

## Lesson 5 on 3/11/04 by Dr. Bhikkhuni Bodhi

This is a personal note on lecture by Dr. Bhikkhuni Bodhi on Historical Survey of Buddhist Thought. This is Module 3 and the last module of the Diploma Course in Buddhist Studies conducted at the Buddhist Library by the Graduate School of Buddhist Studies (Singapore). For other lesson updates please go to: [www.geocities.com/lee\\_mengkai/](http://www.geocities.com/lee_mengkai/)

---

### Continuation on Sarvāstivāda

#### **Citta-caitta-samprayoga theory (psychological doctrine)**

The citta-caitta-samprayoga theory is a psychological doctrine of the Sarvāstivāda. Dr. Venerable Bodhi has written a thesis on this topic for her PhD in Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma.

Is Citta a dharma? To decide whether citta is a dharma or not has to depend on certain criteria. The criteria to decide what is a dharma at least in Sarvāstivāda theory are that it has its own function or characteristic. Therefore with a specific unique function that will have its own specific characteristic and that will contribute to its specific self-nature or svabhāva. Svabhāva means self-nature. Having a self-nature means it would display some unique characteristics or self-characteristics and this in Sanskrit is *svalakṣaṇa*. *Svalakṣaṇa* also means unique function. If we observe the whole wide world just like an element has its unique function not shared with others, similarly svabhāva has *svalakṣaṇa* as its own unique function not shared by others. To the Sarvāstivāda since citta has a unique svabhāva therefore it can be defined as a dharma.

In Buddhism right from the beginning, the Buddha had already taught us that human being as a psychophysical series can be broken down into five aggregates. And citta is under vijñāna (viññāna) in the five aggregates. In Abhidharma, citta is synonymous with vijñāna and is also synonymous with manas (mano). In different context different term is used. Because vijñāna is grouped under the five aggregates which are dharmas therefore vijñāna is also a dharma. Also because citta, vijñāna and manas means the same thing or dharma, these dharmas have unique function of being the ground, at least in the Sarvāstivāda, for mental activities. Citta is defined as the ground or *great sphere* of mental activities. Great sphere is called *mahābhūmi* of mental activities. Citta is like a great playground for mental activities. Caittas are mental concomitants or mental activities. If the mind is known as the great sphere, caittas are the main players in this great sphere or mahābhūmi. In Sanskrit caittas being players in mahābhūmi are called *mahābhūmika-dharmas* or *mahābhūmikā*.

Just as citta is a dharma, caittas are also dharmas in their own right and in Sarvāstivāda there are 46 *types* or *categories* of caittas. Mental concomitants are called caittas or caitasika in Sanskrit and in Pali they are called cetasika. In Sarvāstivāda there are 46 types of cetasika and cetanā is one of the cetasika. Refer to handout under heading “III” there are a total of 46 types of caitasikā-dharmāḥ or caittas from the mahābhūmikā. Caittas means mental concomitants or anything that influence our mind. From the list we can see how the Sarvāstivāda has broken down into smaller groups in the context called mahābhūmika and we are going to discuss what is mahābhūmika theory now.

For the Sarvāstivāda, as the mind arises, it does not just arise on its own. The mind is like a great sphere or playground, as the playground arises it does not just arise with nothing. There are definitely some “children” in the “playground”. There are 10 “kids” in the “playground” called mahābhūmikā dharmāḥ or universal dharmas. If we have a *wholesome mind* then there will be 10 universal mahābhūmikā plus 10 *kuśalamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ* or wholesome universal dharmas. If we have an *unwholesome mind* then we will have the 10 mahābhūmikā plus 2 *akuśalamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ* or unwholesome universal

dharmas. If we have a *defiled mind* then we will have 10 universal mahābhūmikā plus 6 *kleśamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ* or universal dharmas of defilement. Therefore when we have a specific state of mind then specific groups of caittas will arise in the citta.

The first 10 are called mahābhūmikā because no matter what state of mind arises these 10 will always be there. These 10 are *vedanā* (sensation), *cetanā* (volition), *saṃjñā* (perception), *chanda* (predilection), *sparśa* (contact), *prajñā* (understanding), *smṛti* (memory), *manaskāra* (mental application), *ahimokṣa* (resolve), *samādhi* (concentration). These are the 10 universals. They have no moral content.

