equanimity, attitude of non-harming, attachment, aversion, pride, ignorance, views, doubt, anger, malice, hypocrisy, maliciousness, envy, selfishness, deceitfulness, guile, mischievous exuberance, desire to harm, lack of shame, lack of dread of blame, mental foggiess, excitedness, lack of faith, sloth, carelessness, loss of mindfulness, distractedness, lack of recognition, regret, torpor, initial mental application, and subsequent discursive thought.

Among these, the first five occur in every citta. The next five are certain only with specific objects-of-sense. The next eleven are beneficial. The next six are afflictions. The rest are secondary afflictions. The last four also become different (i.e. they are capable of being either afflictions or beneficial).

And what is *contact*? It is the distinguishing which comes after the three (sense-organ, object-of-sense, and corresponding consciousness) have met together. And what is *mental attention*? It is the entering into done by a citta. What is *volition*? It is mental action, which impels a citta towards good qualities, flaws, and that which is neither. And what is *zest*? It is desire towards a range of events of which there is consciousness. And what is *confidence*? It is holding to certainty in regard to a range of events of which there is certainty. What is *memory*? It is the non-forgetting of a range of events towards which there is acquaintance, and is a certain kind of discourse of citta. What is *meditational concentration*? It is one-pointedness of citta towards an examined range of events.⁸ What is *insight*? It is discernment as regards the same, and is either understanding, that which has arisen from not having understood, or that which is different from these two. What is *faith*? It is firm conviction, desire, and serenity of citta towards action, its results, the beneficial, and the Gems.⁹ What is *inner shame*? It is a shame coming about through a committed offense, in which the self, or rather the (psychological) event responsible, is predominant. And what is *dread of blame*? It is that shame towards others that comes about through a committed offense, in which the outer world is predominant. What is *lack of greed*? It is the antidote to greed, a non-attachment to that which is arising in *manas*.¹⁰ What is *lack of hostility*? It is the antidote to hostility, and is loving kindness. What is *lack of confusion*? It is the antidote to confusion, and is right recognition. And what is *vigor*? It is the antidote to sloth, and is enthusiasm of citta towards the beneficial. And what is *tranquility*? It is the antidote to a situation of susceptibility to harm, and is a skill in bodily and mental action. And what is *carefulness*? It is the antidote to carelessness, a cultivation of those beneficial events which are antidotes, and abandoning unbeneficial events through continuing in those beneficial factors : lack of greed, up to vigor. What is *equanimity*? It is whatever evenness of citta, remaining in a tranquil state of citta, total tranquility in citta continuing in those factors-lack of greed up to vigor, through which there is continuity in a state without afflictions through the clearing away of afflicted events. And what is an *attitude of non-harming*? It is the antidote to

an attitude of harming, and is compassion. And what is *attachment*? It is adherence to any fixed intent in appropriating aggregates.¹¹ And what is *aversion*? It is a tormented volition towards sentient beings. And what is *pride*? There are seven kinds of pride: basic pride, greater pride, the pride that is more than pride, the pride of thinking "I am", conceit, the pride of thinking deficiency, and false pride. Basic pride is any inflation of citta which considers, through a smallness, either "I am greater", or "I am equal". What is greater pride? Greater pride is any inflation of citta which considers, through an equality, that "I am greater" or "I am endowed with greatness." And what is pride that is more than pride? It is any inflation of citta which considers, through a greatness, that "I am great". And what is the pride of thinking "I am"? It is any inflation of citta which is connected with the view of either "I am" or "mine" in regard to appropriating aggregates. And what is conceit? It is any inflation of citta which considers, in regard to an excellence which was previously obtained in another moment, but is no longer, "I've attained it." And what is the pride of thinking deficiency? It is any inflation of citta which considers, "I am only a little bit inferior to those of greatly excellent qualities." And what is false pride? It is any inflation of citta which considers "I am endowed with good qualities" when good qualities have not been acquired. And what is *ignorance*? It is lack of knowledge regarding action, results of action, the Truths, and the Gems, and also the mentally constructed that rises together with it. In the realm of desires¹², there are three roots-of-the-unbeneficial: attachment, aversion, and ignorance, and these are the same as the roots-of-the-unbeneficial greed, hostility, and confusion. And what are *views*? These views are generally of five kinds: the view of a fixed self in the body, views regarding the permanence or impermanence of the elements constituting personality, false views, adherence to particular views, and adherence to mere rule and ritual. And what is the view of a fixed self in the body? It is an afflicted judgment viewing either an "I" or "mine" in the appropriating aggregates. And what are views regarding the permanence or the impermanence of the elements constituting personality? They relate to these same elements (the appropriating aggregates), and are afflicted judgments viewing them as either lasting

