

## General Introduction to Sangharakshita's Seminars

### Hidden Treasure

From the mid-seventies through to the mid-eighties, Urgyen Sangharakshita led many seminars on a wide range of texts for invited groups of [Order members](#) and [Mitrās](#). These seminars were highly formative for the FWBO/Triratna as Sangharakshita opened up for the still very young community what it might mean to live a life in the Dharma.

The seminars were all recorded and later transcribed. Some of these transcriptions have been carefully checked and edited and are [now available in book form](#). However, a great deal of material has so far remained unchecked and unedited and we want to make it available to people who wish to deepen their understanding of Sangharakshita's presentation of the Dharma.

How should one approach reading a seminar transcription from so long ago? Maybe the first thing to do is to vividly imagine the context. What year is it? Who is present? We then step into a world in which Sangharakshita is directly communicating the Dharma. Sometimes he is explaining a text, at other times he is responding to questions and we can see how the emergence of Dharma teachings in this context was a collaborative process, the teaching being drawn out by the questions people asked. Sometimes those questions were less to do with the text and arose more from the contemporary situation of the emerging new Buddhist movement.

Reading through the transcripts can be a bit like working as a miner, sifting through silt and rubble to find the real jewels. Sometimes the discussion is just a bit dull. Sometimes we see Sangharakshita trying to engage with the confusion of ideas many of us brought to Buddhism, confusion which can be reflected in the texts themselves. With brilliant flashes of clarity and understanding, we see him giving teachings in response that have since become an integral part of the Triratna Dharma landscape.

Not all Sangharakshita's ways of seeing things are palatable to modern tastes and outlook. At times some of the views captured in these transcripts express attitudes and ideas [Triratna has acknowledged as unhelpful](#) and which form no part of our teaching today. In encountering all of the ideas contained in over seventeen million words of Dharma investigation and exchange, we are each challenged to test what is said in the fire of our own practice and experience; and to talk over 'knotty points' with friends and teachers to better clarify our own understanding and, where we wish to, to decide to disagree.

We hope that over the next years more seminars will be checked and edited for a wider readership. In the meantime we hope that what you find here will inspire, stimulate, encourage - and challenge you in your practice of the Dharma and in understanding more deeply the approach of Urgyen Sangharakshita.

*Sangharakshita's Literary Executors and the Adhithana Dharma Team*

## DISCLAIMER

This transcript has not been checked by Sangharakshita, and may contain mistakes and mishearings. Checked and reprinted copies of all seminars will be available as part of the [Complete Works Project](#).

## MIND IN BUDDHIST PSYCHOLOGY SEMINAR

Padmaloka 1976.

Present: Ven. Sangharakshita, Padmavajra, Sagaramati, Kamalasila, Manjuvajra, Abhaya, Asvajit, Vimalamitra, Padmapani, Dharmapala, Robert Gerke, Mark Barrett.

Tape 1, Side A.

S: We'll read round the circle- eh? A paragraph each at a time, as we usually do.

Sagaramati: "Ten years ago, Tibetan Buddhism and its psychology was not very well known in the West. But with the translation of texts such as this, the practical psychological teachings of Buddhism are now beginning to materialise. "

S: Mmm. Ten years ago- that's a very short time, isn't it. This book was published in '75. Mmm? So one of the implications of this statement is that, in a way, from the Buddhist point of view, in the West we're living in a very interesting time. Eh? We're living in a time when important new texts are becoming available in translation almost every year, and this process, no doubt, is going to go on for quite a few more decades, if not centuries. Things which were not available in my younger days, which I very much would have liked to read, are just now becoming available, so quickly and easily and in such quantities, it's very difficult to keep up even. So we're living in a very interesting, even very sort of creative period, and it'll be very interesting to see what our reactions, or responses rather, are to these new texts, as they become available, or I should say, perhaps, to these new translations, which very often are the first translations to have been made. What impact these translations will make on the West in general is very difficult to say. They'll probably pass unnoticed in, as it were, professional philosophical and psychological circles, but among Buddhists and those interested in Buddhism, and those interested in Eastern Teachings generally, they must, surely, make quite an impact, even though, perhaps, not a very dramatic one. Eh? But we are living at a very interesting and, as I said, very creative phase of the introduction of the better type of Buddhism to the West.

The only comparable period I can think of in Buddhist history is when Buddhism started to be introduced into China, and the Chinese literati became aware of this mysterious literature, you know, arriving [2] via translations from India in China, and they had, as it were, to adjust to it, come to terms with it, and perhaps to some extent assimilate it as best they could. I mention China rather than Tibet, because when the Buddhist texts were translated into Tibetan, there was hardly any indigenous culture, certainly not of a higher kind, so the Tibetans, to begin with, simply received, they didn't really know what else to do, they weren't in a position to evaluate or really react to it in any sort of way, they could only accept. But the Chinese had a great culture, a great civilisation all ready, before Buddhism arrived on the scene.

So in much the same way, in the West, there has been a culture, a civilisation, at least as great as that of ancient China, all ready present before the arrival of Buddhism. So perhaps that is the only comparison that one can make, with ancient China. So that's the sort of situation in the midst of which we are living now. This is what has been happening over the last, maybe hundred years, and the whole process has been greatly accelerated over the last twenty -

twenty five, and even more, as Tarthang Tulku says, in the course of the last ten years, as regards Tibetan Buddhism and its psychology, and his own centre is playing a very important part in that.

Padmavajra: Although it's wonderful, quite magnificent, that all these texts are becoming available, is there not a danger that some of them are quite, I don't know, quite advanced, quite sort of high, and, you know, maybe they're just a bit too far out, and maybe a lot of people reading them without a teacher - that we're fortunate to have - and ...

S: I think this is certainly true. I think there cannot but be quite a bit of misunderstanding. I think with regard to Tibetan Buddhism and its psychology, what does seem to be happening in certain quarters, some of which one would have thought would have known better, is that the whole Teaching is becoming, as it were, psychologised. Things are being understood, not as having a spiritual and transcendental reference, but as having a purely psychological reference, in the more restricted sense - especially the Tantric teachings. So there is definitely that danger, and there seems to be no, sort of, foolproof defence against that. The unenlightened mind will always find a way. [3]

Asvajit: Mmm. Look at what happened to Zen.

S: What happened to Zen - yes indeed. As a friend of mine wrote many years ago, when I was in Kalimpong, talking about Zen, or what so-called Zen had become in London Buddhist circles, he said it was "the witty word among the teacups". That, he said, was what Zen had become. So I think it is quite important that as these texts become available, we should make them the subject of serious "group", (inverted commas), study. Certainly read them on our own, read them by ourselves [4] but wherever and whenever possible go through them in this sort of way. In that fashion, hopefully, a sort of tradition -of study and interpretation and understanding can be built up, which can be continued, so that the text won't just, as it were, be at large in the Western world for anybody to misunderstand.

(Long pause.)

So I think Tarthang Tulku does well to emphasis this fact that 'ten years ago, Tibetan Buddhism and its psychology was not very well known in the West.' That's really quite an understatement. There was really only Dr. Guenther doing any work of any kind in this field. But with the translation of texts such as this, the practical psychological teachings of Buddhism are now beginning to materialise.' You notice he says 'practical psychological teachings.' Psychology in the West is a sort of descriptive science, but it certainly isn't simply that as far as Buddhism is concerned. There's definitely a practical reference, a practical upshot to the psychology.

All right, let's carry on then.

Ashvajit: "The subject of this book is self-knowledge. That is, until we thoroughly examine the nature of our mind, we cannot really be aware of who we are or why we are here. Just as an intoxicated man, lost in his own mind-created distortions, is unable to judge or control his actions, without an awakening into true knowledge we can only continue to create problems for ourselves and others."

S: That's also quite a reflection, 'Without an awakening into true knowledge we can only continue to create problems for ourselves and others.'

Padmavajra: So you can't be compassionate without being wise - not having wisdom.

S: Not really, no. By accident almost, perhaps, but, you know, not of intent.

So, 'the subject of this book is self-knowledge. That is, until we thoroughly examine the nature of our mind, we cannot really be aware of who we are or why we are here. Just as an intoxicated man, lost in his own mind-created distortions, is unable to judge or control his actions, without an awakening into true knowledge we can only continue to create problems for ourselves and others.' In other words, truly our mental state is like that of the drunken man. You may remember that I sometimes say that the first two Nidanas of the Wheel of Life- that is to say, [5] 'Avidya' and 'Samskaras', are traditionally compared to drunkenness, and the actions committed while in a state of drunkenness, and this is what keeps the whole, you know, Wheel of Life going - Ignorance and the activities performed while in a state of ignorance, which is just like the actions and the words of a drunken man. So what is needed is self-knowledge, what is needed is self-awareness, and this book, like the Abhidharma teaching in general, is meant to help us in this sort of way, in this sort of direction. So it has practical value, not just theoretical interest.

But just to emphasize that last clause again, 'Without an awakening into true knowledge we can only continue to create problems for ourselves and others.' I think perhaps sometimes we don't realise the extent of the damage that we do. We start doing things, we say things, we get involved with others, we initiate projects. But very often we don't realise what we are doing, and it's only by luck, usually, that we don't create problems, you know, for ourselves and others, and more often than not the luck isn't there and we do create those problems, and the greater part of our lives, it seems, is made up of the problems that we create in that sort of way. Very often, of course, we don't see them as problems - which is a problem in itself!

Sagaramati: In a sense then, you have to do things.

S: You have to, you have to. But you have to keep as aware and mindful as possible, and learn from the mistakes, which it seems inevitably you commit, and, you know, be more careful next time, or if you see how you got into a certain problematic situation and why you got into it, if you begin to understand the mechanics of that, then just, with that insight, avoid creating or setting up that situation in the future. This is the only way which you can proceed. You can't, unfortunately, wait until you gain perfect Enlightenment, before you do anything. You have to act without that Enlightenment, therefore, in a sense, you have to create problems, but you have to learn from those problems, and then not repeat them - that is the great secret - not repeat once you've seen why and how you do something, how and why you create a certain problem. You know, to become involved in a particular problem once is only human - even twice or thrice - but to go on creating and setting up that problem indefinitely is really culpable.

We could say that this is what Karma means. Karma is a creating of problems for oneself, - and others. A problem is, as it were, a sort of an unsatisfactory situation which can't be resolved on its own terms. On its own terms it can only be perpetuated. You could even say 'Dukkha [6] means problems,' - or 'problems means dukkha.'

(Long pause.)

That is also quite a good phrase - 'Lost in his own mind-created distortions.' That does really describe the state of most of us - that we are lost in our own mind-created distortions of things. We don't wander serenely in a world of Reality, but we're just lost, as though in a dark jungle, in our own mind-created distortions.

All right, let's go on.

Vimalamitra: "The complexities of our mental patterns and the turbulence of upsetting emotions join like earth and water to create a kind of mud which we call "samsaric mind.""

S: Which is putting it rather strongly, isn't it? 'Complexities of our mental patterns.' Pattern suggests repetition, doesn't it? Repeating the same pattern over and over again. So, 'the complexities of our mental patterns and the turbulence of upsetting emotions,' - what those are we'll see later on in the text - 'join like earth and water to create a kind of mud which we call "samsaric mind".' - the worldly mind, the mind that goes on, as it were, round the Wheel of Life.

Vimalamitra: "Until we can cleanse ourselves of inner confusion and penetrate the various "layers" of this mind, our judgements and actions will only reflect our inherent restlessness, like bees trapped in a jar. We can see them moving around in certain patterns, but without understanding their situation they can only move in Samsaric realms - each with its own unique loss of freedom. On the other hand, by properly investigating our immediate situation, we can learn how an integrated patterning of mind can totally free us from our self-imposed restrictions."

S: What do you think is meant by 'an integrated patterning of mind.'?

Padmapani: Regular steps.

S: Regular steps. In what way is that said to be integrated, and in what way is that said to be patterning?

Padmapani: One would create a pattern if it was regular, in a sense, but the pattern would be a skilful one, it would tend to integrate in various ways.

S: It's like the pattern that you set up, say on Solitary Retreat. It's to help you get into a certain level of experience. [7]

Padmavajra: Positive regular steps, skilful patterns, seems to be conscious - you decide to do it.

S: Yes.

Padmavajra: Whether the other ones just sort of arise, you know, you just don't know why you're doing it - you just do it. It's sort of like, it's almost as if you're - well you are unaware. You're just doing it, going through the actions.

S: So 'an integrated patterning of mind can totally free us from our self-imposed restrictions.' And even the integrated patterning is a restriction, but it's a pattern, it's a restriction that can free one, eventually, from all patterns and from all restrictions.

Vimalamitra: If it's an integrated patterning, then in a way it's a repetition of integrated energies, then presumably those energies will build up.

S: Yes, right, eh. In the usual sort of patterning, the energies that make up the patterning, or that enter into the patterning, are in a state of conflict, they're working against one another. But in the 'integrated patterning of mind' all the energies are harmoniously organised. They're all working towards one end, and therefore, as you say, there's a build up of energy, there's a sort of momentum that is gathering all the time, and eventually one bursts, as it were, out of and beyond, even that positive integrated patterning.

Abhaya: I think this is one thing that people find very difficult to understand - people who come along - to accept any kind of patterning.

S: Um. Well then they usually bring in the word 'discipline,' which for most people - I won't say for most people, - but for many of the people who are likely to come along to the 'Friends' or anything like the 'Friends,' you know, has a definitely negative connotation of being forced to do what you don't want to do, and what is also not basically good for you to do. This, for many of the people we meet seems to mean just this. Or sometimes people say 'well I don't want to follow somebody else's pattern, I don't want anybody else to impose their pattern on me. I remember in the early days of the Movement we encountered such a lot of resistance to anything that remotely resembled that.

Padmavajra: I think it almost seems a kind of strange paradox that, you know, I feel the more regular I am, the more sort of integrated in terms of practice, and usually I'm at my most inspired and my most spontaneous, my most creative. [8]

S: Well, there's most energy there then. I mean, if you sort of are allowed to sit around all day and not do anything, or do whatever you like, you end up, very often, doing nothing, and feeling rather dull and listless, and very uninspired indeed. I think it's the very rare person who can be left, as it were, to his own devices without any pattern at all - whether imposed by others or imposed by himself - and still be very positive, inspired and spontaneous. I think that's a very rare person.

Sagaramati: In a sense you have to be very integrated in order to be like that.

S: Right. And you have to be integrated all the time, or integration should be your normal state. You shouldn't have to, well in that case you wouldn't, depend on a pattern to integrate you, and therefore to galvanise your energies. Since you are integrated already, your energies are there and are immediately available. And that is what spontaneity means.

(Long pause.)

All right, let's go on then.

Dharmapala: "The Abhidharma systemizes Buddha's teachings and is one of the best ways

we have of knowing ourselves. As a science of mind, the Abhidharma is such a vast subject that one could spend a lifetime studying the tradition of just one school. This text in particular, through its analysis of the mind and its mental events, is a useful beginning."

S: 'The Abhidharma systemizes Buddha's teachings,' - we saw that last night, didn't we, in the lecture. Two other things as well, that we also saw. 'And is one of the best ways that we have of knowing ourselves.' This is certainly true. 'As a science of mind, the Abhidharma is such a vast subject that one could spend a lifetime studying the tradition of just one school.' In the Theravada, in a text which I quoted once, - I can't remember now where it comes from, - the Abhidharma is referred to as 'the delight of the learned,' because the learned can spend a lifetime happily just immersed in one or other of the branches of the Abhidharma. You hardly notice the years passing by, or the decades passing by, as you burrow, you know, deeper and deeper into your favourite Abhidharma topics. (Laughter.) 'As a science of mind,' - what is this science of mind? Is the Abhidharma a science of mind? What exactly do we mean by 'science' of mind? Is that word 'science' quite appropriate here?

Q: No. [9]

S: What is a science of mind? Can there be a science of mind?

Ashvaji: A science implies the existence of an independent fixed observer.

S: Yes - Yes?

Ashvaji: So in that sense it cannot be a science. But on the other hand science means knowing, or understanding.

S: Um, yes, right, yes. But psychology in the West, certainly in England, used to be called 'mental science' didn't it? You had physical science, mental science, and moral science. So 'mental science', and a term such as the 'science of mind', suggests that you have the mind out there, and that the mind can be studied just like any other object. Like any other natural object, just like, you know, you can study minerals, and that's 'mineralogy', and you can study meteors and that's 'meteorology'. In the same way, well, out there, as it were, you've got 'mind,' and the study of that, if mind is the 'psyche' is 'psychology.' But there's a difference between, say, studying meteors, and studying the mind, and what is that? Well when you're studying meteors, well you've got all of the meteors out there, but when you're studying mind, well, not only is there the mind out there, which you are studying, but there's the mind in here which is doing the studying, and which therefore is not being studied. So there's a quite different situation. So, therefore one can say that there can't really strictly be a science of mind. In a way a science of mind cannot but leave the mind out, that is the mind of the individual observer, the mind that is actually doing the studying of the science of mind. Guenther elsewhere in his writings actually makes this point. But certainly if we don't forget that there is a mind that is doing the studying, if we remember that and take that into account, well provisionally there can be a science of mind, and the Abhidharma is that - it's a very complete and exhaustive science of mind. So this text in particular, through its analysis of the mind and its mental states is a useful beginning, and it is exactly that. It's a quite elementary text and therefore a very good introduction to the whole subject, and to what is probably the most important and relevant and practically useful part of the whole subject, - the whole of the Abhidharma, that is.

All right, let's go on. [10]

Manjuvajra: "A person without understanding is like someone with no tongue who is unable to distinguish the bitter from the sweet. Similarly, when the various "tastes" of sensations, feelings, perceptions and cognitions become muddled, we lose our ability to discriminate true knowledge from opinions and mere speculation. Often we just accept anything that comes in the door and calls itself knowledge. But if this text is to be useful, it should be examined carefully and critically."

S: Mm. So 'a person without understanding is like someone with no tongue who is unable to distinguish the bitter from the sweet. Similarly, when the various "tastes" of sensations, feelings, perceptions and cognitions become muddled, we lose our ability to discriminate true knowledge from opinions and mere speculation.' Sensations, 'Vedana', or rather, 'Sparsa', - feeling, 'Vedana', perception, 'Samjna' - this is a reference to the Five Skandhas, though not a complete one.

When we're unable to sort out the different kinds of our own experience, what is actually happening to and with our minds, then everything becomes muddled, - we lose our ability to discriminate true knowledge from opinions and mere speculations. So this is where the Abhidharma really helps. It enables us to recognise what is really happening in our own minds. 'Often we just accept anything, that comes in the door and calls itself knowledge. But if this text is to be useful, it should be examined carefully and critically.' In other words, in a way, in the Abhidharma spirit. Study the Abhidharma in the spirit of the Abhidharma, which is essentially an analytical and critical spirit. Don't just swallow it whole, as it were, uncritically.

(Long pause.)

All right, last paragraph.

Robert: 'We wish to thank Dr. Guenther and Rev. Kawamura for working so diligently on this translation, and everyone at Dharma Press who helped to produce it. Through future efforts we hope to publish much more material on the Abhidharma, such as Mi-pham's mkhas-'jug, so that the vast and practical psychology of Buddhism will be available to the West.'

S: All right, any sort of general points about that Foreword?

Padmavajra: More in it than I thought!

S: Um. Um. Well there usually is in things that one studies, as distinct from just reading to oneself ...

Abhaya: This Tulku, has he been in the States a long time? [11]

S: Er, - he's been there, I think, about ten years. Yeah, yeah, - I think they started up at about the same time as the Friends did, - yeah. I don't remember whether I met him, - I might have met him, but at that time in India I met so many Lamas from Tibet. But my general impression is that his particular Centre is one of the very best Buddhist Centres in the States,

if not the best one, - yeah? And he's very reliable and sound, and very inspired in many ways, - and putting out some extremely good literature.

(Long pause.)

Padmapani: Where do they get all their information to compile the books from? Where do they get all their texts from? Does Tarthang Tulku, - brought a lot over?

S: Er, - well many were already in the West. In Japan there are quite a lot of Tibetan texts. I think it's not generally realised how much work in the field of Tibetan studies is being done in Japan. Quite a few years ago when I was, you know, more into these things than I am now, I learned that in Japan full provision for Tibetan studies is made in forty universities. Forty universities, - and this is twenty-one years ago, - had already at that time a Department of Tibetan Buddhist Studies. With professors and lecturers and other research equipment and everything. And the Japanese, of course, have brought out a photostat edition of the entire Tibetan Canon. So there is quite a lot of material, the material is there, it's not difficult to get hold of, but it's not easy to translate. But a start has been made, a beginning has been made, and I think we can expect a lot more. So I think it's quite a good idea that we've started studying, you know, the first of these works to be translated, first of the Abhidharma works to be translated from Tibetan, quite soon after it was published. Only published in, - well only published last year. And here we are already, you know, studying it. Maybe in future we (laugh) we can have study seminars within weeks of important new texts being translated, and in that way they can be assimilated, and what is really useful can be sorted out from what is not so useful. I think we've already discovered that the 'Bodhicaryavatara' is a text that is permanently useful for our own Movement, - certainly within the foreseeable future. We've had one or two other things that we've studied, we've seen, or we've come to understand, are not likely to be so useful, at least at this stage. So we can see, as we go through this text, how useful this is at present, how useful this is likely to be within the immediate future. I have a feeling it is going to be quite useful, but let's see, - eh? [12]

Padmavajra: Do you ... as there seems to be such a, sort of, rich material coming out of and available from Tibetan sources, do you think it's worth anybody taking up the study of Tibetan language?

S: I think it is, - if there is anybody who feels that way inclined, - though the great difficulty is that, - or one of the difficulties, - that, at least as regards this country, to take up the study of Pali or Sanskrit or Tibetan, almost invariably, unless you've got a real flair for learning languages on your own, involves you in academic life, which seems quite inimical to any sort of spiritual life. In the early days of the Friends we lost one or two people in this way, - they disappeared into the depths of Academia, - and, you know, we didn't hear of them again, though the original idea was to study Sanskrit, and possibly later on, Tibetan, and so on.

Vimalamitra: How about Nepal, or maybe, say, Dharamsala?

S: Somewhere like that is... very good ... but then again, we also want them to come back! (Laughter.) You know, they might get, you know, lost, - sampling the delights of the Abhidharma, and just forget about coming back. But there may be such possibilities in the future, or maybe even, you know, some opportunities here in this country. It may be. But I think, what is important is not just to lose oneself in study, which is only too easy to do,

because study can be really, not only fascinating, but seductive, to those who are a bit that way inclined. You can be really seduced into study for its own sake, which is a by-path. What is important is that all the material that becomes available should be sifted through, and what is truly useful to us, you know, within the Friends, at least at this stage of our development, should be truly assimilated. We don't need really very much material, - I think we must remember that. We don't have to master the entire field of Buddhist literature. There's quite a lot, I know, which is not really very useful, not really very relevant, so far as we are concerned. But we need to sort out, you know, that which is useful, that which is relevant and which can help us.

For instance, Buddhist Logic, - a very interesting development, whether that would be really useful to us I really doubt.

(Long pause.)

I think it might be a good idea if we go through the description of the illustrations, - it'll be rather sort of easy way of, you know, entering upon the subject, and the illustrations are also concerned with [13] the Tradition.

All right, just turn to the Frontispiece, and maybe we can read the description of that.

Mark Barrett: "Asanga and Vasubandhu, the two brothers seated together with Asanga's teacher, Maitreya, above. Asanga is depicted receiving knowledge by inspiration; Vasubandhu holds a sacred text, indicating his vast scholarship and knowledge of the Abhidharma. The text of Asanga ... "

S: It's the 'Abhidharmasamuccaya.' Why they give first of all the Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit text I don't know.

Mark: "... is an abridgement of the first two chapters of his Yogacaryabhumi, which employs the Hinayana Abhidharma teachings in the Great Way of the Mahayana. Vasubhandu's great treatise ... "

S: The Abhidharmakosa.

Mark: "revived the Abhidharma teaching which had been lost in a fire at Vikramasila monastery. Both brothers started out on their individual paths, but Vasubhandu was later much influenced by his older brother, Asanga."

S: The particular text which we shall be studying belongs, as I indicated yesterday, to the Yogacara Abhidharma Tradition. The Yogacara Abhidharma Tradition is connected with, or affiliated to, originally, the Sarvastivada Tradition, as far as we can tell. But it adapts that Tradition in accordance with its own distinctive philosophical position. So the link is Asanga. Asanga's 'Abhidharmasamuccaya' is an abridgement of the first two chapters of his 'Yogacaryabhumi', which employs the Hinayana, that is to say Savastivadin Abhidharma teaching in the Great Way of the Mahayana, - yeah?

These two brothers, Asanga and Vasubhandu, who lived in North Western India, as far as we know, the fourth or fifth century AD. Asanga was a Mahayanist, apparently, from the

beginning. Vasubhandu had a very distinguished career as a teacher of the Abhidharma of the Sarvastavidins, and compiled what is the major work of Abhidharma in Sanskrit, that is to say the 'Abhidharmakosa,' or 'Treasury of Abhidharma,' but towards the end of his life, under the influence of his brother Asanga, he took up the study and practice of the Mahayana, and became a great teacher in that. So Vasubhandu has the distinction of being the greatest teacher of the Sarvastavada School, and also, apart from his brother Asanga, the greatest teacher of the Yogacara School too.

Ashvajit: Looking at the picture there, - assuming that Asanga is the upper of the two figures, he looks a bit more open somehow. [14]

S: Yes. Yes. Whereas Vasubhandu does look more scholarly. Ashvajit: Yes.

S: Asanga also looks younger. Asanga is really the founder, - on earth at least, in this world at least, - of the Yogacara School, and according to Tradition he received his inspiration from the Bodhisattva Maitreya, who is shown seated in the Tushita Heaven, above him.

Manjuvajra: What categorises the Tushita Heaven, - what's special about it?

S: It's known as the, - the word means 'contented,' and it's the highest of the Heavens of the World of Form. And this is supposed to be the world in which Bodhisattvas are reborn, immediately before their last human life on earth. So Maitreya Bodhisattva is believed by most Buddhists to be in that world at the moment, - waiting until the time is right, for him to take his last human birth on earth, in which birth, of course, he will gain Enlightenment and again teach the Dharma. But that will not be until all record of the Dharma is lost.

Some Western scholars of course believe that Maitreya, the Maitreya who inspired Asanga, was not the Bodhisattva of that name, but a human teacher called Maitreya. They find it difficult to believe that anybody could be inspired from on high, as it were, by a Bodhisattva. So many Western scholars take it that Maitreya was in fact the name of a human teacher who later on became confused with the Bodhisattva of that name. But the Tibetan iconographic Tradition clearly represents the Bodhisattva Maitreya, - yeah? Guenther has his own theory here, which he's rather fond of, - sometimes it's Maitreya, to make things more confusing, is referred to as 'Maitreyanatha.' Some texts refer to 'Maitreya,' some to Maitreyanatha.' But according to Tradition still, if it's Maitreyanatha, it's still a Bodhisattva, and according to Western scholars who believe it's a teacher, well it's a teacher who was sometimes called 'Maitreya,' sometimes 'Maitreyanatha'. Guenther's view, however, is that 'Maitreyanatha' refers to Asanga himself, and means he whose 'Master,' - 'Natha', - is Maitreya.. So Guenther, in a rather roundabout way, comes to the conclusion that the works are authored by, the works attributed to Maitreya the Bodhisattva, - the so-called 'Five Books of Maitreya,' - were authored by Asanga, i.e. Maitreyanatha, but under the inspiration of Maitreya. (laughter) For some reason or other he's rather fond of this view and insists on it rather strongly. (Laughter) [15]

All right, on to the illustration on page 6.

Padmavajra: "Lord Buddha, the Light of the World ..."

S: No, 19.

Padmavajra: "... from whom all teachings originate, is shown upon the traditional teaching throne with symbols of the six perfections which in him have flowered."

S: Oh, just a minute, I've lost you. Page 19.

Padmavajra: Before the Introduction.

S: Ah, there's one, - isn't that the next one, the one straight on page 19?

Ashvajit: 14. XIV

S: Oh, there's another one in the Introduction, - we hadn't thought of that ... come to that yet, have we. We've missed that.

Padmavajra: No, I've just done it.

Ashvajit: We've just read page ...

Padmavajra: I've just read the description, and the illustrations just before the Introduction.

Sagaramati: Is that page XIX?

Padmavajra: No, it's XIV now.

S: It's XIX.

Sagaramati: It's XIX in the original.

S: XIX is the next one.

Padmavajra: No, we haven't done the Buddha one yet.

Ashvajit: We haven't done the Buddha one yet.

S: Where is the Buddha one?

(Much inaudible cross-talk.)

Ashvajit: ... Opposite the Introduction.

Sagaramati: There was one before that.

S: Yes, but what about this one?

Padmavajra: No, that's after that one.

S: That's ...(?) the Introduction.

Padmavajra: Oh, hang one, we've got a different ... Oh, it's not in there. (Laughter.)

Vimalamitra: Oh, really! [16]

(General inaudible cross-talk.)

Tape 1, Side B.

S: Oh, I see! There are different editions then. Is that the new edition, or is it just a ...

Padmavajra: Shall I leave it then?

S: Oh no, you read it.

(General mumbling.)

Manjuvajra: Yes, Second Revised Edition!

S: Well, he's got a Second Revised Edition!

Padmavajra: Unless it's later on in the book, that one.

S: Oh, all right ... (?)

(p. ix) Padmavajra: "Lord Buddha, the light of the World from whom all teachings originate, is shown upon the traditional teaching throne with symbols of the six perfections which in him have flowered."

S: (interrupting?) Something wanting to find him, they, no doubt, have their own difficulty.

Padmavajra: Lord Buddha, the Light of the World from whom all teachings originate, is shown upon the traditional teaching throne with symbols of the six perfections which in him have flowered.

Sagaramati: In this edition it's the last illustration.

S: Oh, is it? Ah! Well, that's all right. Perhaps they ... they made a mistake - or they might have felt, well, it is more appropriate to have the Buddha at the beginning. I would have thought that any way.

?Sagaramati: This one's a bit darker ... (?)

S: Ah yes, here we are.

?Sagaramati: ... The figure has changed ... (?)

S: Yes, pages ... Yes, it's probably ...er ...yes ...This copy has the Buddha at the end.

Asvajit: ... And the face is quite different. [17]

Voices: Oh yes? Really! (Laughter.)

Sagaramati: They probably didn't like the face on this one.

S: Yes! ... All right, Lord Buddha the Light of the World from whom all teachings originate, that is all the Buddha's teaching... huh? He's shown upon a traditional throne... lotus throne... supported by lions ...teaching throne with symbols of the six perfections which... (?)... flowers...

Dharmapala: (?Why are there) six symbols representing the six perfections?

S: I'm not sure about that....

Padmavajra: ...It's got the wheel of (?) and bowl.

Manjuvajra: ...Two flowers...

(Pause.)

Asvajit: It's rather unusual to have both these two ...what appear to be female figures ...at the foot of the ...throne.

S: Are they in fact female figures? Or are they devas? They could be Indra and Brahma ...huh?

?Manjuvajra: One of them's Manjusri...?

S: Ah!

?Manjuvajra: Sword and book!

S: Oh, yes, that's true.

?Manjuvajra: The other one has an initiation vase.

S: Has a...?

Manjuvajra: An initiation vase. The one on the left hand side.

Voice: (?They are both on) ...lotuses...

Asvajit: ...And the other one has a sword and...

S: Yes, so one of them's Manjusri then... presumably...

Padmavajra: I wonder... the female is... this one with initiation vase on quite a few of the things that have come up on Dharma Publishing. Seems to be quite a popular one which they put in the corner.

S: Mmm. I think it might be a good idea if somebody makes a note of things that aren't clear and require some further explanation, and we write off at the end of the seminar and see what

replies we get back... Yes?...Would you like to do that (to someone)? [\*Typist's suggestion (i.e. Vimala): If there replies ever came back, it would be a good idea to incorporate them as an appendix to the MBP seminar edition.]

For instance it [18] does say, the traditional teaching throne with symbols of the six perfections, but there's no explanation of which symbols refer to which perfections... Perhaps we could write and ask about that?

(Pause.)

There are various symbols in the halo, the outer part of the halo, we notice... eh?

(Pause.)

All right, let's get on to the next illustration. I think that is the one facing page 19 ... (?) the introduction.

Abhaya: "dPal-sprul 0-rgyan 'Jigs-med' chos-kyi dbang-po, one of the most renowned Nyingma lamas of the nineteenth century, is shown here upon a teaching throne. He represents the refinement and return to basic principles of study and practice which characterised this dynamic period of synthesis and tolerance.

S: Um! It does seem that during the nineteenth century in Tibet - especially Western Tibet - there was a great Nyingmapa... revival, almost, and ...a movement ...which is called the - as far as I can remember - the Rig-me Movement, or no limits, no boundaries, or non- sectarian movement... of bringing together and almost synthesising different lines of... teaching, eh? And ... Tarthang Tulku is connected with that particular line and that particular tradition or movement...

Voice: What did you call it?

S: Rig-me. As far as I remember "rig" is a sort of barrier or boundary, "me" is "not" - so no boundary, no limit, or non-sectarian.

(Pause.)

'Jam-dbYans mKhyen-brTse Rimpoche is also connected with that particular tradition - quite strongly - in fact he's one of the most important representatives.

Manjuvajra: He looks quite a jolly chap.

S: Mmm?

Manjuvajra: He looks quite jolly.

S: Mmm! ...Looks very intent.

Padmavajra: There's a couple of... there's a translation in an old Crystal Mirror... a thing called (?kalpu) Rimpoche's council... which is quite good, and there's also in Chogyam

Trungpa's Mudra a thing called Maha-Ati. [19]

S: Ah, yes... you also notice that though he's a Nyingmapa lama,... he appears in full monastic costume and is clearly a monk. He seems to have a shaven head also.

(Pause.)

Manjuvajra: Is that unusual?

S: Er, no, it isn't unusual, but it contradicts some of the... more popular ideas (?covered) about the Nyingmapas; that they were, as it were, not particularly monastic... perhaps they weren't in a very narrow rigid sense, but they were, all the greater teachers, in the true sense.

Dharmapala: Would that possibly be part of this... er... revival study ... (?reform) ... concentrate together to do that?

S: It could be that. It does seem to be quite an intensive movement; to have produced quite a number of really leading personalities and great teachers. This was fairly recently - the last century, this one - overflowing from the previous century and into this century.

(Pause.)

All right, on to...page 2.

Kamalasila: "Manjusri, the Bodhisattva of discriminating awareness, is the inspiration for true understanding. He holds the flaming sword of discrimination in his right hand and the book of knowledge in his left. "

S: What is the general impression you get from this illustration

?Padmavajra: Youthful.

S: Youthful.

Padmavajra: Very young.

?Kamalasila: Indian.

S: Indian? Yes, that's interesting. It's Nepalese actually. What sort of general impression do you get from it - aesthetically?

Manjuvajra: Richness.

S: Richness.

Padmavajra: (? )Gross.

S: (? )Gross.

Manjuvajra: Quite lively.

S: Lively, fertile, luxuriant. [20]

Manjuvajra: Lush.

S: Er, lush? Yes, lush. Even a little congested! Do you think that means anything or signifies anything? I think, in a way, it's rather decadent. Purely looking at it as art... yeah? It's as though, you know, I always get the impression of Manjusri being lost in the midst of all this foliage, as it were... You get that impression with some of the Nepalese... the later Nepalese... Buddhist art... As though there's been an overgrowth of detail... The details have got rather out of hand. Don't you get that sort of impression?

Manjuvajra and others: Yes!

S: That the Bodhisattva ought to be much more prominent, as it were.

Ought to be much more empty space. I mean, compare, for instance, with that... with the frontispiece. Don't you get a very different sort of feeling?

Voices: Yes.

S: So to me this in a way is significant. Because it represents... as it were, or could be considered, you know, to represent - if this isn't being too fanciful - the growth of scholasticism, as it were, huh? Of the details of the Abhidharma, for instance, obscuring the outlines of the subject, huh? Eh?

Asvajit: The analogy also occurs to me of the ...the assimilation of a... er... universal religion to a... an ethnic one.

Bhante: Yes! Quite! Yes. Because Manjusri to me looks a little... well, really lost in the midst of all this.

Vimalamitra: He looks really miserable.

Asvajit: He looks a bit (?)tame.

S: Mmm. He doesn't seem to dominate the situation...eh? Even his vehicle seems to have got out of hand!! It's much too big - (General laughter.) - Yeah? Yeah?... This very rich vegetation, eh? Which seems to have run rather wild - so I think there is a kind of moral here, do you see what I mean? Yeah? Yeah? Any way I don't want to press the point too much... huh? But I think in the strict non-pejorative sense it represents a slightly decadent phase of Nepalese Buddhist art... huh? And I think perhaps aesthetic decadence can be paralleled by... by spiritual and intellectual decadence - and we do know that this is what happened in Nepal... eh? We do know that... that Buddhism was literally overgrown by Hinduism, eh? Ah? You can see it in the art, you can see it in the architecture, you can see it in the general spiritual life of

[21]

S (continued): Buddhist Nepal, huh? Many of the Buddhists, in fact, became Hindus, or

semi-Hindus, semi-Buddhists,...eh?

Dharmapala: So in the same way that we should... er sift through material that, in fact, is relevant, art is also ...

S: Yes! Huh, yes! I mean as Tarthang Tulku says at the end of his... er... foreword... eh? ... the text should be - if it is to be useful - it should be examined critically and - carefully and critically. The same with the art... huh? Otherwise, I mean, some people adopt the attitude: well everything... every bit of art that comes from India, that comes from Tibet, China, Japan, is wonderful ...huh?... and it's a masterpiece of art - well, that just isn't true. One has to be critical here. One's critical - in the true sense - one's critical faculties shouldn't be allowed... to fall into abeyance; otherwise you get some sort of poster or some thangka and, you know, some people think you should automatically.. be sort of really overwhelmed by this - it's absolutely wonderful - better than anything else produced in the west - well! ... this is nonsense. You have to be discriminating.

Some thangkas are really fine art - very inspiring. Others are very ordinary - and not in the least inspiring. And one must, you know, be true to one's own... reaction... one's own judgement... - and one must have a judgement. Not just uncritically accept everything that comes pouring in from the Buddhist East. Appreciation - yes, by all means - you know, where appreciation's called for... but discriminating appreciation - otherwise there can't really be any appreciation. You just swallow the lot... huh?... good, bad and indifferent, and getting intellectual and spiritual, aesthetic indigestion... huh?

Asvajit: - If not worse -

S: If not worse. As the Pali Scriptures say, you come by your death and deadly pain... eh? Because you've not washed the lotus roots before swallowing them.

All right, on to the next illustration.

Padmapani: Nagarjuna, the famous dialectician and father of Mahayana philosophy, who lived around 150 AD., is shown displaying the Dharmachakra mudra, symbolic of turning the Wheel of the Dharma. His "rin-chen 'phreng-ba" (Ratnamala) and "bshes-sbring" (Suhrllekha), which are often quoted in this text, were letters of advice written to a king of this period."

Mark Barrett: (?)Is that the same man... little thing in the corner with a (?)bhavana wheel?  
[22]

S: Mmm...

Padmavajra: Could that be Prajna-Paramita? (stop at 4) 14/8/77

S: It could be. Er, I think you had better make a note to write and ask about this. I can't really see it that clearly. It does look a female figure.

Asvajit: Are we looking at the same thing?

Manjuvajra: It's the little figure up the top.

Do those sort of waves coming down always represent inspiration coming from... (?) above?

S: It does seem like this, yes! A rainbow-like, a rainbow colour. The inspiration, as it were, doesn't come down in a straight line.

It isn't, as it were, mathematical or geometrical - it's flowing, huh?

Padmavajra: This is very beautiful - I have this in colour - this particular one. There's three lines going from her.

S: Yes, as though, you know, inspiration comes down to her from even higher up, one could say. It doesn't stop anywhere.

Dharmapala: I noticed that with the last one too, it didn't stop at Asanga - it went on.

S: Yeah. (Pause.)

Nagarjuna is the teacher who is associated with the revival or the publication of the Perfection of Wisdom teachings, eh? And he's the founder of the Madhyamika school, huh? And the real upholder of the Mahayana tradition in India.

Er, the last study seminar, of course, we went through - this same Ratnavali or Ratnamala. It was also a very interesting work, at times very difficult.

So Nagarjuna does not, in fact, belong to this tradition, huh? Er, he's not connected with the Abhidharma tradition, he's not connected with the Yogacara tradition,... huh?...except to the extent that the Yogacara also draws on the Perfection of Wisdom texts. He is connected with - he's the founder of - the Madhyamika tradition. But works of his - the Ratnavali and Suhrlekha - are quoted in this particular text...eh? These are general Mahayana works, eh? Therefore his, er, picture has also been included among the illustrations.

(Pause.) All right, on to 34. [23]

Sagaramati: "Santideva, a great pandit of Nalanda University, brilliantly proclaimed the Bodhisattva ideal of Mahayana in his "spyod-'jug" (Bodhicaryavatara) and "bslab btus" (Sikhsasamuccaya). His works have continued to be studied by all schools in Tibet since the tenth century. "

S: Mmm: Well, as you know, we've also studied the Bodhicaryavatara, huh? Er, Santideva too, doesn't belong to this tradition... eh? He belongs to the Madhyamika tradition of Nagarjuna and Santideva... but , as the note here says, huh? His works are studied by (?probably) all schools in Tibet - they're very, very popular. I think, probably, of ... er... all the texts written in India, apart from sutras, Santideva's Bodhicaryavatara is probably the most popular Buddhist work in Tibet.

Mark Barrett: What's this Siksa ...

S: Siksasamuccaya? Er, Siksasamuccaya is "Compendium of Teachings", eh?

This is another work by Santideva that has survived in the original Sanskrit, huh? It's a compilation of... er... passages from Mahayana sutras, bearing upon the life and conduct of the Bodhisattva, hmm? Er.. many of these passages - many of his quotations - are from sutras which have been lost in the original Sanskrit, huh? Which we have, in a few cases, not even any translations, yeah? So it's quite... the compilation is quite important and valuable from that point of view, huh? Er, there is a complete English translation published which I have...erh? But it's a rather early and not particularly good one - but any way it's better than nothing huh? Eh? It has been suggested we... we have a study seminar on that some time. Er.. I'm not sure how useful that would be... I don't think it would be as useful as the Bodhicaryavatara itself. But still it is quite a fascinating anthology. In a way, it's quite interesting to compare the Siksasamuccaya with the Bodhicaryavatara, huh? Because in the Siksasamuccaya you've got the raw material - it's almost like Santideva's notebook, you know, passages he copied out from... er... Mahayana sutras which he found interesting and inspiring; relevant to the Bodhisattva ideal huh? And then the Bodhicaryavatara would represent the sort of distillation of all this - the essence of all this - in his own words, in the light of his own experience - as he himself tried to practise the Bodhisattva ideal huh? So it's more... condensed, more concentrated, more beautiful... huh? And much more highly relevant, huh? [24]

Dharmapala: What's this... mmm ... symbol by his right hand?

S: This is supposed to be a sort of receptacle for food, eh? Sometimes it has a sort of symbolic significance, huh? There's the food of the Dharma, the ambrosia of the Dharma, huh?

(Pause.)

Asvajit: The face seems to, - I don't know whether it's an accident of the illustration - but the face seems to be much finer than any of the others.

S: Mmm! Mmm! Well, you do get the impression from, er, the Bodhicaryavatara itself, er, of someone very refined and intense temperament, don't you?

Er, of course he was from Gujerat and actually Gujeratis are like that! I've been, quite a number of times, to Gujerat. They're a very refined, a very aesthetic, very sensitive, very emotional people, huh? With a great liking for the arts, and for decoration, huh? Their homes are beautifully kept - especially the more well-to-do people. They're very fond of bright colours, eh? They paint the fronts of their houses in all sorts of rainbow colours, huh? Eh? And they're very intensely devotional, eh? -and emotional even, huh? And they're very intelligent, huh? They're also good at business and trade, eh? Huh? So Santideva came from among these sort of people, huh? And it seems to fit him a lot, huh?

All right, page 7, - er - page 71.

(Pause.)

Asvajit: "Aryadeva, the illustrious disciple of Nagarjuna, is shown with a defeated opponent

at his feet. A master of philosophy and science, his works include the "Catuhsataka".

S: Catuhsataka - "the 400 verses". Er, what is happening to this defeated opponent of his?

?Padmavajra: He's having his hair shaven.

S: Yes! (General laughter.)

Padmavajra: Look at the bloke, he's really into it, he's shaving his head, he's got a real sort of... really good - I think Aryadeva's got quite a good wrathful smile!

S: Yes.

Padmavajra: Like Padmasambhava. [25]

S: And the figure? Who do you think the figure is?

Padmavajra: In the corner?

S: Mmm?

Padmavajra: Nagarjuna?

S: Yes... You see the serpent hood... er, hood, yeah?

(Nagarjuna's halo).

Manjuvajra: What does that mean?

S: (?)...protective... er, protective hood of Nagas, because he is supposed to have gone to the world of the Nagas to retrieve the Perfection of Wisdom Teachings; and Nagarjuna, er, his name incorporates the term Naga. Arjuna is the name of a kind of, er, certain tree.

Robert Gerke: Would this be a debate that he was supposed (?) to be losing?

S: Yes. Right! Yes. The ancient Indians - or mediaeval Indians, at least, were very fond of these philosophical debates and the... defeated person had to give up his own tradition and adopt that of the victor.

Padmavajra: There's a story in the Door of Liberation of Aryadeva, ... defeating Mātrea or something...

S: Yes. So again, he doesn't strictly belong to this tradition but er, is held in high regard by Buddhists of all schools... there may be the odd quotation from him.

(Pause.)

All right, on to the next one.

Vimalamitra: "Tsong-kha-pa, the founder of the Gelugpa sect in Tibet, is depicted upon an elephant, indicating he is an incarnation of Manjusri. His "lam-rim chen-mo" has been used in Tibet for centuries as a basic text for providing a foundation in Buddhist scholarship. "

S: The author of this, er...

(Pause.)

Padmavajra: A bit of a congested picture, isn't it?

S: It is.

Padmavajra: It's not... this congestion - isn't a specific quality of Manjusri is it, in any way.  
[26]

S: Er... No, not at all!

Vimalamitra: He does seem to dominate it... here.

S: Yes, much more so.

Padmavajra: I don't think it helps it being in black and white, I think...

S: No!

Padmavajra: ... (?)... you could probably in colour.

S: Yes, because when something is in colour, the colours themselves give prominence,...  
huh?

?Kamalasila: It looks like it's copied from the same sort of style as as the (other picture?)

Asvajit: Really I get the impression that... (?)... all these illustrations (?) are a bit crude.

S: Mmm. Yes. Well, perhaps that's inevitable to some extent when er... they're just sort of line drawings... eh?

Ashvajit: But... er... who is it?... er,... Glenn Eddie, who does illustrations for a lot of Dharma Publications' works is good.

S: Yes. Some of his are very refined indeed - all of them in fact.

Kamalasila: Although I think this one's got something that Glenn Eddie hasn't got.

Asvajit: It's got very individual character in the faces...

Padmavajra: These two chappies either side of this wrathful deity ... presumably...  
Tsongkhapa's disciples?

S: Yes. There is a pair of chief disciples, huh? And two bodhisattvas at the top. One looks like Manjusri.

Padmavajra: There again - there's an initiation vase...

S: Mmm. Mmm.

Padmavajra: (I'll find out about that...

Padmapani: Is that the yellow hat school er...

S: Yes. Right. Yes. [27]

Padmapani: Gelugpa, yes?

S: Yes.

Padmapani: Is, er, Tsong-kha-pa the founder of the Gelugpa?

S: Yes, he's the founder of the Gelugpa school. Yes.

(Pause.)

And the author of this text... he also belonged to the Gelugpa school. (Pause.) That seems to be all the discussion.

(Long pause.)

Vimalamitra: Eh, what's the deity underneath, er,... er, this illustration?

S: Er, the bottom or the top?

Vimalamitra: Yeah?

S: I'm not sure who that is.

Padmavajra: A wrathful deity. Actually I think I've seen that picture... in one of Trungpa's (?Visual Dharmas). I think it's a form of Ganesh... or ... no, rather of White Mahakala.

S: There's a tiny figure to the right, eh? - And an elephant on the opposite side.

Padmavajra: Bit like patrons, actually.

S: Could be, mmh.

Dharmapala: So, is Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan... he's from the Gelugpa school? And, so this is, would you say, this is sort of a Gelugpa text?

S: Er, no, one can't say that it's a Gelugpa text, huh? Er... the basic tradition is that of the

Yogacara Abhidharma. Er, in Tibetan Buddhism there is no separate school of Yogacara Abhidharma, huh? On the whole the Gelugpas tend to be more closely connected with the original Indian translated Buddhist literature than the Nyingmapas, eh? The Gelugpas tend to go (?) much more in for the study of the Sutras, the Abhidharma, the Vinaya, logic and epistemology, and so on. The Nyingmapas very much less so huh? But they tend to study much more - not even just the Tantras - but the Terma literature... and the writings of the teachers of their own school, huh? But they don't usually study Abhidharma or Vinaya or anything like that.

So the author of the text is a Gelugpa. But he's interested in the Abhidharma... just as part of his general studies, as it were, as a follower of the Gelugpa school. But there's no particular line of [28] Gelugpa interpretation here, huh? Mmmh? He's tried, as best he can, to follow faithfully the original, er, Indian, er, Yogacara Abhidharma tradition, huh? Though he quotes from Tsong-kha-pa, he quotes from Nagarjuna, to... to help make clear the various points that he is raising, or with which he is dealing.

Perhaps the illustrations are a bit confusing, in a way. Perhaps I should, sort of, sort them out... well, the Buddha is included because it's from him that the whole tradition comes, yeah?

Er, then Nagarjuna is the next in chronological order, yeah? Er, Nagarjuna has no direct connection with the tradition of the Yogacara Abhidharma, huh?

Neither does Aryadeva, neither does Santideva... but they've been included because they're all held in high regard by Tibetan Buddhists generally...

And there are a few quotations from the writings of Nagarjuna... er, in this particular work, just to illustrate certain points, yeah?

Er, Asanga and Vasubandhu are directly connected with the tradition of this Particular text - they are the virtual founders, huh?, of the er, Yogacara school in general and the Yogacara Abhidharma tradition... yeah?

And then the... the... the... the portrait of the... the author of the work is included for obvious reasons - he's a Gelugpa, huh? who is er, interested in the Abhidharma - in the Yogacara Abhidharma tradition, and interpretes it as faithfully as he can. But there's no particular Gelugpa line of interpretation, yeah?

Then there is the portrait of the great nineteenth century teacher of the Nyingmapa school, because it's to that line, especially, that Tarthang Tulku himself belongs, huh? That seems to be the connection, huh?

Manjusri, of course, is included as the Bodhisattva of wisdom in general, huh? Although he, as a Bodhisattva, is connected much more with the, er, Madhyamika tradition...(?) and the Perfection of Wisdom tradition... than he is with the Yogacara school.

But with the Yogacara school, it's Maitreya who is connected much more.

Dharmapala: So we have the Nyingmapa connection through, mmm, the introduction here of

a nineteenth century teacher who was connected with the revival of...

S: Yes! [29]

Dharmapala: ... And bringing that teaching out ...

S: ... Then again (?), connected with the, er, broader approach to Buddhism in general... huh? Mmm? Er, and therefore Tarthang Tulku, who follows this particular tradition, which is a branch of the Nyingmapas, doesn't hesitate to, to make use of, to get translated a text written by a Gelugpa, huh? Whereas some Nyingmapas would stick strictly to Nyingmapa works, or works by Nyingmapa lamas. Some Gelugpas would stick strictly to work written by Gelugpa lamas, huh?

But this particular movement of synthesis and re-interpretation of the last century, - which continued into this century, - is non-sectarian, huh?

Er, sometimes it seems to me that the Friends represent the same sort of attitude and spirit, but not just within the limits of Tibetan Buddhism itself, - but within the limits, if you can use that expression, of Buddhism itself, yeah? Hmm? We draw on whatever we find good and helpful in all the different schools of Buddhism, huh? Sometimes we even go outside of the Buddhist tradition, - at least for minor inspirations, huh?

Dharmapala: Umh, would that revival in the nineteenth century be rather, sort of, er, not only a revival but a sifting process taking from...?

S: I think, in effect, this is a sifting process. But it doesn't, er, as far as I know, claim to be such. Some followers might even be a bit shocked at the idea of presuming to sift, huh? But I think in fact that is what happens, and cannot but happen.

You will certainly concentrate on certain things more than others; give more importance, at least practically, to certain things than to others, - certain texts, certain teachings, certain practices, certain traditions. You have to, because the material is so enormous in extent that you can't possibly give equal time, attention, emphasis, to everything!

Dharmapala: You come back to the practically useful.

S: The practically useful, yes. I think we'll find that this particular text is certainly practically useful.

All right, I'll just go outside for a minute, then we'll take up the Preface. (Long pause.)

All right, the Preface. (Long pause.) [30]

Sagaramati: Could people speak reasonably loud - we've just played back ... hardly hear what he said ...

S: Anyone missing? (Long pause.)

Manjuvajra: ""The Necklace of Clear Understanding: An Elucidation of the Working of

Mind and Mental Events" by Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan (1713-1793) is an autocommentary on his own verse text which explains the mind and its fifty-one mental events in 177 four-lined stanzas."

S: An autocommentary is a commentary written by the author on his own work. You get autocommentaries quite often in Buddhist literature. The author writes a series of verses which express what he has to say in a very concise form, possibly for purposes of memorisation, and then, to explain each verse, he writes a prose commentary, an autocommentary, which one can also study. So Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan follows this same procedure.

Right, carry on then.

Mark Barrett: "In the colophon to his 'Necklace' Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan states that he stayed at the ..."

S: That's pronounced "Ta-shi".

Mark Barrett: Eh?

S: Ta-shi sam-ten-ling monastery.((bKra-shis bsam-gtan-gling monastery))

Mark Barrett: " ... on the border of Nepal and Tibet, and that he was the disciple of Blo-bzang-bzang-po, of Blo-bzang-ye-shes- dpal-bzang-po (1663-1737), the second Panchen Lama, and of Blo-bzang-rnam-rgyal. That he belongs to the dGe-lugs-Pa school is evident from his title (Yongs-dzin) and from the fact that he copiously quotes from Tsong-kha-pa's (1357-1419) works and standard Indian Yogacara sources. In fact he builds his presentation around Asanga's 'Abhidharmasamuccaya' "

S: "Abhidharmasamuccaya" means simply "the collection of the Abhidharma".

Mark Barrett: " (51 mental events as against the 'Abhidharmakosa's 46 mental events) "

S: In other words, he's following the Yogacara Abhidharma tradition of India instead of the Sarvastivada tradition as represented here by the 'Abhidharmakosa'. [31]

Mark Barrett: " and Tsong-kha-pa's 'lam-rim chen-mo'. "

S: Yes. The 'lam-rim' is 'Great Stages of the Way'; is Tsong-kha-pa's chief work. It's very, very much studied by Gelugpa monks and lamas, and it gives a general account of the Buddhist path, especially the Bodhisattva path.

(Pause.)

Mark Barrett: ((In his own words,))

"I, Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan... composed this work... by making the 'Abhidharmasamuccaya' the basis and by embellishing it with statements from Tsong-kha-pa and his disciples..."

S: Yes, these two epithets give a good clue to the nature of the work. The 'Abhidharmasamuccaya' is the basis; it's based upon, it continues the Indian Yogacara Abhidharma tradition, and it's embellished with statements from Tsong-kha-pa and his disciples. In other words, he has used quotations from writings of Tsong-kha-pa, and Tsong-kha-pa's disciples to make clear the particular tradition which he is trying to expound; also to beautify it, and adorn it.

(Pause.)

Carry on then.

Padmavajra: " In this way, he offers the reader what may be called "

Tape 2 [32]

Padmavajra: ".....what may be called the 'officially approved version of Buddhist ideas that have come from India.' On the other hand, for what can be done with these ideas practically, we have to look to other sources, above all the rNying-ma-pa tradition which we have utilised in the introduction and in our notes. "

S: Guenther tends rather to identify himself with the rNying- ma-pa tradition, and to regard the Gelug-pas as representing the official point of view. This is not strictly correct, but anyway, we need not bother much about that.

Padmavajra: "Nevertheless, from Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan's account we can learn that positive mental attitudes produce positive situations for man's growth, while negative ones have the opposite effect. Another important observation is that any emotion affects the whole mind. For example, in a (?) of anger, which is a negative state, there cannot be present a positive state such as confidence or tension release. The only way to overcome negative states or events is to strengthen the positive ones. To give an example, when assiduousness and confidence are present there is no room for arrogance or scepticism; while negative emotions merely reinforce negative attitudes, positive emotions lead to growth and health."

S: That's a quite important point. - that any emotion affects the whole mind. You can't as it were compartmentalise. You know quite well that if you are upset or if you feel angry, you can't meditate. There's not as it were a different part of your mind with which you can meditate. The anger affects the whole mind.

Abhaya: "The 'Necklace of Clear Understanding' belongs to that group of literature called 'Abhidharma' which concentrates on the [33] training of one's critical cognition by methods of proper inspection."

S: Guenther tends to use 'inspection' for 'mindfulness and awareness'.

Abhaya: "The Abhidharma, in particular as codified in Vasubhandu's Abhidharmakosa and Asanga's Abhidharmasamuccaya, is a systematic approach to understanding the world as man's horizon of meaning".

S: What do you think he means by 'the world as man's horizon of meaning'? This is one of

his favourite expressions.

Padmavajra: He means the world as, er ...

S: The world as representing a limit.

Padmavajra: Yes, yes.

S: Or a boundary.

Padmavajra: Yes.

Manjuvajra: That's a man's sort of own understanding of the world, that he actually creates the world that he lives in.

S: Yes, yes. So if your understanding is limited, your world is limited, yes? So the world in that sense is a man's horizon of meaning.

Padmavajra: Does he mean man as an individual?

S: Not necessarily. Guenther seems to say 'horizon of meaning ' in a positive sense, as something that one can work with, as it were. But it seems a very vague expression.

Padmavajra: Like your horizon's always changing, presumably, if you practise the spiritual life.

S: Yes.

Abhaya: "For example, the Abhidharmakosa begins with a broad analysis of the psycho-physical constituents, such as the [34] skandhas, dhatus, and ayatanas (Chap.I), and then presents the mind and mental events that deal with these topics and order them into the various levels of the mind's world. This interpretation, as well as construction, is assisted by man's actions (karma) which are sustained by the emotions operating overtly or covertly. While all this may involve man in the world and force him to live uncritically, the major task is to grow and, figuratively speaking, rise above the world. It is here that the discussion of the various paths and stages begins. These stages are intimately connected with the distinct forms of awarenesses which are further developed and made a firm basis for a meaningful existence of man in his world through contemplative processes. In all these processes, the mind plays a decisive role."

S: That's just a little summary of the contents of the Abhidharmakosa.

Abhaya: "We wish to acknowledge and express our gratitude to Tarthang Tulku, Head Lama of the Tibetan Nyingma Meditation Center and the Nyingma Institute in Berkeley, for his avid interest in our work and for his encouragement which spurred us on; to Mr. Leonard van der Kuijp for proof-reading the text; and to Dharma Publishing and Dharma Press for undertaking the publication. "

S: All right, let's go on to the Introduction.

Kamalashila: "The title of this book poses two related questions: Is it justifiable to speak of Buddhist psychology? and, if so, What is the nature of mind in such a framework? The first question can be answered easily in the affirmative since, in many respects, Buddhist ideas are close to contemporary currents in Western psychology which have moved far away from earlier postulational suppositions. Secondly, throughout its history, Buddhism has emphasised experiential [35] knowledge rather than dogmas as the starting point of man's growth and has been less concerned with systems of concepts and sets of postulates which remain hypotheses to be tested, Consequently Buddhist psychological methods of observation are concerned with a study of human potentialities as they now exist, as well as how to develop them in the future."

S: It's one of Guenther's own favourite theses that 'Buddhist ideas are close to contemporary currents in Western psychology', and he often presents Buddhist psychology and Buddhist thought in terms of those 'contemporary currents'. Which is perhaps one of the more confusing aspects of his work. But anyway it doesn't come too much into this particular translation. But it's certainly true that 'throughout its history Buddhism has emphasised experiential knowledge rather than dogmas as the starting point of man's growth, and has been less concerned with systems of concepts and sets of postulates which remain hypotheses to be tested. Consequently, Buddhist psychological methods of observation are concerned with a study of human potentialities as they now exist, as well as how to develop them in the future.'

Any query on that? It seems fairly obvious.

Ashvajit: It's a little bit strange that he uses an idea like 'Buddhist psychological methods of observation' as if there are any such methods.

S: Apart from one's actual observation.

Ashvajit: Yes,

S: Yes. The only 'mental observer' in Buddhism is 'that you observe'. There's no laboratory experiment or anything of that sort. It's just introspection, just looking into one's own mind. Watching oneself, observing what is happening, in one's mind. Seeing how one reacts, for instance. [36]

Ashvajit: It's strange, because in his Philosophy and Psychology of the Abhidharma he's at great pains to dispel any such concept or idea.

S: All right, lets go on to The Way.

Padmapani: "'The Way' is a short term for the fact that man controls his future because of his ability to perceive, to know, and to order what he perceives and knows."

S: Yes, carry on, we'll discuss the whole paragraph. - this is a short one.

Padmapani: This ability is dynamically active at this and every other moment, for the mind cannot be a static entity or a mere state or function of consciousness. Rather, it involves questions of When? Where? Under what conditions? From what perspectives? and hence, the

mind is an on-going process in a person's life history."

S: 'The Way [lam], lam is of course the Tibetan term; the Sanskrit term is marga. "'The Way' is a short term for the fact that man controls his future because of his ability to perceive, to know, and to order what he perceives and knows." In other words we mustn't think of the Way, lam or marga, as a sort of 'thing out there' which is 'given', which is fixed, which is something definite. What we speak of as the Way, or the word for Way, 'is a short term for the fact that man controls his future because of his ability to perceive, to know, and to order what he perceives and knows'.

To 'control the future'. The Path, in a way, represents the fact that we control our own future - that we can go ahead in a certain direction. We can do certain things, we can arrive at [37] certain goals. 'The Path' seems to represent that fact. In other words, if you like, 'The Path' represents the fact, or the concept of 'The Path', or the symbol of 'The Path', because 'The Path' is in fact just a manner of speaking, just a symbol, represents the fact that we can change ourselves.

Padmapani: Then man can control his future through his own efforts.

S: Yes, if he knows himself as he is here and now. If he knows what he is now, and what he can become, then he can take steps to become whatever he wants to become. And that is 'following a Path'. 'The Path' represents the fact that he does have that freedom, that capacity, that ability. So that 'man controls his future because of his ability (to perceive), to know, and to order what he perceives and knows'. He perceives his present mental state, he knows, he understands his present mental state, because he perceives it, and understands it, he can control it, he can change it, because he can change he can develop. And because he's able to do all that, he's said to 'follow a path'. So 'the Path', the term 'the Path', or 'the Way' is simply a symbol for the fact that he's able to do this. It's not as it were something given, objectively 'out there'. I think I've pointed out before that this term, this symbol of 'the Path' can be misleading if you take it literally.

Padmavajra: In that sense very much then, 'we are the Path'.

S: In that sense we are the Path, yes (Pause).

'To order what he perceives and knows' means 'to arrange', to organise into a positive pattern, which will lead to a still more positive pattern, which will lead to freedom from all patterns. The term 'Path' simply represents man's ability to do this. In other words the term or the symbol 'Path' represents the fact that you can evolve, [38] that you can grow, if you know yourself, if you understand yourself. And therefore can take steps to change yourself, from what you are now, to what you see you can become and ought to become. What you see it would be best for you to become. (pause) One could say that this whole question is bound up with the idea of discipline. In this sense: that if you think of 'the Path' as something 'out there', like a railway track, well, there it is, and if you want to gain Enlightenment you've got to follow that whether you like it or not sort of thing, and that's where the discipline comes in. 'Discipline' means 'following that path, out there'. Forcing yourself to follow 'that path out there', whether you like it or not. So if you understand that the term 'Way' does not denote something 'out there', 'the Way' simply denotes the act that if you know and understand yourself as you are now, then you're in a position to develop, and that means you develop in

your own way, though of course there is an objective criterion of development which you have to understand, and act upon. But you're not being as it were 'rail-roaded'. You see the difference?

Sometimes, if you're not careful, you start thinking of developing and following a spiritual path in the sense almost of forcing yourself onto a particular track, or to go in a particular direction, which is not what you really want at all. And then 'discipline' comes in as something negative and coercive, and external.

Padmavajra: So if people do see it in terms of 'out there', something which was 'laid upon us'...

S: Or which you are laid upon!

Padmavajra: Yes, then if we do see it as something within like organising ourselves, as it were, I was just thinking in terms of resentment, we really resent things like that, resent somebody saying, do this, or ... [39]

S: Well, 'you've got to do this, because it'll be good for you to do this, because then you'll be following the Path.' - 'the Path' is something 'out there'.

But Guenther says 'the Way' is a short term for the fact that man controls his future'. In other words controls his development - 'because of his ability to perceive, to know, and to order what he perceives and knows' i.e. here and now, himself as he is at present. If you understand yourself as you are at present, if you perceive yourself as you are at present, know yourself as you are at present, know exactly where you stand, then you can start organising yourself, organising your mental states, in such a way that a certain kind of growth and development will take place. And because of that you're controlling the future. And the term 'Way' is just a short that term for the fact that you do all this.

Padmavajra: Does it follow then, that if you know your mental states and things like that, would it, almost, for me that it would be like a natural inclination to follow?

S: Yes. So therefore it seems of importance to try to help people to see initially where they are now, and what it would be in their best interests to do. And then it's as though they will just do that, they will want to do that.

When they see the need for as it were re-organising their own and mental states, and which means altering their lives, ultimately, in a more positive way, a more integrated way, then they will see the need for development, and for growth. Which means they will want to develop, they will want to grow.

Mark: It seems that people only see what they are going to have to do as 'a discipline' as long as they don't want to do it.

S: Yes. [40]

Padmavajra: Once they do it ...

S: Rather they haven't understood themselves, therefore... (something unintelligible)...

Most people tend to think of the Path or the Way as something that they're being 'herded into', or 'herded along', by people with whips, as it were. Crack the whip and get them trotting along the Path whether they like it or not, with many a reluctant backward glance, rather wishing they could stray off and have a nibble this side or a nibble that side on some succulent hedge or wayside flower (Laughter). This is how it very often feels.

But the Path isn't out there, - the Path is 'in here' The Path is you, in process of getting yourself better organised, more positively organised, more integrated. That is 'the Path'. 'The Path' is simply a term for that ... So 'The Way' is a short term for the fact that man controls his future because of his ability to perceive, to know, and to order what he perceives and knows. He controls his future. He has a certain amount of freedom. I say a certain amount that because the fact that he is here, that he is what he is here and now, is given. That's a fact, that's a datum, so you're not free in the sense you don't choose you're own starting point, but you are yourself, in fact. And you can choose what you make of that. In other words you can control your future. That's your freedom. And the term 'Path [it] simply indicates the fact of that vision.

Kamalasila: Presumably your freedom increases as well, if you go in the right direction.

S: Yes, yes. You can more and more control your future then. So the word ... the term Path indicates the fact that you're free to develop.

[41]

Wherever or whatever you may be, now, to begin with, doesn't really matter., in a way. You are free to control your future. You can evolve from where you are now. And the term 'Path' indicates that possibility, that future. But of course you can only grow, you can only evolve, if you know yourself, and where you are now. Unless you know where you are when you're travelling, you don't know how to get there.

So 'This ability is dynamically active at this and every other moment, for the mind cannot be a static entity or a mere state of consciousness or function of consciousness'. What does he mean by that?

Vimalamitra: So this ability to perceive is itself a (limited?) thing. It's not something ... (unclear)

S: Yes, it says 'because the mind cannot be a static entity or a mere state or function of consciousness.' You cannot but think in terms of 'When', 'Where?', 'Under what conditions?', 'From which perspective?'. 'And hence, the mind is an ongoing process in a person's life history'.

This is all very true but in a way quite vague and general. Because confronting the mind at every moment is the choice of repeating the pattern, or re-arranging the pattern so that it leads to a more positive and better integrated pattern. That is the real point here, isn't it?

So 'this ability is dynamically active at this and every other moment'. Yes, but also the ability to go in the other direction, as it were. Do you see what I mean? It means that the mind is moving all the time; yes, the mind is changing all the time. But it is moving in either one or

the other of two ways. It can either move reactively or it can move creatively. Guenther doesn't bring this out very clearly. It's as though he mentions the possibility [42] at every moment of following the Path, but also at every moment there is the possibility of not following the Path. But because the mind is not a static entity, because it is essentially a movement, yes, it's a movement forward but not necessarily forward up and along the Path, as it were. It can also move round and round in that circle, that wheel of life. But in a way it isn't correct to say that this ability is dynamically active at this and every other moment.

Ashvajit: 'Dynamically' seems to be the key word there.

S: Well, not only is it not dynamically active at this and every other moment, it's not even active at this and every other moment. It is not active if you're repeating the same old pattern, in other words, going round and round in circles.

Ashvajit: Yes. We have to have a clear sense of direction, we have to know where we're headed.

S: So it's quite correct to say that 'The Way' is a short term for the fact that man controls his future because of his ability to perceive, to know, and to order what he perceives and knows,' but it isn't strictly correct to say that 'This ability is dynamically active at this and every other moment, for the mind cannot be a static entity or a mere state or function of consciousness'. It's a non sequitur. It's true that 'The mind cannot be a static entity or a mere function of consciousness'. It is always moving. But it moves in either a reactive manner or in creative manner. What Guenther says suggests it cannot but move in a creative manner. 'This ability is dynamically active at this and every other moment'. But it isn't. If you are merely reactive, if you're going round and round in circles, cyclically, then this ability is not dynamically active. It's in abeyance. But the mind is still moving. But he seems to take into consideration only one particular [43] kind of activity of the mind. Do you see this? So he's not being very logical. He says 'This ability is dynamically active at this and every other moment, for the mind cannot be a static entity'. In other words he's saying 'The mind cannot be a static entity, therefore it's always going ahead and always following the Path'. That isn't true. It is always, because it is not a static entity, either following the Path, and going ahead, or, not following the Path and. going round and round in circles.

Ashvajit: Mixing concrete or planting flowers.

S: Yes, right. So I think Guenther sometimes is a bit slipshod. I think he writes very quickly, and doesn't always carefully revise what he writes. You see this? That 'Rather, it involves questions of When?, Where?, Under what conditions?'. Well, those questions become as it were conscious and aware only if you're following or beginning to follow the Path, as it were, and to 'get off' the 'Wheel of Life'. So long as you're functioning merely reactively, you don't very seriously raise these sort of questions, maybe you don't raise them at all. So 'Hence the mind is an on-going process in a person's life history.' Well no, it isn't. It may be an on-going process, it may be, alternatively, a round-and-round going process.

All right, let's go on to the next para., then.

Sagaramati: "In other words, the central problem of Buddhist Psychology is that of personality, which is understood as implying that man has to be true to his inner nature in

whichever way it may be defined - after, and not before, integrative techniques have been applied. Such a conception has immediate bearings on the individuals responsibilities which are inextricably tied up with the dimension of 'seriousness of living' as contrasted with the shallowness and superficiality of behaviouristic oversimplifications and silly reductions." [44]

S: Now what does he mean by all this? (Laughter) 'In other words the central problem of Buddhist Psychology is that of personality.' Now how does he arrive at that, from what he's just said? What is the connection?

Sagaramati: The thing about 'an ongoing process in a person's life history'.

S: Yes. 'In other words, the central problem of Buddhist psychology is that of personality, which is understood as implying that man has to be true to his inner nature in whichever way it may be defined - after, and not before, integrative techniques have been applied'. Does the 'after and not before integrative techniques have been applied' apply to 'it being defined' or 'being true to his inner nature'? What is he getting at?

Dharmapala: Is it that you can't really have any idea of your nature until you've started to work with that a bit - the integrative techniques, as it were?

S: It could mean that. But the sort of sentence construction isn't really clear. Which again is a bit symptomatic of a certain lack of clarity of thought. Or a certain carelessness. If one can say that 'the central problem of Buddhist psychology is that of personality', one can only say that it's personality in the sense that it is the personality as it were which can either go ahead, which can progress and grow along the Path, or which, alternatively, can go round and round in the 'Circle', the 'Wheel of life'.

Vimalamitra: It seems as if Guenther's just being kind of optimistic.

S: Yes, it almost does seem that. (Pause). So what is this 'being true to one's inner nature'? The only 'inner nature' that one has it seems, according to this, is that one is changing all the time. But how [45] can one be true to that fact when you can't be anything else? Whether you like it or not you are changing all the time. Either reactively or creatively. You've no choice. So there's no question of your being true to your inner nature in that sense.

Ashvajit: It suggests that 'inner nature' is something separate from what you are.

Bhante: Yes.

Padmapani: Don't you think he means that you're aware that you're changing?

S: Don't think so. So the term 'personality' implies that man has to be true to his inner nature. But what this inner nature is is not really made clear.

Manjuvajra: Perhaps that's the 'ordering and refining' that he ...

S: Perhaps it is that. But is it one's inner nature to order and define? No, you don't have to do it. You choose to do it.

Manjuvajra: Yes, but perhaps once you've defined and ordered, defined the direction, then that becomes the inner nature.

S: Yes, one could say that, one could interpret it that way. Yes.

Padmavajra: So you could also say that when one has the ideal, and has that in mind, you're working with your inner nature. But it's very vague.

S: Yes. Anyway, to get back to the two possibilities, there is 'the Path' and 'the Round'. So supposing one has decided to order oneself, to order one's experience, to become more integrated, that means one is ... following the Path. So that becomes as it were your true nature. And you have to be true to that true nature and continue to follow that Path. But there is also the question of the other possibility, that is to say, of not following the Path, [46] and going round and round in the Wheel of Life. He seems to leave that out of consideration, because you could say your 'true nature' is something underlying the possibility of following the Path and the possibility equally of not following the Path, and going round in the Wheel of Life. So he hasn't made it sufficiently clear that this 'inner nature' is something which has developed, or it's your inner nature' now that you are following the Path. It's that to which you have to be true. You know, rather than to the other possibility.

Manjuvajra: Perhaps that's what the second episode could mean the 'after, and not before, integrative techniques have been applied.'

S: Yes.

Sagaramati: 'Inner nature' should be 'Higher nature'.

S: 'Higher nature'. Yes. Inner nature is a very careless expression. So 'Such a conception has immediate bearings on the individual's responsibilities'. One can also say that 'personality' in the true sense develops only when one follows the Path. When one starts ordering one's self. And becoming more integrated. But 'Such a conception has immediate bearings on the individual's responsibilities which are inextricably tied up with the dimension of 'seriousness of living' as contrasted with the shallowness and superficiality of behaviouristic oversimplifications and silly reductions.' He's having a go at the Behaviourists who are rather strong in America. They're hardly known in this country, but I was told when I was in the States that Psychology departments in American Universities are dominated by the Behaviourists. So, possibly Guenther clashes with them from time to time.

Padmavajra: I didn't know there was that involved. When I read that I got the impression that 'seriousness of living' was [47] regular practice, and things like that, and practising the Dharma.

S: You know what behaviourism states, broadly speaking?

Padmavajra: No, no.

S: It's connected with the name of Dr. Watson, originally; Skinner is I think its most prominent representative in the States at present. I met a disciple of his at Yale and he tried very hard to convert me to behaviourism. They're very very zealous and proselytising, they've

almost got a missionary spirit. They believe that behaviour can be observed, but that behaviour is all that you know. You cannot infer from behaviour, any such thing as mind or mental states or emotions: there is only behaviour. That is to say observable behaviour. Behaviour of the physical being, the physical personality. Hence they are called 'Behaviourists'.

So that's why he says 'shallowness and superficiality of behaviouristic oversimplifications and silly reductions'. In other words the human being is reduced simply to his behaviour.

So 'such a conception has immediate bearings on the individual's responsibilities, which are inextricably tied up with the dimension of 'seriousness of living'.

It seems a very roundabout way of expressing himself. In other words, if you do follow 'the Path', if you do integrate yourself more and more, if you choose to follow the Path, that is therefore, if you choose to integrate yourself more and more, you will become more and more of a personality, more and more of a true individual. And therefore life will become more meaningful for you, there will be as it were greater responsibilities for you, life will become a much more serious business, there will be some spiritual meaning and spiritual purpose in it. And the necessity, almost of ... a certain way of life, a certain way of living. A certain seriousness will gradually be laid upon you. That is, you will recognise that and realise that for yourself. This seems [48] to be what he is saying.

So just to summarise that bit so far: 'The Way' simply indicates the fact that you're free to develop in the future from where you are now, and you develop by first of all studying yourself, perceiving and understanding yourself, knowing where you stand and knowing what you have to do. And reorganising your mental states and emotions in a more integrated way, instead of going on in the old way - Guenther doesn't mention that possibility, doesn't seem to envisage it at all. And as you progress, if you follow the Path you become more integrated, more of an individual and that means that you start assuming the responsibilities of an individual, start taking the business of living more seriously. - It seems to mean simply that, though he's rather wrapped it all up.

Let's read that next paragraph.

Ashvajit: "The 'way' as understood in Buddhism. is a continual unfolding of man's potential and passes through several states or phases, each of them involving different references and different self-images. The 'way' begins with the 'accumulation' of all that is necessary for man's intellectual and spiritual growth (tshogs-lam), and then merges into the 'linkage' of what has been learned with further growth (sbyor-lam) which, as it were, results in a new vision or fresh perspective, enabling the beholder to see more easily the intrinsic nature of the universe and of himself (mthong-lam). But this vision has to be kept alive. This is effected by the subsequent phase (sgom-lam), which is a 'live experience', and climaxes in the 'no-more-learning' phase (mi-slob-lam). At this point, the individual cannot but perceive the world around him as-it-is intrinsically, as well as perceive all that constitutes this world as being harmoniously interrelated. Contemplative understanding is never a thoughtless and senseless absorption in an imaginary absolute, but is always active in the special sense of not interfering. Man's actions [49] his very life become more meaningful once this phase has become operative. Furthermore, the 'way' involves the whole personality which is as much body as it is feelings, the mind, and man's set of values and interpretations. The Buddhist

'Way' is thus most comprehensive in being a growth and health psychology."

S: Do you know what he's actually describing in this paragraph.

Padmavajra: It wouldn't be the Threefold Way, would it?

S: No, it's the Fivefold Way, the Five margas - into which the Sarvastivadins, afterwards the Mahayana, divided the whole Path.

Padmavajra: What's that in English, apart from Guenther's English?

S: Oh, well, in Sanskrit? The 'way' begins with 'accumulation'. This is the stage of Accumulation. The sambhara-marga (?). There is a chapter in The Jewel Ornament of Liberation which briefly describes all these five. Then there is the... 'that merges into the 'linkage' ' - which is gotrabhu (That's not a stage). 'Of what has been learned with further growth (sbyor lam)'... prayoga-marga: the path of practice. The path of preparation, the path of practice, 'which, as it were results in a new vision or fresh perspective enabling the beholder to see more easily the intrinsic nature of the universe and of himself (mthon-lam): darsana-marga - path of insight. 'The subsequent phase (sgom-lam): that's the bhavana-marga, or, as I call it, the path of transformation. And then the 'no-more-learning' phase, taking - I'm not sure what that is in Sanskrit, but taking no-more-learning, literally, is the asaiksa-marga.(?)

Abhaya: How would you translate that?

S: It's the stage of complete enlightenment. When you have nothing more to learn. So you start off with a phase of 'accumulation' in which you accumulate certain ... it can sometimes also be translated as the [50] 'path of preparation', in which you as it were accumulate certain moral, intellectual and spiritual qualities. Then you can really start practising, including practising meditation. As a result of that real practice you have an insight into the truth, you have a flash of pure vision, as it were, which you can gradually increase. As a result of that, there is a gradual transformation of one's whole being, which is the stage or path of transformation. And then one's whole being is transformed in the light of that insight experience, which itself goes on growing, then you gain full enlightenment, you've nothing more to learn. These are 'the five paths.' It's these that Guenther is describing, actually, in his own way.

Ashvajit: In what way may the last one there, asaikshya marga be considered 'a way'?

S: One could say it in the sense that it's not a final full stop.

Ashvajit: Ah.

S: Yes, because it abounds in compassionate activities, which are completely spontaneous. It's not something in which you settle down as it were, and afterwards you've nothing more to do. I think Gampopa also calls it, in another Chapter, the Buddha-activity, the stage of Buddha-activity.

Manjuvajra: A sort of continuous creativity with no reactivity at all.

S: Right, yes. And in a sense, no further goal.

Sagaramati: I think this is also mentioned in the back of Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma.

S: It is, yes. [51] One could speak in terms of the stage at which you prepare a good foundation. Then, a stage at which your practise becomes clear on the basis of that foundation. Then the stage at which you have your breakthrough into the transcendental, and then the stage in which you try to reorganise and transform the whole of your existence in the light of that breakthrough, the light of that perfect vision. And then the culmination of that process, which is when Enlightenment is attained. So these are the 'Five Paths' of the developed Hinayana and of the Mahayana.

Padmavajra: The first two, the accumulation, preparation or foundational stage, presumably, I'm thinking in terms of meditation, you would be meditating in that stage, so you'd be doing, you'd just be meditating, but the next one, after having kind of got all that together, then that leads to really practising.

S: Yes, with the greater part of your energy (is) involved.

Padmavajra: So that in a sense there's no pause, you're really going, and er ...

S: Yes, right, yes. There's no conflict any more, no struggle, in a sense.

Padmavajra: It's just quite natural to go and kind of sit down...

S: Well perhaps not completely natural, otherwise, you know, you'd already be there. One also probably will find - in the afternoon when we go on to the next part - that later writers try to accommodate all the different Buddhist practises and teachings within the framework of these five stages, or five 'paths'. Sometimes a bit artificially. But anyway, we'll see something of that in the afternoon. So anyway, any query on what we've done so far? Because it's nearly half past twelve. [52]

Vimalamitra: This comes from the Sarvastivada school. - the fivefold path?

S: Yes. Incidentally it's called the five paths but really it means five stages of the path.

[cassette 2 side b]

Padmapani: Can you recommend any literature on that Bhante because I'm not familiar ...

S: Well there is Guenther's Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma, and there is Gampopa's short chapter in The Jewel Ornament of Liberation on these five. I've got that if anyone wants to borrow it. It's only a few pages, it just summarises those five stages.

I have sometimes thought, in fact I've been thinking for many years of giving a lecture on those five stages. It would be quite useful to do a general survey. Maybe sometime in the future I'll [do] it.

Anyway, any general point about the Introduction so far, about the 'Way'?

Manjuvajra: One little thing that came up when you first started talking about 'the Way', that maybe I should mention now - you said that the external Path, the Path is not something 'out there'. But then you went on to say that there are objective references to 'the Path'. So it actually sounds a bit like a path 'out there'. Can you sort of draw a distinction?

S: Well, when I spoke of the 'objective reference' I meant the idea or the ideal of Enlightenment, or Buddhahood. Usually that is thought of as the 'terminal point' of the path 'out there'. But actually it isn't that. Though one cannot help speaking of it in that way, in those terms, for obvious reasons. So it is, it represents the concept that one frames to oneself and for oneself of the, at least hypothetical culmination of that whole process of controlling one's future. It's what will be achieved, as it were, when the future is controlled, or has been controlled, in that sort of way. So it's the sort of [53] concept that one forms or imagines of that state as a sort of objective reference, to give oneself a sort of direction.

Ashvajit: Insofar as it has an objective reference, it's always unsatisfactory.

S: Well, so long as it is, you know, an objective reference, it means you haven't got there. That is unsatisfactory.

Manjuvajra: But it's something far distant then, a final mountain peak that you ....

S: Well it's distant in the sense that it is different from what you are now. It's not distant in the sense of 'being 'out there'. It means that, it represents the fact that the idea which you form or the ideal which you create, representing what you will be in the future, as it were, is not at all like what you are now. The 'distance' is simply a way of stating that. Or rather the term 'distance' represents just that fact. If you say 'I've got a long way to go before I gain Enlightenment' it means the idea of Enlightenment, as framed by you, in which you believe, representing you as you can be, is very very different from you as you see you are now. 'Distance' merely represents that fact. Not so many miles as it were that you have actually to travel, as though travelling on a path outside yourself in the literal sense.

Anyway, it's nearly lunch time, so let's leave the rest of the Introduction, if we can get through the rest of it, till the afternoon.

[Break]

S: All right, we've got up to page 17 of the Introduction. Before we go on to that next section on the Accumulation phase, let me just say a few more words about the last sentence of the previous section.

'The Buddhist 'way' is thus most comprehensive in being a growth and health psychology'.

Has anyone got any thoughts on this? (Pause) Is the Buddhist [54] 'way' a growth and health psychology, and if so to what extent, in what sense? And is it most comprehensive in being that?

Abhaya: It's more comprehensive than that, isn't it.

S: It's more comprehensive than that, yes.

Sagaramati: That is a sort of by-product of the result in a sense.

S: Yes. I mean it depends how far one conceives of growth as going, and what one considers that health is. Certainly there is growth all the way up to Enlightenment. But when one uses the term 'growth and health psychology', you know, in the ordinary modern sense, the growth doesn't seem to go very far. So if you speak of Buddhism as a growth and health psychology, you almost suggest that it goes no further than the other 'growth and health' psychologies - it's one among many. 'A growth and health psychology'. Whereas the Buddhist at least will say, well it is the Way, that goes all the way to what we consider, or we think as being Enlightenment. Whereas in the ordinary 'growth and health' psychologies there's no conception of Enlightenment at all. So I think it's quite dangerous to talk about Buddhism or the Buddhist Way in that sort of manner, without very careful qualification.

Padmapani: There seems to be quite a lot of it in the statement here - the using of psychology instead of the word spiritual.

S: Yes. For instance, there's 'prostration therapy' (Laughter) Yes, the Prostration and Going for Refuge practice is being presented as a therapy. Well it depends again what you mean by therapy, and how far your therapy goes. I mean there is in Buddhism a conception of spiritual healing. The Buddha Himself is referred to as the 'Great Physician'. But what does 'therapy' convey to the average person who is likely to learn on it (?). Can one really use the Going for Refuge as a 'therapy'? [55]

Padmavajra: 'Therapy' suggests to me a problem orientation.

S: Indeed. Yes. Rather than growth orientation.

Padmavajra: Rather than Going for Refuge and the prostration practice. It seems to me to be something which grows out of a healthy attitude, not an unhealthy one, which 'a therapy' suggests, to me. You want to be cured of an unhealthy attitude.

S: You can't go for Refuge if you've got that sort of unhealthy attitude. So how can you use the Going for Refuge just to cure that unhealthy attitude?

Padmapani: Also one tends to infer that Buddhist psychology refers to something that's going inwards and going backwards in time. Presumably the idea is that if you're healthy you go outwards, you move out from the centre, so to speak, rather than going into, something.

S: Yes.

Mark Barrett: Another thing suggested is to rule out the fact that you actually have to experience changes in your self - it's not some -ology, a science of the mind.

S: Right. Anyway, let's go on to the Accumulation phase. We need not spend too much time over this because Guenther is merely quoting it to illustrate, as he says, 'The complexity of the Buddhist 'way' '. Anyway, let's read through it.

Dharmapala: "The Accumulation phase. The complexity of the Buddhist 'way' may be illustrated by the analysis of the phase of 'accumulation' by Pal-trul O-gyan Jigme Chokyi Wangpo:

The accumulation phase is dealt with under five headings (I) basis, (II) essence, (III) subdivisions, (IV) meaning of the word and (V) levels."

S: The 'accumulation' phase is the first of the [56] five so-called 'paths'.

Mark Barrett: Is that comparable or as near as possible comparable to 'morality'?

S: Oh no, it comprises much more than that, as you'll see in the whole detailed analysis now following.

Dharmapala: "(I) The basis consists of (A) the body and (B) the mind. (A) the body refers to any living being in the realms of sensuousness and aesthetic forms, "

S: Yes, this is the Kamaloka and the Rupaloka. Or the plane or level of Kama or sensuous desire, and the plane or level of Pure Form. Guenther says aesthetic forms.

Dharmapala: "and (B) refers to single-mindedness in the world of sensuousness and to the states of consciousness on the six levels of meditative concentration."

S: All right, let's go straight on and we'll review the whole thing at the end.

Dharmapala: "(II) The essence comprises seven topics for self-growth. (A) to observe manners and morals individually on the level of an ordinary person; (B) to control the senses; (C) to be moderate in eating and drinking; (D) not to sleep during the first part and the latter part of the night, but to exert oneself spiritually; (E) to delight in being consciously alert and aware of what is acceptable and what is to be shunned; (F) to cultivate those positive factors which are the cause for one's real freedom such as never to feel sorry for a positive action or attitude, to be cheerful, to be confident, and to be devoted; (G) to generate diligence in listening to instructions, in thinking about them and in making them a living experience. "

Robert Gerke: "(III) There are three subdivisions: (A) a low- [57] level accumulation in view of the fact that it is uncertain whether the linkage phase will set in; (B) a medium level accumulation in view of the fact that the 'linkage phase' will set in during a future life-situation; and (C) a high-level accumulation in view of the fact that the linkage phase will set in during this very life. The first of these involves the four essential inspections; the second, the four proper exertions; and the third, the travelling of the Path by means of the four foot-like supports of spiritual growth."

Manjuvajra: "The practice of the 'four essential inspections' is the 'way' that deals analytically with particular existents and has five topics: (a) the object inspected; (b) the manner in which it is inspected; (c) the essential factors of inspection; (d) the necessity of inspection; and (e) the meaning of the word."

S: 'Inspection' is of course the word that Guenther uses to translate Smṛti, usually rendered as Mindfulness, or recollection, or sometimes as Awareness.

Manjuvajra: "(a) The object inspected is the body, the feelings, the mind, and the constitutive elements of reality."

S: Ah, these are what are called 'The Four Foundations of Mindfulness.'

Manjuvajra: "The body is a 'without' in the sense of being the sensory apparatus making up the body of a sentient being, and the objects for this apparatus. A 'within' as one's own sensory apparatus, and both a 'without' and a 'within' as the sensory apparatus of others as well as of oneself." [58]

"Feelings are pleasant, unpleasant, and neutral. Mind is an eightfold or sixfold pattern. Most important is the concept-channelled perception.

The constitutive entities of reality are the motivational forces with the exception of feeling; the fourteen schemata of interpretation; and the three absolutes.

Unregenerate persons fancy the body as the basis of a self; feelings as the foundation of what the self enjoys; mind as the substance of the self; and the constitutive elements of reality as the foundation of the refinement of the self. Ordinary people entertain the wrong notion that the emotions project a person into evil forms of existence, while refinement leads to liberation. "

Abhaya: "The manner in which the object is inspected is twofold: (i) general and (ii) specific.

(i) The general characteristics are impermanence, frustration-painfulness, nothingness, and non-existence of an ontological principle. These qualifications apply to every object of inspection and hence range from the investigation of the body to that of the constitutive entities of reality.

Here, the body is perceived as a decaying corpse, crawling with maggots, having this nature and this actuality, and not passing beyond this state of affairs.

All feelings are painfully frustrating. Inasmuch as feelings such as not to like unpleasantness but crave for pleasurable, they are ultimately frustrating and hence coextensive and identical with frustration. However much one tries to leave frustration behind, only to that extent there is pleasurable. Because of its former unpleasant character everything that is felt is painfully frustrating. " [59]

Mark Barrett: "The mind is impermanent because it becomes something else due to the difference in its objects and its basis. The objects and the senses are the basis. The cognition that operates through the senses changes from moment to moment.

All the entities of reality have no ontological principle. In this context the personalistic principle is meant.

The intrinsic characteristics such as the elementary forces of solidity and so on, as well as that which has the defining characteristic derivative from the primary elementary forces such as the eyes and so on, make up the body; experiencing is feeling; cognition of objects is mind;

keeping the intrinsic characteristics apart is what is meant by 'constitutive entity of reality.'

Padmavajra: "(ii) the specific manner in which the object is inspected has to do with the difference in the objective reference, or the epistemological object, which for a follower of the Hinayana is his own body exclusively, while for a follower of the Mahayana, it is his own body as well as that of others; and with the difference in thinking about its observable qualities, which for a follower of the Hinayana is the notion of impurity, while for a follower of the Mahayana, it is the conviction that all that is the open dimension of Being [S: This is Guenther's term for Sunyata] manifest in being; and with the difference in attainment, which for a follower of the Hinayana consists in a sense of renunciation, while for a follower of the Mahayana it is the realisation of a non-localizable Nirvana, as there is nothing to be rejected or to be accepted once the real nature of reality has been understood."

Vimalamitra: "(c) The essential factors of inspection are discriminative appreciation and inspection.

(d) The necessity of inspection is to resort to the antidote of becoming involved in the four perverse notions that come through sloppy thinking. The antidote is, in general, the awareness that the six kinds of sentient beings depend for their existence [60] on karma, that karma depends on the emotions, that these depend on the four perverse notions that come from sloppy thinking, that these depend on the mind-as-such which is an ultimate reality and a radiant light. Mind-as-such does not depend on anything else. An analogy for this is the dependence of the elementary forces on space; and it is also the reason for making a start with the Four Truths.

As is stated in the Madhyantavibhaga, IV. 1;

Because of ineptitude, because of hankering as causality,  
Because of foundation, and because of non-delusion,  
The four essential inspections are to be undertaken  
In order to make a start with the Four Truths."

Kamalashila: "(e) The meaning of the word 'inspection' implies that the follower of the Hinayana applies his discriminative acumen to the object of inspection, while the follower of the Mahayana applies inspection to the object of his discriminative appreciation. Having distinguished between the general and intrinsic characteristics of the body and other topics by way of discriminative appreciation and, then preserving its continuity by way of inspection is to apply inspection to the object of discriminative appreciation. To investigate by discriminative appreciation the epistemological object that is kept steadily before the mind by inspection, and then to become convinced that it has no ontological principle, is to apply discriminative acumen to the object of inspection."

Padmapani: "(B) The practice of the 'four proper exertions' is the 'way' that has come into existence through efforts. It has five topics: (a) the object (of one's exertions); (b) the manner in which one exerts oneself; (c) the essential factor in exertion; (d) the necessity of exertion; and (e) the meaning of the word."

S: I take it everyone knows what these 'four proper exertions' are?

Someone: The four great efforts,

S: The four great efforts, yes.

[61]

Padmapani: "(a) The object of one's exertions is fourfold insofar as refinement by positive forces or defilement by negative forces have come or have not come into play.

(b) The manner in which one exerts oneself is to generate an earnest desire for not generating negative forces that have not yet come into play; (Earnest desire precedes actual efforts); to make efforts (which is to intend a state of tranquillity, to broaden one's horizon, and to intend a state of equanimity); to initiate assiduity (which counteracts states of depression and of ebullience); to seize the mind (i.e. to cheer the mind up by thinking of the Buddha's appearance if one should be in a state of depression; and to settle the mind (i.e. to draw the mind inward by feeling disgusted with Samsara if one should be in a state of ebullience.

(c) The essential factor in exertion is assiduity

(d) The necessity of exertion is to weaken negative forces and to strengthen positive ones.

(e) The meaning of the word 'exertion' is to sum up the abolition of negative forces. Or, it means to firmly settle the actions that are performed by the three gates of body, speech, and mind.

(C) The practice of the 'four supports of spiritual growth' ... "

S: Yes, what are these? These are the four 'Riddhipadas', or 'Iddhipadas', in Pali. Do you know what these are? (They are) translated as the 'four bases of psychic power'. Do you remember what they are?

Abhaya: Clairaudience is one.

S: No, no. Those are the psychic powers themselves. These are the bases of psychic powers, which so far as I remember are kama, chanda, vimansa and chitta. I'm not absolutely certain of the first one - we'll check that - but chanda definitely, vimansa certainly and chitta certainly. We'll talk about these in a minute. Vimansa meaning investigation. Chanda is urge, chitta is of course mind, kama is desire. [62]

Dharmapala: "(C) The practice of the 'four supports of spiritual growth' is the 'way' of thoroughly effecting spiritual integration. It has five topics: (a) object; (b) the manner of growth; (c) the essence; (d) the necessity; and (e) the meaning of the word.

(a) Spiritual growth is concerned with the positive way.

(b) The manner of growth involves the abolition of five obstacles by resorting to eight endeavours. When one is about to exert oneself spiritually, laziness is the primary obstacle. To counter it, one has to resort to earnest desire and assiduity (standing in a cause-effect relationship) as well as to confidence (as a basis) and cultivation of one's abilities (which rests on confidence). When one actually goes about exerting oneself, forgetting the instructions and injunctions is the primary obstacle. To counter it one has to resort to inspection which will

not let the observable qualities of the objective reference slip from one's mind. When the potential is brought to life, states of depression and of ebullience are the primary obstacle. To counter them, one has to resort to an alert awareness. The method of counter-manding states of depression and ebullience involves keeping the mind steady as an antidote to not making use of what counters them, and practising equanimity as a countermeasure to overdoing things."

Robert Gerke: In general the essence of the 'way' is spiritual integration and in particular it is spiritual growth which involves the abolition of all that is negative through concentrative efforts whose support is earnest desire, assiduity, intentionality, and critical assessment. To become involved with what one is going to bring to life, because one trusts in it, is earnest desire; to go about it joyfully is assiduity; to become single-minded is concentrative integration; and to examine whether states of depression or ebullience vitiate this state is critical assessment.

(d) The necessity of spiritual growth is the realisation of all that comes from the desire to actualise spiritual growth and what it involves. [63]

(e) 'Spiritual growth' is all the qualities and virtues such as the five 'higher' kinds of immediate awareness, and since this serves as the 'basis' or 'support' for this realisation, one speaks of 'supports of spiritual growth'.

(IV) The term 'accumulation' is used because it assembles the causes for absolute enlightenment.

(V) Level here means 'level of confidence' because of the active presence of confidence in the Real as absolute. "

S: Hm, so... this is an illustration of 'the complexity of the Buddhist way', an analysis of the phase of accumulation. Actually it's quite simple! It only looks complicated because you lose track of the divisions and sub-divisions. But what is it really saying? It's really quite simple. Has anyone by the way got Gampopa's Jewel Ornament of Liberation?

Manjuvajra: Yes.

S: Mm. Well thumbed, isn't it!

Yes... not Kama, 'virya' instead of kama. It's 'virya' (- one of those four Riddhipadas) (pause) .. They're given in a different order here, but never mind - Let's just try to take a general look at the stage of accumulation, the path of accumulation. We won't linger over it too long because it's only been cited as an illustration, and the actual text by the way is not as complex as this; it's much more simple. (general relief) But this stage of Accumulation basically consists of three degrees of intensity. The first degree of intensity is represented by the practise of the four foundations of mindfulness, or the four kinds of inspection' as Guenther calls them. In other words if you can be constantly aware of your body, that is to say its position, movement; constantly aware of your feelings, pleasant, painful, neutral; as well as of your emotions, -being aware of what is going on within yourself emotionally, aware of your emotional reactions. If you can be aware of all your thoughts, and if at the same time you can have a sort of general awareness of [64] ultimate reality in the Abhidharma sense of the

skandhas, and can begin to see things in those terms, instead of in the ordinary way, then this constitutes the lowest level, lowest degree of preparation. In other words, the practise of awareness, the practise of mindfulness. This sort of slows you down. Of course there is an important point here, which is that in the Theravada, the four foundations of mindfulness are considered as a self-sufficient way to enlightenment, a self-sufficient path; but here they're clearly not so considered. No doubt, if you go on and on and on, practising mindfulness, nothing but mindfulness, you can gain enlightenment, simply by means of that practise, at least according to the Theravada teaching, according to Hinayana tradition; though not so much the later tradition, more the earlier one. But here of course, the four foundations of mindfulness are taken simply as the most elementary level of preparation; it's not conceived of that they're practised right at the beginning to the full. Though no doubt as one gets onto other stages and levels of practise one will be able to practise mindfulness more. In other words, this level of practise of mindfulness represents as far as you can get with mindfulness, without invoking any other type of practise, as it were. You see what I mean, eh? In a way this goes a bit against the Theravada teaching, which does seem, perhaps one can say, a bit dry; if you just try to do everything by force of mindfulness, everything by force of awareness: so that isn't the Mahayana path, clearly. So the lowest level, lowest degree of preparation is simply practising mindfulness, and practising awareness. If you do this, you can be sure that at some future time, in some future life, you will be able to make the transition from the mundane to the spiritual. This is the transitional phase, gotrabhu, the linkage, as Guenther puts it. You will be able to make the connection between the mundane and the spiritual. You will be able to, as it were, latch onto the spiritual, and continue your progress there. If you [65] practise more intensively, then you practise by way of the four great efforts. So in what way do the four great efforts differ from the practise of the four foundations of mindfulness? What are these four great efforts? The four great efforts are, to get rid of the unskilful states which have arisen within you, yes? To prevent those unskilful states, which have not arisen, from entering. To maintain and develop those skilful states which have arisen and to bring into existence, within yourself, those skilful states which have not yet arisen. This is one way of enumerating them. Sometimes they are enumerated in another order, or in other orders. So do you get the general idea?

