



PHASSA - VEDANĀ- SAÑÑA - VIÑÑĀNA
(from Snp 4.11 - Kalahavivāda sutta)
see also [SN 22.55](#)

Thanissaro		Khantipalo		Pali		Notes
------------	--	------------	--	------	--	-------

Question:

“Where is the cause of appealing & un-appealing ?
When what isn’t, do they not exist?
And whatever is meant by becoming & not-becoming:
Tell me, where is their cause?”

The pleasant, the unpleasant, originate from what?
In the absence of what do these cease to be?
That which is being, non-being as well, what their origination, do tell me of this?

“Sātaṃ asātañca kutonidānā,
Kismiṃ asante na bhavanti hete;
Vibhavaṃ bhavañcāpi yametamattamaṃ,
Etaṃ me pabrūhi yatonidānaṃ”.

Buddha:

“**Contact** is the cause of appealing & un-appealing .
When contact isn’t, they do not exist, along with what’s meant by becoming & not-becoming:
I tell you, from here is their cause.”

“Touch”, the origination of pleasant, unpleasant, “Touch” being absent these cease to be.
That which is being, non-being as well, its origin’s thus, I tell you of this.

“**Phassanidānaṃ** sātaṃ asātaṃ,
Phasse asante na bhavanti hete;
Vibhavaṃ bhavañcāpi yametamattamaṃ,
Etaṃ te pabrūmi itonidānaṃ”.

Question:

“Now where is the cause of contact in the world, and from where have graspings, possessions, arisen?
When what isn’t does there not exist **mine-ness**?
When what has disappeared do contacts not touch?”

From what causes in the world does touch come to be
And whence does possessiveness also arise?
in the absence of what is “**mine**” making not?
When what exists not are no “touches” touched?

“Phasso nu lokasmi kutonidāno,
Pariggahā cāpi kutopahūtā;
Kismiṃ asante na **mamattamatthi**,
Kismiṃ vibhūte na phusanti phassā”.

Mamattamatthi
Mama = gen. of pers. Pron. ahaṃ (“I”) - what belongs to the “I”.

Buddha:

<p>“Conditioned by name-&-form is contact. In longing [desire] (iccha) do graspings, possessions (pariggaha) have their cause. When longing isn’t, <i>mine-ness</i> doesn’t exist. When forms have disappeared contacts don’t touch.”</p>		<p>“Touches” depend upon mind, upon form, possessiveness caused by longing repeated, when longing’s not found, possessiveness’s gone, When form is no longer, no “touches” are “touched”.</p>	<p>“Nāmañca rūpañca paṭicca phasso, Icchānidānāni pariggahāni; Icchāyasantyā na mamattamatthi, Rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassā”</p>		.
--	--	---	---	--	---

Question:

<p>“For one how-arriving does form disappear? How do pleasure & pain disappear? Tell me this. My heart (mano) is set on knowing how they disappear.”</p>		<p>For one in what state does form cease to be, how bliss and <i>dukkha</i> come to cease as well, please do you tell me how these come to cease? For this we would know—such is my intent.</p>	<p>“Kathaṃ sametassa vibhoti rūpaṃ, Sukhaṃ dukhañcāpi kathaṃ vibhoti; Etaṃ me pabrūhi yathā vibhoti, Taṃ jāniyāmāti me mano ahu”.</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

Buddha:

<p>“One not percipient of perceptions, not percipient of aberrant perceptions, not unpercipient, nor percipient of what’s disappeared. For one thus-arriving, form disappears - for objectification-classifications have their cause in perception.”</p>		<p>Neither one of normal perception, nor yet abnormal (perception), neither unperceiving no cessation of perception, but form ceases for one who (has known) it thus: Conceptual proliferation has perception as its cause.</p>	<p>“Na saññasaññī na visaññasaññī, Nopi asaññī na vibhūtasaññī; Evaṃ sametassa vibhoti rūpaṃ, Saññānidānā hi papañcasaṅkhā”.</p> <p>Alternate translation: <i>One neither inquiring of inquiries (that lead to “I” and “Mine”), nor inquiring of inquiries “in two parts” (that leads to “mine”), not un-inquiring (beyond the transcended world of forms), nor inquiring of what</i></p>	<p>Visañña = vi+sañña = perception “in two parts”. (<i>external & internal</i>) - <i>vi</i> meaning “in two parts”. = <i>aberrant, abnormal perception.</i> vibhūta: [pp . of vibhavati , or vi+bhūta] destroyed , annihilated , being without</p> <p>Papañca = development.</p> <p>See Vi below.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