The 10 wholesome universal dharma or *kuśalamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ* are *śraddhā* (faith), *apramāda* (diligence), *praśrabdhi* (calm), *upekṣā* (equanimity), *hrī* (modesty), *apatrāpya* (shame), *alobha* (non-greed), *adveṣa* (non-hatred), *avihiṃsā* (harmlessness), *vīrya* (vigor). These are present in a wholesome mind.

The 2 unwholesome universal dharma or *akuśalamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ* are *āhrīkyā* (non-modesty) and *anapatrāpya* (shamelessness). These are present in an unwholesome mind.

There are 8 *indeterminate dharmas* or *aniyatā dharmāḥ*. These 8 *indeterminate dharmas* are *kaukrītya* (remorse), *middha* (drowsiness), *vitarka* (reasoning), *vicāra* (investigation), *rāga* (greed), *pratigha* (hostility), *māna* (conceit) and *vicikitsā* (doubt). Indeterminate dharmas do not arise all the time it will depend on conditions. For example if greed arises in our mind, it is an unwholesome mind plus indeterminate dharma. But wholesome mind can be anger for example, and then it is without indeterminate dharma.

Hence how mahābhūmikā arises will depend on external conditions and internal habitual tendencies. The whole idea here is the whole world are external dharmas except our citta. All other dharmas are external to our citta. The other 4 aggregates except citta are external or universal that is they are common among human being. But our individual mind is not shared; each individual has our own mind that is different from others. Therefore if there are 50 persons in this room then there are 50 dharmas called minds or 50 mind-dharmas and these are very individual. Because we have different experiences that conditioned our mind in the past, so due to these past experiences we will response to the same condition in different ways. It just like soil, we cultivate different things in the soil for different plants to grow. The kind of crops we grow will also condition the soil in one way or another like mutual conditioning. Therefore citta as we go along with experience, the caittas will influence the citta and the citta will influence the caittas. In the long run it will become a very specific kind of citta that is very different from others. A's citta is different from B's citta. Therefore any other dharmas are external the only internal dharma is citta. Internal in the sense that it belong to an individual.

When something arises for example when we see a cat, different people will react differently to this external object. For a cat lover a wholesome mind with loving thought will arises after seeing the cat. Once a cat lover sees a cat, *vedanā* will arise and *vedanā* will propel us to arise wholesome thought of loving-kindness. The first moment when we have eye consciousness of the cat, this moment is neutral. Eye consciousness is also citta and when eye consciousness arises all the other caittas will also arise or at least the 10 mahābhūmikā will arise. Such as *vedanā* (sensation), *cetanā* (volition), *saṃjñā* (perception), *chanda* (predilection), *sparśa* (contact), *prajñā* (understanding), *smṛti* (memory), *manaskāra* (mental application), *ahimokṣa* (resolve), *samādhi* (concentration) will arise. These have their specific function for us for example *samādhi* does not mean only when we sit down then we *samādhi*. That is not possible otherwise every other moment we have to in meditation. *Samādhi* here means the kind of concentration that is needed for us to keep our attention on the cat and not anything else for that moment. Because our mind is affected by so external conditions. We can hear, see, feel etc at any one moment. At one moment

there are so many conditions acting on us but why do we able to keep looking at the cat and not hearing, not feeling and so on. It is because of the function of samādhi and here samādhi is not only experience when we sit down and do meditation. So in Sarvāstivāda they used all these traditional terms first but their functions are different from basic Buddhist doctrine.

Next *prajñā* is not just wisdom although wisdom is one of the different type of *prajñā*. All these are sub-categories and terms, so *prajñā* in the common appearance is the faculty of understanding. In the other extreme when we develop our faculty of understanding to a highest stage it will be wisdom. On the other end of the spectrum it would be ignorance. Hence ignorance and wisdom are classified under *prajñā*. They are different levels of understanding. This is the logic behind the Sarvāstivādin's categorization. There is something common among us and it is the faculty of understanding. Without *prajñā* we don't even know what we are doing. So *prajñā* in daily living is understood as the faculty of understanding. Through spiritual practice we sharpen this faculty of understanding and gradually shift towards wisdom. But for normal people *prajñā* is functioning every moment as understanding and ignorance depending on how sharp are you.