Padmavajra: Could you repeat those?

S: First of all to get rid of unskilful states which have already arisen. To prevent the entering into ones mind of unskilful states which have not yet arisen, which have not yet entered the mind. Thirdly to develop those skilful mental states which are already present in the mind, to maintain and develop them further. And fourthly and lastly, to bring into existence within the mind, those skilful mental states which are not yet there, which have not yet made their appearance. So it's as though, when one is practising simply awareness, and simply mindfulness, you are just watching, you're just the observer. The mere fact of your watching, the mere fact of your observing - body, feelings, thoughts, and thinking as it were of higher things. This has its overall effect, but it's not a very great effect, and not a very deep effect. But when you're practising the four great efforts you are 'doing' something in a much more radical way. You're bringing about much greater changes. You're actually making a positive direct effort to throw out the unskilful, to bring in the skilful to an ever greater and greater degree. So this is a much more intensive form of practise. Do you get the idea? So therefore, if you practise in this way, you'll be sure that in your next life, the one immediately [66] succeeding this one, you will make the connection with the purely spiritual path. And then proceed onto that, yes?

Robert: What's a neutral state?

S: Pardon?

Robert: What's a neutral state?

S: A state where you're not experiencing a pleasant sensation nor an unpleasant one. This is referred to as a neutral feeling.

Someone: Does the four great efforts, Bhante, lead onto, or lead into the spiritual path proper?

S: Well the four foundations of mindfulness do. But it's as though their effect is so weak, that it will take quite a long time to manifest itself. Perhaps also the suggestion is, I'm not sure about this, that you continue the practise of the four foundations of mindfulness through a series of lives. You have to keep up the practise as it were. In the case of the four great efforts you keep up in this life and then in the next life, if presumably you also keep up in the next life, you establish the connection with the purely spiritual stage of the path. But it's as though with the four foundations of mindfulness, you just adopt the attitude of a witness, of an observer; that has an effect, but not all that much effect. And we do know this from our experience, don't we, this is one of the things that was discussed quite a bit some time ago - that is, [is] mere awareness of an unskilful state sufficient to get rid of it, eh? Sometimes in Buddhist literature, especially Theravada literature, the suggestion is made, or the impression is given, that if you just watch that unskilful mental state, it will eventually disappear. But has one actually found that always happening?

Voices: No

S: No. It's as though you have actually to take positive steps to get rid of it, which is represented by the first of the four great [67] efforts. No doubt being aware of it, being mindful of it, will have some effect, but not nearly enough.

Padmavajra: This is where the vow comes in.

S: This is where the vow comes in also, yes.

Padmavajra: I've found, personally - I don't know if this is going off the track a bit - but I find in the morning when I first get up, I don't like to do the mindfulness of breathing because it's too passive. I like to do the Metta, because I feel as though I'm doing something.

S: Yes, well in the case of the Metta, you are bringing into existence skilful mental states. So you could say that the Metta was a form of right effort, or you could say it was a form of one of the four great efforts.

Mark: How can it be said that... just to.... I can see that it's possible in your next lifetime to experience a purely spiritual state through having practised it, but how can it be said that one will, because surely it all depends to what extent one has been practising it?

S: Well that's exactly what it says; that it's as though if you make a weak effort it will take

you a longer time, if you keep up that weak effort, to make the transition from the mundane to the spiritual. If you practise more intensively, it will take you a shorter time. If you practise very intensively, it will take you a very short time indeed. So it's as though a hundred lifetimes of practising, say, the four foundations of mindfulness produces the same result as say two lifetimes of the four great efforts, and just not even one lifetime of the four bases of psychic power. It's more like that, yes?

Mark: So the practising of the four bases of psychic power we should ... in one lifetime?

S: Within this one lifetime, not even a whole single lifetime.

Mark: Ah, I see. [68]

Sagaramati: When you said that in a future life you enter upon a spiritual path, does that mean that you'll enter higher state of consciousness?

S: No. It means that you'll make the transition from the mundane to the transcendental.

Sagaramati: To the transcendental?

S: Yes. That is you'll begin to have some measure of insight. Not enough to put you (the different traditions aren't clear about this) permanently and irrevocably on the spiritual life, but you will make some sort of contact or connection with it.

Sagaramati: Would that come into meeting spiritual teachers? Things like that?

S: There's also the point that this whole subject of Gotrabhu or becoming involved with a particular spiritual family, or lineage, as it's sometimes translated, is quite as it were, obscure - it's then that your fate or destiny, if you can use that term, is determined - whether you are going to be an Arahant, or a Pratyeka Buddha, or a Bodhisattva, you then determine your lineage. What particular sort of aspect of the transcendental path you'll be following. It's connected with that also. This is something I've never spoken about in any of the lectures; something that I should take up sometime.

Sagaramati: One associates developing mindfulness and even the fourfold efforts as being purely having its fruit in, say, the Rupa Dhyanas, or something like, having nothing to do with the transcendental.

S: Well even the Dhyanas themselves are a better basis for the manifestation of insight, than ones ordinary mundane consciousness. All right then, thirdly and lastly, there's the four Riddhipadas, which is Chanda, which means thrust, urge, desire, but desire in a very positive and powerful sense: when the whole force of one's 'will' for want of a better term is bent in a certain direction, this is Chanda. Then there is Chitta. Chitta is mind or heart, as when your whole mind and your whole heart is involved in something. [69] You're really putting your heart into it. It's got that sort of suggestion, not just mind in the ordinary sense. And Vimansa, which means investigation, thoroughly going into something, penetrating into something. Then Virya (is) energy. So what sort of impression do you get here, now? Of greater intensity. It's as though in the case of the four foundations of mindfulness, here you are just watching what is going on. The mere watching is having some effect. Then in the

case of the four great efforts, you are as it were actively interfering. You're weeding out the unskilful, cultivating the skilful. You're making actual changes. But there's still as it were conflict. There is still the unskilful to be weeded out, there is still the skilful to be cultivated. But something is happening, something is going on, and you're no longer the relatively passive spectator.

(end of cassette)

[70]

S: There is still the unskilful to be weeded out; there is still the skilful to be cultivated; but something is happening, something is going on; you are no longer the relatively passive spectator of your own mental processes, your own being. And then by the time you get to the Four Foundations of Psychic Power then the victory is virtually won, yes? You've got rid of the unskilful mental states; at least for the time being; at least you are holding them at bay; your energies are fully aroused, your interest is fully aroused; you are going ahead vigorously; you are investigating; you're alert. So here, as it were, a very high level of integration has been reached, so a correspondingly much more powerful stage has been reached.

Padmavajra: Could you say that the Four Foundations of Mindfulness correspond to the Hinayana, the Four Great Efforts the Mahayana, and the Four Bases of Psychic Power the Vajrayana?

S: You could in a way... but only in a way. It's more like you could say; Mindfulness; Positive Emotion - it's more like that, if you want just one word for each of those three. Mindfulness has a certain power, but not all that much; though that is the starting point. Positive emotions have got a certain power; but you want even more than that - you want to tap that energy which even underlines.. or underlines even, the positive emotions, you want to get the energy which is in the negative emotions too! (Laughter) So this is the stage of accumulation. When you've traversed that phase or stage of accumulation, then you can really start practising! (laughter) And then you go onto the Path of Application, it's called here. And in this stage, you apply yourself to the understanding to the Four Noble Truths. You could say that you apply yourself to the understanding of Mind Creative and Mind Reactive; it amounts to the same thing. And at this stage one experiences what is called 'meditative heat' and its climax, you experience the supreme worldly state, and the Five Spiritual Faculties come into play.

Padmavajra: What is this stage called ?

S: This is the prayoga marga, in English, the Path of Application or I'd say the Path of Practice.

Manjuvajra: Does practise start after you've had some initial vision of....? [71]

S: No, No, that is the Path of Transformation. Let me just say a few words about all this, through this really very sketchy and in passing. Having traversed the Path of Accumulation, you are now in a position really to practise, to really bring your energy to bear on something, and you bring it to bear on the Four Noble Truths. Or, in terms I usually put it, you bring it to

bear on the distinction between Mind Reactive and Mind Creative; you really do see this. And then you experience something which is called the Stage of Heat, though this is a sub-stage, rather, within the Path of Application or Practice. Guenther's written a little bit about this in Philosophy and Psychology of the Abhidharma. But what is meant by 'heat' here? Heat suggests a sort of melting; a sort of warmth generated by the intensity of your spiritual practice. We've noticed this association of heat and spiritual practice or spiritual experience as in connection with tap, you know, from a root meaning 'burn' or to 'glow', to generate an inner sort of psychic heat, and this sort of psychic heat, which is especially connected with meditation, has a sort of 'melting effect' - this is the only way in which one can describe it - it sort of melts the hardness and rigidity of one's whole sort of mental attitude, one's whole mental structure, if you like; it softens it; it makes it more pliable. Do you get the sort of idea? (pause)

And at this point there come into play, as I said the Five Spiritual Faculties. And one becomes receptive to the spiritual truth, on account of the warming up, the loosening up, the melting, and the coming into play of the Five Spiritual Faculties; you become more open and more receptive to something beyond, something higher.

Kamalasila: Do you mean that you are more aware of the Spiritual Faculties? How do they come in?

Sagaramati: Is that when they become balas?

S: Ah no, Balas comes later, here they are only indriyas. You acquire these sort of Faculties. An indriya, don't forget, is a sort of sense.

KAMALASILA: You acquire the faculty of balancing?

S: Not just the faculty of balancing, but you acquire the Faculties which are to be balanced. [72] You get Faith, you get Energy, you get Mindfulness, meditative Absorption, and a modicum of Wisdom or Prajna. Also there is an attainment here which is called the Highest Worldly Realisation; you go as far as you can go in a sense, in regard to mundane development. You could say that this is as far as health, in the ordinary sense, can go. (pause)

Then the next stage or the next Path is that of Seeing. You Know, you have mobilised all your energies, you've melted your old rigidity, you are much more open, and then you enter upon the Path of Seeing, in which you have some direct vision of the truth. You can have a detailed insight into the Four Noble Truths.

Manjuvajra: Is that a general way of saying the direct insight in any of the doctrinal formulations of the Teaching?

S: Yes you could say that. The Four Noble Truths are traditionally mentioned here, but really it means into any of the basic doctrinal formulations. And then the Path of Transformation, as I call it, which follows, which is (4), that represents the permanent transformation of all one's being, at its different levels and in its different aspects, in accordance with that insight and vision one has experienced.

Abhaya: This seems to be somewhat different from your approach in the lecture series on the Eightfold Path, where you talk about the Path of Vision being experienced, perhaps spasmodically, or once or twice, and then, as a result of that small scrap of insight, one embarks on the Path of Transformation, which is a very, well, you might think of it in terms of the Four Great Efforts or Mindfulness ...

S: Yes all these, the Four Great Efforts, again does come in the Eightfold Path, which is connected with the Path of Transformation.

Abhaya: But here, it's much more, I get the impression from what you've said, it's a much more elevated and continuous state of mind with the other practices as a very firm basis.

S: Yes, also there is to be borne in mind the distinction between the Path of Regular steps and the Path of Irregular Steps. If you start off with a flash of insight, whereas before you never even thought about the spiritual life, this is very much the Path of Irregular Steps; you start [73] you started off, as it were, in stage 3 out of 5, you've had a little bit of experience of stage 3, but even if you are able to work that out in practical terms to some extent, i.e. to embark on the Path of Transformation, the insight and the transformation are both so weak that you will have to go back onto the Path of Regular steps in order to strengthen and to carry both of them further. You may not necessarily start with the path of Accumulation, you may have to go back and accumulate so that you can just consolidate the attainments which technically belong to the more advanced stages of the Path. But one can say that, yes, one does have an experience of the Four Great Efforts in the context of the Eightfold Path, again with the context of the Path or stage of Transformation, but when you practise them there, you know, they would be much more effective and permanently effective, as compared with when you practised them earlier on in the Stage or Phase of Accumulation, where they weren't permanently effective, where they represented an attainment which could be lost at any time, but when practised as part of the Path of Transformation when they cannot be lost, because they are the direct consequence of insight - that is, in the case of the mundane Eightfold Path. The mundane eightfold Path is the, or belongs to, the Phase of Accumulation, you could say. Do you see all this sort of cross-referencing? It's a bit confusing in a way.

Padmavajra: But... could you say that that was true of almost any sort of list?

S: You probably could.

Padmavajra: It would be on different levels, but...

S: Like for instance, you could have a sort of intellectual understanding of the Four Noble Truths, yes? And that certainly doesn't amount to an experience of either the Stage of Vision or even the Stage of Practice.

In the course of a previous study retreat I gave a sort of view, I am not going to repeat it now, because it took over half an hour, of Five Basic Stages of the Spiritual Path, to which all the others seem to boil down.

Manjuvajra: Could you say that these descriptions of the Path could be sort of expanded and contracted, even to the extent sort of like contracting them into a very short space of time, and then it would apply to the Path of Irregular steps or if it was expanded in time to be a path of

regular Steps? [74]

S: No the Path of Regular Steps and the Path of Irregular steps have got nothing really to do with time. The Path of Regular steps represents the fact that you do not perfect a certain stage - or rather, you do not pass on to a succeeding stage - until you have perfected the previous one: that is the essential principle of the Path of Regular Steps. In the Path of Irregular Steps, you jump about, and you work on the later stages before you have perfected previous stages, but sooner or later you have to get onto the Path of Regular Steps because you find that you cannot perfect a later stage before you have perfected the earlier stage. So, even though you are cultivating to some extent a higher stage, you find a point comes when you cannot pursue that, you cannot develop it any more, without going back and strengthening its support, which is the previous stage. So that means you get onto the Path of Regular steps. So you can start off on the Path of Irregular steps and, but sooner or later, you have to come back to the Path of Regular steps.

Mark: Could you just clear up this one? There are five paths aren't there in this?

S: Well five stages you could say.

Mark: If I sort of go backwards, I've got Path of Transformation, Path of Seeing ...

S: Ah, there's one more the last one which is the Path of Fulfilment, that is the fifth one. A path of no more learning.

(pause )

Manjuvajra: Who would be the living beings that live in the realms of aesthetic form?

S: Different kinds of gods. There are lists of them given in the Buddhists texts. (pause)

Manjuvajra: Where do the Nasties, the Demons live?

S: Well they come in the world of sensuousness, as Guenther calls it: the Kamaloka, or Kamavacara. And there are gods also in this realm, but the lower gods. Indra, for instance and his heavenly nymphs; they are all in the world of sensuousness. (pause) So therefore it's a bit misleading, if you look at the Wheel of Life, you get the impression that the World of the Gods is one among five and in fact the beings are pretty evenly distributed, but not all. There are many, many worlds of the gods, whereas there is only one world of human beings and one [75] world of pretas and one world of animals and one world of asuras, but there are many, many levels of worlds of gods. So to show the world of the gods as one segment out of five is quite misleading.

Mark: So that only really comes out when you take into account the kama loka, rupaloka ...

S: Yes. So if you take into account the arupaloka, rupaloka, kamaloka - the arupaloka, the formless world is occupied entirely by the gods; the rupaloka is inhabited entirely by the gods; the upper 'bands' of, as it were, the kamaloka even, are occupied by gods; it's only the middle and lower 'bands' of the kamaloka that are occupied by all the other Four classes of beings. This gives one a better perspective, as it were. Let me say a few words here about the

distinction between psychological and spiritual. This has been a little bit in my mind, because I had a letter some weeks ago from Jinamata, who led the Dutch retreat - or rather the European retreat and she said that in the course of that retreat she found a lot of confusion was created by my use of "spiritual" and "psychological" as two different things. And, she said, people just could not understand this. She said the only person who understood or seemed to understand the distinction I made between psychological and spiritual was an American girl who was on the retreat, but all the Europeans could not understand this and were quite unable to fathom what I could mean by making this distinction. Jinamata says that she has worked it out to her own satisfaction: she thinks that I mean by "psychological", material, or materialistic, which I don't mean at all. And she thinks that what I mean by "spiritual" is what Europeans mean by "existential". But again I don't mean that at all. So she wrote a little note for Shabda some time ago, you may remember trying to say that that was no distinction between psychological and spiritual and that to make the distinction was only confusing. So this reference to the bhumis brings this back to mind. So I'll say a few words.

If "Psychological" obviously means 'the science of the mind'. But the question is: what does one mean by mind? What does one mean by psyche? And why does one find it necessary to speak of the "spiritual" as well as the "Psychological"? I think one has got to understand what is the connotation of the term "psyche" and "psychological" as well as the denotation. Do you understand this difference between a denotation and [76] a connotation? It's a logical distinction. You learn this in elementary formal logic: that the denotation of a term is the direct meaning of the term, that is to say, what is implied in the definition of the term itself. The connotation is what is suggested only, by sort of association of ideas. It's more like the penumbra of meaning which attaches itself to the strict meaning of the term.

Padmavajra: Like implicit and explicit.

S: Not quite, no. For instance see if I can think of an example: suppose I say round, what is the denotation of the term "round"?

Abhaya: Circular.

S: Circular. So that can be geometrically defined, can't it? But you take round to mean perfect, whole, complete. This would be the connotation. Or suppose, let me give a sort of controversial example, suppose you were to take the term woman. What is the denotation of that term? A female member of the human species. What is the connotation?

Abhaya: It would take a month to say!

S: Wouldn't it! So this idea is the distinction of denotation and connotation. Or suppose take another example "mother" what is mother? The denotation of that term would be a female parent. But again, what is the connotation? It would take two months to say. So you see the distinction of denotation and connotation? So there is the denotation and connotation of psychological. Now what is the denotation of the term psychological? The Science of the mind. What is the denotation of the term mind, in the West let's say.

Manjuvajra: Thinking

S: Thinking yes, consciousness?

Abhaya: Yes.

S: Yes? Emotions?

: No.

S: No? You'd say no. All right. Put it in this way: suppose you have, say, a Dhyana state, what we call in Buddhism a Dhyana state; say, one of the higher Dhyana states in which there is no perception of external things, the senses are not functioning, there is no mental activity, etc., etc., [77] Are we familiar with this state in the West?

: No.

S: All right, for us therefore, would this state form any part of the denotation of the term 'psychological'?

Abhaya: No

S: So therefore, if we use the word 'psychological' would it to the ordinary Westerner convey that so that such Dhyana states were included?

Manjuvajra: No.

S: No. That is why I use the word "spiritual" to suggest those states. Yes? Because you could say - this is what Jinamata argues - that it is all experienced by the mind. Yes? And that is true. But the point is that in the West 'mind' does not denote Mind in those sorts of states'; psyche does not denote 'psyche in those Sorts of states'. Those states are just not included in the denotation of 'mind' or 'psyche', nor therefore, in the denotation of the term 'psychological'. So when I say something 'is only psychological' or 'merely psychological' and this is also what some people object to, I mean it falls short of those states which in Buddhist tradition we know as Dhyana states.

Manjuvajra: It's rather like the normal states; 'normal' mental states.

S: Right yes, so you could re-define 'psychological' to include all the Dhyana states, but if you use the word 'psychological' to people who've got no conception of Dhyana states, who have not been brought up in a culture which recognises the existence of Dhyana states and they have no experience themselves of Dhyana states, then you have to use an additional word to indicate the fact that there is some range of experience not covered by the denotation that they attach to the word 'psychological' as they use it. So this is why I say 'psychological' and 'spiritual'. And then again, I sometimes use the word 'transcendental'. Sometimes I've used 'spiritual' to cover the Dhyana states plus the states of the Path which lead directly to Nirvana; that is to say those states and experiences which come after Stream-Entry - sometimes I use 'spiritual' to cover the Dhyana states and those post-Stream-Entry experiences, but if I want to distinguish the Dhyana states from the post-Stream-Entry experiences I use the terms 'spiritual' and 'transcendental'. So I've got psychological, spiritual and transcendental. So my own usage [78] is quite consistent, I would say and free from confusion. But Jinamata seems to argue, or seems to think that 'psychological' should be used as applying to all these states; that is to say, what I call the 'psychological', what I call the

'spiritual' and what I call the 'transcendental'. That could be done, because you could say, "Yes, it is again the mind which experiences the Dhyanas, it is the mind which experiences the transcendental" in a manner of speaking; but that would imply an incredible extension of the meaning of the term, which sure fair enough, it may happen eventually, but at present, when you use the word 'psychological', even if you say 'all those states which can be experienced by the mind', the average person in the West will not include what I call the 'spiritual' and 'transcendental' states, therefore I speak of 'merely psychological' to indicate that there is something beyond the entire range of the term 'psychological' as known at present in the West. (pause)

Manjuvajra: Could you also say that 'spiritual' in the way that you use it refers to states which are conducive to growth towards Enlightenment?

S: Right, yes. And especially the Dhyana states. If I use the term 'spiritual life', I mean a life which is organised for the production of skilful mental states, especially as represented by the Dhyanas, so as to form a foundation for the Enlightenment experience. Anyway, I promised Jinamata, I'd write a little article about my distinction between psychological and spiritual. I don't know why it has got or why it is felt to be so confusing!

Manjuvajra: You did make it fairly clear on the 3rd of the New Zealand lectures.

S: Yes. Well it may be that Jinamata is a little bit out of touch with me and my thinking. it may be simply that. [pause]

Ashvajit: That confusion might arise perhaps from a feeling that they ought to be the same, somehow.

S: Yes, so if one says within the hearing of someone who attaches the limited Western meaning to the word 'psychological', or that Buddhism is a psychological teaching, then they will not think in terms of Buddhism including the Dhyanas, including any what I call Transcendental experience but just confined to mental states as they themselves usually experience them!

Ashvajit: And they'd like to think of themselves as spiritual people perhaps.

S: Perhaps, yes. [79]

Manjuvajra: [inaudible] ... a spiritual person is someone who is absorbed in one of purely skilful states, presumably?

S: Right. Yes. Well maybe temporarily. Permanently if you take 'spiritual' to mean also 'transcendental'. So you can be a very spiritual person, one moment, almost, and a far from spiritual person the next. So you can be up in the Devaloka one minute and down in Hell the next; or across in the Asuraloka, or way down in the Pretaloka for instance. Jinamata seems to think that it's sufficient to speak in terms of 'psychological development' and not to speak in terms of 'spiritual development'. But I feel that in as much as 'psychological', the denotation of the term in the West excludes all those higher Dhyana states, to speak in terms of 'psychological development' would suggest, I mean automatically, that the development which one had in mind fell short of what we think of as the Dhyana states, yes? It would

inevitably produce that impression, therefore it would tend to equate Buddhism with the 'Health and Growth' psychologies.

Ashvajit: Also it suggests the word itself that it is a bit one-sided in that it sort of suggests the psyche rather than the soma.

S: Right, yes,

Manjuvajra: Sorry I don't understand that distinction.

Ashvajit: The psyche is the sort of more mental side of our being, and the soma is the as it were the more bodily side. If that distinction has any real basis.

S: Anyway, let's conclude with the Accumulation Phase - that's last paragraph of Guenther's commentary.

"According to this account, 'spiritual integration' is the indispensable precondition for man realising his own nature... ! (to end of para and section, bottom of p.23 of Introduction) [80]

Padmavajra: Do you think it is worth looking at the chart?

S: Briefly, yes.

Padmavajra: It is at the back, p.118.

Vimalamitra: What does 'ebullience' mean?

S: It seems to mean excitement, hilarity, elation. It is the opposite of depression.

Kamalasila: This 'inspection'...?

S: Again, this is Smṛti. 'Alert Awareness' is probably samprajñāna, sometimes translated as 'clear comprehension', I suspect. I cannot be sure of this. It is a pity that Guenther doesn't refer back to the Sanskrit terms. (Pause) Anyway let's not forget that this account of the Accumulation Phase has been cited for purposes of illustration only and as I said earlier on, the actual text we are going through is not nearly as complicated as that, it is much more simple and straight forward.

p.24. "Mind and Mental Events. "It will be helpful for understanding the nature of 'mind'... (to) ... they are given highly technical philosophical psychological and contextual connotative meanings."

S: Yes, 'Contextual connotative meaning' is the meaning that a term assumes by being placed within a certain context and being associated with a certain connotations as I've already mentioned.

"A presentation of any subject matter is a body of propositions which itself is a set of concepts"

S: This is not quite accurately or carefully expressed. A proposition consists of concepts or in logical terms consists of terms. A proposition is simply to state something. For instance, if you state that 'grass is green', this is a proposition and it makes use of two concepts: the concept of grass and the concept of green, so in that sense, propositions are sets of concepts.

"A concept is a term to which a meaning has been assigned... (to) ... deductively formulated theory."

81

S. do you see the distinction here? is that clear? You start off from either end - as it were. A concept is simply a term which denotes something. A concept is if you like, a name for something. So a "concept is a term to which a meaning has been assigned either by having it denotatively associated with some datum or set of data immediately present." right, supposing for instance you perceive a tree. You can say that the tree is your datum or your set of data - because the tree consists of a number of different things - leaves, trunk and so on, but taking the tree as the 'thing', you have an experience of the tree and you want to assign a term to that. You experience that particular datum, so then you invent the term 'tree' to apply to that, so the term 'tree' denotes that particular assemblage of shape, colour and so on. do you get the idea? The tree is immediately present. You see it, you perceive it and you want to find a term for it, so you establish the term 'tree'. that is how you arrive at your concept. Or by having a meaning proposed for it directly by the postulates of a specific, deductively formulated theory." Here, you don't start off with an experience you start off with certain general principles. From these general principles you deduce more and more specific, more and more particular

things. . . for instance, take the concept 'atom', has anybody ever seen

an atom? so how do you arrive at the concept 'atom'? From the general consideration of energy and force and so on and so forth, you arrive at the concept of 'atom', but there is not any thing experienced to which the atom corresponds; you do not start off experiencing the atom and then putting the term 'atom' to that, you deduce the concept of 'atom' from general principles.

Abaya: it is the difference between induction and deduction.

S: You could say that, yes.

Abhaya: Because to arrive at the concept 'tree' you have got to see first of all a certain number of trees.

S: So these are the two ways, according to Guenther, that you arrive at a concept. If you like, yes, either inductively or deductively Either from experience, you have the experience first, and then you find a term to describe the experience - or you establish a general principle or

82

VBP

general theory, and according to that general theory something must exist, even though you don't actually perceive it or experience it and your concept is the term that you apply to the thing which you haven't experienced, but which you think must be there.

Ks: Which is induction ?

S: Induction is when you arrive at general conclusions from specific instances.

Abhaya: A Posteriori,

S: Yes. And deduction is when you go from general principles to specific instances. That is a priori. So: 'The former procedure leads to 'concepts by intuition', the latter to 'concepts by postulation'. Intuition here meaning 'direct experience'.. and the latter to 'concepts by postulation

-- in other words, postulation from already accepted general principles.

Abhaya:sorry.. Intuition ?

S: "The concepts by intuition" - intuition means here 'perception', direct experience, yes, not intuition in the sense of feminine intuition or some higher faculty, it is the Kantian sense of intuition. All right.

"Thus in traditional Western philosophy [to end of para.]...needs no further elaboration."

S: so what Guenther is saying is that in the West we arrive at the concept of mind not because we experience something called mind and then apply to it the term 'mind', but because we have certain abstract ideas, 'we have certain general ideas about what exists and does not exist and ought to exist; we deduce from these something to which we apply the word 'mind' but which we have not actually experienced. This may be either a sort of metaphysical principle: of 'Mind' with a capital M or the so called individual ego. He seems to be relying upon Broad here, for this analysis and discussion, Broad being one of his favourite authors. I don't know to what extent this is true of Western psychology, let's not go into that, perhaps it is a bit of an overgeneralisation, but the point he is making, basically is that mind itself, Buddhist psychology denote something that we experience, it is not something that has been deduced from general principles, but 'mind is a term applied to something

actually experienced by us. All right let's go on:

"In Buddhist psychology 'mind' and 'mental events' are concepts by intuition whose complete meaning is given by something immediately apprehendable, and as such they are denotatively given particulars."

[end of side A, case 3)

S: Do you get it? In Buddhist psychology 'mind and mental events' are concepts by intuition, they are concepts of the first class. They are terms applied to something you actually experience; whose complete meaning is given by something immediately apprehendable - the complete meaning is given by something which you can apprehend or experience immediately, that is for yourself.

Abhaya: This word Intuition is very confusing, isn't it?

S: This is the philosophical usage of the word 'intuition'. "and as such they are denotatively given particulars" Mind and mental events are particulars, they are not abstract ideas, not abstract concepts. They are denotatively given, that is to say they refer directly to their respective objects which can be actually experienced. There's no connotation here. So what really Guenther is saying, although he is going a long way round about it, is that in Buddhism the terms 'mind and mental events' refer not just to abstract ideas deduced from general principles, but to particular things with which we can actually experience for ourselves.

He need have said really no more than that. But being Guenther he wasn't content with putting it so simply. Right.

"He says, 'To be aware (to end of quote).. mental events'"

S: This is quite straightforward. "to be aware of mere facticity..." What is the facticity of an object?

Abhaya: When it is actually being there.

S: When it is just there. And what is its essence?

Abhaya: 'This-ness'

S: But this-ness in what sort of sense?

Pvj: Its quality

Its immediate presence?

S: No its immediate presence is covered by facticity.

Abhaya: its specificity.

S: yes if you can use that expression.

Sag: What does that mean ?

S: Well haecceity is a term apparently in scholastic philosophy, that is: Christian scholastic philosophy of the middle ages, for instance, suppose you take the concept ' man' , you can then say "this man", so the 'this-ness of that particular man is his haecceity, yes ?

Sag: could you say 'uniqueness' ?

S: You could perhaps say 'uniqueness', I am not quite sure, perhaps you could.

Abhaya: Distinctiveness , distinct from others ?

S: Well I said specificity, that it is this particular man, not any man, not any man in general as it were.

ASVA: Why is it said this particular man rather than that one ? it seems easier to understand. One is pointing or looking at something which is presented to consciousness and therefore available as fact in its

S: Well this seems to suggest greater immediacy that it is right in front of you whereas that suggests as it were that it is over there. (laughter)

Pvj: yes, that's here ?

~: Yes this here. So " to be aware of the mere facticity.. . notice mere facticity... and haecceity of an object is mind..." Now this we very important. In some ways, this is the most important part of the whole book. Mind is defined as that which is aware or simply awareness of: not that the thing is aware, but mind is defined as the awareness of and simply awareness of that something is there and it's that particular thing. this is what is mind. Mind is not a thing unrelated; Mind is simply the awareness, of the fact that something is there and that it is this particular thing that is there, that is mind, your awareness of that.

ManJ: So mind sort of stretches outside of him as well ?

S: Yes This is what Guenther also calls 'the intentionality of mind' - cetana is the Sanskrit term. That mind essentially has as it were reference to an object to an object which is a fact a specific fact. Mind, in other words is a relational term, mind is not a 'thing', it is not an object not an entity. ~o "to be aware of the mere facticity and haenct ity of an object is mind and on the basis of this objective ref- erence to become involved with the object by way of toher specific functions is said to be the operation of mental even~s."

It is as though mind is the sort of general seizing hold of or appreher'sio~~ something that is there, of the fact that something is there end it is this particular thing. The mental functions are the mind's becoming involved with that object which it apprehends in certain specidfic ways, either taking interest in it, liking it, disliking acce~~ing it, rejecting it, being pleased with it, feeling angry with it, these are specific ways of the mind becoming involved with that object and these are called 'mental events' or 'mental concomitants', cetasikas in Pali, and caittadharmas in Sanskrit. 0 you see the distinction between the two? Supposing I look at an object. ouppose I look at a person and I say "Oh, I'm aware of that peson being there and I'm aware that it is So and So; that specific person." that is mind. ~ut if I start thinking, "Oh, he is taller than somebody else I know"!Or if 1 start thinking "I don't like I" the look of him ° etc, well those are mental events, mental factors, or mental concomitants comming in. Yes? co this is the basis of the

distinction between mind and mental events.

Vim: Can you say that again?

S: Supposing you are aware of an object as being there~ and as being that particular o~ject, that is mind.

Vim: It is awareness of the fact that it is there.

S: hat it is there and that this particular thing is there.

Abhsya: That is citta in the Sanskrit terminology?

S; that is Citta, yes. And when then you become involved with that objedt in specific ways, for inStance, as I start comparing that object with another object or when I start feeling ' I don't like that particular object" or "I don't like that particular person" or when I feel attracted to~ards it or when I want to reject it, th~se are all mental

mbp SB

concomitants. or I feel angry with it.

Or even if you're purely neutral. would that still be a mental event ?

~: Well how would you feel.. If you were neutral, that would just be mind.

Abhaya: ~o mind is a sort of registering, and mental functioning is sort of response.

B: Mind isn't registering in the sense that it is just like a mirror; mind is as it were reaching out to the object, but it is reaching out to it simply as object. You could say even mind is that sort of reaching out to something in that particular way. it is not simply passively mirroring it. This is one of the great points made by the Buddhist Abhidharma and which Guenther also emphasises - the mind reaching out, a stretching out towards its object; that that stretching out is mind; that stretching out and being aware of and seeing that something is there and it is this particular thing that is there.

what is the Sanskrit for mental events ?

S: In all, cetasika, which means "connected with the mind" or "of mind or "mind like" and in the Sarvastivada Sanskrit tradition it is Caitta dharmas. Caitta is again "what pertains to the mind, or citta. So sometimes the translation is "mind and mental events", as here. sometimes "mind and mental concomitants" sometimes "mind and mental functions". All these translations are used. But mind represents the awareness of the simple existence of the object plus its specific character as this particular thing or that particular thing. And the mental concomitants represent the mind becoming involved with that object in various specific ways. is that clear ? This is the basic point in a sense of the whole volume.

Menj: Presumably that will become clear.

S: Oh yes. Because there is going to be a short section on mind and then a very much longer one with subdivisions on the mental events themselves. All right.

"He then continues, "to be concerned. . [to end of quote). mental event" S: this is saying the same thing in slightly different words. "There are several remarks of a general logical nature to be made." S: there's Guenther coming in again I [laughter)

mbp 87

Text: [i). [to).. the same relation". [laughter)

S: the relation of progenitor.

Text: "in the case of "mind". [to end of para). . the second is the converse of the former."

S: Yes What do you think he is getting at here ? [laughter)

V~' ces: I haven't a clue, Nonsense.

Is he saying that in one objective situation there is mind there and because mind is there, a lot of other mental events can arise? That is the first one.

S: Yes.

and the second one is that a lot of mental events can arise in lots of different mind situations, objective situations.

S: I don't think that is what he is saying.

R: isn't...?

S: R is the relation.

Sag: It seems the relation is determined by the referent, yes?

S: Yes.

o he doesn't seem to imply that, er, he does imply that the converse is true as well. He just seems to be saying there is a relationship between mind and mental events.

S: He seems to be saying that yes. [laughter] Right.

Ks: "[ii] If a number of terms stand in a common relation. ."

S: The terms are here mental concomitants.

". to a certain other term..."

S: That is mind

"it necessarily follows that they stand in a symmetrical relation to each other."

mbp 88

Do you see that? You've got a number of terms; that is to say, you've got a number of mental concomitants; and they "stand in a common relation

to a certain other term, which is the mind. Do you see that? All the mental concomitants, all the mental events, standing one and the same kind of relation to the mind itself. In other words, the mind itself has produced all those different mental events, one and the same mind. It is the their common progenitor. " ~o if a number of terms stand in a common relation to a certain other term, it necessarily follows that they stand in symmetrical relation to each other." All right, let's put it in terms of father and sons: there are a number of sons. They all have the same father. so, they have a symmetrical relationship with each other, that is to say: brother. Say, John is David's brother, but David is also John's brother. so the relationship is symmetrical. You see that? But the relationship of father and son is a-symmetrical; I think this is what he is getting at.

Pdp: Does that mean in actual fact that in a sense there is mind and then these concomitants like.. they sort of pop out from the mind? It's like the mind is a mattress.~~~~i~)C~

3: Yes, but you must distinguish between his preliminary clarification, prior to what he wants to say and his actual saying it. We haven't got yet to what he wants to say. He is sort of clearing the ground for what he wants to say. [laughter] Right.

"If "feeling tone, conceptualisation". . . "

S: All of which are concomitants, of course.

". . be children of mind, they stand in the relation of "brother or sister to each other"

S: In other words their relationship is symmetrical.

"[iii) It is tempting... to all other terms. j"

~: Do you see what he is getting at? Well what he is in fact saying is though it isn't all that clear;; Let me go back to the concrete example: The father and sons. The relationship of father and son is a-symmetrical because you cannot reverse them. Father and son are distinct, irreversible terms. But if you've

85

Mbp

got a number of sons of the same father, the relationship between them is symmetrical; that is, interchangeable. If John is David's brother, well, David is John's brother. But if Peter is James' father, it doesn't follow that James is Peter's father. No. James is Peter's BOF, not his

father; their relationship is asymmetrical. So Guenther is saying that the mental concomitants stand in a symmetrical relationship to one another, but they all stand in an asymmetrical relationship to mind itself. But he then goes on to say that one mustn't think, therefore, of mind itself as a sort of stable centre or ego which doesn't change while all the mental concomitants are changing. He says this in a way - he doesn't state this explicitly, but he's saying implicitly - that mind itself can be regarded as a mental event. And the 'father', as it were, is not mind, but that 'x-factor', if you like, with regard to which, or in relation to which, mental concomitants and mind itself all stand in a symmetrical relationship.

Pp: In other words behind mind is mind.

S: You could say that: that behind mind there is mind, and in relation to that mind, the first mind, as well as its mental concomitants, all stand in a symmetrical, not an asymmetrical, relationship.

Vim: So it's just mind [ ? ] mind, when you're on that....

S: Mm, Yeah. In other words, by putting it in this way, he is trying to point out that you mustn't start sort of regarding the mind as something fixed, unchanging, a sort of Ego. . . He is even saying: not that there is even a mind behind mind, but the term in relation to which - or the term in respect of which - mind and mental concomitants enjoy a symmetrical relationship between themselves, is not any sort of third term, but the fact that they have that symmetrical relationship. Otherwise, if you posited an actual, existent, third term, then you'd have to posit a fourth to ensure that they all had a... for them to have, all to them, an asymmetrical relationship with. So therefore he's stopped here and said that the fact that mind and its mental concomitants (can have an asymmetrical relationship).. can have a symmetrical relationship with one another, that fact itself is the term, as it were, on account of which they can have an asymmetrical relationship.

KS: But does it exist ?

S: He suggests that it doesn't

MBP 80

Asva: it exists only as an operational concept.

S: Yes.



who might otherwise, I think, have benefitted, and perhaps he impresses a lot of people just by this wordiness and who are impressed without really understanding, in fact, what he is getting at.. (inaudible)

~; he is downright verbose.

S: He is verbose. ~but on the other hand, as I've said, he does get to the point in the end, in his own way, and sometimes very brilliantly.

It is like an obstacle course reading him I

S: Yes, with a sigh of relief when you get onto the original text I

SAG: Can we go back to what he said about mind and mental events; I don't know what I've done with my reading.. I've picked up that you can have mind, as it were, just on its own; pure mind; that's got rid of the taints of mental events; that, that can exist on its own, where you have what is called this 'pure awareness' ; and I thought that could exist on its own without mental events.

S: Well, yes, it can, but as result of discipline.

In that case, would that mind be just a mental event ? Just, as it were. single untainted mental event ?

S: One could say that. this is what was referred to earlier as the single mess of mind , I think.

Manj: It is still only a mental event, though, isn't it ?

S: Mm.

~: Yes, I don't know maybe it is my thinking. I was thinking of something that, the mental events take place in something that is alright. And when they go away you've got this thing left and it's quite alright.

S: I think in a sense this is true, except that one mustn't think of it as a

frbp 82

'thing': it's more like a process or an activity of a particularly pure kind, or undiluted kind, that

is going on, that is proceeding.

Pvj: So you sort of have unskilful mental events, if you like...

S: which means less integrated.

Yes. And then you develop skilful mental states, and then you get to a point of pure mental event.

S: Yes, Because you notice that in the case, of the Dhyanas the mental concomitants become pure and fewer the higher you go in the dhyanas, which I think I mentioned yesterday. (babble)

Again, though, I think the point needs to be made that your mind which is left purely perceiving, as it were, is not as it were, chemically pure in the sense that the mental concomitants have dropped off; it is more like the mental concomitants have been absorbed in and fully integrated, yes? So that is is not a oneness of poverty, but a oneness of richness; it is more like that.

Asva: It seems to be.. the sort of state that you speak of sounds very much like the state that one gets into in solitary retreat. You are just happily getting on with something; you're not particularly conscious of the fact that you are doing something, but you are doing it; you are in activity. It's sort of very clear and untrammelled.

S; Yes.

££j Picking up what Padmavajra said, it is like saying when one gets into the higher reaches of region of the Arupaloka, where there is hardly any,

well, there's not any mental concomitants; then that is like what you were saying that this is like pure state...

S: Yes

Vim: Pure mind.

Sag: It is usually referred to as citta, which in its own nature is pure when adventitious defilements have.

S: Yes.

PP: Would that be 'neither perception nor non-perception', on that level would that be the Arupadhyana?

S: Yes. You could certainly say that, because, for instance, if you get up to the Arupa hyanas, what you get first of all - it's the sphere of infinite space. Well, what does that represent? Is there an object out there called 'space', 'infinite space', that you are percei~ing? It's more like, as it were, the unimpeded progression, or proceeding, of your mind without, as it were, encountering any resistance to that particular proceeding. ~o you see what I mean? And then the ust~al explanation of the sphere of infinite consciousness is that, in as much as mind has tra- versed space, infinite space, that mind, for it to be possible for it to traverse infinite space, mtJst itself be infinite, so you realise infinite mind, infin te consciousness. But one can translate it into the language I've previously used: that you become, as it were, aware, or you become, as it were, conscious, of the fact that your mind, is, as it were proceed- \_ing infinitely on. Ard then, maybe, you begin to doubt whether there is an object and therefore, in a sense, whether there is a subject, so therefore -"neither perception nor non-pe ception" And then the sph~re of "no- thing-ness", well, it carries the same thing, the same process, a stage further. It is more like that.

One is still in very, very rarified air, but one's not fully Enlightened.

S: Well one is not Enlightened at all; one has not even entered on the Transcendental Path. One is still completely within the mundane, but of an incredible degree of refinement. This is, of course, the highest worldly attainment of the Second Path, immediately before entering upon the Path of Perfect Vision, which you can enter upon from any of the Ohyana states; the higher the Ohyana state from which you enter upon the P Path of Vision, the more, as it were, concentrated energy there is behind the penetration that leads to the Vision. S0, yes one could certainly t~ink in terms of that mind, as it were shedding the mental concomitants; or rather, absorbing the mental concomitants, Os that all the energy which is in those mental concomitants passes into mind itself, which re"i~ins as the pure perceiver, the apprehender.

PP: Is that what ehy call, generally, in the Yogacara School, the "store Consciousness" ?

S: No. This is a different thing. You could, if you wi hed, say that the "Store-consciousness" represents the possiblity of the calling up of the

mental concomitants at any time. You could say that, though it isn'~ said, and I'M being very sort of freely interpretive. It is the r~pository of

mbp 94

the pure and impure seeds; but anyway, that's a very abstruse subject; probably the mosO abstruse in all Buddhist thought - the Store-Conscious- mess, so we won't go into it now. Let's go on with what the kyingmapa philospers have to say

Text: T' The rNying-ma-pa philosophers.. (end of pare).. farther astray."

S: So mind as pure fact is Like what Pasmapani called ' the mind behind h the mind' , which is not .. which cannot be ~ecribed , yes ? because if you start describing it, even if you describe it as "pure fact", then it is no longer pure fact. [pause)

Rob: That'~ "sems" ?

S:"sems-nyid", which literally.. 'mind-as-such'. "Nyid", as far as I remember, is a negatibe particle, so it means that ~pAkriich it. amanassa. \_that which it, or that which is not mind. So " Tht rNIng-ma-pa philpsoph ers must be given credit for having noticed this implication and foe having clearly distinguished between 'mind'[sems) and 1mind-as such' (sems-nyid)" - the mindless-mind, you could even say - '~ between pure fact'~ -he is a bit misleading here, because the pure fact is the second, not the first. "of which, striccty speaking, we can say notheing, although we may use words to denote it so as to find in the immediacy of our experience (before it is channelled through words and concepts by postualtaion) hat the words mean, and described fact, which by its nature is such that we have formed a concept of something and now attribute the characteristics of which we have the concept to pure fact which cannot be conceptualised." In other words, to come back to his. . this whole question of the symmetrical and the asymmetrical relationships between mind and mental concomitan~s when you describe mind as stan~ing in an asymmetrical re~ationship with its mental concomitants, the mind than yQu are describing is 'a described fact' simply mind. ~ut the fac~ th,Lt mind can be regarded, or is to be regarded, in a way, as itself a mental concomitant, and therefore as standing in a symmetrtcal relationship with one another - this fact is made possible by the fact that. pure fact. . of the existence of a mind - as it were, a mind behind mind - which cannot be described and which therefore does not exist in a symmetrical, or even, strictly speaking, an asymmetrical relationship, with mind as described fact and its mental concomitants, though one can, perhaps, analogically, regard it as standing in an °symm- etrical relationship, to them all, even of mind itself as thought of as standing in

mop 85

an asymmetrical relationship to its mental concomitants, so it is the as it were, well one mustn't say postulation, but it is the existence, perhaps, of mind as pure fact which prevents one from t~king mind as described fact too seriously or thinking of it as a sort of ego.

Abhaya: Could you give an example of mental concom tants standing in symmetrical relationship to each other ?

S: Well, they stand in symmetrical relationdhip to one another because they have all been produced as it werw by the same m~nd, they all pertain to the one and the same mind.

Abhaya: Can you give an example, like with the father and son...

~: Well, you could say, for instance craving and anger. I mean, craving is what arises when anger is. . . anger is what arises when craving is inhibited; so, in that way there is a sort of symmetrical relationship between them - there is no craving without anger; there is no anger without craving. In other words it is the presence of this mind as pure fact that prevents one from absolutising mind as described fact.

Asv: Could you say that again ?

S: That it is the presence of mind as pure fact which prevents one from absolutizing mind as described fact. Otherwise you think of mind, that is, mind as described fact, as something fixed and unchanging and here with all its mental concomitants, which may be sort of changing, coming and going, ranged around it there; but it isn't like that. Even mind itself is changing. In a way, mind itself is a mental concomitant. Yes ?

~: That seems to be the good point in the Theravadin Abhidharma, the fact that they have 89 states of mind, and it is almost like the Sarvastivadin view is the logical conclusion of the Theravadin view.

mbp 98

S: Yes. . . .es. though it is not that in the Theravada there are 89 different kinds of mind; it's more that mind can be classified in different ways and these all add up to a total of 89. For instance, mind functioning in the plane of sensuous desire, mind functioning in the plane of the world of form, mind functioning in the formless world and mind functioning on the transcendental path, but it is not strictly speaking that there are so many different minds. But perhaps, though there are two extremes: one is to think that there are 89 different minds and the other is to think that there is only one mind. But it is very difficult to avoid these extremes.

Pp: I am not clear about mental concomitants. Can you have more than one present at one time ?

S: Oh yes I have whole complexes of them ! We'll be going into that later on in the text. You can have a very large number of them all together at the same time.

Right.

'Following the technical diction of Buddhism.. [end of para)functions are associated.'

S: Do you see this ? It is a bit obscure isn't it ? "Following the technical diction of Buddhism, the distinction between 'pure fact' and 'described fact' - the one being in terms of cognition,

'pure awareness or cognition' rig-pa, the other, 'the lack of pure awareness' ma-rig-pa -presupposes pure awareness..." Hig~pa, 'pure awareness or cognition' is vidya in Sanskrit and the 'lack of awareness' is ma-rig-pa is avidya. ~o he is saying that just as you've got 'pure fact' and 'described fact', so in cognitive terms you've got vidya and avidya. You could say that vidya, which he translates as 'pure awareness' is what perceives simply 'pure fact' and avidya or 'absence of pure awareness' usually translated as ignorance is what perceives described fact.

END OF TAPE /3/

97

MIND TALK BUDDHIST PSYCHOLOGY SEMINAR

Tape 4 Side A

S: 'Pure fact' and 'described fact', so in cognitive terms you've got vidya and avidya, you could say that vidya, which he translates as 'pure awareness', is what perceives simply 'pure fact', and avidya, or absence of 'pure awareness', usually translated as ignorance, is what perceives 'described fact'.

You see that? Ha, yes. (Pause.)

So, Following the technical diction of Buddhism, the distinction between 'pure fact' and 'described fact' presupposes pure awareness(rig-pa) -vidya-, but 'described fact' does not presuppose 'pure fact'. Hence, if 'mind'(sems), as distinguished from 'Mind-as-such'

(sems-nyid), is equated with 'lack of pure awareness'(ma-rig-pa), as contrasted with 'pure awareness'(rig-pa), certain consequences follow. 'Lack of pure awareness' is listed among the 'basic emotions', (er, which are of course unskillful), and yet it is co-extensive with 'mind' with which the 'intellectual' functions are associated.

Do you see that?

Abhaya: Yeah, the other basic emotions are anger and craving.

S: Yes, yes, er, and others too. (Pause.) 96. So, Following the technical diction of Buddhism the distinction between 'pure fact' and 'described fact' presupposes pure awareness(rig-pa), presumably because only if one had pure awareness one could distinguish between the two; but 'described fact' does not presuppose 'pure fact'. What exactly that means is not really clear, but, -in the sense of what presupposes really means, er, you see?- 'described fact' does not presuppose, -presuppose it logically, presuppose it psychologically?- this isn't at all clear. Hence, if 'mind'(sems), as distinguished from 'Mind-as-such'(sems~nyid), is equated with 'lack of pure awareness' (ma-rig-pa), certain consequences follow. 'lack of pure awareness' is listed among the 'basic emotions', and yet it is co-extensive with 'mind' with which the 'intellectual' functions are associated.

In other words, the mind, - the mind as 'described fact', - is really the ignorant mind; the mind overpowered by avidya, yeah, this is what he's really saying.

Manjuvajra: Sems.

S: Yes.

98

-2-

S(continued): Even though, I mean, avidya is listed among the basic emotions, which are unskillful states, but actually, mind itself is, as it were, under the influence of that ignorance, or that lack of awareness, which is also classified among the mental concomitants.

This, though he doesn't say so, this perhaps also suggests that mind is, in a way, a sort of mental concomitant.

All right, let's go on.

Dharmapala: This shows that the distinction we ordinarily make between 'emotions' and 'reason' is a bifurcating description leading away from 'pure fact'. What we so describe by 'mind and the emotions' constitutes a malfunction of 'Mind-as-such' or 'pure awareness' or, to use a more comprehensive term, 'psychic energy'.

S: Er, the mere fact that we distinguish between reason and emotion, the mere fact that we distinguish at all between mind and mental concomitants, is an instance of that ignorance which is itself included among the mental concomitants.

In other words, the distinction between mind and mental concomitants is the, is the product of the functioning of a mental

concomitant. Mmm,yeah? 97.

Padmapani: Ah. (Chuckles.)

S: That means that you've already strayed away from pure mind. The minute you distinguish between mind and mental concomitant, er, reason and emotion, you've already strayed away from pure mind; or mind as 'pure fact'.

So you, in other words, you can't absolutely distinguish mind and mental concomitants. It's only an operational concept, eh?, and that you distinguish in this way between mind and mental concomitants only when you get away from mind as 'pure fact'. Yes; when you get away from mind as 'pure fact', that is ignorance, 'lack of pure awareness',

as Guenther calls it:- which is itself including the mind, the basic emotions which are included in the list of mental concomitants.

So therefore in a way, the fact that you distinguish between mind and mental concomitants is the work of, or the functioning of, one of the mental concomitants themselves. In other words, you can't chop reality up into little bits which are mutually exclusive, and then put them together again to get the truth. You've got to stop cutting up into little bits in order to get at the truth.

-3- 99

Abhaya: So the Abhidharma itself is mental concomitant.

S: Yes, yes, right, - no, er, it's a matter of er, playing with operational concepts for a certain practical purpose; though maybe the Abhidharmikas themselves didn't always see this, but Guenther - he was, is, looking at things very much from the Nyingma point of view, and don't forget he said at the beginning, rather disparagingly, that the Gelugpas continued the Indian Abhidharmas and Yogacara ~bhidharma tradition, but it was up to the Nyingmapas to make a living experience of it all.

Well, here he's bringing in the Nyingmapa interpretation, and the Nyingmapa way of looking at it all. In a way, he's going a bit beyond the Abhidharma proper, you know, quite justifiably.

Sagaramati: There's just another point of confusion, in the sense that you can get this unskillful mental event that can, according to, you know, the fact it's, er, you know, it could lead to actual an experience in a concept by intuition.

S: ~ell, it's an example of what the Tantrics call using dirt to get rid of dirt, hmm? It is the mental concomitant of 'lack of pure awareness' that makes the distinction between mind and mental events; but by making that distinction between mind and mental events, and then classifying and ~ sorting out the mental events themselves into skillful and unskillful, and practising on that basis, you eventually go beyond the unskillful mental events, then beyond the skillful mental events, and then you go beyond the distinction of mind and mental events. So the practical upshot is that (~ause).

Right, let's go on because we're really going overtime, eh.

~aala: (Again it has to be emphasized that these latter terms are pointers, symbolic ways of referring to an experience, but not symbols for some thing or other.)

S: Yes, for some 'thing' or other.

Dharmapala: But even in this malfunctioning, the 'original psychic energy~(psychic energy here is understood as the positively ~good~, or man's inner nature which, if it is allowed to guide his life,

S(interrupting): Mmm, again we get this 'inner nature', you see, a very ambiguous sort

of term, ha.

Dharmapala: will let him grow in health and happiness) is not totally obliterated, but is present as 'appreciative discrimination'(shes-rab).

100 -4-

S: Or what others call prajna or wisdom.

So in a way, Guenther is saying that avidya, sorry, that vidya, pure awareness, is man's inner nature, but this is a bit misleading; not that it represents some sort of true nature that subsequently, at some period of time, became over-laid.

But even in this malfunctioning, the 'original psychic energy'

(psychic energy here is understood as the positively 'good', or man's inner nature which, if it is allowed to guide his life, will let him grow in health and happiness)

Padmavajra: 'original psychic energy'?

S: Yes, this is all rather unsatisfactory, not very Buddhistic, and not very Abhidharma-like. It's not obliterated, but is present as 'appreciative discrimination'(shes-rab); in other words, wisdom.

The faculty of wisdom is the sort of reflection of this much deeper, pure awareness within man. It's as though wisdom is pure awareness in action, you could say almost.

All right, carry on then.

Dharmapala: Appreciative discrimination is a value condition not an arbitrary evaluation, and contrasts sharply with the 'demands' (yid-la-byed-pa) that are constantly made by the ego

S(interrupting): This is manasikara presumably.

Dharmapala: itself a demand or fiction(yid-la-byed-pa), on what is. These demands ~~,re ineytricably intertwined with the powerful emotions of passion-lust and hatred-aversion.

S: So there's pure awareness contrasted with lack of pure awareness, and wisdom is the manifestation of pure awareness.

And in the same way, egocentric demanding and mental confusion, moha, and craving, trsna, and anger, d~esa, are manifestations of lack of pure awareness.

(Pause.)

'tell, carry on, we'll finish the rest. rather quickly.

101

Robert Gerke: The contrast between 'appreciative discrimination' and 'ego-centered demands' thus highlights the conflict between two major opposing forces in each of us. Through making demands we attempt to impose on and to interfere with all and everything; above all, we tend to cut ourselves off from the possibility of seeing ourselves as unique and whole human beings and, as a consequence, we merely proceed under the aegis of suitability-for-purpose, of making everything no more than a means to our selfish, if not paranoid, ends. While through 'appreciative discrimination', we would be able to discover the potential for growth and health that is in us and to develop it so that we might, and could, grow more and more into a human being.

S: This really seems to limit wisdom, because he speaks simply in terms of a potential for growth and health and growing more and more into a human being. He says nothing about enlightenment or an enlightened human being.

Sagaramati: That fits in with the very narrow view of psychology.

S: Indeed it does. It's as though, er, - you say that wisdom, or 'appreciative discrimination', is just not interfering with the ordinary 100. life flow, and is just letting yourself be a free healthy happy human being. He seems to suggest this. He surely knows better than that. Seeing ourselves as) unique and whole human beings, well, it's seeing ourselves as enlightened, which is rather more.

All right, let's conclude quickly.

Manjuvajra: It is for this reason that the 'positive mental events', as aids to growth, play

such a prominent role in the analysis of 'mind'. A 'good' or 'real' human being is one in whom all the human capacities are fully developed and functioning well.

S: Again, it depends what you mean by ~h~~n~, doesn't it. You can say,- if you say, for instance, 'the Buddha was a human being', well you,- well if you, if you have no idea of Buddhahood or, you know, of the nature of the enlightenment experience, when you hear someone say that 'the Buddha was a human being', well then you think that he was just an ordinary human being, because you have no idea about Buddhahood. So Guenther seems to be using the word 'human' in this very narrow sense, and leaving out enlightenment or Buddhahood.

-6- 102

~ff~n~~vajra It seems that man as a living being demonstrates in his very nature this urgency for becoming more fully human, which the Buddhists indicated by the technical term de-bzhin-gshegs-pa'i snying-po, which can be paraphrased as 'man's quintessence being the ressure towards Buddhahood'.

S: Here he does mention Buddhahood, - at last.

i!.anjuvajra: Kiong-chen rab-1byams-pa succinctly states in his... .um....

(Pause)

((Chos-dbyings rin-po-che li mdzod,))

S: Never mind, go on.

Manjuvajra: 1When intrinsic awareness (rig-pa) has been divested of minding (sems) ~nd of the mistaken appearances that go with minding, there is no other way but to go to pure and unadulterated Buddhahood, because man's very nature, which is Buddhahood, has been laid bare in view of the fact that it has been divested of the obscuring forces.

S: ~n intrinsic awareness (ri a), that is, vidya, has been divested 101\* of minding (sems),-that is to say, mind in the sense of described fact, which is itself in a way the product of lack of pure awareness, and are then divested of the mistaken appearances that go with minding, there's ~herwatoo,,other way, but to go pure and unadulterated er, oh, there's no other way to ~ to pure and unadulterated, hmm, no....

Psdmavajra: No other way but to go to.

S: No other way but to go to pure and unadulterated Buddhahood, because man's very nature, which is Buddhahood, has been laid bare in view of the fact that it has been divested of the obscuring forces. Well, it depends; it depends how far you go in getting rid of minding.

If you stop prematurely then you will, and you will stop prematurely if you've got a narrow view of mind; then what you are left with is not Buddhahood, but, you know, simply a slightly higher sta~ of ordinary human consciousness.

But if you really do exhaust all the possibilities of human consciousness,, and you really do get rid of all mental concomitants and of mind in the ordinary sense, then there is no way to go but straight ahead to Buddhahood, because t~~t~5 the next stage.

But through this whole section, this last page or two, Guenther seems to almost psychologise, doesn't he, - taking 'human' in a quite

A

103

-7-

S(continued): ordinary sense, and 'healthy' in an ordinary sense, and 'growth' in a quite ordinary sense.

(Pause).

All right, the last para.

Abhaya: The obscuring forces are precisely what is otherwise termed 'mind'(sems) which we can now more accurately define as a malfunctioning

and which therefore is placed at the beginning of the Twelfold Chain of Dependent Origination, marking the growing involvement in growth-inhibiting forces that have us 'groping in the dark', 'running around in circles', in brief, erring and roaming about in Samsara. This situation itself is to be considered as an incentive to do something about it, which means that first of all we have to find out what has 'landed us in this mess' and, as an aid to finding out, we have the analysis of 'mind' and 'mental events'.

S: Mmm, yes. At the beginning of the previous paragraph it says, It is for this reason that the 'positive mental events' (or skillful mental events)-as aids to growth, play such a prominent role in the

analysis of 'mind'. 102.

And it's those that we should be chiefly concerned with, as I said yesterday. They will occupy, as it were, the, you know, the central place in the text, and in our study.

But the growth, the process of growth, in which they play such a prominent role, as Guenther rightly says, is a process that goes far beyond the limits of the, the merely psychological in the western sense, and we must bear that in mind too, as he seems not always to do.

Anyway, what emerges from what we've done this afternoon?- Do you get at least a clearer picture of what is meant by mind and what is meant by mental events?- Mind meaning simply the awareness of a specific object, and mental events meaning the particular ways in which mind becomes involved with that particular object.-Bearing in mind, though, that the very distinction between mind and mental concomitants is a product of ignorance, which is listed among the mental concomitants itself, and is something eventually to be transcended. So you transcend it by learning to distinguish skillful from unskillful mental, mental concomitants, and to develop, in practice, the more skillful ones. Also of course you learn not to regard mind as something fixed and absolute, as standing in an actually asymmetrical relationship with its mental concomitants:

-8- 104

S(continued): you learn there is such a thing as pure mind, a mind as pure fact, which cannot be pointed to very definitely as a thing, but the presence of which makes it possible to think of mind and its mental concomitants as being related symmetrically, among themselves, so that one does not absolutise mind in any way.

(Pause.)

Certainly Guenther does require a bit of sorting out, doesn't he. It might be quite useful to

write out this whole thing in a simpler way, er, just as ~ sort of summary, er, just as an exercise, if ~nyone would like to do that.

Voices: tkr~m. Umm.

S: Write that in much more simple language, you know, the points that Guenther is making. You could probably do it in about two pages at the most, the whole of his introduction. Leaving aside that, the, you know, the lengthy quotation about, about the Accumulation F~ase. That would be quite a good exercise just to do that.

Manjuvajra: Homework.

S: Hrm. 103.

Manjuvajra: Horriework.

S: Like homework, yes. What Dr. Guenther, you know, should have said (laughter), in brief or more briefly had he given himself more time to say things, you know, in er, succinct and to the point fashion, ha.

Vimalamitra: Send him a copy.

S: Yes, right, yes.

Anyway tomorrow we will get on to the text itself. Eut anyway, I think it's quite good that we've spent a bit of time just clearing the decks for action in this kind of way. Any query or general point about what we've done this afternoon?

Padmavsjra: I used to feel quite angry towards Guenther; now I feel a bit sorry for him.

Manjuvajra: It shows in a way the importance of er, anything that you're going to say

especially anything you're gonna write, must be really clear because

S(interrupting): Yes.

-C?- 105

Manjuvajra Otherwise even a group of people who've got a good attitude towards it will find it difficult to understand and disagree about it and it'll lead to

S: Well, think about the average reader, the average non-Buddhist a bit interested in, well, in Tibet, even if not in Buddhism, they go "Oh~ ~nd In Buddhist Psychology, well, this is very interesting." And they sort of start trying to read through the introduction. (laughter.) They may not get beyond the introduction! They may think, "Well, what in earth is all this about?". (Laughter.)

Dharmapala: I think you're right, I tried to read it and I've been into Buddhism....

S: Especially when they come across 'facticity' and 'hsecceity', well, that just finishes it. You can just imagine someone wandering into Compendium(Bookshop), you know, (laughter), and saying, "Oh! Niind In Buddhist Psychology, that's very interesting, man." (laughter.)

Fadmapani: Some of the words, you can't even find in the dictionary.

S: Er, well, er, I suppose you can't, ha. (laughter.) io4.

Dharmapala: I found even some of the translations of these English sentences very difficult.

S: Well, he isn't English by birth, he's Austrian, er, and he's got a very good command of the language, but not a very great sensitivity to language, ha. It's very insensitive use of

language. I'm personally very suspicious of the insensitive use of language, from a purely spiritual point of view. Do you know what I mean by this? If one uses words in a wooden mechanical sort of fashion, I'm very suspicious of, you know, of the degree of spiritual refinement and penetration there is behind that.

Sagaramati: There just doesn't seem to be any, er, wish to communicate.

S: Yes, it's the wish to pour out rather than to communicate.

Dharmapala: It's a bit like to me, you know, the big Victorian music hall announcer, who, more, wells out all these great words, the people don't understand what he's talking about but it amuses them.

S: Yes.

106

- 10 -

Dharmapala: I suppose this will be a bit different, yes.

S: Yes. It's a pity in ~~ way, because he is so brilliant and he has got such a good mind and understands many things so well, and has translated so much and written so much himself.

~a: Do you know him, }Thante?

S: Oh yes. Yes, I used to know him. I've not met him for many years, but he's very bouncy and self confident and he talks; he talks constantly. You could almost sort of, you know, take a tape recorder and record two or three more books. (laughter.)

Voice: Like you.

S: No. Not like me. (laughter.)

Anyway, I think it's clear from what we've done so far today, that the Abhidharma, at least this section of it, or this aspect of it, isn't quite as formidable as, you know, one might have supposed. It's not very difficult really to get into it and we've probably have done the most difficult bit in the book, actually, which is Guenther's introduction.

I think we shall find the text on the whole more intelligible, Ins. more readily understandable, and as we get more deeply into it, much more enjoyable and of practical utility.

Anyway, let that do for today.

(Voices - various comments irrelevant to text or seminar.)

Padmapani: It's been funny reading that last bit, you get the impression he goes up, you know, in a form in a sense you get by, then he goes right down, it's almost as if I get a very strong feeling Bhante (inaudible tape subsequently spliced, with some verbal repetition)

I got went down, you know, that he had sort of conditioning things to say like, you know, in psychological terms.

Bhante: Yes.

Padmapani: Then he sort of rises above that.

S: Urn. Yes. It's quite odd, as though he doesn't really think.

Padmapani: It's the sort of (unclear) flying over.

Mark Barrett: What was the name of that five whatever it was, paths, er I don't know very well

S: Oh, the rive Paths, they're called in the Jewel Ornament of Liberation from

Padmapani: I'd like to copy that out. It's about three pages, four, five. I found them in the Jewel Ornament.

Voice: (~ yes, you found that.

S: Here is Manjuvajra's copy if you want to look.

Mark Barrett: Er, I've got quite a comprehensive series of notes.

S: I must give a talk on these one day. I meant to years and years ago, even when I was at Hampstead, but I never got round to it.

Abhaya: Do you think you mig~t say a little bit perhaps tomorrow about, er, consciousness, the term 'consciousness' in relation to ~n~l~ a'nd er..

S: Ui~n, I think in this context 'mind1 means just ~con~c~o~5ne5~l 106.

-----Abhaa: I wondered that.

~: Ye~.

Abhaya: So when you talked about 'pure mind' you could substitute 'pure consciousness'.

S: You could, though usually consciousness, like mind, is used as a term that refers to an object, but pure consciousness, or pure mind, doesn't.

In other words, you have awareness without any thing you are aware of, or anybody or any thing that is aware. This is what is usually said. Whereas sGam-po-pa said 'a pure non-dual Shine', capital S.

Sagaramati: Would it be true to say that, that in your mind in mental events, that mind is sort of, er, receiving through the senses and that all the mental events etc, they're all, um, well, they're all mental? They all happen?

S: The mind does perceive mental objects, doesn't it. It doesn't only perceive through the five physical senses.

- 12 - 108

Sagaramati: Does it mean like perceiving the mental object would be like perceiving the, er, mental event? becoming aware of what's going on?

3: One could say that, hmm. Whether there are any mental objects which are not mental events. I'm not sure if the Abhidharma does discuss this. But perhaps one could take that view.

Sagaramati: So in a sense, we're dealing purely with a mental consciousness, not with eye consciousness

S: Yes, because rupa, we're not dealing with rupa, we're not dealing with the physical senses.

(Voices: irrelevant to seminar.)

'llanjuvajra: Some of these objects, if mind, um, if mind becomes aware of something, it can refer to external objects, can't it.

S: Yes.

~anjuvajra: I mean the awareness of er, the cup on the table, that 107.  
would be mind.

S: Yes.

Manjuvajra: Where would the rupa come into it?

S: Well, the cup is perceived; rupa is the object of visual perception. Though again, one musn't think of matter or a thing out there. And Guenther's gone into this in Philosophy and Psychology in the ~bhidharma.

Sagaramati: So that there seems to be a preliminary phase in that we see something and there arises eye consciousness, it's almost like, as it were, in time after that, then there arises mind consciousness which sees~the mental image.

S: Er, yes. One could say that, umm, yes.

Sagaramati: Can you see these things as actually happening in a sequence?

S: I think in a way one can, because you think, you think that well, there the tree, then you think, 'Oh, I see a tree', and then you think, 'Oh, I'm thinking of seeing a tree'.

- 13 - 109 (Voices: Dinner's ready. Oh good.)

NEXT ~Y

S: Er, I think page three.

Manjuvajra: While we were waiting I wrote a little paraphrase.

S: Oh good.

Manjuvajra: An introduction. Can I just read it through?

S: Do.

Manjuvajra: Introduction

Th~ Way

The Way (Iain) is a term that refers to man's ability to perceive and know; and to order and direct his life. In contrast to a cyclic existence, (a reactive following of habitual patterns), man can use this ability from moment to moment and thus lead a life of growth and development, both in a psychological sense and further into those as yet unknown, wholly positive levels referred to as spiritual and the transcendental.

Following such a way will affect all areas of the IOS~ individual's being and present a deep and solid foundation for his life.

The Path has five stages:

- i) The Path of Preparation: The initial ethical and meditational practices.
- 2) The Path of Practice The gradual incorporation of the initial stage in one's life.
- 3) The Path of Vision The resulting vision and complete change in perspective.
- 4) The Path of Transformation:... The gradual change of all aspects of being under the influence of this vision.
- 5) The Path of No More Learning: The enlightened state, which is on-going and is thus still referred to as a path.

### Mind and Mental Events

What is meant by Mind and Mental Events?

Concepts may arise in two ways. Firstly, a direct perceptual experience may be named. This is a "concept by intuition". Secondly, a theory may produce the need for a certain concept and this "thing" is hypothesised as existing. This is a "concept by postulation".

In Buddhist psychology Mind and Mental Events are "concepts by intuition". That is, they are words denoting particular

- 14 - 110

~njugvajra(continued): direct experiences.

Mind is the experience of the actual presence of an object and a sense of its specific nature as an object.

Mental events are any experience that develops with an involvement with the object, e.g. like or dislike.

It is important however, to note that the mental events are not states of a mind. That is, there is no such thing as a pure ego-like mind, to which mental events happen. Mind is a mental event itself.

The Nying-ma-pas distinguish between Mind-as-Such and Mind. The former is pure fact about which nothing may be said; the latter is described fact which is an attempt to describe the former. But in so doing we necessarily falsify the pure fact since we are using concepts. This corresponds to a loss of pure awareness (ma-rig-pa) and thus the pure awareness of mind-as-such has been clouded by an emotion. The distinguishing of Mind and Mental Events is therefore itself an indication of a loss of intuition.

In each of us there are two opposing forces represented by Wisdom on the one hand, and ego demands or fictions on the other. The former is a reflection of Mind-as-such, the latter is associated with craving and hatred which try to set up fictions on the world. The

former will lead to growth into a healthy human, and beyond, towards the transcendental. The latter splits everything up and sees objects only in reference to suitability-for-purpose or other selfish, neurotic or paranoid purposes.

We find ourselves in Samsara, lost in the winds of the emotions and false views leading to deeper involvement in this darkness. With the development of positive emotions, we begin to integrate our mental events and mind, Wisdom acting more and more as the guide in the process. Wisdom itself is always present, in seed form, as the inspiration towards an initially unclear but increasingly clarified goal: that of Buddhahood. It is through an analysis of this disintegrated world that we can set out on the route to integration.

Analysis of Mind and Mental Events is the subject of this book.

S: Un. Good, that makes it very clear, doesn't it, ha. It might be a good idea to send it to Shabda as a product of the, er, the seminar and as hopefully initiating a change of material in Shabda. (laughter).

~ava~ra: Really good~, Manjuvajra.

- 15 - 111

S: There's one or two little points that I want to mention later on there. (Pause.) Anyway, that's what we did yesterday.

All right, let's start reading the Verses of Veneration and Intention, page three.

Sagaramati: I bow with folded hands to him who is inseparable from Lord Manjughosa, the reverend and excellent teacher And I pray that he may accept me in his love for all times.

S: Let's read that note on Manjughosa; er, carry on.

Sagaramati: 'Jam-dbyangs (Manjughosa) is another manifestation of 'Jam-dpal (Manjusri) who has been explained by Mi-pham in his bShes-sbring gi mchan 'grel padma dkar-po'i phreng-ba as follows: He is gentle ('jam) because he has overcome all evil afflictions and he is eternally youthful because his Being (sku), radiating with the splendor (dpal) of two qualities (of benefitting oneself and others), never grows old.

S: This is of course a Tibetan explanation based to some extent on the literal meaning of the Tibetan translation of Manjughosa; er, Nanju is generally explained as gentle, soft, auspicious; ~ is of course 110. voice, or speech. So one gets the usual translation of lAanjughosa,

'He of gentle speech<sup>1</sup> or gentle voice, ha.

And he's also called Kumarabhuta, 'Who has become a youth' or 'Who is youthful'.

Manjusri means, er something like, er, ~~~n~le ~uspiciousness' or even 'Gentle splendour', ha.

So therefore, er, the note says, 'Jam-dbyangs(Manjughosa) is another manifestation of 'Jam-dpal(Manjusri) who has been explained by

Mi-pham as follows: He is gentle('jam) because he has overcome all afflictions . Why should one be gentle because one has overcome all evil afflictions? What does that suggest?

Padmavajra: Presumably one does~'t hate, one doesn't get angry.

S: But why 'gentle' particularly? ~hy not say 'wise', or why not say 'compassionate'- why 'gentle', what does~gentle~ convey?

Sagaramati: There's no sort of hard rigidity.

S: ph.' No hard rigidity, there's a sort of softness, ha. Yeah, you could say a spiritual softness, like a sort of soft glow, as it were, no hardness, no ri~idity, ha.

- 16 - 112

Dharmapala: How does, um, Manjusri normally has a sword, and a sword doesn't seem to quite fit with what you were saying.

S: Well, it doesn't in a way fit, but it doesn't sort of fit with our ideas about prajna, and its cutting ability, um, yeah, er, we think of the, the sort of cutting quality of prajna as something violent, as it were. But it isn't really like that, it, you could say it's very soft, very gentle, very delicate, um.

I remember when I was a, er, a boy, seeing a film on the Crusades, - this may not seem very re~evant, but actually it is (with mirth in his voice) - and there was (I couldn't have been more than seven or eight) - but there was an episode in it which impressed me very much. I think on reflection it must have been a really corny sort of film, ha. But anyway, Richard the Lionheart met Saladin. And P~chard the Lionheart wanted to show his great prowess with the sword to Saladin. So he called for a great thick log of wood, and this was put across two trestles. And with a single blow of his sword, ha, he cut the log in two, yeah.

So Saladin just smiled, ha, and he called for his sword. And he called for a piece of silk, ha. So he just, he held out his sword and he asked for the piece of silk to be °laid on the sword. And the sword was 50 sharp that the piece of silk fell in two pieces on either ~ide of the sword, severed. (laughter.)

Yeah, so prajna is more like the second than the first, yeah, the way in that prajna cuts is more like the second than the first.

We think of Manjusri sort of violently swinging his flaming sword, you know, crash! you know, cutting through all the delusions, but it isn't really like that, ha. The operation of prajna is, in a way, much more, well really devastating than that, but it's quieter, as it were, gentle, ha. It's just like the sensation, I mean, so I'm told, of having a razor blade go through you, ha, it's so thin you hardly feel it. But it cut you most effectively, yeah. tin.

And he is eternally youthful because his Being (sku), pr his body, radiating with the splendor(dpal) of two ~uaThies (of benefitting oneself and others), never grows old. This is the reason

- 17 - 113

S(continued): for the youthful appearance of Manjusri in particular, but also of the other bodhisattvas, that he never grows old. But now wh~t does that mean? That he never grows old?

Abhaya: Beyond time.

S: It means beyond time, but in a way even, er, more than that, ha, er, the wisdom which he

represents never goes, never grows old, but the experience, ha, which he represents

End of Tape 4 Side A

ll~.

- Is - 114

MIND IN BUDDHIST PSYCHOLOGY SEMINAR Tape 4 Side B

S(continued): never grows old. This reminds me of a definition of beauty in, er, Sanskrit poetics which I think sheds some light here. I forget the Sanskrit of it, but, er, in English it

goes something like, that er, something like, this : er, "Beauty is like that which, from instant to instant, er, is always new, um,: yeah. So the eternally young, ha, is that which is always new, ha, it never grows old, never grows stale, you never get tired of it, ha, it renews itself, it's new from instant to instant, from moment to moment.

So the wisdom experience is like that, I mean the enlightenment experience is like that, ha. It's something that sort of doesn't, er, get a bit old or a~bit stale as it were the longer you go on experiencing it; well, to begin with it's outside time anyway, ha, hmm. It's something which eternally renews itself, which is always fresh, always new, always young. Yeah, hini. I mean the enlightenment experience is as it were a perpetual, as it were, transcendental honeymoon, ha, hmm, it's more like that, ha. It sort of never, it never, the beauty of it or the magic of it never starts fading away. It's

always fresh, ha, the experience is always new, ha, so therefore it's 1/3. symbolised by or embodied in an eternally youthful figure, ha.

Padmavajra: It says in the verse here, "I bow with folded hands to him who is inseparable from Lord ~anjughosa".

S: That's right, he's bowing to his own teacher as the embodiment of Manjusri. '~le're not told who that teacher is. (Pause.)

And don't forget that the author is a Gelugpa, and that for the Gelugpas Manjughosa is a particularly important figure. Er, he is the inspirer of the whole Madhyamika lineage, ha, and is particularly associated with that lineage, just as Maitreya is with the Yogscara lineage. And Tsong-kha-pa also, ha, is believed to be a manifestation of Manjughosa.

So he's saluting his own teacher, er, as inseparable from Manjughosa, as the living embodiment, as it were, of Manjughosa. And then he goes on to salute the Buddha.

So let's carry on.

Asvajit: I bow to the supreme protector, Sakyamuni, ~~o illumines the world where he looks By his ~nniscience from which all obscuring darkness has gone and who has fulfilled the two requisites By the power of his spirituality.

S: I bow to the supreme protector, Sakyamuni, that is the human, the historical Buddha, the Nirmanakaya Buddha.

Who illumines the worl~ where he looks

Py his Omniscience from which all obscuring darkness

Has gone . Omniscience; - in what sense is the Buddha said to be omniscient? Is it a literal omniscience or is it something else?

Manjuvajra: He knew, um, the way to enlightenment. He knew

S: The historica~ Buddha claimed, er, omniscience, or full knowledge, only with regard to what constituted the path to enlightenment, - what were its obstacles and so on. (Pause.)

and who has fulfilled the two requisites - that is to say, merits and knowledge; punya and jnana.

The first five paranitas are supposed to represent the accumulation of punya, and the sixth, that is to say, prajna or wisdom, is said to represent the accumulation of knowledge. (Pause.)

The five paramitas without wisdom may be said to represent the full development, the fullest possible development, of the mundane, up to the very highest level of the mundane, the highest possible pitch of mundane perfection; whereas jnana or knowledge represents the full 114. development of spiritual, or better still, er, transcendental perfection, ha.

You could even say perhaps, though, using the terms that I mentioned the other day, tbat, er, the five paramitas represent, er, the fullest possible psychological and spiritual development and the, er, jnana, or knowledge, represents the fullest possible transcendental development.

These two, or rather these three all combined in one person, ha, who is therefore perfect in all respects, both mundane and transcendental, these are referred to as the two equipments, or the two accumulations; an accumulation of all possible mund~ne virtues or mundane cualities, together with the full transcendental insight and vision and enlightenment.

The first iconographically-is symbolised by the halo around the Buddha's body, and the second by the halo around his head.

Do you get the idea? The two accumulations representing, er, a twofold perfection. The consummation of the mundane and the consummation of the transcendental, united in one person, i.e. the Buddha Sakyamuni.

Padmavajra: What is the difference between jnana and prajna?

S: Er, that's quite difficult to say.

Very broadly speaking they have the same meaning, but very broadly speaking indeed.

Nonetheless they are distinguished, ha, er, though it isn't very easy to, er, point out exactly how they are distinguished; it varies according to the context. For instance, if there is an enumeration of six paramitas, then prajna stands for wisdom, or knowledge, in its fullness. But if ten paramitas are enumerated, then prajna is only the sixth out of ten, and jnana is the tenth and last of the series. So in as much as it's in a sense a progressive series, jnana must represent a higher development, as it were, of wisdom than wisdom itself. Prajna then comes to mean something more like wisdom in the Hinayanic sense, and jnana is then wisdom in the full Mahayanic sense, ha.

Prajna is more like that faculty which actually penetrates to reality. Jnana is more like, er, different aspects of reality itself.

So you've got the five jnanas which are, as Guenther translates, five awarenesses, which are five different aspects of the enlightenment experience, one could say.

Whereas prajna is more like that faculty of wisdom which penetrates to the enlightenment experience, and by virtue of which one gains, as it were, the enlightenment experience.

Prajna is that which knows sunyata, knows reality. Jnana represents the different aspects of that knowing, or of that known reality, or that reality which is known, or that reality which is knowing.

But quite often the two are used more or less interchangeably. You could say perhaps, very very broadly, there must be a number of exceptions to this, that prajna represents a faculty, and jnana represents a state. But don't take that too literally.

(Pause.)

The root after all is the same, er, jnana and prajna; it's the word jna, to know; pra, meaning, is a prefix meaning, exceedingly.

All right, let's go on with the verse then.

Abhaya: From the bottom of my heart, I fold my hands devotedly

To the invincible Lord, Buddha's representative, Known as Maitreyanatha in all the three times Because he showers his love on all beings.

- 21 - 117~

S: Let's read the note on Maitreyanatha.

Abhaya: Maitreyanatha (he whose master is Maitreya): In the Western world, more commonly known as Asanga. Asanga styled himself Maitreyanatha in order to show his respect to his teacher Maitreya. Maitreya who at one time was the teacher of Asanga, became identified with the future Buddha bearing the same name.

S: Er, that's Guenther's view. He presents it as though it was, well, just the facts, ha, but actually it's quite controversial, and not everybody would agree with him, ha, certainly not the Tibetan tradition. Anyway we need not bother about that. He salutes Asanga, yeah, (pause), or he salutes Maitreyanatha whoever is regarded as the founder of the Yogacara tradition.

Robert Gerke: I bow to the most supreme leaders from among the

Six Ornaments of India renowned as the Great Charioteers Who having been predicted by the Buddha himself Illumined the auspicious Buddha Teachings, profound and

vast.

S: So these Six Ornaments of India, (this is a very well known set, often represented in Indian thangkas in pairs) are:-

Nagarjuna and Aryadeva;

Asanga and Vasubandhu;

and Dignana and Dharmakirti.

Nagarjuna and Aryadeva are, of course, great teachers of the Madhyamika tradition; Asanga and Vasubandhu of the Yogacara tradition; and Dignana and Dharmakirti of the

tradition of er, Buddhist lo~ic, Indian Buddhist logic, which grew out of the Yogacara school.

You notice that Asanga is, er, included among the Six Ornaments, whereas according to Guenther he has already been saluted as ~ff5itreyanatha in the previous verse. This suggests of course that the author of the verse doesn't regard Maitreyanatha as being Asanga, as Guenther believes, but as being the same person as either Naitreya the human teacher, or as Naitreya the bodllisattva - but distinct from Asanga in any case, ha. (Pause.)

So I bow to the most supreme leaders

from among the Six Ornaments of India, renowned as the Great ~harioteer~.

- 22 - 118

Sa~aramati: Could you, um, say somethin~ about, I mean, to look at these people, you've got Dignana and Dharmakirti, and even Nagarj~una and Aryadeva, I mean, they were all very much into logic and they all wrote treatises on logic and thin~~ like that. Why is it that this seems to be so important to them in India?

S: Ah! Yes, this goes back to the bodhisattva ideal. They believed that the bodhisattva, er, should be able to teach and convert all beings, ha, that is to say he had to, er, rid them of their wrong views to begin with, ha, so they believed that, er in order to do this, or in order to be able to do this, one has to be well versed in logic and rhetoric.

In this way they took up these subjects very rigorously, and great public debates were staged. It does seem that the Indians of all schools, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist, during what we may call the Indian middle ages, were very much into this sort of thing. The approach was highly intellectual; there's an incredible degree of intellectual sophistication, such as you meet with elsewhere in the world only, I think, during the scholastic period of mediaeval philosophy in Europe; that is the only comparable development. And I think the Indian thinkers were much more rigorous, much more exacting, much more sophisticated even II?: th~n the mediaeval schoolmen who were pretty well developed in that sort of way.

So in that sort of intellectual-cum-spiritual milieu a command of logic became of the utmost Thiport~nce. So great importanc~ was attacHed to it; but in the end, of course, it seems to become somewhat of an end in itself, and a reaction eventually set in. That reaction one finds represented to some extent by the whole Vajrayana movement. They stressed again and again, more and more, er, a return to direct spiritual experience; a return to nieditation; and they rather scoffed at things like logic.

Rut for hundreds and hundreds of years, the Indian spiritual, or rather intellectual-cum-spiritual,scene was dominated by these sort of con~iderations, these sort of

topics, these sort of discussions, these sort of arguments, these sort of debates. -- There are some works that give one a very very vivid picture of all this, for instance Satkaryā Yooker's The Buddhist Philosophy of Universal Flux, ha. That gives one a very good idea of the debate, er, in matters, er, not so much of metaphysics, but, er, epistemology and logic as between the different Buddhist thinkers and the different Hindu thinkers; as he said, it was a ding-dong battle that went on for upwards of a thousand years, and ended only with the disappearance of Buddhism itself from the soil of India.

- 23 - 119 S(continued): Of course the debate, in a sense, was continued in Tibet, but the Tibetans were debating with opponents whom they never met, or whom they met only in the pages of books.' But right down into the last century, Tibetan Buddhist teachers writing their encyclopaedic textbooks were still busily refuting the views of mediaeval Hindu and even Buddhist thinkers of other schools.

Voice: Why did they do that? Was it the same as bodhisattva

S: Well, to maintain, the you know, the er, the teaching in its full rigour and perfection; not to let any, you know, wrong view, ha, pass uncorrected. -Even a thousand years later!

But how many people there will be to follow this sort of path, or how many people there will be to derive real spiritual benefit and inspiration from it, is entirely another matter. If one is interested in the, as it were, inverted commas, "intellectual" approach to spiritual things, one couldn't do better than to study the mediaeval er, Indian Buddhist thinkers and their Tibetan disciples and successors. If one wants an intellectual approach, or one is inclined towards the intellectual approach, at least do it properly! Don't mess about with Dr. Suzuki and people like that, you know, get into Nagarjuna and Aryadeva, hum, 118, and Santideva and people of that kind. Asanga and Vasubandhu and so on, ha.

Mark Barrett: You said yesterday, I think it was yesterday, um, that there wasn't really very much point, you know, in getting into things like Buddhist logic and things like that.

S: That means, not if one is going to treat it as an end in itself.

Mark Barrett: Ah, I see.

S: But, as I say, if you are inclined to the intellectual approach, - and it is an approach, we

mustn't forget that, - if you are inclined to the intellectual approach, do it properly, and go deeply into the works of these great Puddhist thinkers, who definitely had an overall spiritual orientation of a very powerful kind. You feel it throughout the writings of Nagarjuna and Asanga and people of this sort, whatever might h~e' happened a few centuries later, you know, among the disciples of their disciples. I mean Nagarjuna and Asanga and Vasubandhu were people who, whose concern really was a spiritual concern, for want of a better term. ~o ~f one has a natural inclination to, towards an intellectual approach, at least go to them. (Pause.)

120 - 24 -

S(continued): There are now available in English two translations of ~agarjuna's Mula-Madhyamika Warikas, so that is the main work, it's the basic work, the fundamental work, of the whole Madhyamika tradition; one has got that, and then on the practical side one has got, er, Santideva, Bodhicaryavat~ra; - take these two together, you can't go far wrong, ha. Pnd then for a more general survey of the Mahayana by, again, Naga~rjuna, one Thaq got the Rstnavali, that we went through on the last study retreat, ha.

~anjuvajra: What were those, what was the first one again?

S: The Mula-Madhyamika Karikas, or simply ~adhyamika Karikas, on the ~mean~, eh. Mula means 'fundamental', ha.

]bhaya: Mula-Maga

S: Madhyamika, M,,A,D,H,Y,A,M,I,K,A.

Fadmavajra: Karikas.

S: K,A,R,I,K,A, meaning ~er~e5~, ha.

Sagaramati: The Golden Zephyr, that's a translation. lif,

S: Right, yeah, that is a translation of the Suhrillekha, er, 'the friendly epistle' of Nagarjuna, which again, is general Buddhist advice directed to a layman, ha.

Kamalasila: Who's translated that?

3: There's a translation by an American scholar, and another by a Japanese scholar, I have both of these upstairs.

Sagaramati: Isn't there one by Stcherbatsky in The Central Conception of Buddhism ?

S: That's only two chapters, though.

Padmavajra: Is there one by an Indian scholar?

S: I've not seen that. (Pause.)

There are editions of the Sanskrit text, I know.

Voice: By Davidson, (I'm sure).  
121

S: So I bow to the most supreme leaders from among the Six Ornament~ of India ha. The Six Ornaments are Nagarjuna, Aryadeva, Asanga, Vasubandhu, Dignaga and Dbarmakirti; and among them, two are pre-eminent, two are the supreme leaders, that is to say, Nagarjuna and Asanga, the actual founders of the two main lines of Thdian Buddhist thought.

Renowne'd~as 'the Great Charioteers, er, 'Charioteer' of course is er, the title of the Btidd}ia himself. (Mumbles) Sattha, deva, manu.... -Purissa~Dharnrna-sarati-, the sarati, the charioteer, of men who are ready to be tamed.

Who has been predicted by the Buddha himself, followers of the Mahayana especially in Tibet believe that certain Sutras contain predictions, here, of the coming, of Nagarjuna and Asanga. For instance, towards the end of the Lankavatara Sutra there is, here, a verse. I think it's in the, here, Sagathakam section, which is interpreted as predicting Nagarjuna - it doesn't use the word Nagarjuna, I think the name used is Nagavahua(?) or Nagavyuha(?) - this is taken as referring to Nagarjuna. Where the prediction about Asanga comes, I don't know.

But anyway, the author says, Who, having been predicted by the Buddha himself, Illumined the auspicious Buddha Teachings, profound and vast. So that was their function, to illumine the Buddha's teachings, to throw light upon them, to clarify them. (Pause.)

All right, carry on then.

Dharmapala: I bow to Jamgon lama worthy of praise

Like the Buddha-sun to unfold again and let bloom forth The forest of Sutras, Tantras, and commentaries, Like the thousand-petalled lotus, in this country Surrounded by snow-capped mountains.

S: So, I bow to Jamgon Lama, - that is to say, to Tsong-kha-pa, the founder of the Gelugpa tradition. Jamgon, I think, means Nanjunatha, here, because he is regarded as an embodiment of, Manjughosa or Yajusri.

So, I bow to Jamgon Lama worthy of praise, Like the Buddha-sun to unfold again and let bloom forth The forest of Sutras, Tantras, and commentaries. Tsong-kha-pa was a very prolific writer, who wrote a very great deal to explain and clarify the teachings of the Sutras and Tantras and Indian commentaries.

Like the thousand-petalled lotus, in this country Surrounded by snow-capped mountains. He did, of course, his work in Tibet, he never

- 26 - 122

S(continued): visited India. So he salutes Tsong-kha-pa. (Pause.) Carry on, here.

Nanjuvajra: Is the Gelugpa a kind of synthesis of the Yogacara and the Madhyamika?

S: Yes; broadly speaking one can say that in Tibet the two main Indian Buddhist

?philosophical -inverted commas- traditions have been combined.

Though one must also say that the Gelugpas are more influenced by the Madhyamika tradition, and tend to regard the Yogacara tradition as, in a sense, as a slightly lower truth, as sort of introductory to the full truth, as exhibited in the Madhyamika system.

My own impression is, and this is only an impression, that the Nyinginapas are more closely connected with the Yogacara and give more weight, as it were, to that. I put this point to some of my own Nyinginapa teachers and friends, er, they were interested, you know, by what I said, but weren't sure whether they agreed with it, but this is certainly the impression that I got, that they attach more weight to the Yogacara tradition, which is perhaps more what one might have expected, ha, in view of the fact that they seem, at least, to give more weight to

meditation and actual experience, whereas the Gelugpas, though in principle give great weight to meditational experience, seem actually more concerned with, with what we would call philosophy, epistemology, logic, - in fact the, you know, the Indian-type intellectual spiritual tradition, as represented especially by the Madhyamika.

Padmapani: Do you find, most of the, er, em, say the Tibetan Geshe, do they come from the Gelugpa school?

S: They do, they do. Don't forget that the Gelugpas are in the majority anyway.

Voice: Ah.

S: The Gelugpas are ninety per cent.

Padmapani: Really'.

S: And the Nyinginapas twenty, er, ten per cent, this is what I've been told. The Madhyamika and Yogacara traditions do not continue in Tibet as independent schools, ha, yeah, you know the, er, the lamas of all schools study er both works, they study Madhyamika works, they study Yogacara works. They value them both, but the Gelugpas definitely tend

S(continued): to place more emphasis on the Madhyamika teaching, hum, and my impression is that the Nyingmapas, er, correspondingly place more emphasis on the Yogacara teachings. But neither exists as a separate independent school. Followers of the Gelugpa school study both Madhyamika and Yogacara texts. Followers of the Nyingmapa tradition study, again, both Madhyamika and Yogacara texts; so do the Sakyapas, and so do the Kagyupas when they get around to P~ny study at all, usually they~re too busy meditating.

Padmapani: What the Sakyapas and the

S: No the Ka~yupas only T said, the Sakyapas are very studious, ha.

Padmapani: Em, you said the Gelugpas represent ninety per cent and the Nyingmapas ten per cent, er did you, you weren't referring to the Sakyapas or the

S: Er, no, er, they, er, I'm leaving them out of consideration: there's even fewer of them.

Padmapani: I mean could you tell us, Pbante, what percentage in the sense 122.

S: ~o, I just couldn't; and now the whole balance has been upset.

But the Gelugpas are very much in the majority, er, and maybe all the others put together, would be a quarter and the Gelugpas would be three quarters, one could say, yeah. The Gelugpa is definitely the dominant tradition, or was.

But on the other hand, it's interesting that their presence in the west doesn't reflect that, the Nyingmapas seem to be much more active, the Kagyupas too, ha. I noticed this even in my own very e~rly days, you know, not very early days, but, er, when I was in India and it was, er, shortly after the exodus of the Tibetan lamas from Tibet as refugees, ha.

Er, the Nyingmapas had much more freedom of action because they weren't, as it were, the established tradition~

The Gelugpas were the established tradition, they had virtually the responsibility for the government. The Dalai Lama was a Gelugpa, the Panchen Lama was a Gelugpa, the three great monasteries near Lhasa with great political influence, they were Gelugpa, hum, so the Gelugpas were very much tied up with the, you know, the political and economic set-up of the

country and so on. So, that meant that the Gelugpas

- 28 - 124

S(continued): had a much closer tie with the administration, the administration with the Gelugpas, and very often Gelugpa lamas couldn't do anything without the permission from Thasa, from the government, from the Dalai Lama, whereas the Nyingmapas either didn't require that permission, or didn't bother to ask for it, therefore they had much more freedom of action, that was very clear already, within a year or two of their all coming out of Tibet.

I remember one occasion, when I persuaded, or rather a friend of mine, er, a Tibetan incarnate lama and I persuaded fourteen incarnate

lamas in Kalimpong, all of the Gelugpa, to get together and form a sort of committee, to consider what was to be done for Buddhism in the area. At that time there were no Nyingmapa lamas around. So they got them all together, they had a meeting, - no sooner had they had a meeting, within a matter of days, an emissary came from Dalhousie from the Dalai Lama's government, er, sent by the government, and took them very severely to task for even holding the meeting without permission. So all their efforts were par..  
..(unclear)...4apparently they never held another meeting, so nothing was done for Buddhism in Kalimpong by them in that sort of organised way. They were threatened with the Dalai Lama's displeasure for venturing to hold that meeting without permission from headquarters I-3. from the government, yeah, er. The Dalai Lama

Voice: You were following the Nyingmapa tradition.

S: So the Dalai Lama may not even have known about that emissary coming, they may not even have told him, because he didn't know everything that was going on or everything that was done in his name.

But the up-shot of it was, and this was very clear to me even then, that the Nyingmapas, being the non-established tradition, had far greater freedom of action and did practically as they pleased. They didn't take any notice of the government. And many of them in any case came from eastern Tibet where the governmental control of Thasa, the capital, was very loose, and sometimes not taken very seriously.

There were also the local Nyingmapa centres and monasteries that had their own powers, their own influence, their own prestige. There were quite a number of petty kingdoms in the area with a sort of semi-independence, and therefore they didn't take much notice sometimes of orders that came from Thasa, - that was their sort of natural tendency anyway, (laughter) so if they wanted to set up a centre or build a temple

- 29 - 125

S(continued): or establish a monastery in India or overseas, they never bothered to ask permission from the Dalai Lama's government, whereas the Gelugpa lamas could hardly stir a step without permission. In fact there were some representatives of the Dalai Lama's government in Kalimpong whose main task seemed to be to stop people doing anything without permission. It was really terrible'. There was one or two who were notorious for this, so Dharma Rimpoche and I used to have a little joke, that, about one of these gentlemen, that he was so zealous and so keen not to do anything without permission that ~~~d send off a telegram to Thasa asking for permission every time he wanted to go to the toilet. (laughter.) It was almost as bad as that, but the result was, nothing was done, which was a great shame, you see. (Laughter.)

Manjuvajra: Could you say something about the other, the two little traditions, the Sakyapas and the

S: Well, the Sakyapas go back er, to (?)Kon-sho-kon, who was not the founder but the, er, blt the virtual founder of that particular tradition. They've always been famous for scholarship and Tantric studies, ha. It was they who were responsible for the compilation of the Tibetan canon which is of course used by all schools.

And then the Kagyupas are the great meditators and yogis. They go back to Milarepa and to Marpa, and of course they're not very much into study but more into meditation. But the distinctive Kagyupa meditation practices seem to have died out and most Kagyupa lamas nowadays er, study and practise the Nyingmapa teaching~, and are virtually indistinguishable from Nyingmapa lamas.

Asyajit: What characterises the original Kagyupa meditation practices?

S: The Six Dharmas of Naropa and the ~ahamudra teachings; whereas the Nyingmapa stresses a slightly different tradition, they stress the Ati- Yoga tradition,-that is their highest teaching,- which corresponds to the Mahamudra, but there is some difference.

Padmapani: Did you have quite a lot of contact with one or two Sakyapas, Bhante? Because I get from

S: Strictly speaking, 'Jam-dbyans mKhyen-brTse Rinpoche was a Sakyapa, though completely imbued with Nyingmapa teachings, and having a very sort of catholic outlook, but he was the abbot of a Sakyapa monastery, though

- 30 - ° 126

S(continued): as it were, mainly in the Nyingmapa lineage, but he combined many lineages. He'd studied with teachers of many different schools, and was a proponent of the non-sectarian approach anyway.

Manjuvajra: It seems to me a strange combination of scholarship and Tantric studies.

S: This was very characteristic of a certain phase of Indian Buddhism; and of course is very characteristic of Tibetan Buddhism generally. You very often had, you know, Buddhist monks devoting many years' to intense study and scholarship, ha, getting very deeply into the Abhidharma and logic and then going off and becoming wandering yogis and practicing Tantric disciplines; that was a quite common sort of pattern.

Y~nguvajra: Would the, no, I was going to say, would the latter be a sort of reaction against the former

S: No, I think that is looking at it as it were too psychologically, yeah. Anyway, let's go on and finish the Verses of Veneration and

Intention. (Pause.)

Who's next? I~5.

Voice: Dharmapala. Other Voices: No, it's....Nanjuvajra.

Manjuvajra: May the light of the sun-like reverend Guru Reside forever in the petal of the lotus-like heart Brightening the mental eye

That views the auspicious path

By merely seeing a ray of his charismatic activity.

S: Carry straight on.

~anjuvajra: Even if others do not benefit from talk by people like me,

I am dealing here with the mind and mental events because I have been urged by others and because I want to increase the training of my own mind.

S: So he says, Even if others do not benefit from talk by people like me, I am dealing here with the mind and mental events. Then he gives the reason for his writing the text: Because I have been urged by others -possibly his own disciples or friends- and because I want to increase the training of my own mind.

As I've said on other occasions, teaching is the best method of learning. You clarify things for yourself because you have to explain

- 31 - 127

S(continued): them to others, or if you have to write them out for the benefit of others.