or discontinuous. And what are false views? They are any afflicted judgments which involve fear towards the elements of existence, and which cast aspersions on the efficacy of cause and effect. What is adherence to particular views? It is any afflicted judgment viewing these same three views, and the aggregates which continue in them, as being the best, the most excellent, attained, and most exalted. And what is attachment to mere rules and rituals? It is any afflicted judgment seeing in rules and rituals, and in the aggregates continuing in them, purity, liberation, and a leading to Nirvāṇa. And what is *doubt*? It is any two-mindedness as regards the Truths, etc. The latter three of those afflicted views mentioned above, and doubt, are the basic mentally constructed. The rest of these views are the mentally constructed that often arise together with those.¹³ What is *anger*? It is any tormented volition of citta which all of a sudden becomes intent on doing harm. What is *malice*? It is taking hold of a hostility. What is *hypocrisy*? It is unwillingness to recognize one's own faults. What is *maliciousness*. It is being enslaved by unpleasant speech. What is *envy*? It is an agitation of citta at the attainments of another. What is *selfishness*? It is a holding fast to a citta which is not in accord with giving. What is *deceitfulness*? It is attempting to show forth to another an unreal object through an action of decoying. What is *guile*? It is a deceitfulness of citta which seizes an opportunity for making secret one's own flaws. What is *mischievous exuberance*? It is holding fast to a delighted citta unconnected with internal good qualities. What is an *attitude of harming*? It is an intention unbeneficial towards sentient beings. And what is *lack of shame*? It is a lack of internal shame at offences one has committed. And what is *lack of dread of blame*? It is a lack of dread towards others at offences one has committed. What is *mental foggyiness*? It is a lack of skill in mental action, and is thickheadedness. What is *excitedness*? It is lack of calm in citta. What is *lack of faith*? It is a lack of trust in a citta, which is not in accord with faith, towards action and its results, the Truths and the Gems. What is *sloth*? It is a lack of enthusiasm towards the beneficial in a citta, and is that which is not in accord with vigor. What is *carelessness*? It is any non-guarding of citta from afflictions, and non-cultivation of the beneficial, which comes about by

being linked with greed, hostility, confusion, or sloth. What is *loss of mindfulness*? It is an afflicted mindfulness, an unclarity as to the beneficial. What is *distractedness*? It is any diffusion of citta, which partakes of greed, hostility, or confusion on the five sense-qualities of the realm of desires. What is *lack of recognition*? It is a judgment connected with afflictions, by which there is entry into not knowing what has been done by body, voice, or manas. What is *regret*? It is remorse, a piercing sensation in manas. What is *torpor*? It is a contraction of citta which is without capacity for entering down into anything. What is *initial mental application*? A discourse of inquiry by manas, a certain kind of volition and discernment, which can be characterized as an indistinct state of citta. What is *(subsequent) discursive thought*? A discourse of examination by manas, which in the same way can be characterized as a more precise state of citta.¹⁴

And what are the *motivating dispositions disassociated from cittas*? These are pure designations for situations in materialities, cittas, and events associated with cittas, and are designations only for these, and not for anything else.¹⁵ And what are they? *Prāpti*, the attainment without cognitions, the attainment of the cessation of cognitions and feelings, any non-meditative state without cognitions, life-force, taking part in an organism, birth, decrepitude, continuity, lack of duration, the collection of words, the collection of phrases, the collection of syllables, the state of being separate from Dharma, and other factors like these.

Among these, what is *prāpti*? It is becoming connected with something attained.¹⁶ Actually, it is a "seed"¹⁷, a capacity, an approachment, and an adjustment to circumstances.¹⁸ And what is an *attainment free from cognitions*? It is any cessation of non-stable events: cittas and events associated with cittas, which is totally clear and separate from attainments, and which comes about through a mental attention dispensing with cognitions about to arise, where former cognitions do not exist. And what is the *attainment of the cessation of cognitions and feelings*? It is any cessation of non-stable and more stable events, cittas and events associated with cittas, which comes about through a mental attention dispensing with cognitions, continuing in which comes after the summits of existence have been practised,

and which is separate even from those attainments present in the stage-of-nothing-whatever.¹⁹ And what is a *non-meditative state without cognitions*? It is the cessation of non-stable events: cittas and events associated with cittas, which takes place, for instance, within those groups of gods which are sentient, but do not have cognitions. What is *life-force*? It is, as regards any events taking part in an organism, any continuity, for a certain time, of motivating dispositions which have been projected by past action. And what is *taking part in an organism*? It is any close interrelationship of bodily parts as regards sentient beings.²⁰ What is *birth*? It is any arising of a stream of motivating dispositions which has not already arisen, as regards any collection of events taking part in an organism. And what is *decrepitude*? It is an alteration in the stream of those like that (i.e. events taking part in an organism). What is *continuity*? It is the serial propagation in the stream of those like that. What is *lack of duration*? It is the discontinuity in the stream of those like that. What is the *collection of words*? It is denotations for the own-beings of events. What is the *collection of phrases*? It is denotations for the particularities of events.²¹ What is the *collection of syllables*? They are the syllables of actual sound through which the other two are disclosed. Though these all refer to speech, meanings are communicated dependent on words and phrases. For the same syllable does not arise with another synonym.²² And what is the *state of being separate from Dharma*? It is the non-attainment of noble psychological events.