*Sparśa* (contact) is a very controversial dharma. The Sautrāntika and the Sarvāstivāda disagreed over this dharma to a big extend. To the Sautrāntika "contact" is not a dharma because they think when the Buddha taught us about "contact", he actually meant that when eye sees a visual object this is called contact. But for the Sarvāstivādin doesn't think so because they say "contact" is a real dharma whose function is to cause two things, the sense organ and sense object to come together and cause the corresponding consciousness to arise. Without "contact" consciousness will not arise. So "contact" is an important dharma for the Sarvāstivāda. Each side has their own scriptural proof and logical proof. In the end nobody can really tell who is right in describing the Buddha's teachings.

*Vedanā* (sensation) is normally translated as feeling but it is actually sensation. There are three types of sensations, namely pleasant, unpleasant and neutral. This is not the common understanding of the emotional aspect like happy or sad feeling. *Vedanā* in Abhidharma regardless of which schools is sensation. For example when we are in this air-conditioned room, some who just came in from a hot place will feel a pleasant sensation. But if we just walk in from the rain then we will feel unpleasant. While others who are already present in this room for a while will be neutral. Hence *vedanā* is not just feeling of happiness or sadness.

In brief these are the few more important mahābhūmikā, there are 10 of them. In this example of killing a cat, when eye consciousness see a cat, the citta is neutral. So we will have the citta plus the 10 mahābhūmikā and by this time for example our cetanā might be the strongest out of the 10 causing us to take action. By this time the 10 mahābhūmikā are working together, that is when our mind arises looking at the cat the 10 mahābhūmikā are also working at the same time. Which one is the predominant caitta will depend on the strength of each caitta working and that again depends on the citta condition. If in the previous moment we are in a good mood and that condition our cetanā to be more influential and tell us to pick up the cat and stroke it. So the next moment because the cetanā tell us to do it the next moment we move our body and pick up the cat with full of loving-kindness in our mind. That mind is wholesome because our mind is now fill with loving kindness. Once we have wholesome citta, we will also have the 10 mahābhūmikā plus 10 wholesome universal dharma or *kuśalamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ*. And these 20 caittas will work in our mind again depending on our citta. Next for example a span of hunger comes to our mind then our attention get directed away from the cat towards our hunger. The next moment our mind will say put down the cat and eat. At that time our mind is still wholesome but it changes to neutral because it says we want to eat. But if the next moment our mind say kill the cat and eat it then it is an unwholesome mind, then the mind will be filled with 10 mahābhūmikā plus 2 unwholesome universal

dharmā or *akuśalamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ* plus either greed ignorance. So these are the caittas that might arise together with each type of mind that arises.

This model in the Sarvāstivāda is not a psychological model but more like a constellation model, something arises together with constellation of other caittas. One citta arises with constellation of other caittas in the *same* moment because the Sarvāstivāda are *kṣaṇikavādins*, who believe in *kṣaṇa* or momentariness, that is everything arises and ceases in *one* moment. *Kṣaṇa* is the smallest unit in time and the *kṣaṇikavādins* think everything arises and ceases in *one* moment. Every moment there is arising and ceasing of dharma. Do not be confused with “only present is real” doctrine, which state that because dharma arises and ceases only in one moment therefore only present moment where dharma arises and ceases or functioning dharma is real and after that they are no longer real as they do not exhibit causal efficiency on us. For the Sarvāstivādin although they are *kṣaṇikavādins* they are also Sarvāstivādin and they still believe that although dharma are in the past they still got causal efficiency as explained earlier. So for citta-caitta arise and cease in one moment and this is because if citta arises then caitta arise then it would be different moment and therefore a different object. Then we have to go back to the perception theory. In Sarvāstivāda if a moment is made up of arising and ceasing then it is no longer be called the smallest unit of time because it already have two stages. Because if we could further divide one moment into arising and ceasing then it can no longer be called the smallest moment in time. Then there are four stages namely, arising, staying, degenerating and destruction. In one moment there are these four stages then it can longer be called the smallest unit of time because it like one quarter of a moment for each stage. Each stage is even smaller than a moment then this would defile our definition of smallest unit of time. What actually is meant by these four in Sarvāstivādin is that these four are *forces* or dharmas. Under section IV of our handout – cittaviprayukta-saṃskārā dharmāḥ (conditionings disjoined from thought) : nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11 these are the *forces*. These forces are named as *jāti-lakṣaṇa* (production-characteristic), *sthiti-lakṣaṇa* (duration-characteristic), *jarā-lakṣaṇa* (deterioration-characteristic) and *anityatā-lakṣaṇa* (impermanence-characteristic). Translated into modern English will be arising, staying, degenerating and ceasing. These are dharmas or forces for the Sarvāstivāda and are not stages. A dharma is a conditioning force for the Sarvāstivāda. So all these forces work in the *same* moment *canceling out* each other therefore the end result is svabhava, which arises and ceases. That is they are not four stages but four forces working at the *same time* in one moment therefore canceling out each other and therefore the dharma can arise and cease in just one moment.