Padmavajra: I find that very much with giving talk.

S: Mmm. (Pause.)

Right, any general points arising out of those verses?

Padmavajra: Is this the standard thing before, you know, a religious, not religious, a Buddhist, text, you know, these Verses of Veneration.

S: It is on the whole; not all the Indian works have them, but the Tibetan works usually do have them.

Padmavajra: It's usually quite beautiful and delightful to read.

S: Yes. (Pause.) Usually quite poetic.

NEXT DAY

S: All right, let's start off on the Introduction to Mind and Mental Events.

Vimalarnitra: Those intelligent people who are not content with merely acquiring food and clothing as long as they exist in this world, but take into account a future life by thinking what might become of them in the next world, should consider what is the root of their experiencing uninterrupted frustration by being driven around helplessly in samsara extending over the three world spheres since beginningless time. Considering the matter in this way, they should realize that the frustration of this world does not come without having a cause or from having a cause that is not appropriate to it, but that it comes from its inherent cause which is man's own actions (karma) and the emotions. Nagarjuna states,

As long as there is the belief in the skandhas, There will come from them a belief in a self. When there is a belief in an ego, then there is karma. From this, there will come (re)birth.

- 32 - ~28

S: Let's just go into one or two points here, ha.

Take into account a future life by thinking what might become of them in the next world, ha, hum, er. Nagarjuna is saying, as it were, that there are two kinds of people, ha.

Those who think only of this world and this life, ha, and are content with merely acquiring food and clothing, ha, er, concerned with acquiring material things, in this life itself, concerned with er, worldly success, worldly achievements, worldly accomplishments, ha, and on the other hand those people who take into account a future life, ha, er, who think, who wonder, what might happen to them, er, in the next life in the next world, ha, after death

when they are reborn, ha, and who therefore, he suggests start thinking in ethical and spiritual terms.

So clearly the author is treating this, this fact of the consideration of another world, another life, as the mainspring, the motivation, for the leading of the religious or spiritual life, and no doubt that is true, er, you know, for Tibet. No doubt that is true for traditional Buddhism, ha.

But to what extent is this true for us today, ha? I mean do we think in these terms, ha? We may perhaps even believe in a future world, but does that supply the sort of mainspring, as it were, of our spiritual life and spiritual activities? Is it on account of that consideration that we do devote ourselves to the spiritual life and try to follow the path?

Asvajit: That may be the reason in some cases but I think, er, most of us, I'm speaking for myself anyway, it's simple enjoyment and participation in the spiritual life, without too much concern of where it's going to lead.

Voice: No, I don't agree at all.

Mark Arrett: I find I sort of see that sort of quite strongly, this idea of what happens in the next world, maybe not all the time, but that's a very strong thing, you know, to think, well, there's always that, you know, why waste your time in future.

Admavajra: There seem to be so many factors, particularly, er, I don't know, about the east, but particularly in the west, I mean, there are obviously people with this sort of intention. There's people who maybe have a sort of flash of something, and there's also people who seem to be

- 33 - 129

Fadmavajra (continued): motivated by their psychological problems to get into the spiritual life, so you know, it's not just, I mean, that particular line isn't specifically true for us I don't think.

S: Well, not so much, not specifically true, not relevant, for so many people, yeah!

~ark Barrett: But surely that must become more relevant for people in the west.

S: Oh yes!

~ark Earrett: ~ people with less and less sort of psychological hang-ups start getting involved in Buddhism.

S: t~ll, as people become convinced of the truth of karma and rebirth; hut if they're not convinced of the truth of karma and rebirth, you know, supposing they don't even know about those teachings, and don't accept those teachings, er, well, consideration of what might happen to them in a future life will not be the reason for why they come into the s~iritual life, or say, become interested in Buddhism, yeah, hum. !~s.

Dharmapala: I think many people now are, sort of, getting a view of the material sort of life and seeing, you know, that perhaps it w~n't make them happy, it isn't very good, they're looking for something more.

S: Also perhaps one can say that people can see

130

S.. why they come into the spiritual life, or, say , become interested in Buddhism.

Dipankara; I think people now are sort of getting a view of the material sort of life and seeing that perhaps it won't amke them happy; it isn't very good; they are looking for something else.

S: Also perhaps one can say that people can see now things happening much more quickly; that you can see the results of karma in this life itself. One can see, you know, quite painful and unpleasant things coming if one acts in a certain way. It seems as though the whole

process has been sort of speeded up, so that therefore people can.. well, while accepting the same general principle, see and accept its operations within a much narrower context and much more limited time scale of the present life itself. Like, for instance, I mean quite a number of people have been galvanised into action thinking of what will happen to the world, what will happen to the human race, if we misuse the atomic bomb, if we misuse atomic power, atomic energy, so this is becoming, you know, in a way quite an urgent question - so urgent that we need not look beyond the present life; you know, many people feel like this; that we've got to do something in this life, otherwise something terrible will happen in this life, I mean, not to speak of other lives, other worlds, future lives, future worlds. But the author of this text seems to be addressing people who are already convinced of the truth of karma and rebirth; who do believe that there is a future life after death, in fact, a whole chain, a whole series, of lives stretching ahead of them, and who are open to that sort of argument - that if you devote yourself only (to) material things in this life, well, what's going to happen to you in your next life? What will be your state then? Think about that! Therefore devote yourself to the religious life, to the spiritual life, so

that you may have a more satisfactory, a more happy, rebirth in the future, or even escape from rebirth altogether, you know, which would be the best.

Mark; I suppose that the attitude of looking at the consequence of things in this life must be about the only other way that you could look at it if you don't accept, you know, another life and future lives. I was quite surprised when this came up the other day round Pundarika, how few people actually take in other lives into consideration. I couldn't really understand it.

S: There is also the point that there can be a positive motivation. If one thinks

in terms of karma and rebirth, and if one thinks of the spiritual life within that particular framework, it's usually thinking in terms of something to escape from, whereas perhaps one can have a positive love for spiritual development itself, without any thought of what that spiritual development will enable you to escape from or to avoid in the future. So perhaps it is, for many people, just the appeal of something positive, here and now, and presumably in the future, regardless of the particular contingencies, unpleasant contingencies, that that may enable you to escape from in the future. It's more like the intrinsic appeal of the spiritual life itself, and following the spiritual path, rather than what that following of the spiritual path will enable you to escape from. I mean, some people, of course, do think in terms of escaping from problems here and now, not from consequences in the future, but they are a bit escape-oriented, but I am sure that there are some who are just attracted by the prospect of developing!

Manjuvajra; I think also people become dissatisfied with the life that the world as they find it, and they look for a kind of transformation, really; the 'other world', the world of the future, is really a transformation of this particular world. Is that a way one could look at karma and rebirth? In terms of just transforming the world that you are in now?

S: Well it does represent, hopefully, a better world than the one you are in now, a better world into which you can be reborn, and in which you can live more happily than you live in this one, but essentially a world of the same kind. It's the same pattern repeated, but in somewhat brighter colours, that's all. This is what Buddhism says.

Sagaramati; I imagine anybody who ever sort of sits back and actually thinks - they must think, you know, as it were, 'well what happens, is this the only life?'. I mean this is bound to crop up.

Asvajit; It seems to me the question only arises if you are in contact with spiritual teachers or with a spiritual group, and then, if you are in touch with this teaching of that kind, with a tradition of that kind, the positive aspect of it becomes equally important, and even more important, than the negative side, which is escaping from because you've arrived.

Sagaramati; I wasn't ..I mean I'm not thinking about escaping from anything, you know, I'm just saying that anybody who sort of thinks that there is only one life, who isn't sort of (fogged ) by the fact that 'there must be something else', with- out thinking of 'this is bad and I've got to escape from it'. They must have taken

132

that into consideration.

S: But do people think very much in these terms nowadays? I get the impression that younger people don't.

Sagaramati; I think they do.

S: You do.

Padmavajra; I do.

S: You do.

Manjuvajra; I never have done. In fact I find the idea of rebirth almost embarrassing.  
(laughter)

Sagaramati; I find it much more adventurous.

Padmavajra; Yes it seems really.

S: I must say, in my younger days I didn't have any problem or difficulty with it. As soon as I encountered it I accepted it and, as it were, took it for granted ever since. And I can't say that I've thought about it very hard or deeply; I must admit that. It seems more or less self-evident.

Kamalasila; That's the trouble.

S: But it make it more difficult trying to impart it to other people.

Mark; It's a case of temperament, I suppose. Some people just can grasp something like that and just see it as obvious, and other people aren't of the sort of temperament to...

S: I don't think it's just a question of tempera ment though.

Mark; I noticed that people who didn't seem to like the idea of karma very much and rebirth, saying, 'well you are just accepting it on blind faith.' you know and this sort of thing. 'You've got no real grounds for belief in it.' Things like that. Whereas, it is not that at all, it just seems so obvious and reasonable.

s; Yes right.

S: Because I mean there are , as I've said I think in other occasions;

there are basically only three views possible. First of all, that you existed in the.. .well you exist in the present; you know that, at least; and that you will exist in the future, but that you did not exist in the past. This is one view possible. It is the christian view, you could say. There is this life, and then there is life after death, in heaven or elsewhere, but not again on earth, and you did not exist before your present birth. So that's one view; that there's life and a future life. The other view of course is that there is a past life and a present life and a future life - that's the idea of rebirth. And then the idea that there's only this one life. Theoretically there should be the possibility of believing that there's this life and only the previous life, and not the future life, but actually we never encounter, to the best of my knowledge, anyone actually believing that. So logically there are these four possibilities, but actually, as believed by people, there are only these three.

Vimalamitra; Sorry what was (4) again?

S: That one existed before one's present birth and one exists, of course, in this present life, but does not exist after death.

Sagaramati; Don't you get that with the Jains, when they are on their last life? They believe that in the last life they should be an ascetic, and then after that there is no more life for them.

A: Ah but they gain enlightenment, just as in the case of the Buddhist, once you've exhausted karmas and klesas there is no more rebirth, yes?

Mark; Perhaps people just can't see that this is something which a past life could lead up to. And even if they don't accept anything to do with rebirth, especially..

S:So there are these three practical possibilities, virtually; these three philosophies of life, as it were, between which you have to make up your mind. And you can look at them in various ways, and you have to accept whichever seems most convincing to you. Not that any one view is altogether free from difficulties. It's a question of making up your mind which, on the whole, is most reasonable and fits in best with the facts as you have encountered them so far. So I personally have come to the conclusion that karma and rebirth does fit in best. But there is one particular consideration that I think also can be looked at, and that is something that happens as you get older. It's something I think that you can't appreciate very much when you are young, unless you are maybe quite exceptional, but,, as you get older, you start seeing that your whole life has had, in fact, certain very definite direction, a certain very definite

tendency or trend, and

134

you cannot account for that tendency or trend by any of the facts or circumstances within this present life itself. It does seem very definitely that the origin of that trend or tendency is anterior to this life itself, and you start feeling that very strongly. And then, of course, you start feeling quite strongly that it could very well continue after your death, and you actually feel this, it is not anything you've thought out intellectually; it's a very definite feeling that you get, I mean, as you begin to see more and more clearly, you know, what is the trend or tendency of your whole life. You see it, as it were, emerging through birth, as originating on the other side of birth, and continuing, as far as one can see, on the other side of death.

Rob; How about for a more ordinary man, though, than yourself?

S: Well I think most people could see this, or could see a definite trend or tendency, as they get older, if they started looking. Well I naturally sort of look, because that is my nature, to look and try to see and try to understand; but I think everybody could see something of that sort. You see that from when you were very young, you know, certain very definite trends or tendency or urge, sense of direction, which is not explicable in the light of the circumstances under which, or within which, you were born and lived and so on; that seems to transcend that framework, or to overlap that framework. So to me, as I get personally older, this seems more and more convincing - that you emerged from the other side of birth and you will project yourself, as it were, beyond death.

Padmapani; Do you think it happens sometimes, as people get older, that their memories of when they were young have become more vivid. I personally remember this, myself - I remember when I was very young standing out in a garden looking up at the sky at night and thinking, 'well I don't in actual fact belong here.' I remember I was looking up at the stars and saying, 'well no I feel more an affinity with that.' And I was wondering if people when they are old then get back to.. they have these very vivid memories of when they were young, and it can happen the other way, can't it? The very young, when you were very young you remember in actual fact something.

S: I think this is very true. I mean, quite apart from the question of actually remembering when you are very young, remembering previous lives. Apart from that, I think when you are very young you do very often have experiences or feelings which somehow don't belong to this world, which seem to belong elsewhere, or which seem to indicate that you, perhaps belong elsewhere. I think that when you are very

135

young, these sort of experiences and these sort of feelings can be quite important for you, but they are gradually obscured and overlaid by other, for want of a better term, worldly experiences as you get older, but I think it does, sometimes, maybe quite often, happen that as you get older you, in an odd sort of way, start coming back to those earlier experiences and feelings. I wouldn't personally say that it is a question of one's memories of one's earlier days becoming more vivid again - I don't personally find that - but as though, having spent so many years, or even over so many decades, in a worldly sort of way, you get really tired of that and you start harking back to your true origins and what you really are like. It seems more like that. You try to sort of find your way, or feel your way, back to that earlier, that truer, more innocent sort of experience and feeling that you did have when you were young. I think this is what sometimes happens, or even quite often happens. Quite a few people have said this to me recently, in the course of the last few months, that, they've said, 'When I was young I really did know what it was all about. But then I forgot. I really did know, when I was young, but I got misled, it all got overlaid; I got out of contact with my true self, as it were, my true feelings.' Not just in an ordinary, worldly, psychological, psychotherapeutic sort of way, but in a definitely quite spiritual way. That it was something spiritual that they did experience then, and with which they lost contact. But some of them say, 'Well I saw it all quite clearly then; I knew what it was all about. I knew what I ought to do, but it all got overlaid, it all got lost, you know in the midst of the confusion of the world and the whole troublesome business of growing up.' People seemed to suggest that this was when they were about 12, 13, 14, this sort of age - Maybe 15, 16, but not later than that. And that in later life one just had to, in a way, get back to that, to recapture something of that original vision; and take that, after loss of so many years, or lapse of so many years at least, as one's starting point. (pause) I myself have been a bit surprised recently, looking back over some old writings and finding that I sort of quite clearly stated there things that I thought I'd thought of fifteen or so years later, but no. It was all there in those early lecture notes quite clearly. And I was quite surprised once or twice in this sort of way. It's as though one really does know it all at the beginning.

Vimalamitra: Is it, in a way, that you are more in touch with it when you're in childhood, and as you are older you approach it - well, I won't say intellectually - but in a less direct way?

S: It's as though - and I'm only saying 'as though' - when you are young; pre- adolescent or early adolescent; you are in touch with some thing which you have, as it were, brought over from a previous life or previous existence. You weren't aware of it as a small child, but as you grew up, became sort of twelve, thirteen, fourteen, and not yet involved with the world and worldly responsibilities, you were old enough to sort of, as it were, recall and experience and feel what you'd carried over, but not so old that you'd lost it in the midst of the confusion of the world. That's what it seems like to me. I tend to look at it as something very much that you've carried over from... the fruits~of your experience in a previous life, or in a series of previous lives.

Sagaramati; That is what Plato seems to say in (Phaedrus?), that it's knowledge by remembrance.

S: But not that there's this sort of primaeval innocence of the child, and the baby is in touch with the absolute. No. That is all, I think, sentimental non- sense. But once you've grown up and once you've started really thinking and feeling and once you've sort of developed to some extent as an individual again, it's as though something of that old experience comes back to you in consciousness, and you are still young enough not to be involved with the world and its the involvement with the world that causes other thoughts and other feelings to arise which eventually become so dense, so complex, that one's earlier, more innocent feelings and experiences are completely overlaid. But I think in middle age you tend -to get back to them, because you haven't found your adult life all that satisfactory, and you tend to recall these earlier states and earlier experiences; not of infancy, in the Wordsworthian sort of way - pseudo-Wordsworthian sort of way - but of late childhood and early adolescence; or even of adolescence itself. In the case of some people, adolescence lasts comparatively a long time. And you get a few people who carry their adolescence, luckily, right up into their twenties.

Manjuvajra; Luckily?

S: Luckily. In a positive sort of way, you know; not in a silly immature way; but in a positive sort of way. They don't lose contact with those sort of feelings and experiences. Very, very few people never lose contact all through their life, for instance like Blake. One gets that impression reading the life of Blake -he

never lost contact; he never grew up, in a sense, though he was a very mature person; but in that sort of way, he never became corrupted with the 'dirty devices of this world' in Traherne's phrase.

So that's one of the reasons why I say we must be quite careful with these innocent people who come along, and not say, 'Oh no, you've got to be corrupted; you've got to really get to know these dirty devices of this world. You've got to really get into them. This is all part of your development.' One really shouldn't say these things. This is absolutely micchaditthi. Let them keep their innocence, but you know, deepen it and let it be a mature innocence but not lose it.

Manjuvajra; Would you say that if one had considered those four possible views of life and had decided on, say, the present life only - would this produce difficulties as far as one's spiritual life was concerned?

S: Well not if one had another motivation for leading the spiritual life. If one's conclusion was - 'Well there's no previous life, no future life, only got this life. Eat drink and be merry, tomorrow we die. Then annihilation.' If one looks at it like that well then there is no spiritual life possible. So then one has to fall back on other motivating factors; either that one has got problems that are bothering one and one comes to the conclusion that only through something like spiritual development that one can transcend one's problems of and in this life and be happy; or one just feels an innate urge to develop, an innate love of growth to higher and even higher levels.

Manjuvajra; Is it still possible as well to see a kind of karma acting in the... you know, your actions in this life are going to reverberate down through the ages. It may not be your actual individual person that reaps the rewards but other people will.

S: But again, for some people, this may work the other way round; that, 'Well I'm just only one person among millions. How does one even know there is going to be a world in the future. They'll probably all blow themselves up with the atom bomb. What does it matter. My tiny little contribution one way or the other - again I might just as well eat, drink and be

merry. Tomorrow they all die.' (laughter)

So I don't see any other motivation in the absence of belief in karma and rebirth, than a desire to transcend one's immediate painful condition- ing; experienced as problem, or an innate and irresistible love of self-development.

138

It must also be said that in the case of the Buddha's personal teaching, as far as we can make that out, there does not seem to have been that emphasis on karma and re- birth that we find in some cases later on, simply because apparently there was the Buddha, who had gained enlightenment in this life, and there around him were so many people who were eager to gain that enlightenment experience themselves in this life, as the~Buddha had done, so there was no thought of future lives, though the reference is there quite a bit to rebirth, but the main emphasis does not seem to have been there during the Buddha's lifetime at least so far as many of the disciples were concerned. So I think one can say that on the whole, the stronger the emphasis on gaining enlight- enment in this life, probably the less the emphasis on the teaching of karma and rebirth. Not always so. For instance, in the case of Milarepa, he decided he just had to gain enlightenment in this life, because he had committed such terrible sins that he would go to hell inevitably and probably remain there for aeons upon aeons. So if he want- ed o escape that terrible fate the only thing that he could do, the only place, as it were, where he'd be safe, was to gain enlightenment; to be there in enlightenment; because if he dies, he'd go straight to hell. So it was enlightenment or bust - enlightenment or hell.

Padmapani; He certainly didn't believe in the third view then - no life before-.,- no life after.

S: No he believed - well at least he believed in life after death.

Padmapani; Can you tell us a little bit about the christian view-no life before the present. I mean, is that held by all the christian schools?

S: Virtually all, as far as I recollect there were only one or two, one or two of the Greek fathers, who believed in some sort of pre-existence before physical birth. Generally as far as I remember - I don't know if Abhaya studied all this in his earlier days. There are two views;

one, that you inherited your soul from your parents, and that ultimately it came from Adam, so there was a sort of 'group soul' of which your individual soul was a part. Or that on the occasion of conception - according to some authorities though, on the fourth month.: after conception - God created out of nothing a new soul. These are the two views. There is a technical term for the first, I forget what that is... traductionism it is called - Traductionism, that your soul is traduced from Adam. That is the technical term as far as I can remember. Traductionism.

139

Abhaya; I never heard of that.

S: That is the view of Saint Augustine. And then there's this other view that God creates each soul out of nothing at the time, according to some, of conception; according to others, at the time when the child is quickened in the womb in the fourth month; but no pre-existence, except in the case of a few heretical teachers like Origen.

Padmapani; And after death, presumably it's either Heaven or Hell.

Abhaya; Or purgatory.

S: Or purgatory.

Padmapani; Ah in the Roman Catholic church.

S: There are several views. According to some schools. christian theologians, the soul, having been created by God, is created. immortal in the-: sense that it doesn't die. According to others it is created mortal and dies at the time of death, and remBins dead until, as it were, miraculously revived which according to some is shortly after death; according to others is at the time, only, of the last judgement. I believe the Seventh Day Adventists for instance, and

Jehovah's Witnesses, they believe that you are dead completely until you are resurrected at the time of the last judgement, and then finally judged.

Padmapani; Oh I see. So that, in a sense, everybody is dead but then some of them are resurrected.

S: Some are resurrected to eternal life, and others to eternal death. Though again, some of them - I think the Seventh Day Adventists - believe that if you are condemned you are thereupon annihilated; you are not sent to eternal punishment you are annihilated. I remember one of them telling me, explaining this point, that the Seventh Day Adventists teaching was more enlightened than that of the other christians, because the other christians believed that God punished you with eternal fire, whereas, he said, according to us God is much kinder than that; he annihilates you. (laughter) So that you don't suffer. But the general view throughout the christian (world?) has been in eternal fire and eternal punishment.

Padmapani; So what's the purgatory you were talking about?

~k~fq%Purgatory is when you die and you've committed a certain number of sins which your soul has to be cleansed

140

S; Venial sins.

Abhaya; Venial sins.. over a certain period of time, depending on the number and magnitude of the sins, so it could be in terms of time, hundreds of years, or just a few days. And then when your soul is cleansed

S: You can be helped by masses for the dead.

Padmapani; So, in other words, in the Roman catholic church eventually everybody gets to

?? No.

Abhaya;No. If you die ~n a state of mortal sin, you go straight to hell for ever and ever.

(Loud babble as everybody chips in)

S: And if you die in a state of grace, you go straight to heaven, but if you haven't committed any mortal sins which are unabsolved at the time of death - but you have committed some venial sins, then you go to purgatory where they are purified and when they have been purified, you are able to go to heaven. That seems quite rational in a way, once you admit heaven and hell.

Padmapani; Yes.

Rob; Quite reasonable.

Abhaya; And there's also a place called Limbo, where unchristened babies, who die before they are christened, they go.

Vimalamitra; Is that a permanent state?

Abhaya; Yes a permanent state. That used to really trouble me. . .I used to think of all these babies with permanent Limbo, cheated of, for ever, the possibility of heaven.

S: .. because without baptism, without reception into the church, then you can't go to heaven,

but they haven't committed any mortal sin; they've not had time, so they can't go to hell; they haven't committed any venial sin even, so

Sagaramati; They've got original sin, though.

S: They've only got original sin, which is not, as it were, personal sin. Manjuvajra; What's the difference between mortal and venial?

S: Well it's a degree of seriousness.

Abhaya; Well mortal sin - you go to hell for ever and ever; and venial sin - you can wash it away through. ...

S; Venial sin is telling a lie but mortal sin ( ) is something like that. Missing church - is that mortal or venial.

-- Abhaya; Well that used to be - I don't know if it still is - but missing mass on Sundays was a mortal sin, and if you died in a state of mortal sin

Padmapani; Really! It's really amazing!!

Sagaramati; Having sex and enjoying it - that's a mortal sin.

Vimalamitra; Yes that's right.

Padmapani; Having sex and enjoying it!!

Sagaramati; Well you have to do it for procreation.

Abhaya; No that's not true.

Sagaramati; (inaudible)

Abhaya; You can have sex and enjoy it in marriage.

S: Well what about the enjoyment of carnal exstasy - that is described as a sin.

Sagaramati; You are only meant to do it for the purpose of having babies.

S: Carnal ecstasy is of the devil, it is said.

Padmapani; I think it's probably a bit more liberal today.

Vimalamitra; You can enjoy it if you're married.

142

Abhaya; It wasn't as extreme as that in my day.

S: I think many priests have relaxed the requirements of the confessional, even though the official theology of the church has not actually been changed. Anyway it's not a very pleasant subject is it. (laughter)

Padmapani; I find it really interesting. Really weird. (laughter)

Padmavajra; I think it's odd.

Padmapani; I think it's odd to notice how one changes one's views in a sense. You know the conditioning drops away.

Padmavajra; I don't think that's views.

Padmapani; Well maybe it wasn't views but it was part of one's conditioning.

Padmavajra; That's not one's views though.

S: No.

Sagaramati; One's views are based on one's conditioning.

Padmapani; One's views are based on what

Kamalasila; They are affected.

Sagaramati; you think there's life after death, I mean, that's based on some conditioning.

Padmavajra; Yes.

Sagaramati; And that conditioning being christian might be. that view might be influenced by the fact that you were brought up a christian.

S: The fact that you are more willing to consider the possibility of life after death than death after death. Anyway where have we got?

Manjuvajra; It's made me quite shivery now.

Padmavajra; All those babies in limbo!

143

S: It's mainly a question of the motivation for the leading of the spiritual life. So the traditional motivation is the consideration of future lives in other worlds, the general consideration of karma and rebirth, so this still holds good for quite a number of people, even in the West, but for others a more effective consideration, a more effective motivation, may be a wish to transcend personal problems and frustrations, or simply an innate love of further psychological- spiritual development.

Manjuvajra; That does seem to me an important thing to bear in mind; in a way, the development of~popular inspiration to follow the spiritual life. You know in this world at the moment, or in western culture at the moment, there isn't so much of a popular idea that can be used to. ...

S: For instance I hear that certain.. the two young Tibetan lamas who are going round giving courses are really sort of hammering this.. I mean, of strongly ad- vocating and very strongly expounding karma and rebirth and the different hells and the different heavens and what will happen to you if you do this, and what will happen to you if you do that, and it seems to be having a definite appeal. I haven't gone into this very closely.

Padmapani; Which two lamas Bhante?

S: I forget their names, but they are two young Gelugpa lamas, and they've been in Australia and I believe they are in Britain and they are giving courses based on Tsong ka pa's Lam Rim and it's a completely uncompromisingly traditional approach, and a couple of our Friends, in fact Order members before they became Order members, went to the course and the camp in Australia and they said it was very strong stuff i~deed, with no sort of concession for western mentality, and they really did ram home the whole topic of karma and rebirth in violent and vivid detail. They; personally found it a sort of very powerful and even positive experience while they were there , and they said others likewise, but on reflection, they concluded that that approach was not for them. Not that they rejected any specific teaching, but the whole approach and, in a way, that rather strong laying down of traditional doctrine in a way that could only appear to them a trifle dogmatic; though they appreciated the lamas' zeal and enthusiasm and positivity; could not be very accept- able. This is the conclusion of two quite sort of thoughtful and non-reactive young Order members came to.

Padmapani; May I ask who they were?

S: One was Megha and one was Vijjaya. Both of them were about twenty at the time. So, if one, of course, is giving some account, a general account, of Buddhism as

144

traditionally handed down, of course one has to bring in karma and rebirth, and this is maybe where your embarrassment comes in, but if one is presenting the path simply as the path, well, one need not refer to karma and rebirth. 'Here is the path which can be practised, which can be followed here and now.' So for many people, that path will ahve an intrinsic appeal, quite apart from any question and any consider- ation of past or future lives. Others may possibly ask, 'Well why should we follow it? What would be the benefit of following? What's the reason for following it?' They may require some such explanation as this, in some cases, or they may respond positively to some such explanation, but if they don't, and if they have no problems, and if they've no innate love of spiritual development, then they'll just go away and they won't come back again. But again, on the other hand, we don't want to put off people who might have, say, an innate love of spiritual development by such a strong presentation of karma and rebirth that they're even put off the£idea of spiritual development thinking that it involves accepting something of this kind which they find, perhaps, quite unreal and quite meaningless, even quite unnecessary. So if they are happy just to follow the path, well let them be happy just to follow the path. If they do come to any deeper understanding or any enlighten- ment, presu- mably, if the Buddhist tradition does hold good,

then they'll come to see the truth of karma and rebirth. I think it also rather interesting that if you look at the whole history of Buddhist thought - all the little schools; all the different sects, there has been dispute and disagreement over practically every doctrine, but no master or teacher of any school, upon gaining enlightenment or claiming to gain enlightenment, has ever said that he has then seen that there's no such thing as karma and rebirth, except in the sense that time itself is not ultimately real. Worldly existence itself, in any world, is not ultimately real. But that, in a conventional sense at least, there is no such thing as karma and rebirth, no enlightened master has ever said, in the whole course of the history of Buddhism. So that, also is something to consider perhaps.

Asvajit; Apparently Milarepa, though, said that when he was asked by one of his disciples whether he had had previous lives, he said that thinking in that way was a hindrance, and that his teaching was that one could gain enlightenment in this lifetime without any previous good karma or recollection of previous births or anything.

Padmavajra; Just got on with it.

Asvajit; Just got on with the practice.

S: But ~!is is not that he denied that there was such a thing as a previous existence; he only was saying to that particular disciple, 'It's not very useful to consider it.'

145

Sagaramati; To deny karma and rebirth is to nullify the path, in a sense. I mean, if you deny it, you are den~ing the relationship of cause and effect

S: Yes but then you don't have to be completely logical to follow the path.

Sagaramati; That's true. (laughter)

S: Not at the beginning anyway. It may dawn on you as you go along that, yes, well, there is truth in the teaching of karma and rebirth.

Padmapani; I'm sorry. I thought presumably what Milarepa was getting at was that he was trying to inspire the person into thinking they could actually reach enlightenment in this lifetime. Do you see what I mean?

S: Perhaps the person was only just thinking about their previous lives.

Asvajit; Well apparently they thought that Milarepa must have had many previous lives in which he was a highly developed spiritual person, but he insisted

Padmavajra; That he was a rimpoche.

Asvajit; That he was a Tulku Rimpoche. But in fact he insisted that he was just an ordinary human being.

S: And, in fact, had committed very serious offences in this lifetime. So that you could. ... I mean his point seems to have been that you could gain enlightenment in this life starting from scratch - that was the point; you did not need an accumulation of good karma from previous lives, or even good karma in this life prior to, say, you going for refuge, but that starting from scratch in this life, with no punya, with no merit to your credit at all, if you MADE sufficient effort you could still gain enlightenment in this life.

Rob; But how many of us come in with a clean slate?

S: Well I imagine not everybody. (laughter)

Abhaya; Milarepa had a very dirty slate

S: He had a very dirty slate, but what he was saying was don't think you have got to start with a clean slate. He was saying, look how dirty my slate was. So the person who was asking was.. perhaps had it in his mind that you need quite a clean slate before you can think of Buddhahood in this life; you need to have practised all

146

all sorts of virtues and perfections for many, many lifetimes before this one before you can dare to think in terms of Buddhahood in this life. But Milarepa was, as it were, saying, No don't bother wondering whether you've heaped up merit in previous lives. You can do it starting from scratch in this life with no merit at all to your credit. You can heap up the merit in this life itself, and then gain enlightenment on the basis of that merit.

Padmavajra; It seems very much as though we'd have to keep channels open for.... within the Friends, in classes and things like that, and in courses, and let kind of people get into their own motivation and realise their own sort of motivation for practising the Dharma.

S: There is also the point that in Buddhist countries like Ceylon, people do believe, or say that they believe, in karma and rebirth, but that's an excuse for postponing any spiritual effort. They even say that you can't gain enlightenment any longer because the Buddha lived so long ago and there are no good enlightened teachers around any more, you've just got to wait until the next Buddha reappears, which won't be for a few thousand years, so just accumulate some merit and hope for a good rebirth in your next life and then hope that you'll be reborn when that next Buddha is around and become his disciple and then gain enlightenment, so all this on the basis of apparently firm belief in karma and rebirth.

Padmavajra; Very clever.

S: But it postpones the spiritual effort of the follower of the spiritual path. So it is better not to believe in karma ~r'd rebirth but follow the path, rather than believe in karma and rebirth and make that your excuse for not following the path here and now. I mean the main thing, after all, must be whether you follow the path.

Padmapani; I must admit, though , that when one reads quite a few Mahayana texts, they very much talk in terms of hundreds of thousands of lifetimes, as if merit is built up...

S: Yes, they do very much speak in those terms.

Padmavajra; Is that rather poetic, though and just really inspiring?

Padmapani; Well it does, it does tend to inspire , yes.

S: Well different people take it in different ways. Some will feel very inspired; others will feel terribly depressed. Well if it's going to take three(asamkheyas)

147

I might as well just not bother. I can't even grasp the idea of three (asamkheyas) in my mind. Some people might think like that. but others might be really inspired and invigorated at the prospect of the spiritual life going on life after life after life, spanning aeons of time, gathering momentum as you go along, and visiting all sorts of Buddha-worlds.. One might be tremendously enthused by this. Others not!

Asvajit; There's also the possibility, I think, of some people feeling that they have already attained great spiritual heights, and then one can point out, well, actually , you know, it takes much longer than that. °There's a great path of practice, you know , various stages.

S: Well it seems to boil down to the fact that one must make the very best effort that one can here and now in this life with the help of whatsoever motivation It seems simply to boil

down to that. If you do, or if you can, believe in karma and rebirth, you're really lucky because you are then in harmony with the whole Buddhist tradition, both in harmony with the spirit and the letter. If you can't well never mind because, yes, there are plenty of texts and plenty of teachings in Buddhism which do speak only in terms of the Path and don't make any reference to karma and rebirth, so that that is not the sole possible motivation for following the path.

Vimalamitra; I'd have thought there would have been a lot more people who would have been around who would have just wanted to follow the spiritual path just for spiritual development; that there was quite a lot of feeling for that, at one time, especially when Maharishi...there~was a lot of kind of feeling for that.

- S: But was it a feeling for a spiritual path, or the spiritual path. What was it?

Padmavajra; I think it was a fashion.

Vimalamitra; Just a psychological.

Sagaramati; I think it was a lot to do with LSD if anything.

Padmavajra; A fashion!

Sagaramati; I mean people talking about all these fancy colourful states of consciousness, and even experienced them, and the Maharishi flew over with his flowers and said, 'yeah, experience it my~way.'

S: The safer saner way.

Sagaramati; I think that's what attracted the Beatles'

148

Padmapani; This was very much from the media wasn't it.

Sagaramati; Yeah.

Asvajit; In a mass movement.

Padmapani; The same thing really.

Padmavajra; Now it's very respectable.

Sagaramati; No (inaudible)

Padmavajra; Well the Maharishi. I'm just talking about the Maharishi. I'm not talking about us

Padmapani; Sixty five centres in England.

Manjuvajra; It's respectable.

S: Airight let's carry on. The quote from Nagarjuna.

Padmapani; "As long as there is a belief in the skandhas,

There will come from them a belief in a self, When there is a belief in an ego, then there is karma. Fromrthis. there will come (re)birth."

S: This summarises more or less what we have been discussing. 'As long as there is a belief in the skandhas'. The skandhas, of course, are form, feeling, perception, volition and consciousness; these five constituents make up the so-called personality, that is to say the psycho-physical. organism. Belief in the skandhas' means taking one 5 psycho-physical organism, taking one 5 self as one empirically exists, as something ultimately real and thinking of it in terms of a permanent unchanging; self, so; 'As long as there is a belief in the skandhas, there will come from them a belief in self. When there is a belief in an ego, then there is karma. From this there will come rebirth.' So long as there is that sort of fixed point of reference in the form of an ego, then there is indefinite repetition of the pattern.

Sagaramati; Someone said, referring to that word, 'rigidity' that if there is some- thing rigid, then there is always a clash, and because there is a clash there is a battle.

S: Right. Well of course, it is sometimes said that the process, the whole process,

is at work within this life itself; not only within this life itself but within each minute of it; that you are constantly affirming, or reaffirming, your belief in the skandhas<sup>1</sup> giving rise to a self which then acts in a particular way, as a result of which your present sort of ego-ridden existence or being undergoes a rebirth, you know, from instant to instant; you are keeping alive the whole thing. You can look at it in that way too.

Asvajit; Can one then talk about the Dharma at all without taking that sort of attitude, at least provisionally?

S: Which attitude?

Asvajit; That there is an ego.

S: One can't. No. But it's a question of the positive conditioning 'eventually undoing all conditionings what soever. You have to say 'I don't exist in reality'.

Right there are further quotations, so let's go through those, and run through rather rapidly, I think, because we are just about finishing.

Padmapani; "The root of samsara is motivation.~

S: This is also a quotation from Nagarjuna; the Mulamadhyamakakarika.

Padmapani; "The root of samsara is motivation.

Therefore the wise do not make plans.

The unwise therefore become agents

~use the only see unwise sense."

S: 'The root of samsara is motivation' I mean not motivation in general. It is a pity we are not given the Sanskrit term. It's probably samskara. I can look this up after lunch. 'The root of samsara is motivation.' I can get the general sense of this from what follows. How would you put it?

Manjuvajra; Motivation of worldly things.

S: Well motivation in worldly things

Abhaya; Blind striving.

S: Blind striving of a repetitive and compulsive nature, one could say. 'Therefore the wise do not make plans. I'm really going to look at another translation after lunch. 'Therefore the wise do not make plans' What is this planmaking? Sagaramati; Would it be living to a (part) using the samskaras as a basis?

S: But 'making plans'; I mean people often say you shouldn't make plans, well what do they mean by that? I mean can one make plans in a positive way as well as in a negative way?

150

Asvajit; Sure.

Vimalamitra; One can make kind of provisional plans, understanding that anything can happen.

S: Yes right.

Dipankara; Don't make rigid plans.

S: Right.

Manjuvajra; Loose ones.

Asvajit; People sometimes think that making plans prevents one from being spontaneous,

and they refuse to make plans.

Padmavajra; Presumably the wise don't need to make any plans at all, because they have reached a point of total spontaneity.

S: Well they are fully equal to each and every situation as it arises. Padmavajra; They don't ~&ve to make positive plans.

S: But it still raises the question of what is a plan, because I mean the Buddha is represented as thinking, 'I shall go and see such and such person. Is that a plan?

Asvajit; It's an idea that occurs.

S: So what is a plan? What is the distinction, then between an idea that occurs and a plan?

Asvajit; A plan is... supposing you are turning over some stencils in the machine and you have an idea of where each one is going to go.. that I don't regard as a plan. But if you churn out ten thousand with no idea of where they are going to go that's a plan. (Loud laughter)

S: I wouldn't have said that.

Padmavajra; I think a. plan is a really.. a plan is complex.. that, you know, you've really thought it out.

S: It's rigid, and the framing of the plan and the projection of the carrying out of that plan in the future sort of satisfies some neurotic need that you are going to satisfy at all costs, therefore you stick very rigidly to the carrying out of that plan and refuse to adapt or adjust in the light of changed circumstances, but carry out that plan at all costs. It would seem to be this sort of mental attitude, this sort of way of behaving, that is being discouraged here.

Mark; Is that like the making of a plan presupposes that you see yourself as a fixed entity which is unchangi~j. therefore if you are unchanging, you need to try and fix things up for the best.

S: Yes right.

Padmavajra; Also I think that things like a vow comes in here. I mean, when we make a vow we always make it for a period of time, like a year, because the circumstances will probably change; with a plan you think well, my plan of action for my life.

Abhaya; What we seem to be doing is to be giving a negative denotation to the word 'plan', for the sake of this translation.

S: Because Nagarjuna says, 'The wise do not make plans.' There clearly is something negative because the wise don't do it.

Abhaya; Yes but isn't it what we need to do is find a better word to translate it than try and make 'plans' a negative word, because we don't really think of plans in all senses, as a negative thing; we all make plans, in a positive way, surely. I mean we would all accept that they have some positive denotations. No?

S: Right.

Sagaramati; Well maybe it should be that the wise don't use plans as a support?

S: 'The wise make only provisional plans'?

Asvajit; Flexible plans.

S: 'The unwise therefore become agents' - the agent being that the person who carries out, presumably, this fixed, unchanging pattern which we call a plan, 'because they see only wisdom'. That isn't very clear is it? Anyway all these are only confirming and supporting quotations so let's go through them fairly quickly.

Padmapani; "And Aryadeva states;"

S: Aryadeva being the disciple of Nagarjuna.

"The seeds for the possible world are concepts." They start off as ideas in the mind. "The objects are their field of activity." where they are, as it were, sown. Again a reference to karma and rebirth.

Alright what about Candrakirti?

Mark; "It has been stated that the mind truly establishes In manifold ways the world of sentient beings and

The world as their container.

All beings without exception have come from karma."

152

S: Candrakirti is a great teacher of the Madhyamika tradition who wrote a very important commentary on Nagarjuna's 5 Mulamadhyamakakarika.

Mark; "And Vasubandhu states, 'The various worlds have come from karma', and, 'The basis of existence are the six latent and overt (emotions)."

Asvajit; What are they?

S: I'm not sure what they are. I think we'll come to them in the course of the text.

Mark; "Thus it has been stated many times (to)...the victorious ones by their own goodness."

S: What is being explained here? Rebirth into the Pure Land, apparently of Amitabha; rebirth into Sukhavati; the very best kind of rebirth under the law of karma.

Kamalasila; "Weakened through flaying (to end of stanza).. the evil doer falls to the ground of blazing iron due to his many evil deeds.'

S: So what is being described here?

\_\_\_\_\_; Hell.

S: Rebirth into a state of suffering. So rebirth into a state of bliss; highest conceivable bliss; rebirth into a state of suffering. These are the two extreme retributions, as it were, under the law of karma. Alright carry on to the end of this introduction.

Padmavajra; "Just as it has been expressed above... (to end of chapter). .gained by the analysis."

S: Do you think the author has made clear the connection; the reason why he embarks upon this study of mind and mental events? Because it's these and the law of karma which determine one's whole future both in this life itself and throughout future lives. (pause).

As one's mind is, so is one's karma. As one's karma is, so is one's rebirth. As one's rebirth is, so are one's happiness or one's suffering, or one's freedom from both happiness and suffering, i.e. attainment of enlightenment. Again depending on what kind of mind. So the investigation of mind and mental events

comes to be considered as very important. Right any general questions on what we've done so far today?

Mark; Is this all exactly as ( ) who wrote the thing would have listed all

153

these verses, all the bits and pieces from other works in the introduction to the... in the section 'Introduction to Mind and Mental Events', all this Madumadhyamika.. all these bits by Aryadeva, Candrakirti and so on - these were all as he's listed them?

S: Yes. I think the references in brackets are supplied by the translators. I think sometimes they haven't been able to find where the reference comes from in just one or two instances, like the first one. I think it's from the (Ratnavali).

So he's quoting from all these ancient teachers just to illustrate and in a way reinforce what he says about the importance of the mind and the way in which mind affects one's whole future course, one's whole future destiny, therefore the study of mind and its mental events becomes of supreme importance.

Alright then we've gone a bit over time so let's close there.

END OF SESSION

S: Airight then. Before we go on let's go back to that verse from Nagarjuna which was quoted by the author as from Madhyamikakarika 25, 10. I've tracked it down; it's actually Madhyamikakarika 26, 10 and I'm sorry to have to inform you that Nagarjuna says nothing about making plans. What he says is,

"Consequently the ignorant create the mental conformations", that is samskarahs, "which form the basis of samsaric life. Thus the ignorant is the doer (and?or?) the wise, seeing the truth, does not create." Does not set up the samskarahs, that is.

There's another translation which I think is even clearer, if anything,

"Thus the ignorant people construct the conditioned thing ", samskarah- "That is the source for existence in flux", i.e. samsara

"The one who constructs is ignorant. The wise person is not one who constructs Because he perceives true reality."

That's clearer isn't it? So if anyone wants to copy those two later on, they are available here. So one has to watch these translators doesn't one?

Alright we come to mind and mental events page nine.

Sagaramati; "Concerning the distinction between mind and mental events.... (to end of par~graph) is said to be the (operation of the) mental events."

154

S: That's quite clear I think. That's what we've already discussed in connection with

Guenther's introduction.

Abhaya; Could I just make one query here? It says in the first verse, 'Seeing a thing belongs to mind, Seeing its specific characteristic belongs to a mental event'.

I thought that yesterday when you defined mind, both of these make up mind; seeing a thing and seeing its specificity. I thought those were the two sort of characteristics of mind, and that mental events were as having some kind of response to that?

S: Ah yes. There is a difference between seeing its specificity and seeing its specific characteristic, or characteristics.

Padmavajra; I'm rather inclined to agree with Abhaya, given that, actually, because 'specific characteristic' does seem to imply what is inherent in that thing, whereas a mental event is your particular way of reacting to it or

Sagaramati; The things got to be isolated for your mind to be as it were aware of it and that would be the specificity.

S: Yes that would be the specificity, the uniqueness.

Padmavajra; The thing as a whole.

Sagaramati; Whereas the other (indistinguishable) function of your mind to be aware of its characteristic.

\_ S: Mm. But it does say 'specific characteristic', whereas if you took that literally it would seem that the 'specific characteristics' are part of the specificity. According to this, in fact, they aren't or they can't be. Perhaps we shouldn't take this word 'specific' too literally. I have got a copy of the Madhyantavibhanga, actually (laughter) so we had better go and look it up. (pause)

Now 1;8, if we are lucky. (long pause)

Hm, there isn't the Sanskrit text here, but there is a translation of the stanza with an explanation by Vasubandhu and another one by Sthiramati.

Let's see what that says.

Guenther renders it;

'Seeing a thing belongs to mind.

Seeing its specific characteristic belongs to a mental event.'

155

Here the translation is;

'The mind perceives the thing.

Its evolutes perceive the qualities.'

'Its evolutes' ; those are the mental events.

'The mind perceives the thing.

Its evolutes perceive the qualities.'

Then there's an explanation by Vasubandhu who says;

'This means; the mind itself, i.e. pure sensation, apprehends the thing alone, i.e., the thing in itself; the pure object.'

Mustn't take that too literally; that is Stcherbatsky.

'The mental phenomena such as feelings, pleasant and unpleasant, etc., apprehend its qualities, i.e. the qualities of the thing pleasant or unpleasant.' Sthiramati 's comment;

'Vasubandhu mentions a characteristic by another name. This means that by pointing to the mind itself and to its different evolutes, i.e.mental phenomena, another characteristic name of the creator, phenomenal appearance,is illicited. Why is that? Because engaged in the construction of the thing which is being constructed and of its qualities are just the mind and the mental faculties. The perceivers of the things themselves and of their qualities are on

one side the mind and mental phenomena; on the other the same is done by the creator of phenomenal worlds. Therefore it happens that the mind and the creator are the names of one and the same thing.'

Vasubandhu says;

'Among them the mind apprehends the thing alone. Here the word 'alone' serves to exclude every kind of definiteness. The meaning is that we call mind itself nothing but pure sensation, i.e., the perception of the mere presence in the ken

— of something quite indefinite. The perception of the thing in itself laid bare of all its qualities. The mental phenomena such as, for example, feelings etc., apprehend its qualities.' Says Vasubandhu. 'This means that they are employed about cognising this or that thing, in this or that of its special functions. Supposing a thing has the peculiarity of being delightful or painful, such a thing is the source of pleasure or pain. The apprehension of this, its quality, is called feeling. Supposing further the peculiar thing can be designated as being a woman or a man or anything else, the apprehension of its quality is called 'idea or 'concept'. All other mental phenomena must be respectively interpreted according to these patterns.

156

So here the explanation is that mind is awareness as it were of pure facticity in the sense of that the thing is just there. One could even say 'specifically there', but there is no question of the mind being aware of any qualities as such, even qualities which differentiate that thing from other things, so in that sense it's a sort of general, not to say vague, awareness. So that when the mental events come into operation they apprehend the object more specifically and thus perceive more specific qualities. This is what Vasubandhu and Sthiramati are saying.

It did occur to me some time ago that there is - perhaps no more than a parallel between citta and caitasika; mind and mental events; or citta and caitta dharmas; and vitakka vicara. You are familiar with vitakka vicara? Vitakka vicara are two mental factors which, according to the sutras - this is not going into the Abhidharma - according to the sutras, are present in the first dhyana. Vitakka, or in Sanskrit vitarka, is usually explained as the seizing hold of a mental object. Vicara is usually explained as the investigation of that mental object. These are often translated as 'initial and sustained application' which really tells one nothing. But Buddhaghosa's illustration to make clear the difference between these two mental acts is quite significant. He says that Vitakka is like the seizing hold of a pot with the left hand, grasping it. Vicara is like scouring the pot all the way round on every side. So it does seem

that there is a certain resemblance between Vitakka and mind and Vicara and caitasika; its almost as though Vitakka or Vitarka was the function or the activity of the mind, the apprehension of the object, and the investigation of the object was the function of the mental events. I don't want to press this too much, because as far as I know this parallel is not actually pointed out in Abhidharma literature. It may well be, but I've never come across it. So it would seem that in the case of mind, one has simply the awareness of something actually being present, but one could even say in a general way not to say vague way, but when you engage yourself with it more particularly, more specifically, then the mental events come into play and you begin to apprehend or cognise the specific qualities, or even distinguishing qualities, of that particular object.

Asvajit; How does this vagueness square with the idea that's sometimes expressed that mind is bright?

S: Well, it's only a vagueness in as it were cognitive terms. It is not assigning the object to any particular class; it's not thinking about it in that particular way, but it has a clear, direct apprehension of the object as there.

157

Padmavajra; It's just a sort of seeing.

S: Just a sort of seeing yes.

Vimalamitra: A perception.

S: A perception yes. This is why it says, 'This means the mind itself, i.e., pure sensation, apprehends the thing alone. The mental phenomena, e.g., feelings pleasant and unpleasant etc., apprehend its qualities.' One also probably must bear in mind that there is not this hard and fast distinction between mind as a thing and mental events as things which that particular terminology might possibly lead one to suppose.

Padmavajra; What is Madhyantavibhaga?

S: The Madhyantavibhaga is one of the five so-called 'Books of Maitreya'. It's a quite difficult work. The five books of Maitreya being works which, according to the Inso-Tibetan tradition, Maitreya the Bodhisattva handed over to Asanga, which Asanga brought down from the Tusita Devaloka which he taught to Vasubandhu and on which Vasubandhu wrote notes and commentaries, perhaps on all of them. I'm not... I don't recollect this for certain, but certainly on some of them.

Padmavajra; Who did the translation?

S: This is quite an old one. This is Stcherbatsky.

Alright let's go on.

"Accordingly, to be aware of the mere facticity and haecceity of an object is mind, and, on the basis of this objective reference, to become involved with the object by way of other specific functions is said to be the (operation) of the mental events.'

So what was the original query or the original

Abhaya; The original query was that in the former definition of mind, which we did yesterday, as distinct from mental events, the two characteristics of mind defining it were seeing it and seeing its specificity.

S: Well this is where the haecceity comes in. Again, how literally one is to take that term as a translation of the word in Tibetan is a bit doubtful, but it means the 'thisness', but perhaps it isn't the thisness of any specific quality so much as the

thisness of being a particular thing that is to be perceived.

Asvajit; 'Seeing clearly' seems to cover it quite....

S: Seeing clearly, Hmm. But it is the 'seeing' that is clear, not the conceptualisation which is clear, yes?

Manjuvajra; It's almost as though the mind happens, in a way, slightly before a mental event. You see a thing, you start to focus on the thing, and you realise it's separate but you haven't actually given it a name.

S: It's almost as though you have an instant, a bare instant, of pure awareness, but you are unable to keep that, your mind starts functioning. Actually there are occasions when we do have this instant, or even a moment or two, of pure awareness, of mind simply perceiving without the arising of any mental events. Can you think when that is?

Padmavajra; In a vision?

S: No.

Sagaramati; When we first wake up in the morning.

S: First thing in the morning when you wake up. Have you experienced that?

Sagaramati; Yes I'd done that (General murmurs of agreement)

S: Yes. You wake up and you perceive, but the - well, I say the mind is not yet working - the mind in the sense of what it perceives is operating, but no mental events arise. And sometimes one can experience this for even a minute or two. And then you actually perceive,

you actually see, the mental events beginning to come into operation.

Robert; How about times of danger, like in a very stress situation.

S: Sometimes it does happen that mental events just cease.

Dipankara; I had one like this when I went for a walk lunchtime. I was walking down the road and I nearly put my foot on a snake, and it was just. . .as my foot was coming down I perceived that snake but I'd gone another step before it really hit me and everything started to move, and there was a lot of reaction, as it were.

S Uttara related a similar rather interesting case when he was nearly run over. so

15~

what he did, he leaped over the car! Just like that, without thinking, he leaped over it. (Laughter) That was a pretty spontaneous reaction. He didn't think, he just jumped. He jumped right over the car!

Vimalamitra; Right over?

S: Well as far as I recollect, if I heard him correctly, he leaped over the car yes.

Sagaramati; Might have been a mini.

Vimalamitra; Even so

Padmapani; It's possible.

~: And of course in meditation you have this - I won't say pure perception p but certainly fewer and fewer mental events arising.

Padmavajra; I often find at the end of some meditations you can open your eyes and you can just sit there and, say, look at the carpet.

S: Right, and you are just seeing the carpet, you are not thinking about it. Some- times one distinguishes the two things, the vitakka and the vicara, as 'thinking of' and ' thinking about'. You can think of a person without thinking about them. When you think of them you simply summons up the bare picture of them, the bare visual image, them mental image, and then when you think about them you start thinking of particular things in connection with them.

Padmapani; Actually in the case of rjttara, isn't there a mental event behind that, in a sense, because there is a reflex, isn't there, so there must be something there which triggers off the muscles into action?

S: Better ask Uttara. He says he didn't think.

Padmapani; No I mean, he bight not, but that's you know, a reflex

S: There might have been a very very quick thought.

Padmapani; Very subtle but reflex ( ) situations from thepast, the memory.

S: Maybe a sudden charge of adrenalin or whatever coming into your blood.

Padmavajra; I can't think of an example, but you said that,, in the past sometimes I've experienced something very similar and just realised that an accident or something would occur if you hadn't done something, and just realised that you'd done it afterwards.

Padmapani; It's the sort of situation that comes in at a critical stage yes? It's to protect one's life, in a way, the organism,, It's sort of

Sagaramati; I think of that other one, especially when you get up in the morning, I mean when the mental events come in, you can even become quite confused. I mean say, like, I remember a lamp and the shadow it made on the roof. I couldn't distinguish which was real. I mean I didn't perceive the shadow as a shadow, it was just something there, and as I tried to grope at that, I couldn't tell which was real, the lamp or the shadow. It was quite odd.

S : Well you merely perceive, you don't interpret what you perceive. So that it shows that we do have - this is why I mentioned the matter - it shows that we do have some, at least, very slight, very instantaneous experience.

END OF TAPE

MIND IN BUDDHIST PSYCHOLOGY - Tape 6 Side A

S: Mmm, mmm.

Sagaramati: ... on.

S: Mmm. Well, you merely perceive, you don't interpret what you perceive.

Abhaya?: Yes.

S: It just shows that we do have er - you know, this is why I mention the matter - it shows that we do have some at least very slight, very instantaneous experience of this state, of virtually pure awareness, that we do experience sometimes mind apart from mental concomitants. So that shows, you know, that the potentiality of an experience of pure mind is already there, in a sense;, in a very minor way, already actively present, already functioning sometimes.

Padmapani: Yes, I think you've mentioned that... those experiences of flashes in between, say, when you're doing the mindfulness,

those slow mental thought processes start...

S: (at the same time) Mmm, yes, right.

Padmapani: ...in between the counting, there are sort of gaps, and in those gaps you have a deeper...

S: You just see.

Padmapani: Yes. 160

S: Mmm, yes. (Pause). All right, let's go on again.

Asvajit: The statement of the learned rGyal-tshab - "When sensory perception takes hold of a colour patch (complex) as its major concern-. there is a singling out process regarding the object" - was not made with reference to gaining certainty. but merely with reference to the (apprehension of) colour form.

S: Mmm.

Asvajit: In the wake of this operation of mind, mental events have the function of

directing the mind towards the object on the basis of the \_\_\_\_\_ objective reference and the function of other special operations such as not forgetting that which has been understood previously. Therefore, the mind as a primary operation is concerned only with the objective reference but not with what the other specific functions perform; a mental event is an awareness which gets involved with this object by way of other specific functions, such as those following the operation, that deal with the objective reference.

S: Mmm. This is simply an expansion of what has gone before, huh? That's sufficiently clear, isn't it? Mmm? All right, let's go on then.

Abhaya: Someone may think, "Are mind and mental events one and the same stuff or are they different?" The 'mngon-pa mdzod'(Abhidharmakosa

II,23)has the answer:

"The mind and mental events are certainly together."

(Laughter....'Oh, no!')

Abhaya, continued: It has been said that mind as the primary factor and the mental events as its entourage are of one stuff and co-existent by way of the five functional co-relations. Thus, since mind and mental events arise together, as far as time is concerned,

162

-2-

and are of one and the same stuff and not of different kinds of stuff, it is inadmissible to claim that mind and mental events are not co-existent in time and are different entities and that these deal with their objects.

S: Mmm.

Abhaya: let me explain this further. (Stifled laughter.)

S: Mmm.

Abhaya: When there is memory, or inspection of an object like a coloured patch, both mind as the primary factor and its attendant function, memory, correspond to each other in their reference to their object which is this colour patch. But their separate functions consist in the fact that the mind is merely concerned with the facticity and haecceity of the object, while, in view of its function of not forgetting (or losing sight of it), mind is spoken of as memory-inspection.

S: Mmm.

Abhaya: But these two (mind and mental event) are not separate entities as are a pillar

and a jar.

S: Mmm. Is this clear?

Abhaya: Mmm. (General murmur.) It is and then it isn't.

S: Mmm. It seems to me that the author goes a little bit beyond what the Abhidharmakosa says, huh? The Abhidharmakosa, as he quotes it says, "The mind and mental events are certainly together." He doesn't say anything about 'one stuff', huh? - perhaps he doesn't feel it necessary to say anything about 'one stuff', not necessary to go as far as that. It's enough to say that they're certainly together, because they're 161 concerned with the same object at the same time.

Padmavajra: There's a suggestion, or I got a suggestion that you have mind - you have your original perce your pure well, you can't have this pure perception without a mental event.

Abhaya: Yes, you can.

Padmavajra: Yes, I know, but the impression I get...

S: Mmm...

Padmavajra: From the text is that, was that...

Sagaramati: He seems to be trying to get rid of the time factor...

S: Mmm...

Sagaramati: It's almost like he didn't actually say mind comes first and then...

S: Mmm, mmm.

Sagaramati: I mean mind follows mental event, but he's saying that it doesn't happen that way. S: Mmm, mmm. Padmavajra: That they arise together? Sagaramati: Yes. Simultaneously.