These all are called "the aggregate of motivational dispositions".

5. And what is *consciousness*? It is awareness of an object-of-consciousness, visibles, etc. "Citta" and "manas" are the same as consciousness. They are so designated because of their variety, and because of their providing a mental basis, respectively.²³ Actually, the store consciousness is also citta, as it accumulates the seeds for all motivating dispositions.²⁴ Its objects-of-consciousness and aspects are undiscerned.²⁵ It joins an assemblage pertaining to an organism into a felt relationship, and continues as a series of moment-events. Thus, though there is awareness of a sense-object immediately upon emerging from the attainment of cessation of cognitions and

feelings, the attainment free from cognitions, or a non-meditative state without cognitions, it arises as the consciousness of the attainments themselves; it is the state of evolvment into another aspect once there has been perception dependent upon any object-of-consciousness; it is the state of citta's arising again even after the consciousness-stream has been severed; it is entry into Saṃsāra* and transmigration in it.²⁶ This same store-consciousness is the support of all the seeds, the basis and causality for the body, and the state of continuance in a body. It is also called "the appropriating consciousness", because it appropriates a body. Used in the sense of a specific entity, *manas* is an object-of-consciousness, within the store-consciousness, a consciousness always connected with confusion of self, the view of a self, pride of self, love of self, etc. It also joins an assemblage pertaining to an organism into a felt relationship, and continues as a series of moment-events, but does not exist in a saint, the Noble Path, or at the time of the attainment of cessation.

Why are the aggregates thus designated? It is through their collectivity, i.e. various kinds of materialities, etc., being heaped up together that "times", "series", "aspects", "developments", and "sense-objects" seem to occur.²⁷

The twelve *sense-fields* are the sense-field of the eye and the sense-field of visibles, the sense-field of the ear and the sense-field of sounds, the sense-field of the nose and the sense-field of smells, the sense-field of the tongue and the sense-field of tastes, the sense-field of the body and the sense-field of tactile sensations, the sense-field of *manas* and the sense-field of mentally cognizables. The eye, visibles, the ear, sounds, the nose, smells, the tongue, tastes have all been discussed previously. The sense-field of the tactile is the four great elements and everything (all the incredibly numerous various sensations) which can be subsumed under tactile sensations. The sense-field of *manas* is any aggregate of consciousness. The sense-field of mentally cognizables is feelings, cognitions, motivating dispositions, unmanifest action, and the uncompounded. And what is the uncompounded? Space, the cessation not through contemplation, the cessation through contemplation, and Such-

*The world of change.

ness. Among these, what is *space*? It is any interval separating materialities.²⁸ What is a *cessation not through contemplation*? It is any non-separation from cessation without antidotes to afflictions figuring in.²⁹ And what is *cessation through contemplation*? It is any non-separation from cessation, any constant non-arising of aggregates through antidotes to afflictions. What is *Suchness*? It is the "inherent nature (*dharma-tā*) of any event", and is the selflessness of events.³⁰

Why are these called "sense-fields"? Because they are the doors to the rising of consciousness. The eighteen *sensory domains* are the domain of the eye, the domain of the visible, the domain of the visual consciousness; the domain of the ear, the domain of sounds, the domain of audial consciousness; the domain of the nose, the domain of smells, the domain of olfactory consciousness; the domain of the tongue, the domain of tastes, the domain of gustatory consciousness; the domain of the body, the domain of the tactile, the domain of tactile consciousness, the domain of the *manas*, the domain of mentally cognizables, and the domain of the mental consciousness. The domains of the eye, etc., and the domains of visibles, etc., are the same as the sense-fields. The domains of the six consciousnesses are awarenesses with objects-of-consciousness in visibles, etc., and which are dependent on the eye, etc. The domain of *manas* is any of these consciousness-moments which are past immediately afterwards, because of the continuity of the sixth consciousness.³¹ In this way, the sensory domains have been determined as eighteen.

Ten of those sense-fields and domains (the sensory organs and their objects) and that part of the sense-field of mentally cognizables which may be subsumed under it (unmanifest action) constitute whatever is the aggregate of materiality. The sense-field of *manas* and the seven domains of citta (the visual, olfactory, gustatory, tactile, and mental consciousnesses, and the domain of mentally cognizables) constitute whatever is the aggregate of consciousness. The sense-fields and domains of mentally cognizables also constitute whatever are the other three aggregates (feelings, cognitions, and motivating dispositions), one part of the aggregate of materiality which may be subsumed under it (unmanifest action), and the uncompounded. Why are these called "domains"? Because they grasp an "own-

characteristic", though without a "doer".³² As to why they are called "aggregates", etc., this serves as an antidote to the three kinds of grasping after self, in order. The three kinds of grasping after self are grasping for one central entity, grasping for an "enjoyer", and grasping for a "doer".