The moment we see the cat, why do the Sarvāstivādin say the caittas will also arise with the citta? Because if eye consciousness arise without say for example vedanā, that is eye see the cat in the first moment therefore eye consciousness will arise that would mean citta would have arisen as well, if there is no mahābhūmikas at this moment, what happen is that in the second moment can anything else arise? In the second moment the cat is already gone, gone in the sense that it is not the same cat we see in the first moment, so it is a different object already. So the citta or eye consciousness that arise in the second moment would have a different object from the first moment. If we do not have caitta at the first moment then there is nothing to tell us what to do or how to feel or what to remember or what to any attention to, therefore they had this theory because they are *kṣaṇikavādins*, everything arise and cease in that moment. The cat in the first moment is already a different the cat in the second moment. Although it is the same cat but definitely as dharma arising, the cat as a dharma in the first moment is different from the cat as a dharma in the second moment. So if eye consciousness or citta arises with this first moment cat as object, then caitta will have to arise simultaneously to influence that citta to respond to the object otherwise there would not be any respond at all since citta is just a ”playground” and there would not be “kids” around to tell us what to do in the next moment. This is one of the reason why the Sarvāstivāda insist that whenever citta arises it must arise with some other caittas depending what state of mind or which caittas in the previous moment have effect on citta on the next moment. The citta or eye consciousness that arises when we see the cat is again a continuation of the previous moment say this moment is called “minus one”. The

mind in “minus one” might be an unwholesome mind so that when we look at this cat with an unwholesome thought, our *cetanā* might propel us to kill the cat. Or if our “minus one” moment is neutral state then we might not touch the cat but just look at it and let it go. But if our mind in “minus one” is wholesome when we see the cat probably the *cetanā* would be strong enough to tell us to feed it. Again it is not only the *citta* moment by moment conditioned by external stimuli or the external object and *citta-caittas* at that moment, it is also conditioned by what *citta-caittas* we have in the previous moment. Because although our mind arises moment by moment in different content, there is a different position in a series, just like one moment conditioning another moment in an on-going series.

### Five Matters of Equality

The mind and mental conditioning forces/mental concomitants (*caitasikas*) necessarily arise together at the *same time*, responding to the same *object*, through the same *sense organ*, in the *same mode*, each having the *same number of members* in the particular mental moment.

Like in the case of eye consciousness, if *citta* function as eye consciousness and having eye as the basis then the *caittas* will definitely would need to have eye as the basis. Can you imagine the situation of ear consciousness the mind is operating with ear as the basis and the *caittas* have eye as the basis, so who is going to listen to who? And at the same time we would be having two organs operating and this is impossible. You might argue that now we are listening to Venerable Bodhi and at the same time looking at her but actually that is an illusion because our *citta* switches option so fast that we think it is simultaneous. But at least according to the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharmikas we cannot have two *cittas* operating in one moment. If we say two *cittas* operating in one moment, for the Sarvāstivāda they would be thinking that of two different people, one listening to the other person or someone looking at the other person. So it must be two persons because in one series in any moment there can only be one *citta* arising. When we talk about one moment there are two *cittas* then for the Sarvāstivādin would say one-moment two *cittas* and two series means two people. Series in Abhidharma means the psychophysical series, which means an individual. Sanskrit for series is *santanti* or *saṃtāna*.

This shows that eye as a matter of equality governing the relationship between *citta* and *caitta* the very first thought is that they must have the same basis. If the *citta* operates through the eye as eye-consciousness then *caittas* must also arise based on eye as its basis. We cannot have a situation when the *citta* is operating as eye-consciousness with eye as basis and the *caittas* with ear as basis. Otherwise which one to respond to what?

Secondly we must have the *same object*. Again we cannot have the mind responding to a visual object and then the *caitta* responding to sound. In the end how are we going to respond or react?

Thirdly they must arise at the *same time*. *Citta* and *caittas* must arise at the same time, with the same basis and the same object. For the above example, the cat in the first moment is not the same cat in the second moment. Without *citta*, *caittas* cannot arise because there is no “ground” for it to arise and without *caittas*, *citta* is just a “playground” it does not know what to do. These two groups must arise together, responding to the same object and at the same time.