Asvajit: Well, it's not really correct to state that mind is not continuous or non-continuous.

~~~

-3- 163

S: ThffR, mmm, yes. For instance, in the case of the first dhyana, you can get rid of vicara....you can get rid of - yes - vicara, with... without having got rid of vitakka. (If you divide in that way, there are five dhyanas instead of four.) So it would seem that there can be awareness of the object, without - on the part of the mind - without, you know, mental events coming into play, - if one does, as it were, equate mind and mental events with vitakka and vicara. Now, let's go through this again. Someone may think. "Are mind and mental events one and the same stuff or are they different?" I wonder what this ~5t~ff~ is? There isn't a clue, I'm afraid. The Abhidharmakosa has the answer:

"The mind and mental events are certainly together."

It has been said that mind as the primary factor and the mental events as its mitourA~~~s ~are~ ~of one stuff and co-existent by Nay of the five functional ro-relations. Th~s~. since mind~and mental~.eV~ettsaris~tog~ther, a~s far as time is c6hcerned, and are of one and the same stuff and not of different kinds of stuff, it is inadmissible to claim that mind and mental events are not co-existent in time and are different entities and that they separately deal with their objects. So this would seem to go against, you know, what I said just now, about the possibility of~ this pure perception independent of mental activity. So how do we reconcile that?

~njuvajra: It's because there's mind as such, as well.

S: There's mind as such, as well, yes, so when mental concomitants cease, yes? It's as though mind, in the sense of the mind that goes along with mental concomitants also ceases, so that what you then have is mind as such, huh?

?: }~nm, mmm, mmm. t~2

S: So it isn't really a contradiction. let me explain this further. When there is memory, or inspection of an object like a coloured patch, er, it's the same word, smrti, presumably - awareness - of an object like a coloured patch, both mind as the primary factor and its attendant function, memory, correspond to each other in their reference to their object which is this colour patch. I~tit their separate functions consist in the fact that the mind is merely concerned with the facticity and haecceity of the object, while, in view of its function of not for ettin (or losin si ht of it) mind is 5 oken of as memo ~ins ection. But these two m nd and menta event are not separate ent t es as are a pillar and a jar. That seems quite clear now,

doesn't it?

Manjuvajra: It c....perhaps you could think of it in terms, you know your...yesterday your...you were talking about brothers.

S: ~nm.

Manjuvajra: Well, you could think of mind, and a particular m~ntal event, say as being like twin brothers...

S: }~nm, yes.

Manjuveira: They come togethe~

S: }~mn, yes, yes, right, yes.

Manjuvaira: Because in Siamese twins

S: Mmm - , yes.

?: Mmm. S: Mmm.

Padmapani~ Mind as such is divined(?) in that sense...

Manjuvajra: No, no

164 -4-

S: Mmm, mmm, so what we....if say one twin dies, well, the remaining twin is no longer a twin.

Manjuvajra: Right.

S: Eh? So if mental concomitants or mental events cease to exist mind is no longer mind, eh? Mind becomes, as it were, mind as such, or is replaced by mind as such.

Abhaya: So we've got three factors now from this.

S: Mmm.

Abhaya: I'm a bit confused because say I had two sort of factors in my mind

S: Yes.

Abhaya: Now there's mind, and then there's mental event...

S: Mmm.

Abhaya: . . .Now we seem to have mind-as-such, mind, and mental event

S: Well, mind-as-such did come in yesterday, didn't it?

Padmapani: That's the X-factor.

-- S: That was the X...yes, the~~X-factor, as it were. (Laughter.)

Padmapani: Can we run round it ??????

S: Yes, that is what youyefferred to as the mind behind the mind, eh? So that it...we got into this via, you know, my reference to the fact that one can ha~ , say, early in themorning, this experience of simply perceiving things without mental activity, yes? So, I cited t~3 this as showing that you could have as it were mind without mental events. But the mind which you have, without mental events, is not the same mind as the mind that you have with mental events.

Voices: Mmm, ahh! ahhL

S: Mmm? yes?

Abhaya: Well, why is that, I mean...

S: Because mind and mental events are certainly together. (Laughter.)

Kamalasila: Ahh, well I mean that second one is the mind that is a mental event.

Sagaramati: Yes.

S: Yes, right. Yes, right.

Sagaramati: I mean i~~~ almost like the mental events working postulate that mind.

S: Yes, yes. Or not actually postulate it, I suppose one....but, you know.

Abhaya(at the same time): I took it as.. ..well, yes. I took it as

mind ~s sometimes associated with mental events and sometimes it isn't, and the point being made here is that...

S:(interrupting): Ah, yes, yes.

Abhaya: ....mind and mental events are certainly together - that is, I thought the inference of that is that you can't have mental events without mind... you can have mind

without mental events.

S: Well, you can't have mental events without mind, yes? Er, you can have mind without mental events, but. ...

~1~6~5&\

-5-

Abhaya: Yes.

S: ...Er, that is then not the same mind. The fact that the mental events cease, means, in a sense, that mind ceases, and is replaced by a different kind of mind, because as we saw yesterday, the very distinction between mind and mental events is, as it were, a product of a certain kind of mental event itself. So if all mental events cease, among the mental events which cease is that mental event which we saw was ignorance or absence of pure awareness, which sets up the distinction between mind and mental events. So when mind and mental events cease you're left with no mental concomitants, no mental events, no mind (in the sense that the mind which always goes along with mental events and with which mental events always go along)- thus you're left with, as it were, another kind of mind, which is, what do we call it?

(Together): ..... Mind-as-such...

S: Mind as pure...

(Together): ...Pure....Fact

Padmapani: Can you use the word pure awareness?

S: ~r, no, l~t~ be careful, because there are different degrees and so on. But, you know, let's just stick with the fact that you're left with a different kind of mind, or if you like, a different mind. You could even say mind-as-such, or mind as pure fact.

Dharmapala: Am I correct in thinking that the mind that goes with~the events, is in fact an event itself?

S: Yes, this is what we've concluded yesterday, that in a sense, it is an event itself, yes, and this is what Guenther was getting at when he spoke in terms of that JC-factor, with reference to which there was a symmetrical relationship between the mental concomitants on the one hand and mind on the other. Not that there was a symmetrical relationship between simply the mental concomitants themselves, in view of the fact that they were all mental concomitants of the same mind. The fact that there could be also this... .tfhis. . . this... .hmm, I've forgotten the term now.

Padmavajra?: Mind-as-such.

S: No, no.

Abhaya: Pure mind.

S: No - this symmetrical relationship between you know mind on the one hand and mental events on the other was due to the presence of that X-factor in the form of mind-as-such, which was the point of reference for them both, in this respect.

Manjuvajra: Mind as....it's important to remember I think that mind and mental events are both conditioned...

S: Mmm, yes.

Manjuvajra: ...Are a part of conditioned existence...

S: Mmm, yes.

Manjuvajra: ...Whereas mind-as-such, I assume, is not part of ~that.

S: Mmm. I wouldn't like to go into that now, especially bearing in mind what the Yogacara has to say about the eight consciousnesses.

?: Mmm.

~-6- 166

S: We're certainly concerned with another mind. But where it- comes with regard to the eight vijnana classification, I wouldn't like at the moment to say. I think we have to tread very carefully with the Abhidharma.

Padmavajra: It reminds me of that phrase in the Pali canon - 'This citta is luminous'...

S: Mmm, yes.

Padmavajra: ... 'except for adventitious defilements'...

S: Right, yes, yes.

Abhaya: So we could say there is pure mind, or mind-as-such...

S: Yes.

Abhaya: And there is mind associated with mental events...

S: Yes.

Abhaya: . ...And there is mental events.

S: Yes, yes, which are associated with mind, yes, mmm.

Asvajit: Is it p...I try to think of it in terms of the analogy of water...

S: Mmm.

Asvajit: ...And ripples appearing on the water.

S: That analogy is used, yes, mmm.

Padmavajra: I definitely see mind-as-such as a S... a calm lak~ a calm pool.

S: But, there is something - it's as though there are two kinds of ripples, or that a ripple has, as it were~ two sides, one side is the mind, and the other is the mental concomitants, and they both cease at the same time; a~nd then you have just mind-as-such, i.e., the body of water without any ripples, eh? Mmm? Whether you can go further than that, well, we'll have to leave for the moment, eh?

~va~it: It does seem to...there does seem to be a state of mind in which there is as it were ~o water, and a state of mind in which there is clear water, and another state in which the water is rippled - they're images.

S: Mmm. Well, one could put it like that. (Laughter). ~ ~ ~amati: The first one is no mind.

S: Mmm. (More laughter).

Mark: Well, inspection we can translate as mindfulness...

S: Mmm, yes.

Mark: Well, what can we use for this last-but-one line where it says 'mind is spoken of as memory inspection'?

Manjuvajra?: That's also awareness.. .I've looked it up.

S: Mmm.

?: That's what?

S: Yes.

Manjuvajra: That's also awareness.

-7- 167

?:~Yes, hah, yes.

S: In Sanskrit the same term is used for awareness - smṛti - as for recollection or remembering, so Guenther in a way quite helpfully distinguishes between smṛti when it's used in the sense of awareness or inspection, as he would say, and smṛti in the sense of memory inspection. Sometimes it is a bit confusing in, you know, Sanskrit - you're not quite sure in which of the two senses the term is being used.

?: Mmm.

Asvajit: Memory inspection would seem there to be mindfulness of mental objects.

S: No, it's sort of recalling past mental objects and bearing them in mind, eh? This memory inspection. Whereas inspection would be simply awareness of an object which is present before you here and now. It is th~ distinction between being collected and being recollected. All right, let's c~rry on then.

Robert Gerke: This explanation is based on the 'chos mngom rgya mtsho'i snying po' which is an explanation of ~ - (hesitates, laughter).

S:(Helps): The 'Abhidharmasamuccaya' -- The collection of the Abhidharma; this is a work of Asanga, hmm?

?: According to ~h~~~amanavart~ka~amka~a~~

S:(Again helps): This is a work on logic. I think, as far as I remember, it's by Dharmakīrti.

Robert Gerke: "The defining characteristic of the mind as the primary factor is to be in union with its attendant mental event by way of the five functional co-relations, and the defining characteristic of mental events is to be in union with the mind as the primary factor by way of the five functional co-relations."

S: Mmm, all right, that's clear, we just have to understand what these five functional co-relations are, hmm? So l~~~s go on to that.

Robert Gerke: These five functional co-relations are dealt with in the 'Abhidh~rma-...

S: --Kosa'- this is Vasubhandu's great work, hmm?

Robert Gerke: ...the Abhidaarmasamuccaya...The Abbidharmakosa says that the five functional co-relations are: Alike basis Alike objective reference Alike observable quality Alike time Alike stuff.

S: Mmm. All right, let's see the explanation of those.

Dharmapala: The meaning of each of them is as follows: Alike basis means that the sense faculties depend on a mental attitude (-sems),so the mental events are alike in this way.

S:~ Hmm. Is that clear?

Asvajit: I must confess I don't see what this is getting at really.

Dharmapala: Is that saying that accordin~ to your attitude, er, your sense faculties, will work in different way~s?

S: Er, mental attitude here is mind, eh? Yes? Er, it's just a different translation of the same term. So alike basis means that the sense faculties depend on a mental attitude - a mind - so the mental events are alike in this way. What is meant by 'in this way'? That is really the point, eh?

168 -8-

Sagaramati:....Well...(Long pause)

Manjuvajra: Well, they too depend on...mind.

?: Hmm. S: It seems to mean that.

Kamalasila: How do the sense faculties depend on a mental attitude?

S: Well, there's no, er. . there's no er ~ense perception without a perceiving mind, eh? Yes? So the sense faculties depend upon a perceiving mind,.. .wo do the mental events, eh? Mmm? Er, it's as though the author is saying that the mental events have the same basis as the senses, the sense faculties, that is the mind. It seems to be saying that- the alike basis is that. (Pause). There is another explanation later on, but er that doesn't...of the five...but that doesn't ...but that doesn't mention alike ~asis; instead of alike basis it has alike fact.

Sagaramati: Mmm. You'd think that...mind ~nd mental events...they haven't the same basis. I mean the sense, what the sense is, aren't the basis (?).

S: Mmm,mmm. Just a minute, it's not very...let's just check up these translations, they

don't seem quite to ...correspond, eh? Here we... like basis is t.. no, that isn't included in the next(?) list. Mmm, there's another explanation of the five functional co-relations, so let's leave that particular one and go on and see whether we make more sense of the next explanation, eh? Go on to alike objective reference, huh?

Dharmapala: Alike objectiv~ reference means that the mental events have the same objective reference as the one taken up by mind.

S: Thmn, that's clear though, isn't it, uh? All right, next one... 167

Dharmapala: Alike observable quality means when the mind has a blue content, then the mental events are bluish in content.

S: Hmm. Right? That seems clear, doesn't it, though it's rather an odd way of putting it, eh? Hmm~? I mean when you are aware of the existence of a blue object, then the mental events are, you know, concerned with the specific properties of that same blue object, eh? Hmm? So they also are bluish in content, eh? All right, alike time?

Dharmapala: Alike time means the mind and mental events arise, stay and fade simultaneously.

S: Yes, hmm, that's clear too. So alike stuff?

Dharmapala: Alike stuff means of whatever stuff a mental attitude may be, the same stuff is the mental event; for example, feeling. S: Mmm,yes. For instance, if you perceive, you simply perceive som~hing with anger, eh? Yes? Then all the mental concomitants, or the mental events which arise, uh? in that situation, will also be, as it were~, imbued with ~anger, eh? hmm~ yes? because if you look at someone with anger, then various mental events will arise - oh, how ugly he is, how stupid he is, eh? They will also be of the same nature, the same stuff, as it were, yes?... 'Stuff' isn't really very happy here, is it?

Dharmapala: What, if you have anger, and then you see something, and the and the anger goes onto that, is that it?

S: Er, no, er, but supposing you are in a mental state of anger,so your mind is an angry mind, eh? So with that angry mind you see an object, eb? Then the mental events will be pre-occupied with that object in an angry sort of way, un? Yes.

?: Yes, fine, yes.

S: Yes? Hmm?

Asvajit: It's as if what we perceive is er sort of a function of what we already perceive...what we see out there, is a function of what we're perceiving in here.

S: Hmm~ yes, yes, huh? I mean the object is as it were coloured by the mind, and, more specifically coloured by the more specific mental events or functions, hmm?

Robert Gerke: Hmm. Can't you have mixed feelings about...

S: Hmm?

Robert Gerke: Can't you be angry sometimes, but also have another feeling at the same time...

S: Oh, yes, then you'll get, you know, a mixture of, you know, mental concomitants, mental events, Still the same stuff: mind is of mixed feelings, yes: mental concomitants are of mixed feelings.

Mark: I can see what...more or less what each of these five means but...

S: Hmm, hmmm.

Mark: But I'm not quite sure about the original...

S: Hmm.

Mark: ...Thing, we tried (?) them all together. It's this, this little paragraph near the top of the page.

Padmavajra: The defining characteristics?

S: Mmm, mmm.

Mark: Yes. I think it's basically just his translation.

S: 'The defining characteristic of the mind as the primary factor is to be in union with its attendant mental event', eh?--The defining characteristic is, you know, the point here--it's as though it's, well, it's the essential nature, it's the essential nature of mind, to be in union with attendant mental events, to have attendant mental events.

Padmavajra: Did these five...

S: And how does it happen? You know, in this sort~of~w~y, byway~of~these five functional co-relations.

Manjuvajra: Ahh,...I see...

S: And similarly, correspondingly, to define the characteristics of mental events , is to be in union with the mind as a primary factor, by way of those same five functional co-relations,

yes?

Padmavajra: So the five functional co-relations keep sort of mind and mental events together? S: Not that they are two separate things held together, though,...

Padmavajra: No. S: ...In that particular way. The alike basis seems to mean simply that one perceives through the sense faculties, which are presumably the

six sense faculties including the so-called mind. And those sense faculties depend upon the mind, in the same way the mental events depend upon the mind. So there's a common basis for, an alike basis for, the senses, the sense faculties, and for the mental events, for the mental concomitants. It would seem to mean that.

Sagaramati: I see something else coming in here now - the fact that this mind that arises can be angry...

- 10 - 170

S: Pardon?

Sagaramati: ...And that anger is not... The mind that arises... S: Mmm.

Sagaramati: You say it can be like an angry mind... S: Yes.

Sagaramati: But that anger is not a mental event. S: Er, yes and no.

Sagaramati: Because I always imagine the mind being quite pure and... S: Yes.

Sagaramati: ...The anger is - S: Ah, well yes, so mind is quite pure, but then this perhaps harkens back to the Theravada view of, you know, the eighty-nine...

Padmavajra: Ahh. S: ...The eighty-nine cittas, yes? - Which are as it were states or moods, of the one original citta, and the Sarvastivada and the Yogacara attend to the oneness of the mind, as it were. The Theravada is more concerned with the eighty-nine different states in which it can be, eh?

Padmavajra: To take up your point, you can have more, sort of perceive with mind... with anger, because, you know, mind as such is the pure awareness, not the mind associated with mental events...

S: Mmm, mmm. Padmavajra: ... So you can have mind with anger, 'cause mind-as-such is a pure awareness.

S: There's usu...I mean, er...ah, the mind that you, that is associated with the mental events is never pure mind...

Padmapani: Yes, right.

S: ...It~is, you know, mind-with-anger you know, in...hyphens eh? ?: Yes.

S: ...Cr mind-with-craving, yes? Or mind-of-the-plane-of-form, or mind-of-the-formless-plane etc.

Sagaramati: This brings in those three things quite clearly.

S: Mmm, yes. I mean so, you know, angry mind looks at the object, yes? And it's just an...angry mind...loQkin...at the °ob~e:ct,~wh1c?h£It just sees in a certain way, er, as there, hmm? But the merital concomitants, the mental events which arise in association with that angry mind, -we'll go into the nature of that object - in much greater detail - and are as it were angry with it in all sorts of specific ways, eh?

Padmavajra: Mmm, mmm,m'n'm.

S: Mmm?

Asvajit: But is it anger in any ordinary sense that we use that term. It seems to be more like that which sort of sets us apart, which creates the distinction of subject and object.

S: Mmm. I~m using the anger just as an illustration here, you know,

it could as well be any other mental state.

Sagaramati: Ah, that would be more like anger as a hindrance. I mean it doesn't depend on an object as it were, it's just something that just pops out and looks at the object...

- 11 - 171

S: Yes, yes, right, yes: that finds an object, hmm?

Dharmapala: ...It's not anger from a past sort of object, situation, that, you know, when you move into a new object, you've just got carrying on those events, as it were.

S: It can be, because where does the anger come from? It's a residue from previous situations which, you know, perhaps you've forgotten, eh? At the same time the anger has not exhausted itself, eh? It wasn't exhausted within the original situation. So it goes on looking for a new situation, you know, into which it can project itself.

?: Mmm, mmm.

Padmavajra: I remember...I ~~~~~ know if this will help - I remember Buddhadasa telling that when he was on his six months' solitary retreat...

S: Mmm.

Padmavajra: ...Anger bubbled up one time - he had no reason for it, and he looked at the front door and he kicked it a few times, and it went away; so it almost seems that the anger's come up, he sees the door, which takes on an ugly characteristic, so he kicks it...

S: Mmm, mmm, yes.

Padmavajra: I don't know if that's helped.

S: Uh, hmm. Right, let's go on to the other description of the five functional co-relations, hmm?

Manjuvajra: Now the Abhidharmasamuccaya says that the five functional co-relations are: 1. Alike stuff 170 2. Alike objective reference 3. Alike fact 4. Alike time ~ikesheresandl~vels.

Alike stuff means that in the entourage of one attitude as the primary factor, there is only one corresponding mental event such as feeling because two different corresponding events cannot take place.

Alike objective reference and alike fact means that as the observable quality and its presence can have no objective reference, and as according to this objective reference and observable quality there is either an emotional colouring or not, when mind as the primary factor becomes emotionally tainted, so do the mental events as its entourage. But when the mind becomes such that it is not affected by what otherwise is bound to break, the mental events as its entourage become such that they are not affected by what otherwise is bound to break.

S: }-i, and there's a note here isn't there?

Manjuvajra: The Tibetan term ~zag~bcas~(what is bound to break') is a difficult term and refers to anything that breaks down the moment we try to build on it. For example, only too often we assume that something could not happen to us, but it does and takes us unaware; then our whole world collapses.

S: Hmm, hmm.

Manjuvajra: Shall I carry on?

S: Yes, carry on, that seems clear.

Manjuvajra: Alike time means the mind as a primary factor and mental events as its attendants arise, stay, and fade simultaneously.

S: Hirin.

- 12 - 172

Manjuvajra: Alike spheres and levels means when the mind as primary factor is on the level of kamadhātu (world of desire), the mental events belonging to the sphere of the rupadhātu (world of form) or the arūpyadhātu (world of no form) cannot arise as its entourage; and for a mind on the level of rupadhātu, mental events belonging to the kaiaadhātu cannot arise as its entourage. To which ever sphere a mind belongs, it is on this sphere also that the mental events as its entourage must arise.

S: Mmm, yes, this is the quite general Abhidharma teaching. Mmm? This explains why say when you're in a state of say meditation, you just can't experience certain kinds of mental events, hmm?

Padmapani:~ Er, you mean they can happen, in actual fact you won't be seeing them...

S: No, they don't happen, they don't happen, heh? For instance, if you're in say an arupadhyana state you can't get angry, hmm?

Padmapani: No, I mean...

S: The mental concomitants of anger just can't arise, eh? They'd require to be...they could only arise in connection with an angry mind, and the moment an angry mind develops you fall right down to the kamaloka, kamadhātu.

Padmapani(?): I do.. hmmm.

Sagaramati: This sort of procession of sort of minds, as it were...

S: Mmm.

Sagaramati: 1,~here you~~~can have one mind being, you know, on a higher level, and then suddenly, as it were, anger can pop up, in this sort of flux, is that what karma would be? I mean, it seems... 17!

S: 1~ama1~~~Karma1?

Sagaramati: 'Karma'? Yes, karma.

S: Karma?

Sagaramati: Yes.

S: Er, no, because you wouldn't experience karma then, you'd only experience vipaka.

~amati: Er, sorry, vipaka, yes, I forgot about that, yes.

S: Hmm? But anger is not a vipaka. Anger is a karma, -so you don't become angry as a sort of retribution for becoming angry in the past, it's not a vipaka.

Sagaramati(?): Ohhhh.

Kanalasila: Could it not be?

S: No, I mean not as those terms are defined in the Abhidharma, hmm? You strengthen the anger, the anger becomes stronger and stronger, but... what you experience, as a result of the karma of anger, is an unpleasant, a painful experience, which of course may exacerbate your your anger, yes? But you won't get into an angry state as the vipaka of indulging... as the vipaka of the karma of indulging in anger

previously.

Manjuvajra: Yes, hinin.

S: Hmm?

Sagaramati: So, if you are going through pleasant states then, and suddenly an unpleasant state comes through you...

S: Ah, that... yes, that...

- 13 - 173

Sagaramati: ...And you react to that, then...

S: Yes, right.

~amati: ...Then...

S: Yes, then if you are in a pleasant state of any kind, eh? And you suddenly experience something unpleasant, that may be a vipaka from from a previous karma of anger, eh? It iay be, -not necessarily. Yes? Of course, then it is up to you either to respond to that with anger or not.

Sagaramati: Yes.

S: If you...if you're able to control your reaction and not allow anger to arise, then, of course, the matter ends there, huh? But of course if you allow anger to arise and indulge in

anger, express anger, then of course you are setting up fresh karma, which will in due course give rise to further vipakas of the same kind.

Sagaramati: Yes.

S: It does just occur to me that there might be some further light shed on these five functional co-relations in the Vijnaptimatratasiddhi Trimsika. I'll go and get that, and... well, we shall see. (tong pause.) Mmm. Relations between citta and caittas. It might be there. Page 473. Yes, this isn't... there's no example as far as I can see of those five functional relationships... but I'll just read what it says about the relations between citta and caittas in general, huh? "With regard to the six categories of caittas, universal, special, good, klesas, upaklesas, indeterminate~'(with which we shall be dealing in this text) - " ~ve they, apart from citta, a self-nature, a svabhava, of their own? Or 172 are they merely particular forms of citta? Are there any flaws in these two theses? Both theses are inadmissible. For if the caittas are things apart from citta, having a self nature of their own, how can one explain the many sacred texts which teach that only consciousness exists?" This is, of course, the Yogacara tradition, heh? "And how can one explain the other texts in which it is said,

i.'The mind goes alone into the distance~ 2. 'Defilement by the mind, purification by the mind' 3.'A mind is constituted of six dhatus, four manabhutas, akasa and vijnana (consciousness )~7

"And how can one explain the Alankarasastra, in which one stanza reads,

'We are firm that the mind, itself unique, appears double, as object and subject - rah a grahaka or, as image and vision,(nimitta and darsanabha a °~ Similarly it appears as covetousness etc; as belief etc: there~ore there ~re~no defilement~~~or good dharma:naa apart~~~ir~ citta.4

if on the other hand~,' if the caittas are merely particular forms of citta, how is it possible to explain the other texts, those that speak~of the associates'of the mind,(Lankajatara)? For assuredly there cannot be associations except among different things,(Abhidharma 5, Yogasastra 56)" (Laughter)"And how can one explain the saying:

'Citta is born with the caittas, as the sun with the light'(Inkavata),

"And how can one explain the Yogasastra which declares:'The caittas are not citta', and cites the stanza which reads,the five gotras, that is to say, the five skhandas, are not established; the theory of particular

forms of mind is erroneous because one cannot conceive any variety of causes and conditions, which is the reason of the variety of forms;

S~continued): furthermore, this system is contradicted by the sacred text~. The truth is that, apart from citta, the caittas are things in themselves. Without any doubt the texts say,

all~is-m~ consciousness for th e res~ th~elv~~es thus be~caus~ ~itta' ie fundamental. They say that citta appears as caitta, for the reason that the caittas depend on citta for support, and are formed by the force of citta. But that does not mean that the caittas are citta. Furthermore, by the words consciousness. mind or citta, the texts understand consciousness or citta with caittas, because caittas are always associated with consciousness or citta. The expressions 'mere consciousness' and 'appearing as caittas-' are therefore correct. (Laughter.) All this is viewed from the standpoint of relative truth, from the Absolute point of view citta and caittas are neither distinct nor identical. This is the same with the consciousnesses among themselves. Such is, in the Mahayana, the marvellous nature of Samvrti, worldly truth, and Paramartha, Absolute Truth." This is of course Yuan Chuan. I don't think there is any account of those five...

Asvajit: Marvellously comprehensive... (Laughter).

Vimalamitra: Who is this by?

S: There are... there's a set of thirty verses by Vasubandhu on the Vijnanavada/Yogacara teaching. These have been explained and commented on by Yit~n Chuan the great Chinese pilgrim, translator and scholar, digesting ten Indian commentaries on these thirty verses, but relying mainly on the commentary of his own personal teacher Dharmapala. This is the standard work of Yogacara philosophy, for want of a better term, in Chinese, and the basic text ..

173 (end of side A of tape 6)

175

- 15 -

MIND IN BUDDHIST PSYCHOLOGY Tape 6 Side B.

S(continued): ....of the Chinese branch of the Yogacara tradition. It's a really massive and detailed work.

Vimalamitra: It's easier to get Enlightenedt

S: Mmm (laughter) I think that you are right there. Yes, it doesn't give those five.... There is by the way a very lengthy discussion of the fiye paths/stages, covering some nearly

150 pages. Anyway, there isn't vbery~much~help from this particular.... Anyway, I think what emerges out on the whole is clear: that citta and caittas are always together, and that they have a common, eh, object, common reference, and that they are imbued with the same sort of feeling, and in that sense are said to be of the same stuff, and they also are alike in their spheres and levels.

Vimalamitra: Could you repeat....

S: I think this... yes, just a moment, I've noticed something... you notice that there are these two lists, yeah, of the five functional co-relations... you see that, eh, they are different in respect of one particular relation. First, is the alike basis, and the fifth in the second list is the alike spheres and levels. I think these are really the same thing. Why? Because on the different levels, kamadhatu, rupadhatu, you have different senses, yeah. Do you see this? On the kamadhatu, the physical senses come into play; on the rupaloka, subtle senses; in the case of the arupaloka, in a sense, there are no senses at all. These are perhaps two different ways of looking at the same thing. All right then, let's go on to the short section on mind.

Vimalamitra: Mind. As to the mind, the 'phung-po lnga'i rab-byed' (Pancaskandhaprakarana, P.ed. 113, p.238, 5.6) states,

"What is perception? It is a distinct awareness of what is before the mind. '

S: This in a way is the simplest definition we have had so far, isn't it. All right, carry on~

Vimalamitra: The 'mngon-pa mdzod' (Abhidharmakosa ,I, 16) states, "Perception is a process of singling out."

The learned rGyal-tshab declares,

S: - One of Tsong-khapa's disciples. -

Vixitalamitra: ~The individualizing perception by means of being aware of the mere factual presence of an object is the defining characteristic of the mind."

S: Nothing about haecceity you notice. I don't know what that might be, G~~~~e~~s very expansive sort of translation... facticity and haecceity. Here it is simply the mere factual presence of an object.

Padmavajra: Isn't the haecceity here the individualizing perception?

S: It could be that. It's this particular thing, this man, not just

man in general.

Sagaramati: It's almost like there are two actions. There's one where there's awareness of something, then the determining of the mind towards it.

S: Mmm - mmm.

Sagaramati: There's almost like a mind before the selection takes place.

S: Mmm.

Sagaramati: There's almost like... I~don't know, I imagine there be a kid, a child sees of a picture, all mucked up, and then something selects out of that picture as it were.

S: Ah, yeah, but one is a sort of general awareness. There is some sort of psychological term for this, isn't it called 'breadth of field' or something like that, yeah? For instance when you are aware of everything in the room, then your attention transfers on to just one thing. Yeah.

Sagaramati: Wouldn't that fastening on to one thing be the selecting awareness?

S: Yes, that would seem to be the singling out, - so mind in the sense of perception is a process of singling out - presumably mind is a... or perception is not used in that sense with regard to just a general awareness of things without a singling out of anything in particular.

Asvajit: More like a faculty.

S: Yeah, yes it's as though when you just perceive things in general, you are sort of passive, hmm, eh. The fact that you, that things register, - this is vipaka; but when you single out that is the beginning of kprma. It seems like that, because you are born with sense organs and so on as a result of karma, hmm. So the sense organs are vipakas - and what those same organs perceive, those are also vipakas; but perceive in a general sort of way. Once you start singling out, that means a sort of motivation comes into play, and that is the first stirring, as it were, of fresh karma. This is, by the way, my own explanation, and not, as far as I know, what the Abhidharma says. All right, let's go on.

Vimalamitra: When one analyses perception, one finds that there are six patterns. The ?~~gon~pa kun-las-btus'(Abhidharma- samuccaya, p.12) states,

"What is perception? There are six patterns: visual perception, auditory perception, olfactory perception, taste perception, tactile perception, and categorical perception.

"What is visual perception? It is a function of selecting colour-form as its objective reference. This takes place in the eye.

"What is au~itory perception? It is a function of selecting sound as its objective reference. It

takes place in the ear.

"What is olfactory perception? It is a function of selecting smell~ as~ its objective reference~. It takes place in the nose.

"What is taste perception? It is a function of selecting taste~ as its ob~jective~reference. It takes place in the tongue.

"What is tactile perception? It is a function of selecting touch as its objective reference. It takes place in the skin.

177

- 17 -

Vimalamitra,(continued, reading from text):

"What is categorical perception? It is a function of selecting out conceptualized contents (chos dfligs). It takes place in the mind."

S: Fairly often in translations of Buddhist texts, what~Guenther translates as 'perception' is tra~slate~{~~#~on5ci0U5ness~~Js0 one gets eye-consciousness, ear-consciousness, and so on where as he says, I think more correctly, visual perception, auditory perception and so on. It's as though one has got all five senses and through these five senses, sense impressions are constantly coming in, so if you are as it were just sitting, you get visual perception, you get auditory perception, you get the whole lot. But then you select, you just concentrate on something as it were, say something that you see - and the other sense perceptions are not as it were registering, or not re~istering with the same force. Yeah. So in that way the olfactory perception proper or the~visua~l perception proper comes into existence, and the first faint stirrings of karma are present.

Manjuvajra: How about perception of things that don't come in through the senses?

S: Well, that's covered by the categorical perceptiOn, as Guenther called it.

Manjuvajra: That doesn't just include thoughts. Would that include sort of visualizing.

S: Well, yes, that would include everything which is not an object of mind, which can be a recollection of an original experience through the senses or something that was never experienced through the senses.

Manjuvaira: How about "vibes", you know, feelings associated with places or people or whatever, that are not necessarily, you can't directly associate with sense perception.

Padmavajra: Atmosphere.

S: Well, there are of course subtle senses connected with the subtle body. One could look at the "vibes" as the objects of those subtle senses, seen on another plane.

Manjuvajra: They would correspond to these...

S: Well, they would correspond to the five physical senses.

Robert Gerke: Well, let's say you meet somebody and don't feel you can trust them, which of the five senses would that be coming through?

S: Is it a sense or is it a mental process? It may be a mental process. You might have encountered before a number of people of that kind who let you down, or of that type who have let you down, so there is a mental association of that type of person with being let down. So this is simple mental association, there is no, as it were, special sense coming into operation here. Hmm. If there is a certain mental state, you could say, untrustworthy mental state associated with that person, well, that is a mental object; if you perceive it directly with the mind then that is a case of categorical perception.

Asvajit: Why a need to postulate such a thing as subtle senses at all?

- 18 - 178

S: Buddhism would say that they are not postulated, they are directly experienced. As when you see something happening in the distance, how do you see it? You don't see it with the physical eye, you see it with the subtle eye, which is not limited in the same way as the physical eye is limited - that would be the divyachakras. Anyway, the general statement is clear, isn't it. I think that in a way the important point that comes across, though it isn't specifically made, is that mind is a movement towards an object. Mind isn't just... (stutter) mind is perception, it is a distinct awareness of what is before the mind; but it is also a process of singling out, which is an activity. Mind in this sense is not just reflecting what is there. That reflection is there to begin with, but mind in this sense is not just perception, in that sort of mirror-like way. That is, the mind which is associated with mental events is not a mirror-like perception in that sort of way, but a sort of tending towards a particular object, a singling out of a particular object through one or another of the senses, amongst all of the particular objects which are presented by the senses in general.

Asvajit: What about the example you gave of waking up in the morning though? That seems more mirror-like.

S: Yes, well, that is a different mind as it were; whether it is the ultimate pure mind, well, that is another matter. But it is not the ordinary mind that perceives things in this singling out sort of way, and in connection with which the mental event comes into play.

Dharmapala: So the senses are not part of the mind, or events, particularly, but sort of a faculty which the mind then goes towards and through, I suppose.

S: Yes, one could say that, but the point is that the mind is not as it were passive; it is not what Locke thought it was, a sort of 'tabula rasa'. A sort of what...an empty wax tablet on which objects impinge, or on which they write or inscribe things, inscribe impressions. The mind is always going out, - because we are never actually in a state when we are perfectly reflecting, there is always a bit of a movement here, a bit of a movement there, yeah, and this is fluctuating all the time until our attention is actually seized by a particular object, or we definitely go towards a particular object, or single out a particular object. And that sort of singling out, that perception, is mind as defined here. "What is perception? It is a distinct awareness of what is before the mind." Perception is a process of singling out, so mind denotes an activity.

Asvajit: The process of singling out is karma, is that correct?

S: I use the expression 'the first faint stirrings of karma'; one could say that, - it isn't, as far as I know, again, said in the Abhidharma, - this is just how I am putting it; but I think one could well say that.

Sagaramati: I think, in the process of perception, what I've read, that the singling out just happens before the karma-vipaka comes in...(unclear)...the ~na.

S:~ Well, this is according to the Theravada, that the javana is, of course, the stage of volition, which is very powerful. One could, in that case, from the Theravada point of view, say that that 'singling out', that advertin~, is what makes karma possible, it's what directly leads to karma, and where that singling out process/adverting process ends

- 19 - 179

S(continued): and karma proper in the sense of javana begins, would be quite difficult to say. That is why I said, "the first faint stirrings of karma". All right, let's go on then.

Padmapani: Although there seem to be many specific distinctions in the earlier and later philosophical systems concerning the three conditions of these six perceptual functions, they are not dealt with here. It is true that Asanga and his brother (Vasubandhu) speak in their works about the alayavijnana and klistamanovijnana. But I will write in a general way about mind and mental events in so far as they are absolutely necessary for our knowledge of how one's actions (karma) and emotions tie one to samsara when, in view of the states on the path

to Enlightenment, a person who is on an intermediary level

S: --Of development that is-

~sni: ... Thinks about the evils of samsara and how they come about. The question whether there is an alayavijnana or not poses a very great and specific problem in the later and earlier philosophical systems. Asanga and his brother who follow the ~dgongs~pa rjes 'grel' (Sandhinirmocanasutra) divide the Buddha Word into implicit and explicit statements and posit an alayavijnana. They declare the whole of reality to be of the nature of mere mentation.

S: Carry on, we'll discuss it generally.

Padmapani: Nagarjuna and Aryadeva, who follow the 'ting nge 'dzin rgyal pa'i mdo' (Samadhirajasutra) and the 'blo-gros mi-zad-pa'i mdo' (Aksayamatipariprcchasutra), also divide the Buddha Word into the explicit and implicit statements but do not accept an alayavijnana. They explain the Sutras that deal with an a~layavijnana as having an implicit meaning and state that the whole of reality is a set of logical fictions.

S: The whole of, you know, empirical reality, that is.

Padmapani: Therefore, in the holy land of India, there are two great trends in the Mahayana. These do not differ in their intention insofar as it concerns the development of the Enlightenment attitude and the practice of the six paramitas (perfections). There is only a difference in philosophical thinking. In spite of this difference, neither of the two great leaders, Nagarjuna or Asanga, is superior or inferior as far as his philosophical thinking goes. As has been made clear by the Buddha himself in many Sutras, these two ways of elucidation correspond to the individual understanding of those who have to be guided. Therefore if you want to know more of the specific points in the teaching of Asanga and his brother positing an alayavijnana and by implication establishing the whole of reality as being of mentation only, you should look up the works of Asanga and his brother as well as Tsong-kha-pa's 'legs-bshad'. If you want to know the specific points of Nagarjuna's thought, you should look up those works which are so valuable in the three worlds, the 'lhag mthong' and the 'jug nam' of Tsong-kha-pa.

S: You notice he refers to the works on Nagarjuna's thoughts as "which are so valuable in the three worlds", but there is no such qualification in the case of the works on the Yogacara school. In the Siddhi-Yuen Chuan, the inter-relations between of citta and caitasika with respect to all eight vijñanas of the Yogacara school are discussed, but this particular author is not going to go into that. He does follow in the main the Yogacara tradition in his explanation of citta and caitta-dharmas but he is not going to pursue the subject to

S(continued): the extent that he is going to take into account the specifically Yogacara teaching of the alayavijnana. This would apparently make the discussion much too difficult and complex. But he does briefly explain that there is this difference between these two great Indian traditions<sup>4</sup> He says, "It's true that Asana and his brother (Vasubandhu) speak in their works about the alayavijñāna and klistamanovijñāna." He's mentioned only the six vijñānas but there are two more mentioned in the Yogacara works, the klistamanovijñāna and the alayavijñāna. Let's see what Guenther says in his note about these:-

Alayavijñāna (kun-gzhi rnam-par shes-pa) is a pervasive medium capable of retaining traces of experiences and their structures which may become actual experiences under suitable conditions'. It is certainly not a mind<sup>4</sup> To associate it with perceptual processes collectively called 'consciousness' or 'mind'(vijñāna)<sup>4</sup> as is done in the Indian Yogacara system, is a continuation of concretistic thinking. In rNying-ma-pa thought, the alayavijñāna is clearly distinct from the alaya and the former is seen as a move towards a subject's mind~ Klistamanovijñāna~ indicates the emotionally toned reaction that goes with our categorical or conceptual perceptions. For example, we perceive visually a green patch and conceptually a tree to which we react positively, negatively, or indifferently.

The klistamanovijñāna is much more like the ego; the alayavijñāna, according to Guenther's interpretation, according to the rNying-ma-pa's, is simply a movement or tendency towards a subject, towards presumably the creation or production of a subject. 'Alaya' simply by itself, and not 'alayavijñāna', has a different meaning.

Sagaramati: Sorry what you said was the alaya by itself(?)

S: Has a different meaning, according to the rNying-ma-pa teaching<sup>17</sup> q a~ interpreted by Guenther, as mentioned here by Guenther. 1 Klistamanovijñāna 1 means the 'soiled-mind-consciousness'.

I will write in a general way about mind and mental events in so far as they are absolutely necessary for our knowledge of how one's actions (karma) and emotions tie one to saṃsāra when, in view of the states on the path to Enlightenment, a person who is on an intermediary level thinks about the evils of saṃsāra and how they come about.

That's all he's concerned with - to talk about mind and mental events for the benefit of such a person.

The question whether there is an alayavijñāna or not poses a very great and specific problem in the later and earlier philosophical systems. Asanga and his brother who follow the 'dḡongs-pa rjes'grel'(Sandhinirmānāsūtra) divide the Buddha Word into implicit and explicit statements and posit an alayavijñāna.

This division into implicit and explicit is, as it were, straightforward statements which require no interpretation; and other statements which require interpretation in order-- to bring out their real meaning, - these are the implicit statements. Some teachers, of course, don't agree that implicit statements are implicit statements. They consider that teachings are being merely 'read into' what are in fact quite explicit teachings. So the Vijñānavādins, they divide

the Buddha Word into implicit and explicit statements and posit an alayavijnana. -- Sometimes on the basis of explicit statements, - and they declare the whole of reality to be of the nature of mere mentation. That is, not mind in the

idealistic sense, but ideas without any object behind them of which the ideas are ideas. This is the Yogacara-Vijnanavads teaching.

181

S(continued): But Nagarjuna and Aryadeva, who follow the...(Samadhi- rajasutra . . . also divide the Buddha Word into the explicit and implicit statements but do not accept an alayavijnana. They tend to explain away any references to anything of that sort, as not to be taken in the strict literal philosophical sense. They explain the Sutras that deal with an alayavijnana as having an implicit meaning, in other words, as meaning something other than a statement regarding the alayavijnana as such, and state that the whole of reality is a set of logical fictions. Rather like some modern thought, isn't it. This is the Madhyamika school. One school maintaining that what WB~ think of as reality is only mentation; the other, that what we think of as reality is only a set of logical fictions. Therefore,...

Manjuvajra: Would it be true to say that, what they mean by mere mentation, is that there is nothing behind the idea, there is no basis.

S: Yes.

Manjuvajra: Pure idea. But "logical fictions" - is that there is something there, but you've laid some kind of story on to it, some kind of... S: No, logical fictions, there is nothing in fact there - there is only Sunyata, the Void, - that even the mental events, or what you think of as mental events, are just logical fictions. In a sense the Madhyamika school goes one step further.

Sagaramati: Isn't it there a division in the Madhyamika though - some of them say that there is something behind...

S: Yes, that is the Svatantrika school, which is regarded by the purists as a sort of concession to the Yogacara; but the dominant school, which Candrakirti established, - and to which Santideva belongs, and to which Tsong-kha-pa belongs, - was the Prasangika school, which maintained very strictly this thesis that reality is a set of logical fictions.

Dharmapala: Does logical fiction correspond with 'operational concept'?

S: Yes, one could say that. Therefore in the holy land of India there are two great trends in the Mahayana. These do not differ in their intention insofar as it concerns the development of the Enlightenment attitude (i.e. Bodhicitta) and the practice of the six paramitas (perfections). There is only a difference in philosophical thinking. As has been

made clear by the Buddha himself in many Sutras, these two ways of elucidation correspond to the individual understanding of those who have obeyed. In other words, you can gain Enlightenment by following the Madhyamika teaching or following the Yogacara teaching, it doesn't make any difference, - even though they are actually different teachings, or different ways of looking at things. Therefore, if you want to know more deeply the specific points in the teaching of Asanga and his brother positing an alaya- vijnana and by implication establishing the whole of reality as being of mentation only, you should look up the works of Asanga and his brother as well as Tsong-kha-pa's 'legs-bshad'. If you want to know the specific points of Nagarjuna's thought, you should look up those works which are so valuable in the three worlds the 'Thamthön' and the 'rtsa 'jug gi rnam' of Tsong-kha-pa.

,~

182 - 22 -

S(continued): These works are unfortunately not available in English. In other words, the author is following the Yogacara tradition, with regards to mind and mental events, only so far as it is more or less common to all the different schools. He quotes, as we shall see, both from Madhyamika teachers and Yogacara teachers.

Manjuvajra: On page 15, in the paragraph that begins Although there seem to be many specific distinctions in the earlier and later philosophical systems concerning the three conditions of these six perceptual functions, what are those three conditions?

S: I think it means past, present and future, but I won't be sure of that.

Padmapani: What are the two ways of elucidation? I know it's the two schools but what...presumably it's made clear in the Sutras. the Buddha himself says....these two ways- of elucidation correspond to the individual understanding of those who have to be aided.

S: In a sense it's very broadly, - it's a more metaphysical approach, or even dialectical approach, - and a more, inverted commas, 'psychological' approach. Or if you like, a more logical approach, and a more psychological approach.

Padmapani: I would have thought that one would have followed on from the other.

S: Well, they are inter-connected. You can't altogether separate the two, it's a question of predominant emphasis. You could say that the Madhyamika is in a way more concerned with abstract truth; the Yogacara more concerned with experience. You could say that, though that is very, very broad, a very crude generalisation.

Padmapani: Wasn't the Yogacara thought taken for relative truth and the Madhyamika viewed as....

S: Yes, by some Madhyamikas, but this author clearly isn't following a particular point

of view.

Asvajit: They clearly lead to the same goal.

S: Well, this is what he says. You could say that Nagarjuna's approach is to try to expose the~ unreal nature of what we take as reality, by exposing its contradictory nature. This is Nagarjunafs approach.

Padmapani: Can you repeat that, Bhante?

S~: - Nagarjuna tries to show the non-reality of what we take to be real, by exposing its contradictory nature; he tries to show it couldn't possibly exist,- he gives sound logical reasons for that. He tries as it were to argue you out of your belief in the reality of things that you usually perceive,in the ultimate reality, that is.

Abhaya: Is it a bit like the Platonic method?

S: It is in a way, yes. Perhaps even more like the Eleatic method of Parmenides and his school.

Abhaya: Eleatic?

S: Hmm. Eleatic philosophers, the philosophers of Elea.

Vimalarriitra: This is Santideva's school, the Madhyamikas.

S: Yes.

Padmavajra: Who's the other bloke....

- 23 - 183

S: Parmenides;-but Parmenides embarked upon, you know, this spiritual exercise, in the interests of absolute being, whereas Nagarjuna~ embarks upon it in the interests of sunyata. Re tried to show that everything we-take as reality, everything formulated which we think of as reality, is riddled with contradictions, including even the categories of Buddhist thought. And so that everything is demolished except sunyata, only sunyata remains. Though not even the concept of sunyata. But it's as though the Yogacara tries more to broaden, and deepen, and purify your actual experience, that seems more its approach. So Nagarjuna seems to rely much more upon sustained philosophical - thinking, and the Yogacara seems to rely more,-though it has a very strong philosophical side,-seems to rely more upon

meditation. It is in fact called the 'Yogacara' school, 'yoga' in the sense of meditation, 'Yogacara' meaning the practice of yoga.

Asvajit: They seem to work very well together.

S: They do, they do, and this is how in fact the Tibetans take them, and many did in India.

Abhaya: Who is the great exponent of the Yogacara?

S: First of all Asanga; following him is his~ brother Vasubandhu, and then there is Sthiramati the Commentator.

Abhaya: What's the difference in time? ~hen did Nagarjuna....

S: Nagarjuna is much earlier, he's at least three hundred, possibly four hundred years earlier. Second century A.D., some say even first century A.D. Conze's given a chart in Buddhism: Its Essence And Development. And the others, Asanga and Vasubandhu, are fifth or even sixth century, probably fifth century.

Padmapani: Did you say A.1). or B.C.?

S: A.D. These are all far earlier than the first of the great Hindu philosophers, like Shnk~r~, he didn't come along until the eighth century.

Padmavajra: Who is that?

S: Shankaracarya. A.D.

Asvajit: He wasn't strictly Buddhist was he?

3: Ho no, that's why I say the great-Buddhist thinkers all c~ome along before the Hindu, the first of the great Hindu t~inkers. Conze has given a time chart at the back of Buddhism: Its Essence And Development. This gives you the dates, at least the approximate dates of all these figures. But do you begin to get some sort of impression of the kind of world of thought, and even in a sense, speculation, in which these ancient Indian teachers lived? The sort of topics that they were pre- occupied with, and concerned about?

Abhaya: Is that one reason, you think, why,- just one reason why,- Buddhism waned in India, because it got too intellectual, too rational or was Yogacara?

S: I think there is such a thing as creative intellectuality, yeah? You see what I mean, the phase of creative intellectuality was as it were very stimulating and challenging and interesting, but the period of creative intellectuality seems to have been succeeded by one of purely

scholastic intellectuality - it wasn't creative, and that in due course became somewhat rigid and out of contact with the spiritual reality, divorced from spiritual experience. Thit there is a

very vigorous intellectual activity almost down to the end of Buddhism in India, and certainly very intensive spiritual activity, before, you know, the crash finally came. Atisa belongs to the eleventh century.

- 24 - 184

Abhaya: Was he Yogacara or what was....

S: He combined both, one can say. (Pause.) Anyway by this time we ought to have a clear idea of what is meant by mind at least in the Sarvastivada-Ahhidharma-Yogacara trad~tion; and even what is meant by mental events. (Pause.) Dead on six; any further points, any general points?

(Pause.)

Padmapani: There seems to me,~~actually,~ Bhante, on~ a practical level,- I remember it mentioned in the book here earlier on,-about the importance of knowing mind and its concomitants in relation say to meditation, but in a way, meditation tends to,-is it a process whereby you assimilate information and then you, through the meditation, situations come up, whereby you classify that information and you say oh yes, you know.

S: No, it's not so much classification, the classification should have been done earlier, but what is usually said, is that, say, one studies a particular aspect of the doctrine; one understands it mentally, say intellectually, and then at the time of meditation, when the mind is concentrated, or when the mind has been concentrated, then one calls to mind the particular d~octrine or aspect~~ of~that doctrine which you hav~ previously understood, you call to mind that intellectual understanding, ~nd then you hold it as it were, that intellectual understanding before you as an object, and you then allow your concentrated mind to penetrate into that intellectual understanding or that doctrine as you had previously intellectually understood~ it. You can then go further and more deeply into it and that gives rise to a sort of actual insight when it becomes practised very much and becomes very intense. In other words it's almost as though the intellectual understanding gives you a sort of almost framework of reference.

Padmapani: Unclear

S: For the development of insight, that insight can only be developed only when there is concentrated energy of meditation behind it. So this is the normal procedure, the standard procedure. Though sometimes it happens that with a concentrated mind you just look and start seeing things, developing insights, for yourself,-that may happen too,- but that's how it originally happened to the Buddha,-but if one takes these sort of

(End of tape 6)

MBP/7 185

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Tape 7; (Page 13 Day 3)

Sangharakshita; ... .. Because sometimes it happens that, you know, with a concentrated mind, you just look, as it were, and you start seeing things, developing insights for yourself. That may happen too, well that's how it happened originally with the Buddha, But if one takes the intellectual formulation of, or rather the conceptual formulation of an insight, of someone else's previous insight, one understands that conceptual formulation intellectually and that understanding becomes a basis, in meditation, for the development of one's own insight. Like, for instance, someone out of a sort of artistic inspiration paints a picture. So that the picture is something which is objectively there, you see that picture, you appreciate that picture, that puts you in a certain mood, and you can, perhaps, if you're very sensitive, capture for yourself the mood of inspiration, in which the artist painted the picture. So, in the same way, in the context of meditation, you can get via the conceptual formulation, which originally was the expression of someone's insight, back to that insight for yourself. Hmm? That is the sort of standard procedure. Hence the importance of having some doctrinal knowledge, so that it can act as a sort of support, at that moment, 184 at that time — so first of all there where it is said that you hear, that is to say you learn, then you turn over in your mind and understand, then you meditate upon, when you meditate upon what you have understood then insight arises~. Not that insight may not, as it were, spontaneously arise without the support of, you know, some kind of doctrinal structure. It may.

Manjuvajra; So the sort of reading, the studying like this and the struggle to understand intellectually is the sort of accumulation phase, is it? Which they then

S: Hmm, one could say accumulation and application basis, prior to the development of insight, prior to the Darshanamarga, though, of course,, one must emphasise that insight will not necessarily arise in this way for everybody.. That for others there will be other ways, others may realise in the process of action. I mean when you give something, for some people that may be accompanied by an insight, well of course, why not give? It doesn't belong to me anyway Hmm? In that way there may be an insight experience, whereas for somebody else it may come about having studied very carefully, certain doctrinal teachings, having

MBP/7 186

2 thoroughly understood them, then calling them to mind, at the time of meditation and using them as a basis for the development of insight which goes much further and deeper than intellectual understanding, though it takes the intellectual understanding as its point of departure, as it were. As I said that's a standard procedure, this is the one favoured by the Gelugpas, certainly. Though, of course, their critics, among the Nyingmapas would perhaps suggest that in some cases they lingered so long over the proper understanding that they didn't get around to practising any meditation or developing any insight, that is the suggestion. That is the suggestion which the Gelugpas usually

are not prepared to accept. (Laughter) They usually say, well this is what some of them have said to me, very sort of gently and kindly, that, you know, the Nyingmapas, they're always talking about meditation. But actually, it's we Gelugpas who quietly get on with the practise. (Laughter) We don't actually say very much about it (Laughter) This reminds me of what a Sinhalese monk, whom I knew in London when I was with the Hampstead Vihara, and he said one day to me puffing his big cigar, he said, "Meditation, what is this talk about meditation", he said, "Why", he said, "We Ceylon Bhikkus", you know puff you know, "We're always 185 meditating!" (Much Laughter)

A Voice; Is that a Bhikku in robes and everything?

S; Yes! (Laughter) Oh Yes he was (indistinct) smoking big cigars. Ceylon monks don't usually smoke cigars. I must say, you know, they usually smoke cigarettes. (Laughter) The Burmese monks traditionally smoke cigars, it's not regarded - everyone in Burma smokes great fat cheroots, (laughter) monks included, perhaps more as the National custom, no one thinks anything of it. You go to see a monk friend and you take along a handful of cheroots for him. I've been given them by Burmese and Sinhalese upasikas, along with the other offerings, bundles of cigarettes and cigars. ...

Padmavajra; What did you do with them?

S; I suppose... I don't remember. I probably gave them to a monk. But there is a Vinaya text, so I'm told which says that a monk may smoke cigars, that is to say, a certain kind of leaf made into a roll, when living in the jungle, to meditate, in order to

their, you know, justification.

Padmavajra; But you once said to me that Padmasambhava and the Nyingmapas are really against smoking.

S; That's true, they are very, very much indeed. In fact Tibetan Buddhists generally, until very recently, the Dalai Lama, the 13th Dalai Lama, prohibited the import of cigarettes into Tibet, in the pain of very heavy penalties. So cigarettes had to be smuggled in during his regime. He was a very strict ruler.

Vimalamitra; Do the Nyingmapas give any reason?

S; Oh yes they do indeed. They say, for instance, why do you burn incense? it's to create a good atmosphere, good vibes,

to attract devas, because it's a sweet and pleasant smell, but the smell of tobacco? It's unpleasant. So what sort of beings, do you think, that would attract. Evil spirits. So wherever you smoke tobacco evil spirits gather, which is exactly the opposite of what you want to do. You don't want to be surrounded by clouds of evil spirits who are snuffing up with this horrible smell of tobacco, you want to be surrounded by, you know, beautiful, pure deva-like presences, inhaling incense. So they say that whenever you smoke tobacco you set off all sorts of unpleasant vibrations, which attract quite unpleasant influences and entities. And they believe this very strongly and because they are so much into meditation and ritual that they insist very much on abstention from, you know, tobacco and from any form of smoking. They don't bother so much about wine. Anyway that is the Nyingmapa point of view. It may be that they reflect,

MBP/7 188 or that they continue, certain Indian traditions, Tantric 4

traditions, of about the time when the muslim invasion started,

because, as far as I know, it is the muslims who brought into India, the custom of smoking - I'm not sure whether it was tobacco smoking, but smoking something or other, of that kind, and it was at that time that the later tantric teachers were around, and the prohibition against smoking, on the part of the tantrics, seemed to originate at that time, and to have been inherited, as it were, by the Nyingmapas, Padmasambhava, of course, going to Tibet at about that same time. Anyway that's what the Nyingmapas believe about smoking tobacco. One can see there is a certain sense in it. It isn't a very pleasant smell, on the whole is it? It isn't very inspiring. Which would you prefer in a shrine? incense or tobacco? I'd personally prefer incense, because it's more uplifting, more inspiring, more purifying as it were. Even if you go into a room the next day~~~ after incense has been burned the previous evening, what sort of smell do you get, quite pleasant. But you go into a room in which people have been smoking the night before, what sort of smell do you get? really stale and, you know, I need not say any more, that speaks for itself, it tells its own story. I don't want to make anyone feel guilty or start being conscious of demons all around or anything like that. Anyway there aren't many smokers left in the Friends now.

Mark; I've got eleven months. I've got eleven months to go now.

S; You've got how long to go?

Mark; Eleven months before I start again! (Laughter)

S; I thought you'd taken your vow only for three months?

189 Mark; Oh no. A year! 5

S; A year was it? That's very good.

Mark; I thought three months. I could see the end of that. A year might work.

S; All right let's leave it there All right, Page 18, "The Mental Events".

Sagaramati; "In the discussion of the mental events the phung-po In a'i rab b ed (Pancaskandha rakarana, P.ed.113,p.237,4.4) states the nature of mental events as follows 7b : What are mental events? They are whatever correspond to the mind."

S; What do you think is meant by "correspond" (Acompany?) Not just accompany but

whatever are in accordance with the general nature of the mind, as it were, as the mind is, so the mental events are, in correspondance. In a way they share the same general nature.

Sagaramati; "When these mental events are classified there are fifty-one:"

S; This is the classification of this particular tradition. There are others.

Sagaramati; "1. Five ever present ones beginning with feeling tone 2. Five object determining ones beginning with interest 3. Eleven positive ones beginning with confidence-trust 4. Six basic emotions beginning with cupidity- attachment 5. Twenty proximate emotions beginning with indignation 6. Four variables beginning with drowsiness"

S; Right, let's carry straight on.

Asvajit; "The phung-po Inga'i rab-byed (Pancaskandhaprakarana, P.ed.113,p.237,5.1-5.2) states: 1. Five are omnipresent. 2. Five are always certain about any object which becomes their domain. 3. Eleven are positive (i.e. only operate in positive attitudes). 4. Six are the(basic) emotions (i.e. the are upsetting and, by coloring one's view, make clarity of mind turbulent). 5. The remaining are proximate. 6. Four are variable."

S; So there's going to be a discussion of each of these,six sets in turn. So let's go straight into the first one, the first set.

Manjuvajra; Could I just ask what "proximate" means?

S; This seems to be Guenther's own word for minor or secondary, It's "klesas" or "upaklesas",in Sanskrit, klesa meaning a'defilement'

190

MBP/7 The word klesa has got a double meaning - it's that which afflicts

6 and also that which defiles. Sometimes it's translated as 'defiling passions' or sometimes simply 'defiled'. So what he translates as the basic emotions or emotions are the klesas proper and what he translates as the proximate emotions or simply as the remaining approximates are the upaklesas. These are mainly secondary or subordinate or minor.

Padmavajra; What was his term for 'klesa', 'the klesas'?

S; Well he speaks first of all of 'Basic emotions' (klesas) and 'proximate emotions' (upaklesas). They're proximate in the sense that they are in proximity to the basic emotions. They sort of hang around the basic emotions in subordinate forms of them. It would probably be best to say 'primary defilements' and'secondary defilements' or 'root defilements' and 'branch defilements', something like that.

Padmapani; "The Five Omnipresent Mental Events" kun'gro Inga The five omnipresent mental events (that operate in the wake of every mind situation) are: 1. Feeling-tone

itshor-ba 2. Conceptualization 'du-shes 3. Directionality of mind isems-pa 4.  
Rapport reg-pa 5. Egocentric demanding iyid la byed-pai"

S: Yes you notice your sheet will give you the Sanskrit, the original Sanskrit terms for these, that is to say 'vedana', 'samjna', 'cetana', 'sparsa' and 'manasikara' ....as far as I know these five are the same in all the different Abhidharma traditions so they may be numerated in a slightly different order.. .so in every mind situation, that is to say, in every situation where there is a mind perceiving an object - or rather in every situation in which there is perception - one could say, in which the mind not only perceives the object but, as it were, moves in the direction of the object. In every situation, whether skilful or unskilful there are these five mental events. They operate in the wake of every mind situation. 'In the wake of' is of course, I think, Guenther's own expression, perhaps one shouldn't take that too literally. . .Alright let's go on and see what the author has to say about the first of these "Omnipresent mental events", which is the 'feeling tone or 'vedana', as it is in the original Sanskrit and Pali.

Robert; "Feeling-tone itshor-bai In the mngon-pa kun-las-btus (Abhidharmasamuccaya,p.2) the nature of feeling is explained as follows: What is the absolutely specific characteristic of feeling? It is to experience. That is to say, in any experience, what we experience is the individual maturation of any positive or negative action as its final result".

S; So what is the 'absolutely specific character of feeling? Th is to experience', which is as good as to say it can't really be defined. Can you really define feelings. Can you describe feelings really? Hmm?

Sagaramati; It can't be described in terms of anything but itself.

S; Even to say that the specific characteristic of feeling is to experience really is some what tautological, you know. We all know what feeling is as distinct from thought but if

there was any such thing as a being that had no feelings we couldn't

191

MBP/7 communicate what feeling really was. Hmm?

7 Vimalamitra; What's the distinction between,.. there is a distinction between 'bodily feeling' and 'feeling' generally; isn't there?

S; Yes, we do come on to that.

Padmapani; Are you saying that the ~xperience of feeling can't be expressed in conceptual terms?

S; Well yes and no. You can't communicate what feeling is like to someone who has no experience of feeling. But if someone has already some experience of feeling and you want to comm-unicate your feeling you can do that by conceptual terms but only through pointing

out by means of those conceptual terms something in his experience which is analagous to something in your experience.

Padmapani; But it's not the same feeling necessarily is it?

S; Oh no how can that be the same feeling, I mean your feeling is your feeling, his feeling is his feeling. That's why I said something analagous~ in your experience and something analagous in his experience. It's a specific feeling - feeling is some- thing specific

Padmapani; That's what I mean, it can't be experienced.

S; He cannot experience your feelings, the same kind of feelings Hmm? I~o

Padmapani; Yeah, Yeah...

S; and you can experience the same kind of feeling that he ex- periences. I mean if you stick a pin in yourself you feel some- thing - you stick it in him he feels something - it isn't the same feeling but is's the same kind of feeling. So when you stick a pin in him and he makes the same sort of, same sort of sound that you made when you stuck a~pin in yourself then you infer that he is having an experience or a feeling of the same kind that you are Hmm? But you don't directly perceive his feeling, nor does he perceive yours. You don't experience each others feelings - most we can say is that you experience the same kind of feeling.

Manjuvajra; Would happiness and sadness and joy and so on - would they be called 'feelings'?

S; Yes again we come on to that - these are 'mental feelings' , as it wer~.

Manjuvajra; What would be the difference between a 'feeling and an'emotion'?

S; Well this is not discussed in this particular question. Wut I would say that a 'feeling' - 'feelings' are the raw material of emotions.. Ah, for instance Spinoza discusses this. If you have, he says, a feeling of pleasure and that feeling of pleasure is accompanied by the idea of the cause of that pleasure then you feel love towards the cause of that pleasure. If you have a feeling of pain and that feeling of pain is accom- panied by the idea of an external cause then you feel~the emotion of hate towards that external cause. In this way emotions are

192

MBP/7 built up out of feelings. Feelings are, as it were, as I said, the raw material of emotions. 8

Manjuvaira; Emotion:~is more connected with an actual relation- ship with

something else whereas a feeling is more integral?

S: Well a feeling is a product of a relationship with something else. There is always an object.

Sagaramati; The feeling can be, as it were, the result of... what he says here - it's the result of past action-. The emotion is definitely you acting. If you feel ( ) then you ( ) the action.

S; Yes it's as though it's you yourself who take them up and use them as raw material and manufacture, as it were, the emotions, not that the emotions are automatically produced. Vedana, as indeed it says here, is maturation or vipaka.

Vimalamitra; So if you have a painful experience you needn't

S:.. You need not manufacture hatred out of that. If you do - and this is what we were saying yesterday - then you render yourself liable to further painful sensations in the future because you've then, by manufacturing, as it were, anger, performed another karma, another unskillful karma - and what is the result of unskillful karma? Pain and suffering. This is why I stressed this point in connection with the Wheel of Life. You remember the nidanas? You remember that feeling or vedana is the last of the nidanas that make up the result process of the present life. And what is the first nidana - the cause process of the present life?

Vimalamitra; Craving.

S; That is craving. So craving here - in the terms of this discussion - one could say is an emotion. Craving is not something that just happens to you. Craving is something that you do. It's a karma. So similarly with hatred and with love - metta and so on. So feelings are presented to one. One experiences feelings, but what do you do with those feelings, as it were, whether you manufacture them into negative emotions or positive emotions, that is up to you. That constitutes your karma. So one could say feeling is passive, emotion is active which is what the word emotion itself suggests, doesn't it?

Sagaramati; Relating it to the metta bhavana practice it seems that originally you try to just contact the feeling, you try to feel a pleasant feeling and on the basis of that

S; Yes, because it's easier to develop metta from pleasant feeling than from painful feeling. When your metta is well under way then you can conjure up the mental picture of the enemy which normally would give rise to unpleasant feeling, a painful feeling and therefore to hatred. But when already the mind is strongly imbued with metta, and you've conjured up the mental picture of the enemy the enemy does not seem, as it were, unpleasant. It is not even a painful sensation or painful feeling so then you can proceed quite easily or comparatively easily, to develop metta even towards the enemy.

Vimalamitra; When you gain insight you've got a kind of permanent gap between what you feel and what

MBP/7 S; Yes, when you gain insight then it is impossible, depending upon the degree of insight attained, for an unskilful mental state to arise in dependence upon a painful feeling. So the author of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, quoted by the author of this text says that "that is to say in any experience, what we experience is the individual maturation of any positive or negative action as its final result". So feeling is experience, experience is maturation, or vipaka. The vipaka or the maturation or the result or the effect of a skilful or unskilful action committed in the past, and that vipaka, that experience, that feeling constitute the final result of that skilful or unskilful action. (Pause) We could say - and this is very roughly following Schopenhauer's line of thought - that from our personal point of view there are two classes of events in the universe. There are things that happen to us and there are things that we do. Schopenhauer calls the first idea the *Vorstellung* and the second *Will*.

Asvajit; Can you say that again Bhante?

S; The German terms? Following, very roughly, Schopenhauer's line of thought, every thing that happens in the universe, from our personal point of view, can be divided into two great classes. There are things that happen to us, for instance it rains - that is something that is happening to us. We have nothing to do with the falling of the rain - the rain just falls. We experience that. We are passive in respect to it, or in respect of it. It just happens to us. This is what he calls idea or *Vorstellung*, though it is a more, sort of, epistemological way of putting it. And then the second class of events, things that we do. Things that we initiate. Things in respect of which we are active. That is covered by the term will. So from the Buddhist point of view it is vipaka, things that happen to us, and karma, things that we do. By doing, of course, is meant willed action not just purely functional activity which goes on independent of the will. But again, the sort of basic point of Buddhism is that the two are tied up together. That our present vipaka is the product of past karma - there is a point here, in as much as it is the teaching, at least of the Theravada and should be the teaching of the other schools too although they don't always make it fully explicit, that not everything you experience is the direct result of a karma performed individually by you in a previous existence. Many of the things that happen to you are the product, as it were, of your environment! But how have you come to be in that environment? You come to be in that environment because you have a particular psycho-physical organism which is in the position of experiencing that environment. And how have you come to be in possession of that particular psycho-physical organism? - on account of previous karmas. So indirectly, everything that you experience is a vipaka of previous karmas. But not necessarily directly. I mean, for instance, suppose it rains and the fact that it rains prevents you from doing something that you want to do. The rain is not necessarily the karmic consequence, the vipaka, of your having stopped somebody from doing something that he wanted to do in one of your previous lives. NO. The fact is that you have set up in the past karmas which result in your being reborn as a particular psycho-physical organism in a particular kind of world which has such a thing as weather.

Kamalasila; Is vipaka always feeling, or is it events, or

S; No, vipaka is everything that happens to you and everything that you experience therefore. I mean, how do you come in contact

MBP/7 with the vipakas? You experience them and that experience has a feeling tone, a feeling quality, in other words - vedana. 10

Sagaramati; When you talk about the whole universe as being the result of karma, I mean it's almost like there are... there is karma as it were outside you - a non-personal karma. I don't mean even other beings' karma. It's almost like the tape-recorder had a karma.

S; The Buddhist texts don't use the term collective karma but they do make it clear, certainly the Sarvastivadin texts and I think, following those, the Yogachara texts, that there is such a thing that we... to which the term collective karma might be applied and a world, as it were, comes into existence, if one can use that expression, because there are a number of beings performing the same kind of actions and therefore setting up the same kind of results so that they have, as it were, results in common. Those results in common constitute their world - which they perceive in common. Maybe each one perceiving slightly differently but, broadly speaking, they perceive in common. They perceive the same world. And on the same principle of course, a Buddha by virtue of his infinitely powerful volition sets up single handed a whole ideal environment which is called a pure land in which others who have managed to tune in to that can be reborn into and which they can perceive and experience and in which they can live. So this is very much the sort of general Buddhist point of view of mind and especially volition as a sort of creative force which is capable of producing what we would call objective consequences, I mean, expressions such as "It's only a thought" are just not very Buddhist at all. If it's a thought it's everything. Thought is a force, thought is a power. If thought is an energy.

Sagaramati; But you talk about matter being born of past thoughts.

S; Yes but it's not matter it's rupa and what is rupa? Rupa is, as Guenther says, the what does he define it as?. The objective content of the perceptual situation.

~;That fits in with what you've just said previously.

Abhaya; So could you say, following from that, what we are striving to do is to be reborn into a Sakyamuni Buddha-field because he is the one that instigated everything that is happening now?

S; One could say that. That is putting it in those particular terms. The matter could be put in, as it were, impersonal terms that one's aim is to gain enlightenment or one's aim is to gain Nirvana. But one can also put it in terms of attaining rebirth in a Pure Land of that sort which is what, of course, the Pure Land schools do. They don't always say that it is another way of putting it. They don't look at it in Abhidharma terms, you know, they just very often look at it in straightforwardly devotional and spiritual terms but this is, in fact, one could say, what it amounts to.

Abhaya; It's the first time it has ever made the connection in my mind. One always thinks of the Pure Land as a purely devotional, sort of, category of Buddhism.

Vimalamitra; Does this necessarily mean being objectively born

19~

MBP/7 into a pure Buddha field, or, if you are following the Bodhisattva Ideal, can you be either in that Buddha-field or still on the Earth? 11

S; But this raises the whole question of what is objectivity. I mean, in a sense Buddhism would regard that as a sort of artificial question. There is a sort of objective pole of one's experience and a subjective pole but Buddhism wouldn't encourage one to think in terms of an object which was actually out there, as it were, waiting for you to perceive it.

Padmapani; But that is what the Ceylonese Buddhists tend to imply when they say about the coming Maitreya. They say it very much as an objective thing.

S; Well that language is not wrong because we speak in terms of, say, something in this room as an objective thing out there but actually it isn't. So we can use the language - there's no harm in using the language - we have no other language to use in fact. It is simply.. we must not be misled by it. Just as the Buddha says in one of the Pali texts, "The Tathagata uses the terms of conventional speech but he is not misled by them". So, in the crude literal sense, there is nothing out there.

Padmapani; Speaking in terms of a friend - it suddenly came to me - you were talking about, sort of, a certain amount of people do certain acts and they create their own world. I mean the question proves that's quite an important point, isn't it?

S; Well, of course, It is suggested for instance by the Jataka Utories, that a group of people can, sort of, as it were, travel down the centuries or travel down the ages even, as it were re-incarnating all together, at the same time and in the same place ~~4 as a "group" - inverted commas - and carrying on their, as it were, group life and various inter-relationships. Well you get this in the Jatakas, don't you? When the Buddha relates a story and he says in that particular story, and it's a story about something that happened millions of years ago, such and such a figure was myself, such and such was Ananda, such and such was Devadatta. There is the same dramatis personae exactly, as it were, in different guises, but standing in much the same relationship to one another as in this last life on earth as Sakyamuni and so on. In this life Devadatta tries to murder the Buddha. In a previous life, when the Buddha was a monkey king and Devadatta was another big powerful monkey Devadatta jumps in his back and breaks it. It's the same pattern. So you get the impression reading the Jataka stories and other works of a group of people, as it were, making this journey together down the ages.

Mark; This is because they are, sort of, creating the same sort of karma and using up, sort of.

S; Not only creating the same sort of karma but creating karma with regard to one another. It is as though Devadatta couldn't leave the Buddha alone. (Laughter) He was always thinking about the Buddha but in a negative sort of way and therefore he got reborn along

with the Buddha. They somehow got sort of tangled up together. I remember reading many years ago at the beginning of an occult novel and the novel began in a quite dramatic manner with a childbirth and just as the child was being born - I mean this is not very accurate from the occult point of view but any way this is the novel - just as the child was being born, WHOOSH, in through the window came a spirit, a discarnate entity

r

196

MBP/7 and went straight into the body of the child and was reborn and just a few minutes later there came through the window, sort of 12 banging on the window, trying to get in, a second spirit which was the husband or lover or boyfriend of the first chasing after her wanting to get reborn in the same vicinity just to carry on that relationship and work things out a bit more or grt them a bit more tangled up so he had to be born next door (Laughter) where another childbirth was in process and then it started all over again - they grew up together etc. etc. So you had this dramatic opening, the one in pursuit of the other trying to get reborn in the same sort of locale so they could continue their karmic games. It's an illustration of the same sort of thing.

Abhaya; It reminds me of that Ouspensky novel. . .Who was that? Ivan... .it's just the name of the hero that in this book he is reborn in exactly the same sort of situation and makes the same mistake at the same point every time.. and realises he has a chance to get out but when it comes to the same point in his life he makes the same mistake again.

S; Sometimes it does seem with certain people that you are picking up the threads that were dropped a long time ago and this is perhaps a possible explanation, though not to press it too much or romanticise it unduly and all that. END OF SIDE ONE

CASS 7 SIDE 2 S; Anyway let's carry on.

Padmapani; The Tibetans call it a karmic link, don't they? S; Yes, yes.

Abhaya; "Here the ~xperience of feeling is called maturation. This is said for the purpose of becoming aware of the fact that pleasant or unpleasant feelings arising in us are nothing more than the result of the maturation of our action. The lam-rim chen-mo explains this as follows: The infallibility of our actions means that, whether we be ordinary persons i~ai or exalted beings, any pleasure with its pleasant feeling tone which occurs in us or any feeling of relief as is felt in a cool breeze by those born in hell, starts from previously accumulated positive actions, for it is impossible for pleasure to come from negative actions. So also, every painful feeling, even if it may occur in a saintly person comes from previously accumulated negative actions, for it is impossible for pain to come from positive actions. The rin chen 'phreng-ba (Ratnamala) states, From negative actions come all frustrations and also, all evil forms of life. From positive actions come all happy forms of life, And also, all happiness in every walk of life. Therefore, pleasure and frustration do not originate without a

cause nor do they originate from inappropriate causes such as the gods Visnu, Siva, or anyone else. From generally positive or negative actions come generally positive or negative feelings. The various shades of these feelings come from the intensity of positive or negative actions. In each case, the certainty that the relationship between one's action and its result is certain and infallible, with no irregularity whatsoever, is the right view held by all Buddhists and praised as the foundation of all that is bright."

197

MBP/7           Bright means... .skilful. That's quite clear isn't it.

13       Tsong-kha-pa is, as far as one can see, a very clear writer indeed. There is an American scholar - Alex Wayman -

who has been working on a translation of the "Lam-rim" at least for twenty-five years. He used to be in quite regular correspondance with me. I think it is pretty nearly finished now. Lengthy extracts have appeared here and there. And, as I said from all that one can see, Tsong-kha-pa is a remarkably clear and precise and scrupulous sort of writer. So, when that translation does come out, no doubt, it will be in many ways very useful.

Mark; Is it a really massive book?

S; It's not all that massive actually. It is certainly not more than that maybe not even half of that. But it is very condensed - and is the leading textbook for the Gelugpas. There are two great works by Tsong-kha-pa, one is this one - "The Great Stages of The Path", and the other is "The Great Stages of The Tantric Path". There is also a very short version of "The Great Stages of The Path" which he made for absolute beginners. A very abbreviated version of not more than about a hundred pages.

Padmavajra; That's published by the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.

S; Alright, let's carry on.

Vimalamitra; Who is the author of this book? Who's the actual writer responsible for the text?

S:       He is mentioned at the beginning isn't he?

Robert; Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan.

S; Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan, 1713 -1793, roughly contemporary with Dr. Johnson (Laughter) He lived a little longer. (Pause) There's quite a thought - enabling one to get a bit of perspective, I mean Milarepa was roughly contemporary with William the Conqueror and Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan roughly with Dr. Johnson. Halfway through his lifetime - that is Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan's lifetime - Blake was born and Goethe was born, so one can get something of a comparative perspective, a comparative time scale. While Dr. Johnson was writing "Rassalas" he was writing this. Alright carry on then.

Vimalamitra; "Feeling is classified as pleasant, unpleasant, and indifferent. The phung-po Inga'i rab-byed (Pancaskandhaprakaran P.ed.113,p237,3.6 - 4.2) i8bi states, What is feeling? It is three ways of experiencing - pleasantly, unpleasantly, and indifferently.'Pleasant' is that which one would like to feel again (when the original feeling is over). 'unpleasant' is what one would like to get rid of when it is present 'Indifferent' is where neither of these two desires occur."

S; Let's just stay with that bit. Does that sound convincing - "The pleasant is that which one would like to feel again when the original feeling is over". Necessarily so?

A You can experience it without wanting.. thinking you'd like to do it again.

198

MBP/7 Abhaya; I think it would be clearer to state it in the same way as he stated unpleasant - pleasant is that which one likes to 14 keep oh I don't know.

Padmapani; It seems to me that pleasant you want to feel again only when you experience the unpleasant.

Sagaramati; One is an experience that is (indistinct) a bit, sort of neurotic, isn't it?

S; Well, perhaps it is. It seems that there are different ways of experiencing pleasure. Or perhaps what we think of as an experience of pleasure is, in fact, more near to indifference! I mean certainly there are pleasant experiences that one would like to repeat. But also there is the fact to be considered that your organism has its limitations. For instance supposing you have a good meal. You enjoy the meal so one can say that is a pleasant experience but you don't desire to repeat the -pleasant experience immediately. But surely there is, as it were, at the back of your mind, a sort of wish almost that you should be able to have good meal the next time the organism is ready for it.

Manjuvajra; That arises in terms of thinking. . . . I mean supposing you were eating brown rice - you start to think, well "brown rice is something I enjoy! I'd like to have that again some time". I mean as you are eating it with the pleasantness you register what it is you are doing so that you can repeat it.

S; It's not that you necessarily want to repeat that pleasant experience again immediately on the spot. It's not as crude as that, as it were, but it does seem that there is this tendency to think in terms of, or to be prepared for, or anticipate the repetition of that experience and to prefer that the experience should be repeated rather than not repeated. No doubt there is all of a sort of scale of pleasantness, a scale of desires to repeat, at some time or other.

Kamalasila; So it's you creating a karma to want that experience.

S; Yes. If you just enjoy your meal you are not creating karma. We did talk about this once or twice before because somebody did suggest.. I think he said that if you were really mindful you wouldn't actually enjoy the food that you were eating. Do you remember that?

Sagaramati; That was ~bodhi in 'Shabda'.

S; Yes, this is what he actually said - that if you were.. if you ate mindfully you would not enjoy the food that you ate. But now, does one agree with this?

Voices; No.

S; No, because you can enjoy, in a sense of experiencing the pleasant sensation, without necessarily giving rise to a desire to repeat that experience. In other words, you can enjoy mindfully. In fact you can only, in that way, enjoy mindfully. If you are not mindful, well then the wish to repeat sooner or later will inevitably arise. But it is possible to enjoy mindfully and without giving rise to karma. I think this is

a quite important point that the fact that you are mindful doesn't mean that you have to starve out or kill out pleasant feeling. Clearly you are on a knife edge here. But you have to balance yourself as best you may. In order to be mindful you don't have to kill feeling, or in order to be non-attached you don't have to kill feeling.

Padmavajra; You can think of it... I think perhaps quite a good example of that is meditation. If you have a good meditation, or a pleasurable meditation, obviously - it is not going to be, well, bad karma anyway. That's a bit different though.

S; So when the author says "'pleasant' is that which one would like to feel again when the original feeling is over". I mean 'pleasant' is that to which, at the very least, one has got no objection to it coming again. That's at the very least, Or one just thinks, "Well, wouldn't it be nice if it happened again," or one thinks, "I'd like that to happen again"; or "let me make sure that that happens again as soon as possible." There are all different degrees of the same thing. Or "Let me have it right away again - now". Even without waiting perhaps, you know, for the first experience to die away. So there are these different degrees but you can see the same tendency at work. "'pleasant' is that which one would like to feel again when the original feeling is over.'" So that may be anything from just a.. lack of... disinclination that it should recur to a violent desire that it should as soon as possible.

Mark; The extreme case presumably being, say,(in meditation?) to something or other. Experience something pleasant and want it to be going on and on.

S; So "'Unpleasant' is what one would like to get rid of when it is present.'" There is no question even of - well, there might be in a few cases, in very borderline cases - there is no question of, sort of, waiting till the unpleasant experience is over and then saying, "Well, I wouldn't want that to happen again". Even in, I mean, the unpleasant experience is that which while you are in the midst of it you try to get rid of it. Obviously depending upon the degree of unpleasantness because there are some unpleasant experiences which are more bother to get rid of than to put up with, so you just put up with it. Others may be so painful, so unpleasant, that you want to get rid of them immediately. While you are in the midst of the experience itself you try to get rid of it, or try to get rid of the object which is bringing it all

about.

Padmavajra; This pleasant and unpleasant - it just came to me, you know, like land of the gods and hell. In hell, presumably you want to get out. In the land of the gods you want to go on.

S; Well, this is true, I think, of any sort of pleasant and unpleasant sensations, but, in the case of the pleasant experience you can't go on indefinitely because the nature of your psycho-physical organism is such that, after a while the senses can't take any more and you start experiencing the pleasant sensation less and less strongly, more and more feebly.

Sagaramati; Would that include mentally pleasant feelings?

200

MBP/7 I think it depends upon the level of the feelings. I think the higher the level, in the sense of the plane of sensuous desire, formless plane and so on. . .the higher the level the more refined the senses, the longer you can sustain, I think. I would not be too sure about that but that is what I tend to think.

Manjuvajra; You could say, in a way, that concentration itself is a pleasurable experience. But that is an experience that can continue

S; Yes. . .For instance when you are at a musical concert you can enjoy it very intensely. But, what, a ten hour.. a ten hour concert could you enjoy? A twenty-four hour? No. At least you would have to go to sleep. You know, your psycho- physical organism is not up to it.

Vimalamitra; Real pleasure is being able to let go.

S; That is because the pleasant experience, if prolonged to the point where the psychophysical organism can no longer sustain it, changes from a pleasant experience to an unpleasant experience and then the pleasure is not in continuing to experience but in, as you say, letting go and ceasing to experience.

Vimalamitra; And knowing it.

S; And knowing it (Pause) This is also a fact that complicates the situation. Pleasures don't remain pleasures, I mean eating is a pleasant experience but if you go on eating.. if it comes on it changes into a painful experience. This is what makes pleasure so elusive. It may seem that the problem is to grasp the pleasure or the object giving the pleasure and you may even succeed in grasping it and holding it. But, to your surprise, you discover that the longer you hold it the more it tends to change from a pleasure into a pain. So in grasping pleasure you grasp pain to your surprise.

Vimalamitra; I think the doctrine of opposites is really important.. very important.. it really gives much more the proper idea of what it is all about. Does the same apply to the unpleasant things as you were just saying?

S; You can get used to, at least, uncomfortable things. You can get used to a certain amount of discomfort. It doesn't actually turn into a pleasure, I think, but you can get used to it.

Sagaramati; You become indifferent to it.

You become indifferent. Sometimes it happens that the painful becomes the pleasant - say with a.. say with an unfamiliar kind of art. You know, you don't enjoy it at all at first. It may be even quite painful. But after a while, with practice, you learn to enjoy it and you derive pleasure from it.

Mark; (Working out ?)an acquired taste.

S; An acquired taste, as with tea... as with tea. They say that infants if they are given tea they spit it out the first time same with chocolates. But they develop the taste for

201 MBP/7 these things, unfortunately.

17 Asvajit; or certain kinds of cheeses (Much Laughter)

S; We need go no further than that. (Laughter) Manjuvajra; Even the Abhidharma.

Padmavajra; Does it get painful?

It did yesterday!!! (Laughter)

S; But are there actual painful sensations which become pleasant in course of time-, in the same way that pleasant musical sensations if indefinitely prolonged become actually a source of pain, quite, as it were, automatically, on account of the weakness of the organism. Do you know of that sort of experience with regard to pain. Pain becoming, as it were, pleasure almost automatically in course of time. Do you ever quite have that?

Manjuvajra; I have had something like that, but more to do with the presence of certain feelings which were painful and sticking with them and the pain sort of increases and increases but then suddenly it seems to bubble up into a feeling of intense pleasure.

S; One does in fact find that sometimes in quite extreme situations, like situations of stress, and sometimes it happens that the painful sensation becomes very pleasant. usually it is very painful and then very pleasant and then again very pleasant to very painful. If you are keyed up in certain ways this can happen and then you can see quite clearly the interchangeability of pleasure and pain and that it is essentially the same energy, in a way.

Padmapani; Won't one arrive at indifference?

S; I couldn't say that. That was not my experience that you ended up with indifference, though, sooner or later, the whole sequence came to an end.

Vimalamitra; You tend to have a completely different view because you are on another level.

Sagaramati; The thing that - even say with people - you can meet somebody whom one, as it were, you have an unpleasant feeling with and suddenly you just see something in them that you like or they behave in such a way that you like. It is almost like you just break right through that and you come to quite like them.

S; So it is as though, whether we experience at least in certain circumstances, whether we experience a pleasant sensation or a painful one depends on just some very tiny flick of the switch, as it were. You flick it one way - pleasure. You flick it the other - pain. It does seem sometimes just like that. People have sometimes reported this. I got a letter about it only a few days ago. In connection, say, with the breakup of a relationship. You can see the .. you can feel the switch apparently going backwards and forwards. You experience the intense, say, relief of being free from the, say, the problematic

202

MBP/7 side of that relationship. On the other hand you have lost something. . . you have lost someone that you are attached to. 18 That is the painful side. So the switch flicks, sort of madly backwards and forwards. Sort of relief/sorrow ; relief/sorrow; joy/sorrow; joy/sorrow like that and you can experience the two alternating in that kind of way and, in a sense, hardly know where you are apparently. But one thing you do see quite clearly that pleasure and pain, in a way, are the same thing. You just change your attitude and you get the other. You can turn pleasure into pain and pain into pleasure just by a simple flick of the switch. The switch is you and the flick is the change of attitude.

Manjuvajra; I think seeing that gives you a feeling of (power almost?) It seems though neither of the feelings can have any effect

S; Yes. Well, that is the, in a way, higher indifference, to use that term. That is the true *upeksa* when you don't bother about pleasure or pain. Alright, indifferent is where neither of these two desires occur. An indifferent feeling - sometimes called a neutral feeling is where you neither want the feeling to be repeated in the future nor do you particularly want to get rid of it when it is actually present. .in the present.

Robert; Is that a, sort of, dead indifferent indifference or is it an aware indifference?

S; As far as I remember there are two or even three levels distinguished here. One is, I think, called hedonic indifference, which is the lowest level, which seems to be the level described here. And then what I would call the higher indifference when the mind is, as it were, poised in a higher, more collected, more recollected state and just observes pleasure and pain and is not particularly bothered by either. There is a, sort of, higher, as it were, spiritual happiness present.

Robert; Go either way.

S; Yes;

Padmavajra; What was the third one?

S; Oh I can't recollect now (Pause) Alright, let's go on.

Dharmapala; "These three feelings become six according to their division whether they occur physically or mentally so that one has three physical feelings and three mental feelings."

S; Is that clear? Alright carry on then

Dharmapala; "These three physical feelings are physically pleasant, physically unpleasant and physically indifferent. The three mental feelings are mentally pleasant, mentally unpleasant and mentally indifferent. The difference between physical and mental feelings is that physical feelings occur within the realm of the five sense perceptions while mental feelings are those which occur in the realm of thought."

S; Is that clear? Alright carry on then.

Dharmapala; "Why do we talk about physical feelings as that

203

MBP/7 which occurs within the realm of sense perception? The bzhi brgya pa (Catu...  
" t9

S; Catuhsataka. This is a work by Aryadeva - the four hundred verses.

Dharmapala; "says, Darkness is everywhere just as the skin covers the whole body".

S; And the explanation - read that - read what follows and then we will discuss the whole thing.

Dharmapala; "Since the skin covers the whole body from head to toe, feelings which originate in the realm of the other four sensory perceptions are also called physical feelings."

S; Alright, just leave it there. "Since the skin covers the whole body from head to toe, feelings which originate in the realm of the other four sensory perceptions are also called physical feelings."

Dharmapala; This is, sort of, skin one could really touch.

S; Yes, the skin of course is touched.

Sagaramati; (indecipherable) you could have a pleasant feeling in the realm of the eye but that would be called a physical feeling. I could understand if you touched the eye you could have an unpleasant physical feeling.

Dharmapala; Well, if someone shone a really bright light in your eye that would give you a feeling.

Sag; A physical feeling.

Dharmapala; Yes, I mean, your eye would move and you would get a, sort of, through that organ, a, sort of sensory feeling.

Sagaramati; Yes, that's right.

Manjuvajra; If you looked at something that was... like a picture. If the picture gave you a pleasant feeling that's a pleasant feeling through the eye.

Kamalasila; Or a colour.

Manjuvajra; Or a sound.

S; Or a colour or a sound through the ear.

Padmavajra; Yes, but doesn't that go into the thought. If you see a picture doesn't your thought come into play.

Manjuvajra; It could be an abstract.

S; Yes, your thought does come into play but the object is experienced via the sense organ. If, at some subsequent date, you conjure up a mental image of that picture, then, of course, it is the mind at work independent of sense organs.

Manjuvajra; I don't understand this quotation.

S; Yes, I wonder what the point of it is - "Darkness is everywhere

K w 204

MBP/7 just as the skin covers the whole body.~ "Since the skin covers the whole body from head to toe, feelings which originate in the realm of the other four sensory perceptions are also called physical feelings." The other four being the four other than touch, because skin is the organ of touch.

Manjuvajra; I can see that that means that everything that is within the realm of your eyes is a kind of visual skin in that it is, sort of, outside.. it is the boundary. And all the sounds that you hear is also another kind of skin.

S; I feel it doesn't explain exactly the meaning here. (Pause) Why do we talk about physical feeling as that which occurs within the realm of sense perception?

Sagaramati; That seems to be. The difficult point seems to be in the realm.

S; Well, yes. What is the difficulty here that he is trying to resolve? Because "Within the realm of sense perception." What is the realm of sense perception?

Sagaramati; I would have thought that would have been the .... Ayatana

Abhaya; Physical organism.

S; Yes, the Ayatana. The realm of eye perception is the whole visual field, presumably and a physical feeling pertaining to the eye is something which occurs or something which is experienced with regard to any object within that visual field. The "Darkness"... obviously this is a visual thing, so darkness is everywhere. You could also say light is everywhere. The visual field is wherever the eye perceives and a visual feeling can relate to the whole of that or to any part of that presumably. So why do we talk about physical feeling as that which occurs within the realm of sense perception? Well, the reading says that "Darkness is everywhere just as the skin covers the whole body". This is. there are two, sort of, analogies being given. So, in the case of sight, there is an unlimited visual field. Darkness is everywhere, or light is everywhere. In the case of touch well, the skin is everywhere - the skin covers the whole body. In the case of sound, well, sounds are filling the whole of space - and so on. It is just I think, the grammatical structure - whether of the Tibetan or the translation - just does not make the meaning clear. Since the skin covers the whole body from head to toe, feelings which originate in the realm of the other four sensory perceptions - which in the same way, have an unlimited, or unbounded field, or skin - are also called physical feelings. The meaning seems to be something like that. (Pause) Alright, let's go on.

Manjuvajra; I think that is a very good way of looking at it. Sort of think in terms of. instead of having just one skin, having five skins. Because that really puts you out. Stops you limiting yourself to your physical skin.

S; Almost like your aura.

Manjuvajra; Yes.

205

MBP/7 Sagaramati; You did talk about the field of operations.. of the eye and the nose. There does seem to be.. I always associated 21 that with the consciousness that arises in the contact.

S; Well, that is the same thing isn't it?

Sagaramati; That is, saying that the consciousness is, sort of, physical.

S; Well the consciousness arises in dependence on the inter- action of the subject and the object. In the case of the physical sense organs, there is the physical subject and the physical object - the eye and visual form.

Sagaramati; That place where they meet is their field of operations.

S; Yes, one could say that.

Sagaramati; Consciousness fills that up.

S: Yes. So one can express it by saying that one's field is one's skin. Because your perception, actually, sort of , stretches out all over that. Just as your sense of touch stretches out all over the physical body. You experience your whole visual field. So that visual field is your visual skin

Sagaramati; Because some of the other ones did bring in the idea of space. With your skin you haven't got that idea of space. It is like - if I see an object, it is like saying "Now, the object doesn't meet", as it were, "in my eyes. It looks as if it meets out there", really.

S; So this way of thinking seems to , sort of, break down the barrier between subject and object by extending the subject and by making you see that what you have been thinking of as object is, in a way, subject, or at least extension of subject. (Pause) Alright. Let's carry on then.

Manjuvajra; "If we further distinguish those six feelings as subjectivistic feelings and transpersonal feelings, we have an additional twelve which make up a total of eighteen. Subjectivistic feelings are those which are always on the level of thinking that they are my feelings, while the transpersonal feelings are those which are felt on the level of primal awareness which immediately understands that there is no abiding principle to which the self may be reduced."

S; Is this distinction clear? - you can have a feeling which you don't experience as your feeling. So that is a feeling on the level of primal awareness. This term "primal awareness" is not very clear. I am not sure what relation it stands.. what relation it stands to mind as such. Anyway we will leave that.

Dharmapala; Can you give an example of that sort of primal feeling?

S; Well this, I think is discussed in the next paragraph so let us read that next paragraph.

Manjuvajra; If there's six subjectivistic feelings, what were the previous six?

Sagaramati; They were general. Now he has split the general into subjective and objective.

-\ 206

MBP/7 Manjuvajra; Well no, he hasn't, because he says there is a total of eighteen, with the result that he has added two 22 extra classes.

Sagaramati; No he has divided the first six.

S; Well, he has done, I think, what he has very often done in these lists. You have your, say ,original twelve, then you divide still further. Actually you have divided what you started with but then you add the product on to the original number as if it was a quite distinct set. They are more like principles of classification than things. - Not that you have got eighteen different kinds of feelings, but that feelings can be classified in these eighteen different ways. It is the same with the so-called eighty nine chittas.

Sagaramati; Ah, it's mind classified in eighty nine different ways.

S; Yes, not literally eighty nine different minds. So, but doesn't one ever have, I mean, to refer back to experience, a feeling or a sensation without the feeling "

that "This is mine

Padmavajra; Like picking up an atmosphere or picking up a vibe?

S; Yes, one could say that, yes.

Padmavajra; You walk into a room where there might be a lot of hate and you just, sort of, pick it up. It is not yours.

Dharmapala; But you feel it.

Padmavajra;Yes ,but it is not your. it is not a feeling which you produce.

S; Well, no, it is not a question of production. It says, "transpersonal feelings are those which are felt on the level of primal awareness which immediately understands that there is no abiding principle to which the self may be reduced."So it seems to go a bit further than picking up an atmosphere, though the picking up of an atmosphere may, sort of, point one in that direction. That a feeling does not have to be 'Your feeling', you know, in the literal sense.

Vimalamitra; Surely this is where the committants - the mental events - do not come in. You just have the perception and that is it.

S; It seems to be a sort of feeling equivalent of mind as such. That mind as such is, sort of,feeling toned - has feeling value. Though not in an egocentric way or possessive sort of way.

Sagaramati; That is the way the metta should end up.

S; Yes, right, exactly. And actually one does feel that - at least sometimes - in connection with the metta. I think I have mentioned this in explaining it sometimes, that you end up with what I have called an impersonal metta. It is not a metta that you are producing, that is you feeling - it is almost like a stream or something "out there" that you are in contact with. But it is not yours. So, perhaps that gives some sort

of clue to this kind of feeling on the level of primal awareness, though I think the level here is an even deeper one - an even more advanced one than that kind of metta experience

207

MBP/7 which I mentioned. But that kind of metta experience, I think, points, you know, still further in this direction. 23 In other words, there can be feelings around without there being anyone around whose feelings they are.

Manjuvajra; Like plunging into something. That seems to, sort ~of, bring in something like the pull of the Buddhas - the pull of the absolute.

S; Yes.. .Alright. Let us go on to this question which arises.

Mark; "You might ask how it is that those who have this primal awareness by which they immediately understand that the self is not an eternal entity, have painful feelings, since the trans- personal feeling just explained would be in the realm of frustration Oh, there are many reasons for this. For example, the 'dul-ba lung (Vinayasastra) states, Even those Arhats who have rejected the belief that self is an eternal entity still suffer such unpleasant feelings as headaches as a result of their former actions."

S; It is almost saying that you can have two kinds of feeling at the same time. You can have a transpersonal, presumably pleasant, feeling, if you are an Arahant and at the same time be experiencing, through one or another of the senses, a painful feeling as a result of karmas committed in the past.

Padmapani; It is a bit like. . .see the other day when I was saying you can have more than one mental concomitant at the same time. Sorry, concomitants with mind, Yes?

S; Well, yes of course you can.

Padmapani; But this is.. .I mean, this is the feeling concomitant.

S; Yes. But well all. ... I mean the feeling is found in all mental situations. Feeling of one kind or another. But the point here is that you can experience, as it were, different kinds of feelings in different levels.

Padmapani; At the same time.

S; At the same time. So, therefore, you get, in a way, the rather odd situation of the Arahant experiencing inner bliss. At the same time he experiences painful bodily feelings. To give an analogy - you might, for instance, be really overjoyed by something that has happened. At the same time you get quite a nasty scratch which is quite painful. You feel the physical pain but the mind is still full of joy on account of that joyful event. The two are going ~on at the same time.

Manjuvajra; There seems to be a connection between experiencing a transpersonal feeling and a loss of idea of the self. Does it mean that maybe, one could experience the headache in an egoistic state - you would experience it as "Your headache", but in a non egoistic state one would experience a sort of transpersonal (indecipherable word).

S; The headache is there It could be anybody's headache.

?; I've had certain experiences like that and I've found them inconclusive. I've never been sure whose... Is it me that

is happy or is it somebody else that is happy and can't quite work

208

MBP/7 out what has happened.

24 5; You could say, with regard to the Bodhisattva that he experiences the suffering of the world, as it were. He feels it even though it is not his own. But he does feel it.

Robert Girk; And that is an example of transpersonal?

END OF TAPE SEVEN.

S: Hm yes.

Sagaramati; At the same time his mental state is sort of pleasant.

S: Yes because that is the nature of the Bodhisattva's mind.

Sagaramati; It's almost like the bigger mind, as it were, (comparing) the human to the small mind.

S: Yes. I sometimes quote Tennyson here, 'Painless sympathy with pain'. It's painless because there's no diminution of your own inner bliss. At the same time you do experience that other pain or are sympathetic with that other pain. (Pause) So therefore one can add something here and say that from the purely spiritual or transcendental point of view what is important is not to have the experience of self, not to have the belief in self, whether your feeling experiences are pleasant, painful or neutral just doesn't matter. It can be anything or any combination. In a sense the fact that you do have the experience of non-self is pleasant but only in a sense. You can have that experience of non-self around that, as it were, presumably almost any combination or arrangement of pleasant, painful and neutral experiences - it just wouldn't matter.

Sagaramati; It also seems to correspond to what you mentioned on the Mitra retreat termed the sphere of utility and the sphere of uselessness. If you're in contact with the spiritual sphere the events of the more mundane sphere don't sort of

S: Yes. You're not going after happiness, you're going after non-ego. If you experience non-ego whether there are states of happiness floating around or states of misery or neutral states it just doesn't matter. Or whether they are, as it were, yours or, as it were, other people's that doesn't matter particularly either. You try and abolish the unpleasant ones and cultivate the pleasant ones but it doesn't make any difference really, basically, to your fundamental experience of non-selfhood. Which has again though in another sense, (on another level), its own very very refined positive feeling value.

Sagaramati; I think also that non-ego's equated with the lower indifference.

S: Yes, a very cold neutral state with no feeling to it. Let's go on then.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; "There are six feelings according to their location:

1. Feelings which occur in the rapport established by the eye."

S: 'Rapport' is Guenther's term for (sparsa), which is usually translated 'contact' - which is literally what it means.

\_\_\_\_\_ "2. Feelings which occur in the rapport established by the ear.

3. Feelings which occur in the rapport established by the nose.

4. Feelings which occur in the rapport established by the tongue.

5. Feelings which occur in the rapport established by the body.

6. Feelings which occur in the rapport established by the mind."

S: The rapport established or contact set up with the appropriate object that is. Carry on.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Since each one of these six can be pleasant, unpleasant, or indifferent, one can speak of eighteen feelings. If I were to deal with these in detail, it would be too lengthy so I shall stop here."

S: Anything to be said here? These feelings associated with the eye, ear and so on arising out of the contact of the sense organ or sense faculty with its appropriate object.

\_\_\_\_\_; Presumably it can all be split up into say transpersonal feelings in relation to the ( )

S: Presumably yes.

\_\_\_\_\_; So it would be about eighteen subdivisions.

S: 'If I were to deal with these in detail, it would be too lengthy so I shall stop here'.  
(Laughter)

Sagaramati; We've actually covered these anyway.

S: Anyway we can probably go straight on then.

Kamalasila; "Feeling classified according to the function of rejection and aiding is twofold:

1. A sustaining feeling of addiction
2. A sustaining feeling of realisation

The sustaining feeling of addiction occurs on the level of desiring sensuous things of this world. The sustaining feeling of realisation is to turn away

MBP/8 III 211

from being addicted to these things and occurs on the level of those thought processes which are summarized by the subject matter of the first meditative stage."

S: What does this mean do you think?

Dharmapala; Is this sort of which mind is present, as it were, a craving mind in the addiction.

S: Yes that seems to be suggested. Go on and read the next paragraph because the reason for the division being made is explained.

Kamalasila; " This division into two kinds of feelings is made here for the purpose of knowing how the strength of feeling itself may, on the one hand , bring to light an existing desire or bring about detachment from this addiction through the subject matter of meditative concentration. But if one wants to know this more deeply, one should look up the Abhidharmakosa, the Abhidharmasamuccaya, and also the byang-chub lam-rim in order to prevent the three feelings of pleasure, pain and indifference from becoming the cause of the three poisons."

S: The three poisons being of course lobha, dvesa and moha. Let's go into this a little. (Pause) 'The strength of feeling itself may, on the one hand. bring to light an existing desire or bring about detachment from this addiction through the subject matter of meditative concentration.' It's almost as though the feeling can go in either one of two ways isn't it? Do you get this picture of the different levels clear. First of all there is the Kamaloka, the sphere or the level or the plane of kama, that is to say of sensuous perception or even sensuous desire and the Rupaloka, the plane of form, sometimes translated as pure form. So the plane of pure form is the, as it were, objective correlative of the dhyana experience, so that when you rise to the dhyana level you are said to be in the world or plane of pure form and when your mind is functioning in the ordinary way then you are said to be living on the plane or world of sensuous desire which is where we are now for instance. So the division into two kinds of feelings , that is to say feeling of addiction, feeling of realisation'is made here for the purpose of knowing how the strength of feeling itself may, on the one hand,bring to light an existing desire' - it's not quite clear what 'bring to light'means - 'or bring about detachment from this addiction through the subject matter of meditative concentration.' It's as though if you can develop the feeling appropriate to or belonging to the higher world of form then you can become detached from, no longer addicted to, the feeling appropriate to the lower level of sensuous desire. It's as though one must learn to lead the feeling upwards. Try and lead the plane of sensuous

MBP/8 IV 212

desire into the realm of meditation.

Vimalamitra; What would you say was the difference between enjoying a meal on the kamaloka and enjoying it on the rupaloka?

S: You don't enjoy a meal on the level of the rupaloka, you turn away from the pleasure of the meal and you try to sort of refine your feeling of pleasure and lead it upwards and develop a sort of meditative pleasure instead which causes you then to reject your addiction to the lower pleasure of eating which occurs on the kamaloka plane. This seems to be the

general sense of this passage.

Vimalamitra; It wouldn't be a sensuous pleasure?

S: You wouldn't experience it as. ...you would experience it as a pleasure but in comparison with the pleasure of the rupaloka it would, in a sense, not be a pleasure.

Vimalamitra; It just wouldn't attract you.

S: It wouldn't attract you.

\_\_\_\_\_; How do you do that ( )?

S: Well this is why he refers that if one wants to know this more deeply one should look up the Abhidharmakosa etc.

Padmavajra; Is there something like a nearest kind of equivalent like turning greed into faith.

S: It's rather as though he's saying that once the feeling is there on the kamaloka plane that it can go in either one or the other of two ways. It can either become a sort of addiction on the kamaloka level itself or it can be guided higher into the realms of meditation. So there can be a sustaining feeling of addiction, that is to say sustaining your existence on the kamaloka level presumably, or a sustaining feeling of realisation sustaining your existence in meditation on the rupaloka level. I think this is the general sense although the actual meaning of the sentence isn't all that clear.

~4jIJM. ; I think (we're) saying on the one hand bring to light an- existing

desire If you experience a strong feeling of pleasure or displeasure on the kamaloka then you know that craving or hatred is present. It's a kind

MBP/8 V 213

of signpost.

S: Yes.

~a; Strong feelings are a signpost of (attachment).

S: Yes.

~; A strong feeling about anything is a sign of attachment?

S: (A sign of) craving. You can't really enjoy something very much without craving for it very very much. So the milder the manner in which we enjoy something the less you are detached from it. If you sort of fling yourself at whatever in a ravenous sort of manner and really enjoy it and wallow in it then your craving is very strong. (Maybe if you) sort of savour it in a somewhat detached sort of well, take it or leave it manner, then yes, you're savouring it, you're enjoying it but then the craving is so much less.

Vimalamitra; if you're preoccupied with something higher the other things become

S: Less enjoyable. You will enjoy them but in this moderate detached sort of way. (pause) What we've said makes clearer the meaning of this first paragraph - 'the sustaining feeling of addiction occurs on the level of desiring sensuous things of this world. The sustaining feeling of realisation is to turn away from being addicted to these things and occurs on the level of those thought processes which are summarised by the subject matter of the first meditative stage.' It's almost as though you can't really turn away from the pleasures appropriate to the (kamavacara) unless you've had some taste of the pleasures of the (rupavacara). You can sort of keep yourself away from them as a disciplinary measure but you can't sort of naturally turn away from them because you've got something better because until you have had some experience of meditative pleasure you haven't got anything better. Unless you've got it in the realm of the arts or something of that kind.

Asvajit ; It reminds me a bit of the story you gave of the Buddha on the wedding night of a person taking him into the forest and wanting to be with his wife and then saying 'no look at these dakinis or these beautiful nymphs' and then he sort of gets into that stage and he doesn't want to go back.

MBP/8 VI 214

S: Yes that illustrates it very concretely.

~.; But one isn't doing anything to the feeling. This is a feeling that. the second one for example is a feeling that when it occurs it's already on the level of turning away.

S: Yes.

~.;(continues) It's not that you are doing something to turn away.

S: No, what you have to do is simply to, in this connection, meditate and experience the sukhka and priti of the meditative level. Then the sukhka of the kamaloka level will appear much less relishable to you, at least as long as you can sustain yourself at that meditative level.(Pause) There's a general point that emerges from this section about feeling ( ) or vedana which is the most obvious one but which we haven't actually discussed. That it is omnipresent - that feeling is omnipresent - pleasant, painful or neutral feeling. That it is present in all experience.

\_\_\_\_\_ On all levels?

S: On all levels. All experience is, for want of a better term, 'feeling toned' not to say emotionally toned. You don't get thought apart from feeling. There is this further question of what is neutral feeling? Is there such a thing as neutral feeling? There is such a thing as pleasurable feeling, the~e is such a thing as painful feeling. You can presumably have a total absence of both but in what sense is that a feeling? (Pause) Or can you have in practice a total absence of both?

Abhaya; Isn't it more that you have a sort of combination of the two which more or less equal

it out?

S: It would seem more like that. So if that was so then one could say quite literally without any exceptions at all that the whole of experience is emotionally toned or feeling toned and that if it is positively toned that is pleasurable toned, there is a tendency, either weak or strong, to prolong that and if it is negatively i.e. unpleasurably toned there is a tendency, even while the experience itself is going on, to try to get rid of it.

Abhaya; Did you say emotionally toned or wouldn't it be more accurate to say feeling toned?

S: Well I said emotionally toned because as you go up the scale the feelings

MBP/8 VII 215

become increasingly emotions in the sense of more intense, more pure, more concrete and so on but basically of course it's feeling, feeling-toned.

Sagaramati; Could you say also then that the ind~fferent periods are just low intensity periods.

