The Five Aggregates

Andrea Fella · Notable Dhamma Teachers — Andrea Fella · 1:01:51

This morning Jill responded to a question around the fourth foundation of mindfulness and explored how that foundation can really be seen as seeing experience. The foundation is mindfulness of dhammas, and as she pointed out, the word *dhammas* has multiple layers of meaning. It can mean simply experience or phenomenon, and it can mean the Buddhist teaching, the Dharma. It can also mean truth. And so in this exploration of the fourth foundation, we're exploring the phenomenon of our experience, what arises through the perspective of the lens of the Dharma, to begin to understand the truth of our experience.

As she said this morning, we don't have to wait to do the fourth foundation until we've mastered the first three. They're all at play in our practice pretty much right from the beginning. We sit down and meditate and try to stay with the breath, and the mind goes off into wanting or thinking. Right there, in observing wanting, observing aversion, we are exploring this fourth foundation—the hindrances—noticing how they come to be, noticing the conditions that put them together, noticing what makes them fall apart. This is an aspect of the fourth foundation. We can open to and begin to explore our experience from these Dharma perspectives.

Tonight I'd like to explore one of those perspectives offered in the fourth foundation: the five aggregates. The word "aggregate" itself, in English at least, is not a very friendly word. It doesn't have a very experiential quality; it sounds rather technical. The word in Pali, *khandha* (or *skandha* in Sanskrit), has a much more ordinary sound, apparently. My understanding is that word basically means something like heap, bundle, group, or collection.

And yet this word "aggregate" is actually, as I reflect on it, a pretty good translation. These *khandhas* are described both as the *what* of our experience—what's happening in our experience—and as the *processes* that happen in our experience. They're both nouns and verbs in a way. The word "aggregate" can function similarly: as a noun, it means stuff made of other stuff, which is a pretty good translation for what we're talking about here.

These aggregates of form, feeling, perception, mental formations, and consciousness—these five aspects or areas of experience—are how the Buddha divided up our human experience, pointing out that all experience falls into one of these heaps or collections or bundles. And yet they're also understood to be processes: the process of body, the process of perception, the process of feeling, the process of knowing. The word can also be used as a verb—we aggregate, we pull things together.

Let me describe these five aggregates briefly. Form refers to our bodily experience, the physical aspect. The other four aggregates are mental processes, mental experience. Feeling is this recognition of

experience as pleasant, unpleasant, or neutral—or as the Buddha says, the process responsible for that recognition. Perception is the process of recognizing what's happening in experience, related to memory, learning, and understanding what objects and experiences are. Mental formations encompass a whole range of emotions, thoughts, and mind states that have a volitional component—the volitional aspect of our experience. And then consciousness: the simple knowing aspect of our experience.

We can think of them as the building blocks of our experience. Any experience we have, we can begin to recognize as these processes or experiences unfolding, intertwined.

Having a cup of tea, for instance: there's the bodily experience of the warmth, the moisture on the tongue, the taste—perhaps sweetness if you put sweetener in, or bitterness, whatever the flavors are. That's all part of form. Then the feeling tone: some aspects might be pleasant if the warmth is soothing, or unpleasant if it's too hot and burns your tongue. The taste itself might have pleasant and unpleasant aspects. Then perception: the recognition of chamomile tea, or Earl Grey, whatever it is—the acknowledgment of what this is. And then mental formations. We have mental formations about everything.

We'll either like this tea or we won't like it, or it will remind us of some other cup of tea we had when we were sitting in some cafe in India one time, comparing and contrasting that tea to this. Our minds will do this forming, this mental formation. Or perhaps the mind is simply present and mindful for this experience—mindfulness itself being a mental formation. And then there's the knowing. We are aware. There's this basic quality that we know this experience.

So these processes make up our experience. Any aspect of our experience can be found in these five aggregates, in these categories. This is simply the way the Buddha divvied up experience. It's perhaps a different divvying than we might expect. And he divvied it up in different ways—he also divvied it up in terms of the six sense bases, a different kind of dividing of the human pie of experience. So there's not just one way, but he pointed to this particular way for certain reasons, and I'll get to that in just a minute.

First I wanted to read to you the section of the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta where it gives the instructions about this foundation. It's actually pretty simple. I'm going to read this translation using different words for *dhamma s* so that it will give you different flavors. Sometimes I'll use the word *dhammas*, sometimes phenomena, sometimes experience.