Fourthly they must be in the *same mode*. This is a bit controversial again but general understanding if let say the mind will respond to an object in terms of its “color”, then the *caittas* cannot be in another mode, that is it cannot respond to this object in terms of “length”. Otherwise then there will be a clash of object. So if the mind say respond to “purple”, then the *caittas* will also have to respond to “purple”.

The fifth matter of equality is *same number of member*. All these caittas are just sub-categories. Under prajñā we can have wisdom or ignorance, under vedanā we can have pleasant, unpleasant and neutral sensations, under smṛti we can have strong or weak smṛti and so on but according to the rules of relationship between citta and caittas all these can have only one member in one mental moment. That means we can only have one type of vedanā but not all three types arising at the same time. We can only have one type of prajñā let say a view but we cannot have two or three types of prajñā. Neither can we have two type of cetanā working in one mental moment. If we have three cetanā working in one mental moment, which one is the mind suppose to take? Hence the number of member must be the same. Whether how big these sub-categories we can only choose one within same mental moment. We have three members in vedanā, namely pleasant, unpleasant and neutral and if we look at the cat, which vedanā arises first depends on a lot of our previous habitual tendencies about our liking of the cat and that moment we are in good mood or not. We can only have one type of vedanā arising, pleasant, unpleasant and neutral, we cannot have three types of vedanā coming up at the same time.

These are the five rules governing the relation between citta and caittas. What sort of relationship is obtained between citta and caittas? It is something called *saṃpryukta*, which means the *conjoined relationship*. This is somewhat circular in argument. The relationship between citta and caitta is called saṃpryukta relationship. A saṃpryukta relationship according to the Sarvāstivāda, because of these five equalities, any one lacking the citta and caitta will not arise together and therefore these five are actually the basis for the saṃpryukta relationship. Why are the citta and caitta conjoined? It is because of these five equalities and because of these five equalities they are called conjoined. This is somewhat circular in argument.

This is one way of understanding citta and caitta. There are some other ways of understanding the relationship between citta and caittas and their arising. The constellation model that means in one and the same moment citta arises with many mahābhūmikas or other caittas pertaining to one object. The next moment this will be the basis for the mind to arise in the next moment. What kind of mind will depend on external conditions, it might still be a mental consciousness. That means after looking at the cat it might still not be an outward action, we might be thinking of our past experience with the cat. That kind of thinking about past experience with the cat is called mental consciousness. This mental consciousness would have the previous mind as its basis. The mind will go on and on and this is what we called the constellation like the constellation of stars. The Constellation model of Sarvāstivāda in which mind and mental concomitants arise at the same time. The mind does not arise alone, it arises with specific content and the specific content is defined by the caittas.

But for the Sautrāntika they strongly disagreed with this model. For them the Buddha did not teach us this way. For them the citta arises and then follow by vedanā and then saṃjñā and then cetanā and so on. To them the mind can exist alone and do not need to exist together at the same time with all the other caittas. In fact all the other caittas would come after the mind. The mind would arise then after that eye-consciousness start processing whatever we think of and then this processing will be about feeling. After feeling would be saṃjñā and after that cetanā and any other caittas. Because of this Sautrāntika's citta-caittha model is called a linear model. And also because they do not believe in direct perception. Just now when we discuss in the Sarvāstivāda's example, the cat in the first moment is different from the cat in the next moment. So what we see is directly perceive in the very same moment. That is what we see out there we immediately process in our mind and then we respond. But to the Sautrāntika they only believe in present exist and only the present is real. So the next moment with the mind arises the cat is no longer there and past to them is not real. So they think we can never perceive anything directly. The first moment the eye sees the cat then this will give rise to eye-consciousness in the second moment. Therefore we can never perceive the cat in the very first moment, it always indirect. What we see is a representation of the cat in our mind. The cat as an object in the first moment is there but when eye-consciousness arises in the

Steven 3/11/04

second moment, the cat in the second moment is so called 'second' cat. What causes eye-consciousness to arise in the second moment is actually a representation of what we see outside and this is what we meant by indirect perception. So if we have indirect perception we would also subscribe to this linear view. Because first we have eye-consciousness arising and we do not need all the other caittas to help us decide in the same moment for example what to eat, what to see and so on, so the other caittas (vedanā, saṃjñā, cetanā) can arise in the next few moments. So this perception theory and the citta-caitta theory are linked. This Sautrāntika theory will be discussed in detail in the next lecture. This is just to show you the different as a reference to Sarvāstivāda. The Sarvāstivāda has the constellation theory, which not all will agree with them. Some Sautrāntika came out with the linear model because they do not believe in direct perception.