S: Yes, I think you probably could say that. I doubt very much whether there's such a thing or experience as neutral feeling in the same way in which there is an experience of pleasurable feeling and painful feeling. I think it's where the two have become so rarified and where there's just a little of each where it's hardly worth bothering either to want to prolong or to get rid of. It hardly matters. Or there may be quite a complicated sort of set of permutations of the two, you can hardly work it out - they cancel each other out as it were so you're left at a stand- still. You don't do anything. You neither sort of try to repeat nor do you try to get rid of.

Dharmapala; I experienced that on a retreat earlier on this year quite a lot. Arriving at a sort of neutral and didn't feel unhappy or un- pleasant and didn't feel particularly pleasant either but it just seemed like sort of lack of energy. It just wasn't moving.

S: lack of motivation.

Padmavajra; Sometimes though you frequently experience that you just don't mind. It's not negative.- it's quite energetic, it's not..~.You're quite sort of easy.

\_\_\_\_\_ ' Surely you can say suddenly experience the fact that you are.. your feet are touching the ground say and all sorts of things throughout the day and yet you wouldn't feel it.... unless you're tired or something.

Manjuvajra ~his experience~a kind of what I call excessive normality where (Laughter) I feel incredibly normal, absolutely ordinary but it's a very intense feeling of ordinary(ness). And there it's kind of neutral because you don't particularly want to hold onto it, you don't want to get rid of it. You feel like you can do anything so it would be alright.

\_\_\_\_\_ I wouldn't question whether ( ) positive mental states

or indifferent mental states.

S: Mm. Well in the context of meditation it's certainly the positive states that arise and which in a sense one should go after because you're not concerned

MBP/8 VIII 216

with what I call hedonic indifference which is just a state of indifference with regard to feelings coming in through the senses and through the ordinary life but you're trying for what I've called the higher indifference which is a more spiritual state and which comes at the~culmination of meditation after the positive feelings have been experienced. So it's as though you should aim at the positive feelings in the context of meditation - maybe not aim directly but aim indirectly through doing the meditation itself and then the higher indifference - upekkha - will arise out of that positive experience but not that one should try to get rid of all painful feeling and all pleasant feelings so that one can arrive at a state of indifference. That~will only be hedonic indifference.

Vimalamitra; Is it more less the kind of, for want of anything better, kind of energy of

pleasure and pain which is just brought up to another level of integrated indifference.

S: Yes. This is what is called upekkha, though there are three upekkhas- these are really the three levels of indifference if one uses that term - what I think Govinda calls hedonic indifference which is this sort of balance, as it were, of pleasant and painful sensations so that you're not particularly bothered either to prolong the one or get rid of the other - this is hedonic indifference and it's that sort of hedonic indifference or neutral feeling that you have in connection with the experience of standing on your feet all day. It's neither particularly pleasant or particularly painful, you can't really say it's either so you neither want to go on doing it nor stop doing it - that is hedonic indifference. And then you've got the upekkha of the dhyana states, upekkha of course comes in early with the fourth dhyana after the after the - of sukhka and priti. That is to say after the of bliss and ecstasy. It is a higher state. It's a higher mental function. So even though it's said to arise when sukhka and priti have subsided it's not as though it isn't emotionally toned. It's as though it has absorbed them rather than got rid of them if you see what I mean. So~this is upekkha or neutral feeling in the meditative sense.

Padmavajra; It's like a (oneness?) of riches.

S: Yes and not a (oneness) of poverty yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Do you think there might be some kind of alchemical equivalent?

S ; Mm. And then of course there's upekkha as a synonym for nirvana. Upekkha occurs in this sense as the seventh and last member of the theory of the bodhiangas. One has to be very careful here not to mistake that upekkha

MBP/8 IX 217

for a purely meditative upekkha. This is the upekkha which is, as it were, in a state of equilibrium with regard to all mundane things whatsoever. It's not affected by any of them or, from the Mahayana point of view, in a state of equilibrium as between samsara and Nirvana. As I've stated it somewhere, maybe in the Three Jewels, a state of metaphysical axiality. You become, as it were, the axis of the universe in which all the different poles turn. So I don't know what the English terms for these three would be. Govinda calls the first hedonic indifference. You just have to be careful not to give the impression that the upekkha, the

dhyana is a non- emotional state in the sense of being something cold and indifferent and also not to give the impression that the upekkha of nirvana, or which was the same thing as the upekkha of the dhyanas.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; So would it be best to put hedonic indifference in the world of kamaloka for classification.

S: Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_, You couldn't experience that indifference in the rupaloka could you?

S: Hedonic indifference?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

S: No, there isn't any sense experience and the ordinary mind is not functioning.

Abhaya; So it's incorrect to say the indifference of the dhyana state comes after the absorption of bliss and ecstasy.

S: Yes, one could say that.

\_\_\_\_\_ Is that like concentration after bliss where it all( )

S: In the case of the dhyanas there's this sort of pyramid of psychic factors. In the first dhyana there's (vitukka-viccarā)(ek-kagata) sukhā and prīti. And then(vitukka viccarā) that is to say mental activities of various kinds very briefly subside and one is left only with the sukhā and prīti. And the (ek-kagata) that is to say a concentrated state characterised by bliss and ecstasy. Then the ecstasy subsides, that's the more ~bb~ r and you've got only sukhā, bliss and one-pointedness, left. Not that one- pointedness is a sort of separate factor, it's the integration of all the different psychic factors as such. But even sukhā is, in a way, too

coarse. So sukhka subsides and is replaced by upekkha. So you have in the fourth dhyana upekkha and (ekkgata), that is to say upekkha and concentration

MBP/8 X 218

or integration. So there's this gradual process of consolidation, integrati~ refinement and bringing more and more together to greater and greater stability. So the higher you go the fewer the mental factors, not in the sense that mental factors are eliminated so much as that they are absorbed and so fully integrated that there's no sort of breach, no sort of break between one and another.

Sagaramati; Also it says here going beyond classification.

S: Yes, going beyond the classifying mind. Any general point about feeling before we conclude? (Pause) Feeling is always present.

Sagaramati; Even although you're alienated from it?

S: Well what happens in alienation?

\_\_\_\_\_ (unclear)

S: Be more precise, What sort of feeling is it. You feel alienated. V~!hat do you feel?

\_\_\_\_\_, Dead.

S: Dead. You feel dead, you feel negative It's nearer an unpleasant feeling than~pleasant one isn't it? So in what way does it differ say from an unpleasant feeling, a painful feeling from which you're not alien- ated? If you say that the feeling of alienation is an unpleasant feeling how does it differ from an unpleasant feeling from which you are not alienated?

Abhaya; It's just another class of unpleasant feeling, another kind of unpleasant feeling.

\_\_\_\_\_; There's less energy.

S: Less energy, your experience is less. Supposing for instance you're very angry and you experience the anger and that's very unpleasant but then supposing you're alienated from the anger what happens then? What is the sort of feeling like?

\_\_\_\_\_; It's unpleasant.

S: It's unpleasant but in a way it's less positive. It's dull.

MBP/8 XI 219

\_\_\_\_\_ A bit like resentment.

\_\_\_\_\_; One is hopeless.

S: One is hopeless. It's as though you're one stage further,,,,,,in a way though it's not a sort of strong feeling one could say that it is more unpleasant in a way.

Abhaya; Because it is a degree further from integration.

S: Mm. yes.

\_\_\_\_\_, Does that usually happen when ( ) People angry and

alienated from their anger.

S: Well in the sense that they don't experience it and one can

#### BREAK IN RECORDING

Padmapani; Well what type of thing makes one angry in the begin- ning. In away (you re already alienated from it)

S: You don't start off by being alienated. You start off by feeling or experiencing a negative emotion but ( ) Perhaps you don't even allow yourself fully to experience it because you're afraid of doing so it becomes what we call unconscious. Though it is, as it were, there. So one is unconscious to the fact that it is there although it sounds contradictory you are angry but you don't know that you are angry. You don't allow yourself to feel that you are angry. You are alienated from your anger. So what puts you in touch with the anger again - that could be almost anything. There are so many different ways of being angry. It could be that you get into contact with some emotion and from that work your way round to all your emotions. Or it might be during violent provocation it breaks through all the resistance. You then do directly contact the emotion.

\_\_\_\_\_, Andinfact that's ( ) progress is it - experiencing an fr m unpleasant state. Progress being alienated.

S: But alienation from emotions is also alienation from energy. It's a dullness and a deadness. Sometimes you wish you could even feel angry you could even feel definite pain rather than this sort of dull state which is hardty~even awake.

MBP/8 XII 220

\_\_\_\_\_, That's the way I can remember it with ( )I was alien- ated and other people were getting violently angry and I was thinking well I'm not . I'm not feeling angry.

if

Sagaramati; Ratnaguna thought that/he couldn't be violent when Lokamitra did then he was alienated but maybe he just didn't feel angry.

S: Right (unclear).. just innocent.

\_\_\_\_\_, I think (one) realised that in certain cases that just wasn't the case.

Sagaramati; But you shouldn't presuppose that you can't have anger when you're alienated.

S: Maybe it (could) be a person who's free from anger.

Padmavajra; I often feel that I ought to get angry actually and I don't. I don't want to get angry but I feel I ought to.

S: In the sense that the situation seems to require anger.

Padmavajra; I feel that if I don't get angry then I'm not getting in touch with my anger or something.

S: I think one should beware of that sort of thing.

Padmavajra; Yeah I think that's the sort of thing that forms ( )

Vimalamitra; Why are you getting angry?

Padmavajra; Well it's not like . you usually don't think of anger in terms

of you just suddenly explode but often I experience that I have to sort of think about it. Well should I be angry with him. Should I

S: That often happens that you sort of wait to explode in anger when you feel unable to be firm and direct with someone about something. (Agreement) Instead of saying 'look here I want it done this way'. Instead of saying that you just let the person do it in any old way that he pleases but you don't really like that. You're not really happy with it and afterwards find the feeling accumulates-that you just boil over. You should have been much more direct and expressive to begin with. Say 'I don't want it done that way.' 'Why are you doing it that way. I want it done this way.' If you let

221

those things slide you will eventually explode.

Sagaramati; But if you're like that with people sometimes you see people almost run off from you. They accuse you of being sort of angry and sort of authoritarian and things like this but maybe you're just sort of being direct. I see the difference quite a lot from(these Order meetings)~~~~on

Saturday night. ( This sort of movement) being desperate (with their) sort have of attitudes with the (building people/ of) being too heavy handed. They're

not frank enough and things like that (???) You can, as it were, see people move away.

S: Well (There should be a few more centres up North then.) (Laughter)

Padmapani; Presumably if you suggested it you would, in actual fact, grow in a situation like that. Presumably the energy or the anger is your unconscious ( ) You tend to accept things and then resentment does build up. But after a period of time it's a growing situation. You realise that you have kept these. ...

S: Well maybe other people realise that when you speak directly and strongly you're not angry.

\_\_\_\_\_; Why do other people's feelings of anger tend to bring out one's own feelings of anger?

S: Those feelings are there but you're not allowing yourself to experience them. Their anger puts you in touch with your anger.

Manjuvajra; I find that if I come into contact with someone who I feel is being particularly negative I may feel negative. I'm aware that I'm feeling negative and that it's my negativity.

S: Sometimes people want to goad you into being negative and often it happens that they succeed. It has been said by a psychologist (

) if someone habitually makes you angry you may take it for granted that that is what you want to do.

\_\_\_\_\_; I was just going to say before Manjuvajra said that that I don't tend to get angry very much. I haven't done for a long time and then it occurred to me that when I was very young, up to the age of about twelve I used to get incredibly angry with ~~~ sister and I think that was probably the(clue) She used to goad me into it.

Sa aramati; But the same must happen with the positive emotions then.

MBP/8 XIV 222

Surely if someone is always so positive to you and are being non-reactive then, if you are aware you are just bound to respond to that.

S: I think thoughtbe:ppositive person has to be very patient and not look for immediate results. The short term result may be that someone just gets annoyed with you for being so blocked.

\_\_\_\_\_; I think I've heard someone say lately ' you're always so positive'.

S: Yes they can't stand it any longer. (Laughter) It sometimes happens when someone likes to be superior. Perhaps he can only be superior or she can only be superior by sympathising with you. Then you've got them in a low state so that they can sympathise with you. If you're in a very positive sort of mood well you don't require their sympathy therefore they can't sympathise with you therefore they can't feel superior and that makes them feel uneasy and you notice sometimes with some people if you're in a low state they seem rather pleased. It seems to put them in a good mood because why - they can sympathise with you but that isn't real sympathy. They're expecting their ( ) sense of superiority though they might be very kind and very gentle but really this is what it is. They're getting a definite satisfaction or even there's a strong element of satisfaction out of the situation-that you are, as it were, in an inferior position now to them which means that they're in the superior position as regards to you. A lot of people that are consoling people are a bit like this, at least a bit like this.

Manjuvajra; This is why in the dreaded relationship you get one person 5 down and the other person goes up and then the thing will gradually change over and it always seems that one person is slightly up when the other is down.

S: Oh yes ( )

Manjuvajra; Like a see-saw. They can't both be up at the same time.

S; Someone came to me several months ago and said that her particular relationship had broken up. Her boyfriend had left her and she'd gone for sympathy to certain other women and they were saying, 'Oh you poor thing. Isn't it terrible, we know what it's like' etc, etc, all this sort of sympathy but she said she felt there was something phony about it all and she was sensitive enough to feel this so I agreed that I thought there was something phony about it and I said 'You do feel a bit upset at first, you want a bit of sympathy that's only natural but put an end to it as soon as you can. Sympathy is a weakness' and she really saw that point and she

MBP/8 XV 223

said she really had felt that, that it was weakening her to receive that sort of (Pause) And it's really where this sort of giving and receiving of sympathy occurs turn by turn in, as you say, the dreaded relationship.

\_\_\_\_\_; It's terrible to think you become friends and the relationship's liable to (ruin it).

S: Well you become friends they don't want to see you any more. (Laughter) Anyway before there are any more dirty~~~(laughter)

END OF SESSION

NEXT SESSION

S: Alright then it's page 23 isn't it? 'Conceptualisations' - let's start reading.

Sagaramati; " Conceptualisation :

In the Abhidharmasamuccava the nature of conceptualisation is stated as follows:

What is the absolutely specific characteristic of conceptualisation? It is to know by association. It is to see, hear, specify, and to know by way of taking up the defining characteristics and distinguishing them.

It is an awareness that deals with the specific characteristic of an object when the object, sensory capacity, and cognitive act have joined.

And in the Pancaskandhaprakarana it is explained as follows:

What is conceptualisation? It is taking hold of the defining characteristic of an object.

Conceptualisation is twofold:

1. Dealing with the defining characteristic

## 2. Dealing with the specific characteristic

The former deals with the specific characteristic of an apparent object in a conceptless perception and the latter deals with the specific characteristic of an apparent object in a judgmental perception.

The bases for the operation of these two forms of conceptualisation are seeing, hearing, specification (differentiation), and full cognition. Their meanings are:

To see is to make a proposition about what has been seen in immediate perception,

To hear is to make a proposition on the basis of trustworthy information

Differentiation means to make a proposition about an object which is ascertained as this or that object in view of its characteristics.

MBP/8 XVI 224

Full cognition ~s to make a proposition by way of concept about this object as it is, in the certainty of immediate perception.

The Abhidharmakosa explains the two aspects of conceptualisation as the defining characteristic and as propositions. That is to say, the former is to distinguish the individual colour design such as blue, yellow

etc., and the other is to distinguish the individual propositional form "

in making such statements as, 'This is a man' and 'This is a woman

S: So does the general nature of conceptualisation become clear? It's 'samJna' in Sanskrit, one of the five skandhas. It's a bit like recognition.

\_\_\_\_\_, There's one paragraph I'm not so happy with, It's the one 'conceptualisation is twofold' then it gives the twofold classification. Then the paragraph underneath that - I'm not clear(on) that.

-S: I think the later extract from the Abhidharmakosa makes it clearer. The two aspects of

conceptualisation as the defining characteristic and as

propositions.' That is to say defining characteristic and specific

characteristic. 'The former is to distinguish the individual colour such as blue, yellow etc.'  
You see something which is blue and you, as it were, recognise, well that's blue because you  
already know what blue is so when you see think of the colour blue or when you hear  
that something before~~ou

is the colour of the clear sky -'oh yes that's blue'. That would be the first of these two.  
That~~ould be conceptualisation as dealing with the defining characteristic. But in dealing  
with the specific characteristic which means to make a proposition, presumably a judgmental  
proposition 'is to distinguish the individual propositional form in making such statements as  
'this is a man' and 'this is a woman!' You see for instance something before you. You see oh  
that particular object has a head, has two arms, has legs, it has two breasts - this agrees with  
your concept of a woman so you recognise or you cognise or you conceptualise that object as  
a woman. This would seem to be the second kind dealing with specific characteristics.

Vimalamitra; I can't quite see the difference between them actually

S: The one seems to be a matter of more direct perception. The other would seem to be more  
indirect.

Vimalamitra; But in the second one you couldn't say this was a woman or this was a man  
unless you knew before, as in the first one, that this is a man.

S: Well in the case of the blue and the yellow you see them as simple objects.

MBP/8 XVIII 226

The making of the proposition takes place with-in a context of certainty of immediate  
perception, or it could mean that in the certainty that immediate perception follows  
thereupon. Or that one S cognition will be confirmed by it, by immediate perception  
consequently. You could take the English phrase or clause to mean either of those two  
things. Do you see that difference?

\_\_\_\_\_ ; No

S: 'Full cognition is to make a proposition by way of concept about this object as it is, in the certainty of immediate perception.' So what does in the certainty of immediate perception refer to? It can be taken in two ways. That you make the proposition basing yourself upon the certainty of immediate perception or that you can make the proposition in the certainty that immediate perception of the object will follow.

\_\_\_\_\_ Where does it say that?

S: In the certainty of immediate perception.

Sagaramati; (I can't see how it follows)

S: That is ( ) in the certainty of immediate perception. You go into the dining room in the certainty of a dinner.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; But it's different surely because in the certainty of immediate perception you go into the dining room, you don't know that there is a dinner....

S: Wait a minute - what am I actually saying? I'm saying that before you get at the meaning of the text you have to get at the meaning of the English~ of the translation. This is what I'm saying. The English of the translation is ambiguous therefore we have to settle what is the meaning of the English before we try to discuss the meaning of the author in the original.

Abhaya ; Oh I see. So in the certainty of immediate perception could mean the object predominantly there before your eyes so that you can say well you know it's going to be there

S: Right so the English, taking the English without reference to the author's meaning can mean either of those two things. So whether you take it in the one way or the other will affect

your interpretation of what the author says. Translators shouldn't do this sort of thing should they?

MBP/8 XIX 227

PadmaV.: Is it like you're given a...you have this certain situation in towards it front of you and you act or you because of that you act/in a certain

way or you know you can act towards it in a certain way?

S: No I don't think it means anything like that. Anyway there's a foot- note. Can you read that to see if that throws any light - twenty-four.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; "The author obviously tries to give an analysis of a ~-reptual situation indicated by the phrase 'I see a woman'. This is to say that there is an objective constituent which displays certain qualities about which we believe that 'this is a woman . This belief of course does not guarantee that there is an ontological object of the physical object corresponding to the epistemological object of the perceptual situation."

S: (reading his own text) 'an objective constituent which displays certain qualities that there is in a perceptual situation an objective constituent which we believe of the proposition 'this is a woman'

(General hubbub about differences in Bhante's text and everybody else's)

S: 'This belief does not guarantee that there is an ontological object of the physical object corresponding to the epistemological object of the perceptual situation.' That holds clearer actually. What have you got in your

\_\_\_\_\_, I think we've got a line missing.

S: I think mine is fuller and it seems to be clearer. Let me explain what I understand of that particular footnote then. This is Guenther's own footnote. 'The author obviously tries to give an analysis of a perceptual situation indicated by the phrase 'I see a woman'. A perceptual situation is a situation in which there is, as it were, a subject and there is, as it were, an object or there is mind and its object and the mind perceives the object. So that is a perceptual situation indicated by the phrase 'I see a woman'. 'I' representing subject whom I see, perceive, the object which is a woman. So what is happening when you say such a thing. 'This is to say that there is an objective constituent which displays certain qualities'. Alright there's an objective constituent. There's something which is out there in your perceptual situation which is not you, which is not subject and you see this has got certain qualities. Alright certain qualities that there is in a perceptual situation an objective constituent which we believe of the proposition 'this is a woman'. 'This is a woman' is the proposition. You understand the proposition. Leave aside your actual

MBP/8 XX

228

perception. You understand the proposition 'this is a woman', you know what it means. Then within your perceptual situation there is an object with certain qualities. You then proceed to apply your proposition, 'this is a woman' to that particular object which you perceive. That is your conceptualisation.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; After seeing the object.

S: After seeing the object yes.

Sagaramati; That would be what you meant by association.

S: Yes this belief of course does not guarantee that there is an ontological object, there's only a perceptual object if the physical object corresponding to the epistemological object of the perceptual situation.

\_\_\_\_\_; The epistemological?

S: Would be an object of knowledge. It is something which you perceive and know. But there is no guarantee that there is an ultimately real i.e. ontological object behind the object that you know.

Abhaya; It seems to be more a matter of language rather than anything else.

Dharmapala; We perceive something there which has certain qualities and then we conceptualise what that is.

S: Yes you as it were fit that into propositional categories which you already had in your mind. This is why we use the term recognition. You recognise that that is a woman because you already have this proposition 'this is a woman' ready in your mind so when you encounter a particular object of perception with certain qualities which square with the qualities of woman in the proposition which you have in your mind you fit the two things together and you say 'this is a woman'. That act it seems is the actual process of conceptualisation.

Abhaya; Isn't it more like.. that sounds rather sort of artificial in the sense that you get . . .from what you've said I get the impression that you've got stored in your mind all sorts of propositions and that when you see something the right proposition comes up. Whereas in fact you've got certain...it seems more like to me you've got a lot of (concepts~) from past experience you've got a lot of conce~pts built up and you can relate these concepts together to make a proposition to suit a particular object you come up against.

MBP/8 XXI 229

S: Yes but don't you think that although there are concepts already in the mind that many of these concepts have already been built up into prop- ositions which include two or more concepts. In other words firstly with regard to objects which are quite familiar to us. For instance we have the concept 'car' ready in our mind. This is a car. The car itself includes quite an number of concepts, the concept of wheels, the concept of body, the concept of paint colour, steering wheel and all that. We've already combined all these into the proposition which is a car.

Abhaya; It seems very sort of artificial to me. It's just a matter of language - the way you express this recognition to someone else rather than having these propositions already built up.

Sagaramati; having seen a woman before. If you've never seen a woman before in your life (that will be taken first).

S: Unless you'd read about women in books and had a ready description which would include through hearing or through seeing. (or) that you've seen a picture of a woman(which)you could recognise from the picture. Just like when you see a rare animal or a rare bird which you haven't seen before you've seen it in the bird book. That's such and such bird. That would seem to be an example of conceptualisation.

Dharmapala; Even if you hadn't read it it could still (come into contact with feeling through that ?)

S: You could work it out because if you knew about ornithology you would know what bird the various species are and what ( ) of birds were particular species. For instance you'd know that is a kind of seagull I've not seen it before, I don't know what species it is but clearly it is a kind of seagull.

\_\_\_\_\_ ' ( )if you'd never seen a woman before, never heard anything about women and so on.

S; You would say well it's some kind of human being.

\_\_\_\_\_ You'd conceptualise it as near as you possibly could.. slightly different from a man.

S: For instance when in the Middle ages they first saw a leopard it reminded

MBP/8 XXII 230

them of two things, a lion and a devil so they called it the leo-pard - the leopard - the lion-devil. There you get the coalescence of the two propositions this is a lion and this is a devil.

ManjuV; That would be an example of the first of these two kinds of conceptualisation. Supposing you have this rare bird. If you've seen it in the book and then saw the bird that would be the specifying character- istic

S: Yes.

Manjuvakra; And if you were the first person to see the bird and you called it such and such that would be the defining characteristic.

S: Yes, one could certainly say that. If you see something and label it as such that's one kind but if you've got various ideas in your mind and then you see in that object qualities which correspond to the prop- osition or sets of propositions in your mind - you put the two things together and that may be that the conceptualisations (are there) specifically.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; But surely you notice these ( ) which you haven't seen before.

\_\_\_\_\_ You're putting together a whole series of ( )

S: Unless you just give it a name as when you say 'blue'. You're not put- ting together any things that form the concept of blue. This is where I think this first mental thing comes in. 'The former deals with the specific chara- ristic of an apparent object and the latter deals with the specific characteristic of an apparent object in a judgmental perception.' What is this

'judgmental perception'?

\_\_\_\_\_; Making a proposition.

S: Making a proposition. (Pause) So what is this 'characteristic of an apparent object in a conceptless perception.'? 'The former', that is to say, dealing with the defining characteristic; deals with the specific characteristic of an apparent object in a conceptless perception and the latter deals with the specific characteristic of an apparent object in a judgmental perception.' So one has to understand these two things (conceptually)~ conceptless perception which is which is (fairly) non-judgmental and a judgmental perception which is presumably non-conceptless.

MBP/8 XXIII

\_\_\_\_\_ What would the first one be?

Abhaya; An example of the first one (that we've established is blue)

S: Yes.

Abhaya; Which is a concept isn't it?

S: Blue is a concept applied to...

Abhaya;...an object out there. So to say that it is a conceptless perception is confusing.

S: Yes. Judgmental perception. How can (external) perception be judgmental, that is (in) the perception itself. Perception is just pure perception. Is it a perception to which a judgment is applied?

\_\_\_\_\_, I think with both judgment takes place because you have to decide which proposition you (could) apply.

S: Which proposition is appropriate. It isn't altogether clear is it? (Pause) That is to say the first mental perception if one can call it that, at least the assigning of the correct proposition or set of propositions to the object that one perceives in the perceptual situation, that is clear enough. But it's that nature of the difference between defining characteristic and specific characteristic and the conceptless perception and the judgmental perception that's not very clear.

Dharmapala; Is it that you see an object and you give it a name, you define it. But if you go into it a bit more and say well it's a certain shade of blue for instance. Is that more the sort of giving it the judgment that it's a certain type

S: It could be difference between naming and defining. To name is not to define, is it? If you say well this is blue you're naming, you're not defining. But if you say ( ) this is a woman you are defining because what is a woman - a woman is a female member of the human species as the definition is, in logic, defined as the binding a thing to its correct genus and species. You bind that object to its genus, that is to say it's human and then its species - female.

Abhaya; Say you're defining the other one - blue - it's a colour - the (wider) experience is colour. The specific is blue as distinct from red.

A

MBP/8 ~IV 232

S: You could say that, yes.

Dharmapala; I can relate to the sort of, naming woman and then maybe

getting specific about that woman - that it's a mother or it's a young woman or ....

Abhaya; It all seems a bit arbitrary.

S: Yes. Well let's go back to what the Abhidharmasamuccaya says; 'What is the absolutely specific characteristic of conceptualisation?; It is to know by association. It is to see, hear, specify, and to know by way of taking up the defining characteristic and distinguishing them.'

Abhaya; That seems to be quite clear and straightforward.

S: Yes. So perhaps we'd better leave it at that. We've got a general idea of what conceptualisation is even though the nature of the distinction which the (book) author is trying to make isn't really very clear.

Padmavajra; I rather like your term 'recognition' and then ( )ing out.

S: It's to recognise the object of perception as such and such which means to refer it to some sort of idea that you have in your mind. That (seems) to be the essence of the situation.

\_\_\_\_\_; It seems quite clear in a way. The different ( )

Sagaramati much more complex than we think.( One bit is more intellectual than the others?)

4\$~.; Maybe he's just saying that there are degrees of it.

S: There's also the question (what is the difference between) defining characteristic and specific characteristic? That is

Padmavajra; So you recognise something and it associates with a particular idea. At length maybe as it goes on there are more ideas and following on like that.

S: No it seems to me that it's something different. It's more like this. It's more like the defining characteristic is the characteristic possessed by that object which you see and you recognise. The specific characteristic is that characteristic which the object shares or does not share with certain other objects. It seems also like that doesn't it?

MBP/8 XXV 333

Asvajit; It's a sort of discriminating thing.

S: Yes one could say that.

Sagaramati; But he does say that the defining characteristic deals with the specific characteristic.

S: Yes that seems confusing.

Dharmapala; At the bottom of that page he goes into differentiation which sort of opens it up a bit.

S: 'Differentiation means to make a proposition about an object which is ascertained as this or that object in view of its characteristics.' This is clearer from what Guenther says in his note. You ascertain the object as this or that object because you see it has certain characteristics and you know that what you think of in your mind as such and such has those characteristics therefore that is this or this is that. Recognition. Yes I think recognition really sums it up without going into this sort of (detail).

Sagaramati; When you think of the word it's re-cognise...

S: Yes you cognise it again from the object which you perceive. The object which you perceive calls to mind that cognition which was already in your mind. (pause) You can begin to feel how misleading it is to translate samjna (or)Cprajna)as perception as is often done in translating the Pali samjna. It is perception, but perception of a particular kind. It's not a perception of that, it is the perception that that is this,or that this is that ,which is quite a different matter. That is presumably judgmental perception. You could have say samjna as judgmental perception. That might be even more accurate. Conceptualisation is, I think, not really a good term. Because conceptualise means to turn into a concept.

Abhaya; ~~Ihat &ooout identification?

S: Identification,yes that is this is that,yes. I mean the general nature of this particular mental operation or mental element is clear even though we've not been able to work out very well the details according to this particular text. Let me just see what this work says. There's a very short bit on samjna here. It's called conception. 'The nature otconception or samjna is to perceive or apprehend the characteristic of an object and its activity when it is mental is to divide and produce various names and concepts.'

MBF/8 XXVI 234

When the characteristics of the object are established - this is cream or not cream then only can we produce the various expressions that correspond to the general characteristic.' It's vaguely clear.

\_\_\_\_\_, Can you say it once more.

S: 'The nature of conception or samjna is to perceive or apprehend the characteristic of an object'. That would be really the perceptual part. or the perceiving part of samjna and then 'It's activity when it is mental', which would seem to be the judgmental part, 'is to divide and to produce various names and concepts.' This is what that is. 'When the characteristics of the object are established - oh this is cream, 0 not cream, then only can be produced the various expressions that correspond to the general characteristic.' It's not quite clear what that means

is it?

\_\_\_\_\_; It seems to me the process that you see the object, say, and then there's a sort of process going on, a mental process, where you get associations of that object and then that dissolves back into that object

you saw before but with both.

S: It might have been recognition.

Padmapani; Yes the first one being the defining and the second one being the specific.

Padmavajra; Recognition really sums it up.

S: Recognition or identification - it could be identification because you may not have actually cognised that object before. You don't recognise a bird from the bird book except metaphorically speaking - you identify it from the bird book. If you've seen the bird before and are familiar with that kind of bird then you recognise it when you see it. But if you're not a person who is familiar with it but have seen a picture of it or know its definition in ornithological terms then you identify it.

Dharmapala; So, in easier terms, we have a perception, we define that and then identify it particularly rather than define it and that is

S: Well no we've seen the characteristics (and we know) characteristics agree with the abstract idea of something which we have in our mind which is already (labelled) then (the thought) this is that. This thing which I perceive because of those characteristics is i.e. agrees with or corresponds with, the idea which I have of a certain figure in my mind with

(MBP/8 XXVII 235

identical characteristics.

Sagaramati; The idea of this conceptless one is more like it's ( ) by mind in a way. Because unless you have a concept (and can utilise that) there couldn't be any identification or recognition.

S: Anyway let's go on.

\_\_\_\_\_;  
That is, "Conceptualisation is sixfold according to the basis from which it operates.

1. Those that start from the rapport that exists in visual perception.
2. Those that start from the rapport that exists in auditory perception.
3. Those that start from the rapport that exists in olfactory perception.
4. Those that start from the rapport that exists in gustatory perception.
5. Those that start from the rapport that exists in tactile perception.
6. Those that start from the rapport that exists in ideational (thought) perception."

S: Is this clear? How samjna is ( physically) the rapport, the contact. Visual perception - this is when we conceptualise with regard to an object which is through the content of a visual perception. You see something and then you recognise it or identify it. In the same way you hear something. You recognise, you identify it - oh that came from ( ). Or those that exist in olfactory perception - (There's a curry taste in that).

Abhaya; That's gustatory?

S: That's gustatory. Olfactory sorry - olfactory means you smell . That doesn't matter they're ( ) (Laughter). Those that start from the rapport that exists in thought perception. What would be an example of that? Well, that's the same thought that I thought of - that occurred to

- me - last week. You recognise it as the same thought.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; ( ) that some people can't think or feel

\_\_\_\_\_ (unclear)

S: This is the same thought that I had in such and such (~~ ). Anyway carry on, that seems clear enough.

MBP/8 XXVIII

236

Abhaya; "It is again sixfold in view of its reference.

1. Conceptualisation which has defining characteristics.
2. Conceptualisation which does not have defining characteristics.
3. Conceptualisation which is limited.
4. Conceptualisation which is broader.
5. Conceptualisation which is infinite.
6. Conceptualisation which is nothing whatsoever.

The first ('conceptualisation which has defining characteristics') is threefold:

1. One in which one knows the coherence between names and things.."

S: That's quite clear isn't it? One knows which names apply to which things.

Abhaya; "2. One which refers to the fact that everything composite is transitory

3. One which clarifies this reference."

S: Why does number two come here? -'One which refers to the fact that everything

composite is transitory.' This is of course the second of the three kinds of insight.

Abhaya; "The second is also threefold in view of the fact that it is opposite to the previous ones.

'Limited conceptualisation' refers to the ideas of those who are concerned only with the pleasures of this world and to all those ideas of the ordinary people who are in the world of desire and who have not reached the subJect~matter of meditation."

S: This presumably is a question of fear. Conceptualisation as regards to the ways that your perceptions( ) are limited to the kamaloka.

\_\_\_\_; So somebody not coming into contact with meditation wouldn't be

( ) number two wouldn't apply.

S: No, (they have)'limited conceptualisation~refers to the ideas',presumably concepts forming (absolutely), 'of those who are concerned only with the pleasures of this world and to all those ideas of the ordinary people who are in the world of desire and

END OF TAPE EIGHT

237

Mind in Buddhist Psychology

Tape 9 Side A

(Tape begins mid-sentence)...S: of no thingness, of no particular things, so it could refer to conceptualization at that level or including that level. On the

other hand one of Guenther's more irritating habits is to translate 'sunyata' as 'nothing' or as nothingness. It could be that in the original there is the Tibetan term for %~Sunyata .  
(unclear)...

Padmapani: If it was Shunyata Bhante, you wouldn't have conceptualization would you?

S: Presumably you wouldn't.

Manjuvajra: When you've got Sunyata (unclear).. Sun~ata itself is a concept.

S: Well, yes and no. The word Sunyata refers to an experience which is simply labelled Sunyata. .first there is the Sunyata experience, and then the label for that, which is the concept Sunyata.

Manjuvajra: It does.. (unclear).. give the idea of an experience. But maybe that does refer to Sunyata.

S: Yes, but the experience of the sphere of no-thingness is still an experience.

Padmapani: We're talking about.. in the realm of conceptualization, Sunyata is outside that...

S: No, you can conceptualize with regard to your experience of Sunyata. You have to do that for the purpose of communication - as when one asks the Buddha what was your experience, he says, my experience was Sunyata. Surely, this is conceptualization in order to communicate something of the nature of his experience. I rather tend to think though, this definitely refers to Sunyata in view of what goes before.

Mark: What's this thing...the m'kas 'jug?

S: This is a text.

Mark: Well have you got that?

S: Don't think so. NO, this is one of those untranslated Tibetan works.

Padmapani: Did you say the fourth arupa dhyana Bhante or.. (unclear)...

238

S: Well, there is a theory that of four arupa dhyanas, the infinite viewpoint firstly refers to the sphere of infinite space and the sphere of infinite

consciousness. The next is the sphere of...it is usually translated as neither --.-M,MwA perception nor non perception. But if we use this terminology idea of experience...(unclear). .the fourth sphere is.. (unclear).. the sphere of no-thingness. So, it seems to me, this infinite viewpoint firstly refers to the sphere of infinite space and the sphere of infinite consciousness. Whether it refers to the sphere of neither conceptualization nor non-conceptualization is obviously doubtful. And therefore whether the sixth refers to the sphere of neither conceptualization nor non-conceptualization, or to the sphere of no- thingness, that also is doubtful. Perhaps there is no exact correspondence here. But you get the general idea? That the sort of enlargement of the field of conceptualization in dependence on the heightening of one's experience, I mean this is pretty clear isn't it? The general Principle, even though we can't trace exactly how far it goes, or, you know, what corresponds to what...

Voice: . . .(unclear).. broadening?

S: Yes, you start off with a very limited field, that is limited to the kamaloka - then as you ascend in meditation to the rupaloka it broadens out to include that loka and then presumably, though this isn't specifically mentioned, with the infinite viewpoint you expand up into at least the lower reaches of the formless sphere, and that comes within the range of

the process of conceptualization—because don't forget, conceptualization or samjna is a mental event which is omnipresent, which is found in all mental states and that means at every level of mundane existence. We don't go here into what is beyond the mundane, though in this text, (in the Siddhi of Yuen Chuan) there is a discussion of... these five omnipresent events as present in the Alaya, but then there's a discussion as to whether the Alaya is transcendental or not so we'd better not touch that. You get the general impression of this broadening of fields, broadening of the field of conceptualization? For instance, supposing you have a dhyana experience which you've never had before, but you've read books about meditation and you think Ah! that's the experience which is described on page 24. This would be a conceptualization within that particular sphere, that broader viewpoint.

Abhaya: .. (unclear).. I remember in 'Dhyana for Beginners' when you go into the dhyanic state, after the second dhyana there is no conceptualization whatsoever.

S: Yes, but when you come out of the dhyana...

Abhaya: Ah, I see...

S.. You recollect the experience then there's conceptualization.. (unclear).. Otherwise how would you know what you'd experienced? Sometimes it's difficult to say, but in a sense you can describe what happened even though mental activity was not present at the time, as when you say for half an hour there was no mental activity, but, you know, you are conceptualizing with regard to that. You're using mental activity to say that there was no mental activity. (pause) Anyway, just to go into that point a little, about the omnipresence of conceptualization, it suggests~that we're conceptualizing all the time - that this is a mental event which is present in all states of mind. All the time

we're conceptualizing, that is to say we're recognising and identifying and so on But this happens, I won't say unconsciously, but this is a constant process, we're always doing it.

Abhaya: Except in the Thyana state.

S: Except in the dhyana state. Though we can of course do it even with regard to the dhyana state subsequent to the actual experience of them.

Voice: Presumably you're not doing that necessarily if you're creating a true work of art..  
(unclear). ..?

S: Well, if you are creating a true work of art, you could be said to be in a dhyana state.

Voice:...(unclear) Could be in the first dhyana...?

c): Yes, there is vitakka/vicara there, yes.

Padmavajra: That's what's happening, you are creating something new, so you're not  
recognising something, that's what Oscar Wilde said.. (unclear)... the ~h~rma

S: I won't be completely sure about the absence in dhyana states of all conceptualization. Perhaps we've been taking conceptualization in a rather crude sort of way. One very likely could say that even in the dhyana states there is a very refined conceptualization. Like for instance, you know that 'this is -- blissful' or, 'this is a blissful experience'. You may not, as it were, say it to yourself in a sotto voce but you sort of know, you sort of recognise in a very refined and subtle way.

Voice: Otherwise it would demand that you did come out of it to experience it.

S: Ah, not come out of the experience but to come out of it to...

240 Voice: . . to know that...

S: To recognise it, yes. So I would be a bit careful about saying in the quite literal sense, there is no conceptualization in the dhyana state. You know, vitakka/vicara refer to comparatively coarse mental activity, and perhaps conceptualization is capable of degrees of refinement that is very difficult for us to conceive of.

Voice: There must be a difference between mental activity and this other mental activity.

S: Huh?

Voice: The thing that disappears in the dhyana states as mental activity.

S: Vitakka viccara.

Voice: I mean this isn't mental activity as such is it? This is only conceptual- ization. Mental activity is the connection between conceptualization, that sort of conceptualization is just names, not more than that, whereas discursive mental activity...

S:~.. is thinking much more about things, almost like a train of thought. yes?

Voice: I mean, if you were in a state of bliss, you might be saying to yourself 'Ah, bliss, bliss.'

S: Well, yes, there is a text to that effect...

Abhaya: But that is a mental activity. I mean, what seems to be happening when you talk that way - as I see it you've got a broad field of mental activity which is conceptualization. But when y~u say 'Ah, no, conceptualization is not mental activity', you seem to be sort of taking ground from the mind unnecess- arily, it seems to create a sort of compartmentalization which is false. Do you Gee what I mean?

S: I think it's probably safest to say that in view of the fact that conceptual- ization is one of the omnipresent mental events, and therefore present even in dhyana states, that it represents a degree of mental activity so subtle as to be excluded from the definition of vitakka/vicara. This is what is usually trans- lated as initial and sustained application, which

is present in the first dhyana but not present from the second dhyana onwards, yes. There's a thought of an object, which is a bit like conceptualization, and then thought about the object.  
241

Voice: Could you give us that term again?

S: Well, vitarka or vitakka, v-i-t-a-r-k-a then vicara, v-i-c-a-r-a. 'c' in Pali and Sanskrit are always pronounced 'ch'.

Voice: . . (unclear)...

S: Vitakka or vitarka is the apprehension of the object. And vicara, this is the usual explanation, is the investigation of the object. Thinking of and thinking about, or, if you like, apprehension and comprehension, yes? in their quite literal sense.

Voice: Apprehension and...?

S: Comprehension, usually rendered in translation of Pali texts by Rhys Davies and others as 'attention initial and sustained', which doesn't really tell you anything, or 'thought initial and sustained', or 'initial and applied', so you see various expressions, which are not very helpful.

Voice: . . (unclear)...

Voice: . . (unclear).. fifth dhyana. . (unclear).. second dhyana. . and arupa dhyana. . (unclear)...?

S: What I'm saying is - the original point of this discussion was, whether there is conceptualization in the dhyana states, from the second dhyana onwards. Now there are two apparently conflicting theses. One is that as from the second dhyana onwards there is no vitakka/vicara. It would appear that conceptualization is a form of vitakka/vicara, therefore it would seem that as from the second dhyana onwards, inasmuch as there is no

vitakkaIvicara, there is no conceptualization. On the other hand, thesis two- samjna is said to be an omnipresent mental event, which means it is present in all states of consciou- ness; which would therefore include the dhyana state~of consciousness. The only way in which one can reconcile these two diffeient points of view is to suggest that there is a conceptualization in the dhyana ~tates but it is of an e~tremely subtle and refined nature. So subtle, so refined, that it does not come within the definition of vitakka and virara, which represent a comparativel~ coarse kind of mental functioning, yes? (pause) Whether this is actually the view of the Abidharma I couldn't say, or whether the Ab~~dharma has even discussed that apparent contradiaction, I don't know. The A~dharma literature is very vast. It probably has been discussed somewhere.

Abhaya: If you created a work of art and say there's an equivalent state of mind say, to the second o~third dhyana, and quite clearly you're writing a poem, then there would be a very highly refined form of conceptualization inevitably, because they'd be going through your mind.

S: I'm a bit doubtful whether you could write a poem in the third dhyana but... certainly in the first dhyana.

Abhaya: No, I was thinking that you once said that the second dhy~na~ when you were describing~ it, was as if water was Springing up from the well, rather, maybe it's like a form of artistic inspiration.

S: At the same time it iay well be that when you want to express that and you get down to words and to pigments then you're back, you're no longer actually in the state of inspiration, I think one can't generaliz~ too dogmti~~Ll~ %hout that, it may be that~~in rare moments you remain in the state of inspiration and the words come too, who is to say?

Voice: What about the stage of knowledge of the destruction of the biases... there's that state where these biases are destroyed...

S: This is jnana asavakayajnana. So this is not knowledge, this is more like awareness - you see. There is no, I assume, cognitive process, it is instant- aneous and direct. It is not asavakaya sunya, it is asavakayanana. . which is Pali for jnana. So this is something direct and

immediate, not a process, it's a sort of higher spiritual or transcendental perception. Not a cognition, unless you use the word cognition in its direct sense too. It's not a mental process by which you recognise that the asravas are no longer there. You don't

see, one could say, you don't see that the asravas are no longer there. You simply see, as it were, the empty place where the asravas were, but you don't go through a mental operation concluding, 'Oh! the asravas aren't there any longer', no, it's a direct perception. You could of course discuss whether you see the process of their cessation or whether you simply see, not that they are not there, but that there is an absence there - you wouldn't even be able to say it was an absence of the asravas. (pause)... It really means the discussion what actually happens cognitively when you perceive the non-existence of something. This has been exhaustively discussed in later Indian logic. What actually happens, what is the cognitive process, when you see and you understand that something is not there...

Voice: . . (unclear)...

243

S: The Indian logicians though, go into it quite thoroughly. Well, when you, for instance, say the car is not here, what is the object of your cognition, it can't be the car, because the car isn't there.

Voice: The not-car.

S: The not-car. Can you recognise a not-car? You know, they go into things like this but we're not going to do that. (laughter) This is long after the disappearance of Buddhism from India. This is the so called Nyaya (?) school of Indian, mainly Bengal, logic....

Voice: Sounds a bit like a koan doesn't it?

S: No, I don't think it is meant quite that way.

Voice: . . (unclear)... well, how do you recognise an object as blue? And he says the only reason it j~s blue is because he sees it as none of the othe~ as it were.. (unclear)...

S: Well, this is perhaps connected with the defining characteristics. It's not the attributes of the thing itself but it's the attributes it does not show of anything else.

Voice: But surely taking what you just said to its logical conclusion you could say that about everything. I mean everything like blue... (unclear)... colours. So therefore you haven't got any colour at all, which you can...

S: Well, no, you haven't got any cognition of a colour at all. You've got the perception of a colour but you haven't got a name for it.

Voice: . . (unclear)...

Padmavajra: Right, really it's not even saying that, blue I'm thinking of, that it isn't green, or it isn't yellow.

S: But if you want to tell someone else what colour was such and such thing, and they don't know blue, well, you say, it's not green, it's not red and so on. Anyway that isn't a very good example because, you know, you need to have a reasonable experience of blue to be able to recognise blue, otherwise you've got a merely formal ideology.

\_\_\_\_\_ - ~~~ 244

Voice: I was thinking you know, in connection with all the colours. If they didn't happen to know any of the colours then you wouldn't be able to explain it.

S: You wouldn't, no.

Voice: Right, same as you explain colours to a blind man.

S: Except that apparently a blind man can have an t4t~tic (?) perception of colour. What they've been discovering recently, even someone who was born blind. Yes, it's quite interesting.

Voice: What was~detic?

S: Well, mental images inside the head. I was reading an article about this recently.

-Voice: I wonder how they ascertained that a blind man could see,..

S: Yes, but apparently they have done this to their own satisfaction anyway. Anyway, enough about conceptualization. I think we'd better (inaudible)... to get back to the main point I was making; that we do in fact conceptualize all the time. In a gross or in a subtle way, all the time we're recognising and identifying - this mental activity is going on incessantly. Does it go on in dreams do you think? 'Oh yes' (general) There would seem to be no exceptions- but what about deep sleep?

Voice: In general the deep sleep state would be very much like a dhyanic state. (inaudible).. your consciousness.

Padmavajra: You know after you've woken up from a deep sleep tha;t you've had a deep sleep.

S: Yes, but you don't know.. (inaudible). . perception...

Voice: .. (inaudible).. because you can conceptualize things which you wouldn't normally.. (inaudible).. you just think of it as... (inaudible)

S: Not quite the same thing as conceptualization, is it? In the sense of samjna.

Voice: You can't recognise Lt at the time.

Padmavajra: Well, wouldn't that be the same like the formless dhyana, presumably

245

8

if there's only a subtle conceptualization, you're not - that sort of carries over 'til after the experience has ended.

S: Yes, and this is how you're perhaps - this is a bit speculative - able to enlarge it and make it grosser and in this way arrive at a statement about the dhyana experience itself. Otherwise how could you? It's like when you get back to your dream, because there is a very subtle thread that connects you with your dream and you sort of make that thread a bit thicker, you enlarge it and then you get back, as it were, haul back, the whole dream. This is, there must be some subtle thread of conceptualization connecting you with the dhyana state and also with the state of deep sleep, otherwise you wouldn't even be able to make any statement about your experience in those states after coming down from or out of those states.

Padmavajra: I had an odd experience the other day actually; I was lying in bed and I was suddenly aware that I couldn't, that I'd kind of completely lost all consciousness for a while. I was aware that it had happened, but I just completely lost everything, but I was aware that it had sort of happened but at the time I wasn't aware of anything.

S: If what I have said is correct it would suggest that that even when you are in that state of lost consciousness there was a very, very subtle thread of consciousness.

Padmavajra: 'Cause I knew it had happened because there was this incredible sort of feeling of fear.

S: All right, on to the next one, directionality of mind, sems-pa. 2ems-pa is Cetana, isn't it? Oh dear! Here it's translated as 'volition', which

. mmm.

Padmavajra: Couldn't sems-pa mean something else? As in Dorje sems-pa.

S: Sattva, isn't it. That which is defined as that which possesses a mind. (pause) . . . Cetana.

Manjuvajra: One of the skhandhas, isn't it ?

S: Yes, it's one - er, no, it's not one of the skhandhas.

Sagaramati: . . . samskaras...

246

S: It is more like the samskaras. It is translated sometime~ as volitional will. Guenther clearly wants to avoid Western ideas about the will and the freedom of the will, so he translates it 'directionality of mind'. Perhaps it's more like impetus of mind. There is a footnote here: 'see so and so. Sems-pa refers to the total ps~chic energy. It is motivating force'. Will is defined as the sum total of energy available to the conscious subject, whereas Cetana refers to the

total psychic energy, not only the psychic energy available to the conscious subject. So you could say, in Cintamani's phraseology, it's more like power than will.

~ava'ra: Cetana's more like power?

S: In Cintamani's phraseology, ye~

Vimalamitra: Is this what he's translated as directionality of mind - Cetana?

S: Er, well, no, not quite. The original Sanskrit term was Cetana; this was translated into Tibetan as Sems-pa, and Guenther translates ems-pa as direction-ality of mind, without refering back to the original Sanskrit term which was Cetana.

Vimalamitra: Ah. So this is (not?~ in actual fact Cetana.

S: Yes, and then he gives a footnote to say that it refers to 'the total psychic energy. It is motivating force.' It is not that there is some thing called mind which is moving in a certain direction; there is a sort of stream, - a total stream of psychic energy, - moving in a certain direction. This is Cetana. Do you get the idea? - moving towards an object, that is to say.

So it isn't volition - because volition is the sum total of psychic energy available to the conscious subject. So here there's no question of a conscious subject as distinct from the energy itself and also it is the energy, as it were, of the total being - there isn't a total being apart from the energy itself

Abhaya: So here it's not right on the (list?) - It's translated as 'rolition.

S: Yes, don't take that seriously at all. This translation is of voli~ion here, (inaudible)... in the ,iddhi - but it isn't that.

agaramati: It's funny, Conze translates sems-pa as Cinta.

S: There is a word, Cinta - Cinta though, as in Cintamani; Cinta is more like thinking about, worrying even. Cinta is more like that.

Sagaramati: Definitely not what is meant here.

S: No, definitely not what is meant here, no.

Abhaya: So there's no single word you can describe it; 'a total stream of psychic energy moving in a certain direction' we've got.

S: It's the movement of the whole subject towards its object, and there's all that energy which is involved, impetus, yes. You could say psychic impetu~, which is experienced as the subject. You could say something like that. This is in fact how one experiences oneself, as it were on the psychical side.

10

You're all the time moving towards, turning towards an object; now this object, now that object,. You always have an object in view, you're never inert, never passive, you're moving towards a certa~object, Huh? You're not just reflecting things or just aware of things; there's a flow of energy towards things all the time. This is the directionality of mind but not that mind is a thing which ha- direction, this is why he says directionality of mind.

Voice: (inaudible)

S: Yes, quite, yes. Perhaps it would be better to say mind's directionality. In other words

the emphasis is on the dynamic of the mind - so there's no question of there being a sort of static thing called 'the mind' which has a faculty of volition which it, as it were, operates. It isn't like that at all. There is this total stream of psychic energy which is the mind, moving towards the object of the mind. So one mustn't think again of the two things as separate - there's a perceptual situation, as it were, with these two poles - one of the poles moving towards the other. Or you could speak in terms of two poles with a flow from pole A to pole B, as in a case of the charge of electricity with a positive and negative pole, you could think of that like that.

Vimalamitra: What would the two poles be? One pole would be .....

S: One is the subject from which the energy flows, the other is the object to which the energy flows within that single perceptual situation.

248

Padmapani: What would be the positive and what would be the negative?- although I suppose it wouldn't matter.

~aramati: Well, you'd go from negative to positive.

S: This I don't know. I don't know very much about electricity.

Sagaramati: You talk of electrons going from positive to negative. In transistor theory you talk about holes which are the spaces left by these negative particles going from the positive to the negative - you could look at it either way.

~ava~ra: Its quite good.

S: It sounds quite Buddhistic.

Padmapani: In communication, between two people, it might be positive-negative,

positive~negative. (laughter)

S: Well, it could be, well it could be both at the same time - like when you just look at each other - who is object and who is subject then?

II

Padmavajra: Well, its not only the energy going towards the object from the subject, but I got the impression from what Sagaramati gave in that analysis, of an energy coming from the object.

S: Well, if the object is also a subject, but the object may be °~imply an obj~ct Or, if the object is also another subject.

Padmavajra: But its not like I look at that lamp, or I.. .my energy goes towaris that lamp, its not like that lamp gives that energy to me.

S: No, if you're looking at another person and that other person looked at you then it would be, that's what I call the object being another subject. That would seem to be a different sort of situation. That is in a way ulte inter- esting; where a subject is an object, or when the object ha its own dimension of subjectivity. Then you get a quite different kind of experience, then you can get communication. You can't communicate with an object, you can only communicate with another subject. So to the e~tent that subject for you is object, to that extent there's a non-communication.

Sagaramati: Maybe that's what Jinamata's complaining about - 'I am not as object'.

Padmavajra: Oh.

S: That subject is also object. Otherwise, if the subject is not an object for you, how can there be communication. So to refuse to be object is to refuse to be in communication. You have to be object as well as subject, so its your subject which is an object - not a subject which is a subject except for your- self. So you cannot expect to be completely non-object for another person, otherwise you go out of their range of vision and experience altcgsther.

Padmapani: Its a bit like, you could say, like on one level like a tomato or something or a plant, is an object; and if you had a human being that would be an object something like a subject. Well, presumably, I don't know, well, you can get communication towards plants which in that case is, in that case it i½ a subject and you're an object and a subject at the same time.

S: Well it is then to that extent, a subject. That is, you recognize that the object; tomato, has a subjective dimension but even that subjectivity of the tomato is still an object for you. You do not experience your self as subject: apart of course from a very mysterious process of empathy which takes place on a quite different spiritual level altogether.

Padmapani: (inaudible).. .Siddhi power...

S: No, I'm not thinking about that but about a level where subject-object duality is abrogated. Where a hole is made as it were, but that is, that i[ a purely transcendental thing.

Padmapani: I said siddhi power becau3e there was a psychic stream of energy going

towards the object, you know.

S: Ah, now just a minute, when we say psychic we mean psychic as in psychology not psychic as in psychic powers.

Padmapani: Oh, I see. I've got them wrong.

250

S: Psychic energy is nothing to do with supernatural power energy but just the energy of the mind, whether conscious or unconscious, yeah? Well this is the Jungian use of psyche yeah? Of psyche as in psychology. Its got nothing to do with psychic powers. You've got to be very careful of language. Alright, let's go on to the text then.

Vimalamitra: Text - 'Directionality of Mind. In the Abhidharma-Sammuc0aya the nature of directionality of mind is described as follows; What is directionality? It is a mental activity that propels the mind forward. It has the function of making the mind settle on what is positive, negative or indeterminate.'

S: This is very clear. 'What is directionality? It is a mental activity. ' Though one mustn't think there is a mind, on the one hand, which is active on the other. 'It is a mental activity that propels the mind forward'- not that there is a mind being propelled forward which is separate from that which propels it forward, no. 'It has the function of making the mind settle on what is positive; - i.e. skilful - 'negative' - unskilful - 'or indeterminate.' It's as though the mind has this natural innate tendency to move forward towards objects of different kinds, whether its skilful, unskilful or neutral.

Voice: Something like gravitation?

S: Yes, its like that, except that gravitation implies a sort of falling down. Its more like gravitation towards.. You can as it were, gravitate down or gravitate up or gravitate out. Right, carry on.

Vimalamitra: Text - 'It is a mental event that arouses and urges the mind with its

corresponding events on towards an object a From among all mental events it Is said to be the most important because the force of thIs event sets the mind and any mental event on to the object. Just a iron cannot but be attracted by a magnet, so also the mind cannot but be set on an object by this mental event.'

S: Mmm, yes, that's pretty clear isn't it? And again this is an omnipresent mental event, in all mental states there is this tend~ncy for the mind to move forward and settle on an object. But clearly this is something much broader and in a way more fundamental than volition or will in the ordinary sense, because you can will and then not will. But even then you're not willing it in that sort of way there's always this at least unconscious tendency of the mind towards this, towards that, to settle on this, to settle on that.

Abhaya: Could it be equated with what Nietzsche calls the 'life-force'?

13 251

Sagaramati: And the will to power?

S: The will to power is a quite, sort Of, technical conception. Life-force perhaps. Though life-force is also biological, this is psychological.

Sagaramati: It fits in more with Schopenhauer's will.

S: Yes, yes. It is will, it's not simply the will of the co iou subject it's much broader, much deeper than that.

Padmavajra: Is this directionality of mind, you know, ~- it says here, it'. eb, the most important...

S: Hmm.

Padmavajra: Is that because we have to, although it's a sort of innate tend~ncy of the mind to

do that, we have to sort of, choose which object to go towards.

S: Hmm. Yes. Yes right, because this is Karma. It is the raw material of Karma as it were.

Abhaya: It suggests a sort of activity which has to be harnessed or.

Hmm, yes, guided.

Abhaya: That something is going on, whether you like it or not and what you have to do is to channel it all the time, whereas I get the feeling that, like if you let go, then it will go spontaneously where it should go, whereas the harnessing is an attempt to...

S: Will go spontaneously where it should go? Hmm?

Padmavajra: I don't agree.

S: You mean in a...

Abhaya: It has a natural sort of...

S: Will it spontaneously go towards the... skillful, you're saying? Well it can go towards the skillful, towards the unskillful, and toward - that which is neither skillful nor unskillful. If you just allow the mind to roam, will it naturally go towards and settle down on the skillful?

Voices: .. .... .Hmm.. .h.m...

Abhaya: I'm thinking of this directionality of the mind as being something which is going on. It's a given.

S: Hmm, yes, yes

Abhaya: You know that, that...

S: That's you eh.

Abhaya: And ultimately, given the enlightenment experience it's a spontaneous thing 0 that...

S: Hmm yes.

Abhaya: So that there is a spontaneity about the.

S: Once the enlightened state has been attained it's as though that directional-ity persists but it is now permanently channelled into it - not simply skillfully channelled even, but completely spontaneous channels even, if one can use that expression, which can't even be spoken of as skillful...

Abhaya: So really the skillful - the unskillful - could be said to interfere - with some stage in

ones karma - interfering with this spontaneous...

No. No, I think that 's confusing the two different things. ThIc, I don't, I wouldn't say that the unskillful would be interfering. You could only speak in that way if you distinguished two quite different kinds of directionality: one the, as it were, the mundane - where the mind is much more likely to go on the unskillful than the skillful, and then a much more fundamental, a it were, basically transcendental directionality which would, as it were, left to its own devices, go towards enlightenment. But thi is something beyond the purview of the Abhidharma at least. I think in practice it would be almost dangerou to suggest that if you let the mind alone, if you let the mind find it~ own direction it would end up in the right place anyway, without any sort of gi2idance and direction.

Padmavajra: Directionality of mind is going towards... thi seem to be, in a sense, where the battlefield lies/is.

S: It's what you allow the mind to go towards.

253

Padmavajra: And where we choose to go towards indulgence and where we choose to go towards growth.~Or reactive and creative.

S: But what you cannot choose is whether the mind should or should not go towards something. That is given, as Abhaya said, that the mind does and mu t go towsrd something. You can only choo.~e what it goes towards.

Abhaya: What I'm trying to get at is, if there ì no ego really, a the text and the doctrine says, then if there is nothing to.interfere with this flow then if it does just go - it must be spontaneous.

S: Ah, but that's only if the ego is removed. But you know, in our experience, it is always associated with ego.

Sagaramati: It's sort of predetermined. It's got a predisposition to go in a certain direction and if that direction is unskillful it will never gain enlightenment.

S: Yes. You could also say that eh you know, if there is no question of ego which means no question of a subject/object division, strictly speaking, though the energy is there, there is no question of it going towards anything. There is nothing for it to go towards.

iharmapala: What is given here, mind is~ a result of past life karma anyway so, you know, you...

S: It's not the result of past karma though it has been reinforced by past karma; it's not a vipaka. It is karma itself, - underlying all vipakas - but it can certainly experience vipakas, but it itself is more than vipaka.

Voices: . (unclear)...

S: For instance we speak in terms of karma and vipaka alternating, but~that is not strictly correct. Even when you are experiencing vipaka, karma is~ still going on. So karma is absolutely continuous; the mind is always~ flowing forward.

Mark: Does that explain wk~, in one lifetime and the next and the next the same things are experienced; like you were saying this morning about between the Buddha and deva what...

S: Well, if the mind continues to flow in the same direction, then it sparks off the same vipakas.

Mark: Yes, but surely if a certain vipaka is sparked off, then that will produce the same karma as cause?

S: You don't produce karma.

Mark: Well, no.

S: In a sense, a karma does not produce karma. Karma is not a vipaka. Though if you perform certain karmas, the fact that you've performed them will tend to enhance your tendency to perform them. Karma can gather, as it were, momentum.

Abhaya: So could you say that this directionality of mind is karma?

S: You could say that, yes.

agaramati: Ah! that's an equation, isn't it?

S: Yes, well in fact it is said in the Pali texts cetana equals karma. This is said. Cetana is the more psychological term. Karma is, as it were, the more existential term.

This directionality of mind which is being spoken of... (unclear)...

S: Yes, from a slightly different point of view it can be looked at as karmas - it is karma. Considered as karma, when one takes into consideration the fact that it produces effects, that it produces consequence. in the form of pleasant or painful experiences. It is then karma.

Abhaya: Then why can't it be equated with volition? Why can't it be translated as volition?

S: Because volition refers only to the sum total of ps~chic energy available to the conscious subject. Wherea~ cetana or intensionalitty of mind i~ the pres ure fo~vardof your whole being and it is this which count~. ometimes it's said that karma is what you do deliberately - but this musn't be taken in too narrow a sense.

Manjuvajra: You are suggesting that karma can have a quite a large uncon~ciou' element?

255

S! A~ it were, yes. In otherword~ I'm almot saying you can't - it's hard to distinguish between conscious and uncon~scious.

Mark: Could it be said that it's something that whether consciously or uncon- sciously i. done for some sort of purpose?

S: Yes, but it is generally said that the more conscious you are the more serious the karma, or the more intense the karma.

Padmavajra: Like, in the Bhodicaryavatara, Santideva peaks of every trans- gre%~ion of the Bhodisattva as having erious con~equence3...

~: Yes

agaramati: Where does the (um I hope I'm not complicating thing but) idea of the bhavanga come in? Is it this sort of flow that's going on and on...

S: Yes, yes.

Sagaramati: Results in the whole....

S: The bhavanga is a purely Theravadin conception. As far as I recollect the bhavanga is an unconscious process. Here, cetana though, would seem to include both conscious and unconscious intentionality of mind.

Sagaramati: the unconscious pressure?

S: No, I think in the case of bhavanga the aspect or the characteristic that is especially emphasised is the fact that it flows on independently of external stimuli, yes? and that an external stimulus impinges and disturbs the bhavanga and then there is an adverting of the mind through the appropriate senses (where there is you know, impingement through the senses) to the object, which has impinged; for instance the analogy which is given, I think by Buddhaghosa, or it may have been the commentary in the Abhidhammatta Sangaha, but a man is sleeping beneath a mango tree. He is sound asleep. A mango falls on his head,

so he experiences a certain sensation. That causes him to wake up, so he then looks at the mango and realises that it was the mango which hit him. So the man who is asleep is: the bhavanga - shrota, the bhavanga - I don't know - the stream of becoming - yes, and the fact that he's asleep suggests or indicates the unconscious nature of that process. And he's hit by the mango - that corresponds

to an impingement of an object on the flow, through the senses, or through the mind directly. And then his waking up, refers to the arising of the consciousness. And then he looks at the mango, the mind now awake, now conscious, adverts to that particular object and sees what it is. So that the aspect that is emphasised in the case of the bhavanga is the, what shall I say, the fact that the bhavanga flows on when left to itself, without reference to external objects and perception or consciousness arises when an external object impinges on the flow of the bhavanga. So, here, what is emphasised is not the fact that the bhavanga is flowing towards, or that the stream of consciousness is flowing towards a particular object. Not its intentionality, but the fact that it flows only disturbed when an object impinges upon it. So it's a somewhat different point of view.

How that ties up with the Theravada conception of cetana I'm not sure.

Sagaramati: I think the man grabbing the apple is cetana

S: Yes, yes that is cetana or javanna.. (pause)... and then he eats the apple doesn't he? That's vipaka. Oh no, is it vipaka? No, when he gets the stomach ache that's vipaka.. (gentle laughter).. and when he eats it that's presumably sparsa. Anyway I think ~'ve got a clearer impression of the directionality of the mind, that it's something that flows on towards the object, settles down on the object, and so on.

Dharmapala: I~m still a bit unclear about this karma - that thi~ movement itself is karma, you know, is karma just movement?

You're creating karma all the time. You are karma. In a very general way you are just living as you are and your directionality of mind ~¼ continuing in the way that it does, this ensures that you are going to be reborn again, in a similar kind of body. And then the more sort of crucially important actions that you make up your mind to do, these represent more sort of specific, and more concentrated karmas which will result in the future in certain very definite life situations and experiences within the general human framework or context

Dharmapala: £0 there's thi movement going on all the time but ~,~~~ can choose to make that go in a definite way.

Yes - ', but ultimately you can choo~e to do that.

Voice: So karma's quite impersonal, in a way?

257

S: Well, in the sense that you are quite impersonal.. (laughter).

Voice: What I meant was, it's just a sort of force, and you choose whether it, if you like, works for you or if it doesn't.

S: Yes, but you mustn't press this distinction of 'you' and 'it' too far. (pause) You are a drive, you're not a thing, you're a drive - and you're keeping up that drive all the time and, because you keep up that drive all the time, without serious modifications, you'll be reborn more or less as you are now. If you, if that drive assumes a certain very specific, definite form, then the future life situation will be correspondingly modified; but actually, all the time you are - well not just creating karma, you are karma - and the things you think of more specifically karma, the things you definitely do, are things that are modifying that overall flow in one direction or another. Your overall flow is a general human flow, which will bring about general human rebirth. But supposing you've modified the flow somewhat, set in the direction of kindness, you'll have somewhat happier experiences in your future human life. Suppose you modified it in the direction of cruelty, you'd have somewhat unpleasant experiences within the same general context of a human life for you.

Padmapani: 'o, if you applied this law of karma to the Buddhist eightfold path, and take up the eightfold path, in that sense, you know, as best one could, then in actual fact it's the drive is going toward .. it's like a spiral, presumably going in towards its centre. Could you see it in those terms?

~~: I'm a bit doubtful about that.

Padmapani: I was picking up on not the eightfold path; Lama Covinda's graph of consciousness in the...

U: What I'm thinking is that one should be careful not to think of karma in terms of normally you're not committing karma - you're just sitting here and then you do something, maybe you go and steal something, that's karma, or you give something to a beggar, that's karma; but when you're not doing those things then no karma is being committed. No - karma is going on all the time. I think this is the thing to grasp really. That you are karma, your whole life is karma. It's a momentum carried on from the past and which will continue into the future, and what we think of as karma are only the more noticeable ripples and waves, even billows - positive or negative - on the surface of this flow. But the flow itself is going on all the time, or is proceeding all the time.

258

Mark: That's a very good incentive for someone...(unclear)...

S: That's why so much importance is attached to constantly repeating mantras, constantly giving dana etc. etc. Constantly reciting pujas, because you are then, for hours on end, seriously modifying in a positive manner, the whole karmic flow. It doesn't matter if you don't attain spectacular results at that particular time. Just as, throughout your whole life, by performing a characteristically human act; eating, drinking, copulating etc. you're ensuring a future life as an ordinary human being. So, in the same way, if you constantly recite mantras, constantly recite sutras, all the time you are modifying the general, or the overall, flow, which is you, which is your karma, which is cetana which is directionality of mind. Hence the importance of the repeated regular practice.

Padmapani: I meant that in the sense you will always be taking up, say, the Buddhas noble eight-fold path, karma would be sort of really changed, yes?

.your ordinary.. you took up right livelihood, right.. right, you know.

S: Yes, if your whole life, if your whole life flow, if your karma was shifted up into a more positive gear, well yes - that would mean that the future life would be completely changed. It mightn't even be a human life at all.

Voices: WOWEE!

S: This is no doubt one of the reasons why the Tibetans insist on a hundred thousand of this, a hundred thousand or that, at least you're passing your time in a highly skillful and innocent manner. (General laughter) And anyway, if you're meditating all the time, or much of the time, well you'll be born as a god, you know, reborn in the higher heavenly sphere - corresponding to the state of dhyana in which you have normally dwelt. On the other hand, if you have habitually performed those actions which are animal actions, and nothing but animal action~, then there is that extreme possibility that you may be reborn as an animal. If you've only eaten, only drunk, only copulated, then well, that is an animal existence. But, really very few people sink as low as that, even the very lowest. In fact it would be quite difficult to sink as low as that, one would have to try quite hard. No doubt a few people succeed occasionally.

Voice: (unclear)

S: No, no. Not in one lifetime anyway.

259

Sagaramati: You even have this in Greek thought. It's not really something Plato mentions that if you're totally preoccupied with say sex then you're reborn as an animal. Because that's...

S: Also it is of course the Buddha's teaching; if you're more, if you, as a man, are preoccupied with sex more than you should be, well you'd be reborn as a woman rather than a man, because the traditional teaching is that the female psychophysical organism is more adapted to those functions than is that of the

male. (pause) Also, if you are constantly occupied with eating and drinking, then you're more likely to be reborn as a preta; and if you're constantly preoccupied with competition and fighting and quarreling - as an asura, This is why, again, from the Abhidharma point of view, the habitual karma is considered so important. You remember there is the death-proximate karma, do you remember about that? There is the (gualpa) karma, the heavy karma, and then there is the death-proximate karma. There are others, but these are relevant from the point of view of rebirth. But what determines which particular karma determines the nature of the next rebirth? The one that immediately determines, though there are some different points is the death-proximate, the kind of thought or idea you had actually at the time of death. That comes first into operation. Then the (gu~lpa) karmas, which are weighty karmas, either skillful or unskillful. The unskillful are such actions as murder; the skillful, such actions as meditation. Meditation is a skillful weighty action. Meditation has a more powerful effect than any other karma. So, therefore, it comes into operation immediately after the death-proximate karma comes into operation. If there's no death-proximate karma the (gua~lpa) karma comes first into operation. If there's no (gu~lp~ karma, no weighty karma, then habitual karma comes into operation. 'c you can see how important habitual karma is, because the likelihood is there won't be any death-proximate karma in many cases, or a very weak death-proximate karma. In any case the effects of death-proximate karma are soon exhausted. They only determine the first few moments, or stages, of the next birth, after that the weighty karma comes into operation, and then habitual karma. So if you haven't any weighty karma, either positive or negative, then it is the habitual karma, the, you know, the

general karmic trend of the whole life, that determines the future rebirth, or future experience. So what one habitually does is regarded as of extreme importance. If you spend your whole life listening to taped lectures, you might be reborn in the Pure Land listening to the Buddha Amitabha.

Sagaramati: You may be reborn as a tape recorder. (laughter)

260

S: You might be reborn as the man in charge of the tape recorder. (pause) Might be reborn with large beautiful ears. (lots of happy laughter)

Padmavajra: Or something like the person who gave the tape recording. (pause)

S: Anyway, you understand now that karma is not just something you happen to do every now and then - it's something that's going on all the time - and producing or storing up effects for the future all the time.

Padmavajra: I read somewhere that sometimes people who, you know, who are into mantras and stuff, sometime~ have sessions where they say the mantras all day.

Oh yes.

Padmavajra: I mean, you know, maybe longer.

Robert: Which is more weighty, meditating or saying mantra~~

~: Well it depends on the degree of concentration. You can say mantras with high degree of concentration, in which case it becomes weighty karma, but usually that is difficult because, you know, as you enter the deeper states of concentration, there is a tendency not to want to repeat things aloud, or even eventually not to want to repeat things mentally. You become completely absorbed. So, broadly speaking, probably there is a more weighty karma, stronger karma, from meditation, you know, in the sense of dhyana experience - not just struggling to get concentrated, that's from mantra recitation.

Mark: I found that in a puja while the mantras, the chanting is going on, sometimes... (unclear).. the mind wandering anyway, but, presumably, to some extent that even that is better than not doing it at all?

~: Oh yes, yes. It is.

Voice: That often happens, the mantra going on without you having to try. You~ (unclear)~.you're thinking about... (unclear)

S: Again, this is one of the reasons why the retreat situation is so positive. Because, for say ten or fifteen or more days you are not performing any unskillful actions. You are performing only skillful actions and performing them every day and all day. So, in that way, you are creating, or you are in a very  
261

positive karma. And again storing up very positive consequences for the future. And you do gather a certain momentum don't you? The more skillful you are, the more skillful you want to be.

Robert: [~o why did Asvajit get sick then? (laughter)

S: Well, I don't know what he did on previous retreats that you attended, maybe in previous lives, who knows?! (laughter) On the other hand maybe it's a good thing that it happened. You know, one mustn't assume that it's a bad thing. It may be a positive purification or catharsis.

Vimalamitra: Maybe his psychophysical organism is going through a change?

S: Mm (laughter) A positive change that is. (lots of laughter)

Well let's carry on because... oh, we're already well over time. Never mind. Let us carry on to the end. (pause) Right let's carry on.

Vimalamitra: "It is sixfold..."

S: We've had that, immediately after that.

Vimalamitra: Oh yes. (page 26 Mental Event-;)

"While this directionality is a mental operation, action (IIb) is twofold insofar as it is directivity and intentionality.

The Abhidharma-kosa IV Ic d states "Action is directional and what has been set up by it. That which has been set up are bodily and verbal acts.

S: So, the directionality is of the mind. Intentionality is, as it were, directionality operating indirectly through speech and body. All right.? Carry on with that then.

Vimalamitra: "Intentional activity takes place in bodily and verbal functions. Although they are unlimited, in summarising their most important features, there are seven in reference to actions by body and speech, and ten in reference to actions in a social context."

Therefore the Abhidharmakosa IV 66 states, "From a broad viewpoint, the path: of action are said to be ten, according to their being wholesome and unwholesome"

262

S: Just a moment. "Intentional activity takes place in bodily and verbal action" In contrast to the directional activity, which takes place only through the mind.

"Although they are unlimited, in summarising their most important features, there are seven in reference to actions by body and speech, and ten in reference to actions in a social context." Hmm.

Manjuvajra: Is that seven of the ten precepts?

S: Well, I'm trying to work out what precepts it refers to, it doesn't seem quite clear.

Manjuvajra: Would it be the ordinary ten, except for the three associated with the mind?

?~: Yes, but then why "ten with reference to actions in a social context"? Where does that come from? Or what does that apply to?

Manjuvajra: Well maybe that includes the three that are normally associated just with the mind in their more social context. (pause)

S: Perhaps one can say that there are seven which pertain to body and speech, and ten which pertain to body, speech and mind. (pause). No, sorry, ten which pertain to mind. (pause) Because, yes, there are three which are directional i.e. directly of the mind and seven which are intentional i.e. mind operating either through speech or through body. It would

seem to refer to that. That there are seven in reference to actions by body and speech, and ten in reference to actions in a social context? It doesn't really quite follow, does it? Ten in reference to directionality, or maybe the 'social context' refers to both intentional and directional together.

~a&"-iramati: Maybe one of them's sort of with people and the other one means the sort of things you do when there is nobody there?

Voices: (unclear)

23

S: . . . the mental acts...

Voice: Yes but even more.

263

c~: I think possibly the translator has translated a little hastily. All right carry on.

Dharmapala: "From a broad viewpoint, the paths of action are said to be ten according to their being wholesome & unwholesome'."

S: It says wholesome and unwholesome, well actually, it is wholesome or unwholesome - the ten wholesome and the ten unwholesome. That's clear, these are the well known ten precepts of course, which are known as dasa kusala patha (or dasa kusala kamma-patha) or dasa akusala kamma patha. The ten ways of wholesome action or ten ways or paths of unwholesome action. So they are paths of action. You notice the term kamma pathas. They are what we call the ten precepts or the ten pathways of ~kill action, killful karma, or, if you like, the ten avenues of skillful karma. The ten ways in which skillful karmas come out. (pause) Perhaps, that's interesting, that what we translate as vows or precepts, that's not really quite correct, they are actions. Actions in the sense of karmas 're directions. They are movements in a certain direction. The ten intentionalities you could say - the ten skillful intentionalities. It's more like that. (pause) Even the ten creativities. (pause, mumbled)

of agreement)

Padmavajra: That really makes it much more, stronger.

S: Yes, because they are paths through which the skillful karms flow out; they are channels, as it were. Specific channels for the skillful karma to flow in. This is what the actual term suggests, not precepts in the same sense of rules to observe. And then if you think of them as channels well, that '~ggests' guiding, and as the Dhammap~da says, 'The skillful person guides his mind, :just like the irriga:bor guides the flow of the water'; which is a good comparison. You can either u~e the water for irrigation and therefore nourish the crops, water the crops, or you can let it overflow the whole land and destroy every- thing.

Padmavajra: What was that quote from the Dhammapada again?

U: Just that the, I think it's the monk, or the wise man, guides or controls his mind ju~t as the irrigator guides or controls, or 'leads' ~think i the term, nayati (?) I think, the water.

Padmavajra: Brilliant, yes.

Vimalamitra: There's quite a lot of reference to the mind and growing and cultivating.

264

~: So, it's as though the ten kusala karma pathas represent, you know, just so

many chawiels which you open up for the waters of your cetana to flow into. They represent the skillful directions in which you guide.

Dharmapala: certain are~s?

S: Yes, yes. (pause)

Sagaram~ti: Sometimes when you notice it afterwards; when you guide Ct you ap~ly a bit of pre~£sure.

S: Well you may have to block it in certain directions. Just as the irrigator does - it flows in another direction. You know, what is the term, it's not ri look but there's a particular term...

Abhaya: A s~ce.

S: A sluice, yes.

Kamalasila: Water alway flows, you can't stop that.

S: Yes, quite, yes. In the same way the mind also ha- its own intentionality, you can't stop it you can only guide it, and then you can only blsck it in certain direction - not to press this analogy too far '. -if you open up in an- other direction. It's not quite so mohanical a' that anilogy might sugge t. of cour~e.

Padmavajra: %"till quite an amazing analogy. Quite a thought.

S: Yes. (pause)

paimavajra: The precepts become much more dynamic when you put it in those terms.

S: Yes. In connection with the five precepts the term is siksapada that is the factor of learning. But in connection with what we call the ten precepts, the original term iikusala karm pitha; ways of skillful - even 'action' doesn't render it really adequately - ways of skillful intentionality. That's closer to it. 'Ways of skillful mind-intentionality'

265

Mark: Makes it much more positive.

U: Ways of skillful cetana; channels of skillful cetan'. (pau-e) All right, carry on then.

Manjuvajra: " The classification of action is threefold: positive, meritorious and intermediate' or meritorious, non-meritorious and neutral".

S: This is, presumably, skillful kusala, akusala - negative and intermediate

which is Or meritorious which presumably is punya;

non-meritorious which is presumably pap- or apunya and neutral which is presumably again avyakata.

Vimalamitra: What's neutral?

U: Avyakata.

Manjuvaira: Is that A-v-a...

U: A~v~y~a~k~a~t~a. Right, concluding paragraph.

Manjuvajra: "It is very important to know well the differentiation of how to recognise these actions and how their effects come about, how they project (a life style) and bring about it fulfillment, how they are to be experienced with certainty and without certainty, how in the way of being experienced with certainty they are experienced immediately, indirectly, or in the future; but it would be too much to go into these details. Those who are eager and intelligent will know them (laughter) when they study the Abhidharmakosa and its commentary by the great scholar Vasubandhu and (12a) the 'Legs bshad dri ma med pa' by Tsong-kha-pa'."

S: So it's very important to know the differentiation of how to recognise these actions; which are skillful, which are unskillful, how their effects come about under the so-called 'law of karma'. Incidentally, you can realise this expression 'law of karma', is quite misleading - because it suggests the analogy with law in the ordinary sense. Well, here are you and there is the law and the law is applied to you; you have to obey the law (general sounds of assent). But here there isn't a law of karma separate from karma itself, nor is there a karma separate from you. The law of karma is the law of your own being. It's you.

266

Voice: .. (unclear)...

U: Yes (pause).. "How their effects come about, how they project ~"i life style"- I don't know where this 'life-style' comes from, it doesn't sound very Tibetan.

Padmavajra: Sounds quite American.

S: Mmm. "And bring about its fulfillment" I'm not quite sure what it meant by that. (pause)

Voice: Existence perhaps?

S: Could be a certain kind of existence in a certain world. (pause) Or cause you to live in a certain way - a certain pattern of ethical observance. (pause) But anyway "It would be too much to go into the details" Just as well perhaps. (laughter). Karma is a very complex subject. I think that in the R'li texts somewhere, as far as I recollect, it says that only a Buddha fully understands the workings of karma.

Vimalamitra: I remember there was this Ceylonese monk who was teaching us karma, I think, at the Working Man's College. He was talking about it in a very definite kind of, I don't know, vibration or atmosphere around it. Very - following along, you weren't just listening to the words, you had, to kind of, get into that state to try and follow him.

S: Mmm (pause)

Padmavajra: That's the first time I've sort of thought I've got a kind of inkling of what karma is. I've always been, you know, sort of - you know, I've always felt, been rather sort of, you know, just haven't thought about it, you know, haven't looked into it, because it's just been sort of, you know, out of my ken.

U: Well usually the presentation is rather rigid and mechanical, as though it is a sort of law, sort of pressing down upon you.

Mark: Can't remember if this is the case or not but if, as I do remember it listening to your lecture about karma and rebirth, that's how it came over then.

S: Yes but there I've gone into the different kinds and types of karma. Perhaps I'll have to do another lecture.

Padmavajra: o thi'~::~ karma, you know - you are the karma - thi is incredible, you know, it's an incredible sort of thought.

U'agarams:~ti: How do the five Niyamas fit in then? Ij~ a '-.~'en e they're all karma. There's specific things like the ethical side of it - we name the others different forms of conditionality. Uo really it's all karma, in a ~en~e, i'-'- that right?

S: Well it i~n't all present karma, but it, as it were, well, you could ~ay the other~s are past karma, a crystallised karma i.e. vipsks.

'agaram"ti: cryst~'llified on to the phy -ic~l level or the mental level or..

Yes, or at le~- t indirectly.

L~- 'aaramati: Indirectly yes.

?~: Yes in a'~ much is you, you know, through your, the keeping up of the gener~-l human k~rma li brought about again a humsn body, which mean thatl you know, you are reborn in a world where you are exposed to all sorts of experiences as represented b~ the other niyamas. (pause) The good lady who arrived from Australia the other day, and who rang me up, and wanted to order some tapes, and she said that was the one she found most useful - oh, she's rather strongly inclined to the Theravada - the lecture on karma, which rather surprised me. But anyway in view of the fa~t that she is a Theravadin perhaps it i~n't -0 surprising, but she said she'd found that very useful. But perhaps that doesn't

give, you know, quite the spirit o~ the thing as we've been talking about it today. It gives the bare bones of the subject and not very much more.

Voice: In a way it gives you the bare bones which are necessary to produce killful karma.

': Ye--, well bare bones of the subject are also sometimes necessary to give you something solid on which to build. You know, if you were all flesh you couldn't even stand up, you need really the bony skeleton in order to keep you erect - to provide a sort of framework for the flesh and blood and marrow and you know, all the other stuff that's more delicate.  
(pause)

Mark: Maybe if we have a subject like that it would be worthwhile to have more than just one miscellaneous tape as it were.

268

S: Oh, indeed it would be.

Mark: At least a short series.

S: Right. Well, you'd better all divide the subject between you then.

Voices: Yes. Mmm. (pause)

U: We could even have a whole seminar on karma and rebirth, couldn't we?

Voices: Yes, lovely yes.

S: And do quite a lot of reading up and go through different texts.

~maWft~ra: In 'Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma' unless I was mistaken, Guenther talks about karma in terms of energy, at one point.

S: Well he talks about here in terms of energy doesn't he? He says, '~sem~a', (which is cetana, which equals karma) refers to the total psychic energy. It is motivating force!

Padmavajra: When I read that it really seemed to mean something.

S: Mmm, yes, yes. (pause)

Sagaramati: It's kind of hard to associate ethics with energy or its form.

Ethics is the giving of a certain direction to energy, yes.

Voice~: Agreed.

Sagaramati: But that would make directionality of mind an ethical thing in some sense.

28

Well then, what we may call the natural directionality of mind is not necessarily ethical.

Sagaramati: I meant including unskillful in 'ethical'.

S: Yes, it has ethical significance, the directionality of mind has ethical

significance. But becomes, I mean, but is only actually ethical when directed

towards skillful ~-objects or skillful states.

All right let's leave it there for today.

Incidentally it just occurs to me that we could do one of the well known summ-'aries or calculations that, in the course of your life, how many hour' do you '~pend asleep? How many hours do you spend for eating? etc. etc. You could pretty well calculate what your next life would be. (laughter) - And also give imp- ortance not only to the aetua~ time spent but "al ~o to the degree of involvement in the particular activity.

Padmavajra: Dormouse. (laughter)

Mark: It would be difficult to do that, to actually work it all out and putting it all down on paper because you wouldn't know what to compare it with. I me~n, maybe you can gtt a very rough idea, but I mean you wouldn't know if you're on the verge of human and god or animal and human.

S: Well supposing you had spent, over many, many years say

(Tape runs out here)

270

TAPE NO. 10

S: Supposing you had spent, over many, many years, say, eight or ten hours a day in meditation. Well, then you would have spent, in the course of a lifetime, quite a number of years in meditation.

Dharmapala: You couldn't really definitely point out where you

(unclear) land up, but you could see what the tendencies are ...

S: Yeah. Well, supposing you, years and years of your life in intense competitiveness, yeah? Well, that would clearly point in the direction of the Asuraloka, wouldn't it. Or suppose you'd been a gourmet, tasting food, and spending hours and hours every day at the table (laughter), every evening at a well known restaurant, yeah - with your own cellar. Well, (pause) ... a preta. Or perhaps an animal if it wasn't too neurotic. Or supposing you were a king, who spent most of his time in the harem, then also you'd probably end up in the animal kingdom.

Mark: Quite interesting because even though certain people are actually taking part in life on this world, some people seem to be living in a land of the gods, living a god like existence, presumably, if what you're saying is true, then all those things, even though they might be enjoying them, er, are probably like, even a life of, whatever - animal

S: (breaking in) ... well, no, it depends also on the degree of (intensity of) involvement for instance, two people may be leading, apparently, the same life, eating, drinking, etc., etc., but they may mean very much more to one person than to another ....

Mark: Oh, right.

S: ... and one may be very much more into them than another. So they wouldn't be setting up the same sort of karma, or even if it's the same sort of karma, not to the same degree.

Mark: I'm thinking of the people who dwell in that .... (unclear) ... who appear to be very happy, doing things which, well, I know that I probably wouldn't feel happy doing all the time - but they seem to be totally happy all the time. They seem not to want to concern themselves with anything positive .... (very unclear)

S: I'd like to examine a bit more into the nature of happiness.

(General murmurs of agreement)

Sagaramati: Couldn't happiness be, as it were a Vipaka? Even though as it were you re-creating unskillful karma

S: Oh yes, mmm. Pleasant sensation. Right. There is a discrepancy between your past skilful and your present unskillful behaviour.

Manjuvajra: Couldn't it though be that you've been reborn as a sort of god, in one of the, well, god in the heaven of sensuality. I mean the gourmet, for example, or the king with his harem, couldn't that be, couldn't he be still very interested in his spiritual development, and maybe working towards that, but still be enjoying the fruits of previous actions?

S: I think it depends on what you mean by enjoying the fruits. The fact that he had, you know, through no effort of his own, say a harem, of five hundred women, could well be considered vipaka, but the fact that he was making use of that harem, could well be considered, you know, unskilful karma in the present, yes? The fact that he has got

272

S: (cont.) those things due to his previous skilful actions doesn't mean that he's got to enjoy them.

Dharmapala: He can choose how to relate to that vipaka . ...

S: Yes. And as he chooses so he sets up either fresh skilful karma or unskilful karma. I think this is also why one must be so careful when one is happily situated, when the vipakas are good: that's the time when you can lose your mindfulness, and you can become elated and careless, and foolish, and silly. Not in times of adversity when you may be having to struggle and really think very seriously, yes?

Ratnajyoti: Perhaps the best time to practice meditation is when you're ill.

S: There is a certain truth in that, yes.

RaThajyoti: It depends how ill you are, I suppose .... (unclear)

Padmavajra: Well, he might not have a good sort of meditation, when you're ill, or something like that, but you're picking up the, the it's a karma.

S: Not only that - it sometimes happens that in certain kinds of illness, especially fevers, you experience a sort of separation of the mind from the body, yes? And in that sense you could be having a kind of meditation ... and even quite profound reflections, undisturbed by what is happening to the body. Sometimes it happens quite spontaneously. I think quite a lot of people have experienced this.

Vimalamitra: Sometimes when the body is in pain ... you can maybe still kind of ... well, meditate.

273

S: And you can be very aware, you know, when you're ill. Not just aware of the illness, but just aware within yourself - in a way that amounts almost to a slightly higher state of consciousness.

Padmavajra: Aloka was telling me that when he has a cold he works best, because he's most concentrated ... on his rupas

S: Anyway - alright that is all, I think: Rapport - more usually translated as Contact.

1, The Abhidarmasamuccaya explains rapport as follows: It is a determination, a transformation in the controlling power, which is in accordance with the three factors coming together. Its function is to provide a basis for feeling."

S:        Alright. Lets carry on with the explanation by the author of the text.

"It is an awareness in which a pleasant feeling is felt when the object, sensory capacity, and cognitive process have come together and which is restricted to the appropriate object. Transformation in the controlling power means that when the visual sense meets a pleasure object and the feeling becomes the cause of adhering --to this pleasure, rapport restricts the pleasant color-form and the feeling becomes the cause of pleasure."

S:        That reasonably clear? It'll probably become clearer if we think of rapport as simply contact, as it's usually translated. 'It is a determination' ... here determination seems to be used in a more philosophical sense of 'specific mode'. Are you familiar with that usage?

Dharmapala: No.

S:        It seems somewhat Hegelian, a determination of something is that particular thing existing in a certain mode. It's got nothing to do with psychological determination. 'It is a determination, a transformation in the controlling power.' What is this controlling power? The original

274

S:        (Cont.) word is probably indriya. As it's more usually translated, sense faculty. So contact is a specific mode, a particular transformation, in the sense faculty, which seems pretty straightforward. "which is in accordance with the three factors coming together". These three factors are the object, the sense faculty itself, and the consciousness which arises when the two come into contact. "Its function is to provide a basis for feeling". So this is what contact, or rapport, is.

Manjuvajra.' So the 'controlling power' is the senses?

S: Yes. 'Controlling power' seems to translate indriya, which is faculty, or sense faculty. It has a wider meaning too, but here it refers to the six faculties of sense, including the mind.

Manjuvajra: It seems very strange ... I can't see any connection between 'controlling power' and 'sense faculty'.

S: We~l, we just happen to know that indriya is the technical term in Sanskrit for what we usually call 'sense faculty'. The literal meaning of indriya is 'the ruler', that which rules, that which controls, that which governs - therefore Guenther renders it 'controlling power

Dharmapala: So ... there's a sort of, an object perceived, and, just because you perceive it through a particular Thina, it's that perception is contrasted with that thing.

S: You could say that

Dharmapala: And then feelin~arise on that.

S: As the Abhidharmasamuccaya says, the function of contact, rapport, is to provide a basis for feeling. No feeling arises unless there is already that situation of contact, So how does this contact arise, what is contact?

S: (Cont.) Well, first of all you start with a particular sense organ, you start with a particular indriya. Contact is essentially a modification - a specific mode, a transformation of that. How? That sense faculty comes into contact with its appropriate object, the appropriate consciousness arises, the appropriate awareness arises, and within that context, within that situation, feeling arises. So the function of contact is to provide a basis for feeling. Therefore in the nidana chain in dependence upon contact arises feeling.

Ashvajit: So the 'determination' mentioned here is according, in accordance with, a particular sense?

S: No. 'Determination' is more or less the same as 'transformation'. A determination of something is that particular thing existing in a specific mode. As I've said, it's the more philosophical usage of the term 'determination'.

Ashvajit: Can it exist in any other context than the five or six senses?

S: No. It is the sense itself that is, as it were, transformed, to become contact. So "what is rapport - it is a determination, a transformation in the controlling power'. Yes? In other words contact is a sort of change to put it in the simplest terms, that takes place in the sense faculty ... consequent upon that sense faculty coming into contact with the appropriate sense object and giving rise to a certain kind of consciousness, and making possible the arising of contact ... sorry, making possible the arising of feeling.

Vimalamitra: It's only when the three factors come into play that there is contact?

S: Yes, yes.

276

Vimalamitra: The consciousness must arise for there to be contact?

S: Yes, yes. No it doesn't - it says "which is in accordance with the three factors coming together". It actually says that contact is a change in the sense faculty, in accordance with the three factors coming together, or if you like on account of the three factors coming together. When the three factors, that is to say sense faculty, sense object, and sense consciousness, come together, a certain change takes place in the sense faculty. That change we call contact. And on the basis of that contact, feeling is possible.

--Ashvajit: It sounds very much like a kind of absorption with the object or in the object of perception. So that before the modification, before the determination, the indriya is sort of held within the subjective mode ... correct? It's not hooking up with ... (unclear) ...

S: It's more like the, the indriya is turning towards a particular object. And on account of that it comes into contact with that particular object.

Sagaramati: I think there's a difficulty, the way we sort of tend to see things in the West - the fact that it's like as if the eye can exist without the consciousness, or without the object it's seeing .... but I mean, I feel that in Buddhist philosophy, that sort of mode of thinking just doesn't enter into it.

S: Yes, in other words thinking is in terms of relations rather than in terms of entities. Which is of course the Buddhist outlook very definitely.

Ashvajit: It is possible to be looking at something and not see it. What's happening there?

277

S: Well, if you don't see it, how do you know you're looking at it? In what sense are you looking at it?

Ashvajit: Your eyes have been open ... well, I was sitting outside the other day, my eyes open, I realised thoughts were going through my mind, and I wasn't actually in visual contact with what was out there.

S: But was there no awareness whatever of something out there?

Ashvajit: Difficult to say.

S: One can have one's eyes, you know, wide open, but consciousness is completely withdrawn from that particular sense organ. So that you don't perceive, you're not as it were using the eye. When you're using the eye then all three things are present.

Vimalamitra: Could you say that again. What is the difference between the Indianway and the Western way of looking at this?

S: Well, I didn't say that. That was what Sagaramati said.

Vimalamitra: (to Sagaramati) Well you said, er, I've forgotten what you said,

S: I said that Buddhism does tend to look at things in terms of relations, rather than in terms of things. Not even things that are related - but relations - and the so-called things are the different terms, as it were, in the relation. Yes?

Vimalamitra: Ah. So there's no idea of, of, concrete things, rather~this relationship.

278

S: Yes, yes. One could say that. No idea of concrete things existing apart from relations.

Manjuvajra: If the contact is a transformation, I can understand how the

visual, well, how the sense faculty finishes up on an object, but what was - w~s ~'t w" it before it transformed ... (unclear) .~.. another object?

S: Well, there is some explanation of this: "transformation in the controlling power means that when the visual sense meets a pleasant object" - presumably the pleasant object is taken only as an example - "and the feeling becomes the cause of adhering to this pleasure, rapport restricts the pleasant colour-form and the feeling becomes the cause of pleasure"

Ashvajit: A state of equilibrium is set up, between the feeling and the visual perception

S: ~apport~-contact, I restricts the pleasant colour-form.' I almost feel it does not restrict ... (unclear) it's more like it sort of holds on to it.

Padmavajra: captures ....

S: Captures, yes. That's a good word, yes. Captures. "The pleasant colour-form, and the feeling becomes the cause of pleasure". That is the modification, that the sense faculty captures, as it were.

Manjuvajra: The feeling itself is the pleasure, though, isn't it? How can the feeling become the cause of pleasure?

Sagaramati: Pleasure would be the emotion in that case.

S: Usually one speaks in terms of pleasurable feeling, rather than pleasurable emotions, but it could be that, yes, that pleasant feeling becomes a cause or condition for taking delight, which would imply something stronger, a stronger clinging - which is of course what happens according to the nidana chain, that in dependence upon the, the vedana, the pleasant feeling, arises craving. There's a difference between say, feeling pleasure, and taking pleasure in. In fact it's sometimes difficult to say where the experience of pleasant feeling ends, and the active taking pleasure in, which is of course craving, begins.

Ashvajit: Presumably one can only learn that through long process of experience.

S (It depends on ?) how easily you can detach yourself from the object of the pleasant feeling; if you can detach yourself immediately, well, clearly it has been just a pleasant feeling that you have been feeling, not taking pleasure in. But if you can detach yourself - if you can give up that object only with great difficulty, or perhaps if you can't give it up at all, then clearly you've been taking pleasure in, and craving has developed. And therefore Karma has again been, you know, set in quite vigorous motion. Right, let's go on to the six terms.

"According to its operation, rapport is sixfold:

1. Rapport with visual situations. 2. Rapport with auditory situations. 3. Rapport with olfactory situations. 4. Rapport with gustatory situations. 5. Rapport with tactile situations.
6. Rapport with thought situations.

S: It's usually translated simply as visual contact, auditory contact, and so on. This seems reasonably clear, doesn't it?, the discussion of rapport or contact. Well, I think we'll have a little more fresh air. Would someone like to open a window? Anyone else feel stuffy?

Alright, on to the fifth and last of the omnipresent mental events, Egocentric

280

S: (Cont.) demanding, which I think is manasikara, isn't it?

"The Abhidaramasamuccaya explains egocentric demanding as follows:

What is egocentric demanding? It is a continuity having the function of holding the mind to what has become its reference."

S: Read the whole thing, it's very short.

"It is a cognition that keeps the complex of mind in its specific objective reference. The difference between directionality and egocentric demanding is that directionality brings the mind towards the object in a general move, while egocentric demanding makes the mind jump on this particular objective reference."

S: Literally manasikara means mind-making, doesn't it? Manasikara. Egocentric demanding. It's as though intentionality is the sort of creeping up on the object, and egocentric demanding is the final spring. (laughter) "It is a continuity having the function of holding the mind to what has become its reference" - presumably, reference means what it has become concerned with, what has become its object, its point of reference.

Dharmapala: What is the difference between that and contact?

S: Well, contact is simply contact. It's simply mutual impingement. I mean, the senses can come into contact with their respective objects without any sort of particular movement on the part of the part of the mind. This is why contact is part of the effect process of the present life. It is something that just happens, it isn't anything that you do. You open your eyes, you see things, you can't help it. You don't decide to see things, you just see them. But when you start taking up a definite attitude, a moving towards them as it were, then comes the intentionality and egocentric demanding.

fadmapani: Could you say that egocentric demanding would be like, a bit like when, the final spring's a bit like when things start sticking to you? In that sense, start sticking to you, your mind. You know  
281

S: Well, a key word possibly is continuity, a continuity. It is something that is going on. Yes? It's almost something that becomes habitual, one could say, yes? At least within a relatively short time scale. It's something that you do again and again. Hence the term 'demanding'.

Sagaramati; It's almost as if it has - it doesn't mention here - but it has the feeling as a basis.

S: Mmm. Yes. Let's see what the Siddhi says. (pause) The Siddhi translates it 'attention'. Or at least the translator of the Siddhi

.... (pause) "The nature of attention, manasikara, is to arouse the mind to action. Its function is to direct the mind towards the object

.... It is called attention because, first of all, in the state of bija, latent in action, it excites the bijas of the mind~ which is about to be born~ The other conditions being given, and directs this mind once born in such a manner that it makes for the object. It exercises the same function in regard to the mental associates, caittas. But the texts speak only of the directing of the mind, because the mind is the sovereign power. According to Sanghabhadra attention causes the mind to turn towards another object: According to the Abhidharmasamuccaya it holds

-- the mind fixed on an object. Both explanations are contrary to reason. Because, in accepting the first, attention would not be universal, and the second explanation confuses attention with samadhi." Yes? So, one mustn't think, according to this author, of manasikara as a definite firm holding of the mind on the object - this would confuse it with samadhi, or concentration. Yes? It is more like that leap on to the object, not the actual holding fast to it, once you've leapt on it. 'Egocentric demanding' is not bad as a sort of interpretive translation.

-- co£j/d r~5eJ~ Ashvajit: ~ .....arepetitive just sort of touching,

to a wholesale grasping.

S: Yes, yes.

282

Sagaramati: It says on this thing, it says, 'it is the mind's first confrontation with the object' (he's reading from a gestetnered list of mental events taken from the Abhidharmasangaha, Manual of Abhidharma) 'and binds'...

S: Where is it?

Sagaramati: Just at the bottom there ....

S: Ah. Here it is.

Sagaramati: That's taken from the Abhidharmasangaha.

S: Ham, confrontation.

Sagaramati: It says it binds the associated mental factors to the object.

S: Yes. But it is sort of a bit like samadhi, though, doesn't it?

Sagaramati: Yes.

S: But no doubt it is very difficult to distinguish absolutely starkly between the different mental events. Alright, let's go on. There's a bit more about the mental events in general.

"The reason for speaking of these five mental events, beginning with feeling-tone as omnipresent, is that they are lumped together because they are events that operate in the wake of every mind situation."

S: Mmm. This is what was said at the beginning. Alright, carry on then

283

"Moreover, if any one of the five omnipresent mental events is missing, the experience of the object is incomplete. If there is no feeling-tone, there is no relishing of it. If there is no conceptualization, one does not get the specific characteristic of the object. If there is no directionality of mind, there is no getting on to the object. If there is no rapport, there would be no basis for perception. If there is no egocentric demanding, then the various objects would not be confronted. Hence, in order to have a complete appreciation and enjoyment of an object, these five omnipresent mental events must be there altogether, completely and fully."

S: It's as though the presence of the five mental events is implicit in the very definition of what it means to experience an object. It's not only when you experience an object these five are present, but when these five are present, the situation is that you are experiencing an object, yes? When these five are present, that is what we call experiencing an object.

Ashvaji: Anything that falls short of that is alienation to some degree, from the object.

S: I don't know whether I'd use the term alienation, but it's certainly not, it's not an experience of an object. In a sense there would be no object there, so in that case one wouldn't be able to speak of alienation from the object. So if you say ... (unclear) ... alienation from the object, it assumes that there is an object there from which you are alienated. But according to, according to this, if the five are not there well there is ... no perception of an object - in a sense the object is not even there. Hmm. Ham? .. (pause) ... So with regard to the object of every perceptual situation, well the objective content of every perceptual situation, these five mental events are present. If these five

284

S: (Cont.) mental events are not present, it's not er, er, a perceptual situation, with er, with an objective content represented by the object ... (pause) ... This in a way makes it much clearer still. Here again it's an example of what you were saying about, you know, relations and entities, hmm? It's not that there is a thing called the object and a thing called you, and you happen to perceive. But it is a product of a sort of network, of er, mental events, hm? When all these five mental events come together, the situation is that there, there is a perceptual situation. A situation in which an object is perceived.

Abhaya: This is more in, in line with the doctrine of conditioned co- -production.

S: Indeed, yes, yes - anatta, yes.

Sagaramati: Could you, er, would it be ... to qualify these omnipresent mental events that

they're all omnipresent on all levels in the mundane?

S: No. I, I, I'd hesitate to qualify it in that way because, as I've said, they have been discussed in the Siddhi, you know, in the context of the alaya.

Sagaramati: Ah, yes.

Abhaya: (?) Could you explain that further, Bhante?

S: No, I think we'd better not try to go into that, there's a very, very long chapter about the alaya. It's not even agreed whether it, as far as the different schools are concerned, whether it is mundane as it were, or transcendental as it were, yes - but there is a discussion in the S~ddhi of the five omnipresent mental events as pertaining to the alaya.

Vimalamitra: What is the alaya?

285

S: Well, the, the, what is usually translated 'store consciousness', it's the eighth consciousness according to the Yogachara School. But it's probably the most difficult of all the topics that they deal with~ It's very, very abstruse, with many differences of opinion. But I think that's something we can't go into, and, this author, as we saw earlier on, deliberately sets it aside and doesn't take it into consideration.

Manjuvajra: The point as to whether these five mental events are present in ... soft of the higher dhyana states, is quite important.

S: Well they are present in the higher dhyana states, it is said that they are omnipresent, hm?

Manuuvajra: Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't remember ... (unclear) ... what was said.

Sagaramati: .... (unclear) .... what I meant when I said the mundane levels, I didn't mean the alaya (unclear) ....

S: Ah. Well yes, otherwise they wouldn't be omnipresent, yes?

Alright, let's go on then to the five object~etermining mental events.

"The Five Ob~tct~etermining Mental Events.

The five object~etermining mental events are: 1. Interest.

2. Intensified interest which stays with its object.

3. Inspection (to learn more). 4. Intense concentration.

5. Appreciative discrimination."

S: What is the Sanskrit for that, by the way?

Sagaramati & Padmavajra: Viniyata.

(CHANGE OF TAPE)

286

LAcr 4r~ S: Alright. Well,~these five objectdetermining mental events, as Guenther calls them, but we're not given any general explanation of them, are we? Viniyata, in Sanskrit. There is a little bit about them in general in the Siddhi, which I'll read. The Siddhi also has a lengthy discussion of all five of them. Here they're called 'Special caittas'

"The special caittas are desire - chanda, resolve - adhimoksa, memory - smrti, meditation - samadhi, and discernment - prajna. These are caittas the objects of which are, in the majority of cases, specified and different."

Thcr~'e the word next in the stanza indicat~£"among the six categories of caittas this category comes next to the first in the order of consideration." So 'these are caittas the objects of which are, in the majority of cases, specified and different'. Now what does that mean? It seems to suggest something to which you apply yourself more particularly, hence, presumably, 'object-determining', in the sense that they determine that it shall be this object and not that object. That seems to be the general sense. So let's go through the accounts of all five, and then review the sort of general states(?) again at the end.

"Interest."

S. This is chanda, which here is translated in the Siddhi as desire. Chanda.

"The Adhidharmasamucca a e lains the nature of interest as follows: What is interest? It is the desire to endow a desired thing with this or that particular attribute, and has the function of laying the foundation for making a start on assiduous striving."

S: Hm. Read the whole thing.

"It is an awareness which gets involved with the intended object. The way of laying the foundation for making a start on assiduous striving is explained in the Madhyantavibhaga as follows: The occasion, that which depends on it, and their cause and effect relationship. The lam-rim chen-mo states, If one is unable to