So these are the instructions: A practitioner abides contemplating experience as experience in terms of the five aggregates affected by clinging. And how does one abide contemplating experience as experience in terms of the five aggregates affected by clinging? Here one understands: Such is material form. Such is its arising. Such is its disappearance. Such is feeling. Such is its arising. Such is its disappearance. Such is perception. Such is its arising. Such is its disappearance. Such are mental formations, such are their arising, such their disappearance. Such is consciousness, such is its arising, such is its disappearance.

A practitioner abides contemplating phenomena as phenomena in terms of the five aggregates affected by clinging. A practitioner abides contemplating *dhammas* as *dhammas* in terms of the five aggregates affected by clinging.

I like this translation—contemplating our experience in terms of the five aggregates. Beginning to understand our experience from this perspective.

Initially this can take some navigation or understanding, looking at experience and recognizing, "Oh, this experience—that's body. This experience—that's feeling." Sayadaw U Tejaniya points to the study of the five aggregates as being kind of like learning to read. As we learn to read at the beginning, we learn to recognize the shapes of letters. We have to recognize the shapes of letters and associate those with sounds. At first we need to learn the letters: this shape is a C, this shape is A, this shape is T. Then we learn the sounds associated with them, and we learn that it becomes "cat." But once we've learned this, once we've begun to understand how to read, we don't have to do that breakdown anymore. We just see the word and it's "cat." We understand it fully just from the contact with it.

He says it's kind of like that with the study of the five aggregates. Initially we may need to actually spend some time with each of these aggregates, getting familiar with them, like we get familiar with the alphabet. And then after some time we don't have to do that work anymore.

So this section of the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta—the instructions are actually pretty simple. Notice each aspect of experience. What kind of experience? Notice such as feeling. Notice its arising and disappearance.

And so that's the main emphasis I'd like to look at tonight—just exploring how to begin to recognize these aggregates in our experience.

But why? Why recognize these in particular?

The emphasis partly in this exploration is on clinging, to begin to recognize how we tend to cling, how we congeal around these aspects or areas of experience. There's a way in which the Buddha pointed to these five aggregates of clinging as being central to the process of selfing. This is another aspect of the question Jill addressed this morning, looking at the sense of self and how to begin to explore it. Well, this is the main tool that the Buddha used for exploring the sense of self—exploring how the sense of self is created.

In many places where the Buddha talked about this selfing process, he used these five aggregates as a way to help us see through it as just another process in our mind. Again, as Jill said this morning, it's not that we're trying to stop this process of selfing, but we're trying to see it for what it is, which is a process of mind constructing this sense. Seeing the process at work begins to weaken the clinging and weaken the ways in which that process leads to suffering. And so this exploration of the five aggregates is one of the ways in which we can begin to explore this teaching of not-self.

Bhikkhu Anālayo has a simple way of describing how a sense of self is associated with each of these

aggregates. I like this because I think we can all resonate with it as a way of locating a sense of self with each one. He says body or form, this experience of body—the sense of self tends to locate it as *where* I am. The body is where I am, kind of located in the body perhaps. Feeling—pleasant, unpleasant, neutral—is *ho w* I am. Perception is *what* I'm recognizing in the world. Mental formations are *why* I'm doing things, that sense of volition or agency, why I am acting. And consciousness, the knowing aggregate, is *whereby* I am experiencing—the medium through which experience is recognized or known.

And so to begin to get familiar with these aggregates can help us see our experience in a different way. Not as I or me or mine, but as just these processes of body and mind interweaving, interconnecting, influencing each other. No need actually to have an ongoing I controlling anything. It's doing itself; these processes are doing themselves.

While the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta doesn't point explicitly to this teaching on the connection to the selfing process, there are many other teachings in the suttas that point to this. And if I have a chance tonight, if I have some time, I may talk about one of those, but we'll see how far we get here.

So, body, form. We've talked about this quite a bit already, so I won't spend too much time here. Brian spoke about it last night in mindfulness of the body. Really, I think this foundation, this aggregate, is looking at the physicality of our experience in its basic form. Just beginning to recognize the language of the body. How does the body communicate with the mind? It communicates through the touch sense, through these elemental experiences of feeling tingling, pulsing, vibration, hardness, softness, moisture, dryness, heat, coolness—these areas of physical experience that come through our touch sense.