has disappeared (the “I”).
 For one thus-arriving, form disappears.
 (Note that the above is just the process leading to the transcendence of forms in Buddhism).
 - for developments have their cause in inquiries (and their assumptions).”

Note: Sañña has an underlying meaning of ***inquiry*** (in the experience it is perceiving – like a “feeling”) - **and coming to some assumption.**

- “Feeling” (vedanā) is an **experience; followed by a wish to know more.**
 - “Perception” (sañña) is an ***inquiry that yields an assumption*** = perception.
 - “Consciousness” usually means a **realized knowledge**. (see note at the end of that page.)

Question:

“What we have asked, you’ve expounded to us. We ask one thing more. Please tell it.
Do some of the wise say that just this much is the

Whatever we’ve asked of you, to us you’ve explained, another query we’d ask, please speak upon this, those reckoned as wise here, do they say that “purity of

“Yaṃ taṃ apucchimha akittayī no, Aññaṃ taṃ pucchāma tadiṅha brūhi; Ettāvataggaṃ nu vadanti heke, yakkhassa

Do some of the wise say that just this much is the utmost, that purity of spirit is here?

Or do they say that it’s other

utmost, that purity of spirit is here? Or do they say that it's other than this?"	soul is just for this (life)" or do some of them state there's another beyond?	suddhiṃ idha paṇḍitāse; Udāhu aññampi vadanti etto".	<i>than this?"</i> <i>In other words: Does getting rid of "mine-ness" enough? Does getting rid of the external in the "vi", enough? (through samatha).</i>
---	--	--	---

Buddha:

<p>"Some of the wise say that just this much is the utmost, that purity of spirit is here. But some of them, who say they are skilled, say it's the moment with no clinging [upādisesa:still dependent on existence] remaining. But knowing, 'Having known, they still are dependent,' the sage ponders dependencies. On knowing them, released, he doesn't get into disputes, doesn't meet with becoming & not becoming : He's enlightened."</p>	<p>Here some reckoned as wise do certainly say:"Purity of soul is just for this life"; but others who claim to be clever maintain that there is an occasion for what has nothing leftover.</p> <p>And Knowing that these are dependent on views, having known their dependence, the investigative Sage since liberated knows, so no longer disputes, the wise one goes not from being to being.</p>	<p>"Ettāvataggampi vadanti heke, yakkhassa suddhiṃ idha paṇḍitāse; Tesam paneke samayaṃ vadanti, anupādisese kusalā vadānā.</p> <p>Ete ca ñatvā upanissitāti, Ñatvā munī nissaye so vimamsī; Ñatvā vimutto na vivādameti, Bhavābhavāya na sameti dhīro"ti.</p> <p>— 'Thus some (who are considered) wise in this world say that the principal (thing) is the purification of the yakkha (demons & lower gods); but some of them say samaya (annihilation), the expert say (that the highest purity lies) in anupadisesa. And having known these to be dependent, the investigating Muni, having known the things we depend upon, and after knowing them being liberated, does not enter into dispute, the wise</p>	<p>Buddha says that one should also get rid of the "scent" (as in SN 22.89) – that is to say, to get rid of the clinging – of the "I". And that is usually done with vipassanā.</p> <p>Knowing that both are related, the skilled sage knows they are related – and does not dispute between samatha and vipassana – Does not dispute between the becoming (through the "mine-ness), and the non-becoming (of the "I", through the realization of impermanence, etc.).</p>
---	---	--	--

*

Note

CONSCIOUSNESS (vi-jñana) in pre-Buddhist Texts.

Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa

In ŚBr., vijñana (knowledge,) is often the result of oracles. Like, if this is red, this will be - and if this is yellow, that will be. Vijñana is the knowledge of all these options. And generally, it means that the knowledge comes from discerning between several options. Like something warm will live - while something cold will die. The option does not have to always be there; but it is implied. Like when one feels joyful, and that it leads him to go partying. (Sorrow does not have to be mentioned as the second option - but it is implied - if there was sorrow, there would be no partying). Vijñā usually comes after thought (citta). In ŚBr. 6.6.1, the sacred rite is originated by thought; and many are the oblations done.

Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad

vijñā has the meaning of knowing = ****realizing**** (be fully aware or cognizant of).

- I know this - this is what I know - I become this. (1.5.8)
- Vijñā is the knowledge of the whole (2.4.12)
- It is the duality that allows to know (vijñā) - you can only see, when there is the other. (*"By what means can one perceive him by means of whom one perceives this whole world? Look—by what means can one perceive the perceiver?"*) - (2.4.13)
- But you can't know the knower (self) who does the knowing. (3.4.2)
- The self within knows; but it does not know the sacred knowledge. This self within, that controls the knowledge from within, is the inner controller - the immortal (3.7.22)
- Vijñā is knowledge among the vital functions (prāṇa). (4.3.7)
- Vijñā is consciousness of the awaken state (not of sleep) (2.1.16)

Chāndogya Upaniṣad

vijñā has also the meaning of knowing = ****realizing**** (be fully aware or cognizant of).
- But also the meaning of knowledge by inference - an enlargement of the concept.
As in: seeing a piece of clay, one infers all the objects made of clay. (6.1.3-6)

- The meaning of knowledge through learning -6.7.3)
- Knowledge through hearing about (7.2.1)
- One who realizes (vijñā) knows the truth.

Taittirīya Upaniṣad (pretty contemporary to Buddha's time)

Same:

For instance, it is through austerities that one can know (realize) what Brahman is really.

वि vi

meaning " in two parts " ; and opp. to [sam]

- apart , asunder , in different directions , to and fro , about , away , away from , off , without RV.

It is esp. used as a prefix to verbs or nouns and other parts of speech derived from verbs , to express " division " , " distinction " , " distribution " , " arrangement " , " order " , " opposition " , or " deliberation "

In RV. it appears also as a prep. with acc. denoting " through " or " between " .

Sometimes it gives a meaning opposite to the idea contained in the simple root (e.g. √ [krī] , " to buy " ; [vi-√ krī] , " to sell ") ,

It intensifies an idea (e.g. √ [hims] , " to injure " ; [vi-√ hims] , " to injure severely ") .

May also be used in forming compounds not immediately referable to verbs , in which cases it may express:

- "difference" - "change" or "variety" - "intensity" - "manifoldness" - "contrariety" - "deviation from right" - "negation" or "privation".

Being often used like [a] , [nir] , and [nis] - [like the English (a) , (dis) , (in) , (un)]

In some cases it does not seem to modify the meaning of the simple word at all.

VEDANĀ

Experiencing & wishing to know (more)

√ vid

As knowledge:

Into blind darkness they enter, people who worship **ignorance**;

And into still blinder darkness, people who delight in **learning**.

andhaṃ tamaḥ praviśanti ye **'vidyām** upāśate

tato bhūya iva te tamo ya u **vidyāyām** ratāḥ

BrĀrUp. 4.4.10

The gods, therefore, are not pleased at the prospect of men coming to *understand* this.

tasmād eṣāṃ tan na priyaṃ yad etan manuṣyā *vidyuh*

BrĀrUp. 1.4.10

As wealth:

his sight is his human *wealth*

caḥsur mānuṣaṃ *vittam*

BrĀrUp. 1.4.17