28~

to suppress laziness which delights in the non-inclination towards the practice of meditation and which delights in the factors not conducive to the practice, then one quickly loses all interest because first of all one does not allow the mind to go into concentration and, even if one should attain concentration, one can not maintain its continuity. Therefore, at the very beginning it is most important to overcome laziness. When one has attained a state of alertness which is satiated happiness and pleasure both on the physical and mental level, and when one is not weary to apply himself day or night to what is positive, then laziness is overcome. In order to generate this alertness, it is important

-- that one has the concentration which is the sustaining cause of the aforesaid state of alertness and that one makes this a continuous process. In order to have the power of concentration, one must have a strong and continuous involvement in concentration. In order that concentration be a sustaining cause factor, one must repeatedly invoke a firm conviction which enraptures one's whole mind because one has seen the virtues and value of concentration. To understand these qualities and processes in this order must be taken as the most essential point because they become clear and certain in seeing them in one's own experience."

S: Do you see the significance of this? Well, Tsong-ka-pa has explained er .. interest, as Guenther calls it, especially in the context of, of meditation - it suggests that all these five object-determining mental events are especially concerned with meditative states, doesn't it?

Padmapani: So the object-determining mental states according to this text is referring to ... eradicating the unskillful?

S: Before you determine a .., er ... an object, you say as it were, well, let that be my object. Let that be the object of my thought. So this

288

S: (Cont.) suggests a sort of will, or interest, or desire - which eventually leads on to concentration, and which implies the setting aside of, of laziness, making a definite effort, with regard to that particular

object. Determining that object - in a very active manner. And obviously /1' this is especially important wit~ the context of meditation. Yes? So it

would seem that these five object~etermining mental events have a special reference to the whole process of meditation. (pause) So, 'if one is unable to suppress laziness which delights in the non-inclination towards the practice of meditation and which delights in the factors not conducive to the practice, then one quickly loses all interest'~yes? quickly loses all chanda. 'because first of all one does not allow the mind to go into concentration and, even if one should attain concentration, one can not maintain its continuity. Therefore, at the very beginning it is most important to overcome laziness.' (pause) And this overcoming of laziness makes possible the development of chanda, of interest, in this case, the meditative object - and in that way, the other, er ... object~etermining mental events then gradually come into play. Right let's carry on.

"The meaning of the passage, 'the occasion' in the work cited above is as follows &' occasion 'means interest, the starting point of endeavor. 'That which depends on it' means endeavor or effort; 'the cause,' the sustaining force of interest,~ns a firm con- viction regarding the quality and value of the thing. The 'effect' or outcome is alertness."

S: Yes. 'Interest is the starting point of endeavour', this is quite important. (pause) The, er ... interest means a firm conviction regarding the quality and value of the thing'. Unless you see that you're unlikely to take an interest in it. Do you see how this applies to meditation? Unless you've seen the quality and value, unless you've seen the positive quality and real value of the meditative state you're unlikely to take an interest, unlikely to overcome your laziness, in the sense of your delight in those things which do not make for that meditative state.

289

Dharmapala: Is it different from faith? Or is this to do with just a so~

of feeling-tone value?

S: There certainly seems a resemblance to faith, but it seems something much more, more general. As regards this particular context, that is the context of, of meditation, it's simply, it's simply a firm conviction regarding the quality and value of some higher state; whereas faith, as I think we shall see, refers specifically to the Three Jewels - which is a much more concrete and definite object. But there does seem a certain kinship, yes, with the chanda, and faith, sraddha.

Ashvajit: Chanda could sort of set during the of for instance a beginner in meditation.

S: Mmm. Yes, yes. Whereas faith would be possible only to the really committed person. Well, where there was faith, there would certainly be chanda, there~ certainly be interest. But where there is interest, there is not necessarily faith.

Manjuvajra: This sort of indicates in a way that you would have to .... or one would tend to develop laziness towards, ..... objects that are not to do with .... growth, and development. In other words you'd develop laziness towards unskillful states.

S: Well, the laziness is with respect to skillful states.

Manjuvajra: Yeah.

S: Yes. But the laziness comes about, or laziness consists in the taking delight in the unskillful states. Which prevent and which obstruct the, er, the development of the skillful states, yes?

Manjuvajra: I can see that but I was thinking more in terms of when one is perhaps accused of being lazy because you don't sort of go out and

do a lot of ... digging, umm, or do a lot of work of some sort. Well, really that, that is, that sort of laziness in a way could be developed,~because it's umm, it's a laziness that is indicative of not taking an interest in something which is not specifically skilful.

290

S: Laziness is defined as the, the taking of delight in a certain thing in such a way that you are prevented from taking delight in, and devoting your- self to something which is of greater worth or greater value, yc~~ So it depends on what you consider or what in fact is, of greater worth and greater value and what is of less worth and less value. So this is why I think Gampopa speaks of, of laziness as 'devoting yourself day and night to defeating enemies and making money'. You might think that such a person was very, very busy but actually not so because he's taking delight in those activities, he's occupying himself with those activities, but preventing him, from occupying himself with something more valuable, so in respect of those more valuable things, he was simply being lazy. And his so-called business was an expression of that laziness, or even a cause of that laziness. Padmapani' That's what you mean when you're talking about say in Shabda about people doing organizational work, and there are people who are being maybe hookwinked into things because maybe those people you know, a person says that you're lazy, but you might be in actual fact getting into something which is quite positive, like, you know, doing meditation, or painting thankas, or something like that. Which would be of interest ... to yourself ... in your development.

S: But, on the other hand, of course, one must, you know, see the other possibilities, like, you know, if you weren't doing something active and, and useful you'd just be, you know, lying in bed, etc., etc. Which was, you know, usually the case in earlier days, almost always the case, uh? So.... (Mark laughs loudly) Tsongkapa speaks of 'laziness which delights in the non-inclination towards the practice of meditation and which delights in the factors not conducive to the practice'. Yes? If one has that sort of laziness then there is, there is no interest. It's not, not only, sort of, according to Tsongkapa, taking a delight in something of lesser value, it's almost taking delight in the, in the fact that you are not occupying yourself with something of higher value, in that what you are occupying yourself with is preventing you from taking delight in those things of higher value. Laziness according to Tsongkapa involves that sort of mental attitude.

291

S: (Cont.) There's a sort of complacency and satisfaction in the fact that you are not

occupying yourself with higher things, that you're occupying yourself with lower things, as it were. That is laziness, you know, or part of laziness, according to Tsongkapa.

Ashvajit: It seems a much better characterisation, put that way. (pause)

Padmapani: It's very clear the way that Tsongkapa puts it.

S: Yes, indeed, yes. Alright. Let's go on, there's a comment by the author on what Tsongkapa has to say. (pause)

"If one thinks deeply about this in the manner that Tsongkhapa has explained, one may discover a special importance attached to his words: however, if one has put into one's mind merely the words of the great charioteers, who state that the progress of the path follows a distinct pattern, one will gain certainty regarding practice; but because one believes merely the words and thinks only of the arguments and supporting teachings of those great charioteers, he not only rejects the opportunity of practice, and thus loses the opportunity of obtaining certainty about it but he even loses the opportunity of understanding anything. Just look at how the path in which the Buddhas delight comes to life in oneself!"

S: So what, in fact, is the author saying?

Padmavajra: He seems to be saying that if one doesn't practice meditation and just concerns oneself with the teachings and things like that, you won't understand them, and you won't get anywhere.

S: No, I think what he in fact is saying that if, if you occupy yourself only with the words of the teachings, and the various arguments pro and con, without getting on with practice - this is a form of laziness. (everyone - Ah!) This is what he's saying, isn't it? (pause) 'but if one thinks deeply about this in the manner that Tsongkapa has explained, one may discover a special importance attached to his words; however, if one has put into one's mind merely the words of the great charioteers, who state that the progress of the path follows a distinct pattern, one will gain certainty regarding practice; but because one believes merely the words

292

S: (Cont.) and thinks only of the arguments and supporting teachings of those great charioteers, he not only rejects the opportunity of practice, and thus loses the opportunity of obtaining certainty about it, but he even loses the opportunity of understanding anything.' Yes? So - that is a form of laziness.

Padmavajra: The last, the last line 'Just look at how the path in which the Buddhas delight comes to life in oneself.' goes back to that business of the path is us, not something out there.

S: Yes. The path comes to life in oneself. You develop the path, you make the path 'to become', which is . . . a Pali idiom.

Ashvajit: The path is also the path of practice and not the path of reading.

S: Well, reading is included, study is included, that is the first of the three ... wisdoms. But you're lazy if you remain in that, and take delight in that, to the neglect of ... of the higher powers, the higher forms of

wisdom. A

Sagaramati: If you got up in the morning and you'd rather read ~ book,

rather than go to sit, that would be an example of that.

S: Possibly, -but you might need to read the book to understand what you had to meditate on, in which case it wouldn't be.

Ashvajit: They're mutually supportive for a very long time ...

S: Yes. And also er ... it is said that 'believes merely the words and thinks only of the arguments', which doesn't even imply study at it's best: I mean, study can be a method of practice, just as meditation can. Yes? (pause) Alright, carry on then.

"Interest is threefold: 1. That with which you want to meet.

2. That with which you do not want to part. 3. That in which you really want to get involved. There are many other involvements of interest such as the involvement with desired things and involvement with what one sees."

293

S: So does the general nature of interest become clear (General 'Yes') It is something much more specific, something much more definite, which is, getting the, the object, you know, much more clearly into view, which is determining the object.

Abhaya: We've come across the word Chanda earlier on, is it the same meaning, I can't remember.

S: I don't remember that. Did we?

Abhaya: Didn't we come across chanda in the text?

Sagaramati: You mentioned it, we didn't come across it.

Robert: Eagerness. It came across as eagerness, as far as I remember.

Abhaya: As what?

Robert: Eagerness.

Abhaya: Eagerness - urge -

S: Yes, I did mention, ah, I think in connection with the iddipadas (last part unclear)

Padmavajra: That's right. It's the first basis for psychic power.

Abhaya: That's right.

S: Actually, eagerness is not a bad translation - rather than ... rather than interest, chanda 'Interest' is something almost a bit ... sort of dilettante, if you know what I mean ... interest: it's not dynamic enough.

Eagerness is, I think, better. Yes. (pause) A ~ / ~~~~~:.. eagerness, you know, is the opposite of laziness.

Sagaramati: It also implies some level of commitment.

S: Or at least devotion.

Sagaramati: At least devotion, mmm

S: Well, let's go on to inspection, which I think is smṛti. Usually translated recollection, or mindfulness, or even awareness.

Others: uh - uh, no .... not that .... it's

S: No? I'm sorry

294

"Intensified interest which stays with its object."

S: Ah, right. What is that?

Sagaramati and Padmavajra: Adhimoksha.

S: Adhimoksha. Ham.

"Intensified interest which stays with its object. The

The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains the nature of intensified

interest which stays with its object as follows: What is

intensified interest? It is to stick to the determined thing

just as it has been determined, and the function of intensified interest is that it cannot be taken away."

S: Right, read the rest of the paragraph.

"It is an awareness by which one stays with what the mind has logically established as this is so and not otherwise."

S: 'Intensified interest which stays with its object'. I think the general nature of this is clear. Isn't it? It doesn't seem to refer especially to the meditation object, it can refer to other things.

Mark: Shall I go on.

S: Mmm. Go on then.

"Here, its specific function has been described in the words, 'it cannot be taken away', because when one has a firm conviction about the object, one is certain and cannot be swayed by anyone. For example, if one thinks about who is the infallible refuge, the Buddha or another, then one will find out that only the Buddha is the infallible refuge. Then one becomes certain, through valid means of cognition, that the teachings of the Buddha and the community which has realised the teachings are the infallible refuges. Anyone who has this firm conviction can not be swayed by any other opinion and is counted as a Buddhist. On this basis the bright qualities (of spiritual progress) increase. Therefore, the Bodhicaryavatara states.. The Buddha has said that the root of everything positive is the intensification of interest. That root always matures by producing an effect."

295

S: 'The root of everything positive is the intensification of interest' - that is interest in the positive. So one, one again gets the, the, the, impression, that the object-determining mental events are concerned, you know, with their particular objects in a much more definite and even dynamic fashion, than are the five omnipresent mental events. You come as it were much closer up to the object. You're concerned with it in a much more vital manner, whatever it may be.

Padmavajra: The Sanskrit for the five object-determining mental events

vi- is vinayata - does that have a relationship with S: Yes. It means to lead. Usually, vinayati means to lead ~y from, but

it could also mean, you could also take vi- in the sense of an intensive prefix, which means

'very much to lead' - hence 'object~determining' .... (long pause) Usually for instance the word for ~atal is written 'inlyata' it's 'that which leads inevitably' - you can't stop it. So viniyata, if you take vi- as this intensive prefix, it gives you the, the suggestion of something definitely leading towards, definitely establishing, fixing, determining

Alright, on to smṛti, then, 'inspection.'

"Inspection. The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains the nature of inspection as follows: What is inspection; It is not to let what one knows slip away from one's mind. Its function is not to be distracted."

S: That seems pretty clear. Carry on then.

"It is an awareness which has three specific features:

1. Specific feature of the object - it is a thing you know.
2. Specific feature of the observable quality - this object is not forgotten.
3. Specific feature of the function - it remains steady. Since inspection does not arise concerning a thing which has not been well known previously, the specific feature of its function is said to deal with something familiar. Since inspection does not operate on an object which does not come to mind at present even though it may have been familiar

296

before, it implies the feature of not letting the object slip out of the mind. On the basis of this special function, the levels of the mind can grow in intensity and this means that mind does not swerve, The fact that inspection must possess the three specific functions is very important whether one deals with the Sutras or Tantras. Therefore N -ar una has said, 'The Tathagata has taught that Inspection belonging to the great beings is the only path to walk. To this hold tight and preserve it. If inspection slips, everything is lost.'

Vimalamitra: 'Inspection' doesn't sound like

S: No, mindfulness would seem to be a more appropriate translation.

Sagaramati: The bit about 'that which has been well know,,previously', would that indicate the, the previous two, of, interest and intensified interest?

S: I don't think so, no. No. I think one has to bear in mind the, the double meaning of smṛti, which I've mentioned. It's recollection, yes? It's calling to mind, yes? So if you translate inspection as recollection, then you get the meaning clearly ... 'Since recollection does not arise concerning a thing which has not been well knowi previously, the specific feature of its function is said to deal with something familiar. Ham?

Abhaya: Ah, so recollection is a sort of secondary meaning of mindfulness?

S: No actually it was the primary one. I think maybe we ought to go into this a little bit.

Recollection. Smṛti as recollection, as memory, as keeping in mind~therefore as being aware of, the meaning seems to have developed in this sort of way. So sometimes it's definitely clear that smṛti is being used as recollection, or even as memory; oometime~ it's clear that recollection is, or smṛti is, being used in the sense of being aware of something here and now, yes? But sometimes it's sort of intermediate between the two. So when you, when you recollect something, well, you're recollecting something that you were familiar with in the past, but in as much as you recollect it now, it is, as it were, mentally present to you, now. And if you go on recollecting it, you know, it remains present to you now. In

297

S: (Cont.) that sense you are said to be aware. You keep it in front of the mind, you're steadily watching it, steadily watching it, steadily looking at it

Abhaya: You said at one ... I don't know whether it was a lecture, or an explanation, that recollection is a good word, because what is in fact happening, in the mindfulness of breathing, is re-collecting all the energies.

S: Yes.

Abhaya: I thought that recollection was a description of a psychic process, rather than a different kind of, like ... calling it up .. (muffled...)

S: Yes, but this is the effect, because when you recollect something, you are as it were bringing things together. For instance, as when you recollect your purpose, you recollect yourself. You don't allow yourself, your self-consciousness, to be lost. And this is recollection in more the Western/ mystical sense, isn't it, where you practice recollection. You don't allow yourself to be lost or scattered, or as we would say, become unmindful. But as far as I know the word smṛti originally meant recollection more in the sense of memory.

Ashvajit: But then you can't really be er ... collected or recollected with regard to mental events unless there was also collection or recollection of oneself, or one's various energetic processes.

S: Ham. Ham.

Manjuvajra: Does that .... that doesn't mean surely that if you remembered something that you did last week, that's .... is that .... not awareness, is it?

S: That is recollection.

Manjuvajra: That is recollection.

S: If you remember something that you did last week, then something that ~,s you did last week is mentally present to you now; w~ is what recollection

is. So it's as though the meaning of the word developed, and it came to signify just being aware of what is present before you mentally now, yes? And in that way, what we call recollection, or even memory, came to mean LAJe c;~fl kmindfulness or awareness. Perhaps we could say that we should or could use

298

S: (Cont.) the three terms here, recollection, mindfulness, and awareness: recollection is clearly recollection of something past which you think of now; awareness is simply awareness of an object here and now

in the present; mindfulness seems to come somewhere in, in between the two, to

and~connect up, on the one hand, with recollection, on the other hand, with,

with awareness. (pause) ... But even here,~because of these different mean%ings of smrti, the discussion here has a certain ambiguity, yes? 'It im~lies the feature of not letting the object slip out of the mind' - so this is a sort of common characteristic. It doesn't allow the object to slip out of the mind: it may be an object which you've experienced in the past, you don't allow it to slip out of the mind, that's memory. or it ~y be an object which is present before you, and you don't allow it to slip out of your mind, that is awareness. (pause) You could say that recollection is a training in awareness, couldn't you, yes? If you practised recollecting things.

Abhaya: It would be a check on how mindful you'd been?

S: No, but of the fact that you were holding in your mind at present, now, something that had happened in the past, yes?

Sagaramati: Aren't there ... there's ten recollections, aren't there?

S: Yes, the ten anusatis, yes. (pause) That means 'calling to mind', it. is~ a recollection, they're just thinking of, being aware of. For instance you've got the Buddha anusati(?) thinking of the Buddha, recollecting the Buddha. I mean you've heard about the Buddha before, you now recollect him. Even .... you may not have seen him but at least you've heard him, about him, or you've seen a picture of him, so, you recollect him, you call him to mind, yes? First of all you remember the Buddha, then you become aware of him, ham?

Manjuvajra: I have a feeling that my memory, what you would normally, you know, norm. ... using that word 'normally' is, is gradually getting worse. Because I find there's lots of things that people say I've said that I can't really remember ever having said.

S: Yes, I think this happens as one gets older. (laughter)

Manjuvajra: Given another five years, I'll be

Padmavajra: Colin Middleton Murray ... (indecipherable interruption) ... Colin Middleton Murray, in his book 'One Hand Clapping' said that he used to remember when he was ... very young having a really perfect memory. He used to be able to just store things up. And then he had a lot of, you know, bad ... family, stuff like that. And when things got better, it came back again.

S: Ham. Ham. This is true, I think this does happen.

Padmavajra: It almost suggests that, if you're in a positive state of mind, well, your memory's good.

Vimalamitra: It suggests in a way, that if your mind gets clogged up with things or congested, then, your memory doesn't flow (back so easily ?).

S: I, I, I think sometimes you refuse to remember because you refuse to think. If you're having to think about a lot of things, yes? - and especially if they're worrying things, you don't want to think about other things as well - I mean, remembering means you think about things. So in order to avoid that sort of, you know, thinking, you just won't remember. You refuse to remember.

Manjuvajra: Sort of laziness?

S: No, I don't think it's laziness at all, no. I think it's from sheer ~elf-protection. Because if you were to have to think about some more things, you might break down under the strain. So you refuse to remember so that you don't have to think about anything extra. Ham? But apart from that I, I think that certainly memory weakens as you get older and I think also that it's good thing that it does, yes? Because what does it mean, when memory weakens, what is happening?

Vimalamitra: Your links with the past ...

S: Your links with the past, ... th0~ again memory is a strange thing: you tend to not remember things which happened, you know, more recently, and to remember quite clearly things that happened a long time ago. So, so what does it really mean? That when you start, you know, not remembering, what do you not remember? What sort of things? I think usually you don't remember trivial things, matters of detail. So I think what is happening is as you get older, the sort of, the basic or the general character of your

S: (Cont.) life-pattern becomes clearer, and you want to intensify and deepen that - you don't want to bother about the details, yes? So that when you're young, you perhaps haven't developed, or at least haven't seen, you know, your basic, your fundamental life-pattern, yes? So you can as it were, you know, afford to occupy yourself much more with matters of detail. In fact you don't even know they're what are matters of detail, huh? Those that may turn out to be, you know, matters of detail, might look as though they're things of fundamental concern. So, as you get older you're much more concerned with the elaboration and strengthening of the basic pattern, you know, than with matters of detail, detailed information, facts.

Padmavajra: I've always felt with my memory that it's always been concerned with detail, I've always felt that I haven't really remembered what I thought would be important things. I can always remember little sort of snippets, and, sort of things which would seem like the colouring in, but I don't feel that I know, that I remember, the basic stuff.

S: I, I, I think that you tend not to remember a thing which has got no significance for the, for the elaboration as I call it, perhaps it's more the strengthening or deepening, of the basic pattern. You just tend to sort of leave aside the irrelevant things, they make much less impression.

You don't remember them therefore. Well, I think that happens generally. So by the time you come to the end of life you've got a quite strongly held- to basic pattern, perhaps without much factual content, and presumably it's that which you carry over to your next life. And, you know, by the time - if you live to be very, very old, your memory altogether disappears, doesn't it. And you become like a child again, as though you're ready for rebirth, a child. It is that sort of state, yes?

Sagaramati: I ... I just recall my grandfather, he was, just before he died, and often he used to actually think that he was five or six, and he'd see me as being his father, and my mother as being somebody's wife, and really odd things like that. But to him it was perfectly real. It was quite odd.

301

S: So it's as though your memory weakens as it were when, well, you don't need all that sort of detailed information. What is more important is what I've called the, you know, the elaboration of the basic structure, ham? Anyway, let's carry on .... there's a quotation from the Bodhicaryavatara now.

"Those who have listened and have confidence But do not apply assiduous striving,

By being attached to the defect of not knowing properly, Will become soiled by falling away from their status. Those thieves, the lack of awareness and The pursuit of that from which inspection slips, Not only rob one's wealth and a happy state of existence, But they also cause one to wander about in evil existences. These robbers, which are the emotions,

Go about seeking an opportunity. When they get it, they steal the wholesome And even

destroy life in a good existence. Therefore, never, never allow inspection To wander out of the mind's door. But if by chance it should, then by recalling

Those pains of evil existence, bring it back close to you."

S: You can only recollect recollection by means of recollection, it seems! 'never allow inspection to wander out of the mind's door - but if by chance it should, then, by recalling those pains of evil existence, bring it back to you'. You have to remember that you've forgotten. Before you can remember again. It's quite an odd thing. What makes you sort of remember that you've forgotten?

Dharmapala: When you bump your nose sort of thing or something, and you realise you .. shouldn't be here perhaps!

Vimalamitra: You, you ... perhaps you, you know, you wonder why you're here, what you're doing, and then you remember, well, maybe I shouldn't be here! (laughter) I was on my way to do something else!

302

S: Sometimes you promise to phone somebody at six o'clock, and then at seven you think, oh! good heavens, I've forgotten. You remember that you've forgotten, or you recollect. What is that, how does that come about, it's rather odd, isn't it, rather mysterious.

Sagaramati: You probably just Thought~ I mean you thought~ of that person you should have rang, and then ....

S: Yes, there's a sort of association of ideas. Yes ... (unclear) ... Hm?

Vimalamitra: Something tends to follow you. You often feel something kind of ... bugging you, and you remember it's something you've forgotten.

Padmavajra: Yes, that's ... I always have that experience when I have to go ... I go away somewhere. I always have a feeling I've forgotten something, and I always have. I've always forgotten something. But I have the feeling first. I can't, you know, think what IT 15

S: But sometimes you get the feeling that you've forgotten something, but actually you haven't. ('Yes' and laughter) That's (unclear) ... sort of over mindfulness.

Dharmapala: Is that because you know, you've had that thought, that sort of action, in the past, that you would do, like phoning a person, and then later on, you know, that action's still pulling you, or ....

S: Mmm. There's a tendency that's still there, as it were, and it, you know, it sort of emerges into consciousness. Sometimes you've had to do other things so it's got submerged, but the tendency, the sort of original impulsion to make that phone call at six is there, and it

surfaces as it gets the opportunity, and then you think, oh! good heavens, I forgot to do so and so. Or, you see the clock ... it's seven o'clock - time. Oh, six o'clock - I should have made the phone call then. Ham?

Vimalamitra: It can get quite difficult if you, if there's lots of things you've got to remember, and there's so many things that you're bound to even forget or not be able to do them.

S: Well, then you should write them down, hm?

Alright, go on with the last verse then.

303

"By keeping company with a guru and By the instructions of the learned, Those who are pious and pay respect because they are afraid something may go wrong.

Will gain inspection which develops the positive."

S: How do you gain inspection by keeping company with a guru and by the instructions of the learned? How does that help you?

Abhaya: Their (experience ?) their example.

S: They remind you, uh? In one way or another, huh?

Padmavajra: I think Matsya translates it 'mindfulness is easily generated when you're living with a guru'.

S: Hm. Ham.

(pause)

S: Right, well, the general characteristic of inspection seems to be not letting the object slip. Right, let's go on then.

"All values (qualities) inherent in the various levels and paths depend on inspection and awareness. Since any attainment of concentration, be it on the basis of the Sutras or Tantras, must be attained by virtue of this specific function, the application of inspection is very important for those who want to have this

experience coming from the bottom of their hearts."

, . S: Yes, why or how is this? since any attainment of concentration must be attained by this specific function'.

Padmavajra: Any attainment comes from mindfulness.

S: Any attainment comes from mindfulness ... but how is this?

Kamalashila: You have to remember to concentrate.

S: You have to remember to concentrate, and not only that, you have to remember the object. Concentration, in a way, is constant recollection of the object. Mindfulness or awareness merges in meditation, merges in, in samadhi. So that there's no, there's no spiritual attainment, no attainment of meditation, of attainment of the dhyanas, without, without well, inspection, Guenther calls it, you all can see how inappropriate this translation is now? without mindfulness, without recollection, without awareness hm? (pause)

304

S: (Cont.) One can imagine, you know, somebody reading this, this book, ar~ not having any knowledge of Buddhist thought, and not knowing that

inspection' was a translation of a Tibetan word which translated the Sanskrit smṛti, not knowing what smṛti meant, you know, could be really puzzled here. Yes? To work it all out, uh?

Padmavajra: The feeling I get from ins ... from the word inspection is that sort of, that sort of pseudo ... what you hear about in these vip ... these pseudo vipassana places, that 'I am lifting my arm (~, I'm going to lift my hand, I am lifting my hand' sort or really sort of drongoid sort of ... (laughter)

S: Sukhavati slang, uh? (explaining)

Abhaya: Drongoid? ... drongoid ... rather good that ... (unclear) ... where does that stem from?

S: I don't know, I think it comes from Australia actually.

Padmavajra: Drongo? (laughs) alien literature ... (unclear)

S: Yes, even Guenther couldn't explain it very well. (laughter) alright, carry on then.

"Thus, the Bodhicaryavatara states, May my possessions, my status, My body, and my life be for nothing!

May even all other wholesome things come to nought!

But, may the mind never be lessened?

S: Ham. Mind presumably in the sense of mindfulness.

"To those who desire to guard the mind,

I pray, saying,

'Preserve your inspection and awareness

Even if it costs you your life'"

S: So recollection is, in the most general way, a sort of constant remembering of, of what it is all~about, and what you are all about, and what you are really supposed to be doing. That's why it sometimes hits us, well, you know, why am I doing this, or why am I here? What am I here for? We suddenly sort of wake up to the fact that you've strayed away from, you

305

S: (Cont.) know, where you really ought to be or, from what you really ought to be doing, ham?

Sagaramati: That, the, ceremony, the dedication ceremony - I think that's very, very good for that, because it brings in the whole, you know, every- body's sitting in the shrine room, and .... might be miles away, but that really brings out the relevance of what you're supposed to be doing, what the shrine room's for!

S: Ha. Ha. yes.

Padmavajra: I almost wonder if that shouldn't be recited at ... before every session!

Sagaramati: Yes, I ... yes.

S: I think it's now recited at the beginning of every retreat, isn't it? That is when we go away to some new place or some place that isn't our own.

Sagaramati: At Pundarika we do it at the beginning of every session.

S: Yes, that's really good, yes.

Mark: (to sagaramati) Do we?

Sagaramati: Yes, you're probably never there.

Padmavajra: You 're probably not mindful. (Mark laughs)

S: He remembered not to go (laughter) .... c(o~t j'i~p ~~~~~t unmindfulness) I

Airight, we come on to Intense concentration. What is that?

Padmavajra: Samadhi.

S: Samadhi. Ham.

"Intense Concentration. The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains intense concentration as follows: What is intense concentration? It is one-pointedness of mind which continues with an idea, and its function is to become the basis for awareness.'~shU--~3"

S: What is the shes-pa, awareness? Have you got that?

Padmavajra: I don't think we have.

S: It's clearly not mindfulness, it's using awareness in a quite different way. It's not jnana ... shes-pa?

Sagaramati: Shes-rab is appreciative discrimination .

306

S: Yes, but it can't be shes-rab. And jnana is ye-shes(?) although it is shes, shes-pa. Airight, it must be ~ana (?) - not jnana, but ~ana. It's clearly from a root meaning 'to know' - as Guenther would say, 'indicating a noetic function'. (laughter) Yes. Or wisdom, very broadly - 'it's function is to become the basis for wisdom'. It's function is to become the basis of prajna, or jnana, or nana, he renders jnana always as awareness, doesn't he, though (?) he speaks of the five awarenesses, yes? So 'what is intense concentration? It is one pointedness of mind which continues with an idea' - I think one mustn't mean, understand 'idea' as necessarily 'concept' - idea in that sense is a mental object - 'and its function is to become the basis for awareness' - a higher intuitive understanding which we usually call wisdom or insight. Right, now what else does the author say?

"It is to let the mind continue with its objective reference. The reason for calling the particular content of intense concentration an idea is that in practicing concentration, one holds the mind to what is postulated by intellect, and this is an idea."

S: 'Intellect' isn't perhaps quite a happy word, in fact, one is, holding the mind to an object which is as it were seen internally. It is not seen through the five physical senses.

Padmavajra: I think Guenther's term 'intense concentration' is really

horrible, actually.

S: Oh. I was thinking it was all right.

Padmavajra' Well, I mean, just the word 'intense' - I mean it sort of

implies, you know, really sort of ... kind of ... forcible ....

S: Yes, it does imply strain, yes, that's true...

Padmavajra Yes, strain, that's the feeling I get off it.

S: It does say, m~~~on-pa kun-las-btus. Mgon-pa is samadhi, but what is kun-las-btus? Oh, no, sorry, that's, another one (wrong place in text) ... Ting nge 'dzin, which is-usually the word for samadhi is mgon, usually in Tibetan.- What is this ting nge 'dzin? We haven't got a translation of that? Is it samadhi?

Sagaramati: Samadhi.

307

MBP/10 Samadhi, usually it's mgon.. . oh, I know it's probably citta ekagatta - could be that. One pointedness of mind... ( ) That's only a guess, though don't take it too seriously. 'That continues with an idea'- with a mental object - 'and its function is to become a basis for awareness in the sense of insight and wisdom. Right carry on then. It seems quite clear.

Robert; "Moreover, although there are countless things which may appear

as that on which one can concentrate, in brief, there are four:

1. The objective reference which purifies the conduct of life
2. The objective reference which purifies emotions
3. The objective reference which are the (four) encompassing activities (of loving kindness, compassion. joy and equanimity)

END OF TAPE 10

308

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Cassette 11

Robert: (reads, p. 35) 4 The objective reference with which the wise deal The objective reference with which the wise deal is said to be limitless and refers to (such topics as the five) constitutive elements, the (three) levels of existence, the (six) perceptual spheres, dependent origination and so on.

Bhante: In other words, the subject matter of the Abhidharma, considered as an object for intense concentration or meditation. What is this 'objective reference which purifies the conduct of life? Manjuvajra: an ethical precept?

Bhante: In what sense is it an object of concentration?

Padmavajra: It wouldn't be something like, um.. I was thinking of, er, a (inaudible) Bhante (" )... 'purifies the conduct of life'.

Manjuvajra: could it be karma(?)

Bhante: that would come under number four, wouldn't it. Well, what about the objective reference which purifies the emotions?

Voice: Metta

Bhante: Well, metta is..

Mark: ..it's in number three.

Bhante: This isn't.. I wonder if there's anything in the 'Siddhi.

Asvajit: Could it be the Buddha, the recollection of the Buddha?

Bhante: This is not recollection, this is intense concentration. (looking through book)... no, there's no discussion here, but there's a quite good general account of samadhi in the 'Siddhi, which I shall read: 'What is samadhi? or meditation? The nature of samadhi is to cause the mind to apply itself with full concentration on the object of meditation and not to stray. Its special activity consists in serving as the supporting basis for transcendental wisdom (jnana). It signifies that in the qualitative examination of an object, (of its virtues, defects, and qualities, however neither the one nor the other, samadhi causes the mind to concentrate without straying in different directions. With this samadhi as support, there will be born pure transcendental wisdom, the sure knowledge that apprehends the qualities, etc., of the object.

The expression 'concentration of the mind' indicates that the mind is fixed where it wishes to be fixed, not that it is fixed on only one object. Otherwise, there would be no samadhi on the 'Path

and contemplates successively the eternal verities and where, in consequence, the object changes from moment to moment.'

° .That's quite an important point, isn't it.

'Samadhi is not universal, because the mind is lacking in the state of meditation when it is not concentrated on the object.1

. .But that doesn't cast any light on this 'objective reference which purifies the conduct of life' - this 'conduct of life' could be the

word carya..? The objective reference which purifies the emotions..?

Padmavajra: Ah. Would the objective reference which purifies the emotions be something like a corpse meditation, or something like that?

Bhante: that could be, because there is the reference to the four infinite states. Yes, it could be that the objective reference which purifies emotion is the stages of putrefaction of the corpse

Padmavajra: Maybe the first one's the positive precepts?

r 2 309

Bhante: Er, it could be, but we are guessing, aren't we.

Sagaramati: The four of them basically cover sila, samadhi and praj~na.

Bhante: Yes, they do seem to, yes. The first one presumably covers sila, the second and third samadhi, and the fourth prajna. (pause) Anyway, the general meaning is clear.

Vimalamitra: How does a corpse meditation purify the emotions?

Bhante: Because it counteracts craving, especially lust.

Padmavajra: Although it does seem to say that this concentration happens, you know, actually in meditation, maybe these stages, I mean the first one - presumably you have to be concentrated to observe the precepts; to properly purify..

Bhante: Well, it says the objective reference, so in that case you would have to concentrate on the precept. So in that case the meaning would be-to concentrate on the precept, to make the precept an object of concentration, purifies the conduct of life, you

know, purifies your observance of the silas. It could be that, but we don't definitely know. There may be further light shed in the course of the rest of the section, so let's read on. The para. at the bottom of the page.

Padmapani (reads, p. 35): 'Nowadays, some people who take the Buddha's word out of context and make a display of meditation. meditate by concentrating on what appears before their visual perception, but Asanga has stated very clearly that concentration does not take place in sensory perception but in categorical perception, and the objective reference is not the visible object that is present in sensory perception, out its precept.

Bhante: It should be percept, it's a misprint.

Padmapani: Is that spelt wrong?

Bhante: Yes, it's a misprint. The meaning is clear, isn't it. What do you think those sort of people were doing? Well, maybe they were concentrating on a leaf of a tree, or something of that sort.. though, there are of course preliminary practices of that kind, which develop a preliminary concentration - as when you concentrate on a red disk of colour. Then of course you concentrate on its after-image in the mind, but perhaps in the time of Asanga there were people who tried to develop concentration in all its stages simply by concentrating on an external physical visible object, and Asanga corrected that. Concentration in the sense of samadhi develops only with reference to an object which you perceive within.

Manjuvajra: That would be an answer, perhaps, to a number of people who come along to classes and say that they meditate 'all the time', you know, when they're - whatever they're doing. Could one sort of say that that can only go to a certain degree of concentration?

Bhante: Yes, right.

Manjuvajra: That can only be awareness, really, can't it, rather than,

Bhante: Yes, it's more akin to awareness rather than to samadhi.

Padmavajra: There's this meditating with one's eyes open, you know, looking at the ground while you're..

Bhanteq: Then you're not usually meditating on what you see, you have an internal object which you 'objectify' with, or a mantra, even though your eyes are open. So you're not actually concentrating on the visual object: you're concentrating on the mantra, but your eyes are open. If you're deeply concentrated, though the eyes are open, you don't register any visual perception.

3

3~0

Vimalamitra: What exactly does 'categorical' mean?

Bhante: Well, that's a reference back to the beginning of the text, isn't it. It's something that's judgemental, that takes place in the mind, is not a matter of perceptual or through the senses.

Manjuvajra: I might be splitting hairs a bit, but if sometimes the mind is counted as the sixth sense - can that perception occur in that mind?

Bhante: Oh yes, it occurs in that mind, it's not a fixed thing - we say sense, but the Sanskrit is *indriya*: it's the controlling faculty of mind. Just as the eye perceives visual form and colour, so the mind perceives mental objects. The basic structure is exactly the same, therefore the *indriya* of mind is enumerated along with the five *indriyas* of the senses: not placed on - at least this time - not placed on a separate level.

Padmavajra: Does this refer to that mind?

Bhante: Yes, because that is the mind with which you start off. But as you progress in the meditation, the mind itself of course changes. So that the mind with which you start meditating is not the mind with which you finish up: you could finish up completely transformed.

Padmapani: That wouldn't be Mind-as-such, though, would it? (giggles)

Bhante: It could be - you could speak in terms of your experience of Mind-as-such but your mind? You know, the whole phraseology becomes inappropriate.

Padmapani: You might end up with mind, a changed mind..

Bhante: Well, one thing leads to another.

Sagaramati: You give a very good description of that in 'Dhyana for Beginners'. We had a reading from 'Some sayings of the Buddha'-the senses find refuge; not refuge..well it is refuge:the senses find refuge in the mind as a sixth sense, but the sixth sense finds refuge in mindfulness; and mindfulness finds refuge in the (mind)

Bhante: Mm.. I vaguely recollect it, ..oh yes, that was explaining a Pali text, wasn't it. I remember now, yes. All right, read on then.

Padmapani: (reads, p. 36) 'Now if you think that the object of intense concentration must necessarily be a real object, this is not the case. You can concentrate on anything - be it a real or fictitious object. If you work on it intuitively, you get from it a pure and non-conceptualised vision. The *manuśya* (Brahma-śāstra) states, Whether it is real or not, whatever becomes truly familiar when you have become fully conversant with it results in a clear feeling of presence without subject - object dichotomy.'

Bhante: Dichotomy. In other words, division. Do you get a general idea of what the author is talking about? You can concentrate on anything, it doesn't have to be something that actually exists - it can be a real or a fictitious object. But if you work on it intuitively, (I'm not quite sure what's meant by that) you get from it a pure and non-conceptualised vision. A direct experience. A direct perception. Mark: would 'intuitively' mean that you're not

actually thinking about

T7,as such?

Bhante: It could be that, yes.

Man;iuvaIra: Could it also be referring back to (tnat bit about) 'concepts by intuition'~  
.. .... experience? Bthante: Yes. Direct experience not mediated by  
concepts.

4 311

Bhante: (continues) And then the Pramanavarttika states, 'WTheti~~ it is real or not...0.subject-object dichotomy'(as above). In other words, this suggests that when you are fully absorbed iii the object, in meditation - whether it's a real or a fictitious object - then eventually the feeling of dichotomy between subject and object dis- appears, and you become as it were one with the object on which you are concentrating; or it becomes one with you.

Dharma ala: What does it mean by a 'fictitious object'here, could you mean hat to be a visualisation?

Bhante: You could be concentrating on something quite imaginary. For 77nsance, you could concentrate on a Unicorn, on the image of a Unicorn, though there's no such thing.

Dharma ala: And become one with it, or rather with that.. what you've pro uce

Bhante: Mm. Yes. But in a sense that cozanection is t~iere from the beginning, beca~se you have produced it: you've created it.

Dharmapala: . . (?) . .communication.

Rhante: So meditation is working on the mental object - as you change the mental object, you change: and gradually the two become one.

P~: But say, when one does a visualisation of a Bodhisattva. In the higher stages, presumably one's meditation one links with that Bodhisattva. Does what one links with in actual fact have a corresponding qualities of that Bodhisattva, or it's just a.. oh, I suppose it's the same thing?

Bhante: No, there's a distinction. We can't really go into it now, but I'll just explain it briefly: there's a distinction between what is called samavasattva and what is called jnanasaLtva. Sam,aya- sattva, which is sometimes translated as the 'convention being', is the Bodhisattva as imagined, if you like, as visualised by you acc- ording to traditionm~~d so on. You see it quite clearly before you, you have a quite vividexe--rience, and you can even merge with that. Bu~t it is not the Bodhisattva himself, as it were. Yes? It is a product of your mind, admittedly ty-our concentrated mind, but your mundane mind. So you~can have the

experience of being very concentrated, seeing the Bodhisattva, merging with the Bodhisattva - but it is not the Bodhisattva himself: it's only the samayasattva. The jñanasattva means 'knowing'. Jñanasattva literally means 'knowledge being'. There is a particular process, in fact one could call it a meditation, by which the 'knowledge being' descends into the 'conventional being'. That is to say, the 'knowledge being' represents a particular aspect of Enlightenment, therefore it is something actually existent, in a manner of speaking. It is not a product of your own mind. But by developing the samayasattva, which is a product of your own mind, by meditating upon that, you have prepared, in as it were phenomenal terms, a sort of counterpart, or something in correspondence with the jñanasattva. So therefore there is a particular process of invoking the jñanasattva, who descends into the samayasattva. So when you..., when that has been done, then you are in contact with the Bodhisattva himself, and that of course becomes a transcendental experience, not just a meditative experience, in the sense of a mundane experience. This is a very important process of practice.

Dharmapala: Is that the sort of thing that happens with the Vajrasattvasamaya, where you (pair?) your mind more directly..

Bhante: You could say that. The building up of the samayasattva is like a sort of tuning in to the jñanasattva. It then becomes possible for the jñanasattva as it were to descend. - Because there is as it were an appropriate form: you've prepared the sort of mundane

5 312

Bhante(continued): simulacrum, into which the sort of transcendent original can as it were descend, or through which it can manifest. So, this is a quite important process in Tantric practice. (pause) So clearly, if you just visualise a Bodhisattva, well this is an object of concentration: one is not obviously in contact with the Bodhisattva himself. That only happens when the jñanasattva has descended into the samayasattva. There's also a samadhisattva - but we won't go into that now.

Pañcānāni: Will you be talking more about those on the visualisation retreat 5.

Bhante: Mm, no, I don't think so. But let's see.

Manuśānta: Would the first... be associated with the more Mahayana aspect of that practice, and the second with the more Vajrayana?

Bhante: In a way, yes, because when you visualise a Buddha out of devotion, this is a sort of meditation practice - on the other hand, I would say, that the invoking of the jñanasattva as a tantric process, one mustn't think of that too narrowly and technically. By the sheer force, as it were, of impetus of your spiritual practice, even though you know

nothing about the tantra, know nothing about the samayasattva and jnanasattva, and invoking the one to as it were to inhabit the other, by the force of your practice that may in fact be what happens. Right, let's carry on, then. The specific function..

- - Padmapani; "The specific function of intense concentration is said to provide a basis for an awareness in which one has a state of mind settled in itself, (a mind) taking every individual aspect of the perceptual situation as it is and never occurring in a vacuum, even though attention may shift within this perception (from one aspect to another) .

~ Right, read Guenther's note here.

Padmapani; "On Spiritual discipline', (Maitreya No. 3, p.30.) 'Attention is always a fluctuating process, but its fluctuations can remain strictly within the perception. That is, we may concentrate on one aspect of it and then on another; in each case we will not use attention for meta-perceptual ends, but will find ever new potentialities.'"

-- Well, this happens in the metta-bhavana, doesn't it? The metta remains constant, but you change the person. So you don't lose your concentration.

Dharmapala; It's also a bit like going through the details of a visualised Bodhisattva.

~ Right. You may be concentrating now on this, now on that, aspect, or part of the visualised figure, but again attention, concentration, samadhi, remains constant.

Padmavajra; Or like maybe when you just move on from one practice to another.

~ Yes, right. Right carry straight on.

Dharmapala; "The spyod-'jug(Bodhicaryavatara, VIII,4) states, 'From having known that the changes of emotions are

overcome Through a wider perspective which is together with calm 116a One must first become calm, and this comes When one is not attached to the world.'"

313

MBP/11 S: Typical Guenther terminology, 'the changes of emotions . I'm not sure what that means - possibly the klesas or even the asavas. 6 'Through a widened perspective which is together with calm' Presumably vipassana which is together with samatha. 'One must first become calm , and this comes when one is not attached to the world' ; the reference here, of course, is to the fact that samadhi becomes the basis for the development of wisdom.

Padavajra; It'd be good if we had a copy of the Bodhicaryavatara, because he seems to be translating a lot....

~ That's true. I haven't got one.

Padmavajra; I rather get the feeling that Matics is (inaudible)

S; Right, the last quotation.

Dharmapala; "The 'dul ba lung(Vinayasastra) states, Depending on conduct there is intense concentration, And depending on intense concentration, there is appreciative discrimination."

S: This is very, very basic and standard Buddhist teaching indeed, going right back to the beginning and running through all the three yanas... The author says. carry on.

Dharmapala; "Such statements are made over and over again. Therefore, those who want to have liberation must take these works as the Sublime Instruction." '4, S: Anyway, the general nature of Intense Concentration or samadhi is clear, isn't it, and the way in which it is an object-deter- mining mental event (Pause) Right on to Appreciative Discrimination. We're a little bit over time, but ew'll finish this this morning, because we re going on to the eleven Positive Mental Events in the afternoon.

Vimalamitra; "The mngon-pa kun-las-btus (Abhidharmasamuccaya.p.6) explains the nature of appreciative discrimination as follows;

S: 'Appreciative Discrimination'is Prajna "What is appreciative discrimination? It is the distinction of all that which is firmly established. Its function is to avoid any confusion or doubt. It is an awareness which discriminates between the individual observable qualities and defects as well as between the qualities of what is under consideration."

S; Do you see this? Basically shes-rab is to see the qualities of things as they really are. Sees, for instance, that the conditioned is impermanent, painful and so on. It sees that the unconditioned is permanent, blissful and so on. This is the mature of appreciative discrimination or wisdom. This is why Guenther translates it as appreciative discrimination. Sometimes he says analytical appreciative discrimination, because - discrimination, because it as it were, sorts out, at least initially, the qualities of the conditioned, and the qualities of the unconditioned, and doesn't confuse the two; sees that the qualities of the conditioned are not the qualities of the unconditioned and vice-versa. And it's appreciative because it's not just something intellectual - it's something of 'value-tone', as he would say. Alright let's read on.

Vimalamitra; "The object which has been singled out by appreciative

314 MBP/ 11 ~crimination is threefold 1. Positive 7 2. Negative 3. Indeterminate and the individual defects and qualities of these are distinguished."

"The object which has been singled out by appreciative dis- crimination is threefold; positive, negative, indeterminate." It's~not quite clear wh~t~those are - presumably it's skilful, unskilful, indeterminat&-. Wisdom sees the skilful as skilful, the unskilful as unskilful and so on. 'The individual defects and qualities of these are distinguished.'

Vimalamitra; "There are four logical procedures by which the in- dividual defects and qualities are distinguished; 1 . Awareness of what must be done 2. Awareness of

relationship 3. Awareness of attaining proper validity 4. Awareness of the absolute real  
Since doubt is dispelled when certainty is attained through an investigation which derives  
from these four operations, the specific function of discriminative awareness is said to  
abolish doubt."

S: Carry on, there seem to be some further explanations.

Vimalamitra; "In cogitating their respective significance, Tsong-kha-pa states (in the  
lam-rim chen-mo), May the investigating mind which arises from thinking {,~  
day and night, about what is before the mind, dispel doubt after singling out the significance  
of what has been heard by means of the four operations."

S; So it is a singling out of the significance of what has been heard - i.e., what has been  
studied - by means of the four operations. one must be aware of what must be done, one must  
see this with wisdom; one must be aware of relationship, - presumably this refers to  
something like the content of the Abhidharma. 'Awareness of attaining proper validity' -  
awareness that one's knowledge is as it were true, or is real; and awareness of the absolutely  
real - direct knowledge of the Unconditioned itself. The meaning of these four isn't altogether  
clear, but they seem to mean something like that.

Voice; Could you run through them again?

Awareness of what must be done - that is to say that the skilful is to be cultivated.  
Awareness of relationship - presumably this refers to the whole network of relationships  
studied by the Abhidharma. Or perhaps it also means awareness of the relationship between  
cause and effect - you understand that. Awareness of attaining proper validity - awareness of  
how a genuine knowledge is to be (obtained?) - valid knowledge is to be (obtained?) -  
knowledge which cannot be contradicted. And awareness of the absolute real - presumably  
the unconditioned itself. 'The special function of discriminative awareness is said to abolish  
doubt' - when there's wisdom, then no doubt is possible. (Pause) It's not a very lengthy  
discussion of wisdom, but perhaps it's all that's necessary for discussing it simply as a mental  
event. Airtight concluding paragraph.

Vimalamitra; "The reason that the five mental events beginning

315'

MBP/11 with intention are here called 'object-determining' is that these mental events  
have each grasped the specification of the 8 object. When they are steady, there is certainty  
concerning each object."

S: This is the general character of them all. But I think the general character has emerged  
quite clearly from the discussion of the five - even though certain matters of detail may not  
have been altogether clear. So we've covered now the five omnipresent mental events, and  
the five object-determining mental events. It's quite clear that in the case of the  
object-determining mental events that the subject gets as it were to much closer grips with the

object. That seems to be the overall difference between the two especially in the case of meditation.

Mark; Those first five seem to have an air of being quite nebulous, sort of.

S: Yes, yes. Well the more general a thing is, the more nebulous it is. Any query about what we've done this morning? We seem to be getting on reasonably well with the text. We shall get through it in ten days. This afternoon we come on to what is, probably, from the practical point of view, the most important part of the whole text.

Manjuvajra; Just generally. These five object-determining mental events - could one say that the first three can also refer~ to objects in the external world, whereas the last two (get) further removed from that.

S: There does seem to be a definite progression of them, because 7n the case of shes-rab, in the case of wisdom, then you do come to grips with the object in a really ultimate sense, you really know it as it is. Whether it's conditioned or w~conditioned. You can't get closer than that, you can't get more to grips with it than that. So, if you just read through the list, Guenther has translated interest; intensified interest which stays with its object; inspection to learn more; intense concentration; appreciative discrimination. It does suggest something cumulative. So it could well be. Inasmuch as the meditative is more intense than the non-meditative, yes, there seems to be a progression, as it were, from the external world to the world within.

Dharmapala; Are these sort of mental events, do they only happen, come in, when one is involved in meditation?

S: Well, no, one can have interest, taking this word literally, Th anything: But there has to be interest if you are to meditate. You can have interest without being interested in meditation, but you can't have meditation without interest in the object of meditation. The same with intensified interest. Mindfulness and awareness sort of bring you closer, definitely to the meditative level, and away from the external world, and intense concentration even more so. (Pause) But Prajna, perhaps can't quite be classified in this sort of way, because wisdom's operating even when you're not in a meditative state of consciousness. It's not something that you ever lose, even when you have your eyes wide open, and you're moving about, and you're doing this, that and the other. You may not be absorbed in a dhyana state, but your wisdom is alive and functioning. You never deviate from it. But by that time there's no subject, no object, not as absolutes.

316

MBF/11 Manjuvajra; So these are not omnipresent mental events?

9 S: They're not, no.

Manjuvajra; Unfortunately you can exist even without interest.

~::~ Without chanda, without eagerness - dull, lifeless, 7pathetic! Not really interested in

anything at all, it's all too much of a bore, too much of a drag. (Pause) You're much too cool (Laughter). Alright let's leave it 'till the afternoon.

Sagaramati; "The Eleven Positive Mental Events'idge-ba bcu-gcig1 The third the eleven positive mental events are: 1. Confidence-trust dad- a 2. Self-res ect n o-tsha 3. Decorum khrel- od- a 4. Non-attachment ma cha 5- al 5. Non-hatred zhe-sdan med- a Non-deludedness ti-mu med- a 7. Diligence brtson-' rus Alertness shin-tu sb an 5- a 9. Concern ba od to. E uanimit btan -sn oms 11. Non-violence rnam-par-mi- tshe-ba

Confidence-trust dad-pa The mngon-pa kun-btus (Abhidharmasamuccaya,p.6) explains the nature of confidence-trust as follows: What is confidence-trust? It is a deep conviction, lucidity, and longing for those things which are real, have value, and are possible. It functions as the basis of sustained interest, It is an awareness that counteracts lack of trust through three aspects of trust, namely, deep conviction, lucidity, and longing trust."

S: Is this clear? 'deep conviction, lucidity, and longing for those things which are real, have value and are possible.'

Padmavajra; What does 'are possible' mean?

~ Well, it suggests that those things can be attained.

Padmavajra; Or even, perhaps, the only real? I mean, it kind of suggests that there are things which are impossible - that other things are impossible to sort of really (go?) for and really...

S: Other things may be possible of attainment, but they may not be real, they may not have genuine value.(Pause) Deep-conviction - the english terms don't really convey very precise meaning in this context, do they? 'Lucidity' - let me consult the 'Siddhi' (Pause) Yes, it seems to be more or less the same thing, but maybe a little clearer - "What is belief (Sradhdha)?" You notice the translation here is 'belief', which is what it isn't - "It is the deep understanding of, and the ardent desire for, realities, qualities, and capacities." - it seems to be taken from the Abhidharmasamuccaya, doesn't it? "It has as its essential nature the purification of the mind. Its special activity consists in counteracting unbelief (asradhdha) and loving that which is good. The varieties of belief are three in number: 1. Belief in realities. This signifies the profound faith in , and understanding of, dharmas really existing, things of principle, verities. 2. Belief in qualities. This

317

MBP/1i signifies a profound faith in, and intense fondness for, all the pure qualities of the three Precious Ones (Buddha, Dharma and Sangha) 3. Belief in capacities. This signifies the profound faith in one's own power to attain and realise all good mundane and supramundane dharmas, and produce a desire and aspiration for them. It follows from this that belief (sradhdha) counteracts unbelief (asradhdha) on these three points, and produces the ardent desire to enter into possession of supramundane dharmas and cultivate mundane

dharmas."(Pause) Let's go into the tree different kinds of confidence-trust. Let's see whether that makes things clearer.

Asvajit; "Confidence-trust is of three kinds: 1. Lucid confidence dan -b'ai dad- a ~ Trusting confidence yid ches gyi dad-pal 3. Lon in confidence mn on'dod yi dad- a Lucid confidence is a lucid mind. It is an attitude that comes when one has seen the worth of such valuables as the Three Jewels (Buddha, Dharma and Sangha).117a When one puts a water-purifying gem into murky water, it becomes limpid immediately. So when this confidence is born, the turbidities of the mind become limpid and all the values of real understand- ing can grow in one."

~ Yes, is this clear?.. This confidence-trust produces a sort of limpidity, or pellucidity of mind, a sort of clarity. (Pause) There's a word in Sanskrit I'm trying to think of that means something like this It begins with a 'P' .

Sagaramati; It's in Guenther's 'Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma'.

S; Mmm, it's not listed here. It means something like - oh it's a very subtle word - 'serene confidence' - It's more like that.

Sagaramati; It suggests it's something - mind and mental events.. something. more emotionally satisfying than (the mind with?) mental events (unclear)....

S; It's a state of serenity and confidence, and trust, and clarity - and contentment, in a very refined sort of way. Anyway, 'lucid confidence is a lucid mind. It is an attitude that comes when one has seen the worth of such valuables as the Three Jewels (Buddha, Dharma and Sangha) ' There are two things here - first of all, there is seeing the worth, seeing the value, seeing the highly positive qualities, of the Three Jewels, and then, having seen, becoming very clear, very limpid, in one's mind. So what do you think is the connection - why should that sort of effect be produced? How is that sort of effect produced?

Padmavajra; It suggests a sort of.. it suggests to me, anyway, a sort of commitment, in a way - and your mind has decided, if you like, that that's the thing it most wants, and so therefore, if it's going towards that, all the other things will sort of gradually go away.

S; Because it's not a sort of cold, pseudo-objective seeing of the worth of such valuables as the Three Jewels. It's also being affected by them, responding to them. So this at once introduces a sort of order, a certain clarity, into one's life, into one's mind. Certain things are sorted out, as it were, automatic-

318 MBP/11 ally. There are certain things one is going to do, certain things that one is not going to do - hence clarity is introduced. Limpidity is introduced, just as when a water-purifying gem is put into murky water.

Padmavajra; It suggests to me also, I don't know why, regular steps.

Dharmapala; Well it can be - just that having contact with the Three Jewels, and there's something responding to that.

Abhaya; Also indecision comes to an end - there is no conflict.

S: Hence no turbidity. Great relief. Alright on to the next one then.

Padmavajra; "Trusting confidence is trust which arises from thinking about the connection that exists between one's action and its result as taught by the Buddha."

S: So in a sense it is the trusting confidence in the operation of what we usually refer to as the law of karma. Whether the sphere of reference is this single life itself or a succession of lives. You trust that if you perform such and such an action then such and such results will inevitably follow. You have that confidence, that trusting confidence, or faith in, the law of cause and effect, or karma. Not that karma literally is the law of cause and effect. (Pause) It seems that the trusting confidence corresponds to the 'deep conviction' of the quotation from the Abhidharmasamuccaya. And then 'lucid confidence' to the lucidity, and the longing confidence simply to the longing. (Pause) And the same with the earlier three - it's the deep conviction in, or trusting confidence in, the reality of karma; the lucid confidence in the value of such things as the Three Jewels, and the longing confidence in the possibility of actually realising the truth. Do you see that? Right, on to longing confidence then.

Padmavajra; "Longing confidence is the thought that, having pondered over the four truths, those of frustration and of its origin have to be given up, and those of the cessation and of the way to it have certainly to be realised. When we know that through our efforts these truths can be realised, we certainly will do so."

S: So *śraddhā*, or faith, or confidence-trust, is of these three kinds. If one takes them in the order of the quotation from the Abhidharmasamuccaya, then trusting confidence in the operation of karma, lucid confidence with regard to the value of such things as the Three Jewels, and longing confidence that one can actually realise the truths and attain to the goal. One finds these three, in effect, in many of the Pali texts, doesn't one? (Pause). . . There are various passages where, for instance it is said, that one has faith that actions do have results, and that there are in the world beings who have realised the truth, who are enlightened, who are worthy - there are a number of passages, almost sort of stock passages, to this effect. (Pause) Alright, let's go on to the further explanations.

END OF TAPE 11 SIDE ONE

319

TAPE 11 SIDE TWO MBP/t 1      Alright, let's go on to the further explanations.

12

\_\_\_\_\_ "Here we have only touched upon the nature of the three kinds of confidence-trust, but they are not exhausted thereby. At present, people lump pleasure and confidence-trust together. We may say that the pleasure in drinking wine is a trust in the wine, but pleasure and trust certainly are not one and the same. Trust is a mental event which is essentially positive, but pleasure shares in what is positive and negative."

If it is put into English one doesn't quite get the meaning does one? In English we don't quite speak in terms of trusting wine - what would be a more idiomatic expression?

\_\_\_\_\_ Enjoy?

S; No.

Dharmapala', To believe in booze.

S: To believe in booze, yes, it's more like that isn't it? \_\_\_\_\_ To get into booze.

S: To get into, yes... Well let's go on to the detailed A  
explanation.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Moreover, in explaining these two in greater detail, we have four alternatives: 1. Liking something but not trusting 2. Trusting but not liking 3. Both 4. Neither

S: So what are these?

"The first 'liking something but not trusting': you may like your son and wife (but not trust them), and you may like such activities as drinking wine and eating food at inappropriate times 117b1"

S: Yes, so do you see the difference between liking and trust- ing? You like your son and your wife but you don't trust them. What does that mean?

\_\_\_\_\_ Faith, confidence.

S: Your confidence in them as what?

\_\_\_\_\_ An ultimate aim.

S: As an ultimate aim. Or as giving you ultimate security, t~Itimate happiness. You don't put that sort of trust in them. You like them but you don't trust them. This rather reminds me of something I quoted before, I was reading, a review I think it was, of a book by Cardinal Newman, and it was said of him that he believed in ~od but he didn't trust him. (Laughter) So this is sometimes the position, or the plight, of the orthodox christian believer. You believe in ~od but you don't

320 MBP/ti trust him. So what a terrible position to be in. You believe in him - you believe that there is such a being as ~od but you 13 don't trust him. You can't be quite sure what he's going to do to you, or not do to you. This is the feeling he might be hiding round the corner, he might be waiting to pounce on you. He mi ht be sort of gleefully rubbing his hands at this very momen thinking what he's going to do with you when you die. It's that sort of feeling.

I believe in ~od but I think he's a rotter.

S: Right, yes. I believe in god but I think he's going to do me down. So anyway here it's liking something but not trusting. You like something, you're quite fond of something or someone, but you can't repose absolute, as it were, existential confidence in them, So you may like these activities. ... drinking wine, eating food even at inappropriate times. But you know that these things are not going to give you real happiness. You like them, you enjoy them, but you don't place any trust in them. Alright, what's the second one?

Dharmap.; I don't understand the second half of this.. that you may like such activities as drinking and eating food at inappropriate times.

S: These are some of the things that you may like doing, just as you may like your son or daughter, but just as you can't trust your son, can't trust your wife even though you like them, in the same way you can't place your trust in such activities as drinking wine and eating food at inappropriate times even though you may like to do so. These are not going to give you any real happiness. You can't place any trust in them as such. I mean in them as things which are capable of giving real happiness, permanent happiness. So it's like that. But you can like them, enjoy them, but you shouldn't place your trust in them. And the test comes of course if they are taken away from you. Then you can see for yourself whether you simply liked them or whether in fact you placed your trust in them.

Sa~aram.; Trust is like an emotional investment.

S; Right, yes indeed. That's a very good way of putting it. I think it was Cardinal Wolsey who said, "Put not your trust in princes", or is it the bible.. .Put not your trust in princes - well you can be quite fond of your prince and serve him quite ~evotedly but don't put your trust in him. Don't commit your- self emotionally to him.

\_\_\_\_\_ You can see a sort of process happening when you are growing up with your parents. I think when you're young you can really sort of put your trust in your parents.

S: Yes.

As well as sort of liking them and then gradually, that sort of starts to end.

S: Yes, you may still like them but you don't put your trust in them in that sort of way, not that you distrust them or develop a negative attitude towards them. You just see that you can't put your trust in them, and you've either got to put your trust somewhere else or in somebody else or withdraw that kind of trust altogether.

\_\_\_\_\_, Both occurs in current micchaditthisin that a 321 cultural view is that you can get satisfaction from or that you can in fact get satisfaction from living the good life.

S: Well this is a very old micchaditthi (which was) present in the Buddha's time

\_\_\_\_\_ But you wouldn't expect to be secure.. ultimate.

S; If you were asked, you would say of course not-but actually emotionally you do in many cases.

\_\_\_\_\_ really they do?

S: Really, yes. (Pause) In a sense they can see, well you can't gain any ultimate satisfaction from it. But very often they think well what else is there - they don't see anything else, they don't see any other way. But actually there is that emotional investment even though, in a sense, they recognise that they ought not to be making it. That it's dangerous to make it.

\_\_\_\_\_ Quite often when you go to eat a meal you may find yourself with that attitude. You trust in it.(It is) to provide you with satisfaction.

S; Yes. This is going to be a really good meal. I've been waiting for this, I've been looking forward to this. Maybe it's a special meal - it's been planned weeks in advance. 2 Alright, let's go on to the second one.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The second, 'trusting but not liking': you may have a strong conviction from a deep fear of the evils of samsara (and hence not like it)." (Laughter)

S: Yes, You trust. .you really do trust that there is really going to be a result of every action that you perform. That you know you perform many unskilful actions so you don't like to think that. So you trust but don't like. It's a bit like Cardinal Newman with god except that it seems very in- appropriate to have that attitude with god who's supposed to represent some of your highest ideals at the same time. It's an appropriate attitude to have towards karma because karma is something that you are, that you do, that you are producing. It's the results of your own actions. So you trust in the law itself but you're not very happy about the way you're operating the law. You know that you are operating it in a way that is not in accordance with your own interests. So you trust the law but you are not happy with what the law brings you as a result of your own actions.

Asvajit ; Wouldn't that imply that one has lost one's innocence in a sense that - trusting but not liking - I mean presumably you could. . if you were innocent you would you'd be completely trusting in a sense if you were innocent of the situation but

S: It's not just trusting the situation it's trusting here, the law of karma. I mean probably a trust in the law of karma isn't compatible with a state of innocence (but) you can hardly trust

322

MBP/t t the law of karma without knowing about the law.

t5 Asvajit ; That's what I mean, sorry.

S: You have to know about the law of karma before you can trust it. So the innocent person - (who) trusts the situation would not be very likely to know about the law of karma. That suggests an amount of reflection, even experience, at least of Knowledge. Alright, what of the third (point) then

Vimalamitra; "Both liking and trusting is joyful trust that comes from a deep conviction after having pondered over the positive results deriving from positive actions and (from having pondered) on the value of spiritual friends."

S: Yes, this seems to involve something like rejoicing in merit doesn't it and also with satisfaction - with true non-egoistic satisfaction the course of your own skilful action. (Pause) And on the value of spiritual friends (Pause) This liking and trusting is very important in the spiritual life generally.

Vimalamitra.; seems to kind of depend on a kind of positive attitude to what you learn about the karma.

S: And also on a certain amount of actual practice. A deep conviction after having pondered over the positive results deriving from positive actions - presumably you have performed at least some positive actions. And you can begin to see them or you can see them beginning to give rise to positive results and that's a source of joyful trust. You both like and trust. (pause) And from having pondered on the Value of spiritual friends. Why do you think this gives rise to joyful trust? Because you see for a start that spiritual friends

S: Yes, that they are there. . you can see what they are like. You can see how they can help. So that you also like what you see of them, you have trust in them. Now what about the fourth one.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Neither liking or trusting is like anger or frustration."

S: So how is that?

Well so it's if you don't like (it) and you don't trust it.

S: What source of happiness is there for you. Dharmapala., Is that (like) a non-acceptance of the situation?

S: But suppose for instance that you neither like nor trust The Buddha or you neither like or trust the law of karma where does that leave you. Well according to the text it leaves you in a state of anger and frustration. Alright, let's go on.

How can you move, say, supposing you're in the sort of second type - supposing for example there is a particular practice that you can trust, but you don't like doing it.

S: Well, sooner or later you will see the positive results of

MBP/11 that practice. You'll start liking it. If you see some positive change in yourself however painful the bringing about of that change may be you'll start liking the fact that a

positive change has occurred, then your attitude will change. It will change from the second to the third - 'trust- ing and not liking' to 'both liking and trusting

Sagararn..; I think that we see that in the metta bhavana practice, people just don't like it.

S: Yes. (chuckles)

Sagararn.; and then after they do it they don't like it then after a while they begin to like it.

S: Yes. Alright on to the next paragraph.

Manju.. ;"Now then, are pleasures and personal feelings the same or different? We can say in some sense they are one and the same but actually they are not. To like a spiritual friend is a trust, but the personal feeling of respect regarding that spiritual friend is a distinct mental event which is produced in one's being. It is to feel humble and cherish this feeling by thinking of what he has done for you. And these are two different mental events."

S: Pleasures and personal feeling - the basis of the distinc- tion isn't very clear is it? Now then~are pleasures and personal feelings the same or different1. We re still concerned with this matter of faith. We can say in some sense they're one and the same but actually they're not. To like a spiritual friend is a trust but the personal feeling of respect regarding that spiritual friend is a distinct mental event which is produced in one's being. It is to feel humble and to cherish this feel- ing, by thinking of what he has done for you and these are two different mental events. ' It seems to mean that theS two are distinct and that you can like the spiritual friend as distinct from his function as being a spiritual friend, or you can like him as a spiritual friend and that these are two distinct things. It seems to be meaning that. (Pause) But why is it that to like a spiritual friend is a trust but the personal feeling of respecting your spiritual friend is a mental event. But why that sort of distinction is made is not clear.

Vifflalam..; It seems to kind of suggest in a way that trust is, kind o~ transpersona~ like trust in Our own view.

S: It1s almost as if the word trust is out of place here.

Asvajit\_; Trust surely arises when, after~a series of inter- actions with one's spiritual friend, one finds that he does what is helpful.

S; No, I think that that comes under the personal feeling. I think he~e trust is used in a negative sense. To like a spiritual friend is only trust and you're very sort of... well you like someone and you place asort of trust in them. "But the personal feeling of respect regarding that spiritual friend is a distinct mental event produced in one's being. It is to feel humble&tocherish this feeling by thinking of what he has done for you." So it's as though the first is just the ordinary liking that you have for the spiritual friend, as a person, and the other seems to be the attitude towards, the

MBP/tl attitude that you have towards him in his capacity as spiritual friend. It seems more like this. Yes. '7

Dharmap.: That seems like just a question of degree. And yet they're both sort of distinct mental events (not like)

S: For instance, it's as if you can respect the Buddha as a great teacher, as a great thinker etc. etc. but to respect him as the Buddha is a quite different matter. To respect him as the enlightened one is a quite different matter. So to like the spiritual friend because he is a good chap, you get on with him well and you can go out with him here and there, and he's good company, that is one thing. But respect him because you feel he is more developed than you and he can help you is quite another thing. The two are two quite distinct mental events. I think this is what the author is getting at though it isn't altogether clear.

Vimalam ; You mean you kind of trust the spiritual friend because you know they've got something.

S: (Although) the word trust is used in connection with the first kind of mental event it seems rather inappropriate. So one is liking the human friend, one is liking the spiritual friend just as another human being. But the other is respecting him and appreciating him as a spiritual friend.

\_\_\_\_\_ I think that's something one can feel quite deeply 2: in the metta bhavana (often)(that sort of )trust goes beyond the(personal.)

S: Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ Doe~ the spiritual friend in this sense specifically mean a guru rather than a spiritual friend like other Order members?

S: I think it does probably though it could still apply in but not quite to the same extent, but it could still apply. If you like, a spiritual friend is a trust, here the word trust seems to be a bit misleading in a way.

Sagararn.; It's more like the trust you have in ( wine

S: Yes, he's just someone pleasant to be with.

\_\_\_\_\_ And that's just the pleasure of the feeling.

S: Just the pleasure of the feeling. Yes, quite. A distinct mental event from the confidence you feel in him, the faith you feel in him as spiritual friend.

\_\_\_\_\_ So maybe this trust could be compared to ( faith

S: Yes. Because it says that our pleasure and personal feeling is the same. The distinction is made on that basis, that to like a spiritual friend is a pleasure. The personal feeling of respect etc. etc. is to feel humble and cherish that feeling by thinking of what he has done for you.

So that's trust.

That is confidence-trust or faith. Sraddha. But one could~

MBP/it by way of analogy extend that. You can have the same sort of 325 feelings and the same difference of feelings as say when you 18 go to the Centre. It could be a nice friendly place - a bit quiet, peaceful, colourful - where you meet your friends and where everyone is nice to you. Or it can be the place where you go to meditate, the place where you get help in your personal development, on your progress towards enlightenment and so on. But these would be two distinct mental events. Two distinct mental attitudes.

\_\_\_\_\_ It's like what you said in the Survey about the Buddha I think, where you say about people who see the Buddha as a sort of great reformer or as a great thinker or a great this that or the other. They didn't sort of see him as the Buddha.

S: Well, this is what I mentioned a few minutes ago. That 7 you say he's a great thinker etc. etc., this is not seeing him as the Buddha. And you have faith, sraddha, in the Buddha only when you see him as the Buddha. You could say it was the same attitude towards a book. You could, for instance, read the 'Life of Milarepa' and enjoy it and derive pleasure from it without developing faith in it. And I think a lot of people do this who read Buddhist literature and so on, they read it with pleasure, but they do not read it with faith and these are two quite distinct things. When I say reading it with faith I don't mean believing in it, but with this particular mental event they don't read it with that; they get a lot of pleasure out of it but they don't experience faith in this sense.

\_\_\_\_\_ People experience it as a good story rather than as the dharma.

S: No, not just even that but you can sort of enjoy it and enjoy the fact that Milarepa is practising all those austerities and meditating so much. You may enjoy all this but without there being actual faith in it. Making the distinction you can relish it in an almost aesthetic sort of way,

\_\_\_\_\_ Or as a good story

S: More than that as I'm saying, more than just a.. well, sure the good story's here but you could even enjoy, sort of vicariously, somebody else's experiences that you're reading about, spiritual experiences, but without there being faith. That is a distinct mental event. This is, I think, what most of our reading is like when we do happen to enjoy it. You can in a way be sort of affected, in a way, moved, but in an aesthetic sort of way. Faith does not arise.

If you read a book could you. 15 there a way of judging whether that sort of feeling comes up. I know

S: Well, it's a different feeling. If you know at all, if you have an experience of faith, well you know when faith has arisen rather than just the sensation or feeling of pleasure.

\_\_\_\_\_ It's a feeling of humility and respect.

S: Yes, of humility, respect yes,yes

\_\_\_\_\_;Inspiration?

326

MBP/11 I think you could even feel inspired without faith being present. I'd even go as far as to ,well, not to say that, at 19 least sugg~st~that, )sort of carried away but still there may not be faith. So I think therefore one has to be very careful and not assume that because one is feeling very stirred up and emotional , enjoying the story very much, say the 'Life of Milarepa', therefore you've got faith. Faith is quite a distinct quality.

\_\_\_\_\_;You see that sort of thing in cerain people who go round to different groups and really enjoy it and get stirred up and get a lot out of it, enjoy it but not actually ( ) think ( ).

Asvajit ; Faith is a certainty that you've~at last met the real truth.

S: Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ Faith would prompt you to act.

S: Faith would prompt you to act. Yes, but what kind of action? Sagai'am.; After reading Milarepa you may want to go and meditate.

S: Yes (laughs) the fact that you say you might even want (7o) but not even necessarily.

Sagaram. ; ( ) if you did really want. If you did go and meditate.

S: Yes.

Vimalam.; When you know thatthat is the way.

S: I do say that even that wouldn't prove that it is faith because you might want an additional enhanced or pleasurable experience. Faith~ is a very rare thing. I think the author here hits the nail on the head, it is to appear humble and to cherish this feeling by thinking of what he has done for you. this is in the case of the spiritual friend, but it could be extended to, say, to Milarepa, to the Buddha and so on.

\_\_\_\_\_ Well that's quite something.

S: Yes, it is.

\_\_\_\_\_ You could read Milarepa and believe him and feel quite bad about it.

S: For instance, I think T.S.Eliot refers to people who read, Wooks on mysticism, and writing of great mystics, and quite enjoy them but without any faith in ~od; or even without any belief in ~od. I think especially he refers to religious poetry, that you read religious poetry, quite enjoy it without accepting any of the beliefs of the author.

\_\_\_\_\_ It's the same I suppose withall the pictures in the National Gallery, I mean a lot of people( but there must be some ( unclear

\_\_\_\_\_ Saying that about faith, I've just sort of been thinking and I really wondered...  
.1 mean

MBP/tt The fact that you have a pleasurable feeling with regard to some allegedly religious or spiritual object does not mean 20 that you have faith in it. Or does not necessarily mean that you have faith in it., You may have faith in it but you don't have faith in it simply because it makes you feel good. The fact that you're feeling good when you re reading about it or thinking about it doesn't mean that you have faith in 'it in this sense. Faith is a quite different kind of feeling or emotion.

Asv~jit 3 Would it mean that you are prepared to use that as a basis ( 'for ) the rest of your life?

S: What, you mean the faith?

Well, that particular book, the ideas in it (even ~Figures In it.

S: ~aith would tend to involve that. You would 7e prepared to devote yourself to it. Rather than '~se it to give satisfaction to you. That is why so much of religious reading is self-indulgence but presumably you could have faith'in something and be acting on that faith even though you never got any pleasure from it. Yes? That would, in a way, be the test, that you could carry on without pleasure. This is why you could say, going a bit further afield, in the writings of some of the christian mystics they warn, say, that you must carry on with your meditation or contemplation, regardless of, what do they call it - sensible delights or something like that, there's some such phrase - sensible consolations - ah yes.

They went very' much to the other extreme.

S: They did perhaps, but it is something of that kind ).

S: No, I think the more balanced ones didn't say that, they Thaid that the fact that you were deprived of'sensible consolation' did not mean that you were not making progress in your meditation or your contemplation. That you should not be attached to the sensible consolation and continue nonetheless, even if they were withdrawn. So in much the same way

if onthad faith that would (persist) even if there was no pleasurable sensation or pleasurable feeling or emotion, associated with the object of the faith; as for instance in the case of the law of karma, you might have deep faith in that, even though the thought oF the operation of that law gave you no pleasure, and for the time being at least you could continue to observe that law and to act in accordance with it even though there was no pleasurable' feeling in connection with it

Asvajit ; So how would you classify faith then, not as a feeling.

S: Well, it's a separate kind of mental event from the pleasurable Ueeling

Abh~ya ; Not as a thought or a feeling but as a, more like

S: it's an emotion but it's another kind of emotion from the feeling of pleasure that you get from something.

328

MBP/t1 Just as in the case of a spiritual friend - you can get a great deal of pleasure with being with them, going around with them, 21 but that by itself is not faith in the spiritual friend. That faith is a quite different thing from th e experience of pleasure in his company.

\_\_\_\_\_ So, looking for examples, you can sort of see faith manifest in people like Milarepa when Marpa really put him through it. It wasn't a pleasurable experience.

S: Right,yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ And the same with people ~ike (~,a~~~~ ) and all those sort of people.

S: His faith was there ,even the entire absence of at least for a while any pleasurable feeling or emotion. That is the criterion. But therefore I say one has to be really careful not to mistake this sort of pleasurable feeling that we get when we go through. religious literature, for faith. It can make us feel really good but that's not faith. Tn a way it's a sort of higher indulgence, I mean t~O£'s why sometimes you just skip from one to another as y~u might skip from one box of chocolates or a bag of 'Malteasers' to a 'Mars' bar. It's much that sort of thing.

Sagaram.. ; I think sometimes you c~%>~'~~e%~%hough you're not getting any pleasurable result, in the hope that you will.

S: But if you do it out of faith the emotion of faith is present and there is, after all that is a positive emotion. You could even ,say, get a certain amount of pleasure from that, I mean,just to use that term in this context too but it is quite a different thing from the mere pleasure you get without faith.

Asvaiit ; Does it correspond with Perfect Emotion, in the Eightfold Path?

S: You could say faith was an aspect of Perfect Emotion, I wouldn't like to go further than that. Again this links up with a psychological approach, there can be a great deal of positivity in the purely psychological, therapeutic sort of approach, but there's no faith and that is what I would call a spiritual quality. In so much as you really feel good, very positive, very happy, very joyful but faith does not enter into it, therefore there is no genuinely spiritual dimension there, or better, no transcendental dimension and this is what I find lacking in those, as it were, psychotherapeutic circles. They are very positive, there's a great deal of pleasure in a good sense, there's a great deal of energy, of happiness, but there is no faith. This is what makes all the difference. And they're quite oblivious to this sort of distinction.

So the group gets into sort of pleasure, and the Sangha, faith.

S: Right, you could say that very much, the positive group goes into pleasure which is perfectly o.k., which is perfectly positive and a good foundation in a way but the spiritual community revolves around faith., not belief. This kind of emotion for the highest spiritual values especially as represented

MBP/11 by the Three Jewels.

22 \_\_\_\_\_; I want to go back to the( ) where I drew a distinction between the friend and the spiritual friend and a friend is someone in whose presence you feel a pleasure because that person has got something that makes you feel pleasant in their presence and you limit it to that a spiritual friend is one in whose presence you feel pleasure and you feel a kind of determination to be like that.

S: Right, Yes.

;(continues) So as well as feeling the pleasure of their presence you also feel a kind of pull to actually make yourself like that. Which is a lot more active.

S: Yes, or the presence of the spiritual friend makes you aware of something within yourself that you had not been aware of before.

END OF TAPE ELEVEN

Held at:            On:

Present:            Ven. Sangharakshita, Upasakas, Padmavajra, Padmapani, Manjuvajra, Sagarmati, Kamalasila, Dharmapala, Abhaya, Asvajit, Vimalamitra and Mark Barret, Robert Gerik.

Day    Tape 12 Side A

Voices:            Hmn.

Sagramati:        But the eh. Faith is very much um a vertical

S:            Very much a

Sagramati:        Vertical it's vertical

S:            Yes it's vertical

Mark    Something in - from your lecture "Enlightenment as experience and Barrett:            non experience".

S:            Yes

Mark    You know comes in mind when you talk about Faith, in that sense, you Barrett: know like eh getting plea            just just getting full of mere pleasure in            a way from things

S:            Yes

Mark    Like smash and grab round the Barrett:

S:            Hmn right, right

Mark    You know            waiting for something to come Barrett:            along and give it to you.

S:            Hmn Yes

Mark    Rather than you actually working for it putting energy into it. Barrett:

S:            Yes hmn but it's even more than you know working for it. Eh. Faith represents a very distinctive eh, one might kind of say a unique kind of emotion. Yea.

Voices:            Hmn

"MBP/12" Page 2

S: Which can be present when there is no pleasurable feeling present at all huh?

Padma- Hmn. As a fact at the point where there is no pleasurable feeling at all. Isn't that the point where Faith can arise?

S: No, it can arise if you are feeling pleasure too, but it must be distinguished from it. It's more easy to see when there's no, you know, pleasurable feelings in the mind at the same time.

Voices: Hmn. Right

Sagramati: But once you've had um Faith

S: Hmn

Sagramati: Em you wouldn't from what I pick up you saying. It's almost like you'd never actually lost it.

S: Ah. I think that's so. You may forget from time to time but I think you never actually lose it. And I think if you've not had the experience of Faith eh er then you tend to think or you cannot help thinking that that the feeling that you get when you read something or hear a lecturer or take part in a Puja and feel good that is Faith eh? You can't help making that confusion.

Kamala- So Faith is a weighty Karma, a strong karma sila:

S: Faith is a very strong karma hmn. I mean even a sort of happy joyful state which is innocent you know is good karma, but Faith, even though it is not technically qualified, technically classified as a weighty skilful karma or skilful weighty karma, could well be regarded in that sort of way. In a way ... - well I don't know, one's getting into technicalities now and the Abidharma is a very tricky subject. - It's almost as though it was more than just a skilful action hmn.

Sagramati: It is eh it is tinged with the transcendental

S: Yes. I mean the Faith in the law of Karma isn't or what this Author calls the "Trusting Confidence" that isn't but the Lucid Confidence and the ? longing Confidence, well they certainly are eh, tinted with the Transcendental.

Dharma- In the Positive Nidanas it's got Faith as the turning round point at the Pala: beginning eh and that goes right through.

S: Coming to the question of Ordination, someone might feel very good about the friends very good about the order, very good about the Spiritual Life excetera but may not have Faith yea? and one must be able to, to dis- tinguish this eh? hm? So one can't really go for refuge until, unless one has Faith can one eh. You go for refuge because you have Faith, if you've no Faith how can you go for refuge? Hmn Faith, as defined here. So you havn't got Faith and therefore you can't go for refuge and therefore you can't be Ordained if you, meerly feel good about these things or derive pleasure from them. Faith is something more.

332

"MBP/12" Page 3

Padma- But if it's, you know, Faith. I get the fee~ling eh, that, that when it vajra: gets heavy, you know like, like the Buddha attacked by Mara, something like that, that's the real test.

S: That is when Faith sustains you, huh? Then you can be sure it's Faith (laugh) because there is no pleasure for you to fall back on, not even as it were you know, Spiritual Pleasure, its only Faith you know, in the midst of sort of desert of suffering. But in a sense you don't mind that... Faith is there, that's all that you need in a sense you-'re quite happy with that Faith even though you're really going through it in other respects.

Padma- It's what St. em. St. John of the Cross calls the "Dark Night of the pani Soul". Presumable (Pause)

S: Eh no, I think it would correspond probably more to the "Dark Night" of the sense

Voice: Ah, yes.

S: Of sense. When all sort of pleasures of the senses and lower mind are withdrawn including sort of lower meditative pleasures. The Dark Night-of Soul is when the presence of God is withdrawn, or seems to be withdrawn. There wouldn't be any Analogy to that, probably, in Buddhism. (Pause) Anyway, let's go on

Vimala- What would that be then the Dark tnitra:

S: Now I'm not going to try and puzzle it out

Mark "When someone in his individual awareness deeply questions this according Barrett: to the great treatise (Lam-rim)

S: That's Tsong-kha-pa

Mark Barrett: "And when he analyzes how it grows in him when he turns the mind inward, then he can know what is meant. Mere words cannot explain this.

S: He is referring to the extreme difficulty of explaining what Faith is. I think we've seen this for ourselves: the difficulty of knowing what Faith is, but "when someone in his individual awareness deeply questions this according to the great treatise. (the Lam-rim of Tsong-kha-pa) and when he analyzes how it grows in him when he turns the mind inward, then he can know what is meant. Mere words cannot explain this.

Blowing of nose S: All right! On we go.

334

"MBP/12" Page 5

A voice: Hmm

S: There seems to be, at least judging, on looking superficially not even any awareness that something is missing. Hmn? Pause.

Padma- Hmn. In a way these psychological groups are a real threat in a way perhaps because they smother the idea that maybe there is something higher. Pause.

S: Yes. Someone. Oh er I think it was in course of Mitra Retreat, yea, that someone happened to remark on the fact that there were so many ex-Catholics hmn present. I think we had six. And, someone mentioned that this seemed to be disproportionate if you, you know, you look at it statistically: what is the percentage of Catholics in the total population, well on that basis perhaps we should have had two Catholics present, but we had six so the question arose whether this was a coincidence or whether there was any actual reason for it, and someone made the point, I forget who it was, I think it was probably an ex-Catholic that however bad the Catholics may be, at least when you are very young they batter into you and hammer into you that there is something higher than this world; that this life, a worldly life; a material life - are not everything - yes? So even though you lose your Faith in the Catholic Doctrine, in the whole sense of Catholic way of life even in the whole Christian Religion, you still may retain that sort of sense, of this presence of Faith - that there is something higher - and you go on looking therefore. Even after you have abandoned Catholicism, abandoned Christianity, you go on looking, because at least the Church has shown you that there is something higher than this world.

Voice: Hmn.

S: So therefore this person concluded that perhaps we shouldn't be surprised that we have seen on a retreat, such a high proportion, such a high percentage of ex-Catholics.

Padma- But eh. What you were saying earlier on Bante; with lucid and trusting pani: confidence you feel they may be tinged with something transcendental in a sense, you couldn't say the same in that sort of a sense - its a formal sort of conditioning which has eh been put on to you.

Sagramati: Is it?

S: Is it altogether?

Padma- Ah yes, that's a point. pami:

S: I mean undoubtly there is some genuine spiritual residue in the midst of all the dross, yea?

Padma- Yea pami:

S: It may be very, very obsured and very distorted but there is something of that nature of that quality there which is not here in secular, secular thought.

335

"MBP/12" Page 6

Robert Why is it then that Buddhism does so poorly in Catholic countries? Gerk:

Dharma- They don't let it in! pala: Laughter

S: They don't take the risk eh?

Padma- What is the view of Catholic Church towards Buddhism? pani:

S: Well, it has changed a bit more recently. The old line used to be that Buddhism, in fact all the Heathen Religions, was just totally false. But now they are beginning to say well there is something in them.

Mark Giggle Barratt:

S: They're ever beginning to have actual contact with them. Eh, I think I've mentioned before that - I think it was a Japanese monk who I knew who came to England, had been to Rome on route to see the Pope and he was very pleased. He had a letter from the Pope. This monk was the head of a sect in Japan. And he said that the Pope had really appreciated Buddhism, and spoken of it very highly, and he was really pleased about it. So I asked to see the letter and in it - it was not signed, it was on Vatican notepaper but it was not signed by anybody, nor addressed to anybody; it just said that "buddhism was a very good human teaching."

Mark Giggle Barratt:

S: The Japanese monk didn't realise the implication of that. He was quite overjoyed that he had got this in writing but - "A very good human teaching", Christianity is the teaching of the Son of God - It's not ~ human - Buddhism is a very good human teaching. And that represents, probably, their current attitude. It's put on the level more or less of the teachings of Plato & Aristotle. But not any higher than that.

Padmava-jra: They're being pretty sort of clever though. They are gradually absorbing things like, you know, Buddhist meditation techniques. I mean there are certainly centres where you can gather, I do, you know, Yoga.

S: Well I, I was reading a list of Retreat Centres and one, - Christian Retreat Centre - where you can go for retreat - and one of them was listed as having on the premises a Christian Monk trained in T.M!

Laughter

S: I don't think though, that this will get them very far. Laughter

336

"MBP/12" Page 7

S: I think they'll find this sort of, you know, this sort of approach something of Trojan Horse.

Laughter S: So, I don't mind. I'm not bothered

Vimala- The stink of Christianity will still come through mitra: Laughter

S: I should think in this case it's the stink of Buddhism that will penetrate through

Laughter

S: Penetrate through the walls of the Wooden Horse's body yea? So in a hundred years time there will be good Catholics saying. "There's a funny smell about!"

Laughter

S: And you'll have a Pope who is a Crypto-Buddhist!

Laughter

S: Anyway let's carry on. (Pause) Top of the page. No we're not. No, we've come a bit further down than that.

?: 41 S: Hmn.

Kamala- Also the Ratnolkanama-dharani states: sila: "Confidence must precede all things like a mother (her child) it guards and increases all positive things. It removes fears and rescues from the four rivers. Confidence is the road sign to the citadel of happiness."

S: Now let see what the four rivers, the four floods:- centrality, Karma, existence bhava opinion drishh and unknowing or avid. Right, carry on with thenextverse.

Kamala- "Confidence is not murky and makes the mind translucent, it removes Sila: arrogance and becomes the root of devotion. Confidence is wealth, treasure, and the best foundation. Like a hand, it is the means of gathering what is wholesome.

S: Hmn. Yes. It removes arrogance and becomes the root of devotion. This ties up with something that was said earlier on.

Manj uva- jra: The humility

33~

S: Hm? - Yes. It is feel humble and to cherish this feeling. Yea. so it removes arrogance and becomes the root of devotion. So in this case how does devotion differ from Shradha?

Sagarmati: It is an expression of Shradha

S: Yes, it is an expression of Shradha. Yea, in thought and words and deeds one- could say

Manjuva- That's using devotion in quite a different way to what on the convention jra: you made distinction between de~otion and commitment.

S: Yes.

Manjuva- And I think that means we use the word commitment when its devotion. j ra:

S: Yes, but devotion to the group ties up with er, finding the group pleasant, pleasurable - yea?

Voices: Yea, hmn.

S: You like the group huh? But you don't have Faith - in what the Spiritual Community represents. Or don't have Faith in what the Spiritual Community has faith in, but you like the group. This is devotion. So, yes, I used the word commitment as corresponding to some extent to what we are now calling Faith. Faith results in commitment whereas duration doesn't necessarily.

Asvajit: Basically, there are two meaning of devotion. One is devotion to the group, the other is devotion which is an expression of Faith.

S: Yes, right

Padma- What would be the difference between, em, Faith and, pani: in a different way, in a different context, Bhakti?

S: Bhakti is more like devotion. Bhakti is a more Hindu term, although it does occur in Buddhist literature: that's more like devotion. Though I would say personally, on the basis of my own experience that a lot of Bhakti is only taking pleasure in

Padmava- Do you think, eh, I'm just thinking of the Hare Khrisna movemont. They jra: seem to really get off on, you know, Hare Khrisna and they're always going on about Bhakti but it looks as though they're just missing out.

S: Yes, it is very much that kind of thing

Padmava- Yes, all smiles and garlands jra:

S: Which is very nice, very pleasant. But one must be able to distinguish that kind of pleasurable experience from Faith, eh.

Voices: Hmn.

338

"MBP/12" Page 9

S: Faith is something much more deep; something much more pr~found; something much more calm, serious, hmn.

Padmava- jra: Didn't you once call it an emotional equivalent of insight?

S: Yes I, this, this is in the Survey, speaking of the true Pure Land School-I say that where they speak of Faith one must read Wisdom. That Faith is, here, a touch of the Transcendental in this case. Again, this ties up with, you know, what I said when we were studying the Ratuagruasamcayagatha. Don't be misled by the language of the Perfection of Wisdom literature. This is not an intellectual approach.

Abhaya: Well that would invalidate the difference, quite clearly, the difference, between Faith, as we understand it now, and Faith as a belief - 'cos it's the emotional equivalent of wisdom, then Faith as a belief could no longer apply, could it?

S: Eh, No.

Voices: Hmn

Abhaya: Like if it's something that you can't believe in but you're taking the plunge, the plunge into the dark and hope that it will turn out all right.

S: Right, yes, right

Abhaya: It's something much deeper than that.

S: Yes, Well it's almost a sort of certainty.

S: I think the word certainty is used isn't it?

Abhaya: I think it's very hard, maybe just me because of my background of getting rid of associating Faith with uncertainty.

S: Well, there are degrees of Faith obviously. Sometime you may have enough Faith to commit yourself, but not enough Faith to know.

Padmava- It's really profound actually with Faith, it really does - really high. j ra:

S: Well, this is what gives, I think, a completely different dimension to Tibetan Buddhism. I would say that Singalese usually, good Buddhists in many respects, do not have Faith. This might seem a very surprising statement but this is what I felt after being in contacts with many of them - they don't have Faith. They, you mix with Tibetan Buddhists and then you mix with Singalese Buddhists and you really see the difference. It's true. I'd say many Burmese have Faith, but maybe I can't generalise too much, but certainly I don't remember meeting I think any Singalese Buddhists who had Faith in that sort of way that the Tibetans had. Maybe I didn't meet enough Singalese Buddhists but I certainly met a lot. I hardly met any Tibetans who didn't have at least some touch of this kind of Faith; many had it in a quite marked degree. I hope I'm ending enchantment to the view, but I think it does in general hold good, this statement.

339

"BMP/12" Page 10

Asvajit: Eh. They had contact with quite a large number of enlightened people.

S: Yes, the enlightened teachers lived in this sort of climate, as it were, climate of Faith. They are also helped by that to become, you know, great Spiritual teachers. If you're living in an atmosphere of scepticism, cynicism & Doubt and Materialism, well even if you have got some Faith yourself it, you're not very much helped by that sort of environment.

Pause S: All right lets go on.

Kamala- "wherever one may arrive at by being led sila: confidence is the best  
vehicle Therefore, the intelligent person Sticks close to confidence

In people without confidence Positive qualities are not produced just as a seed consumed by fire Cannot become a green sprout"

S: That's quite an important statement "in people without confidence positive qualities are not produced" This is confidence in the case of Shradha hmn. It's the root, the mother positive qualities.

Pause S: Right go straight on then

Kamal- "Thus it has been stated that all bright qualities come in the wake asila: of  
confidence trust, and so the statement 'where the root of confidence is made firm' in the  
Sikasamucoaya explains that confidence trust is the foundation of all the paths. The great

personality and teacher Nagarjuna also states in the byang chub I am gyi rim pa's table of content: "The root is the development of confidence. The root of everything happy is this trusting confidence."1

S: Hmn. So this just about sums it up "The root is the development of confidence, The root of everything happy is this trusting confidence.

Voices: Hmn.

S: And one could say another sign of confidence is a sort of, not exactly a respect, I don't think we have a word, a sort of care. The way that you care for certain things hmn. or you have regard for them, or you observe them. Eh?

Mark A sense of responsibility. Barrett:

S: A sense of responsibility towards them yea? It goes back in a way to the old meaning, perhaps the original meaning of, the work religion, it means to observe. For instance, in that way you observe the weather, or observe the signs. You observe certain things. You are very careful about them, very mindful of them huh, very circumspect, almost fearful in this sort of context, so when you have Faith, you know, you almost adopt that sort of attitude though in a much more sort of positive and happy way.

340

"MBP/12" Page 11

S: Yea, you're very careful about everything that concerns the object of Faith, very mindful, very regardful, very scrupulous hm., very thoughtful.

Abhaya: Yea, I sometimes feel that this regard for detail perhaps in trivial ways relating to - there is a disregard for this. Perhaps it's because of our conditioning.

S: Hmn.

Abhaya: Because we are brought up in a sceptical sort of environment.

S: Quite

Abhaya: There is a tendency to treat the embellishment of religion

S: Yes. Carelessly

Abhaya: Carelessly. It's almost a bad habit.

S: Hmn.

Voice: Hmn.

Sagramati: Well people think you're a bit naive, if you're like that.

S: Or fussy

Sagramati: You feel like sometimes they might sneer at you.

Abhaya: That's right

Sagramati: So, again how can you contend with Faith?

S: Hmn. Well also there is a difference between doing the same things just because they give you pleasure and doing them out of Faith, like decorating the shrine : - you could do it because you get pleasure out of doing it which could be not much more than an Aesthetic pleasure, but you could do the same thing, in a sense go through the motions out of Faith yea? Yea.

Hmn.

Padma- I think that's something you know really good about things like the four vajra: foundation yogas where you have to do them a hundred thousand times.

S: Yea.

Padma- You know it's not like you just do them because you enjoy them, you've got to do a certain amount, if you really want to get going, you know, and you've got a goal so no matter what, you really keep going, if you really take them on properly.

Pause

341

S: All right, let's go on to the next one, hmn. You note, incidentally, that Faith is innumerate first, yea, of all the positive mental events. As far as I know that it is innumerate first in all the different traditions of the AbhidharmaW~~~. . Perhaps is indicative of its importance, huh?

Abhaya: "Self Respect The Abhidarmasamuccaya explains self respect as follows: What is self respect? It is to avoid what is objectional as far as I see it and its function is to provide a basis for refraining from evil behaviour It is to refrain from what is objectionable by having made oneself the norm

S: What is meant by having made oneself the norm? This gives the clue to the meaning of this particular quality. Its hiri, isn't it?

Padma- Made oneself the part. vajra:

S: Hmn?

Padma- Made oneself the part vaj ra:

S: Eh, no, no

Abhaya: Made oneself the judge

S: Er, in a way, but even more than that, eh, it's sort of feeling:- "How could I do such a thing". In that way it's self respect. "It is not proper that I should do such a thing, this is not becoming. This would be very demeaning) I would be demeaning myself if I did such a thing. How could I tell a lie". It's that sort of healthy self respect. This is what is meant by having made oneself the norm. Yea, you make yourself at your best the norm for your every day behaviour as it were. Therefore, you think "How could I possibly do such a thing. This is not worthy of me". Mmn, yes? So this is Hiri? yea? And this is regarded as a very important quality or attitude in Buddhism. Heri and Ottopa, - the next one is Ottopa hmn, decoram as it's called here, - are jointly referred as the two Lokapales. the two guardians of the world. So in what respect are Heri and Ottopa, that is self respect and decoram, the two guardians of the world?- There would be no social order without them, no proper social life without them, no civilised existence without them. So they are called the two lokapals, the two world guardians. "What is self respect". It is to avoid what is objectionable as far as I see it. Eh? And its function is to provide a basis for refraining from evil behaviour". This doesn't bring out the meaning of hiri clearly - The real meaning is brought out when the author of this book says, "By having made oneself the norm". Let just see what the Siddhi says. Long time while finding the place This doesn't help all that much. "It is the nature of the sense of shame" - This is translated shame here,

342

'1MBP/12" Page 13

S:

to revere and respect good dharmas,. These sentiments being chosen by the Yogin both by reason of his own power and by reason of the power of the Dharma. It's special activity consist in counteracting and thwarting shamelessness and arresting all evil acts of body and mind. that is to say, with his esteem for the Dharma the Yogin reveres virtue, respect good Dharmas, feels the shame of his transgressions and evil acts, comes back to strenuousness and ceases from all evil acts". Hmn. So here it is out of respect for himself and his esteem for the dharma yea. So it's his esteem for himself, his self respect. His healthy self respect which is really the operative factor.

Padma- Has this anything to do with something like vajra pride? vajra:

S: At it's highest developement, in the Tantric context this is what it is Vajra pride or Buddha pride. How could a Buddha, which is what I essentially am, ever commit such an action. Therefore, I shall not commit it. How could I commit it?

Vimi lemi- tra: This is the pride of the Bodhicharya A'Aatara

S: Yes, it figures quite preminately in the Dodhicharya A~atara. Yes. So this mental event of self respect is~considered~Ve~ry, very, import- ant in Buddhism. It's mentioned in all the schools. It mentioned repeatedly in Pali texts yes, along with the next one hm. Let's see what the next one is because we can understand the two better by con- trasting them

Sagarnati: Decorum

S: Ottopa in Pali, what is it in sanskrit?

Padma- Appotrapa pani:

S: By the way, speaking of Sanskrit - Lama Govinda has something to say about Hrih in his foundation of Tibetan Mystism,'doesn't he? Hrih is the Bija mantra of Amitaba, isn't he? What colour is Amitaba.

Voices: Red.

S: Red, so lama Govinda says, or he suggests that Hrih in the sense of ~c1f respect or shame is a sort of blush of shame, a red blush of shame which comes to your face when you've done something wrong, which you know is wrong. This is quite interesting sort of associa- tion.

Upasakas: Is it the same word then?

S: It is the same word yes, Hrih

?: ?

S: Hmn.

Padma- I think there was a connection but I just kind of dismissed it. vajra: I didn't think it would be

S: Hmn. Yes.

Asvajit: It's also the seedsyllableof AvaloiC~tes~vara

S: Yes, Yes

S: Alright, so what is decorum Hmn? What are the other translations of this?- moral dread, fear of consequences, no, no.

Laughter S: Let's leave that.

Sagramati: The Abhidharmasamuceaya explains decorum as follows: "What is decorum? It is to avoid what is objectionable in the eyes of others and has the function of doing just that."

S: Hmn. Just read the next line too.

Sagramati: "It is an avoidance of evil action from making others the norm"

S: This is what it is but there is one very important work left out. A very important term. Yea?

S: Whisper. What is that?

Sagramati: The other is a Spirtual Friend

S: Not only Spirtual Friend, the wise. Yea

Sagramati: Ah; the wise.

S: Again~and again in the Pali Texts and you know Sanskrit Buddhists texts you get the statement:- "Not doing something for which you would be blamed by the Wise Hm. So this is making others the norm but the emphasis is on the wise - Otherwise if you take it literally. "It is an avoidance of evil" er, "It is to avoid what is objectionable in the eyes of others" Hmn.

Voices: Yes

S: Well, that isn't nearly enough, is it? Hmn. It must be the avoidance of what is objectionable in the eyes of others who are wise. Otherwise, you'll just be having to satisfy public opinion and convention all the time and this is actually what the Pali texts say and the Sanskrit texts repeatedly. "Avoid an action for which others who are wise would blame you".

Abhaya: So, that's a bad translation then.

344

"MBP/12" Page 15

k

S: Er, it's not a complete definition. Probably the Abhidarmussamuccaya does' just say that as translated but even the Abhidarmasamuccaya then will seem to have missed the main point or at least part of the main point. So does one find this very helpful, huh? To think well I shouldn't~~~is, If I do this or such and such people whom I respect as my Spiritual Friends, who are wiser than I am will blame me. They won't be happy. But what is important to distinguish it is that this does not mean refraining from doing the unskillful action out of a sense of guilt. It's quite different from that eh?

Voices: Hmn.

S: So can you see the difference, or feel the difference? That you don't want to disappoint them, you've got a real liking for your Spiritual Friends, if it's a question of Spiritual Friends, a real regard for them. There is no question about feeling guilty about doing something that they wouldn't like you to do. You genuinely would not want to do that. Hmn? There is no question of your refraining from the action of which they disapprove being motivated by a feeling of guilt. It's quite different from that. Hmn?

Padma- You're consciously putting yourself in that position if you take a vow. vajra: in front of a lot of other people around.

S) In a way you are yes. Especially with the Buddha around as it were, yea? In a way the Buddha if you take the vow in front of the Shrine and all that - In a sense you are calling the Buddha to witness, and all the Bodhisattvas - to speak of the Arahats eh?

A laugh

S: But even without making a vow you reflect well what would they think if they knew? They wouldn't like it. They wish, they would like me to develop, they would like me to grow. This is going to hold me back. I don't want to disappoint them, I don't want to let them down. But this is a healthy, positive feeling not associated with a feeling of guilt. And I emphasise this because it is very easy for us here not to do something because people will blame us for it out of a sense of guilt hmn. This guilt is associated with Fear of withdraw~ of affection. Our Spiritual Friends aren't going to withdraw their affection even in a sense however bad we become; - that affection will always be there. That care will always be there. Huh? So, we've nothing to fear in that respect. There is no question of our losing their affection but we just don't want to do anything that they wouldn't be happy with. Because you have complete confidence that if they wouldn't be happy with it, it just wouldn't be good for us huh? So we ought not to be doing it.

Padma- Is that, is this sort of er, em, mental event. You know, like, in the vajra: sutra of Golden Light where we say may the Buddhas forgive my faults with mind attentive is it, well not in the sense of guilt but in this, in this sort of sense, that you don't to eh, you know, you don't want to displease them because eh..

345

"MBP/12" Page 16

S: But in a quite positive way. Not that you're afraid or that you've anything in a sense to lose. Eh? Not of a worldly nature or of a group nature anyway, yes? hmn. But you know, you as it were use the thought of what they are expecting of you and the way they look at you eh? As a support to yourself in moments of weakness. yea. Because in a way you share their view, I mean, at least your better self shares their view. You've chosen them to be your Spiritual Friends. That's way you've chosen them Huh? So to help re-inforce as it were, you know, your better self against your worst self. Let's the rest of this section because that deals with both self respect and decorum. So self respect is really more like shame isn't it? And decorum is more like fear of blame hmn. Do you see that?

Voice: Hmn.

S: Self respect isn't a bad expression so self respect and decorum - decorum isn't really very good.

Abhaya: It's something to do with etiquette

S: No too much of you know ?

Abhaya: So what would be, sorry, what would be good?

S: So, self respect or shame and fear of blame. We don't have a single word for that, do we?

Abhaya: No

Pause

S: Moral dread and that~s quite inappropriate isn't it? Fear of consequences that arise from without. Tell me what is this "M.A.", where do you get that?

Sagramati: Ah, that's the Manual of Abhidhamma

\_ Oh dear!

Sgramati: Laughs

S: Whose manual?

Sagramati: The translation by ~arada (TheYa)

S: Of Abhidhammatasanghaha

Sagramati: Yes

Sagramati: When I went to the eh, the class where they done that

S: Huh!

346

Sagramati: The guy expressed it as you wouldn't have a slash in the street because a policeman might catch you! In other words .... (laugh)

S: You wouldn't have a what?

Sagramati: Well you wouldn't sort of urinate

S: Oh I see, sorry!

Laughter

S: I'm not sort of up with the latest idicims

Laughter still in progress

That's no idi~m

S: No, that's eh.. Well at nine years old

Laughter

S: No, just out of date

S: Well, that is just what it isn't. I mean it is, you know, that would just be fear of convention or or so on. Fear of people for whom you have no respect. Yea. So it certainly isn't that. I mean he's completely wrong. Well, who on earth said that?

Sagramati: That's Dettavilland - Nye

S: No

Padma- He's a bit of a Vajra:

S: Well, that is the whole emphasis, it's eh, you know, it's eh, the wish to avoid what is objectionable in the eyes of others who are wise. Yea. Anyway lets go on to that concluding paragraph.

Asvajit: "The difference between self respect and decorum is that, despite their similarity in avoiding evil actions when the chance of doing evil actions is close at hand, self respect means to refrain from evil actions in view of the consideration, "This is no part of mine".

S: This~is:~This is not worthy of me. This is not appropriate to me.

Asvajit: "Decorum means to refrain from evil action by haing made others the norm in view of the consideration. "It is not appropriate to do so because others will despise me".

S: Despise is not really quite a happy word here. Others will feel grieved Others will feel sorrowful on my account for my sake, yea It's a feeling for which there doesn't seem to be any word in English.

347

"MBP/12" Page 18

Asvajit: The primary realm of restraint is the fear that one's guru and teacher and other people deserving respect would be annoyed. ? ? S: Again aAn-is not,-it's more like troubled on your account concerned and almost hurt, huh? Again not on their own account but for your sake.

Padma- As you pointed out. They represent your better self vajra:

S: Yes, quite, yes.

Padma- Your deal vajra:

S: Yes. 'Cos sometimes it can be mutual between people, you know, at one time you're his better self and another he's your better self. It's not a static sort of thing. The function is sort of interchangeable.

Padma- The statement that the function of self respect and decorum is the vajra: basis for refraining from evil action properly emphasizes the necessity of these two in refrainin~ from evil action by body, speech and mind, because if self respect and decorum are not there, one is incapable of restraining any evil action. If there is no fear about the result that might come from one's own action and rio fear that the guru, teacher and others deserving respect would be annoyed, there is no chance that evil behaviour will ever stop.

S: Hmn. That's quite a consideration. If there is no fear about the result that might come from one 5 own actions there is, no fear with regard to the law of Karma, and no fear that the guru,~teacher and others deserving respect will be annoyed, "There is no chance that evil behaviour will ever stop" Do you think there is any other possibility of it stopping?

Padma- Yes, one is enlightened pani:

S: Hmn. But how would you get there?

EH.

S: Is there any other possibility of it stopping?

Vimila- Well, if one enjoys certain states of mind which, em, which you couldn't mitra: do those kind of things in.

A Voice: No

S: So, at least it's a very, very important factor hmn. And again, this is one of the great functions of the Spiritual Community and if for instance the second of these two was explained in the way that you've mentioned, it really means that the person~giv~ingthat~cxplanation hadn't understood, really, the difference between the group and the Spiritual Community. This is what it implies.