And then through the other physical senses: we experience through the eye, for instance—we look out into the world and we think we're seeing people and walls and windows and zabutons and zafus and chairs and lights. But all of that is actually in the perception aggregate. What comes into the eye, what the bare experience in the eye is, is form and color. That's the basic experience in the eye. In taste, the basic experience—we bite into pizza, we taste pizza—but we're tasting salty, sweet, bitter, savory, sour. That's it. That's the language of the tongue. Pizza, cheese—those are concepts, ideas, learned through time, learned from exposure.

So beginning to recognize what our actual bodily experience is. This helps us, as I think I said—it seems ages ago now—when I gave an instruction on the body in the morning. I talked about how as we begin to recognize the language of the body, we begin to tease apart these processes, to recognize that in fact there is a difference between the taste of salty and the idea of pizza, the pleasantness or unpleasantness of that, and all of the ideas and associations that we have about it. We begin to recognize that there are processes going on in the mind. And so beginning to get familiar with this language of the body helps us tease apart these five different processes, these five aggregates.

I think one of the key ways that we identify with the body, in addition to this sense of locating ourselves in the body—I think that's a pretty common feeling, though it may be cultural to some extent, this sense of

"I'm in the body"—because the Buddha also talked about different ways that this could be experienced. He said it might be that the body is in me. Or, I am part of the body.

Or the body is mine. That's another one that's very familiar—this body is mine. We carry it around with us like it's something we own, as opposed to being a process that's integral to our being. The way Brian spoke about it last night was so beautiful, this very integral nature of embodiment, how experience comes through this body. And somehow we feel like we own it. So we can begin to recognize the ways in which we congeal a sense of self around each of these areas.

Then feeling, this second aggregate, we've also spent some time on already. Feeling is understood to be a mental experience—it's a mental aggregate. Now this may be fairly easy to understand in terms of mind states. The feeling of happiness is pleasant; we understand that to be a mental pleasure. The feeling of anger is often unpleasant. But even physical sensations—feeling associated with the physical body, feeling associated with sight, with sound, with smell, with taste, with touch—is also understood to be mental.

I want to give you a bit of an understanding of this. I think we all know this to some extent because we do recognize how a state of mind can influence what we feel. Someone touches us by surprise, and perhaps if the mind is in a certain state, that would be experienced as unpleasant. If the mind is in a different state, it might be experienced as neutral or even pleasant. With mindfulness too, as the mind becomes really present for experience, sometimes we're surprised at just how beautiful things are, how pleasant some experiences can be—things you wouldn't expect to be beautiful or pleasant.

At Spirit Rock one time, I was sitting one of the long retreats and doing walking meditation in the upper walking room. The bell had rung, and I turned to leave the hall. My gaze just glanced out the door, and my perception was that there was a picture hanging on the wall just outside. That picture seemed very beautiful to me—really simple but incredibly beautiful. Just these three squares, offset in a way that created a feeling of great pleasure and beauty.

Now, I'm fairly nearsighted, so I was curious to look more closely at this beautiful painting. I walked closer and discovered it was a fire extinguisher. Not something I would have normally thought of as pleasant or beautiful.

This points to how feeling tone is constructed by the mind. The feeling tone, the process of feeling—and so the feeling tone itself is what we would call the "what" of our experience, that things are pleasant or unpleasant or neutral. Yet this process of feeling, the verb side of this, is that our feeling is conditioned. The conditions of our mind—views, opinions, ideas, attitudes, state of mind, whether we're in a state of concentration and equanimity, of mindfulness, or a state of aversion—all of this influences how the process of feeling unfolds. The mental climate of our mind affects feeling.

We can also start to see—and this is a hugely important area in our practice—just how our reactivity operates when we are not mindful, when we are not clearly knowing, "Oh, this is a pleasant experience.

This is an unpleasant experience." How the mind will tend, based on its habits, to spring into wanting to create conditions for us to have the pleasant, to get rid of the unpleasant. The seeing of feeling tone helps create the conditions for us to recognize that tendency to leap off of feeling tone into reactivity.

Play with this in your sittings at times. It is really helpful. Just begin to track a little bit—again, not all the time. I don't want this to be a big project. But from time to time, especially if you find your mind in a state of reactivity, it can be really useful to recognize or reflect on what the mind is actually reacting to. What is unpleasant in my experience that the mind is moving into this? What's pleasant in my experience that the mind wants to hold on to? Sometimes we can be surprised.