Among these eighteen sensory domains, which contain materiality? Whatever has the own-being of the aggregate of materiality. Which do not contain materiality? The rest of them. Which can be seen? Only the sensory domain of visibles is an object-of-sense which can be seen.³³ Which are invisible? The rest of them. Which exercise resistance? The ten which contain materiality, which exercise resistance on each other. Which do not exercise resistance? The rest of them. Which are liable to be connected with afflictions?³⁴ Fifteen (i.e. the sensory domains of the eye to tactile consciousness), and part of the last three (*manas*, mentally cognizables, and mental consciousness). Which are unliable to be connected with afflictions? Part of the last three. Those because of having a scope allowing for the direct perception of the arising of afflictions.³⁵ Which are without afflictions? Part of the last three. Which occur in the realm of desires? All of them. Which occur in the realm of simple images? Fourteen: all of them except smells, tastes, olfactory-consciousness, and gustatory-consciousness. Which occur in the imageless sphere? Part of the last three. Which are included within the aggregates? All of them except the un compounded. Which are included within the appropriating aggregates? Those constituting a "personality". Which are beneficial, which unbeneficial, and which indeterminate? Ten may belong to any of the three categories: the seven sensory domains of citta, and the sensory domains^{35a} of visibles, sounds and mentally cognizables. The rest of them are all indeterminate. Which are "internal"? Twelve of them: all of them except visibles, sounds, smells, tastes, tactile sensations and mentally cognizables. Which are "external"? Six of them: those not included in the preceding. Which have an object-of-consciousness? The seven sensory domains of citta, and one part of the sensory domain of mentally cognizables, namely, whatever events are associated with cittas. Which are without an object-of-consciousness? The ten others and most of the sensory

domains of mentally cognizables. Which contain discrimination? The sensory domains of *manas*, mental consciousness, and mentally cognizables. Which do not contain discrimination? The rest of them* Which are appropriated? Five of the "internal" (organs I-V) and part of the "external" (i.e. part of visibles, sounds, smells, tastes, and tactile sensations). Which are unappropriated? Part of the four (all visibles, smells, tastes and tactile sensations not integral parts of the sensory organism)³⁶ which are functional (*sabhāga*)? The five internal material ones (organs I-V) because there is a correspondence between the specific consciousness and its sensory domain. Which are non-functional (*tat-sabhāga*)? The same when they are empty in relation to their specific consciousness, because of a conformity of each to its own knowledge.³⁷

NOTES

*This seems in contradiction with note 14, but Yaśomitra explains: Though the sensory consciousnesses do have basic discrimination, they lack the discrimination of definition (*abhinirūpaṇa-vikalpa*), i.e. "This is this, that is that", and hence are called non-discriminatory. (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, ad I 33).

1. On the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī "who has become a prince", see Introduction to this text, p 58.

2. *The great elements.*

The great material elements accepted by the *Vibhāṣā* are earth, water, fire and wind. It has been held (cf. Jaini, *Abhidharma-dīpa*, Introduction, p 90) that the theory of these elements may have been inspired by the Vaiśeṣikas, who enumerate earth, water, fire, wind, space, time, place, soul and *manas* as *dravyas* (Kaṇāda, *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra* I, I, 5). But their adoption in Buddhism may actually antedate Kaṇāda, as it is in evidence in the *Dhammasaṅgani* (648). It is possible that both Buddhist Abhidharma and Vaiśeṣika may derive their elements via the *Upaniṣads* (cf. *Praśna-Upaniṣad* IV, 8) from the cosmogenic categories of the *Brāhmaṇas*. The *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, XI, I, 6, 16-24, states that water, breath (wind), speech, and fire were created at the first full-moon and new-moon rites performed by Prajāpati and Paramēsthin; at the second rite, the sky (space), earth and water were created.

Already in the *Prakaraṇapāda* of Vasumitra (Chinese translations Taisho 1541 and 1542), a text held in canonical esteem by the *Vibhāṣā*, these elements are not the common things usually designated by the names "earth", etc., but rather represent more abstract principles to be found in materiality. Earth is the solid principle that holds things in place, water the wet principle which has cohesion as its special quality, fire the hot principle that cooks and transforms, and wind the mobile principle that expands and displaces (*Prakaraṇapāda* 13 a, quoted La Vallée Poussin, *Kośa* I, p 22). Vasu-

mitra says further that these elements are directly perceptible only by the fifth, or tactile, consciousness.

3. A detailed discussion of the Vaibhāṣika concept of "unmanifest action" occurs in *A Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*, 14 and in note 3.

4. A discussion of these divisions of the visible (all of which except color are rejected by Vasubandhu) is given in *A Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*, 1-5. On "configuration", see note 5 to that text.