34

"MBP/12" Page 19

Voices: Yea, Hmn.

Sagramati: Well even the difference between conventional morality and er. natural morality.

S: Right, yes, right which is you know a distinction clearly made in the Theravada tradition as it is in Buddhism generally. Pakkati(i)&la and Panati(?)sila. I mean it isn't any offence against natural morality to commit that particular action in the street, yea? It may be an offence against conventional decency. Anyway, we come next to a set of three quite different terms - I think we'll leave those till tomorrow, especially as the thrid of them goes right into Buddhist literature hm. and spends quite a bit of time on that. Any further point arising with regard to what we've done so far today? Long pause.

Kamala- They do seem to go together. sila:

S: Hmn, the three you mean. Yes, very much so. Because in a sense one could say that self respect implies Faith in onself and fear of blame implies Faith in others, Fa~th in

Spiritual Friends, Faith in the wise hm. That they are the wise, that they have your best interest at heart, and would be genuinely grieved to see you acting against your own best interest.

Voice: Hm. Hm.

Pause

S: I think there are quite a few emotions for which we don't have any terms in English

Voices: Hm.

S: Perhaps rather complex and subtle emotions, hm.

Mark In the case of things like decorum Barrett:

S: Hm.

Mark If we didn't have sort of manners and decorum as the word is used in Barrett: the West, then there probably would be but that sort of general kind of decorum tends to cover the whole lot doesn't it?

S: Eh. Wherever there is a group there will be certain things which are acceptable to the group, you know, certain modes of behaviour are acceptable to the group, and you know the interest of the peace and quiet, one may well have to conform, knowingly and awarefully. Certainly if in that conforming there goes against one's personal development. But one must be able none the less to distinguish quite clearly the group from the Spiritual community and conforming to the requirements of the group and living up to the genuine Spiritual Expectations with regard to oneself, of other members of the Spiritual Community. Those are two quite different things, yes, hm. This is not to say that one need go against decorum of the

group wantonly, without proper reason. That just makes trouble for oneself.

349

S: But, if the decorum of the group insists upon something which is definitely opposed to one's own individual spiritual development then you may have to flout the decorum of the group, and take the consequences.

Vimil- It's often the attitudes of groups of people or communities which are against one's growth and one's spiritual ideal. You have to be quite careful that you don't fall in with that.

S: Hmn. hmn.

Asvaji: So that was quite evident in certain parts of Brighton until fairly recently, whereupon, it seemed as if there was sort of expectation that one must behave in a certain way socially. Going to parties and things like that.

S: Hmn. When you say one, you mean

Asvaji: I mean me

(Laughter)

S: Yes, yes, and Order Member. Well, perhaps they just didn't know any better, you know, they hadn't had much experience of Order Members and how they behave. Maybe some Order Members they'd met did go to parties.

Mark Giggle Barrett:

Manjuva- I think I find this fear of blame and decorum really quite a difficult thing to, em, to experience because

S: To distinguish you mean?

Manjuva- No, I can distinguish. I can understand it because I, you know, I've had some experience of it but I feel myself that that's the sort of emotion that I'm a bit frightened of

S: Hmn. Well both or

Manjuva- em, no the one based on others really

S: Well, both are based on others but different kinds of others, hmn. You're speaking only about, you're speaking only about the two kinds of decorum or about self respect and decorum?

Manjuva- Self respect and decorum

S: Ah!

Manjuva- Self respect is. No I don't think I would do something that would destroy myself in my own eyes, em, but as far as destroying or doing something that would make

others sorrowful for my activity. I find it difficult to comfortably settle myself in that emotion because eh.

350

"MBP/12" Page 21

S: But your not refraining from it just because it would make them sorrowful, but because you have faith in them; and also because you have taken them as your Spiritual Friends so that they can as it were when necessary remind you of what you ought to be doing which is your own ideal, huh, which you have chosen for your self, not just something which they are imposing on you. In a way you ask them to act as your reminders.

Asvajit: I mean the function of the Spiritual Community is very important

S: Hmn.

Asvajit: It's something that I felt quite strongly right from the beginning but I must confess I've not always followed.

S: Hmn. Pause. It also suggests that one must be very much in touch with the Spiritual Friends or the Spiritual Community, or the wise. They must~be some kind of distant sort of slightly threat- ening body of people. You must be in close almost familiar contact with them for that sort of relection to have the right sort of effect.

Padma- There is a, there is a line in the Bodhicharriaavitarra which goes vajra: something like, "Mindfulness is easily generated when living with a teacher", which sort of suggests that if youare~unmindful it kind of will invoke this em, sorrow in your teacher but it also goes on to say Buddhas and Bodhisattvas are everywhere unimpeded, so even i-f your out of touch in a way you can still sort of bear that in mind.

S: Yes, but you have to be above to feel it rather strongly, Yes, after all, every Christian believes that the eyes of Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good. Yea. I mean, Christians literally believe it. God sees everything. Well, yes he does, if you believe in God, that's the sort of God you believe in. He sees every single thing that you do, in every instant. But I mean, you don't quite believe in Christians, they do all sorts of things that surely God would not like to see them doing! So, I think if anything, the sort of the fear almost of, eh, you know, people your actually in contact with, eh, is far more effective that the fear of

Padma- I would agree vajra:

S: God or Buddha or Bodhisattvas or so on. I mean there are many good Catholics are far more afraid of the local Priest than they are of God or even the Pope. (Pause) I mean Pope (the poet that is) says eh, "should I not be proud to see men not afraid of God afraid of me"

Mark Giggle Barrett:

351

"MBP/12" Page 22

S: So, I think it is the actual Spiritual Friends or the actual presence of the wise that one needs. And one needs to be in pretty close contact with them, pretty regular contact, for this particular mental event to become operative. I think the thought~~of them there in- the distance somewhere isn't enough, or that they might get to know, - no I don't think that is enough.

Padma- I was just thinking in terms if you ever sort of find yourself in a vajra: position where you might be away

S: Oh yea, then take whatever help you can

Padma- Obviously there is no substitute for the real thing vajra:

S: Well, there are degrees of the real thing. Anyway, any further point? In these three. Pause.

S: All right then, let's close for today.

352

"MBP/12" Page 23

Day Tape 12 Side

S: We come up to Page 43. Alright, non-attachment, huh? It eh, what is it? Alobha?

S: Pause. All right lets sts~rt reading then.

Sagramati: "The Abhidharm a samuccaya explains non-attachment as follows:- What is non-attachment? It is not to be attached to a mode of life and all that is involved with it. It functions in providing the basis for not getting caught up in evil action It is an awareness in which there is no discontentment and no attachment.

S: I wonder what is meant by not to be attached to a mode of life? Perhaps he means a mode of existence. Hmn. A mode of conditioning, a mode of being. I wonder if the Siddhi throws any

Dharma- Perhaps it's not to be attached to the mode of existence where in there pala: is discontentment.

S: And it's this - "What is non-courtness? It is the nature of this caitta to remain detached from and unfluenced by the 3 states of mental existence in the 3 dhatus and the causes of this triple existence. The three dhatus of course are karnaDhatu ~~a dathu and aru~a dhatu." Hmn. That makes it clear, the three dhatus.hmn. "It is the nature of this by this mental exerts that is, to remain detached from existence". Eh. This is where the, the way of life come in, huh? In the three dhatus, that is to say in the Kama loka or Kama dhatu, nipa loka or nipa dhati and arupa loka or arupa dhatu- and the cuases of this triple existence. It's special activity consists in counteracting courtness and accomplishing good deeds". So the mode of life is, eh, mode of conditioned existence. Hmn, in the sangsara. "It functions in providing the basis for not being caught up in evil action. It is an awareness in which there is no discontent, and no attachment." So discontent is also in a way a sign of attachment. It's a sort of attachment to something you haven't got.

Mark Saying that you can only be discontented with something which you are Barrett: attached to. If you're not attached to anything your

S: If there is no attachment, there is no discontent. You are usually discontented because you haven't got the thing that you are attached to. You've got something else!

Mark (giggles) Barrett:

Padma- That. Does that have a sort of positive twist at all? I mean like, er, vajra: with not being a buddha? Or you know not, er, discontented.

S: You could be discontented with you know, not being a Buddha. That would suggest that you had a sort of an attachment to becoming a Buddha. A sort of greed eh? Not a genuine sort of Spiritual aspiration. You know, wouldn't it be nice to be a Buddha? Huh? Non-attachment is not one of the most popular virtues nowadays is it? Hmn?

?: I think it is regarded slightly as an evil action.

S: Hmn. But there is the fact that, eh, non-attachment is innumeration here as a mental event huh? It suggests that non-attachment has a certain sort of eh, positive nature of its own. It's not merely an absence of attachment.

Abhaya: I was trying to think of word, positive word but I couldn't.

S: No, It's more like content. Hm. Because, eh, at least content is the positive counterpart of discontent but what is the positive counter part of non-attachment? Is it a sort of serenity?

?: Freedom

S: Freedom, hmn. Maybe freedom goes a bit too far. Though it certainly is a kind of freedom, -a form of freedom.

Sagramati: It's more like the reason why you are not attached.

S: Hmn. Yes, yes

Sagramati: Well you are not attached because you have got this other mental event going.

S: Yes4 called non~attachment

Sagramati: Called non-attachment

S: So what is that? What would be a much more positive term for it?

Sagramati: Contentment. Hmn.

S: Contentment seems to be the nearest doesn't it.

Padma- I don't know. Discontent seems so sort of er, ingrained. I don't know vajra: that's what I feel. (Laughs) and attachment. It really seems as if it's really ingrained.

S: Well we do use the word discontent, huh, in a positive sense, don't we. We speak of a

devine discontent, something like that. But that is more akin to you know realisation of dukka hm. But there is a discontent which. It's more like disgruntlement isn't it?

354

"MBP/12" Page 25

Voices: Hmn.

S: Yes?

Voices: Yes

S: But it would be a good idea if we had a more positive term for this non attachment, otherwise it seems as though non attachment is a purely negative state consisting merely of the absence of attachment. Hmn.

Damma- What does detached mean then? palla:

S: It means\* well, DE - TACHED. Your attachment is taken away from some- thing. Non attachment is simply the state of not being attached. Detached suggest possibly an object to which you would be attached or perhaps were attached but you are not attached to it. Huh, But non ~tt~chment seems to have you know, no reference to any particular object. Hmn.

Manjuva- It's a much more integrated state, is it? jra:

S: Hmn. Yes, yes, It's a more balanced state. Yes, one could say that non attachment is a state or a condition of being balanced upon oneself. It's a state of confidence in a way.

Asvajit:- Given by the image of a soap bubble floating around.

S: Yes. (Pause) The traditional comparism is I think a thistle down you know floating in the wind or on the wind.

Voices: Hmn.

S: There is also a not sticking in there. A not sort of setting down

Sagramati: Doesn't, ~m, this traditionally suggest, em, dana

S: Et. yes, yes, yes

Sagramiti; But dana seems to be more the practise of reaching a state of non attach- ment

S: Hmn.

Abhaya: Like a function of non-attachment

S: Well there is either a discipline, you know, to gain the state of non- attachment or it is an expression of the non attached state itself. But here in the sitti? it does talk of counteracting co~etousness and accomplishing good deeds of,~eh, "attachment"~to what is positive. Hmn One is detached from what is unskilful because one is attached to what is skilful.

Voices: Hmn.

355

"MBP/12" Page 26

S: Non attachment is also a sort of non involvement isn't it. It functions in providing the basis for not being caught up in evil~ action. Hmn. (Pause) It is also a state of self containedness. Hmn. Non attach- ment. Do you see what I mean?

Voices: Hmn.

S: Non attachment is also a sort of non involvement isn't it. It functions in providing the basis for not being caught up in evil action. Hmn. (Pause) It is also a state of self containedness. Hmn. Non attachment. Do you see what I mean?

Voices: Mmn

S: Self containedness. You don't, he, feel any need to reach out beyond yourself for something that would as it were, you know, complete you, huh. or make you feel better. Make you feel whole.

Padma- Suggest individuality vajra:

S: It suggest individualities.

Asvajit: Self sufficiency

S: Self sufficiency yes. Though self sufficiency tends to have eh, rather hard sort of overtones, doesn't it. Yes. Hmn.

Sagramati: Independence.

S: In a rather or slightly negative sense

Manjiva- Could you go into that a little bit. The difference between eh, the jra: individual and individualism. You know, this hardened individuality.

S: Well individualism is much more like egotism, isn't it? It's more the assertion of yourself or your ego, over against others. Hmn. Even in competion with others. But in the case of an individual there isn't anything like that. Individuality suggest eh, self awareness. It sug- gests responsibility. It suggest objectivity, sensitivity, Hmn. But if you are being individualistic, assertion of selfhood, and assertion of the ego. You know it suggests basic insecurity and uncertainty, huh.

Manjuva- So would that have to be preliminary to becomming an individual. jra:

S: No. I think pronounced individualism is quite neurotic

Padma- Surely that is the opposite extreme. vajra:

356

"MBP/12" Page 27

S: Yes. I think what you start off with is your sort of, er, heal thy self identity, a memeber of the group, huh and the tendancy to assert yourself eh. hmn. To stand up for yourself at least hm. With the support of the group. The feeling that the group is behind you. Er, but he, individulism seems, to go, you know, very much beyond that. That is the sort of behaviour you engage in when you feel very insecure, when perhaps you feel you don't have the support of the goup behind you either implicitly or explicitly and eh, when you havn't as yet developed, eh, any more individuality on which you can fall back, yea, hm. (Pause)

?: You say it soundsegotistically, setting yourself up as independant of the group is still

dependant

S: Yes, whereas you are still dependant. Yes, hm. yes. This a pseudo individuality

Abhaya: It's a way of drawing the groups attention to yourself.

S: Therefore, also it is to a great extent infantile and regressive hm. It isn't natur~~  
Hm. You expect, without being an individual your expect, more attention and consideration from other members of the group than as a presumably or ostensibly grown up and Mature person, you're really entitled to that sort of attention but you continue to claim it. Hm. You expect to be, you know, indulged in. Eh. Little mistakes and that sort of thing are overlooked. Hm. You expect to be given special treatment. (Long pause)

S: No doubt a lot more could be said upon the subject than that. I think that is the broad outline of the difference between the two.

Marju- I think there is a genuine danger to interpret, em, particularly your vajra: teachings on the Development of the Individual in that way. If some one's tending towards individualism they can use these teachings as a support for their, em, you know, for their neurosis if you like.

Sagramati: So, if they claim that you're not treated them as an individual. In actual fact they are saying that you're not giving in to my infantile

S: Right Yes.

Padma- I had this experience at the Four Winds Retreat with somebody. And er, vajra: I had to tick him off because I thought he was behaving in a really quite out of place

S: Yes

Padma- And I just said to him "No, you're not an individual". vajra:

S: Hm. mm. Well, you get the same sort of thing with women, huh. You know, when they say that you're not treating them as an individual. Eh, actually what they want in some cases is not be treated as an individual but to have their individualism catered for. Individualistic tendency's taken for. And you get it in other ways as well. So how is one going to avoid this sort of confusion?

Abhaya: You just have recognise the symptoms. Well both in yourself and others

S: Well one has to make it much more clear perhaps what an individual really is.

Padma- It seems really quite high sort of state vajra:

S: Hm. hmn. I think if anyone has listened to any of the lectures in which I have dealt with this topic at some length, huh. They couldn't have had that sort of misunderstanding. They come along and they hear references of being an individual and they might well misunderstand that huh? I also think that in talking about er, this aspect of the ideal of being an individual one doesn't always speak of it in such a way as to suggest self assertion. Yes, hmn. For instance, I think more often that not, when we speak in terms of being an individual, being yourself, you know, not letting other people tell you what to do and all that kind of thing, we don't speak of it so much in terms of being very responsible, or being very concerned about others, yea? So you know, well I was going to say there are equally important aspects of individuality but in a way they are more hmn? The, the assertive part is only depending on circumstances eh. If the group as such gets in the way of your being an individual, well you have to assert yourself as an individual but that is as it were ~ttrensic to being an individual. You might have a sympathetic group or a sympathetic environment and therefore feel no need to assert yourself as an individual. For self assertion is as it were, not any part of the definition, hmn, of being an individual. I mean if you are an individual, if circumstances require it, you can assert yourself as such hmn. But it isn't intrinsic to being an individual that you are asserting yourself all the time as it were. But it is intrinsic to the nature of being an individual that you are responsible all the time, that you are aware all the time. That you are concerned all the time. So perhaps we should stress these aspectsos being an individual much more than we do.

Sagramati: But that seems of imply Faith in a sense.

S: Hmn.

Padma- The individual, I get the feeling is quite content. Eh, he doesn't sort vajra: of have to please anybody. I mean he just sort of em.

S: On the other hand he doesn't go out of his way to displease anybody.

Padma- Yea, yea, that too, hmn, yea. vaj ra:

Dharma- that the last two events that we've been pala: talking about, decorum and self respect. S: Hmn. Yes. Pause.

S: But often there is a tendency on the part of people to think that if they just react strongly they are showing that they are individuals.

Sagramati: But I think this has something to do with strength

S: Nothing to do with strength.

Sagramati: But the individual is going to be strong yea, therefore, they associate with being strong any strong emotion as being an individual emotion.

S: Yes, yes, even though it may in fact be highly reactive.

~mati: Yes, because it comes out of insecurity.

S: Hmn, there are at least two or three of our own friends who seem very prone to this individualistic interpretation of being an individual, huh, As for instance you show your individuality, you know, by not coming along to the Centre or not coming along to Order Meetings, arriving late, or something like that. It's supposed to show the fact that you are an individual you know, which is really ridiculous huh. It just shows you haven't grown up!

(Muffled laughter and murmurs) S: Well, doesn't it, huh? Voices: Yes.

Asvajit: I remember you saying that, er, if one is a true individual, you don't have to go out of your way to show it.

S: Hmn. Yes.

Padma- Hmn. Supposing you see somebody acting in an individualistic way, say  
Pani: another Order Member, presumably you have to be quite careful how you approach that person

S: Yes, you do. It's a bit difficult to generalise isn't it You just have to watch and wait for a favourable moment. Hmn.

Padma- Because that person like you say is probably neurotic in that sense may even pani:  
be reactive therefore if you suggest this, they 'll think in actual fact you're sort of putting something on to him, some authoritative figure, in actual fact they feel as a threat.

S: Yes.

Padma- To their individualism. And they react against that. pani:

359

"MBP/12" Page 30

S: Yes. Well this happens quite a lot. Perhaps not so much with Order Members but with quite a few who are not Order Member, yea. But sometimes even with Order Members in their weaker moments as it were, hmn. I mean, the minute that you start feeling that are being got at or pressure is being brought to bare on you he, you know, you are regarding the person, the dther Order Member or the Order itself as a sort of Authority ~even as a group hmn, and yourself as a sort of weak member of the group. Therefore you react, you assert yourself. In other words you act individualistically, behave individualistically.

Padma- If you think the Order or whatever are pressurising, you, you~must be vaja: seeing them as a group.

S: Yes.

Padma- It's the other way round. vaja:

S: Hmn. This one may say

Sagramati: Your obviously seeing the pressure

S: Hmn

Sagramati: Obviously you can see

No but pressure as a group

Sagramati: But your reaction to that is not reative in a sense, I mean you see the pressure and you see

S: flut if they do happen to do thatSuppose they themselves are acting in a group fashion.

Sagramati: Yes

S: As a member of a group rather than as a member of a Spiritual community. You see that but you-'re not going to feel it as pressure in a neurotic sort of way. It, I mean, you just feel a bit sorry or a bit amused.

Sagramati: Hmn. yea.

S: But it's not going to affect you~and you~re not going to react. You're certainly not going to feel your individuality threatened eh? If it can be threatened in that sort of a way it is not individuality it's just individualism and that should be threatened

Mark Laugh Barrett:

S: That's shown no mercy;; hmn? But one can see from time to time, people behaving in this really childish way which is supposed to, you know, demonstrate, their individuality and independence and freedom and creativity when you can see it's just,-you know, just childish.

S; Anyway, is that all about non-attachment? (Pause)

1Not to be attached to a mode of life, any mode of conditioned existence, That's also worth noting, not even to a happy successful one. Not even

to existence in a higher heavenly world. Being as it were quite indifferent even to that.  
(Pause ) Alright then, on to non-hatred, advesa or adosa.

Asvajit; "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains non-hatred as follows; What is non-hatred? It is the absence of the intention to

torment sentient beings, to quarrel with frustrating situations, and to inflict suffering on those who are the cause of frustration. It functions in providing a basis of not getting involved with evil behaviour."

S: Now read the prose part.

Asvajit; "It is an awareness in which there is no intention to inflict suffering since, in view of any one of the three possibilities by which I can become an object of hatred, the rise of hatred has been crushed."

S: 'The three possibilities by which I can become an object of hatred.' Can anyone think what these might be?

Padmavajra; By causing hatred, by sort of. ...

\_\_\_\_\_; Provocation?

Manjuvajra; Is that the three bases of....

Kamalasila; Body, speech and mind?

Manjuvajra; No, I was thinking of hatred, delusion and craving.

S: No, the three possibilities by which I can become an object of hatred to others, Well presumably one way is that you inflict suffering on them directly - what would be the other possibilities?

Asvajit; You inflict suffering on something that they love or have regard for?

S: Could be that. (Pause) There is a little bit in the Siddhi - 'It is the nature of this caitta, this mental event, to remain non-irritated by the three kinds of suffering and their causes.' We may get it from this. 'The three kinds of suffering are, suffering produced by direct cause, suffering by loss or deprivation, and suffering by the passing away or impermanence  
361

of all things.' So, you can become an object presumably, because, looking

2 at it in this light, you inflict suffering directly on someone, you give them a blow. Or, you take away something that they are fond of. And,

if you yourself are the object of their attachment, you become an object of hatred by just fading away. (Laughter)

\_\_\_\_\_; That was that last one?

S: Well, here it is, the third kind of suffering is that produced by the passing away or impermanence of all things. So taking these three, as applying to what the text says about the three possibilities, then, you arrive at the conclusion of the third way in which you can

become an object of hatred is by yourself being an object of attachment, and because you are an impermanent thing, you pass away, you grow old, you die. And actually you do sometimes find this. That when people lose their near and dear ones, sometimes there's a sort of resentment against the near and dear one for having, as it were, gone away! Have you ever seen or encountered this?

Manjuvajra; Yes      In the relationship.

S: Yes, right.

Manjuvajra; When she leaves you, you really hate her

S: Oh No, that's different, that comes under the second one. When you yourself are the object of attachment and you take yourself away, yes? And then you become an object of hatred, yes. But supposing you don't take yourself away, you remain, you know, faithfully with the one who is attached to you, but in the end you die. There can be a sort of resentment against you for dying! As though it was your fault. Or the person says, 'Why did this have to happen to me?', 'Why did he have to go?', 'Why did he have to die just now?'... 'When I needed him so much.' - or - 'When I needed her so much.' It might seem a bit far-fetched but these things do sometimes happen.

Vimalamitra; It's not necessarily against the person though, is it. It's also against the situation.

S; No, even against the person, though it's completely irrational and illogical, but even against the person. (Pause) Now, supposing, for instance, that someone has an accident. It's no fault of theirs whatever. But because

362

MBP/13      they have the accident they're incapacitated. You've got to look after

3      them. So you can get angry with them, even though it's not their fault! They're the victim, but still you get angry with them. Why? - because you've got to look after them. (Pause) Anyway it may not be this explanation actually - I'm just trying to find an explanation. Anyway, 'It's special activity consists in counteracting anger and accomplishing

good deeds.' Then there is a further point, 'When a good mind is born, whatever may be its object of perception, it always manifests itself as non-attachment in regard to existence and non-irritation in regard to suffering. This means that non-covetousness and non-anger are established in relation to existence and suffering. But it is not necessary for the mind actually to consider existence and suffering in order to manifest these two caittas.' Presumably not necessary for it to consciously think about them. It's almost as though it's a sort of natural endowment, that you are free from covetousness and free from anger, 'Similarly, the sense of shame and that of integrity', that is hri and ottapa, 'are established in relation to good and evil. But it is not necessary for the mind actually to experience good and evil in order to manifest these two caittas. It follows from this that non-covetousness and non-hatred accompany all good minds.'(Pause)

Sagaramati; Those two, they always, they must come together, to the extent you are in touch to that extent (you can get angry).

S: Yes.

Sagaramati; You can get out of it.

S: Yes. (Pause) Anyway, to go back to the Abhidharmasamuccaya's definition, 'What is non-hatred, it is the absence of the intention to torment sentient beings.' Not only do you not torment them, there is no intention to torment them. It's also 'the absence of the intention to quarrel with frustrating situations.' Sometimes you get angry just because a situation is painful and difficult and frustrating, or loaded with dukkha. And 'to inflict suffering in those who are the cause of frustration.' Non-anger also involves that absence ~ven of the intention to inflict suffering on those who are the cause of frustration, even when people are inflicting suffering on them in return, doesn't enter into your head. This is the sign of non-anger.

Vimalamitra; It kind of implies a kind of insight into the real, you know

S: It suggests that too, yes. 'It functions as providing a basis for not

MBP/13 getting involved with evil behaviour.' Why do you think they don't mention  
4 love or at least metta? Why is there no positive term do you think?

Sagaramati; Because that's to be developed, whereas this one is probably inherent.

S; But then it is a positive quality.

Sagaramati; I sort of meant anger is inherent, whereas metta is something to be developed.

S: But if you've got metta, then there is no anger. And if non-hatred is not merely the absence of hatred, if it is a positive quality in itself, why isn't that positive quality not just termed love, do you think, or metta?

Manjuvajra; Can it be equanimity, beyond that?

S: I think actually, myself, the reason is these three terms - non-attachment, non-hatred, and non-delusion have come down in Buddhist tradition, and are so firmly established that they continue to be used. Also, as I've pointed out on other occasions, words which are grammatically negative have a sort of positive connotation in Pali and Sanskrit. As with our English word 'immortal'. You don't think it, you don't feel, when you use the word 'immortal', that it simply means absence of mortality. It has a positive flavour of its own. So alobha, adosa, amoha have something of this sort of positive flavour. But it results in the corresponding positive quality, the quality which is the opposite of attachment, opposite of hatred, opposite of moha, having a sort of elusiveness. It's not very easy to get at. Maybe that's not a bad thing because you have to ask yourself, well, what actually is that feeling? You have to sort of try to capture that feeling, rather than just using the words and thinking, well, that's that, you know all about it. As we do with love, we use the word love and we think, well that describes it but love is totally ambiguous, there are so many different kinds of love. But when you have to sort of really think, what is that alobha, what is that adosa? - then you begin to get a sort of sense of the quality, that you can't just slip a label on it happily and then not think about it any further.

Kamalasila; I found it very helpful in the metta, to reflect on the fact that there shouldn't be any dislike in my metta.

S: Yes.

364

MBP/13      Karnalasila; That one should be trying to transform that. 5

S: Yes, (Pause) So "It is an awareness in which there is no intention to inflict suffering, since in view of any one of the three possibilities by which I can become an object of hatred, the rise of hatred has been crushed." That's not altogether clear is it?

Padmapani; No, it would be very hard in the third case - passing away, impermanence....

S: Well, this is just a possible interpretation I've suggested, in the light of the 'Siddhi' It may not in fact apply.

\_\_\_\_\_; That's true.

Padmavajra; That in fact suggests that you shouldn't get involved in sort of a .. where that can arise. .you should steer well away from that sort of thing.

Vimalamitra; Devadatta hated the Buddha.

S: Yes.

Padmavajra; Well, I'm not saying

S: The Buddha was not in any danger presumably of returning that hatred. But with us we usually find that hatred sparks off hatred, that hatred is, as it were, contagious.

Padmavajra; What I'm saying Padmapani, you shouldn't involve yourself in a relationship where that sort of a hatred like that just because you die...

Padmapani; Yes.

S: You know, if you involve yourself in relationships of any kind. I'm not only thinking of the 'dreaded' relationship, but relationships of any kind, when attachment is involved, hatred is bound to arise sooner or later. (Pause) Are they surprising - these terrible fights and quarrels, that arise in the context of the same dreaded relationship? Why are you surprised when you have your first quarrel? Why, it was inevitable. And therefore if your relationship is positive and hatred and quarrel free, you can be pretty certain then, if it's been going for some time, that it is not in fact based upon attachment.

365

MBP/13 S:(cont'd); If you go on happily and positively for a matter

6 of years and there aren't any quarrels, there aren't any experiences of violent hatred or auiger, well then you can be

pretty certain, provided of course you haven't both got so much into a rut that nothing is likely to disturb you. (Laughter) You can be pretty certain that attachment is not strongly present and that it is a relatively healthy relationship.

Padmapani; It seems that in that sense a healthy relationship ceases to be a relationship.

S: In the sense of the 'dreaded' relationship, yes.

Padmapani; It also makes a relationship in a way quite pointless.

S: Yes, Well, if you see someone you see them, if you don't you don't. Why speak in terms of

a relationship? (Pause) But 'relationship' suggests you've got to be together, you're officially together. Yes, and woe betide anyone who thinks you're not together; or who tries to prise you apart and treat you as distinct individuals.

Sagaramati; The three things stated from the Abhidharmasamuccaya, they seem to be like levels... It's much easier to work on the first level.

S: Yes, there are very few people who want actually to deliberately cause pain and suffering to others. (Pause) So do you think there is this sort of positive quality of non-hatred, which is distinct from metta?

Sagaramati; I can think of qualities distinct from metta but I wouldn't call them positive qualities.

Asvajit; There is I think. ...one may come up against a person who has quite a strong propensity for hatred and one can sort of just observe that, just not react to it. In such a situation, it's very very difficult, or the feeling of metta seems to be something else, I mean quite distinct.... from that non-reactivity.

S: Yes, because usually we found when we were studying the Bodhicaryavatara that Santideva, apparently following Mahayana tradition, regards ksanti or patience as the positive counterpart of anger, not metta. It would seem that metta, though it involves or takes for granted non-anger, goes beyond non-anger. Therefore, as you say, if you are in a situation with someone who is very angry with you, you can not get angry with him, you

366

MBP/13            can experience non-anger but you do not necessarily experience metta

7            towards him, but at least you experience non-anger. So, that does suggest that there is a distinct positive mental quality, a distinct mental event, called non-anger, which can not be identified with metta, though metta presupposes it, although it is an aspect of metta, perhaps, one could say.

Vimalamitra; You could also just be kind of objective in a situation, see what the situation is, what is likely to happen if you react and what's needed to be done to alleviate it.

Yes, I mean the author of the text says, 'It is an awareness, in which there is no intention' I don't know how literally we are to take that English word awareness here', but it is interesting that it is used. It is a form of awareness.

Kamalasila; Well, patience seems to have an element of awareness.

S: Yes.

S: As if you say, well what's the use of getting angry? What is really happening, why should I get angry? There's no reason for it! So there is an element of awareness, not to say even insight. I mean, I've taken the body, what's he done? He's only taken the stick! I'm just as much to blame as he is. What's the point of getting angry?

Sagaramati; You could say... I don't know, I would say, I've taken the body in order to become enlightened (Laughter) That'd be my logic.

S: He might say that I've taken the stick in order that you might become enlightened. (Laughter) To help you practise ksanti (Laughter) and you are refusing my co-operation.

Sagaramati; Yes!

S: This is what Santideva says, isn't it? Here are all these people trying to help you by beating you and kicking you and enabling you to practise ksanti and what do you do, you foolish man? You get angry with them!! (Laughter.) Well, let's go on to non-deludedness, amoha.

Padmavajra; " Non-deludedness. The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains non-deludedness as follows:

What is non-deludedness? It is a thorough comprehension of (practical) knowledge that comes from Enactment. instructions. thinking~

367

MBP/13 and understanding, and its function is to provide a basis for not becoming  
8 involved in evil behaviour."

S: Carry on with that last bit.

Padmav 'ra; "It is a distinct discriminatory awareness to counteract the delude ness that has  
its cause in either what one has been born into or what o e has acquired."

S: So w on-deludedness? 'It is a thorough comprehension of (practical)'

Confusion and

Sa ara ti; It's almost a sort of a counteract to advesa(?)

S: Ye , let's see what the 'Siddhi' says: "It is the nature of this caitta to unde stand principles and thin 5. Its special activit consists in counter ctin i norance and delusion and accomplishin ood deeds. Accordi to one opinion non-delusion is of the same nature as discern- ment, b cause the Abhidharma sa 5 that non-delusion has as its essential nature t e certitude which arises from retribution, instruction, demonstration and int ition." Seem to be the four things mentioned in the Abhidharmasamuccaya. "These", says the Tsar~i which is a commentary on~the Abhidharma by Sthiramati, "are re ectivel the varieties of inborn discernment, which corresponds to retr'butio, audition, which corresponds to instruction, co itation, which r sults: in- demonstration, and self-cultivation, which leads to the awakeni of intuition all of which have the qualit of certaint as their essenti l nature." This seems to throw some light doesn't it. (Pause) "It is a th rou h comprehension of practical knowled e which comes from maturation." This is what is here called 'retribution' - 'inborn discernment which corres- ponds t retribution.' Presumably a sort of understanding that oncuis born with - s a result of having developed ones understanding in previous lives. "Audition which corresponds to instruction": the non-deludedness that comes about as a result of instruction, then 'thinking' and 'understanding

MBP/13 'thinking' by turning over in your own mind. 'Cogitation which results 366

9 in deminstration' and 'self-cultivation' that is to say meditating upon ( ) which results in the intuitive understanding. So non-deluded- ness is a thorough comprehension of knowledge that comes either as a result of practice in the past, or instruction on the present, or turning over and becoming convinced in ones own mind in the presint, or as a result of wisdom which arises from meditation. So non-deludedness it seems can be of all these kinds, It's your natural sort of intelligence tobegim with, it's the under- standing you gain from study, the understanding you gain from reflection, the understanding that you gain from meditation.

\_\_\_\_\_; How is it different from wisdom then?

S: That is a point. I think this is discussed here because 'according to one opinion non-delusion is the same nature as discernment.' I think discernment here means wisdom. I believe the Sanskrit term isn't given; but again further

on this being the case why is non-delusion regarded as a good caitta instead of as a special caitta?' That's the question, you see, one of the special caittas was prajna. So why is non-delusion regarded as a good caitta, as a positive mental element, instead of being

regarded as a special caitta, i.e. as identical with wisdom? So there is a discussion about this.

\_\_\_\_\_ Are these special caittas the ones listed in the Sarvastivadin - its associations  
(Unclear )

No, we've done those. Those were the object-determining caittas. The fifth and last of the five object-determining caittas.

\_\_\_\_\_; No, I'm talking about (Unclear )

S: That's right. That was the fifth and the last of the object-determining caittas which are here called special caittas. Yes?

\_\_\_\_\_; Ah, right.

S: The point is that non-delusion has been defined in such a way as to suggest it's the same thing as prajna. 'Prajna' has already been enumerated as the fifth of the special caittas, that is, the object-determining caittas. So why is it included here as a positive mental event suggesting though it's been defined more or less in terms of prajna - why is it included here as a positive mental event when prajna has already been included as an object-determining event? Anyway, there now follows a short discussion about this. "Although non-delusion is discernment by nature and is essentially a special caitta,

369

MBP/13 still in order to indicate that the good aspects of discernment possess a super~0'r

10 power for the accomplishment of good acts, it is separately regarded as a good caitta, just as false views, drsti, which belong to the bad aspect of discernment because of their special power of causing grief and distress are specially regarded as fundamental klesas."

\_\_\_\_\_ Well, it's both.

S:Also, of course,we mustn't forget we're concerned with relations but not with things. There is that point too. But there's something more said., "According to another opinion, Dharmapala", that is Dharmapala, the commentator, the Abbott of Nalanda who was the personal teacher of (C~u~n )

, whose interpretation he usually follows in preference to those of the other nine commentators, "Non-delusion is not discernment - it has a separate self-nature." This is what he has to say, "For it is directly opposed to ignorance and like non-covetousness and non-anger is comprised among the roots of good." In a way it is more basic, almost, than prajna, he is saying. 1Another reason is that the Yogasastra, 57,says thQt~Ma.hakaruna - Great Com assion is com rised in non-an er and non-delusion not in the twenty-two J#R6~yA~ or roots. Now~ 'if non-delusion h~discern- ment as its essential nature1~ahakaruna,like the ten spiritual powers,Jetc.,

would be comprised in tk~ Indr'y~~ of discernment, the gthree~Wt~o0t~~CA~h-)~~ r -- \_\_\_\_ etc. Besides,if non-delusion had not a self-nature of its own, then~just

as harmlessness(which is non-anger by nature), equanimity.etc., are not real entities, it would not be a real entity. This would be contradictory to the Yogasastra~55,which says that among the eleven good caittas~threc only are conventional existences, that is; vigilance, equanimity and harm- lessness~a~ the others are real. It is true that the Abhidharmasamuccaya says that non-delusion is discernment by nature' but this text explains the nature of non-delusion in terms of its cause and fruit, just as it explains the nature of belief in terms of its cause (i.e. the understanding r~'ffl~t

which is resolve) and its fruit (i.e. ~~tdi IS, 2 desire? The cause of non-delusion is discern

ment." (pause) So what does one make of that discussion? It's interesting that ( Yveit C~v~~ ) says with regard to Dharmapala's opinion, 'According to another opinion' - he doesn't say it's right, he doesn't say it's wrong. My own impression is that he doesn't agree with it but out of respect for his teacher he doesn't say that he regards that opinion as wrong. I get the impression that he agrees with what was said before that;- that 'although non-delusion is discernm~nt by nature and is essentially a special caitta, still, in order to indicate that the good aspects of discrnment possess a superior power for the accomplishment of good acts, it is separately regarded as a good caitta just as false views, drstis, which belong to the

370

MBP/13 bad aspects of discernment, because of their special power of causing grief

11 and distress are specially regarded as fundamental klesas." In other words you must be prepared for a bit of overlapping. You are not concerned with mutually exclusive things which can be separately enumerated. What Dharmapala says is quite interesting, that amoha has a separate self nature because it is directly opposed to ignorance and like

non-covetousness and non-anger is comprised among the roots of good. But usually (

says quite categorically that this opinion is right or that opinion is wrong. Here he doesn't say anything because it is his teacher's opinion. But reading between the lines, it seems, he doesn't agree with or accept it; not that he even necessarily rejects it but he seems to favour the view I've just read for the second time but which seems reasonable. Do you see what that view consists in?

\_\_\_\_\_; No.

S: "Although non-delusion is discernment by nature" - prajna, wisdom by nature, "and is essentially a special caitta" - that is not denied - "still in order to indicate that the good aspect of discernment" - that is wisdom - "possesses a superior power for the accomplishment of good acts" - there's this power or function of making good acts possible by getting rid of deluded-ness; and in order to indicate, to emphasise that special power, 'prajna' or 'wisdom' as 'non-deludedness' is enumerated as a separate mental event, a positive mental event.

\_\_\_\_\_; So it's like wisdom manifesting itself on a different level.

S; You could say that but that's not the sort of language the Abhidharma uses. The Abhidharma, in fact, is careful to avoid such language.

Sagaramati; It seems more like seeing wisdom in terms of skilful and unskilful.

S: Yes, whereas as an object-determining mental event wisdom was seen primarily (to get) to closer and closer grips with the object. That was the context of the discussion there, in the case of the object-determining mental events. Each mental event gets to closer grips with the object, confronts it more directly. Wisdom most of all but here the consideration is not that it confronts the object or gets to grips with the object. Here the consideration is that it provides a basis for the performance of skilful actions.

Dharmapala; So that the 'prajna' one is more seeing things as they are and

MBP/13      sorting out the qualities and then this one sort of acts on that. 12

S: Yes, it's more like that.

Padmavajra; This is more a basic level of perhaps knowing what is skilful and what isn't.

S: Ah, yes. So therefore we can make sense of the remark by the author, 'It is a distinct discriminatory awareness . He says a distinct discriminatory awareness. In other words a special form of wisdom which has special reference to the skilful and unskilful. But to counteract the deludedness which has its cause in either what one has been born into or what one has acquired. What comes from maturation or retribution is what one has been born into or one is born with; and what one has acquired is the instruction, thinking and understanding. "Its function is to provide a basis for not becoming involved in evil behaviour." This was not mentioned in the case of prajna as one of the five object-determining mental events. There its function was to get closer to the object. (Pause) So again we're not concerned with things. (Pause)

\_\_\_\_\_ ; It's funny but I find the more intellectual approach is more akin to prajna as an object-determining mental event - they don't like to see things in terms of good and bad it's more in terms of knowing. I notice people at the Centre - some people who have a more enquiring mind don't tend to see things in terms of skilful and unskilful. They want to (

).

S: That's true. But this is why perhaps Guenther puts 'practical' in brackets here. 'It is a thorough comprehension of (practical) knowledge.' Here it's the practical which is relevant whereas in the context of the object-determining mental events the 'practical' was not relevant. So 'it is a thorough comprehension of practical knowledge that comes from maturation, instructions' and so on. Practical in the sense of concerned with the skilful and the unskilful. But the point you make is a very good one that very many people do want to know what is rather than 'to know what to do'. Or they think of knowing in terms of knowing 'what is' rather (than) 'what to do', how to behave, what is skilful, what is unskilful. (Pause) Why do you think this is? Is it a particular kind of temperament? or what?

\_\_\_\_\_ ; That was definitely true of me. I was a 'what is' person because it was an extension of. ... be I saw. .I see my interest in Buddhism as being an extension of my interest in natural science.. sort of desire to find out what makes things work. It wasn't until I saw some reason why things did work~

372

MBP/13 but I still didn't find them very satisfying. I felt it was another area

13 to be looked into.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Could it be sort of not coming to grips within yourself that you're actually going to have to do something?

S: I think it's personally I think it's connected with the fact that one is doing things. You are living your life in a certain way and you take that~or granted. It's some time before the idea that a change is necessary hits you. So to begin with you're living your life, you're doing this, you re doing that, taking it more or less for granted that what you're doing is all right. It doesn't require to be changed; and you're just concerned with knowing what is. It's as though what you have to do has already being looked after... .society tells you what to do, your friends tell you what to do, you're following the usual tracks - so that whole side of things is looked after. Only your mind is free, as it were, to think what is. The example I sometimes give from my own experience is when I was quite young, in my late teens, even into my early twenties I certainly was much more interested in knowing what is. And, I sometimes mention, that when I was in Singapore - this is I think mentioned in my memoirs - some friends asked me why I was not a vegetarian. It may seem strange but actually, the truth is I'd never thought about it... .I'd never thought 'Is it skilful to eat meat, or is it unskilful?'. . .would it not be more skilful to be a vegetarian? This thought, although I'd been reading about Buddhism by that time at least six or seven years had never crossed my mind! But when it was pointed out to me I said well yes of course!!! So I became a vegetarian but that was not the sort of thing I was interested in. I was interested in knowing. I was interested in knowing about sunyata, about the One Mind and so on. I was not interested in knowing about what I should do, what is skilful, what is unskilful. That came very much later on.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Surely that must be the case with just about everybody before

they actually ( ).

S: I don't think it is in the East. I don't think it is even now with regards to the Friends because now, it sometimes happens, people see you doing certain things, especially at Sukhavati and they like you and they like what you're doing and they feel like joining in - which is action. They don't come along wanting to know. Usually people who come along to lectures want to know - what is, not so much what to do; and therefore we notice that when we do have lectures where all sorts of people may come who may never come along to classes, who don't want to meditate but who will turn up for a lecture.

373

MBP/13 Asvajit; I've noticed in Brighton that there seems to be a distinct sort  
14 of dislike for people who ask what is - a reaction against them.

S: Well, perhaps also it may be that people who are a bit involved with the world who have worldly responsibilities are much more likely to want to know "what should we do?" - what is right to do what is wrong to do, what is skilful, what is unskilful. But perhaps those who are not so involved don't bother about that side of life. They take it for granted that their way of life is O.K., just because they've dropped out. So they don't give it another thought. They want to know what is. They think they've already done the right thing - nothing further to bother about.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Maybe the level of suffering a person is... (Unclear)

S: Yes, perhaps that's more likely to arise, that sort of question, if you are involved in the world and you do have responsibilities and difficulties do arise. But if you've dropped out and you're just going with the flow.... (laughter) there's usually not much suffering involved. There's just the suffering of dragging yourself along to the Ministry of Labour and withdrawing your dole money (Laughter)(Pause)

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Seems very much to refer to the person that ~!,~enquiring ( almost a goal orientation.

Sagaramati; Dole orientation? (Laughter)

S: Well there is such a thing as dole orientation we know!!!!

Asvajit; Do you think it would be wise) as it were, to counteract a tendency to continually ask 'what is the skilful' by raising the question 'what is' because the attitude of 'what is skilful?' suggests something of dependence~ unwillingness to learn for oneself - what is skilful.

S: Could be. But this discussion puts me in mind of a good point which was made by Jinamata in a recent letter, a propos of retreats, especially in Europe and in particular a propos of instru~tion in, say meditation and yoga. She pointed out that there were two extremes:- one is talking so much about the theory of the thing that you never get around to actually getting people to do it. So in this way you have a good interesting lecture about say meditation, and a ~ood discussion at the end but no one thinks seriously about doing meditation, about taking up meditation. On the other hand you don't give any explanation - you just get people doing the concentration exercises but they're

374

MBP/13 never told why they are doing them (laughing)or what the good of them would

15 be. They're just given the exercises and told how to do them. Not only told how to do them - just guided through them. So she says, quite rightly I thought, these are two extremes. They correspond to the extremes of exclusive knowing and exclusive doing. She suggested and again, I feel, quite rightly that we need to have a middle way between these; certainly some explanation of why you are doing them and what it means and what it involves and what it is meant to accomplish. But at the same time some actual practice and experience.

Asvajit ; I always try to blend these two in my introduction to beginners classes.

Padmavajra; I think that's already in the Friends, actually in beginners' classes, definitely. I don't think there's any question (Unclear)

S: But, anyway, this is what she had observed or at least a danger that she had observed in the course of that retreat. (Pause) Possibly it's more likely to arise with yoga than it is with meditation. So there are, as it were, these two aspects of prajna. Prajna as concerned with knowing the object and eventually knowing the object as it is in truth and reality, and prajna in the sense of being able to distinguish the skilful from the unskilful. So one needs to stress perhaps these two aspects, well undoubtedly one needs to stress these two

aspects of prajna. And the Abhidharma tradition clearly considers the distinction so important and considers what we may call the practical aspect of prajna so important that it enumerates it separately as an independent skilful mental event.

END OF SIDE ONE

SIDE TWO 375 MBP/13 \_\_\_\_\_; So it could be accurately rendered as the ability to distinguish 16 between skilful and unskilful action.

S: I think so, yes. That would be non-deludedness, which is a form of prajna. So non-deludedness is a mental event, a positive mental event, which is prajna, which is primarily an object-determining mental event, in its aspect of distinguishing practically between what is skilful and what is unskilful. (Pause) So if you're thinking of prajna only in object-determining terms and not in positive mental event terms then you don't have a complete or comprehensive grasp of prajna.

Abhaya; Don't you think it is something that needs to be stressed.

S: I think very likely it is yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ ;(

S: Because no doubt most people do have, at least some of us have had this attitude of wanting to know what is, rather than to know what to do.

Sagaramati; ( )'Pundarika' I'd say now there is much

more a tendency of what to do~is in some ways disheartening I find, that nobody wants to know 'what is'.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; That's why I suggested that one should perhaps counteract this attitude by encouraging the attitude of asking what is.

Sagaramati; I've said this in an actual Order Meeting. I reckoned that,

it would be more useful ( ) really interested in what is

even in the actual Order.

S: I think it may be, in some cases at least, due to the fact that people, in a sense, have already generally determined what is. I mean they accept that enlightenment is the ultimate goal, that that is something transcend-ental, that they are working towards that or trying to work towards that. They also accept that it is very distant and that in the-meantime they have just got to get on with whatever lies practically to hand; get on with their meditation, get on with their work for the Centre if they are so involved, attend retreats and so on. But not think too much about 'what is'. I think this would be the attitude of many people in the Order. But whether when you get there you find the Void or you find the One Mind - well they're quite willing to wait and see when they get there.

376

MBP/13 Sagaramati; Well, what I meant by 'what is' was in fact the more practical -

17 what you actually do. I mean I find people are ( ) interested in  
that really.

S: Well, perhaps again they find it easier to follow the accepted pattern whether in the friends or in the Order. There is also some sense in this because they've made up their minds once and for all about the general nature of the pattern. So all right you go along to retreats, you go along to meditation classes and so on. In a way they don't need to think because they've accepted that that is the skilful pattern and they want to be involved in that skilful pattern.

Vimalamitra; Dharma Cows!

S: NO, I wouldn't say that because you can't stop every minute of the day as it were to work it all out over again. Once you've found your skilful pattern - well alright stay

with that, stay in that for a few years at least and then review it and turn it over in your mind, and see whether any modification is needed. I think many of them are just in that sort of position - apart from the fact that they don't have any metaphysical aptitude. But I mean this is very much the attitude of many practising Buddhists including practising monks in the East - not to think too much or too often or too deeply about the why and the wherefore of it. You are involved, as it were, in the skilful pattern for want of a better term and that is all that you need to be involved in for the time being. Wisdom will grow as you become more and more deeply and truly involved in that. That doesn't mean just mechanically following or getting into a religious rut. I'm not thinking of that. But I'm thinking of a sincere, intelligent co-operative involvement with that positive pattern. You don't need to stop every five minutes and ask yourself 'Is this the right pattern? Is it really going to help me and wouldn't a sufi pattern be a better one?'. No, you don't need to!!

Padmavajra; You're quite happy with that.

S: You're quite happy with that.

Padmapani; So in a way it's a question of temperament - some people would have that inclination to do that, question their patterns, but other people wouldn't. Are you saying that?

S: No, I'm saying there's not much point in questioning a pattern, a skilful pattern, a positive pattern, when you've accepted that pattern initially as

377

MBP/13 a result of some thought and investigation; and when you have come to the

18 conclusion that the pattern is a positive one, that being involved with it is going to help you - well then you just need to involve yourself with it for a few years, and then see what happens, or has happened or not happened.

Padmavajra; There's almost a suggestion of path of vision or path of transformation. (Pause)

S: Although it's more likely the keeping up with the regular pattern of activities that's going to get you a glimpse, hopefully, of perfect vision. You can't change your horse in midstream too many times. I mean there's also that.

Sagaramati; You can pick up some really odd things when you're reading. The thing that's stuck in my mind is a quote from Chandakirti who says something like "Those who go through the day without wondering about the existence or non-existence of things are not fit to be called human.

S: Well, perhaps he's thinking about those who haven't as yet made any commitment.

Padmavajra ; It's almost inevitable though even if you are following a skilful pattern that it won't arise during the day that you do, whether it be for five minutes - they'll be a long ponder on something like that.

S: Yes part of your skilful pattern presumably includes meditation, includes mindfulness and awareness....

Padmavajra; Includes study.

S: Yes.

Sagaramati; I think that was my objection - there wasn't enough study.

S: Yes well that may be so. I noticed when I took the study for five weeks at 'Pundarika' by the evenings, at least half the people were very, very tired and a couple just arrived and collapsed into chairs and were all out for some minutes, well no - half an hour or so, and clearly many of the Order Members, it was for Order Members only, involved with the Centre were working so hard they just hadn't the time and energy to give to study. So one needs a separate arrangement, a different environment, in other words, the retreat context.

378 MBP/13 Padmavajra; I also think as Sagaramati said there's a general laziness

19 against study ( )them. It's not that they're in a skilful pattern.

They might be but they just don't want to know.

Padmavajra; I really say it's a lack of interest ( ) a meta- physical aptitude. Maybe it's something like that.

\_\_\_\_\_, I don't know. I don't think it is. It certainly isn't that way at 'Sukhavati'. I think a lot of people like to study.

Sagaramati; That's because it's all men.

S: would you then go so far as to say that perhaps women are more inter- ested in the practical side of prajna ( ) in what they should should do? Would you suggest that as a possibility.

Sagaramati; I'd say that.

S: That's quite interesting - because one does need both. Any individual, anyone who wants to become an individual, needs to develop both.

Asvajit; Let the women run the Centre and the men go off and do study.

S: Yes, well you might even

Padmavajra; ( ) not a bad idea at all. Very good idea.

S: Probably suit both men and women down to the ground.

Padmapani; The men can come in and take the classes, the study classes and even the meditation.

S: Well, don't forget that the practical application of prajna, which is not just practicality in the ordinary worldly sense, but the distinguishing 'skilful' and 'unskilful' which is rather a different matter. (Pause) Personally I feel after this long discussion that probably there isn't nearly enough of either - that one needs a much greater concern with what is and also a much greater concern with what should be done in terms of skilful and unskilful. Both are rather weak, I think.

Padmavajra; I think this knowing what is does have quite a lot of relevancy for us in as much as the amount of literature that's -- available. We can gaily go from one book to another without seriously thinking about them.

379

MBP/13 S: There are far more books available on~Buddhism which tell you about 20 what to do. If a book tells you what to do that's all dismissed as dry

Theravada stuff. yes? That's all moral,ethical,that's very uninteresting?! On the other hand there are some Theravadins who are very much into this and completely ignore the more ultimate metaphysical questions - sometimes saying well the Buddha has told us not to think about these things. Again you need both to quite a high degree. (Pause) Alright let's carry on.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; "These last mentioned mental events - non-attachment, non- hatred, and non-deludedness - are the foot of everything positive and the means of ending all evil behaviour. They are like the very heart of all paths. Since they are there for getting rid of the three poisons and their tendencies on all levels and paths and for becoming disgusted with each of the three poisons which are the cause of evil action, it has been said that they function as providing a basis for properly refraining from evil forms of behaviour."

S: That seems quite clear doesn't it. The three poisons are of course the three unskilful roots: craving or covetousness, hatred or anger and delusion or deludedness. Right let's go on.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; "The divisions one can make are infinite but broadly speakin~ all the levels and paths come together in these three."

S: That is to say: getting rid of the three poisons. Go straight on.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; "To understand non-attachment as turning one's mind from this life so as not to be attached to it, but still looking forward to a future life, is the attitude of inferior persons. To turn away from desire in being unattached to all the good things of life is the attitude of the mediocre man. To be non-attached to both samsara and nirvana, but to look forward to a non-localised nirvana is the attitude of a superior man. To explain it this way is only a hint to those who have an inquiring mind - because how is it possible to explain here everything that is necessary? The same argument applies to non-hatred and non-deludedness."

S: 'But to understand non-attachment as turning one's mind from this life so as not to be attached to it but still looking forward to a future life is the attitude of an inferior person' - Do you see that? There is no very great craving as regards this life but it's been displaced on to a future life - a future life perhaps in heaven - so this is the attitude of inferior persons. So to turn away from desire in being unattached to all the good things of life, that is to say the good things of life - not

380

MBP/13 in the sense of just this life but the good things of any level of samsaric

21 existence, whether in the present existence or the future - not being attached even to the good things of life in a higher heavenly world and aspiring to go beyond the world all together is the attitude of a mediocre man. This is to say the attitude of a follower of the Hinayana - the one who follows the Hinayana path is aiming at Nirvana - he doesn't want the good things of life, he isn't attached to the good things of life, either in his present human existence or even in any future divine existence, not to speak of any other. He's thinking only in terms of Nirvana but from the Mahayana point of view this is the attitude of a mediocre man.

Then to be non-attached to both samsara and Nirvana because the Arahant is said, by the Mahayana, to be attached to Nirvana, it is true that he has non-attachment as regards Samsara but as regards Nirvana from the Mahayana point of view he has attachment. But to look forward to a non-localised Nirvana is the attitude of a superior man. This 'non-localised Nirvana' is the Mahayana understanding of Nirvana - the APRATISTHITA Nirvana.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Apratisthita???

S: Apratisthita nirvana - the non-established or the non-localised.... that is to say not localised here as distinct from being samsara which is localised there. It is not a nirvana which can be assigned, as it were, to any particular thing so this attitude of a superior man is of course the attitude of a Bodhisattva - a follower of the Mahayana.

\_\_\_\_\_ How is that spelt - that Sanskrit

S: Apratisthita - as far as I remember it's A-P-R-A-T-I-S-T-H-I-T-A. 'Non-established' it literally means, or 'non-particularised' Nirvana. So to explain it in this way is only a hint to those who have an enquiring mind. You can follow it up further and discuss the difference between the ordinary worldly person who only wants a happy life on earth and a good rebirth and the Arahant and the Bodhisattva. You can discuss the differentiation between these three ideals in terms of non-covetousness and so on. The same applies to non-hatred and non-deludedness.

\_\_\_\_\_ How would it apply?

S: Well, how do you think it might? This is what those who have enquiring mind are left to work out for themselves. Perhaps we'd better leave it at that because today's the fifth day. I want that we should get half way through

22 the text. We've still got quite a few pages to go. So I think we'll leave it to those who have an enquiring mind and if they do manage to work it all out maybe they could let us know tomorrow. (Laughter)

END OF DAY

\* \* \*

NEXT DAY

S: Let's carry on.

Asvajit: "In this context non-deludedness is a distinct discriminative awareness. In the above statement about what one has obtained by birth and what one has acquired, the former comes from the maturation of that which one has done in previous life, not by the conditions of this life. Therefore one speaks of what comes from maturation. What one has acquired is that which comes through listening, thinking, and contemplating."

S: So in the first verse the author says, 'In this context non-deludedness is a distinct discriminative awareness' - that is to say it is the practical application of wisdom and the practical application consisting in the discrimination between spiritual and unspiritual. 'In the above statement', that is to say the statement quoted from the Abhidharmasamuccaya defining non-deludedness, 'In the above statement about ~a~t one has obtained by birth and what one has acquired, the former comes from the maturation of that which one has done in previous life.' In other words there is the non-deludedness which is the result of maturation, which is itself a maturation - you carried it over from your previous life - your stream of consciousness is, as it were, imbued already with this quality. You naturally distinguish skilful and unskilful. Then, . not by the conditions of this life. Therefore, one speaks of what comes from maturation. What one has acquired is that which comes through listening, thinking and contemplating.' Yes, the famous triad of the wisdom that comes about, or in this context the non-deludedness that comes about by listening to the teaching, by thinking about it and by contemplating, that is to say by meditating deeply upon it in such a way as to give birth to insight. Alright let's go on then.

Asvajit: " The basis of what one has to listen to with a discriminative awareness derived from studyir~ are the Buddha's teachings and the commentaries.

382

MBP/13 This is the first of the three ways in which non-deludedness is acquired.

23 That is to say fr'm studying the Buddha's teachings and the commentaries. Carry on.

Asvajit; "The teachings have twelve divisions:

1. Sutra
2. Geya
3. Vya

S: Don't read it. I'll just briefly tell you what they are - Sutra is the discourse - you know this I think already - sutra is discourse in prose.

Geya is mixed prose and verse.

Vyakarana is prediction.

Padmavajra; Could you say more?

S: Prediction to Enlightenment.

Gatha is verse.

Udana is inspired utterance.

Ni dana is a connection usually it means a connection of the past with the present (via) say a Jataka story. It also means a continuous narration.

Avadana is an heroic deed of disciples in previous lives - a heroic deed of disciples in previous lives not of the Buddha - of disciples.

Itivrittaka 'thus it was said' - sayings of the Buddha you could say, sayings.

Jataka is a birth story.

Vaipulya is extended discourse.

Abhutatadharma is miraculous happening - reference of (nagas) miracles worked by the Buddha and so on.

Upadesa is instruction.

Vimalamitra; What is number ten. extended

S; Extended discourse.

Padmavajra; Upadesa?

S: Instruction.

Asvaj it: Adbhutadharma?

S: Adbhutadharma - wonderful happenings or miraculous events. These are twelve categories of scriptural material. They're not necessarily different forms of scriptures, though some of them are. Sometimes they re

383

MBP/13 mixed up. You might get gathas in the context of a sutra or you might get a jataka in the context of a sutra and so on. They are twelve categories

of canonical literature. This is the Sarvastivadin classification. The Theravadins reckon only one to nine. Ten, eleven and twelve were (either) done by the Sarvastivadins and the Mahayanists inherited the Sarvastivadin list. There's no need to go very much into it.

\_\_\_\_\_ I Don't quite understand the sixth part - nidana.

S: A connection. A making of a connection. For instance, you tell a story about the past - a jataka story. Then you connect it with the present by saying such and such a person in that story was Ananda who is in the present.

S: That sounds exactly like the Jataka.

S; No, you can have a jataka which is simply a story of the past without making a connection with the present. The jataka is simply the story of the past. The nidana makes the connection with the present. Nidana also is - you can have nidanas which are not connected with jatakas, for instance a connected account of certain events in the life of the Buddha is also called a nidana. Some of these terms are very familiar in meaning. They give you a

rough idea. For instance Buddhagosa's introduction to the vinaya pitaka is called nidana ( ) - the connected relation - he gives an extended account or connected account of the Buddha's life. But that was non-canonical. Anyway let's carry on.

Dharmapala; "Since a detailed explanation of their specific function and which of these is the most important would take many words, it will be omitted here.

These twelve divisions can be condensed into nine according to the master Candrakirti. He considers the four up to nidana as one."

S: That is to say vyakarana, gatha, udana and nidana.

Dharmapala; "The nine again can be condensed into three groups:

1. sutrapitaka
2. vinayapitaka
3. abhidharmapitaka

The main content of these three baskets are the three trainings."

S: Do you know what the three trainings are? The tri-(\$'IkSa.9 Sila, Samadhi, ,Prajna.

384

MBP/13 \_\_\_\_\_; Each one corresponding

25

S: (Wait a minute they're) going to try to explain that.

Dharmapala; " The main content of the sutrapitaka is the training in mental integration, that of the vinayapitaka is the training in discipline, and that of the abhidharmapitaka is the

training of one's critical capacity."

S: So according to this classification the sutrapitaka is concerned mainly with samadhi. This is a rather formal sort of classification. There is quite a bit of material in the sutrapitaka about samadhi, the second of the three training principles. It's a bit of an exaggeration to say that the main content of the sutrapitaka is the training in mental integration. This is a highly schematic sort of classification one could say. That of the vinayapitaka is the training in discipline - sila. Again that's a bit of an exaggeration - there's a lot of other material too. A bit over schematic ( ) That of the abhidharmapitaka is the training of one's critical capacity. This is quite correct. This is much more nearly correct. The Abhidharma literature does not contain anything about the actual practice of samadh" although it contains an analysis of samadhi nor does it contain anything about sila. It's entirely concerned with Prajna. With the development of Prajna through a review of the dharmas. Or according to the Hinayana especially as developed in the Abhidharma Prajna consists essentially in this reviewing of the dharmas. Anyway, Prajna is the study of the Abhidharma or the knowledge of the content of the Abhidharma itself. This is a traditional sort of classification.(Pause)  
Let's carry on.

Vimalamitra: " Just as it has been said repeatedly, the Abhidharmasamuccaya states that the sutrapitaka deals equally with the three trainings,"

S: This is a rather more subtle and complex classification - that'the sutrapitaka deals equally with the three trainings,' This is nearer the truth actually at least of the contents of the Theravada sutrapitaka. But in this sutrapitaka we find sila, samadhi and prajna more or less equally dealt with.

Vimalamitra; "The vinayapitaka explains both discipline and mental integration,"

S: Yes, both sila and also samadhi. Well certainly it deals with sila,  
certainly it deals with samadhi ( ).

Vimalamitra; "and the training of one's critical cognition is explained by

S: This is quite true as we've already seen. 'Critical cognition' here being Guenther's term, in this context, for wisdom. Critical because we critically examine existence and discover that it consists of dharmas, a certain number of dharmas in all sorts of different combinations and permutations. Let's go on.

Vimalamitra; "The purpose of this rendering is that when one preserves by proper inspection and knowledge the basic and subsidiary rules of the vinaya, this facet becomes the best means for the growth of samadhi (integration) because it has the power to end, once and for all, elation and despondency. Today, there are very few who understand this gradation of the path."

S: (There's quite an important point). 'the purpose of this rendering is that when one preserves by proper inspection and knowledge'- we might say proper mindfulness and awareness - the basic and subsidiary rules of the vinaya, this facet becomes the best means for the growth of samadhi (integration) because it has the power to end, once and for all, elation and despondency.' So how does the observance of sila have the power to end, once and for all, elation and despondency? That is the point really to be examined here.

Asvajit; Despondency comes quite clearly from lack of a clear conscience. So that if one has no reason to ... if one observes the rule then one has no reason to be despondent.

S: But where does elation come from then?- too much observance of the silas.

Abhaya; An imbalance. You might be practising some of the silas and that leads to an elated state of mind.

S: You attach too much importance to certain silas.

Abhaya; You get carried away after a little bit of observance.

Padmavajra; Or that observance is consistent.

S: But surely elation and despondency have got a wider framework of reference than that.

\_\_\_\_\_; I think it means more that a disciplined life is a moderate life.

386

MBP/13 S: The disciplined life prevents you from going to emotional extremes. 27  
It's as simple as that, isn't it? A disciplined life prevents you from

going to emotional extremes - especially the emotional extremes of elation and despondency. A disciplined regular life. It isn't, don't forget, just a matter of observing rules. That mention of the vinaya here, basic and subsidiary rules of the vinaya, might give that impression. But it's more like practising what is skilful in a regular and constant manner. (In other words) in an organised manner. So this will certainly give stability to one's whole life and, in this way, end elation and despondency. That way we get firmly settled into a retreat and they know the retreat programme is going steadily on. There's no room for either elation or despondency. So it's a disciplined life rather than the observance of rules. (Pause) If you've got a disciplined life or a disciplined way of life to fall back upon that provides a sort of firm basis - something to which you can return. Something with which you can occupy yourself. There's no place for any ups and downs.

Kamalasila; Following rules tends to promote elation and despondency. Because you feel very pleased if you did it right or very despondent if you didn't.

S: Yes - following rules isn't a very (happy) word but certainly, skilful mental attitudes can be, as it were, standardised into rules. But if one thinks exclusively in terms of observing rules and not observing rules then you may experience ups and downs and elation and depression. You're very depressed when you happen to have broken a rule and very elated when you've kept it for a whole week. (Pause) Alright carry on then.

,"Thus,~ certainty is produced by striving to hear many times the expositionsofthe three trainings whicharethe foundations of what is to be studied, and by investigating, over and over again, the meaning of what has been heard by means of the four methods of critical investigation."

S: That refers to page thirty-seven. (Pause) Yes awareness of what must be done, awareness of relationship, awareness of attaining proper validity, awareness of absolutely real. So, 'thus certainty is produced by striving to hear many times the expositions of the three trainings which are the foundations of what is to be studied, and by investigating, over and over again, the meaning of what has been heard by means of the four methods of critical investigation.' So one should strive to hear many times the expositions of the three trainings. If one takes that literally it means to hear, to listen to somebody's actual exposition of them and then to turn that over in one's mind again and again until one has mastered it all

38~

MBP/13 thoroughly. Sometimes one reads biographies of ancient Tibetan and Chinese  
28 teachers and one finds for instance that they explained such and such a

sutra ninety-four times. Presumably there were disciples who listened to it ninety-four times. Things like that.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Is this why also you find a lot of discourses are on discipline and ethical matters rather than... there seem to be more on ethical matters than there are on meditation, more on meditation than there are on the Abhidharma. Perhaps.

S: If you regard sila, samadhi, prajna as an ascending series one would only expect that there were more expositions of the more elementary stages. That is to be expected. There are more elementary text books than advanced text books. (Pause) Let's go straight on.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; "Since it is affirmed by the great charioteers that a thorough experience of the path in its totality is accomplished by thinking about it and by settling on the content of this certainty that has come from thinking about it, it stands to reason that intelligent people will set out on a path in which the Buddhas delight."

S: It stands to reason.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; "But those who give up learning which is the real course of a distinctive discriminating awareness are like sheep following blind fools and idiots. Boasting without ever having thought, and merely pre-serving their utter laziness, they think that they now have a noble mind, that they have fulfilled a religious life, and that they have spiritual attainments. They merely waste the unique occasion that they have as human beings. Worse

than this are those who hold themselves to be superior even when people in the same situation perish and the (Buddha's) teaching declines. These people had better concern themselves with this discriminative appreciation which we have just discussed above."

S: The author seems to be criticising those who undervalue study. He could of course be criticising the pseudo-meditators or possibly some people on the fringes of the Nyingmapa/Kagyupa schools, the pseudo-yogis, who profess to be perhaps Milarepas and Padmasambhavas without really being such. Possibly such people in mind or even possibly lazy members of the Gelugpa ( ) itself who say study doesn't matter and you don't need to know all these things and learn all these things. In a sense of course it's true. One has to be very careful. There is a distinction between the doctrine follower and the faith follower - the Dharma(~'P~re)ji ) and the

388

MBP/13        Sraddha (--Or~ ). The doctrine follower can be very stimulated, very

29        helped, very inspired by study. But the faith follower just doesn't seem to need that or seems not to benefit very much from it. He's much more concerned with getting on with actual practice and meditation and keeping up contact with the teacher and so on. So one has to make due allowance for difference of temperament. But no doubt the author is right in criticising those who without being even faith followers and getting on with their meditation undervalue the importance of study of this kind.

END OF TAPE 13

Mind in Buddhist Psychology:        Tape 14 MBP/14

1S:        study of this kind and if the Gelugpas, and the author is a Gelugpa,

have always attached very great importance to study. They regard study as an indispensable preparation for meditation. The only thing being that some of the more learned geshes get so deeply into study that they have no time, even towards the end of their lives, for meditation. I mean that does sometimes happen. I've even met one or two geshes, tibetan geshes, who almost scoff at the idea of meditation and say it isn't necessary, that study is the real thing.

You can still meet fully traditional tibetan geshees of this kind - and some who openly scoff at the Tantras. I've even met one or two like that. They say that of you scoff at all this ringing of bells and banging of drums, you know, what is all this - the real.. what Buddhism is really all about is metaphysics and logic!(Laughter) Yes, you meet such types, purely traditional types too.

Padmavajra; Do those sort of get rid of those people who are pseudo- Milarepas and Padmasambhavas -when you read the life of Padmasambhava he was a great scholar as well.

S: Indeed yes.

Padmavajra: Even Milarepa spent twelve years....

S: He'd more than quite a good knowledge of the tantras. But no doubt, among your own friends, you know, within our own Movement there are several who undervalue study. Not because they're faith followers who're quietly getting on with their meditation, but just because they're too lazy. Some of them need more study undoubtedly just as we also need more meditation, in fact more of everything. More work(Laughter) Also more leisure (Laughter) Right carry on please.

Mark; "The Prajnaparamitasamcayagatha states, How will millions of blind men ever enter a city without knowing the road to it?

Without appreciative discrimination, the other five

perfections are blind.

Therefore, without this appreciative discrimination (the blind man's guide), Enlightenment cannot be attained. When one is taken hold of by appreciative discrimination, He regains his sight and is called the Enlightened One.

And also the honourable Maitreya says,

Any preconceived idea regarding the gift, the giver,

390 MBP/14 and the receiver 2 Is considered to be a mental obscuration. Any preconceived idea regarding avarice Is an emotional obscuration.

Everything but appreciative discrimination must be given up. Therefore, discrimination is the highest (value).

And since its basis is learning,

Learning is the highest(value)."

S: This really sums it up this last verse. 'Everything but appreciative discrimination' - everything but wisdom - 'must be given up.' Therefore wisdom is the highest value and since its basis is learning, learning or study or hearing in the positive sense; learning is the highest value. This is the classic Indian Buddhist attitude - that these three levels or grades of wisdom: first the wisdom that comes by hearing, by learning in the traditional way and then the wisdom that comes by reflection, cogitation upon what you have learnt and then the insight which arises when you actually meditate upon what you have cogitated and reflected~upon and understood. Let's go straight on.

Mark; "And Asvaghosa says,

Knowing little, the blind men do not know how to bring contemplation to life.

Because they lack that, they cannot think of anything."

S: When they try to meditate they've, as it were, nothing to meditate on, because they haven't studied.

Mark; "Therefore by bringing contemplation to life by continually thinking about the basis of striving towards learning, appreciative discrimination will increase.

And Vasubandhu says,

He who is disciplined and possesses learning

Will practice the way of bringing contemplation to life. Thus has it been stated over and over again in the Sutras and commentaries."

Abhaya; Although the.. you said that the non-deludedness is the ability to distinguish between

skilful and unskilful therefore it's got a practical connotation - this last bit seems to emphasise the what is-ness rather than what's to do.

391

S: Right, because also three kinds of wisdom are mentioned but we have 3 dealt at length only with the first, which is connected with study.

Though one could say that the study is concerned with both - as a result of the study (one) comes to know(what is and also what should be done).

Sagaramati; In some of the Mitra study groups it's more what is to be done. There's very little talk about sunyata!

Padmavajra; There's very little interest - I remember in Brighton one time, in the Dharma study group. .no it was the Mitra study group. .we got talking about sunyata and people were really angry about this -'What right have you got to talk about things like that, it's just not practical!'

S: Of course that isn't quite correct. What could be more practical than destroying your ego? Well actually, it's quite a few minutes overtime so, rather amazingly (Laughter) I think we'd better stop until the afternoon but before we do stop, any general points about this morning - all upon these three skilful roots:- non-covetousness, non-hatred and non-deluded-ness. The main points that emerged.. .well the main point to have emerged being the point that non-deludedness was the practical aspect of prajna and owing to its importance it's enumerated as a distinct mental event. You can well understand, I think, now how some scholars can spend their whole lives on the Abhidharma. This is just one branch of it, just one aspect of it. Just spend all their lives happily immersed in these questions. If for instance you read the Abhidharma kosa of Vasubandhu, which is his own sort of commentary on the discussion of his own verses, he quotes so many opinions of different teachers and different schools you get the impression of this vigorous discussion going on over the centuries over these various knotty points of Abhidharma which some Buddhist scholars found really fascinating.

Padmavajra; Is the Abhidharmakosa available in translation?

S: In French. I've got an English translation in typescript of three volumes out of seven, but there is a complete French translation by Poussin. It's a very difficult work, very complex, and it's difficult to get much out of it in a way - so concentrated and so technical.

Vimalamitra; What level would you put that on? I mean these three of learning, thinking and contemplation.

S: Well, that is definitely learning and thinking. What gives you the raw

392

MBP/14 material. Well first it's the learning which gives you the raw material

4 for thinking, then the thinking gives you raw material for meditation which penetrates into the subject more and more deeply. Then presumably some, at least, of the teachers have meditated upon what they'd (apparently) what they'd thought about - and as a result of their meditation had developed a certain insight which shared itself in their own contributions to Abhidharma studies. There's a very vigorous and lively movement. It's also occurred to me, once or twice, that perhaps some day we should have a study seminar on the *Katthavattu* which is the points of the discussion among the very early Buddhists. I'm sure that there are ..I do collect some points that come up amongst ourselves - It might be quite interesting to go through all these, there are more than two hundred - two hundred and sixty *Katthavattu*. Mrs. Rhys Davis translates it 'Points of Controversy'. It's really 'Matters of Discussion' would be the literal translation - *Kattha Vatthu* or *Katthavastu* in Sanskrit 'Matters of Discussion'. Which sometimes are left unsettled. There's no final decision given, one way or the other, You're just given the views of the different schools. Some- times, of course, it is said that Theravada accept this view and rejects certain others - as of course in the case of the *pudgala* which they definitely reject against the *Pudgalavadins* who accept it.

Padmavajra; Seems odd that.. *Pudgalavadins*. . . .I've read about it. .seems really odd.

S: Well, perhaps it deserves careful consideration.

Padmavajra; Apparently they weren't considered as Buddhists by the other schools of Buddhism. They were sort of, slightly not Buddhists.

S: Ah. .But what does one mean by Buddhist??!

Padmavajra;

S: No, I don't think one could say that.

Vimalamitra: Who were these people?

S: This was a school of early Buddhists, one of the most important schools. They survived for a long time in India. They were very strong. Yuen Chuan found many of them. They believed in the existence of the Pudgala which was not the same as the Atman. Pudgala means something like person. Conze calls them, therefore, the Personalists. For instance they point to such

MBP/14

5 texts as the Attha arya pudgala. The Arahant is a pudgala! I mean the scriptures say so. So what does that mean? He isn't a self because there is no self but he is a pudgala. And also the Tathagata refers to himself as a pudgala. There is a pudgala who has arisen for the benefit of the world. Who is that pudgala - the Buddha! So they point to all these texts. And they're not satisfied with a straightforward anatmavada, they advance the pudgalavada - which is not an atmavada though their opponents say it is a form of atmavada. But the Pudgalavadins strongly deny that. So it's certainly a position that can be defended rationally.

Padmavajra; I forget where I read it, I think in 'Buddhist Thought in India', where the other schools say, well they - because they put forward the pudgala rather than the

S: The other schools admitted that Pudgalavadins could attain Enlightenment and that is the criterion. And Conze himself is rather unfavourably disposed toward the Pudgalavadins - he does agree with the view that the Pudgala is the Atma in disguise. So he would tend himself to regard Pudgalavadins as not being really Buddhists. In India itself the discussion was not conducted in those terms. The term Buddhist itself hardly existed.

Padmapani; Could it be a sort of Pratyeka Buddha?

S: No, it's nothing like that, it's a purely metaphysical position. (Pause) Anyway, I don't

propose to go into it now. If we do go into it it'll be in some other connection. There are, interestingly enough, there are a very, very few modern Pudgalavadins. A very famous Pali scholar A.P.Buddhadatta Thera was a Pudgalavadin.

Sagaramati; Really?

S: Oh yes. He came to the conclusion that as a result of studying the Pali texts that the Pudgalavadins were right. Yes. He was a quite famous case but nobody bothered him. He was. it was just considered as mild eccentricity on his part (laughter) to be a Pudgalavadin.

Abhaya; Are there Pudgalavadin texts, exclusively Pudgalavadin texts?

S: There were, I mean, they had their own recension of the scriptures, but they've not survived as an independent school, nor have their versions of the scriptures survived.

MBP/14 Abhaya; So you're not able to get any, read any? 6

S: But the verses to which they refer in support of their views are also found in the Pali texts. They're verses which all schools accepted as actual utterances of the Buddha but the other schools interpreted them differently. The verses that they, the key verses that they cite in support of their views are found in all the different traditions and are accepted by all schools, like the ones that I mentioned.

Padmavajra; Other than in 'Buddhist Thought in India', that the discussions between the Pudgalavadins and Sarvavastivadins in Buddhist scriptures, are there any more translations available of texts concerning them or?

S: I don't think so. Very scanty material indeed.

Padmavajra; They were a Hinayana school?

S: They were a Hinayana school.

Padmavajra; Doesn't Conze also suggest that the alaya, that the alaya is a sort of atman as well?

S: Yes. I think Conze doesn't go deeply enough into the matter. He's very acute but not quite acute enough - and also there is a touch of cynicism in Conze. He almost enjoys the idea that there is someone sort of getting away from the real teaching and trying to smuggle in something heretical in the guise of orthodoxy. He rather likes, one feels, to sort of think in these terms, it's quite congenial to his way of thinki~g. Rather than to think, to use the term Buddhists. They all did go for refuge, they were all trying to attain enlightenment. So why did they introduce this doctrine? Maybe one should look at it more in those sort of terms, rather than all go in there with Brahmanism converted to Buddhism and they couldn't give up their Atman ideas and they sort of smuggled it in under the guise of bhavanga or pudgala or alaya - that doesn't ring very true to me.

Asvajit; All seem to be various ways of explaining the fact that despite all our metaphysical assumptions or knowledge, we still experience ourselves as ourselves.

S: Yes, well the Buddha apparently continued to experience himself as himself.

Padmavajra; If a Theravadin was listening to what was being said just then would he consider it, think it heretical?

3'5

MBP/14 S: Well, most Theravadins are metaphysically quite unsophisticated. 7 Kasyap-ji had trouble with them, as I've related in my memoirs, when he

was in Ceylon. They're not very bright in these sort of things one can say quite frankly. They're metaphysically naive. Metaphysics has not been cultivated in Ceylon.

Vimalamitra; Maybe that is, in a way, why they are Theravadins.

END OF SESSION

## NEXT SESSION

S: Page forty eight. Diligence - this seems to be virya doesn't it, isn't it~ Yes Virya - alright let's start reading.

Sagaramati; "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains diligence as follows: What is diligence? It is the mind intent on being ever active,

devoted, unshaken, not turning back and being indefatigable. It perfects- and realises what is conducive to the positive.

The mind ever intent on the wholesome is diligence, Therefore Vasubandhu says,

What is diligence? It is the antidote against indolence and is that which makes the mind move out towards the positive.

And the Bodhicaryavatara states,

What is diligence? It is the inclination towards the wholesome.

Nowadays, in society, there are those who claim that every endeavour is a case of diligence, but striving for this life here is not diligence. Diligence means going out to the positive, but the attempt to shun what one must do in this life means to cling to evils contrary to diligence..

S: The essence of the matter is -the mind ever intent on the wholesome is diligence. Or, diligence is the inclination towards the wholesome. Virya is not energy in general. It is that particular kind of energy, that particular form of energy which is bent specifically on the whole- some,~the skilful. I notice here in the Siddhi it says that energy 'has the characteristic of supporting, upholding, sustaining the caitasikas.' Well it's not all the caitasikas obviously, but only the skilful ones, the positive ones. 'Nowadays in society there are those who claim that every endeavour is the case of diligence - but striving for this life here is not diligence. Diligence means going out to the positive, but the attempt to shun what one must do in this life means t~cling to evils contrary to diligence.' Sometimes we talk almost as though having ones' energy aroused was in itself a positive thing, but not necessarily so - the energy becomes

N

396

MBP/14 positive only when it's directed towards the positive.

S

Padmavajra; So if one just has energy that's not necessarily virya?

S: No, one is just energetic. One just has a lot of energy. It becomes virya only when directed towards the skilful, towards the positive. (Pause) Another micchaditthi for you to list!! Energy as such, is not positive, not in the sense of being skilful, anyway. Right carry on then.

Asvajit; "In classifying diligence the lam-rim gives three:

1. Diligence which is ever ready
2. Diligence which collects wholesome things
3. Diligence done for the sake of sentient beings But the Abhidharmasamuccaya explains five:

1. Diligence which is ever ready
2. Diligence which is applied work
3. Diligence which is not to lose heart
4. Diligence which does not turn back
5. Diligence which is never satisfied

S: Right there is an explanation of these it seems, so let's go into that.

Asvajit: "The first is to put on the heavy armour"

S: There's a note about the heavy armour -'heavy armour refers to the armour of strenuousness.' We need not go into the details of that.

Asvajit: "The first is to put on the heavy armour in view of the fact that, before one embarks on positive action, the mind must first be made to go out in that direction.

Regarding that the Parinitasamasanama states,

If one, indefatigably, with a mind bent on the wholesome, Is compelled to act properly as regards to oneself and others In a manner which is likened to the one-pointedness of mind Of the Supreme Enlightenment whose vastness is like the ocean which is Made up of infinite numbers of water drops, and If determination is of long duration in the manner that a year Consists of the coming together of those days and nights Of a great expanse in which a day and a night Is likened to the termination and equanimity of the Endless rounds of birth, then he will attain The Supreme Enlightenment which is ever active

39?

MBP/14        When the mind, having been released from the frustrations of

9        One's round of samsara, becomes ever active, Immovable and infinite, that (mind) becomes possessed of The capacity towards the wholesome which is a brave mode of action,

And is said to be the first of the pure things to be grasped."

S:        So what does one make of that, 'the diligence which is ever ready'? It seems to be the pure capacity for virya, before virya has actually been manifested as it were in action. 'The capacity towards the wholesome which is a brave mode of action.' It's more like willingness - willingness to apply virya. The diligence which is ever ready. And the second?

Asvajit:        The actual energy put to effect?

S:        No, it is the energy ready to be put to effect.

Padmavajra; Diligence which is ever ready.

S; Yes right.

Padmavajra; "The second(diligence which is applied work) is twofold:

1. Steady engagement

## 2. Enthusiastic engagement

when by application the mind goes out to make a real experience."

S: Yes, so diligence which is ever ready. Diligence which is the capacity for a certain activity in the direction of the skilful. And then, secondly, the diligenc which actually goes out in that sort of way, which applies itself in that sort of way, which applies itself to that particular whole- some quality or objects. So that is the diligence which is applied work and it's twofold:-'steady engagement' and 'enthusiastic engagement'. What do you think is the difference between the two? The steady engagement and the enthusiastic engagement.

Robert: Regular steps versus irregular

S: No,I don't think that actually, No I think'steady' means when you are exerting the virya, you are intent upon the skilful and you're keeping it up steadily, but there's not much enthusiasm in it. Yes? But enthusiastic engagement is when you're not only intent on the skilful but intent upon it in a very enthusiastic and joyous manner. And there is quite a difference between these two things. You could be intent upon the wholesome, intent on

3~6

MBP/14 the skilful in a very steady\* not to say systematic manner, a very 10 persistent manner, but without real enthusiasm - but in the second case,

enthusiasm is there.

Asvajit; Do you think it~s possible to actually keep up the steady practice without any measure of enthusiasm?

S: I think it is possible. I think enthusiasm will be likely to accrue as the steady engagement continues. But I don't see enthusiasm as necessary to keeping the engagement.

Padmavajra; Is it possible for the enthusiasiw to come in sortofbursts? So you might be keeping up steady but sometimes you get enthusiastic? and then it goes away.

S: Possible, Yes, right.

Dharmapala; Like those patterns we were talking about earlier. I mean going to retreats.

S: So 'when by application the mind goes out to make a real experience' and is of the positive to which it's directing itself. Alright let's go on.

Padmavajra; "The third ('diligence which does not lose heart') is to develop this outgoing of the mind without weakening it by thinking, 'How is this possible by me?' It is just as the Jatakamala states:

To be released on account of faintheartedness is useless,

Therefore, don't be afflicted by misery But rely on a knowledgeable person who has gained the meaning of the teaching.

Then even the most difficult will be easily attained.

Therefore, one should not be afraid nor be unhappy To do what is necessary, but as circumstances

should warrant,

He should be encouraged by the splendour of the Wise And go out to attain all those (positive) values."

S: This is more like virya as courage, virya as stout-heartedness, one might say. Or as this text says, 'the diligence which does not lose heart'. You have confidence in yourself, we don't weaken your exertion by thinking, 'how is this possible by me?' 'How is it possible for me to do this?' You feel confident that you can do it. Alright on we go then.

399

MBP/14

11 Robert; "The fourth ('diligence which does not turn back') is to make the mind go to its limit without letting it ever be changed by conditions. Regarding this, the venerable teacher (Tsong-kha-pa) says,

When diligence which does not turn back wears its armour, The virtue of intuitive understanding increases like the crescent moon.

All activities of experiencing the path become meaningful, and

Whatever is begun will result in the manner that one wishes.

From understanding it thus, the Sons of the Victorious One Begin with diligence, the big wave which sweeps away all indolence."

S; So what is this diligence, this virya, which does not turn back?

Abhaya; It's: not put off by any obstacles.

S: not put off by any obstacles - or even by unforeseen hindrances, unforeseen circumstances. It doesn't mean - you might sort of take it upon yourself to achieve your certain goal and then you're quite certain that you have the energy to achieve that goal. You also see quite clearly all the obstacles that are likely to arise; but in the course of your exertion you come across, or you come upon, an obstacle or an hindrance which you had not anticipated. Well some people might say 'well this was not in the bargain', as it were, 'I was quite prepared to make the effort under such and such conditions but not under these conditions' so we're, as it were, excused from continuing to make the effort. I'd undertaken to make it under quite different circumstances, so if one does that, that is the diligence which turns back. So this fourth kind of diligence is 'the diligence which does not turn back' even though unforeseen obstacles and hindrances arise, one carries on. In fact, this is almost always the case, that when one would make an exertion but some unforeseen difficulty always arises, it's very rarely otherwise, even in worldly matters not to speak of spiritual matters. So you need all the time, the virya, the energy, the diligence which does not turn back, even when unforeseen obstacles are encountered.

Asvajit; It is said in spiritual striving that if one makes the effort then the result will be certain - If one continues to strive.

S: If one continues. Yes. It's like when people are ordained and maybe a little while later they, when certain demands are made upon them, or they

MBP/14 think they are made upon them. then they feel 'well I didn't bargain for

12 this. They didn't become an upasaka to do this, or to do that or not to do this or not to do that. So this is also a sort of turning back (Laughter) But how can one foresee, you may foresee to some extent - but how can you foresee completely anything that you undertake, anything that requires virya or any other form of energy. You can't know completely, you can't be sure altogether; some unexpected factor is sure to arise. But you shouldn't abandon your original intention just because the going has become more difficult than you expected. I mean often people will make that an excuse. But the Bodhisattva, the would be Bodhisattva or even the ordinary upasaka shouldn't do that - should have the... diligence, the virya not to turn back.

Asvajit; What about the case where you realise something to be so, and there is a tendency sometimes to go back and re-examine it? Is that something that one would not do if you had this kind of diligence, having realised something to be so you don't question it again. You don't go back, sort of re-affirm it or test it out again.

S: Do you mean that you might have made a mistake in the first place?

Asvajit; Yes.

S: Well perhaps you did. But you can't have made a mistake if it is virya because by very definition it is intent upon what is good, what is positive. Yes, you might have made a mistake in your way of going about the realisation of that good but you couldn't have made a mistake in being intent on that good itself. (Pause) On with the fifth diligence then.

Padmapani; "The fifth('diligence which is never satisfied') is an effort to seek more than the previous and not to be contented with just a little. Moreover, to take a small portion of the path as the most important one and to reject all others is a great hindrance to implanting the inclinations regarding the path in total; therefore, it is very important to have a clear understanding of the entire path. The lam-rim chen-mo states :

Arya Asanga had stated over and over again that even if one knows properly the way of how to strive after the wide and great, it is very important to have two~qualities; 1. one must not despair, and 2. one must not be satisfied with merely some triviality. To think that a great portion of the path is established if only one aspect of it arises, whether it be an apparent quality or the real quality, and to be content with attending to it habitually, even though it has been taken from the teachings and represents logical forms to those who know the essence of

401

the path - this may be acceptable as part of virtue. But to understand that one cannot proceed anywhere by that alone, to leave despair behind, to seek indefatigably the specific positive value of a higher level with a total commitment, and to learn whatever one must learn without ever failing in one's efforts - this is indeed a wonderful thing."

S: So, the diligence which is never satisfied - that is even though something quite exalted, even though something quite sublime, - has actually been achieved. One doesn't, as it were, rest on one's laurels, on one's virya. It just goes on and on indefinitely. That is, as it were, the very nature of virya, not to rest, not to be satisfied, so long as there is something higher to be achieved, something higher to be attained - and of course there always is. Perhaps it's better to think in that way rather than in terms of coming to a full stop, a complete full stop when enlightenment is attained. (Pause) Alright let's carry on.

Dharmapala; "That this activity is said to function as the realisation and completion of all positive values means that all positive values depend on diligence. Therefore, the Adhyasayasamcodanasutra states:

What is to be done in this world, and What is to be done in the world beyond, Is not difficult for one who exerts diligence.

The positive values of the wise result through the power of diligence.

Those who have entered the Enlightenment of the Buddha, Having seen the detriment that comes from indolence and sleepiness,

Always make diligence the basis of endeavour. This I have always told them to do.

And the Mahayanasutralamkara states:

Of the positive values, diligence is supreme. Therefore, he who relies on this truly attains the real. By diligence, one instantly gains the sublime states Of the mundane and transcendental.

By diligence one attains the desired mode of life. By diligence one also becomes transformed. By diligence one becomes free by standing above worldly things.

By diligence the Supreme Enlightenment unfolds completely. Since all positive qualities come in the wake of diligence, it is very important to initiate assiduous striving. When one deeply studies and knows the works that have been mentioned before, there are very effective means of initiating diligence. For people with low intelligence like myself,

402

MBP/14 it is difficult to understand these things merely by dealing with these

14 works. Although Tsong-kha-pa has stated in his lam-rim,

It is very important to know the way to end idleness which is not conducive to diligence in view of the profit that comes from making a beginning of assiduous striving and the disaster that comes from not doing it. It is important to know how to realise the powers of 1. active implementation of devoted interest, 2. active implementation of steadfastness, 3. active implementation of joy, and 4. active implementation of rejection.

Since I cannot put down everything in writing here, one can learn them by looking up the Bodhicaryavatara and the lam-rim chen-mo."

S: So the important point here is that as the author says 'of all positive values', it means that 'all positive values depend on diligence'. All positive values depend on diligence and therefore as the Mahayanasutralamkara says, 'Of the positive values, diligence is supreme.' Virya is supreme - without virya, no other positive quality. It occurs to me that this is another of those words for which we don't really have a term in English, not as it's used in the Buddhist context. It isn't just energy. It certainly isn't just diligence - that's a very feeble translation indeed. It is the being intent on the good, or if you like, is energy in pursuit of the good. Energy in pursuit of the skilful. So what one English word is there for that. Can anyone think of one?

Asvajit: Perseverance.

S: No, you can persevere in anything - good, bad or indifferent.

Manjuvajra; Is steadfastness sometimes applied like that?

S: Sometimes steadfastness has a slightly positive connotation - but you can be steadfast in doing evil even - can't you?

Asvajit: Earnestness.

S: Earnestness, yes that's coming nearer. That has been used as a translation of mindfulness though hasn't it? Woodward in his verse translation of the Dhammapada uses it in that way.

Abhaya; Zeal can have a very bad

S: Yes, it's more like zeal, if zeal was only a very positive quality, a very positive quality. Energy in pursuit of the good.

END OF SIDE ONE

SIDE TWO 403

MBP/14

15 5: Intentness on the siilful. It's the inclination towards the good. Taking 'inclination' in a maybe somewhat stronger sense than it usually bears.

Mark; That sounds really weak to me, inclination sounds like you've got to make a choice then you're sort of

S: Inclination is literally bending towards, inclining towards. So I think that the important point to remember really is that, as I said, that virya is not just energy. The fact that you've got energy doesn't mean that you have virya.

Asvajit; 'Striving for the good' - that's a bit shorter than 'energy in pursuit...

Dharmapala; Striving again can be.

Asvajit; Well, you may be striving for the good.

S: Or exertion for the good.

Mark; Don't you think that all these sort of words like virya as we found untranslatable and

no doubt others which we haven't come across are just eventually going to have to be called virya - because

S: Well don't forget, even in Sanskrit, virya didn't originally have this Buddhistic meaning. The Buddhists themselves had to enlarge the meaning of the Indian word itself and give it their own definition.

Vimalamitra; What did it mean originally?

S: Just strength , energy.

Abhaya; I suppose what will have to happen we'll have to adopt the language eventually. Simply by using words in our own special way or... .but that'll take some time.

S: Not very long I think actually.

Vimalamitra: Have to have our own dictionary.

S: Well, Sagaramati is helping to compile one.

Abhaya;What have we got so far?

4o4-~.

MBP/14 Sagaramati; Nothing (Laughter) I haven't got the time.

S: maybe it's just a little twinkle in his eye.

Manjuvajra; I've noticed that with all these positive mental events, there's been a statement saying either it's supreme or It's the most important, or it's the primary one....

S: I don't think we've had most important or supreme so far. Manjuvajra; We've just had supreme, diligence is supreme. Then we had... Kamalasila; Faith was quite like that.

S: We noticed that faith. ...

Abhaya; That without faith one couldn't have anything - now we say that without vigour we can't have anything.

S: Yes, right!!! (Laughter)

Abhaya; So which came first?

S: Well, neither in that case.

Voices: They're all essential.

Asvajit; But they all arise at the same time.

S: They tend to, they tend to arise together, one could say that. They tend to be found together. Perhaps not all of them but at least quite a good number of them.

Sagaramati; Then again I suppose they are all aspects of them. I mean of that is a positive state of mind you would find faith and vigour and..

S: Yes, how could you possibly be bent on the good unless you have some measure of faith in the good. Which also implies that you know the good. You don't simply have belief in the good, you have faith in the good.

Abhaya; Yes, which helps to break - to rid you of this concept that we're all static entities, or...

S: Yes, just things.

MBP/14      Abhaya: Things, yes or labels for a thing, or the states of mind are things. 17

Asvajit; It occurs to me faith is a really bad word - there are so many unsatisfactory connotations, it seems so weak compared with what it really means to us.

S: Well, perhaps a Christian wouldn't say that faith was a weak word. Sagaramati; You can go to war because of it!

S: One of the three cardinal virtues, faith, hope and charity. They'd probably consider it a very strong word.

Asvajit; It suggests something rigid and armoured.

Sagaramati; They talk about armour here.

S: The whole armour.

Abhaya; The whole armour?

S: This is what Saint Paul says, isn't it. putting on the whole armour of Christ.

Dharmapala; That note on armour, going back, had quite a lot more to say than we actually read.

S: Alright, read it then.

Dharmapala; "The heavy armour refers to the armour of strenuousness."

S: It's not clear whether strenuousness is the same thing as diligence.

Dharmapala; "The armour has been explained in the collected works of Gam-po-pa as follows; One must pursue the paths wearing two armours, the external which is the armour of seeing and the internal which is the armour of discriminative awareness."

S: Presumably these are vipassana and prajna.

Dharmapala; "Also Klong-chen-pa in his Zab mo yong thig speaks of four armours. In putting on the armour of trust, one will endure hardship. In putting on the armour of learning, one will destroy external and internal

MBP/14 postulates. In putting on the armour of assiduous striving, one will  
°406\ 18 experience realisation. And by putting on the armour of humility, one will  
not cling to fame."

S: What do you think this phrase 'putting on the armour' really signifies? Asvajit; Being rooted in a certain attitude.

Abhaya; It may suggest an animative

S: Yes, I think getting ready for battle. I think this suggests readiness for battle. I think we should be careful not to take it in the sense of the adapting, as it were, of a rigid attitude. I mean the fact that the word is armour would almost suggest that, almost automatically but I think we ought to resist that; I think that is not the point of the idiom. You put on your armour when you prepare for battle, just as when you take up your sword.

Asvajit; Or the Zen people talk in terms of a bowstring which is tightly drawn.

It's more like 'bring me my bowl of burning gold' - it's more that sort of attitude isn't it. Otherwise, if we take the phrase too literally it suggests the Bodhisattva making himself sort of hard and resistant to something which seems to contradict the very nature of the Bodhisattva himself.

Manjuvajra; Because Tibetan armour would be very different from the western concept of armour wouldn't it?

S: Yes, probably less elaborate. Though the idiom is of course, originally, Indian.

Padmavajra; In the 'Perfection of Wisdom' they

S: Yes, you find it repeatedly there.

Manjuvajra; We think of armour as being a great metal suit whereas theirs includes more horse, sword and shield.

S: We tend to think of body armour.

Padmavajra; They have the term 'heavy armour

S; Yes, so what is, if virya is, - especially the first kind of virya - if it's

497

MBP/14 the virya that's ever ready - well that also links up with the idea of 19 being ready for battle, sort of girding oneself for battle, preparing to make the great effort.

Asvajit; Suggests not resting on one's laurels.

S: Yes, indeed yes.

Vimalamitra; It also suggests taking up the attitude there 5 going to be a battle.

S: Well, yes that is part of being ready.

Dharmapala; Being keyed up for all these other phases.

S: Yes. It's not to be taken as meaning the Bodhisattva, as it were, hardens himself. Not anything like that. Or seals himself off. Right, let's go on to alertness then. What is that in Sanskrit?

\_\_\_\_\_; Prasarabdhī.

S: Oh dear! Prasarabdhī! Well it's not alertness at all! No, this is the tranquility, relaxation, calmness no, quietitude no, serenity no, no, no, no. (Laughter) Well read it and then see.

Padmavajra; Have we got the wrong Sanskrit or?

S; No, not all, no

Vimalamitra; "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains alertness as follows: What is alertness? It is the pliability of body and mind in order to interrupt the continuity of the feeling of sluggishness in body and mind. Its function is to do away with all obscurations.

Alertness is an awareness in which the mind is made to serve the positive as a docile servant serves his master. It interrupts the continuity of the feeling of sluggishness in body and mind.

Alertness is twofold:

1. Physical alertness

2. Mental alertness

Physical alertness means that when through the power of concentration the sluggishness of the body, which does not allow one to do anything, has been overcome, one feels light like cotton floating in the air and the body can be made to work towards any positive value one wishes. Mental

MBP/14 alertness means that when through the power of concentration, mental

20 sluggishness has been removed, the mind moves on towards its object without friction and can operate smoothly. It is as the venerable teacher (Tsong-kha-pa) states,

Concentration is the king that rules the mind. When he is seated, he is immovable like Mount Meru. If he travels, he goes to all positive values And brings about great happiness which consists in the pliability of body and mind."

S: Yes, this is much more like it -'it is the great happiness which consists in the pliability of body and mind' - but how that comes to be we shall see in a minute. Read on,

Vimalamitra; "The statement here that its function is to do away with all obscurations means that, through the power of alertness, sluggishness of body and mind is cleansed, and, when one has alertness, one is drawn towards integration from within. This integration through its mere spreading increases the feeling of pleasure, and by its mere increase, integration becomes ever more intense, and so one becomes powerful to do away with all obscurations."

So the literal meaning is the word *prasrabdhi* or *passaddhi* in Pali, is tranquility, relaxation, calmness, quietitude - this really is sort of calming down - but calming down of what?

Sagaramati; It's the calming down of the *caittas*.

S: No.

Sagaramati; Aren't there two types, the~s the mental calming down and the physical calming down.

S: Yes.

Abhaya; It's the calming down, isn't it the calming down of the blissful feelings that are

experiences in the dhyana state.

S: Ah, that's getting closer, not blissful feeling but the ecstatic feelings. Prasarabdhī comes immediately after prīti so....

Abhaya; Tension release?

MBP/14 S: This is why Guenther translates it as tension release - but it isn't  
4o9\ 21 really that, though he's getting somewhere near it. So what is prīti?  
One has to understand that first - it's ecstasy, it's more than joy, it's ecstasy or rapture,  
but what is its main characteristic?...

Padmavajra; It's bodily as well as...

Abhaya; Releases energy.

S: It's bodily as well as mental, it releases energy, but in what sort of way?

Dharmapala; A bubbly way.

S: A bubbly sort of way, yes. So the prasarabdhī as calming down is the calming down, not of the ecstasy itself, so much as of its bubbly quality. So you mustn't think of prasarabdhī in the sense of calmness or serenity - which is its literal meaning virtually - as representing a sort of complete calming down of emotion as it were. Not that it completely calms down the prīti, in the sense that there's no emotion left. It only calms down that bubbly quality by as it were absorbing the excess energy which is producing the bubblyness. This is why our author here says, 'this

integration through its mere spread increases the feeling of pleasure' pleasure is a very bad word here - 'Increases the feeling of bliss and by its mere increase, integration becomes ever more intense and so one becomes powerful to do away with all obscurations.' So as a result of the calming down, the pacification of the bubblyness, the rapture becomes, as it were, quieter, without ceasing to be rapture, and becomes more intense. So it's much more, therefore, than alertness, isn't it? And it's because of that as it were calmed down state of

rapture that the body and the mind both experience intense pleasureableness and pliability, malleability, workability and so on, and are fit to be used for any skilful pursuit that one may choose. The mental factor in the positive nidana chain immediately succeeding prasadhi is sukhha. Sukhha represents the bliss that remains, after the bubbly quality - what Guenther calls 'The ( ~\$S+'Vdt-ions) of priti' have subsided, what remains is this priti which is a very pure, stable, but at the same time light, almost floating blissfulness which makes it very easy for you to do anything either mentally or physically. Obviously a very useful quality. So clearly it's very much more than alertness. And it's also not quite tension-release, because in tension-release energy is, as it were, expended, not to say wasted - but here the excess energy, the

410

MBP/14 bubbly quality, the effervescence is all absorbed, and contributes to

22 the intensification of the blissful feeling, and gives the blissful feeling a sort of lightness, a sort of floating quality that it didn't possess before.

Abhaya; Energy is released, there is blocked energy released in that state of meditation you talked about.

S; No, it seems as though in the state of quite what is happening is that there is an upsurge of energy which produces the ecstatic feeling. It would seem that that is what is happening, that, deeper sources of energy are being tapped. Perhaps blocked energy is being tapped, and the upward rush of that energy is experienced as something intensely pleasurable but it isn't completely integrated, it isn't completely harmonious. So some of it, as it were, bubbles over - you start laughing, as you do sometimes in meditation. Or you start sort of shaking or twitching, or your hair stands on end. All this is the sort of unintegrated energy sort of breaking out in various ways. For the time being, it's so strong you're sort of taken by surprise, thrown off your balance, you can't cope with it. But in the course of time as prasadhi, calming down, comes into operation, the effervescence subsides, but~it leaves a residual blissful feeling. It's not that you return to your previous, as it were, comparative emotionless state. You're left with a feeling of lightness, of blissfulness and exhilaration which is not out of control which is completely integrated, which is, as I said, light and floating, and when your mind is imbued with that sort of quality it becomes very easy to do things. Everything becomes very pleasant, everything becomes very flowing, smooth, spontaneous. You feel light both mentally and physically. Nothing seems heavy. So clearly it's somewhat opposed to indolence and sleepiness. (Pause) So alertness won't do.

Abhaya; So have we got a one word translation of this?

S: We don't really. Tsong-kha-pa's getting pretty close to it when he speaks of it 'bringing about great happiness which consists in the pliability of body and mind' (Pause) Right let's go in to concern then, what may that

be? Oh Apramada. Pali is App~mada - zeal, non-laxity, earnestness, diligence, Buddha's last exhortation. We often translate it as mindfulness. This is non- heedlessness - pramada is heedlessness, it's connected with the sort

of state of being infatuated, ~ven intoxicated. So apramada is not being in that sort of state. I have a really good little - Oh where's that dis-

411

MB?/14 cussion of apramada? By SurendraNath Dasgupta. Let me see if I can find 23 that. Have you heard of SurendraNath Dasgupta?

Asvajit; Tell us a little about him.

S: SurendraNath Dasgupta was a very great Indian scholar. One of the very greatest of modern times possibly the greatest. He is the author of a history of Indian philosophy in seven volumes published by the Cambridge University Press. He's written a number of other works, and he's written quite a lot in Bengali and was quite a distinguished Bengali poet, at the same time. His principal feature was that he went directly to original texts. He was a very, very good Sanskrit scholar and to write his history in philosophy he went around India searching all the ancient libraries and reading Sanskrit texts and he had a wonderful memory. I met him many years ago at the Lucknow University when Guenther was there. Guenther was quite influenced by him and had a very high regard for him and Guenther doesn't usually have a high regard for anybody. (Laughter) And I think actually he influenced Guenther quite a bit because Guenther is also one who goes direct to

original texts ( ) in Sanskrit or Tibetan. They got on

very well together. At that time Suvandramath Dasgupta was quite old and he'd retired. He must have been almost seventy, He was very, very frail and weak and he presided over a lecture which I gave at Lucknow University. I'm going to mention all these things at the beginning of the next volume - of memoirs. That was the first time, incidentally, I ever gave a lecture at a University. This was, I think, in 1950. So I thought it had better be really good, so I prepared my lectuer and gave it on anatmavada and gave it under his chairmanship in the philosophy department of the Lucknow University. So afterwards I asked him what he thought of the lecture. So he said he enjoyed it very much and he said, 'I think I was the only person present who understood it' (Laughter) Which in a way quite pleased me. I

also realised that university audiences were not as intelligent as I had thought! (Laughter) That is also a bit disillusioning. Anyway he had a wife called Suleima Dasguptya. S~iLeima

Dasguptya was a former pupil of his who he had married and he was very, very much younger. She was also a Professor of Philosophy and quite a learned woman and she has written, I think it's been published, but if so it's in typescript, a history of karma, the concept of karma in Indian thought. It's quite a massive work and I've not seen it since those days. I hope it's been published. Anyway he died quite a few years ago; she is still alive and teaching in an American University. Recently, fairly recently she brought out this little book called 'An ever expanding quest of life and knowledge' which is a boo!: about him, especially about her life with him and it includes a large number of letters from him to her. Mainly on philosophical and

MBP/14 spiritual topics. I should also mention that though he was a very, very