What we think of as what we're reacting to and moving towards or moving away from—it may not be what we think. And so it can be a very interesting exploration.

I think a sense of self, in addition to this sense of feeling being how I am, there's this strong sense of self motivated around feeling—to maximize pleasant and minimize unpleasant. Kind of an underground sense of self that feels like it cannot be okay unless it's in control of maximizing pleasant and minimizing unpleasant at a very deep level.

And then the process of perception. Perception being that aspect of experience where we recognize what's out there. This is a really useful function of our minds—thank goodness for perception. If I had to come in here every time and figure out that this was people and chairs and floor and stairs and wall, it would be exhausting. And so this is a useful kind of shortcut in our minds to quickly recognize what's happening and recognize how to navigate things.

The way this works is basically our minds contact some experience—a sound, for instance—and then the mind kind of goes into its memory banks and looks for the closest match. What's the closest match I can find to that sound? And then perceives or recognizes it as that. Many times perhaps during the day you have heard the sound of a car going down Pleasant Street. That sound is one thing. And then the mind will label it or recognize it as car, perhaps, or truck, maybe. So that is perception at work.

I think in the realm of hearing is one of the easiest places to begin to recognize this process, because it's fairly easy to see or recognize the distinction between the vibration in the eardrum, that thing coming into the ear, and the mind in some fashion identifying it. That identification of the experience might come as labeling it, if we're talking to ourselves—oh, car or truck. Or it might come as an image, or even as a feeling. It can come as a feeling in the body. Maybe, for instance, as if you're riding in a truck, something like that. That could be a way that perception would work.

So this process of perception does a pretty good job for us, but it is not perfect by any means. It easily makes mistakes. I'll give an example from my own experience, an example that uses sound. I was in Burma, practicing in a monastery. I was meditating in my room primarily, and my dorm was in a place near the wall of the monastery. The village sounds came over the wall fairly easily—the loudspeakers, the

sounds of the farms, and all the things that were going on. So there was a lot of noise.

At a certain point each day, I began noticing a squealing sound, and my mind perceived it as pig. That squealing—I mean, I had heard pigs squeal, and that's the closest thing my mind came up with. Okay, it's a pig squealing. But my mind didn't quite stop there. It also added a little bit more, because it sounded to me like this was a distressed squealing. And so I kind of created—this image appeared in my mind—that what was on the other side of that wall was the butcher shop of the village, and these were pigs being slaughtered for the next day. That was what my mind created.

I knew that was a creation. I knew that I did not know if that's what was going on. But still, that's what was coming up. And so I just noticed it and I felt compassion for the pigs.

Then one day I was doing some walking meditation instead of sitting meditation. There were bats flying in the air, coming really close to me, and they were squealing. This was what I had been hearing. And of course, the compassion vanished. There was no need for that compassion. There were no pigs being slaughtered. I knew—I knew that I did not know there were pigs being slaughtered. I knew that was a construction of the mind, a mental formation. But what I was not prepared for was that it was not a pig. That it was a bat.

That was a kind of real eye-opener—just how much was constructed out of that idea that it was a pig.

And so we can see that we create the idea. I heard the sound, I believed it was a pig, and that itself was a place where the mind slips into delusion. Now, the misperception of it as a pig is not necessarily delusion. That's just the mind making something like the closest match it had. I don't think I'd ever known that bats squealed before, so that was the closest match it had. But believing that what I was hearing was a pig—that is delusion. Believing that my mind was accurately experiencing and knowing reality through its perceptions, that's a form of delusion.

This is one of the main places that delusion enters in our mind: taking our perceptions to be reality, to be what's out there. We take our experience as if our eyes are cameras, seeing actually everything, every little bit of information that's out there. But that's not the way our minds work. We see some things, we don't see other things. Our minds perceive things and not other things. This is a really important area of recognition.

To come back to feeling tone, because there's a real blend here, an interweaving between perception and feeling tone: that example around believing it was a pig being slaughtered, the feeling of the ache in the heart around a being being killed—all of that was constructed by the mind. When we are responding to something and take it to be pleasant or unpleasant, it can be really interesting to check in. Is it actually a sound or a sight or a smell that we're taking to be pleasant or unpleasant? Or a touch? Or is it an idea that is happening in association with that sound or sight?