Question by student: When a wholesome mind arises does *all* the 10 mahābhūmika arise together?  
Answer: Yes, all mahābhūmika will arise except the list in *aniyatā dharmāḥ* (indeterminate dharma) where only 1 out of 8 indeterminate dharma will arise. For example the content of a wholesome mind consists of 10 mahābhūmikā dharmāḥ plus 10 kuśalamahābhūmikā dharmāḥ so a total of 20 dharma.

Question by another student: For an unwholesome mind, will all three categories (unwholesome universal dharma, universal dharma of defilement and subsidiary universal dharma of defilement) arise together? No, it will depend. Let say an unwholesome mind with greed arises, but greed is not listed in the unwholesome mind because greed is not there all the time that is why it is listed under indeterminate. That means greed plus the 2 unwholesome dharma plus 10 mahābhūmika. The next moment because of greed we will have pleasure or defilement, let say we cannot get what we want and then we get angry, then our mind will be defiled. So now we have the 10 mahābhūmika plus our pleasure mahābhūmika and so on. Different kinds of mind will be conjoined with different types of mahābhūmika. The only exclusive one will be the wholesome mahābhūmika can never arise with unwholesome ones. When we say *arise*, it means which one is more predominant. This is also controversial and Venerable Bodhi wrote it in her thesis but her Supervisor did not say anything about it and she is not sure whether this is correct or not. Because we are given this Sarvāstivāda theory that all dharma arise together or at least citta-caittas arise together. But it is only after external condition that conditions the citta that different caittas are given different strength at different moment. So if that is the case there are wholesome and unwholesome caittas, they arise together but if the mind decide on the wholesome caittas then the wholesome caittas will have more strength in over-riding the unwholesome caittas. That is how Venerable Bodhi reason it out but she has yet to an affirmation from her Supervisor on this reasoning.

Question by another student: What is the role played by this subsidiary universal dharma? In Sanskrit these are called lesser kind of defilements. Even though they are lesser kind of defilement they still play a role for example in anger I see a cat and my previous citta was already unwholesome and when I see the cat I became angry. But before I get angry some other moments must elapse for example my *pratigha* (hostility) dharma must play a role in bringing my citta to be of that unwholesome category. The next moment I probably would have started to feel angry because the *krodha* (anger) dharma or caitta is conditioning my mind. Because my mind is conditioned by this anger caitta so it will affect cetanā and cetanā might say kill the cat. By the time my cetanā tell me to kill the cat that is already unwholesome citta. The next moment would be my citta and cetanā working on me to bring me to kill the cat. These are conditioning forces working on the mind and at the same time the mind is working on these conditioning forces. So each of them is mutual conditioning each other. Do not be misled by their names, they are just categories, how the Sarvāstivāda choose to categorize all these dharma, moods and emotions that are working on us. Why do they classified *krodha* (anger) under the lesser category or subsidiary universal dharma of defilement is a big question. We would have to do lot more research on it but it is more like they agreed to give them a name and why they called it lesser defilement is anybody guesses. It is just that every time we refer to *parīttakleṣabhūmikā dharmāḥ* (subsidiary universal dharma of defilement) then the

Sarvāstivādin will know which category we are talking about. When we say *kleṣamahābhūmikā* they will know it is another category. They had a few fundamental defilements as well like rāga, dosa and moha. These are just classifications. In the beginning of the class I told someone that the Sarvāstivādin are especially expert in analyzing and in the study of defilements. That is under chapter 5 of *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. But when Venerable Bodhi did her thesis she concentrated on chapter 2 which is the study of citta-caittas and she had only a cursory gloss on the chapter of defilements.