5. Though an "unmanifest action" is a residual force which has as its locus the material elements of the body, it does not share the usual characteristics of materiality, since it is not directly perceptible, and exercises no resistance. This latter phrase means that the locus of one materiality can not be occupied by another, so that if two instances of materiality collide, one will displace the other.

6. A cognition is a particularization of perception, and may accompany any type of consciousness-moment. Certain "signs" or salient features are taken hold of: thus there may be "the cognition of the smell of a jasmine flower", "the cognition of the taste of rice", or "the cognition that everything is impermanent" accompanying instances of smell-consciousness, taste-consciousness, and mental consciousness, respectively.

7. On *cittas*, see introduction to this text, p 59-60.

8. "One-pointedness" is a metaphor for complete concentration. Any range of events may serve as a focus for meditational concentration. See introduction, p 63. A totally formless meditation is still "one-pointedness of *citta* towards an examined range of events", since formless experiences are still included in a definite range of events.

9. This is a Buddhist definition of "faith", which focuses on those few "articles of faith" accepted by Buddhism: that actions all have retributory effects for their "performers", that there is a beneficial course of action which is not conducive to the arising of suffering, and that the "Gems" (the Buddha, the Dharma and the Buddhist community) are worthy of respect because they indicate beneficial courses of action.

10. On *manas*, see introduction, pp 60-61. This definition of "greed" suggests that greed (or attachment, which is seen to be the same) can arise only in regard to mentally constructed events.

11. "The appropriating aggregates" are those collections of aggregates that constitute a definite life-stream: they "appropriate" their interrelationship.

12. The three realms of experience are "the realm of desires", "the realm of simple images" and "the imageless realm". Any state where all the sense-consciousnesses are operative, and where all passions and aversions have their full opportunity to develop, is subsumed under "the realm of desires". Thus, all non-meditationally concentrated states are included there. "The realm of simple images" comprises the four first meditational stages, where certain senses, such as smell and taste, are not operative. "The imageless realm" comprises any state where all senses except the mental consciousness are suspended. It is "imageless", then, in the sense that the first five consciousnesses no longer perceive their objects. These states are the ex-

treme meditational concentrations, the four "imageless attainments", which culminate in the attainment of the cessation of all cognitions and feelings.

The conception of these "realms" in Buddhism shows an amalgamation of cosmological needs with the result of meditational experimentation. In the earliest Buddhist conception, there were apparently only two "realms": a "realm of images" and an "imageless realm". (cf. *Sutta-nipāta* 755-756, *Itivuttaka* 51, 73.) Przyluski noted that the contrast between the 'realm of desires' and the 'realm of images' was added later ("Bouddhisme et Upanishad", *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française de l'Extrême Orient*, 1932). Falk supplies an explanation for this when she says that the assumption of a three-"realm" division was made necessary by increasing experimentation with the imageless attainments (*Nāmarūpa*, p 98). Originally, these meditations were not very important in Buddhism, though they were practised and held central by several religious orders, including that of Udraka, the second religious teacher of the Buddha. In *Digha* III, 131, ff, it is stated that the four simpler meditations are all that are needed to attain the fruits of sainthood, and it is also significant that directly before his death, the Buddha went into those meditational concentrations only (*Digha* II, 156). Increasing experimentation with the sense-suspending attainments made it necessary to distinguish "realm-wise" between them and the simpler meditational stages.

13. It is primarily doubt as regards the clearly perceived, false views, adherence to any particular view, and adherence to mere rule and ritual, that gives rise to mental constructions—those focuses of mental consciousness that have no reality outside of the constructions of that consciousness. Other particular views which have an unbeneficial effect rest on those four types of confusion.

14. "Initial mental application" and "subsequent discursive thought" are two kinds of flows of discrimination—in fact the first of them is to Vasubandhu *svabhāva-vikalpa*, "basic discrimination", the kind that makes all other kinds possible. Both of these are regarded as existing together within the sensory consciousnesses by the *Vibhāṣā*, and by orthodox Vaibhāṣikas such as Saṅghabhadra and the *Dīpakāra*. But in the face of Vasubandhu's attacks, which state that these two are not genetically different, but only different stages in the same "series", and thus can't be situated together within one moment of consciousness, both Saṅghabhadra and the *Dīpakāra* are forced to admit that the second of these can be present in the first five types of consciousness only "in an unmanifest state", cf. *Abhidharmadīpa* ad II, 123, p 83; Yaśomitra's citation of Saṅghabhadra's *Abhidharmayāyānusāra*, ad II 33, Law ed II, p 57. (See also Jaini's discussion, *Abhidharmadīpa*, introduction, pp 83-88.) To Vasubandhu, "initial mental application" is not really a separate event, but represents a certain kind of volition and constructing discernment existing, as he says, even in sensory consciousnesses, as long as these are not meditatively concentrated, (cf. Yaśomitra's discussion, *Vyākhyā*, ad I 33, Law I, p 74) whereas according to older definitions, such as the *Vibhāṣā*'s and Asaṅga's, it and discursive thought rest on volition and discernment, rather than being strictly identifiable