Very often our pleasant and unpleasant experience is connected more to the perception and associated

ideas, mental formations around that perception, than it is to the actual sense contact. This for me has been a really fascinating exploration—useful and eye-opening to see what is actually being reacted to. The vast majority of the time, it is something my mind makes up. It can be a pretty close match to reality, but it is not what's actually out there that the mind is reacting to. It is something that the mind has constructed. This is a really useful understanding.

And so a sense of self around this: "I am recognizing what I am recognizing." I think the sense of self here is, "And I'm doing it accurately. I'm seeing things correctly." This is a piece of that selfing there.

Mental formations is a huge aggregate. It includes all of our mental activities that have a kind of volitional or intentional effect. This includes all of our emotions. It includes our mind states like calm, concentration, mindfulness, boredom, confusion. It includes the emotions of anger, patience, impatience, frustration, irritation. It includes bliss, joy, calm, pride, conceit. Thoughts are in this realm of mental formations. Beliefs, agendas, views—also mental formations. It's a lot of what we observe in our minds.

So that's kind of the "what" of our experience, but in this realm of mental formation it's really helpful to recognize the process nature of mental formations—even more so than some of the others, in a way. Not only are mental formations formed, they are formed. We see that, we recognize that anger, for instance, comes into being in dependence on conditions. It's shaped by conditions, by history, by our state of mind in the moment, by something that's being met in our senses. It's shaped in that way. It comes together based on conditions.

But mental formations also have this nature: not only are they formed, they form. They construct. This is the process of mental formations.

mental formations in the suttas that points to this. I'm going to read this just as it is here, and then I'll talk about it a little bit.

"Why are they called volitional formations? They construct the conditioned, therefore they're called volitional formations."

Now, there's a note here that this doesn't translate into English very well, because in the Pali, the word for volitional formation, the word for construct, and the word for conditioned or constructed are all based on the same word. So you might say something like, "Why are they called volitional formations? Because they form things that are formed." That would be kind of what it sounds like in the Pali.

But they construct the conditioned—therefore they're called volitional formations. And what is the conditioned that they construct? They construct conditioned form as form. They construct conditioned feeling as feeling. They construct conditioned perception as perception. They construct conditioned formations as formations. They construct conditioned consciousness as consciousness.

This is the engine. This is how the aggregates tumble on. This process of mental formation is constructing

them, continuously constructing feeling, perception, knowing, form, and mental formations.

For example, with anger as a formation: the volitional formation of anger affects our body. It can be experienced as pressure and heat internally. It can affect the face—we may have a scowl or distorted muscles in our face when we're angry. This is how anger shapes or constructs the body in some ways. It tends to construct feeling as unpleasant when we're angry; things tend to be unpleasant. It tends to construct our perceptions in terms of that anger, so we perceive things through that lens—perceiving things in ways that justify our feeling that anger. Anger tends to construct more anger. And our consciousness is affected and directed by this filter.

I talked about this in the delusion talk—how when we have a filter, our consciousness will land on certain things and not others. So it shapes what we know. Again, it's not that we are taking all experience in; what we know is shaped by our mind state.

This points to the power of our minds to construct our experience. This is a really important exploration: looking at how experience is affected by our minds. What is the state of this mind having this experience?

Something like anger potentially has more obvious ways in which it affects our aggregates. Other mental formations are a little less obvious, perhaps, but still have incredible power to shape our minds. Views and beliefs are very powerful mental formations, often below the level of our conscious awareness.

In this country, in this culture, we tend to have this belief that America is the land of opportunity—that anyone who works hard enough can achieve their dream. This belief pervading our culture creates a kind of blindness on the part of the dominant culture, a failure to see how the power structures, the institutions, the organizations support people with white skin and not so much people with darker skin tone. This not-seeing—essentially the blindness of white privilege—views shape our minds in this way. Not seeing that the whole structure of how institutions are put together creates an inherent imbalance.

So much suffering comes from these kinds of views and beliefs when they are not seen as views and beliefs—basically just taken to be true. "America is a land of opportunity. If you're not achieving your dream, you're not working hard enough." That can be the belief there.

So a lot of suffering comes in this terrain of mental formations. And essentially what we're doing in our practice is exploring how to shape wholesome mental formations—bringing in mindfulness and concentration, peace and patience and equanimity. This has a transformative effect on our minds, and it begins to reveal the way this all works.