### **Prāpti and aprāpti of the citta-viprayukta category (liberation theory)**

*Prāpti* and *aprāpti* are under the citta-viprayukta saṃskātā which is the result of a very controversial classification again. There are 14 members in this category and all of them are argue over with the Sarvāstivāda's opponent, the Sauttrāntika. From the handout these 14 members are: *prāpti* (acquisition), *aprāpti* (non-acquisition), *nikāyasabhāga* (group homogeneity), *āsaṃjñika* (ideationlessness), *āsaṃjñi-samāpatti* (ideationless attainment), *nirodha-samāpatti* (cessation attainment), *jīvitendriya* (vital faculty), *jāti-lakṣana*(production-characteristic), *sthiti-lakṣana*(duration-characteristic), *jarā-lakṣana* (deterioration-characteristic), *anityatā-lakṣana* (impermanence-characteristic), *nāma-kāya* (words), *pada-kāya* (phrases) and *vyañjana-kāya* (syllables).

Out of all these 14 we will discuss only the first two, which are linked to the *liberation theory* of the Sarvāstivāda. What is *prāpti*? All these dharmas are *forces* and to the Sarvāstivādin dharmas are conditioning causal forces. That means they can have some effect on each other. Imagine for a moment citta is in the universe and all the other dharmas are floating around it. So how do we relate all these dharmas floating around it? To the Sarvāstivādin, *prāpti* is the answer. Let say this person has greed and to the Sarvāstivādin, do you know how they imagine it? For citta to be linked to greed, greed is a caitta and caitta is a force floating around. So when we say this person has greed it means that this person's citta is being linked to this other force called greed. This link is not something "aspect" but real. This link is called *prāpti*, which is another force and its function is to link other dharmas to a particular psycho-physical series (*santati/samtana*). Psycho-physical series means the individual or five aggregates. Another example is we might have *śraddhā* (faith) in the triple gem, faith is a force and faith is floating all around and how can we connect to this force called faith? We need to have *prāpti* and once this force (*prāpti*) connect us to the other forces it will stay with us forever and ever, for example we are connected with greed, until we can get rid of this conditioning force that bring us to greed, we will forever be stuck with greed. To get rid of greed or *prāpti* we need to have an *equal and opposite* force called *aprāpti*. To get rid of greed we need the arising of *aprāpti*. *Prāpti* and *aprāpti* are translated as acquisition and non-acquisition respectively.

How do the Sarvāstivādin define an *ordinary* human being and how do they define a thing? The answer is by using *prāpti* and *aprāpti*. A *worldly* person like you and I would be people or a series linking through all unwholesome dharmas and especially to what we called *prthagjanatva*. *Prthagjanatva* means a being and sometime we can understand it as or synonymous with pudgala (puggala). Next week we will discuss more about this when we discuss about Vātsīputrīyas as they are known as Pudgalavādins. And in the Kathāvatthu, they were criticized for holding on to an ultimate Pudgala, which is not different from nor the same as the five aggregates. For the Sarvāstivādin, they think that there is this force and *prthagjanatva* that characterized everything about a normal worldling. Once we get attached to *prāpti*, forever and ever we will be just an ordinary worldling until we severed the *prāpti* to it. How? Through spiritual practice that we strengthen all the wholesome dharmas and because of the strength of the wholesome dharmas we induce the arising of *aprāpti*, which cuts off the *prthagjanatva* so then we will be a saint. By definition a saint would be someone who has *aprāpti* of *prthagjanatva* and *prāpti* of all the other wholesome dharmas. Conversely a *prthagjana* or worldling would have *prāpti* of *prthagjanatva* and *aprāpti* of all the other pure dharmas.