with them (*Abhidharmasamuccaya*, p 10; Yaśomitra *Vyākhyā*, ad II 33, Law II, p 57). Following Vasubandhu initial mental application is volition or discernment inasmuch as it does or does not involve deduction (cf. Yaśomitra, ad I 33, Law I, p 74 : "Anabhyūhāvasthāyām cetanā abhyūhāvasthāyām prajñeti vyavasthāpyate"). The discussion of Schmidhausen in his article "Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen in *Viṃśatikā* und *Triṃśikā*" which attempts to uphold some kind of a fundamental distinction between sensory and non-sensory consciousnesses in Vasubandhu's psychology, is confused to some extent by a misquotation from Yaśomitra in Jaini's edition of the *Abhidharmadīpa*. Initial mental application is certainly not for Vasubandhu "only an impulse", as Schmidhausen claims. Jaini's quotation from Yaśomitra is "Cetanāviśeṣa eva vitarka itī" (p 19, n 4), "He says that initial mental application is only a certain kind of volition", but the text clearly reads "Cetanāprajñāviśeṣa", "a certain kind of volition or discernment" (Yaśomitra, ad I 33, Law I, p 74). Vasubandhu does not place too much emphasis on the distinctness aspects of these mental streams, as he considers such descriptions quite relative (cf. *Kośa* II, ad 33a-b, La Vallée Poussin, pp 173-174). Sthiramati explains that the "indistinctness" of initial mental application when compared to subsequent discursive thought consists in the fact that initial mental application considers only the object of sense or understanding, without further connections being made. These are made by subsequent discursive thought. (*Triṃśikavijñaptibhāṣya*, p 32). (See also *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* 7-8, and Carolyn Rhys-Davids' comments on Buddhaghosa's *Atthasālini* 114, 115, where "initial mental application" is described as "a distinctively mental procedure at the inception of a train of thought, a deliberate movement of voluntary attention" and "subsequent discursive thought" as "the movement and maintenance of a voluntary thought-continuum, as distinguished from the initial grappling with the subject of reflection.", *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* translation, p 10, note 1; p 11, note 2.)

It is interesting that Vasubandhu will characterize these mental flows which make for discriminations as being potentially afflictions. These flows tend to result in holding fast to views, etc., and thus give rise to afflictions. They are both eliminated fairly early in meditational concentration streams.

15. Vasubandhu is here eliminating the entire category of "motivating dispositions disassociated from citta", and proceeds to explain how each of these "moment-events" thus categorized really represents a particular condition in materialities, cittas, and events associated with cittas.

16. "Attained" is here being used in its most bland scientific sense, to mean "becoming intimately associated for a time".

17. See Introduction, pp 61-62. Here, what the Vaibhāṣika and Mahīśāsaka accept as a special entity *prāpti* is equated to residues in consciousness effected by latent impressions.

18. When one says, conventionally, that "X has Y", the Mahīśāsaka and Vaibhāṣika explain this as moment-event A subsumed in "series X" connected by a *prāpti* to moment-event B subsumed in "series Y". A *prā-*

pti is recognized by them as a special kind of entity that links diverse but related elements. As such it plays a role not unlike the inherence-category (*samavāya-padārtha*) of the Vaiśeṣikas, except that the latter, at least in the earlier theory, is single, whereas there is a *prāpti* for each connecting relationship between two events. Vasubandhu regards the concept of *prāpti* as bogus. What is thus designated may be a "seed", as when one says "X has such and such a view". This means that, within the aggregate-series designated as "X", there are consciousness-moments accompanied by latent impressions from past moments ("seeds"), making for a view. It may be a capacity, as when one says, "X has great bodily strength." This means that, within the aggregate-series designated as "X", there is the capacity for doing heavy bodily actions. It may be an "approachment", a growing physical proximity of two events, as when one says "X is eating food". It may be simply an "adjustment according to circumstances", as when one says, "X has a feeling of pain" (explained by the Mahīśāsakas and Vaibhāṣikas as a consciousness-series designated "X" linked to an aggregate of suffering-feeling by a *prāpti*). According to Vasubandhu, this is simply an alteration from one citta to the next because of a circumstance of pain in the feeling-aggregate interrelated to the consciousness-aggregate.

19. The attainment of the cessation of feelings and cognitions, last of the "imageless meditations", is reached only after the consciousness-series has passed through the other four imageless attainments, which are also designated as "the summits of existence". These latter are the meditational attainments focused on infinite space, on infinite consciousness, on nothing whatever, and the state which is neither cognitional nor non-cognitional. For the attainment of cessation of feelings and cognitions to be reached, even those events present in the stage which is neither cognitional nor non-cognitional must no longer be present. Vasubandhu says that the attainment of cessation of feelings and cognitions must be separate from the subtle attachments present even in the stage of nothing whatever, but actually he "should" say in addition that this attainment is separate even from the dim cognitions of the stage which is neither cognitional nor non-cognitional, as well.