Then there is the aggregate of consciousness, of knowing. This is the bare experience of knowing. Every single moment of experience, whether we're mindful or not, there is a knowing. I think I mentioned at one point that we can walk down the street, completely lost in thought, and yet we're still not walking into trees and falling off the edge of the road. Something is knowing where we are, what we're doing. So whether we're mindful or not, this knowing is functioning—this simple, very simple aspect of every

contact with the sense base.

There's the eye, and there's form and sight, and then there's the knowing of that. There's the ear and sound and the contact, and there's the knowing, the consciousness. Each sense base has this consciousness aspect to it: eye consciousness, ear consciousness, nose consciousness, tongue consciousness, body consciousness, mind consciousness.

Every experience, whatever experience there is—a sound—there's the sound and the knowing of it. There's the sight and the knowing of it. There's a mind state and the knowing of it. And it's possible in mindfulness for mindfulness to recognize this knowing side of the experience. We tend to gravitate, especially before we start looking at our minds, toward the object, toward what is known. That seems to be the way our minds are basically oriented. And yet we can know the knowing itself. We can be aware of the knowing itself. It's possible to distinguish between sight, the seeing, the object of sight, and the knowing of it; the sound and the knowing of it.

One of the places this became most obvious to me, one of the early places I could really begin to see this distinction and recognize that the mind was actually landing on the knowing side of the equation—I was sitting one time and having a real unpleasant experience, an unpleasant physical sensation, a lot of strong bodily energy. There was some aversion there. So there was the aversion to the physical sensation, and I was recognizing the aversion and noticing the unpleasantness. Noticing the unpleasantness of the unpleasant sensation, and noticing the unpleasantness of the aversion—both of them.

And then at some point the mind kind of got interested and actually shifted its orientation. I don't know if I did this intentionally or not, but the mind began recognizing, "Oh, aversion is known. Aversion is known." And with that, the mind kind of settled back. It was more interested in the knowing of the aversion. The feeling tone—the thing that was so clear to me in that moment—was that the feeling tone was neutral. The entire experience felt completely different because it was no longer unpleasant. The mind was interested in knowing. Aversion is known. Wow, knowing is happening. And when it was paying attention to the knowing, the feeling tone of the knowing was neutral.

So sometimes we can be curious about the knowing. I invite you at times to explore experience in this way. Seeing is known. Hearing is known. Frustration is known. Just see what happens in your experience with that.

This last little piece I'm going to drop in as a forward pointer—not so much something I'm going to go into right now, but probably in a week or so, the next time I get to give a talk, I'll explore this in a bit more depth. This is an exploration of how we can begin to understand these processes as not-self. It uses something that we can actually really recognize in our experience.

So I'll read this to you. This is the Buddha speaking: "Form is not self. If form were self, this form would not lead to affliction. And it would be possible to have it of form: 'May my form be thus. May my form not

be thus.'"

But because form is not self, form leads to affliction, and it is not possible to have it of form: "May my form be thus. May my form not be thus."

Wouldn't that be nice? "May my face be thus. May my age spots be thus. May my arthritis be thus." Wouldn't that be nice?

And the Buddha points to this as evidence for not-self—this lack of control, that we cannot say, we do not have agency over, we do not have complete agency over our five aggregates.

I can have some agency. I think this is where we get confused. I can say, "I'm going to move my hands like this," and I can do that. But that's a very limited aspect of control. And so the Buddha is pointing to this—that we do not have control—as being a pointer to, or evidence for, not-self.

And so with mental formations, to get specific here: wouldn't it be nice? The Buddha says, "Concentration is not self." I'm putting concentration in where mental formations is what's used, but this will give you the flavor. "Concentration is not self. If concentration were self, it would be possible to have it of concentration: 'May my concentration be thus. May my concentration not be thus.'"

Wouldn't that be nice?

With respect to all the aggregates, the Buddha points to the fact that they are not inherently controllable, and therefore that is evidence for not-self.

And so this is a piece of the exploration—recognizing it's not a mistake when we can't control our minds. It's not a mistake. It's the nature of the mind.

So let's sit for a moment.

Transcriptions produced locally using Swiss low-carbon electricity. Corrections and rewriting by cloud-hosted AI.