This is a very interesting concept of *prāpti* and *aprāpti* and in Venerable Bodhi's notes she said something more detail about the two moments. A person will be forever attached or forever stuck with greed as long as the *prāpti* is not severed. What happen when a person practises enough so much so that he is liberated from greed? So the Sarvāstivādin will again explain the process using *prāpti* and *aprāpti* idea. The first moment they say for example people who go into the first three stages of sainthood, they still have greed, just that greed is very much weaken and only if we attain Arahanta then will we fully get rid of greed. Now we take the example of an Arahant, the moment before one become an Arahant, a stage before Arahant is called *anāgāmī*, so the *anāgāmī* is practicing very hard all the pure dharmas until the point when greed is severed. The *first* moment when greed is severed is called *uninterrupted* moment and now the *prāpti* to greed gets disrupted. *Prāpti* like any other dharma repeat itself in a series moment by moment. The *prāpti* of the previous moment gives rise to the *prāpti* of this moment and the *prāpti* of this moment will give rise to the *prāpti* of the next moment and next and next, going on as a series for as long as we are still a *prthagjana* or before we get out of the samsaric cycle. So still go on until the time when the *anāgāmī* become an Arahant. So the *prāpti* series get disrupted which means the *prāpti* cannot arise in the next moment. The series get disrupted because of the strength of the pure dharma and this is the *first* moment. And when we come to the *second* moment the *aprāpti* to greed actually arises so that forever and ever the *prāpti* to greed will never arise again. They give a simile likened to the first moment like chasing the thief out of the house and the second moment shutting the door so that the thief can never get in again. This is how they use *prāpti* and *aprāpti* to explain the concept of liberation. In theory also in the second moment the *prāpti* to fruit of liberation would also arise training us to be an Arahant. It is something like *magga* (path) and *phala* (fruit). You know the four types of people and eight types of individuals? First of all before we become a saint we attain the path and then the next stage we attain the fruit of that level of sainthood. This is similar to that but first we have the path then fruit and then path and then fruit. So for the Sarvāstivāda these are moments. So this is how important the *prāpti* and *aprāpti* to the liberation theory of the Sarvāstivāda and without these in the Sarvāstivādin system we cannot get enlightenment because these are forces and to them actually everything are forces. Without *aprāpti* how are we going to sever the tie to greed? Greed is not something we can check since it is a force all over us for aeon and aeon of time and we get attached by means of *prāpti*. Hence without *aprāpti* we cannot gain enlightenment or cannot severed the link to greed and this is how they explain. Through all these examples perhaps we have a better understanding of the world-view of the Sarvāstivādin. To them they do not talk in personal terms such as you and I but they talk about forces. They look at Venerable Bodhi as an embodiment of forces and what are these forces? *Citta* is a force and *caittas* are forces. So the only thing that we can define "Bodhi" as "Bodhi" is *citta*. Because *citta* is directly or indirectly the activator of all the other forces, linking all the other forces or creating the conditions for the arising of *prāpti* which link all the other forces around us. And depending on how much we have done in spiritual practice, we might have left with more wholesome forces than greed for example. Or person "A" might have more *prāpti* to pure dharma than person "B" so each individual is different in this aspect.

Question by student: Can we say that *prāpti* to greed in the first moment is like "attachment" to greed? Answer is no because they do not talk about attachment in abstract term. They talk about real thing, real as if we can actually touch them if we can and they are real forces. So if we say we have greed it is not like attachment to greed just like having it in the mind. They are really "real" thing that really stuck with us with the force of *prāpti*. So the Sarvāstivādin have been called realist among Buddhists because they see everything as real forces. They are real forces and does not just happen in the mind only as opposed to the Yogacara. They are actual real forces or real thing or real dharma, whether they are past, present and future is alright but they still have influence or causal efficiency on the other dharmas. So they represent one extreme understanding of the world and the other extreme is the idealist. Realists are one extreme and idealists are the other. The Buddha is not a realist and neither is he a perfect idealist because he taught us

that there are always interaction between the mind and the material physical world. Because he is neither perfectly realist nor is he perfectly idealist.

Question by another student: Could you explain sunyata doctrine and svabhava? To the Sarvāstivādin all dharmas have svabhava or they are real things. If we go back to the reality of the past, present and future dharma, underneath all these changes as dharma comes to the present from the future and go to the past, svabhava never change. This to Nagarjuna is something dangerously close to atman. That is why the Sarvāstivāda became very influential so much so that everyone is led to think along the line of svabhava. That is so dangerously close to what the Buddha had rejected, i.e. the atman. So Nagarjuna reminded us that the Buddha taught us Paticca Samuppāda. Paticca Samuppāda is like the corollary idea of soul-lessness or svabhava-less. The condition of the whole Buddhist community had been influenced so much by the Sarvāstivādin that he had to say something about the Sarvāstivādin by balancing the wrong view with the right view. In Buddhism if we talk about the atman then we are totally out. When Nagarjuna see the Sarvāstivādin so dangerously close to atman theory that he had bring the whole Buddhist community back to the fact that the Buddha did not teach this way. Of course the Sarvāstivādin did not think that way so what the Nagarjuna criticizing was the general misinformed kind of Sarvāstivādin which then formed the majority. The elite philosophers of the Sarvāstivāda might not Sarvāstivāda or Sarvāstiva the way the misinformed majority believe. But because it is a mass thing so Nagarjuna had to criticize it.

If you think the Sarvāstivāda is confusing when you come to Mahāyana is worse.