20. The factor here translated as "taking part in an organism" has usually been rendered "generic similarity". This however is clearly not what is involved, as can be seen from Vasubandhu's definition.

21. A word may indicate the "own-being" or "nature" of a moment-event, e.g. "blue", but a complete meaning dealing with particulars of events can only be expressed by a phrase.

22. Syllables themselves are not the conveyors of meaning, otherwise each synonym would consist of the same syllables.

23. "Cittas" are so called because of their variety (*citratva*), and all instances of "manas" are so called because of providing a mental basis (*manāśraya*). The first of these etymological explanations is used by Vasubandhu again in *A Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*, 31, and in *The Teaching of the Three Own-Beings*, 7.

24. This is the second etymological explanation of "citta", by the root

ci, cinoti, "to accumulate". This again occurs in KSP 31 and TSN 7. The six consciousnesses are variegated, thus fit with the first etymology; the store-consciousness accumulates "seeds", thus fits with the second.

25. According to Mahīśāsaka and Vaibhāṣika theory, each consciousness must have an object-of-consciousness and also an aspect, that is, some special characteristic by which it can be recognized. Since the store-consciousness underlies the six discerning consciousnesses which have definite objects-of-consciousness and aspects, it cannot be discerned by any of them. Thus its object-of-consciousness and aspect must be undiscerned. It is known only by inference, as Sumatīśīla says in *Karmasiddhiṭīkā*, ad 36. Though this may be an embarrassing admission to make in the face of Vaibhāṣika charges that a consciousness should be directly experienced, it at least has the value of consistency. Vasubandhu's admission that the object-of-consciousness and aspect of the store-consciousness are undiscerned is better than the approach of Occidental "depth-psychologists", who posit a "subconscious" and then try to fix its contents, which is tantamount to saying that the "subconscious" can be consciously discerned.

26. Here, Vasubandhu has compactly given the inferential justifications for assuming a store-consciousness within his definition of it. The meditative attainment of the cessation of cognitions and feelings must itself be accompanied by consciousness-moments, otherwise the consciousness-series could never resume once the attainment ceases. This is one of the main arguments for the existence of the store-consciousness in *A Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*. A consciousness-series changes permanently after it has been impressed by an object-of-consciousness: again this is impossible without some substratum. Entry into Saṃsāra, i.e. consciousness' becoming linked with an organism, is again impossible without some consciousness preceding temporally the six discerning consciousnesses, as these do not yet exist at the inception of an embryo's existence. Transmigration in Saṃsāra, or, more properly, the residue of the aggregate-complex from one life to the next, is again impossible unless there is a substratum where the residue exists. Some of these arguments were already used by Aśaṅga. (The argument of a consciousness' being necessary in the attainment of the cessation of feelings and cognitions is raised by Aśaṅga in *Mahāyānaśāṅgraha*, I, 31., the change in aspects in consciousness implying a substratum in I, 32., no possibility of the carry-over of impressions from one moment to the next without an underlying consciousness, in I, 33-34., and the impossibility of there being a residue of one consciousness-complex from one moment to the next without a store-consciousness in I, 38.)

27. The aggregates are first of all so designated because they are not simple moment-events, but are moment-events "heaped together". For instance, "materiality", though one kind of aggregate, consists in one moment "in one organism" of a huge number of moment-events, in fact all the events which twentieth century physiological chemistry is attempting to define. Furthermore, they are not only "aggregated" in one moment, but the events in one aggregation-moment help give rise to the next. Time, a real category to ancient and modern Vaiśeṣikas, is recognized already in the *Vibhāṣā* as being only a name for the flow of compounded events (see

Vibhāṣā selections translated by La Vallée Poussin, *Mélanges* 1936-37, p. 8). Thus "time" exists only because moment-events are followed by subsequent moment-events. A "series", similarly, is only a metaphor for the phenomenon of one aggregate-moment's arising when the other has ceased, and being causally linked to the previous one. An "aspect", defined as a distinguishing characteristic for a moment-event, is really not anything of the sort, either, since "it" is abstracted from the many events arising in one moment. A "development", again, does not really occur, since there is not anything which can undergo change: rather each moment is distinct from the previous one. It is conventionally said that "A visible is a sense-object of an eye", but this statement comes only from the visual consciousness-aggregate arising in a compounded and cognitional form.

28. "Space", recognized as a definite kind of entity in Vaiśeṣika philosophy, is also accepted by many Abhidharmika systems, including that of the Mahīśāsakas (Bareau, Mahīśāsaka thesis no. 19, *Les sectes*, p. 185). If it is accepted, it must clearly be uncompounded, i.e. not consisting of conditioned moment-events. Vasubandhu however denies that space is an entity at all. He says that it is simply an interval between materialities, and is thus an absence of impinging materiality.

29. "Cessation not through contemplation" is the Abhidharmika term for a cessation of the psychophysical complex which has not come about through the specifically Buddhist contemplations of the truth of suffering, the truth of the arising of suffering, the truth of the cessation of suffering, and the truth of a path leading to the cessation of suffering. Passages which in detail discuss "cessation not through contemplation" indicate that any cessation of "an aggregate-series" can be designated in this way, as long as the cessation has not come from a contemplation of the Four Noble Truths, nor by the inherent destruction of each moment-event. (This latter type of cessation, which refers to moment-events rather than to "series", is called by the *Vibhāṣā* "cessation due to non-eternality" (*Vibhāṣā*, 31, translated by La Vallée Poussin, *BEFEO XXX*, p. 1 ff). Thus, a non-Buddhist yogi who through meditations is able to annihilate factors of suffering, has achieved this through "a cessation not through contemplation", because the knowledge of the Noble Truths was not involved. A series of blue visual consciousnesses ceases when the stimulus giving rise to blue visual consciousnesses ceases: this would also be, and far more obviously so, "a cessation not through contemplation". The nature of this cessation was however the subject of much dispute among Abhidharmikas (cf. *Vibhāṣā* 31, 32, translated by La Vallée Poussin, *BEFEO XXX*, pp. 1-28; Vasubandhu, *Kośa* I, ad 5-6; Saṅghabhadra, *Nyāyānusāra*, I, 32, translated by La Vallée Poussin, *BEFEO XXX*, pp. 259-60, cf. pp. 263-298). "Cessation through contemplation" is essentially an Abhidharmika synonym for "Nirvāṇa" (*Vibhāṣā* 31, synonym no. 1, La Vallée Poussin, p. 10).

It is interesting that Vasubandhu here reduces the cause of "cessation through contemplation" from a realization of the Four Noble Truths to antidotes to afflictions. Presumably, for him, a non-Buddhist not recognizing the Four Noble Truths could still give rise to cessation through contemplation, if antidotes to afflictions were applied.

30. In other words, the only inherent nature in all events is that they have none! Suchness is the equivalent of Emptiness, by which all events have no graspable nature. Vasubandhu has thus eliminated the entire Mahīśāsaka list of uncompounded events, for all of them, by his definitions, are mere absences.

31. The sixth consciousness, or mental consciousness, includes in its "domain" residues of consciousnesses of all six varieties. For example, an audial consciousness may arise in one moment, the mental consciousness "That note was flat", referring to the previous audial consciousness, may arise in the next moment. The domain of *manas*, i.e. any of the consciousnesses preceding a sixth-consciousness-moment, is itself "past immediately afterwards", i.e. it is momentary. But a reflection on this *manas* by a succeeding sixth-consciousness-moment, is possible. Thus, a kind of continuity in succeeding sixth-consciousness-moments is possible, because previous consciousness-moments of all six varieties affect succeeding sixth-consciousness-moments. In the example above, the sound itself is an audial consciousness, and lasts for a moment. The mental-consciousness-moment "That note was flat", which depended on the previous second-consciousness-moment can itself give rise to a "series" of new sixth-consciousness-moments, such as "The singer might have been under some strain at that moment", "This composition requires great skill in executing musical ornaments," etc., etc., all of which are continuous upon one another and derive in part from the audial consciousness-moment which has long passed.

32. There are only the efficacies of these particular domains, without there being any central "doer". This is of course a necessary recognition in realizing "the selflessness of personalities".

33. This should seem obvious, but the implications of this statement may not be. Thus, wherever visual "models" are made in regard to that which isn't visible, what is being made is a distortion. It is as futile as attempting to explain the visible in terms of smell.

34. See *A Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*, note 43. The term "connected with distress" (*sāsrava*) has been rendered by "liable to be connected with afflictions", which is what the prior term really means.

35. The mental-consciousness-aggregates have the possibility of recognizing the arising of afflictions; for instance, when they are meditatively concentrated in certain ways. Thus they may be either liable to be connected with afflictions, or not.

35a. The sensory domain of visibles can be beneficial or unbeneficial only because of manifest action (*vijñapti-karma*), which is assumed to be part of the sense-field of visibles. (See, in this book, *A Discussion for the Demonstration of Action*, 1-4). The sensory domain of sounds is beneficial or unbeneficial only if it is verbal action.

36. "Unappropriated" from the point of view of a particular aggregate "series", see note 11.

37. An object of consciousness is functional when the consciousness proper to it has arisen or will arise. A non-functional object of consciousness is when it has not, for one reason or another, become "conscious" (cf. *Kośa* I, Pradhan. p. 106; LVP, p. 75).