24 great scholar and a great intellectual he was also a deeply spiritual man and a very humble sort of man. This was the thing that most impressed me about him when I met him. He was very very humble though he had, not in a false sort of way, but he genuinely had a sort of love for knowledge and no airs and graces. No pretensions whatsoever for himself. This was very very noticeable in him I'm afraid, in comparison with someone like Dr. Guenther who was young and really exuberant in those days, even more so than he is today. I mean Dr. Dasguptya's humility was quite remarkable in comparison but it was completely natural, nothing false, nothing put on. Anyway in the course of this little volume which is quite a beautiful volume in some ways, there's a very interesting account of what apramada really means. It's the fullest account I've seen. I'll just see if I can find that in one of his letters. I think she asks him what apramada means. No, there isn't an index, I'll just have to look through. I did when I originally read it. I might extract it for 'Shabda'.

Abhaya; Is it a recent publication?

S: ( ) a few years ago, not very very recent but fairly recent. This is a bit typical, here is Dasgupta as a very young man meeting Lord Ronaldshay, the famous Governor of Bengal, who's deeply interested in Indian thought, afterwards became the Marquis of Zetland. 'Yes', said Lord Ronaldshay, 'in which branch of Indian Philosophy have you specialised?'. 'In all the systems' answered Professor Dasgupta. Lord Ronaldshay smiled in reply. Perhaps he thought that it was rather incredible that a person could be competent - a competent scholar - in all the systems of Indian thought. Mr. Day, then the Commissioner of the district, who was with the Governor, came forward and said, 'May I interrupt your Excellency?' 'Yes', said Lord Ronaldshay, 'What is it?'. Mr. Day said 'Professor Dasgupta is an authority on the subject and whatever he says has to be accepted'. Lord Ronaldshay got interested etc. etc. This ~/as in his very young days when he was a lecturer in college. I must say that reading through this book, which not only contains his letters but is an account of the relationship between the two of them and not on the sense of the dreaded relationship but something much more genuine, one realises how much more, as it were, sensitive and reticent the Indian is, the traditional Indian than the modern western European, because she's written about her life with Dr. Dasgupta and the interests that they shared but there's nothing at all about sex or anything like that, at the same time you feel that she's giving a complete and full account of the

relationship. You see what I mean? The thing that really matters to both of them are

4L3

MBP/14 being fully treated but there are no, sort of, reservations about

25 private life or anything like that. It is all very much on the level of common intellectual and spiritual interests but is, at the same time, in a deeply human sort of way. So it's the sort of beel which could hardly have been produced by a western woman I think. I'm just looking for this quite interesting description of what apramada really is.

\_\_\_\_\_, It's not the same description ( ) Introduction

to Tantric Buddhism is it?

S: -No, that is ( ) Dasgupta who was one of his pupils and he, as a matter of fact, spoke to me ( ) he gave Dasgupta all the Tantric manuscripts that he found so he could write this book and he said to me in front of Dr. Guenther, 'I gave him all the material and he made a mess of it'. So the material is there but it hasn't been, sort of, very well angled. Ah here we are. This is a letter from him to (his

wife ) 12th. March 1943. "In our scriptures, particularly in Buddhist literature, the quality of 'lack of carelessness', or 'lack of inattention or inadvertence' (apramada) has been emphasised very much and very much has been said about its usefulness in spiritual life. The word 'pramada' means inadvertence. In simple Bengali it means lack of attention. Therefore, the term 'a-pramada' will mean absence of inattention, i.e. full and complete alertness and attention without which we cannot accept or understand any subject. It does not need to be emphasised that attention is essential to acquiring knowledge. But it is not easy to understand why this should be so very important for spiritual life. Then again there is another point; why should the scriptures use the word in a negative form, i.e. instead of emphasising attention, why should they use the word in a negative way, why should they speak of 'lack of inattention'? This evidently seems to be a roundabout way of expression. Again if we try to understand the meaning of the word a-pramada from its positive counter-part 'pramada', the word will bring a different significance. The word 'pramatta' (he who is under pramada) means a drunkard or a lunatic. The bhasyakara Patanjali has quoted a verse which asks that if one cannot get to heaven by drinking wine or liquor from several red vessels, can one do so by performing sacrifices? Here, the bhasyakara says by way of elucidation that 'this is a saying of the pramatta'. Kaiyata, a famous commentator, interprets the word used by the bhasyakara like this: the verse quoted means ignorance or error. The error lies in this - that the drunkard thinks that there is no such delight as that of drinking wine. Again, if anybody neglects his duties then also he is referred to by the term 'pramatta' as the poet Kalidasa has described the Yaksha in his Meghadutam.

MBP/14 So we see the word 'pramada' means error, ignorance, drunkenness, in-

26 advertance or carelessness and laxity. Apramada or lack of inattention has been accepted as a very essential function of the mind. This means that it stands for the negation of the defects of laxity and the like. The negative particle 'a' stands here in the sense of 'the least amount' of ~ramada. Therefore apramada does not mean that we have been able to eliminate pramada completely, but that we have been able to reduce it. Perhaps we are thinking of the constant mobility of our mind; all the time inattention and errors are trying to get hold of us, but our mind, keeping alert all the time, is trying to drive them away. Herein lies the difference of 'lack of inattention', on the one hand, from tenacity or firmness and from knowledge on the other. Tenacity, firmness, knowledge, wakefulness are positive qualities and apramada, lack of inattention, is of the nature of both positive and negative character. In other words we may explain it like this: when we are faced with various ideals and temptations, when we are being affected by fame or slander by our contemporaries, and we feel excited and perturbed, at that time that quality of alertness which can hold us together and send our mind onwards through the right path, may be called the capacity of apramada or lack of inadvertence. It is this mental attitude and capacity that helps us from going astray and moves us on towards the ideals of our spirit, of love and of the good.

I have described apramada as something which is in the process of making. That is, it is not one of those functions of the mind which we call accomplished or stabilised. In apramada we get the idea of a movement or a process. The brightness of intellect, tenacity and firmness are steady characters of the mind. But apramada is of the nature of movement. Our mind is always drawn towards small achievements in the outside world. We have, therefore, to withdraw our mind from those small interests, keep it alert so that we are not dragged into a current to other goals, and we have to be very careful that we are moving towards the achievement which we value and which we desire. Therefore, I have said that apramada means a continuous course of action. In our Yogasastra we do not find that much of emphasis on apramada, but we find that faith, energy, penance and contemplation have been mentioned. These are all positive qualities of the mind. But when we try to use these them we come across the quality of apramada because if we have faith in our ideals and wish to undergo hardship for their sake and use our vitality and energy for this purpose, then naturally we have to practise 'lack of inadvertence' - apramada. There is another point to be considered. The yogis start their spiritual career with detachment, or complete indifference to the world (vairagya). Without this detachment one is not entitled to start the career of a yogi. Those who have detachment in an extreme form naturally cannot be tempted by any outside interest. Therefore, they may not require a separate quality

MBP/14 of alertness, or lack of inadvertence. He who has entered the path of Yoga

27 has already achieved detachment from the outside objects. Therefore, for him the main fear is that he should not be idle or devoid of energy, he should be able to go forward towards his ideal with a continuous zeal and enthusiasm and that is why he will be more in need of energy and capacity of endurance. But if somebody thinks that his ideal is to make

him free from false attitude and outlook, from all traditionally acquired beliefs, that his end lies in being luminous in knowledge, liberated from the bonds of passion which act as detriments in a spiritual life, then he has to practise *thi~ apramada*. He has to protect himself from all temptations of the so-called pleasures of life, the misguided attractions towards fame and wealth and has to be continuously alert, getting rid of all inadvertence about his obstacles, which are his natural enemies. He will have to analyse himself and should not forgive his own faults; rather he should be ruthless in self-criticism and purge himself of all the impurities that he may have. He should take those means which will purify him completely. Without this kind of self-criticism, self-analysis and guiding oneself by the right path, one cannot expect to discover the truth. In Kamandaka, this *apramada* means (besides self-criticism) that one should treat one's own faults and defects as objectively as one does with reference to others. This means that man has to be continuously alert and critical. The more we do this, without sparing ourselves, the more we shall discover that our mind and emotions have been polluted to a great extent by the traditional practices, by our weaknesses and our passions of anger and hatred. The more our mind gets vitiated by these, the greater is the chance of straying from the right path.

There is another meaning of *apramada* by which we understand 'lack of inattention'. This is not the same as the presence of attention, because the attention that we require for study, is punctuated with gaps; we try to collect knowledge and move on from one object to another. Therefore our attention also shifts from object to object. It is not like the continuous flow of the river Ganges. Our attention fluctuates and also changes its course with the change of its objects. Therefore, we should distinguish between *apramada* meaning the lack of inattention, and the presence of attention, by accepting the former as an attribute of the spirit." So, That's quite interesting isn't it? Especially the idea of *apramada* as a process. Because things are continually happening, you need to be continually on your guard, continually to be taking precaution against inadvertence. It's not a sort of stable quality that you have, it's an activity in which you have to engage. That's the main point he seems to be making. Anyway it's not every husband who writes letters like that to his wife. After that there is another long discussion of what is meant by

or the spiritual. (Laughter) So that was concern, let's see what this author has now to say about it.

MBP/14 Manjuvajra; "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains concern as follows:  
 416 28 What is concern? From taking its stand on  
 non-attachment, non-hatred, and non-deludedness coupled  
 with diligence, it considers whatever is positive and protects  
 the mind against things which cannot satisfy. Its function is  
 to make complete and to realise all worldly and transworldly  
 excellences. It is intelligence which realises the positive and protects the  
 mind from what is unreliable by persevering in diligence and not falling  
 prey to the emotions. According to the  
 Bodhisattvabhumi, there are five kinds: 1. Concern with regard to things in the past  
 2. Concern with regard to things in the future 3. Concern with regard to  
 things in the present 4. Concern with regard to things which were to be done before  
 5. Concern with regard to things which continue together with  
 what is done now They have been explained by Tsong-kha-pa as follows: To

get rid of the evil done in the past by means of the teaching,  
 And in the future to think of doing what is positive, and, in the same  
 way, In the present to do acts without being absent-minded,  
 And to carry oneself in such a way that evil will not rise,  
 And to gain control over oneself in thinking that all this is  
 possible, Then, in view of the above facets, one acts  
 appropriately."

S: That seems clear doesn't it? 'To get rid of the evil done in the past by means of the teaching, and in the future to think of doing what is positive, and, in the same way, to do acts without being absent minded' - without inadvertence, as Dasgupta would say - 'and to carry oneself in such a way that evil will not rise, and to gain control over oneself in thinking that all this is possible, then in view of the above facts one acts appropriately.' You can begin to see now the quite subtle but important and quite definite differences between the terms *apramada* and *smṛti* and *jñāna* - yes? In other words we might say recollection, or rather, let's say non--heedlessness, recollection and awareness. We quite often confuse these, don't we? Some- times we just speak of mindfulness and awareness in a rather loose sort of way; sometimes this non-heedlessness is translated as mindfulness but it's more than that as you can see from Dasgupta's discussion and also from this one.

Padmapani; Can you name those three again Bhante?

417

MBP/14 S: Non-heedlessness that is *apramada*, recollection, that is *smṛti*,  
 29 awareness which is sometimes translated *vijñāna* and sometimes *jñāna*.

Sagaramati; Sorry, what was it you translated awareness as?

S: Awareness can be - Guenther translates *jñāna* as awareness - the five *jñānas*, the five awarenesses. *Prajña*, of course he translates as analytical appreciative discrimination. (Pause)

Abhaya; So you translated *jñāna* as awareness, Bhante, did you? Did you give the English equivalent as awareness?

S: Yes, jnana, yes.

Abhaya; I'm still not sure about

S: Though we do sometimes use awareness for recollection, but that is when you are recollected in the present. Your recollection consists in the fact that you call to mind something former, - of the past - and you think of it in the present. So it is in the present before you. In other words, you are aware of it.

Abhaya; So if you're being mindful of your bodily posture - that would not be smrti

END OF TAPE 14

S.: You are aware of it.

Abhaya: So if you are being mindful of your bodily posture, that would not be smrti?

S.: Well, that is more like awareness, isn't it? Like watching and seeing, in the present. So recollection does include awareness, but awareness is not recollection, because in awareness you may be having no thought of the past at all. But the term 'recollection' in English is ambiguous. It's a distinction between recollecting and being re-collected. Do you see this distinction? Being re-collected means being together in the present, being mindful and aware in the present, but recollecting means calling up a mental image pertaining to the past.

Sagaramati: So smrti is more like recollecting?

S.: So smrti is more like recollection; yes.

Kamalasila: It is more active, in a sense.

S.: It is more active. Mindfulness is more like the state of recollectedness.

Abhaya: So mindfulness is smrti?

S.: You could say that smrti could be translated as re-collection and as mindfulness. It is used in both senses in Sanskrit. And you can also use mindfulness - I mean, you can also use awareness - as an equivalent of mindfulness. Though Guenther uses it for jnana which is, as it were, the higher awareness: the awareness of the transcendental. But non-heedlessness, though it is also translated as mindfulness, is much more active than that; it is being constantly on one's guard against interruptions and temptations and unskillful states,

constantly warding them off, being on the look-out for them, on the alert for them. It's much more like that.

Abhaya: It sounds very much like what you were saying about virya.

S.: Well, you would not engage in that kind of activity unless you were essentially intent upon the good, because why do you want to ward off the unskilful and be on your guard against it? So that it does not obstruct your realisation of the good.

Padmavajra: That seems to suggest having the armour on? Is it protection?

S.: No, it seems that it suggests the actual fighting, doesn't it? The warding off of the enemy, not just having the armour on.

419

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont.2.) Tape 15.

Manjuvajra: Diligence could go in other directions, couldn't it? I mean

S.: Yes. I mean, diligence in English is a neutral quality; an ethically neutral quality.

Abhaya: No, I mean virya.

Manjuvajra: Well, I mean, virya can I mean, there is a difference between virya apramada.

S.: Yes.

Manjuvajra: You need virya to apply apramada.

S.: Yes.

Manjuvajra: But virya can also be the development of the positive qualities.

S.: Yes. Manjuvajra: Which isn't actually apramada. S.: Right. Abhaya: It's a more general term.

S.: Yes. Though at the beginning, until one is really established in the positive, one will need all the time to be warding off the negative qualities and that is where the apramada comes in.

Manjuvajra: You've drawn a distinction here, between smṛti and apramāda, have you?

S.: Yes. Because, I mean, as I say, apramāda is this active warding off of negative states and being on the alert with regard to them, whereas smṛti is:

- (1) recollection, in the sense of calling up something of the past, and
- (2) mindfulness, in the sense of being aware of something in the present, either of something called up from the past, or of something which is in fact immediately before you, whether your own body, your own feelings, your own thoughts, or the Dharma itself.

When it is directed towards the Dharma and as it were really and truly sees that, then it becomes more like awareness in the higher spiritual sense, (known as?) jñāna or prajña.

Asvajit: One becomes aware of the necessity of all these qualities very much when perhaps you've given a talk to a group of beginners, and then one asks perhaps for questions, or allows a period for questions, afterwards, and very often it seems, for some reason, that quite a lot of negativity comes up and one has to be very alert, very quick, very

energetic, to ward that off.

420 Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont.3.)

Tape 15

S.: Have others found that? After talks?

Padmavajra: I can see what he means, but I have never experienced it. But I've sometimes seen, with talks I've been on - not always, but sometimes - seen cases of somebody trying to catch the speaker out.

S.: Mm. Yes.

Padmapani: Oh, Yes!

S.: All right. Let's carry on to the end of this section.

Text: Since it has been said that its function is to provide a basis for letting the worldly and transworldly excellences all be present, it is very important as the basis of all the levels and paths. In the same way, Nagarjuna

"The Buddha has stated, "Concern is the basis of immortality. Negligence is the state of death." Therefore, in order for you to increase the wholesome, always be concerned and be so

devotedly'.

S.: This is a quotation from the ~hammapada, isn't it? Yes? appamado anatapadam. The basis, also usually translated in Pali as 'the way to immortality'. So do you think 'concern' is a very appropriate translation for Iapramada'?

(Chorus: No.)

S.: No.

Abhaya: In fact, listening to your translation, I begin to wonder how could he possibly have arrived at that ( ) translation!

S.: Yes. Indeed. I think this sort of thing comes about when, at least to some extent, one is trans- lating the words and not the meaning! I mean, Guenther makes a great sort of point of this, not to say a great play with this of translating meanings, and hence he uses very modern, not to say contemporary, philosophical, linguistic, analytical, terminology, but I think that at least sometimes he doesn't stop and ask himself what it means spiritually, what it means in terms of spiritual practice, what difference it does make in one's spiritual life; in other words, he doesn't relate it back to spiritual experience, even though he does go on at great length about the Tantras and the emphasis of the Tantras on experience, which is all perfectly correct, but I think he himself does not always try to relate back what he is translating in that sort of way.

Padmavajra: Just reading some of his texts, just reading it, you kind of feel there's certain words which just seem completely out of line with the whole feel of the work; they just don't seem to be right, somehow.

S. : As, for instance, with this "calming down". Well, it isn't enough to translate prasrabhdi as "calming down", which is quite correct, because after ( ) well, what is being calmed down? And that means going back to the meditation experience itself and what is actually happening in that. You know, unless you refer back to that and try to explain it, try to understand it, then you can't make sense of the terms. But this is what the dictionary translators have .... dictionary scholars, tend to forget, just as in the famous example: Mrs. Rhys Davids' "musing" for jhana. (laughter).

Asvajit: I suggest that these people actually have very little experience of meditation. (or 'it suggests').

S.: It does, because they trip up on - I was going to say 'little things like that', but they aren't really little things. But they are just single words and expressions. If you'd asked yourself, "Well, what was the Buddha talking about? What does it mean in -: terms of one's spiritual experience. What phase of one's spiritual experience does it refer to?" Then one couldn't translate certain terms in the way that some translators do! Because it doesn't make sense, spiritually, in terms of one's actual spiritual life.

Padmavajra: Do you think it is possible, with Guenther's trans- lations of terms, it's got anything to do with what it's what they actually mean more in the state than in that context, or do you think.

S.: I don't think there's such a big difference. There's a concern - this just does not translate 'non-heedless-ness' at all! Well, you could say, 'concerned lest you should slip', but.... No, it's not. 'Non-heedlessness', 'inadvertence', 'absence of advertence', these are much better, much clearer (or 'closer'?)

Padmavajra: Do you think he also translates the Tibetan word without referring back to the Sanskrit?

S.: Perhaps he does, but then the Tibetan word translates the Sanskrit. You still have to make sense of the Tibetan Buddhist's actual spiritual experience.

Padmavajra: He seems to make a big thing about this sort of originality of Tibetan and Nyim-g-ma-pa thought, and doesn't sort of refer it back to the whole Buddhist tradition.

Asvajit: It seems to be quite reprehensible to produce a book like this, which purports to be something very

profound, and then to make quite a superficial translation.

422

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont.5.) Tape 15.

Padmavajra: It's quite odd, at the back the classification has bot psychology first and then Buddhism.

Sagaramati: Well, that's not ( ), that's publishers.

Manjuvajra: This 'concerned' reminds me of what I imagine to be the protectors.

S.: Yes. Yes.

Manjuvajra: A giant 25 ft. Warrior, with a

S.: A sort of 'Gog Magog' kind of figure.

Sagaramati: Leaving out this 'May the fluddhas watch over me with minds attentive'.

S.: Why? Does this sound a bit like Big Brother?

Sagaramati: Well, let's say I'm not too keen on that!

S.: It suggests sort of angels hovering around your bed? All right then. Let's carry on with Equanimity. What's that? Could be upeksha in this It is.

~xt: Equanimity:

What is equanimity? It is a mind which abides in

deludedness coupled with assiduousness. It is quite dissimilar to a state that gives rise to emotional instability. It is a state where mind remains what it is - a state of being calm and a spontaneous presence of mind. Its function is not to provide occasions for emotional instability.

S.: This seems to be equanimity more in a sense of the equanimity which is a factor of the 4th. Dhyana, doesn't it? It seems more like that. Well, let's go and see.

Text: Equanimity means to make the mind fully concentrated on its objective reference by relying on means and techniques internally in order to generate the nine phases in the process assuring stability of mind gradually. When the nine phases in this process have been completed, one need not seek for counteragents of elations or depression - the mind is free spontaneously as what it is.

S.: These are the nine so-called stages of concentration, some people call them. Let's see what these are. Clearly they are leading up into a quite high level of meditation. Read the footnote.

423

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont.6.) Tape 15.

Text: Footnote 43:

For the nine phases in the process assuring stability of mind (sems gnas dgu) see Mahayanasutralamkara, XIV, 11-14 (P.ed.108, p. 85, 1.5 - 2.2):

Because the mind is made to stay with its objective reference, It cannot wander about to this or that. Because the mind quickly experiences an distraction It returns to its objective reference once more.(11).

The wise one gradually draws His mind inward, and then, Because he sees the virtue of this, He tames his mind through deep contemplation. )12).

He sees distractions as offensive And subdues unpleasant things on account of that. When greediness, unhappiness, etc., arise, He subdues them in the same manner.(13).

Thus, the one who strives assiduously will experience the natural state of impermanence directly. By concentrating intensely on what is present before the mind, He attains the unconditioned.(14).

These four verses explain the nine phases in the process assuring stability of mind. The nine are:

1. The mind is made to settle on its objective reference ('jug-par byed).
2. It is made to stay with it totally (kun-tu- 'jog-par ye
3. It is made to stay with certainty (nges-par 'jog- ~ar byed).
4. It is made to stay with intensity (nye-bar 'jog- par byed).

~istamed'dul-barbed.

6. It is subdued (zhi-bar byed).
7. It is intensely subdued (nye-bar zhi-bar byed).
8. It is made to flow in an integrated manner (rgyud gcig-tu byed).
9. It is made to stay with unanimity (mn am- ar ' o - byed).

S.: These are sometimes called the Nine Minds.

Rest of Footnote 43:

This statement in the Mahayanasutralamkara becomes more lucid when we understand it according to Mi-pham's 'ng 'grel phyogs-bcu'i mun-sel gyi.spyi-don 'od- gsal snying'po (fol.59a.-61b) where he relates the nine phases to the six powers (stobs-drug) and the four mena conro S 1 - ye z 1 ee ppen ix igure , p.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar. (Cont.7.) Tape 15.

Footnote 43 (Cont.):

Mi-pham continues by saying, "These nine phases are completed through five stages. The

first one is like a water a over a 5 eep moun ain. e second one settles like the water in a pool at the foot of the fall. The third one flows like a river. The fourth ones is calm like tne ceptn of the ocean. The fifth one stands firm like a mountain.

S.: So one gets the impression of ever-deepening con- centration culminating in equanimity. This is the main point to be noted here.

Text: The mind is there spontaneously as what it is. In general, equanimity is threefold:

1. Motivational equanimity. 2. Feeling equanimity. 3. Immeasureable equanimity.

The one under consideration here is the motivational equanimity.

In the first phase of this stabilizing~rocess, one ~as to know thoroughly the methods which set the mind on its object and then, how its state with this ob~ect dee ens after one uses what counteracts elation and depression, ow 0 use ese coun eragents when this deepening takes place, how in the end one obtains full concentration in integration, and now to obtain this equanimity in between periods wnen one watches for elation or not. All tnis one can learn from the byang-chub lam-gyi rim-pa.

This statement that equanimity functions as not roviding occasions for instability means that when hese nine phases of the process assuring sta~iitiy of mind have been completed, it is eas to turn Dack e mani es emo ions w ic belong to the world of desires. In articular, when composure sets in, elation or depression do not come a out.

S.: It stands firm like a mountain, as Mi'pham says. That is its equanimity. So obviously one doesn't need any counteragent then for the elation or depression.

S.: Let's see what (the Siddhi) has to say about this.

'Equanimity has as its essential nature, zeal' - presumably virya - and the three roots of excellence, alobha, advesa, amoha, which cause the mind to rest ;in the state of equality, rectitude and effort less- ness. Its special activity consists in counteracting men a a l a ion r In other words, these four Dharmas causing the mind o be far removed and separated from the barriers of a itation etc. and to rest in a sta e o ran- quility and ( ) equanimi y.

'Eauanimity is~understood as the Dharma that can

tranquilize the mind.'

425'

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont.8.) Ta~~e~15:

S.: Often, of course, equanimity is mistakenly considered to be indifference. It is not quite clear what these technical terms mean in translation, the three kinds of equanimity, motivational equanimity, which is the equanimity under consideration here, feeling equanimity, and immeasurable equanimity. They might possibly correspond to the three meanings of upeksa which I gave the other day.

Manjuvajra: In that case, we are only here considering the first one?

S.: Yes. We are not considering the... Though the first one here is much more like the second one that I explained. Whereas I explained the second one as being the upeksa which is experienced in connection with the 4th. Dhyana, and the first one in my sort of classification as hedonic indifference, and the third as being the equanimity of Nirvana itself, a meta-physical axiality, as I've called it. So the -- third of mine could correspond to the third one here. As regards terminology -- Oh, feeling equanimity could be my first one. The hedonic one. And this motivational one my second. Yes, it probably is like that, then. But why Guenther calls it motivational equanimity I'm not sure. Where does motivation come in? It is equanimity which is the culmination of concentration. (pause).

Padmapani: It really looks as if this book ought to be completely rewritten!

S.: Well, it is being revised, isn't it? But I wonder whether things like this will be given attention? Because if you just read something, you don't notice things like this, do you?

Asvajit: One can't help but sort of get a feeling somehow that it's too woolly; something not really bright and attractive about it.

S.: Woolly thinking is very common!

Padmavajra: It seems too personal. He seems to be using much too personal sort of language, just for the sake of it, something that he's sort of invented. Deliberately sort of putting his own terms down.

Asvajit: What's the best course of action in a case like this, where we have Guenther who is likely to produce many more such books?

S.: Ah, Well! We have our own study seminars and we transcribe and edit them and we bring them out pointing out things of this sort.

Asvajit: But what about the rest of the unfortunate public who never get a chance to read our seminars?

Padmavajra: Oh, they will by then!

S.: I don't think the rest of the unfortunate public is going to try to act upon these things!

Padmavajra: If they were, they'd be here!

S.: But in a way one has to be grateful to the translators, because with all their imperfections, some of these translations are the only ones that we have, so if one isn't going to learn Pali, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese and Japanese, and Mongolian oneself, then one just has to use them as best as one can, but make any corrections that may be necessary. (pause).

Right. Anything further about equanimity? As I said, this is clearly the equanimity - the concentration that culminates in equanimity; the equanimity which is the culmination of concentration.

Do you think that equanimity is an adequate translation of upeksa? It seems more satisfactory than most, yes?

All right. Let's go on to Non-Violence.

Text: Non-Violence (rnam-par mi 'tshe).

The mngon- a kun-btus Abhidharmasamucca a . 6) explains non-violence as follows:

What is non-violence? It is an attitude of loving kindness belonging to non-hatred. Its function is not to be malicious.

Non-violence is patient acceptance which expresses itself in the sentiment of how wonderful it would be if suffering sentient being could be released from all their frustrations. Patient acceptance is an attitude not the slightest idea of suffering (26a).

This non-violence and the rejection of harming others is the central idea of the Buddha's teaching. It has been explained as follows (in the vinaya):

True patient acceptance - patient acceptance difficult to attain - Has been said to be real nirvana by the Buddha. A monk who harms another and who acts violent towards another is not a religious person.

S.: This is in fact from the Dhammapada, though it occurs elsewhere, too. All right. Let's just look at that. It is interesting that it is said that non-violence 'is an attitude of loving-kindness belonging to non-hatred'. Hm? 'Its function is not to be malicious.' 'Non-violence is 'patient acceptance - ksanti, presumably - which expresses itself in the sentiment of how wonderful it would be if suffering sentient being could be released from all their frustrations. '

That is to say, goodwill, maitri, or loving-kindness, towards suffering sentient beings. It's avihinxa, isn't it?, in Sanskrit? Is it avihinxa or ahinxa?

427

Mind 'in' Buddhist' Pysc'hology Seminar (Cont.10.)

Tape 15:

Sagaramati: It's both.

S.: Because there is a difference. Ahinxa is non- violence; avihinxa is non-cruelty. "Vi" is an emphatic prefix which gives a stronger, more intense meaning. So 'hinxa' is harming, so 'vihinx' is 'harming extremely' or practical cruelty; it's malice rather than violence.

Padmavajra: Hinxa is violence?

S.: Hinxa is violence, ues: causing harm.

Padmavajra: Vihinx is

S.: Vihinx is more like the deliberate infliction of pain and suffering, for the sake of the gratifica- tion that it gives you.

Asvajit: How can it give any real gratification in a proper sense?

S.: It depends what one means by 'the proper sense and what one means by 'real gratification Certainly some people get satisfaction out of cruelty, don't they? And some people are sadistic, hm? Are malicious? And get a certain - we might - say, perverted or distorted - satisfaction from that, but it appears to satisfy something or another. So 'this non-violence and the rejection of harming others is the central idea of the Buddha's teaching.' How literally must one take tath?

Sagaramati: Well, if you act in that way, you do sort of ... you couldn't be said to be one of his followers of the Buddha's teaching. Or even if you are interested in following the Buddha's teaching.

S.: It also ties up with what the Mahayana says specifically about off ences based upon hatred being very much more serious than of fences based upon craving and attachment.

And also, of course, abstention from violence is the first of the precepts, or rather the ways of skilful action. (pause).

All right, then. Carry on, then, with this.

Text: To fulfill the vinaya, it is necessary to carry about a water strainer in order to avoid harming life in water. Since a person who does not carry a water strainer is one who goes against loving kindness taught by the Buddha, he must be uprooted from his foundation of harming another and be earnestly advised of the need to actualize the four attitudes by which one becomes an ascetic, namely,

1. Even if one is reviled, he should not revile in return.
2. Even if one is angered, he should not retaliate with anger.
3. Even if one is struck, he should not strike back.
4. Even if someone pries into one's affair, he should not pry into someone else's affair.

Therefore, when those who have insight truly understand these four attitudes, they will necessarily conclude that the renunciation of violence is the quintessence of the teaching.

S.: What is this carrying~;'abou~'t of a water-strainer? Do you know anything about this?

Abhaya: The monks used to have to do that.

S.: Yes. This is one of the 8 requisites. When you are ordained you have 8 requisites, 8 things that you are provided with. Do you know what these are? The 3 robes, the needle and thread, the bowl, the razor blade, and the water strainer, and the girdle.

Padmavajra: Staff?

S.: No. That's the Sarvastivadin (interpolation?).

S.: So the water strainer is 1 of these because in those days, of course, the bikkhus had to drink water from pools, rivers and so on, and there might be living things in there.

Padmapani: They'd be more likely to have a water strainer because they didn't want to eat mosquito larvae, rather than (laughter).

S.: So 'to fulfill the vinaya, it is necessary to carry about a water strainer in order to avoid harming life in water. Since a person who does not carry a water strainer is one who goes against loving kindness taught by the Buddha, he must be uprooted from his foundation of harming another and be earnestly advised of the need to actualize the four attitudes by which one becomes an ascetic, namely,': that's a separate consideration.

## Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont.12.) Tape 15:

S.: But the point does arise as to how far one should carry this question of the practice of non-violence. I mean, the use of a water strainer just gives us an example. We don't need to use a water strainer nowadays, usually, because water comes straight out of the tap, and with all the chemicals that are in the water, I take it that there couldn't be any living things in the water!

Padmavajra: Didn't the Jains, though, come round about the same time as the Buddha?

S.: It was a bit prior to the Buddha.

Padmavajra: In that case, why is it that they stop short of, in these days, did they stop short of going round brushing the insects out of the way? If they went to the extent of the strainer?

S.: Well, in the case of Buddhism, it was a distinction between intentional and unintentional. The Jains held that even unintentional taking of life constituted a bad karma. The Buddhists held that the unintentional taking of life did not constitute bad karma, so the Buddhists simply took reasonable precautions, whereas the Jains went to extremes, and they wore, of course, masks over their noses and mouths so that they shouldn't breathe in any living thing, but of course nowadays there is the question of microbes and so on and so forth and the difficulty of a completely literal observance of this has become apparent. So how far should one take it?

Asvajit: As far as one well, if one is a sensitive person, as far as one feels.

S.: As far as one's sensitivity goes. Maybe just a little bit further. And also perhaps one should be careful not to attach excessive importance to the particular form of non-violence which perhaps other people are observing but one is not observing oneself. Do you see what I mean? Well, you get a lot of this in India. There, if you are a vegetarian, well, that's everything. You can, for instance, extort money from the poor, lend money at a high rate of interest, but provided you are a vegetarian everything is alright, but if you are not a vegetarian, then no other virtue counts; you are completely out as far as religious minded people are concerned, in many parts of India, anyway. Your pretensions to lead a spiritual life just can't be taken seriously, but automatically dismissed if you are not a strict vegetarian. This isn't so in Bengal, it isn't so in Kashmir, but it tends to be so almost everywhere else. So an exaggerated importance is attached to that particular form of the practice of non-violence. Not that it isn't important, but the exaggerated importance exists in the fact that it's held to be all-sufficient and a substitute, as it were, for the practice of other forms of non-violence. In other words, if you are a vegetarian, well, you can get

away with almost anything, then!

Padmapani: You can beat your dogs, or ....

S.: Right! Or let your cow die of starvation.

Asvajit: On the other hand, it is a bit difficult to place much credibility in the Buddhist who is not a vegetarian.

S.: Right. Indeed. Yes. Because that is obviously, to the average person, the clearest and most obvious way of practising non-violence. You don't claim that it is perfect or that there aren't all sorts of loose ends, such as, well, you might have leather shoes and you may drink milk, well, sure, those are loose ends, but at least the main thing you have made sure of which is that you aren't actually responsible for the torture of animals because you eat meat and fish. So if you are not even able to do that, well, there's a seriousness of one's involvement with Buddhism may well be questioned, unless one lives, as many Tibetans did, in a country where, you know, fruit and vegetables are just not available. And the Tibetans, I've found very scrupulous about this. Where they were not vegetarians, they never made excuses, never! They always say it is an unskillful action. I'm sorry I am having to perform it, but there are no fruits or vegetables available, and they try to take as little as possible and kill as few creatures as possible. This was their attitude. They never excused themselves. They never tried to justify it. They always say: "What I am doing is wrong". This is one of the saddest experiences that I had in the East: that so many bhikkhus were just so unwilling even to consider becoming vegetarians. Oh, yes! That is, Theravadins. Indian bhikkhus were almost always vegetarian, but Sinhalese, - not so much Sinhalese - more the Burmese and the Thais, they just couldn't consider - it. Some Sinhalese bhikkhus are vegetarians and vegetarian bhikkhus are respected, but among the Burmese and the Thais there was almost a hatred for those who were vegetarians! It's as extreme as that! The idea being that you are trying to go one better than the Buddha. They say: the Buddha wasn't a vegetarian. He didn't insist on vegetarianism - which is true; he didn't. He didn't make a hard and fast rule about it, but he certainly laid down the principle of non-violence.

Padmavajra: A lot of people say, "Well, I wouldn't actually kill the animals." But I think that's a real cop-out, because I mean they just have to sort of consider the way the whole meat industry.

S.: Yes.

Padmapani: Did the Buddha not become a vegetarian after his Enlightenment?

~4'31

S.: Well, the subject isn't discussed, but there is this point: that if you are a wandering monk and you are living on alms and the society in which you live is not a vegetarian society, then you may have to take non-vegetarian food. In that case, I think the Buddhist attitude would be that the fact that you were leading an ascetic life and were living on alms and practising indifference towards food, that would as it were compensate any unskillfulness that might be incurred, or that you might be practicing, by actually taking meat. And there are stories told about famous ascetics who even ate somebody's thumb that had fallen into the alms bowl without making any distinction. So if you are able to practice this sort of asceticism, well, vegetarianism is hardly called for. It doesn't matter. You eat the meat that is put into your bowl. But if you have a choice, and if you are in a position to influence society, then it should clearly be in a direction of vegetarianism. This is what I used to point out to some of my Thai bhikkhu friends. They'd excuse themselves by saying, "What can we do? The lay people always give us meat! So we don't want to hurt their feelings", so we take it!" So I used to say: "Well look. The lay people are supposed to be your disciples. That you've been Buddhists for hundreds upon hundreds of years. You've taught the laity all sorts of things! You've taught the laity to make these complicated robes, and offer you. You've taught the laity all sorts of words to ... and phrases, to use when offering you these things. You've taught the laity how to bow to you in a certain way. Can't you teach them vegetarianism, too?" This is what I used to say.

Padmavajra: Sort of suggesting that they'd been taught to give them meat?

S.: Yes. Almost. Yes.

Abhaya: I used to ask by Thai students, sometimes, in oral exams, why they didn't why they ate meat, because I didn't know much about Buddhism, but I knew one of the precepts was non-killing, and one or two of them used to get quite annoyed. I never got a straight answer.

S.: Yes. I used to do this with some bhikkhus. They felt very much as though they were challenged or threatened, or that you felt - however mildly you put the question - that you were thinking that you were better than they were. It's very strange, this very strong irrational reaction. More than about any other topic, I think. If there is anything that is calculated to make the Burmese or the Thai bhikkhu irrational, it is this question of vegetarianism. Not the Sinhalese, I must say.

432

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont.15). Tape 15.

S.: They are usually, even though they are non-vegetarians, they are usually quite

prepared to concede that vegetarianism, is a good thing and that if you are able to practise it, well, that's very good, and they don't condemn it, except one or two very strict Theravadins. (laughter). But mostly they agree with it, and just say, "Well, I am not able to be a vegetarian." And they say no more than that, in most cases. And, as I said, some Sinhalese bikkhus are vegetarian and the lay Sinhalese Buddhists highly respect vegetarian bikkhus; they consider that they are extra strict.

Padmavajra: I have heard, going back to the Tibetans, that even Tibetans coming to the West are still eating meat.

S.: That's true, and that is a bit surprising, isn't it? Some of them say that they've got so used to eating meat... This is what I used to be told: that they were brought up in a meat-eating country; their constitution needs meat; they can't change. I used to say: "Well, I was brought up in a meat-eating country. I ate meat until I was 21 or 22, but I changed! Can't you?" And then, do you know what they used to say? Not only my Tibetan friends but my Thai friends - they used to say: "Oh, your mind is very strong!" And I used to say, "Nonsense! Your mind is equally strong! Of course you could! Do likewise." So this is what they used to say, more especially the Thais: "Your mind is very strong!" And then they'd laugh. (laughter). But it's strange the feeling that this subject arouses! It is comparable to sex, or men and women, in our own circles - vegetarianism versus non-vegetarianism. If we really want to set the cat among the pigeons, you know, you raise this subject! I mean, this is set the cat among the pigeons where Theravadins are concerned, especially the Burmese and the Thais; the reaction will either be extreme embarrassment, or else it will be just displeasure and anger, even. Quite remarkable! Why do you think this is?

Padmavajra: Well, they don't want to change!

S.: Yes, but there are all sorts of other things that they could change in respect of. Why so sensitive about this?

Abhaya: They (like it, but?) really feel it's wrong.

S.: Do you think so?

? (Inaudible).

S.: Perhaps they do!

434,

S.: They do. I met an old monk who had been a strict vegetarian all his life, well, certainly since he was a small boy and entered the monastery, and at that time he was nearly seventy and he had never taken meat all the time that he had been a monk. He was, in a way, a bit like an old Theravadin, a bit like an old arahant-type - he was very thin and very active - he was staying with Dando- Rimpoché - and very bright; he had a very bright face and very bright expression and bright eyes. Very beautiful, but very thin and very ascetic-looking, but at the same time very cheerful and very active, friendly. But very strict, and he only ate once a day - he also observed that rule. Only ate once a day. And I am afraid he looked as though he only ate once a day, but at the same time he was very bright and lively and cheerful and he lived to be about 70, which very few Tibetans do! That's quite interesting, too. He looked healthy, though thin, and he was very active, and ( ) upright, whereas Tibetans usually by the time they are 55 or 56, they are bowed! But he wasn't!

Padmavajra: I think it was the incarnation before (Dzogya Trungpa?) that Tulki. He was a vegetarian, apparently. Quite strict.

Sagaramati: Another thing in point is - you ( ) have met monks who were virtually .... who actually ate meat - I'd find it very difficult even to consider them as Buddhists! I do, really!

S.: Yes. Right. I really find it very difficult to understand how this attitude has arisen in South East Asia. The Chinese monks, of course, are all almost invariably strict vegetarians, and the Chinese nuns, to use those terms. The Vietnamese monks are strict vegetarians. Though they also live in South East Asia, and their laity also like pork and fish and chicken, but the monks are strict vegetarians, I think invariably. The Japanese again, are not.

Padmavajra: They are a mixture, are they?

S.: I think a few Japanese monks or priests may be vegetarians, but the vast majority certainly are not.

Sagaramati: Even Zen!?

S.: Even Zen. They take fish, and I think meat, too.

? Koreas?

433 Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont. 16.) Tape 15.

Padmapani: Perhaps they are a sort of Buddhist country, in a way, so that keeps (it?) sort of resounding in background all the time, and they must sort of have an effect.

S.: Because I noticed with the Thai bikkhus - they don't just eat a little meat. Every dish has meat in it! Every vegetable is mixed with meat. There's not just meat separately. I mean, like the Bengalis take it - some Bengalis, even, monks are not vegetarian - but there's just a bit of fish, separately, usually a very small piece. But with the Thais including the bikkhus, every single dish is mixed with meat, and you can't - I mean, I know this from painful personal experience - you can't get a dish which is not mixed with meat, except maybe just the rice, but every vegetable. Sometimes, I have seen on certain occasions when I have been present myself, there has been pork and there has been chic' ken and there has been fish, in the same meal.

Robert: What about the rest of South East Asia?

S.: It's more or less the same, I think. The South East Asian, apart from the Sinhalese, are great meat eaters, mainly pork and chicken.

Padmavajra: So it's sort of says, by putting your finger on their non-vegetarianism, you are pointing out a hypocrisy.

S.: Because it isn't as though vegetables don't grow in these countries. They abound in vegetables! There are plenty of vegetables. They could easily be vegetarians, not like the Tibetans. But they don't care to, so in a sense, that gives their whole game away, in a sense. In this respect I must say the Sinhalese are much better, though one has fault to find with them on other scores, but in this respect they are much better. It may be the Indian influence. I've known, as far as I recollect, I've never known a Sinhalese monk getting angry when this question was raised. But Burmese and Thais can even fly into quite a temper. More so the Burmese. The Thais tend to become very uncomfortable and embarrassed.

Robert: You mean, the majority of the Buddhists?

S.: I'm talking about the bikkhus, now. But I mean the bikkhus take meat, not to speak of the lay people.

And the lay people (follow the same way?)

S.: But this is a great pity, a great shame.

Padmavajra: I was reading about the Tibetans, even some Tibetans try to be vegetarian.

435

Mind in Buddhist Psychology Seminar (Cont. 18). T~a~e 15.

S.: Korea, I think, as far as I know, they follow the Chinese traditions, and they would be vegetarian. But the main offenders - to use that term, I am sorry to say - are the Thais and the

Burmese. No doubt there are a few vegetarians among the Thais and the Burmese, but they have to keep it dark, they don't let it be known. Otherwise, I mean, the attitude of the other monks sometimes is very, very negative. They feel that the offending monk, the vegetarian monk, is just trying to go one better and show up everybody else! He's very much the odd man out, which is a real pity! You have to be a very, very eminent and influential monk in Thailand or Burma to get away with vegetarianism! A few do. I believe Buddhadasa Thera is a vegetarian. I've heard so. But he doesn't ( ).

Abhaya: What about the English monk who was there, the ( )? Who wrote that book 'What is Buddhism?'

S.: I think, originally at least, he was inclined to vegetarianism, but I think he has just had to become a non-vegetarian.

Padmavajra: Who's that?

S.: That's Kantipalo. There are quite a few English bikkhus out there. There's about twenty that I know of. They've just settled there quietly. They don't want to come back to England.

Padmapani: What do you think should be our attitude if we were in a situation where there was only meat available to eat?

S.: Nothing but meat?

Padmapani: We...ell.

S.: You see, if there's a choice between eating meat and virtually committing suicide, well, eat the meat! (pause) Personally, I wouldn't hesitate if it really was that alternative! Yes. It is important you should maintain your own life. Your life is more valuable than animal life. But I think it is highly unlikely one ever would be in that sort of situation. No doubt one would do it with regret, and get back to vegetarianism as quickly as you could afterwards. I think, if one was in that position of either eating meat or dying, I think you should eat meat. But make sure it really is that sort of situation, it's not just your fancy. I mean, this is what the Tibetans do; this is their attitude. It's better to eat meat than not eat anything at all. Anyway, we've gone over time and I think we can well consider the next part of this section, which deals with those ten (positive faculties?) collectively, tomorrow.

436

Sagaramati. ( ) a German Thai Monk ( ), very, very fat.

S.: Oh, I've heard about him. I didn't hear him described as fat.

He's been round (S ).

Padmavajra: Oh, I can never remember his name ( ).

S.: I remember he gave me a (telling?) off, as it were, for offering him a cup of tea while he was standing up, or something, and he said, "Don't you know the Vinaya?" I said, "No!" He was quite odd.

S.: (They?) do attach great importance to these things

Sagaramati': - Yes. Padmapani: Eh!! ? What's that, then? I didn't know about

S.: You should offer a monk food or drink only when he is seated.

Abhaya: Yeah. Asvajit: What is the importance of that, then?

S.: Well, it's just a matter of etiquette. There's not exactly a Vinaya rule about it, but this is considered polite, as it were. It's just equivalent to our taking off your hat when you go into somebody's house - it's just that sort of thing. You ask him to be seated and then you offer him tea just so that he can drink it more comfortably and with greater dignity as it were. It's just Indian etiquette.

Sagaramati::~: He always asked three of everything. You gave him a cup of tea, he said he must have three cups of tea - one of the Buddha, the Dharma, the Sangha...!

S.: Well, that's a bit like the mediaeval Catholic monks taking three of everything in honour of the Holy Trinity!

Padmapani: Does he only drink one, though? Sagaramati: No, he drinks three! (laughter).

S.: Browning's poem: 'With three sips the Aryan frustrate...' (laughter) ... Aryanism, you know; no Father, Son and Holy Ghost! He refutes... you know, the heresy of Aryanism, ( ) an orthodox three sips in honour of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost!

Padmavajra: Actually, he's not.. apparently he's not strict about that... he doesn't have three meals or.. he doesn't always have three

4~7'

Mind~ in~ Bfl'ddfri~st' p'~yc;ho~lo~g ' S'em'inar Cont. 20) T~ape 15.

S.: Or if he does, they must be before 12 o'clock.

( ) waltz around.

S.: If you are really observant and particular, you can fault even the strictest monk over some point of Vinaya. If you are a clever lawyer, you could find something that every citizen is doing that's against the law. It's like that. But then it's just legalism - what's the value? Someone tried to talk to me about this and I said, "Look. At this very moment you are breaking three Vinaya rules". Which he was. I forget what they were, but, you know, they could be pointed out! And there are certain Vinaya rules which are habitually broken, even by the strictest, like you are not supposed to shave your face without shaving your head, but all the bikkhus do it, nowadays, virtually! They shave their faces in the morning, every day, and they only shave their heads once a fortnight. That's against the Vinaya!

Manjuvajra: What's your opinion of most of the Western monks (in the East?)? What (sort of approach?)...

S.: Well, most of them have not stayed monks long enough for me to form any real opinion! They usually stay monks just a few weeks or a few months or a year or two at the most. It is very difficult to generalise.

Padmapani: Well, do you mean people who have become monks, in England?

Manjuvajra: No. Englishmen who've gone to the ( ), and become monks.

S.: I think.4 I mean, those who stay on out there are very much those who want a sort of sheltered environment and to be looked after and just to get involved in quiet studies and all that kind of thing. Some of them are a bit sceptical of certain aspects of the Theravada, but they as it were go along with it - because many of them are not fools - because they are looked after, they are provided for, and they can basically live the sort of life that they want to lead. Some seem very timid people. Several I've met are very nervy ( ).

Manjuvajra: Why do they choose Buddhism, do you think, rather than ?

S.: I think that in most of them have a sort of ascetic streak, which possibly in some cases is based on guilt; they are not intellectually happy with Christianity and they take to Buddhism, thinking more of those who go into Theravada Buddhism. And they like the strictness and narrowness and rigidity, in a way, of it; it appeals to something in them.

Manjuvajra: Are there any other English monks that you'd like to

see come back to work within the Western Buddhist Order'.

S.: Not that I know personally! I hope they never come back! Frankly, that is the last thing I'd hope for, not unless they change their ways. There may be some that I don't know of, that we could welcome back, but certainly not any that I know. Quite definitely not. Which is rather sad... (long pause) It's not easy to cop~ with you lot! I wouldn't have the heart to bring them back! (laughter) I think they'd be really puzzled and bewildered, you know! I really do!

Manjuvajra: Do you think there'd be many bikkhus in the East who would take the kind of approach that you have taken in this country?

S.: I think there are some that would be very glad to if they got the opportunity. I used to find in India that many of the bikkhus, especially the Sinhalese, who often are really intelligent, strongly supported whatever stand I took or whatever attitude I took; were very pleased that I took it, but you know couldn't express my sort of views very openly to their own Sinhalese Buddhist Lay people. They can be very, very narrow indeed.

Padmapani: Why couldn't they express it to their lay people?

S.: Well, I'm afraid, very often the - well, this may be out of date, because a lot has happened in Ceylon since - but at that time, certainly, many of the monks went in virtual terror of the lay people, and the lay people seemed to be~always exerting pressure on the monks to be very strict, and observe the minutiae of the Vinaya, to be very annoyed with them when they didn't observe them: "Oh, he's a bad monk! He's a (du-sila?) bikkhu!" etc., etc., and to give him a very bad name. There's a lot of this, and some monks really suffer for it. It's as though the laity, very often, sort of live their Buddhism vicariously through the monks. I really saw this! They don't bother about things themselves. They can do almost anything. The monks have got to be religious and ascetic on behalf of the whole community and earn merit for the whole community. This is the attitude they take! They pay him to earn merit for them! It virtually amounts to that! And some of the monks deeply resent this. They are quite aware of it. Well, one of them got really angry one day in discussion with me, and he really abused his parents and swore at them - not in their presence, but - "My so-and-so parents!" he said. "Why do they make me a monk? So that they can go and have a good time while I earn merit for them, so that they can go to heaven!" He was really bitter about it! He had been put into the Order as a small boy. Because the belief in Ceylon is that if parents contribute a son to the Order,, it's a very meritorious act and they will certainly go to heaven when they die.

Padmapani: Like selling a slave.

S.: It sometimes is almost like that! As I say, some of the monks really felt this. And also in Ceylon - unlike Burma and Thailand it's a disgrace to leave the Order, yes, so the ex-monk is the man who has failed, the man who has opted out, the degraded monk, etc. He wouldn't be respected afterwards, although that, again, is lessening now.

Padmavajra: Is saddhatissa (sp?) Sinhalese?

S.: He's Sinhalese, yes.

Padmavajra: And he's a monk?

S.: Oh, yes! Very definitely! But some of the more sensible ones and the more broadminded ones, they just prefer to live in India or somewhere else... They like India, because it is near enough to Ceylon,~, the climate is pretty much the same, people are sympathetic to (the) monks, and they are just away from the surveillance of the lay people. The lay people in Ceylon are sometimes really neurotic about the monks, always sort of spying on them and trying to find out if they are doing anything wrong, just to safeguard their purity. The lay people will tell you "Oh, our monks are very pure! Our monks are very pure. Not like those Japanese monks, you know!" They say things like that. So they are always safeguarded. If it is getting on for 12 o'clock, the lay people especially the lay women, will say, "Come along! Nearly time for food! Monks have to eat before 12 o'clock, you know!" And they'll say things like that in a quite bossy sort of way to the monks. "Don't be late! It's getting on for 12 o'clock. Don't forget!" Bossing them around. The poor monks are sort of very resigned to it all.

Padmapani: They could always say they were on a diet or fasting that day.

Padmavajra: There must be a lot of monks in the Sangha who are just there completely against their will?

S.: No, I think that would be a bit of an exaggeration. There are not very many who are there completely against their will, but, of course, you know, it is a happy life; it is a sort of bachelor existence. At its very worst it's that - a bachelor existence with everything provided. And if you can find some- thing to do - and most of them do find something to do - it can be quite happy.

Abhaya: What do you mean, something to do?

S: Well some of these engage in teaching - this is the commonest activity teaching, teaching Pali, teaching Sinhalese, teaching Pali literature, Sinhalese literature, giving lectures, building temples. Most of the Sinhalese monks especially, are very active; they are very easy to get on with; they are very friendly people; they may not be very spiritually minded, but they are very friendly, and they engage in lots of cultural activities, even social activities, more recently, and they do lead a very good life, from the ordinary human point of view. They do no harm, they are very positive, they are friendly, they do some social good. The only thing is: they are not spiritually committed! In most cases, one has to say that. But as human beings they are fine, in the ordinary sense; very easy to get on with, some of them; very good companions; very generous; very kind; but not with a spark - in most cases - of any spiritual commitment. They hardly know what that means. So such a bikkhu coming over here would be completely bewildered by what we are doing. Really! He wouldn't know, in a sense, what it was all about! It seems really strange, doesn't it?

Padmavajra. Come all this way..

Sagaramati: Hm. Yes.

Padmavajra: The way Sagaramati got picked by that bikkhu, I wonder what the sort of general attitude of bikkhus from that tradition would think of us mere Upasakas!

S: Right. I think certainly many of the bikkhus, and I suspect more and more even from Thailand, nowadays, if they had at least some feeling for the Dharma in a genuine way, they'd feel quite happy within our movement once they settled down and forgot about home. They are usually very attached to their own culture, their own country, and think that it's right and proper they should be because it is a Buddhist country, you see! They don't think in terms of freeing themselves from cultural conditioning. This sort of way of thinking is completely foreign to them! You'd have great difficulty in explaining this.

441

Padmavajra: As you pointed out in that review of (Rahula's) book.

S: Right. Yes.

Padmavajra: Did you get any feedback from that, by the way?

S: Oh, a chuckle from Dr. Conze. He was very pleased. He sent me a little card.  
Oh, he was very pleased with it!

Padmava3ra: Not Rahula? He hasn't sent you anything?

S: No. Well, what could he say?

Abhaya: Does Conze meditate?

S: He has meditated. He spent the war years in the New Forest in a small cottage and did a lot of meditation there. Yes. I don't know how much he has done since, but he certainly has some experience of it. I was thinking it might be a good idea if I go and see him sometime. I see he is 72, and I think he is not all that strong, not in very good health. Maybe in the new year I will go and pay him a visit. I know him fairly well. I have met him many times. We have corresponded quite a lot in the past and always got on very well. He lives in Dorset.

Abhaya: Is he a vegetarian?

S: That I don't know. I know he's an astrologer! (laughter). Anything more?

Robert: Is he married?

S: He is married.

Padmavajra: I think he is a vegetarian, actually.

S: I wouldn't be surprised.

N

4.

Padmavajra: (inaudible).

Abhaya: He read your review in the Newsletter?

S: We sent him the Newsletter, yes. We send him the News- letter. In fact, he subscribes to it. He is not well off, but he sends us money occasionally, doesn't he? In small amounts.

?: Yes.

S: At least he sends us subscriptions.

Yes, he does that.

S: And he has sent donations in the past.

Sagaramati: I think he's sent us a bit in the past.

S: He has always very strongly supported me in everything that I've done.

Padmavajra: I wonder what he'd be like on a seminar.

S: Intellectually, of course, very, very good indeed, but I think you'd find that lack of relating things back to spiritual experience. I think you'd find a lack there. I think he'd quite hesitate to undertake anything - i.e., he's very aware of what he can do and what he can't do, and he won't even try to do what he knows he can't do very well.

Padmavajra: I don't mean taking it, I mean sort of in... with us?

H

S: Well, he did have contact in America - he told me about this himself - with the Sakya Rimpoche, the head of the Sakya School. He said he was profoundly impressed by his knowledge of the Prajna Paramita literature, and said he learned a lot from him. He is quite a sort of receptive, though not sort of artificially humble - he doesn't suffer fools gladly. Has a very biting tongue indeed! Christmas Humphries is said to be very afraid of him! (laughter). Because he doesn't spare him any sort of deviation from strict Dharma. Conze sort of deals with quite mercilessly. Because anything like "All is One", you know... He can be very, very scathing! Apparently it was a few years ago he was invited to give a talk at the Buddhist Society and he asked Burt Taylor, before it started, - before the meeting - "Well, who is going to be in the chair?" "Well, Mr. Humphries is being in the chair." So he said, "Oh! Then I shall have to be 'on my very worst behaviour!" (loud laughter) I think he was! (laughter).

Well, talking of vegetarianism, its..time to eat.

8: All right, page 58, at the bottom. We're still concerned with the eleven positive mental factors, but we're concerned with them now in general.

Sagara- In case one should think that this is all there is to make eleven be innately with confidence, it is said to be wholesome by their very nature in view of the fivefold classification of the positive. Wholesome by its very nature

so be noted that which follows Wholesome in the intimate

S: Right, let's see what the explanations of these are.

Sagara- They are spoken of in this way because they originate mainly as the wholesome by just being there, independent of other factors such as causative circumstances. Therefore it is in this context that they are explained as the eleven primary positive factors.

S: Kim. What does one make of this? You notice that there seems to be no explanation of 'Wholesome by its very nature': the text goes straight on to 'Wholesome by being related'.

Ka-la- Well, that's the next paragraph, isn't it? Sila: Yes -

Sagara- The one I've just read is 'Wholesome by its very nature'

444"

S:- But it doesn't actually say so, does it? - 'They are spoken of in this way' - presumably all the positive factors - 'because they originate as the wholesome by just being there, independent of other factors such as causative circumstances. Therefore it is in this context that they are explained as the eleven primary positive factors'

Sagara: Wouldn't that be an explanation of 'by its very nature'?

S: Emil. It could be.

Sagara: But it's not clear.

S: But it isn't clear. It would also seem that all eleven positive factors are said to be wholesome by their very nature, in that case they are spoken of in this way~, i.e., presumably, as being wholesome by their very nature, 'because they originate as the wholesome by just being there'. That would seem to tie up with 'wholesome by its very nature' - independent of other factors such as causative circumstances. Therefore it is in this context that eleven primary positive factors'. Well, it isn't clear at all, is it? Let's carry on and see if it becomes clearer by going through the other four.

Asvajit: That which is wholesome by being related are the five functional co-relations which operate at the level of the five positive factors being inner confidence~trust.

S: What are these five functional co-relations? We've gone into these, haven't we? Where was that?

Asvajit: (.....) that was to do with the way the mind and mental events are related.

S: Symmetrically and asymmetrically.. ah, yes, the five functional co-relations~ alike stuff, alike objective reference, alike fact, alike time, alike spheres and levels, hmn? (pause) Mind and mental events are associat-

being five of the functional relations - that is to say, they are as it were permeated by the same feeling, they refer to the same object, and so on. There is a certainty in this expression 'by'. Do you see that? 'that which is known as wholesome by being related' - 'being related', at least in English, suggests that the wholesome is brought about by the fact that they are related: but that doesn't seem to be suggested by the meaning of the text, does it? They are wholesome and they are related. But are they wholesome by virtue of the fact that they are related? Do you see that difference? That is not clear. It is more like the related wholesome, rather than wholesome by being related. Sagara: Yes. Because they're wholesome, they are related.

S: Er', yes. They aren't wholesome on account of being related. (pause) Or they are related on account of being wholesome: the citta is wholesome, the caittadharma is wholesome; the mind is wholesome, the mental event is wholesome, so they are related. It seems more like that, not that they become

1/4 -'-' 44~

wholesome through being related to each other. -Right, let's go on to the next one, then.

Asvajit: That which is known as 'wholesome by being related to what follows - are those experientially initiated potentialities of experience which are wholesome. S: What does

mean? °Wholesome being related to what follows?

Vimala: They produce them.. they're the basis..

S: They are wholesome in the sense that they are the basis for the production of the wholesome. They could of course be wholesome in themselves, independently. There's no explanation of these, by the ~Tay, in 'the 'Sidahi, though the 'Siddhi does discuss various problems connected with the positive mental events. All right, what about the next. Padma:

That which is known as 'wholesome by inspiration' are actions & ~~~~~rboseec4 and m~nd that have been initiated through confidence.

S: It's more like wholesome by having been inspired by faith, isn't it wholesome on account of the fact that they have been inspired by faith, or wholesome by virtue of the inspiring quality of faith.

Padma: That which is known as 'wholesome in the ultimate sense' is called the absolute. One labels this positive because, when the absolute

It is not, as it were, positive as opposed to negative. It's a Positive with a capital P, just as, you know, Plato, speaks of the Good with a capital G: not the good which is opposed to the bad. It's only labelled the positive. ~°

\_\_\_\_\_ "These positive factors that have been explained can be divided according to the occasion in which they occur:

- 1. Wholesome by being inborn
2. Wholesome by means of involvement
3. Wholesome by what has been done
4. Wholesome by being involved with benefiting
5. Wholesome by leaving out nothing
6. Wholesome by being a counteragent

7. Wholesome by being in a state of rest

8. Wholesome by being similar to the cause Wholesome by being inborn, to give an example, is confidence-trust which has been set up by the latent potentialities that have come from a previous life independent of what one does about it in this life."

S: This is clear isn't it? It's an innate wholesomeness - something which we carry over ( ) from your previous existence. It's determined through our attitude, at least to some extent in this life.

"Wholesome by means of involvement, for example, is the desire to become a Buddha by relying on the four conditions:

1. To rely on spiritual friends in this life
2. To listen to the teaching of the Buddha
3. To pay proper attention
4. To realise what is conducive to the attainment of nirvana"

S: So this is wholesome by means of involvement. That is to say presumably involvement with spiritual friends, involvement with listening to the; teaching of the Buddha and so on. Something becomes wholesome by virtue of its involvement with these four things. Alright carry on then.

"Wholesome by what has been done, for instance is to pay one's respect to deserving persons."

\_\_\_\_\_ Would that be similar to rejoicing in merit?

S: I don't think so. To pay one's respect to deserving persons seems to be just an example of the wholesome (and) skilful action. A certain amount of skilfulness, as it were, has accrued to you by virtue of a particular skilful action being performed. Carry on then.

Dharmapala; "Wholesome by being involved with benefiting, for instance, is an activity through which sentient beings reach maturity by four essentials:

1. Charity
2. Speaking kindly
3. Acting in such a way that others benefit
4. Sharing '

S: Do you recognise these?

Sagaramati; They're like the four levels of perfect speech.

S: No, These are the four so-called means of conversion of the Bodhisattva.

MBP/15 IV

44~~\ Dana, priya-vaccena and so-on.

Vimalamitra; The four means of?

S: Conversion - I forget what the Sanskrit term is.

\_\_\_\_\_ Means of converting.

S: Yes, means of conversion it's usually translated. I wrote about it in the Survey. The Bodhisattva, as it were, converts people, influences people by means of doing four things. He's generous towards them. He speaks kindly to them, He acts in a beneficial manner towards them. Sharing is more like exemplification - he sets them a good example - this is what it usually means. So nothing is ( ) by being involved in these four means of

conversion as practised by the Bodhisattva.

\_\_\_\_\_ Are these what you've also called the four ways of(ascending?)

S: Yes. These are also the four way of(ascending) (unclear)

(Pause) S: Alright carry on then.

Vimalamitra; "Wholesome by leaving out nothing, for instance, are special bright pure actions that make one attain heaven or the good things in life."

S: (One) for instance (can) call this the mundane wholesome or the mundane skilful. I remember Mr. Chen telling me that in Chinese Buddhism they distinguish between red merit and white merit. Red merit would be the merit which led to heaven or the good things in life and white merit for those which led to enlightenment. The wholesome by leaving out nothing seems to be an example of the red merits.

END OF TAPE 15

S.. - .. Well, it depends on the intention The action may be the same, but if the intention is to get to heaven by means of that action, 1~&1, to heaven you go, but if the intention

is that (indecipherable) that action you progress

towards Nirvana, then in the direction of Nirvana you go. The action may be the same. So the redness or the whiteness of the action depends, not on the action itself, but on the evil intention by which it was accompanied, or with which it is performed. (silence) On to the next one then.

p58 "Wholesome by being a counter agent, for instance? is the wholesome action that has special power of overcoming thoroughly all that is not.....all that is not conducive to the positive and all that has to be given up."

- S: That is quite positive, isn't it?

"Wholesome by being in a state of rest. for instsnce,

is the truth of cessation of frustrations as indicated by the following verse ..

"When one becomes separated from cupidity attachment and is overcome evil actions b ositive acts he becomes immed adorned with the supreme. This is called "having come to rest."

-S: Mmm. Yes. "Wholesome by being in a state of rest."In other words, equivalent to the Third Noble Truth, the cessation of

suffering through the cessation of craving, as that is another kind of the wholesome.

It is not quite clear why these different kinds of wholesomeness are enumerated. Maybe just to give one a better understanding of how wholesomeness functions, or the different kinds of wholesomeness, or the general principle or arrangement. That isn't very clear - not very systematic.

page 2 q Aby: Are these the author's own classification?

S: No. It may be. He doesn't actually put, does he? He

usually does put (indecipherable) but he

may well be relying upon indian tradition, or his, sort of, general reading in the Abhidharma, but this part of this particular section doesn't seem so clearly or systematically arranged as the rest.

Let's go on to the next one then.

"Wholesome by being similar to the cause means the five higher kinds of insight that come with the attainment 9f the

truth of cessation of frustrations and the ten powers of the Buddha'.

S: There is a footnote about "the ten powers of the Buddha'.' ¼ Perhaps we don't need to go through them?

"There is no foundation for considering the wholesome things as entities."

S: Yes. We haven't fully understood there. "Wholesome by

being similar to the cause\* means the five higher kinds of insight#S~ that come with the attainment of the truth of cessation and the ten

powers of a Buddha'~ So what are these five higher kinds of insight? Five wisdoms.

Mnju: usually S: Except that Guenther doesn't use the term insight for

wisdom or jnana. It could be more the five higher abhinyas. It could be those. What we usually call the superknowledges that come with the

attainment of the truth of the cessation of frustrations and the ten powers of the Buddha. But, in any case, what is meant by being

similar to the cause? What cause? (silence)

Presumably the cause is the attainment of the truth of cessation

and the ten powers of a Buddha and the five higher kinds of insight are wholesome - or are wholesome things which come about as a result of that attainment and are similar to them in nature.

It seems rather abstract, doesn't it?

Dp: - I couldn't quite see when he introduced this wholesomeness how these things could be independent of other factors such as

¼ %~1~('page 3 450

causative circumstances, but here he seems to be, sort of, bringii them back.

Mo~\t~ (Ratnajhoti): I can't quite see what you meant by that.

\_ Right.

~cL~VTqD (Ratnajhoti) V--ihat did you mean when you were explaining that. I couldn't quite understand it.

Well, first of all ~Ve are trying to understand 'I similar to the cause', but I said "What cause?" The five higher kinds of insight that come with the attainment of the truth or cessation and the ten powers of a Buddha. So, presumabl~, the five higher kinds of insight qa~~ the effect and the attainment of the tr~ of cessation and the ten powers of a Buddha are the cause.

\_\_\_\_\_ (~atnajhoti) Oh, yes.

-q The cause is wholesome, similarly the effect is wholesome. So 'I wholesome by being similar to the cause' in this

particular instance. ~~qZ~

-(v~o~~q (Ratnajhoti): Yes

S': In other words, those insights which arise in dependenc~ upon the attainment of enlightenment are wholesome because the

enlightenment itself is wholesome. But what is the point o~q saying

this is, rather difficult, you know, to understand. But this seems

to be the general meaning. (silence)

q~~~~~ What did you say you thought th~se five higher kinds of

insight could be?

The tive abhinyas, or abinchinyas. There are usually six enumerated but sometimes five. They could be translated as insight. As I said, Guenther invariably q~ran5lat~5 the five Jnanas as the five awarenesses.

What are these five abhinyas?

-I can't remember offhand. They differ also - there are sometimes five, sometimes six.

?q, Yawn.

K~ 16J page 4

On the other hand it could be a quite different list.

(indecipherable) (silence) (sigh)

- ~: All right. Then he goes on to say there is no foundation~ for considering the wholesome things as entities. This is something that we've noticed through our commentary. And the fact that there is a certain amount of overlapping as between the mental events prevents us from doing that. All right. There is another explanation of unwholesome factors, so let us go on to that.

"Unw ae

as bei fivefold. Unwholesome b itls ve nature' unwholesome b being related; unwholesome by being related to that which follows; unwholesome by ins~iring; unwholesome in the ultimate senseq.

5: All right, let us see what they are then.

"The first is in eneral the basic and roximatQ factors of emotional instability."

S.. - 5!e shall be going into thosi two a bit later on. These qq are unwholesome in their very nature. Presumabl~, that means they ~q~

can't become wholesome under any circumstances even by being related to something else that is wholesome. They are always unwholesome. They are unwholesome by their very nature.

All right, the next.

' The second is the mind and mental events which are simultaneous and on the same level as those unstable emotions."

Yes, this is corresponding to what we saw in the case the wholesome emotions, states of mind and mental events.

Mar~: (Ratnajhoti): I can't understand that second one. I

couldn't understand it before.

I think the difficulty is, as I've said, in that the expression uses "by being related". They are wholesome and they are related. There are some wholesome things which are related to other wholesome things. That is all that he is really saying, as far as I can see. But not as

with the english phrase itself suggests that the~

w

l(~/page 5

are unwholesome by virtue of the fact that they are related. Again, this does say "unwholesome by being related" but I think that "by being" is misleading. So this is the excerpt here is the second, it is that mind and mental events which are simultaneous and on the same level as those unstable emotions. so this is the way in which they are related. They are unwholesome and they are related. And the unwholesomeness is... the fact that they are related is not the cause of their being unwholesome. If anything, the fact that they are both unwholesome is the cause of their being related.

Yes, it is ... it is inverted.

-- Inverted. But if you want to take that "by being"

literally, it should be the other way round. Related by being unwholesome. It is the same kind of unwholesome as occurring on the same level - with regard to the same things etcetera. All right? Mprk. - ~Ratnajhoti): ~s. Mmm. Yes, sorry.

\_\_\_\_\_ The rupee has dropped.

- "The third are the experiential initiated q~fq~~~)

~potentialities of experience which is negative."

° q~ich are negative, yes. Unwholesome by being related to that which follows. ~ething that becomes the basis for the arising of something else which is negative. So, unskillful in that sense. Unskillful by virtue of the fact that it is the basis for the development of something which is unskillful. This...this 'experiential initiated potentialities is...this is his typical Guenther verbosity. Tibetan, as a language, as far as I know~ is very terse and concise...as is Sanskrit, sometimes. Maybe this is Dr. Guenther's teutonic background.

Alright - four. ~at is four?

initiated by those unstable emotions."

16/page 6 4~3

Just as faith inspires so many different mental states

and events, in the same way the various unstable emotions inspire aTh sorts of unskilful activities of body and speech.

1, The fifth is all that is summarised b~ samsara. Lii

so far as these are consid~red to be the situation of the mortals b the...sorry..0in so far as these are considered to be the situation of the mortals by those who would become elevated, they are said to

be unwholesome in the ultimate sense. but there is nothing to estab1:sk that everything in samsara is concretely an unwholesome thing."

~s.. That is quite an important point, isn't it? '~Unwholesomt i~ the ultimate sense" but 'lthere is nothing to establish that

everything in samsara is concretely an unwholesome thing". \$0 what does that mean?

That there is always the possibility of transformation.

S: ~nm. Yes. It's not quite that.

~: (Ratnajhoti): That it is not the things in the mundan. that are tainted and unwholesome but our...uh...but us. 4~ ~q

No, I don't~ think it is that.

They don't really exist.

No, it doesn't mean that either.

It means you consider them unwholesome so as to enable you to grow. \_ No.

~~Ac~ ~RatnaJhoti): That they are not completely wholesane, unwholesome things.

In a way. Because you can have a skilful mental state that brings about happiness in this world and the next. It is not

ultimately wholesome. It is not wholesoma in the ultimate sense, but it is not absolutely unwholesome eithet. This seems to be what the

text is getting at. They are not absolutely unwholesome on the

° samsaric level, that is to say, not c~retely an unwholesome thing.

You can have an experience of pleasure, or even pure joy, but this is not...bhis is unwholesome in the ultimate sense, in as much as it

16/page 7 454 isn't nirvana, but it is not concretely an unwholesome thing.

Concrete.ly, it is positive.

So you can experience the positive in samsara.

Yes, yes, yes.

Relatively.

- q It is rather like this question or dukkha. In the absolute perspective, even pleasant experiences are dukkha, but as experiences they are pleasant. They are pleasant, not painful. So the fact that all conditioned things are dukkha does not mean that there is no pleasant experience. The pleasant experience is dukkha, metaphysically speaking, without ceasing to be a pleasant experience~

: Is it a sort of. .?~.v~<~.

In the same way, things can be wholesome, relatively speaking, though unwholesome in the ultimate sense.

Is this...ah...~.'~0?1')t?~&~

-S'. 1fhat means they are not concretely unwholesome. They are called concretely wholesome - skilful - but unwholesome in the

ultimate sense, in as much~as, they are not the, as it were, absolute positiveness or nirvana or enlightenment.

~t. Anything to do with relative and absolute bliss?

- Yes, yes. S~ 'lthere is nothing to establish that everything in samsara is concretely an unwholesome thing." Oconcretely, there are many wholesome things, pleasant things, happiness producing things. It is only in the ultimate sense that everything is unwholesome. So why is it important to understand this from a practical point or view?

; Well, if everything was unwholesome, even wholesome things, we wouldn't get anywhere.

Not necessarily. You could launch yourself directly into nirvana.

b~'. : You avoid the Theravada view of nirvana as a.. able)

16/page 8 455

I think you would avoid a sort of negative, pessimistic,

cynical attitude. That negative kind of pessimistic, cynical attitude couldn't be the foundation for any actual spiritual practice. If you have a really jaundiced view of the world - that there is nothing good in it anywhere - well, this is actually not likely to lead you to nirvana. It is more likely to lead you to a very negative state indeed. So it is important to recognise that, in the samsara, there are things which are concretely wholesome things and not everything concretely is unwholesome. In other words, one must be...seeing that all...seeing that everything in samsara is ultimately unwholesome is quite a different thing from having such a jaundiced view or existence that you see everything in samsara as unwholesome concretely.

Supposing someone is meditating and is in a quite, sort of, positive state - not a nirvanic state - a mundane state, but still quite positive, and suppose somebody comes along and says 'Oh, what's the use of that - there is nothing in that etc. etc. ' Well, this is taking a jaundiced view of the concretely wholesome. I mean, this is

true, in a sense, that the meditative happiness is not the happiness of nirvana, that it is ultimately unwholesome, but, so long as you

are in the samsara, you can't afford to take up negative attitudes towards it. So therefore the jaundiced and jaundiced view of things, refusing to see that there is a limited kind of happiness within the world, is not a very good basis - or is not at all a basis - for any

kind of spiritual realisation or attainment. It is quite different from true disillusionment. It is more like disillusionment. You can be disillusioned with things

whilst you are thoroughly enjoying them.

' The word "unwholesome" does suggest not complete. Not necessarily (indecipherable)

complete or imperfect. Not positively bad all the way through.

~: (quietly) Not whole.

There does seem to be a natural tendency to absolutise things, or ~ 0~par~ental 1q5e.

16/page 9 456

In what way?

Well, it is either good or it is bad. You establish something as black or white. It is like the mind seems to work in the... the western mind seems to work in that way, you know,...till something is established as black or white... and once you have established it as black or white then you can get on with it.

~p'q : Bhante, you can't though, can you? That's the thing.

A~: No, there does seem to be a tendency in a lot of people's minds~ I mean in my mind, at any rate. V~hereas it is a completely false basis or judging by.

Ppt It is almost suicidal, in a way.

-- S~~q That seems to be the opposite view. It is almost like a reaction against woolly thinking, in a way. You are determined not to be woolly thinking, so you are determined to actually, you know, come up with whether it is black or white.

S: q q q q q, To give an example - it is rather like taking the view that the householder's life, say, is completely unwholesome. We can

certainly say it has its limitations. But if you just take a jaundiced ?q

and jaundiced view and you say that it is completely unwholesome and

there is nothing wholesome in it at all, well, this is, within a certain sphere, establishing that everything in samsara is concrete~ an unwholesome thing, which it is not.

q Is it something to do with Aristotle and the way he, sort of, philosophised. He tended to put things in pigeon holes and put them all cut and dried and analysed. Is it this sort of tendency?

Well he certainly did do that. He certainly had a great influence in western thought. It is certainly what the scholastics did. But there were other influences at work too...(interruption)... but there were other factors at work too, I mean, the Platonic influence was completely different and that was no less - possibly rather more - than the influence of Aristotle on his followers. I doubt if we can lay the blame on Aristotle. I think it is much more

45? 16/page 10

connected with the Judeo-Christian ethical absolutism.

There is a strong element of scholasticism in christian, so called, philosophy which stems from Aristotle, so mainly it is that..

q~ Even, I think, deeper and more fundamental than that is the Judeo-Christian way of thinking that there is something which is absolutely right and something which is absolutely wrong. For instance, it cannot, under any circumstances, be right to bow down to a graven image. That is absolutely wrong. There is no justification for it under any circumstances. The Muslims have much the same feeling with regard to what they call idolatry, joining others with God's because of any deviation from strict monotheism.

I think you could have a, sort of, uncompromising attitude with yourself, which, I don't know, is what you might mean. I mean, the idea that the householder's life is alright, but for

you, you might say, well for me it is not alright. I mean, although you might admit, as it were, for that person it is pleasant, but for you, you know, you are quite uncompromising with that, you know. You are ~ qq~ ~q saying - No, for me it is H.q~.~4

- That is because you see something as more skilful, not that you see the householder's life as completely unskilful. You

~q just see something else as more~skilful still, so far as you are concerned. But you don't take a completely negative view of the householder's life.

M~'. q (Ratnajhoti): Do you know that microphone is not plugged in?

: No. ~bumps and scrapes)

I don't think it will make much difference actually.

- qq~ich microphone is it?

- voices: Yours.

Oh dear, I've been doing most of the talking. (laughter)

This one is much more sensitive than that actually.

458 l~/page 11

: This reminds me of a thing that I read in (indecipherable

about offerings. There were three sorts of offerings. The first one was the offering that was given; the second was the offering that was not given; the third was the offering that was neither given nor not given. And what I understood by this was that, you see, you can (can't) give something up. You can push it away and be free from it or you can pull it to you and be secure with it or you can remain on a kind of knife edge that neither pushes it away nor brings it to you. But you, sort of, balance on this - like accepting of it but not getting involved in it. And isn't this...doesn't this give the same kind of attitude towards the world generally, in that it doesn't, sort of, cut oneself off from it so that you reject it. It doesn't mean that you get totally immersed and involved in it, but it means that you somehow, kind of, float on it.

- No, I don't think it is connected with that actually. I think that knife edge would be a real knife edge. Well, can one remain balanced on a knife edge?

But here is a question of what I have described in the "Surva" as a difference of Doctrine and a difference of Method. There is a,

as it were,... in doctrinal terms everything is ultimately unwholesome. That is the ultimate truth, as it were. But methodologically speaking one does not adopt as an attitude the attitude that everything is, as this author says "concretely an unwholesome thing." I mean, there are things which are concretely wholesome things even though they may be samsaric things and you take your stand upon those so that ultimately you are in a position to see and to experience everything within the samsara as ultimately unwholesome. So you take your stand upon the relative truth, as it were, in order to realise the absolute truth. But if you regard everything within the samsara as concretely unwholesome you have nothing upon which to take your stand, even to actually realise that ultimate unwholesomeness. -But isn't it just a way of looking at it? To rather say

16/page 12

U,

everything is... or everything is ultimately unwholesome.

Yes, well, that is not just a way of looking at it. That is the truth, as it were, That is the way things are. That nothing within the samsara has the wholesomeness of nirvana.

~. But suppose one became enlightened - sort of, like that - and everything would become... would it still be unwholesome? How could that be unwholesome?

- Well, it depends what you mean by "be". There is the ambiguity in the word "be".

° \_\_\_\_ Is that, sort of, a kind of emptiness?

5: Well, wait a minute. What do we mean by "be & unwholesome"? Well, even if you were enlightened it would still be

true that anger would be unwholesome, wouldn't it, yes? That is, there wouldn't be any anger in you. You would be completely wholesome, but that wouldn't prevent you from seeing that there was such a thin, as unwholesomeness in the world.

But everything, that everything is unwholesome. Doctrinally it says... is ultimately unwholesome, that is, within the samsara.

But isn't the samsara just a view...a way or looking at things?

° An\*well, you can say that too, but that leads you on to quite a different perspective - outside the Abhidharma. I would be very cautious before one, as it were, arrives at that perspective. If you do actually arrive that is fine, but one can't, sort of, invoke it hypothetically. (pause) You can say, once you are outside the samsara, I mean, everything

is wholesome, but then you are outside the samsara. In a way...in a way, you don't see the samsara.

° Consider it. It is like things... things you used to do that you found pleasant, but later on in life, I mean, you don't do

them because you see they are not as pleasant as the things you do now Yes.

-: Your concept of pleasure is always changing.

16/page 13

S: q Yes. 4.60 \_\_\_\_ Your concept of the wholesome.

Your concept of pleasure, maybe formerly was a good party, but now your concept of pleasure is a good retreat. What a difference.

What I was getting at when I, sort of, initiated this discussion was that one need not, in fact one should not, and can not, regard everything in the samsara as concretely an unwholesome thing. That is quite a different thing from regarding everything in samsara as ultimately unwholesome and one must not confuse these two. If you do then, as I said, you have no basis to stand on. If everything is unwholesome, well, why should you... within the samsara, concretely unwholesome... well, why should you practise anything, or try to develop anything, or try to cultivate anything? Why should you make any effort?

\_\_\_\_ This is the view that some people actually come to.

~°°tq Yes, well, this is a sort of pseudo-Theravada, akin to

"everything is dukkha". You know...concretely. Because everything is

not dukkha concretely. And in the same way, everything is not unwholesome concretely. Some things are wholesome concretely, some

are unwholesome concretely. You take your stand on the things which are wholesome concretely and you try to develop them.

Alright. Let's go on then.

"Accordingly, the need to distinguish these unwholesome factors as to their actual postulated particularities seems to be very important. These unwholesome factors can be divided according to their circumstances. One the unwholesome by being inborn unwholesome by means of involvement unwholesome by means of what has been done...so-ry- what has been done; unwholesome

by harming; unwholesome by leaving out nothing; unwholesome by things not conducive to good things; unwholesome by being destructive.



"Unwholesome by means of involvement is, for instance, evil behaviour which comes from associating with evil friends and going to religious freaks and thinking of them as gods."

S: This seems to be very much the author's language for the benefit of an American audience, doesn't it?

\_\_\_ : Yes. (laughter)

:"Freaks" (laughter)

: Are there a lot in America?

\_\_\_ : Oh, yes. (laughter)

q~~~~at the original word was in Tibetan (indecipherable) in Sanskrit heaven alone knows. It was probably

-In the previous one 'by being inborn' it says "there may be .1

a point in making the distinction between the actual act and intent to

but the bit that follows doesn't seem to follow on. He doesn't seem to go into this thing about the actual act and the intention. In an,

it almost seems as if the division between good and evil is related to the act and the intention. I think the intention is as important as the actual act.

S.: Well, the context of discussion is the unwholesome, so what are these young people that he refers to supposed to be thinking?

what is the mistake that they are making?

That the intention is not .

-° : They do not consider this division between good and evil as something very important. He seems to go from a distinction between act and intention to a distinction between good and evil. q~ : Perhaps he means that if the... people think now that if there is the intention but it isn't acted upon it isn't evil.

Yes, or if the action is evil it doesn't matter if the intention wasn't evil.

- ° ~ That would be a case of carelessness.
- ° I see it more as a case of m~chaditthis. (indecipherable)

° : ~indecipherable)

° °q The expression "there may be a point in making a distinction" suggests that there is something doubtful about it, whereas, later on, there doesn't seem to be anything doubtful about

it. It is very important to make this distinction. The whole construction of the sentence is very loose and not very logical. But again, that may be the translator.

\_\_\_\_\_ \A~bat is the actual distinction. ~hen - between act and inte~~ Is there an actual difference in terms ~r (indecipherable)

° °° . The only difference can be ... there can be, presumably) It is when you perform an action, as it were, mechanically, almost without mindfulness and, according to some Buddhist teachers this is) in a sense, worse.

° I've heard you mention this, Bhante, in connection with t~qgh~ repetition of mantras. One can't, in fact, do something like that~ mechanically. It has an effect.

S: q It has an effect even if you do it mechanically. It

can't be done with complete unconsciousness. There may be a better example - if, supposing you give something to a beggar, you may just give it quite mechanically, you may be thinking about something else or even carrying on your conversation, so there is no, sort of, real feeling to give but you do carry out the act of giving. Clearly, it is not completely devoid of intention but the intention is absolute~ minimal. But you might, on some other occasion, not only give but sort or give with a very warm, generous~feelings and concentrating

entirely on that particular action. So here would now be the full intention and the action~ried out. But in the former case you cou~

action without there being the intention. So the action is not complete, really, without the intention to fully back it up. No doubt by performing the act of dana with only minimal intention, more or less mechanically, you do gain some merit, as it were, though it is very, very small. But if you were to perform that same action, but with a much stronger intention, then it would be greater. Probably there is no action, other than purely spontaneous actions like blinking your eyes, which is unaccompanied by intention.

Young people nowadays, he says, don't consider the division between good and evil as very important, but he is insisting that it is and that attention must also be paid to this question of the intention as well as of the action. There is such a thing as good and evil, but good and evil are not to be thought of, either in terms of actions exclusively, or in terms of intentions exclusively. That a good action, at its best, involves a combination of intention and act and a bad action, at its worst, includes a combination... involves a combination of intention and act.

But the sentence, as I've said, is rather loose and not very logical. Right, let's go on then. (pause) At 1, unwholesome by what has been done

Unwholesome by what has been done for instance,

making blood sacrifices to idols for those who are evil deceived by friends in the belief that harming is a religious activity

S: This, of course, is referring back, either to, of

course, the animal sacrifices of brahminical India or Bon in the animal sacrifices of pre-buddhist Tibet.

"Unwholesome by harming is for instance to harm sentient beings by body speech and mind"

I wonder why unwholesome by harming is enumerated separately in this way, why not unwholesome by lying? Is it because

harming is so

so comprehensive.

16/page 18 465 Not only so comprehensive but so important. I mean, we

learned a few years back that non-violence or non-harming is the central point of the Buddha's teaching. But, even so, it does not make for very... a very logical, you know, enumeration or the different kinds of unwholesome. (pause) Alright, carry on then.

Unwholesome by leaving out nothing is for instance activity which sets out a path and makes certain that there is

nothing left but to °-to~ only painful results."

Presumably in one of the hell states. That seems pretty clear. Alright, go straight on.

"Ljnwholesome by things not conducive to good things are ' fo~

instance, the evil views that obstruct the birth of a path which does not collapse."

"Evil views that obstruct the birth of a path which does not collapse." That is an irreversible path - the higher spiritual paths, which becomes permanently a foundation for the realisation or nirvana. This, of course, emphasises that evil views or false views are important. They do make a difference. It does matter what you think. It does matter, as it were, what your views are. Clear and j;q/qq

correct thinking is very important. q~~

( end or side one of tape 16 )

q~~: ° Yes.

reads: "Unwholesome by being destructive are. for instance, those evil views that destrmU£~r#An~c9nd1Lcive to tha t~which is wholesome.

What would be an example of such evil views'\*- for instan ( blank part in tape )

\_\_\_ Views which rationalise not developing. like the pseudo-zen views.

- s°-°. "Thich destroy everything conducive to that which is

wholesome". As if you will get there anyway, it does not matter much what you d9~ one way or the other. ~n the Pali texts tner are two

16/page 19 usuali

particularly pernicious views or a general nature that are -- mentioned. One is that there are no results of actions, anah,,ewbt, there are no beings existing in the w~rld who have realised higher

stages of spiritual development.

How is it then, that, in his "Twelve principles of Buddhis~

Christmas Humphreys says something like 1,all life is on. and indivisible"

° : How does that come in? As a micchaditthi?

° P~' : I just think it is an incredible thing to say, really.

S: .: Incredible good or incredible bad?

: I think it is bad.

: Something I came across which sounds a bit like one of

these things is so~ody in a beginners' class saying that there is absolutely no point trying to develop metta.

° sp° . - ° What did you say to him?

: I don't know. (indecipherable)

I just didn't know what to say. I mean,

everything I said... didn't seem to make any difference to him.

Do you think he was the sort of person who sees no

point in anything? , 'qq~q~ 6q q~

~~ :Yes, could be.

'S: - What do you think is the mental state of someone who who says he sees no point in developing metta?

Sagaramati: He is completely out of touch with his feelings.

~ ~Y.~~~~'#e were saying earlier on - you know, seeing things

in a concretely unwholesome sense.

~sq'k~~' : He does not see that one thing leads to another. ~undecipherahqle babble)

S. - That one skilful thing leads to another. Chintamani, when he went to Wales, (indecipherable)

4~d t~ey S aq~~ (t toq qk'~~ "j~m'otions have no place in the spiritual life." {phat, I mean, that would be a destructive ~iew.

16/page 20

qs'° It would be, yes. Because it means... saying that all

°well. emotioni is concretely unwholesome. Well, what would they say,

metta is an emotion and that has been taught by, the Buddha.

~qq

What carries you is energy and most of our energy is emotions.

: You 'could relate the unwholesome Dy being destructive to

a person, maybe, who thinks they might be (indecipherable) unwholesome by leaving out nothing. Sorry4

Here it is evil views that are under consideration. Unwholesome by being destructive (indecipherable) are evil views that destroy everything conducive to that which is wholesome. jell, the view, for instance, that there is no point in anything. To go back to the example that Mark quoted of the person who says there is no point in trying to develop metta. ~]hat do you think, ° would be~~e state of lind of' that person?

Hate?

S: ° Kate. It seems to me that it is fuli, cf resentment.

(confused babble) ° q Sort of; 'I don't want to develop metta.' This is what he is really saying, I think. "I don't want to develop metta." "I don't like metta." And why do you not like metta? £~811Yr~ /c because you want to express something else. You don't want to develop metta, you want to develop hate. You want to express hate. You want to expre?'s resentment. So perhaps you should have realised t~t it is a resentful perso~~~~ :w~re dealing with and unless he acknowledges the resentment and gets in contact with it and experiences it consciously without indulging in it, well, he will continue not to see any point in developing metta and not want to de~elop it. He dislikes the idea of metta. Some of th~ people involved with... or at least some 7~en circles seem rather of this kind. The; seem' rather resentful pe%le, dis~runtled people. But they get a certain satisfaction out of thinking they are, as it were, on a higher spiritual path. Looking down upon those who have emotion~

16/page 21 469 ~y,e anything to do with the emotional. rnhat, sort of, little kid's

stuff, as it were. This metta bhavana. ~~~~~t~a~.

This is what they think.

~hey can't really feel like that all the time. If they are like that then they will experience a lot of negative emotion.

Well, I think they do. You can see that by looking at the faces or some of them. I think they do, but, then they think this is the dukkha that is doing them good. I mean, they are having a hard time. They are really practicing all so painful and difficult they must be on the right path. (indecipherable~

. another sort of rationalisation. You come up against that in the case of people who are doing vipassana, or what I call the "so-called vipassana".

\_\_\_\_\_ That's very interesting. I was reading an article the other day by a vipassana teacher. It was all about dukkha. It just went on and on about it. I got quite sick of it.

S: q q If it gives one an insight into the truth that is fine, but if it makes one think and feel that everything in samsara concretely is dukkha then that is an absolute micchaditthi, and very, very misleading and inhibits any kind of spiritual practice, really; it's in the long run - or even in the short run. So it is very important to believe and to see and to experience that there are, within the samsara, concretely pleasant; concretely happy; concretely skilful states and experiences even within the so-called ordinary mundane life-ordinary worldly life- which can serve as a stepping stone at least to a higher spiritual realisation.

° : Isn't the ~,t,q~A%q~1~ o5'(v'o~o)l~/ based on that.

Yes. Right. Yes. But there is no sila without skilful mental attitudes. But they are still very much in the conditioned.

(pause) Alright, let us go on then. "Indeterminate7,

° q ° ~'Indeterminate also covers the range from what is

indeterminate in itself what is it

Similar to it's cause."

16/page 22

q 7~e haven't had anything about indeterminate. Th~N is

introduced '~'q rather abruptly, isn't it? Anyway, let us go on. Read the whole paragraph.

(laughter) "Moreover in the ~ositive and ne~ative there is that

negative but is not. However, it would be too far to put it all down here. (laughter) If you wish to know any further you can,

look it up in the Abhidharma texts." (laughter)

:(indecipherable) (laughter)

— "Indeterminate, - presumably neither definitely wholesome or definitely unwholesome - "also covers the range from what is indeterminate in itself to what is indeterminate by being similar to its cause." In other words, one can say much the same sort of thing about the indeterminate as about the wholesome and the unwholesome. "Moreover, in the positive and negative" or, presumably wholesome

and unwholesome,"there is that which seems to be positive but is which not and that which seems to be negative but is not" (indecipherable)

"However, it would be going too

far to put it all down here." If you wish to know more thoroughly then look them up in the Abhidharma texts.

Then follows a "dictum" - let us see what that is 4j~

"How foolish is the person who indulges in meaningless,

activities and himself like a man who sifts the grain from the chaff when he rejects the seven jewels which grant all superior things in this life and the next after he

has obtained . The eye of intelligence,

which distinguishes the path from that which is not is blinded by the rough waters of the fools and idiots. To claim that one can walk the path and scale the spiritual levels using an artificial staff that resembles the Dharma is too ridiculous for words. Oh, friends with intelligence and sustained interest, if you want to search for the jewel that elevates your mind to the two positive qualities, then follow Tsongkhapa, supreme bodhisattva, and dive deep into the ocean of the Buddha's Word, which is like a wish-fulfilling gem.

16/page 23

lines are meant to summarise what has been said so far."

ka~'. : 1) What are the seven jewels?

--S: There is a rootnote. I don't think they symbolise anything\* though probably the~ could be made to symbolise certain things.

°q~° : ~~at colour is beryl?

I think it is green but I am not sure. Some kind of gret~° Going back to the "young people" that he was talking

about- I think again that is a rather free translation. I rather

suspect th&t in the original it was the Tibetan word corre5pon~~ng°q

to "bala" which is both fool and child, or young person~ both

"those foolish ones~. I think "young people nowadays" is a bit too ~q contemporary. It is "those foolish ones". And he may again have been

thinking or sane of the fringe followers of the Nyingmapas who adop~&

a rather (indecipherable) :~~~~~(~~ sort or attitude and did

not bother much about\* from the Gelugpa Point of view, did not bother

much about, you know, good and evil, especially on the level of sila : That is also a current micchaditthi by people who pretend

to follow the spiritual path in the West. I have known people call ,~~~q'~

themselves Nyingmapas very proudly and...they are not ~~~t~ing~~he~

S.. I had a letter today from...from Buddhadasa in Helsinki~

'~ Fle has met two Danish Buddhists who are followers of the Karmapa. The~ gave a quite good talk on Tibetan Buddhism and Buddhadasa invited them back to the Centre for a talk - found them very friendly - and they had quite a good talk but he said that there was one very sensitive area, as regards this particular couple, especially the man, and he said that was the area of sex and relationships and he said he regarded his wife as a Dakini. You see. So this is an example of that kind of thing. We&l, maybe there are occasions when his wife is a Dakini but I think such wives are few and far between (laughter) and to look at things in that way just seems to be, you know, an example of, you know, using the Tantric teaching for, you know, certain quite, you know, mundane purposes.

16/page 24

: (indecipherable) 471

: You see - quit~0~~t~~ptation, in a way, here.

'Nhat do they actually mean with this thing ... what do they mean with this thing?

S'. Well, what do you think they mean?

Spiritualise, you know, just getting it on.

Bring down the level... bring down from the transcendental level to the mundane.

\_\_\_\_ Yes, but what? %tha~ctually?

°: They are trying to elevate sex, or their, sort of, desire

for sex. They are trying to spiritualise it.

: It is alright because it is quite... it is a Tantric activity.

Yes. The wife is a Dakini so t~~~~~ I am getting together with her it is in fact a, spiritual activity. Rather than saying, well, it is a purely mundane activity which, admittedly, has its part in my life but it is a minor part and subordinate. You q,~~ -q'~~ don't want to say that ... presumably the relationship is so ~j;/~qq

important to you, you 'q~ant to place it right in the centre of things and have everything revolving around that but you don't like to say that sex is the most important thing in your life because that would go against your apparent spiritual commitment so you say, well, your wife is a Dakini or your girlfriend is a Dakini and that, you know, when you get together with her it is just the Buddha and Dakini getting together, as it were, and uniting Wisdom and Compassion.

Would it be a bit like what you were talking about in the spring,

Bhante, at Albemarle? a'hfl 'jo~ ~%(t

about~0~eople who are sexually repressed - they can feel inspired by having sex with somebody if they are repressed, according to Blake, did you say?

— I don't think I used that word "inspired".

: Oh, that is right. No. They were taken up to a higher level.

5! I think all that I said, in effect, was "it is better to be unblocked than blocked".

The quote was that Blake said that sex was the gateway to eternity but people at that time were so blocked that getting in touch with that energy was...

5: .. a step forward. A step in the right direction. A

step, you could say, from the... in these terms, from the concretely unwholesome state of blockage and sexual repression to the concretely wholesome state of unblockage and lack of repression.

The concretely wholesome, however humble and however elementary and however crude, is much better in comparison than the concretely unwholesome. I mean, you could even say that a lesser degree of the concretely unwholesome is better than a greater degree or the concretely unwholesome. Even if you take the sort of, unfavourable view of sex at least you could say that it is better to be sexually unblocked than sexually blocked. That was all, I think, that I was saying. I think I said also that if someone was

completely blocked, emotionally and sexually blocked, and was, sort

of, completely dried up and petrified, as it were, you can't start

unblocking on a very subtle level. You have to start, as

it were, on a quite crude level unless something really exceptional happens, unless you say, some

ritual experience, or something like that, which unblocks you. But if you want to go about it in the ordinary way, it seems you have to start at the comparatively crude level - in this case the sexual level. That's how I was, you know, interpreting, as far as I remember, what Blake says about sex as the gateway to eternity. That sort of completely blocked person ... well, the only thing he can do at least is to get sexually unblocked and hope that that will lead on to emotional unblockage and that will open him up spiritually. He

just can't get on the spiritual (indecipherable) or then the emotionally (indecipherable)

I am not over generalising? I hope, but, for some at least the point

of~lockage is the sexual.

° : In the sense of somebody who was blocked and became unblock~ through using ...  
y0J~<aY having sex, then th~rt Of~n~lly elevated.

° ~° ' .: They might. They might not. The emotional elevation, irankly, would be the next stage. But certainly, I think, if someone

ha~ b~pl~te1y blocked and then became unblocked, at least from the

s~xual level, there would be a, sort of, sensation of re1~ which  
will be experienced as something very positive. But at least there

is a relative degree of unblockage, at least on that particular  
level. That would be experienced in a positive sort of way. Perhaps  
even with emotional overtones. I don'~ want to attach too great an

impatance to this by any means but if one comes in contact with  
people who are completely blocked - really blocked - that may well  
be, for some of them at least, the way to unblocking themselves.

Again, on the other hand, you can meet people who are certainly not,

blocked sexually but who are completely blocked emotionally. In I

other words, sex is q: clearly not automatically a way to complete by any means  
unblockage~ Anyway, how did this question of sex come in?

: I was ~oing to try and relate it to the people who1

t~ ~q~ q are having to use the

idea of a Dakini. Bringing down...you know, bringing it down to the

level of sex. They would feel.. you know, ,q be~au~~y~~ey were

repressed that they used this word Dakini because they felt maybe

the a bit elated about their relationship through sex.

It couldqbe that.

(indecipherable)

q: I think, in the case that I knew it was more n~~q~a~ly

understanding what that term means than just, sort of, regarding

this as a spiritual friend .

16/page 2? 4j4Th

S: ° It is also the difficulty of accepting your experiencE for what it ° is. In connection with sex especially, there is still so much guilt around in Western circles - in \~estern people's minds - that they rind it very difficult to accept sex as sex. It has to be dignified, as it were, you know, as something else. It has to be pseudo-spiritualised. This is what I felt with two of our Friends

who wanted a Buddhist ceremony - a Buddhist we~ding and all that. I wrote to one of them that, you know, you feel that there is somethi~ wrong with the relationship - with a sexual relationship - and you want it to be sprinkled with religious rose water to make it alright So to free you from your sense of guilt. like, in the old days, many a woman felt quite guilty about sex without marlaige in church. Many women felt that if they were only married in .~q ~registry office, well, you know, that wasn't the real thing - it had to be in church, because then it had the blessing of the spiritual powers that be. So bringing in the Dakini business seems to possibly have overtones of this sort.

-: I think that is what I was getting at.

: Perhaps, I mean, I don't want to extend .. but it does seem .:'q? that it is possible on some occasions for a sexual experience to takc

on almost, you know, a kind of divine quality, for want of a better description, that. seems something very unusual. I mean, couldn't... what I am saying is that one may have a perfectly, kind of, ordinary fairly non-guilty attitude towards it, but still, on certain occasions

something, kind or, very different could happen.

--q ~: Well, I'd look at it in this way. You remember I was

discussing about faith? ~sk you, well, does faith come into it even anywhere? Does faith come into it anywhere - that is to say - in the

sense that I described it. In fact, that is the (indecipherable) the criterion, at least as far as sex is concerned. I would personally be very doubtful whether faith came into it.

I think it does - but probably wrongly directed.

16/page 28 475

q~ : It seems .. ah

& ' But, then again, can faith be wrongly directed? If it is wrongly directed is it faith? I mean, surely, part of the very essence of faith is its direction - in Buddhist terms to the Three Jewels.

Sorry, could we get this straight. If faith is

in the sense we were discussing yesterday, a positive feeling towards one's own spiritual development...

No, it's more than that. It is more than that.

° : Faith is something which takes you beyond your present situation - higher

A constant spur to carry you on.

~'ven more than that. More than that. ' : It takes you out of yourself.

S.' , No. One must be careful about saying "takes you out of yourself". There are lots of things which take you out of yourself. There are different ways of being taken out of yourself. But this... the question I am, sort of, putting is that if these sort of claims are made for the sexual experience, even though only occasionally,

I think the criterion would be this - whether that experience is compatible(at the same time with the experience of faith, or not.

: I think it has probably got something ... if you say that faith must be based in the Three Jewels then probably it hasn't got anything to do with it but if it could be a kind of misdirected faith in a person then I think it could have something to do with it.

S" But then, if it is misdirected it is not really faith. Because - leave aside the Three Jewels in the narrow, technical sense - but the overall orientation of the emotion towards, you

know, what the Three Jewels represent - what they symbolise.

It is Faith in the transcendental.

S: L: ~nm. Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ It would seem to me to be the same quality as experience on its own.

~~}': Could it be more like confidence?

IC/~age 29 476

I tend to say that if one has that actual experier

of faith that would be quite, at that particular moment, it would be quite incompatible even with a quite defined sexual experience. I think it would inhibit the sexual experience - inhibit it in a quite positive and health~way. If one got into faith, to take that as an example of a generally spiritual state, then the sexual consciousness - sexual experience- would automatically dissolve immediately. One would not be able to be in the two states or the two experiences simultaneously. This is why it is sometimes said, you know, in the Tibetan tradition that the relationship with the Dakini has nothing to do with sex.

\_\_\_ : Doesn't the Dakini, in a way, come from inside yourself anyway.

Well, this is the psychological way of looking at it. I think the great danger is that... well, twofold - first of all~

as I said, not recognising one's own experience for what it actually is - the skilful as skilful; the unskilful as unskilful; the lower skilful as the lower skilful; the higher skilful as the higher skil~ and so on, and - two - trying to... trying to invest something of a lower order with the light and even the glamour, as it were, ~r'lq' something that belongs to a higher order in order to justify one's attachment to that thing of a lower order and it seems to me, you know, without going too closely into that particular example, because one is always open to the possibility that maybe his wife is a Dakini, it would seem that that is an example of that kind of thing.

Well, Dakinis are female Buddha forms.

'S'. : Well, that is one meaning.

Anyway, that came in as an example of a micchaditthi, didn't it? Alright - the next one.

It seems here that the author is having a go at the pseudo-Nyingmapas. "The eye of intelligence, which distinguishes

the path from that which is not, is blinded by the foul waters of

16/page 30 477

the fools and idiots. To claim that one can walk the path and scake the spiritual levels by using an artificial staff that resembles the Dharma is too ridiculous for words." A pseudo-Dharma will not help you follow the spiritual path. And s~ing things like "Oh, my wife is a Dakini" - this is all pseudo-Dharla. "Oh, friends with intelligence and sustained interest, if you want to search for the jewel that eleva~ your mind to the two positive qualities, then follow Tsongkapa, the supreme bodhisattva, and dive deep into the ocean of the Buddha's words, which is like a wish-fulfilling gem." Clearly, he is a loyal follower of the Gelugpa an~ no doubt, he does look rather askance at

least at those people on the fringe of the Nyingmapa movement who adopt a rather, sort of, cavalier attitude towards things ~~~~ the Gelugpas regarded as being of great importance. tike, you know, the observance of the precepts and the study of the scriptures. And, no doubt there were people on the fringes of the Nyingmapa movement, you

know, who certainly weren't true Nyingmapas.

pj~ Have you ever met any?

S. Oh, yes indeed. And pseudo~Kagyupas too. Oh, yes, real rascals some of them. ~ou don't meet such people among the Gelu~~~P~~~52 you meet people who are very dry scholars, you know, and so on, that is the extreme to which they go. But among the Nyingmapas and Kagyupas you meet some, you know, on the fringe of the movement who are just charlatans and mountebanks. Oh, yes, imposters and tricksters. There was one who came - a Kagyupa from Tibet - giving himself out as a certain incarnate lama. He took the name of that incarnate lama. And he was accepted as such for a while until he was discovered - which was not, you know, for a couple of years. And he was a very big, well-built man with rine fresh complexion and a lo~ white robe and lots of hair. He was very bold, very confident

offerti~ to give people initiations and so on. I mean, I didn't

like the look of him but he often used to cane to see me and was quite friendly. But I thought him a bit of a rascal (indecipherable~

but many were impressed by the

16/page 31 4Th'

fact that he was supposed to be such-and-such Rimpoche. Thventually,

he goes to Italy to work with Dr. Ttcci. He was supposed to be /~Ingli sh compiling a Tibetan dictionary, this chap. He knew a little ~nglish,

not 'very much. So, in the end, he got... he managed to get, through

some scholarly (indecipherable) an

invitation from Dr., Tucci. So he asked me for a letter ~fq reconsendatot

So this put me, you know, rather on the spot. But anyway, he didn't

know all that much ~glish, so I wrote the letter and highly recommended him as a good Upasaka - and I used the Sa'skrit word "Upasaka". So he was quite happy with my letter. He didn't know what Upasaka meant. After reaching Rome - reachi~Dr. Tucci-he came to know what Upasaka meant. I had not introduced him as a very learned lama and great Rimpoche but a good Upasaka. This rather took the

wind out of his sails. Anyway Dr. Tucci discovered he wasn't a scho~ just,you kn0Wj at all - couldn't gi've him any help whatsoever and~sent him packing.

Afterwards he wandered around Eitrope for a bit then came back to I&alimpong. He was a real rogue, but he was quite alright to get on with. Very cheerful, you know, and, in the end, he almost openly

confessed to being a humbug and carried on as before anyway. And ~q ?% people found out that he was not that particular Rimpoche and theY'

were rather angry and disappointed for a while but meanwhile so many other genuine Rimpoches had come along so he took his place eventually in th~eligious life of Kalimpong. Peo~ple to'le~ated him but did not think that much of him and he was, you know, not a whit abashed by all this. As bold and confident as ever. So, that is an example, you see, So, when the Gelugpas degeneiate they teA~~5~o become dry-as-dust scholars and sticklers for rules. \qi~~n the Nyingmapas degenerate, or the Ka~~tupas, then they just tend to become people like that.

Tsongkapa was the great reformer, wasn't he? which 5: Yes, well, that is the word, you know, Western

scholars use but the Nyingmapas q~~, you know, were... strongly

disagree with that. Western scholars sometimes write that : Tsongkapa reformed the Nyingmapa and made the Gelugpa so the Nyingma~ say no, the Nyingmapa did not need reforming - he reformed other people but not the Nyingmapa. They don't accept this idea of reforming at all. But there is no doubt that, in the name of the Tantra, \_\_\_\_\_ also before the time of (indecipherable) \_\_\_\_\_ and before the time

of Tsongkapa there was a great deal that was being done that had nothing to do with Buddhism and nothing to do with the Tantra. The same thing happened in India. Clearly the Tantra is a very, I won't say dangerous but a knife edge path. You can very easily go wrong as regards Tantric teachings. In fact, if you enter upon it prematurely, without proper preparation, by way of following the

Hinayana and the Mahayana. And lots of people do plunge directly into the Tantra, you know, just as they are trying to do in the West

It is a higher path and only the higher path is good enough for them and it seems to, you know, condone certain things that other forms of Buddhism do not condone. It looks like an easier path as a higher path. What could be better? It is a higher path and also you don't have to give anything up. There is a sense in which that is true but it is a very profound sense which is not accessible to people of that sort.

\_\_\_\_\_ surprised when Dharma Press brought out \_\_\_\_\_ by Trungpa and Guenther. It seemed very much out

of place.

\_\_\_\_\_ : It wasn't Dharma actually. It was Shambala.

S.. \_\_\_\_\_ : It's \_\_\_\_\_ books like this are much more useful,

for the majority of people.

° \_\_\_\_\_ : I don't see the point at all of bringing out books like

"Introduction to Tantric Buddhism" - which seemed decidedly erroneous anyway, as well as being impossible to read.

that

- ~' \_\_\_\_\_ But anyway there is not anything we can do about it - we can only sort out things within our own

\*y and think as clear q~ as we can and practise as sincerely as w

can. So, no doubt, the author of this book, writing in the middle of

(indecipherable) towards the end of the eighteenth

century, in Tibet, felt very strongly about , you know, people who.. who were~o, anyway, confusing the issue. And my guess is that if he had... that would be the Nyingmapa thing in mind He felt the Gelug Wtpatition was so much better.

Oh well, we have finished now with the positive mental events. An~ general questions about them?

° q : Have you thought any more about wh~ they are enumerated ~

the beginning rather than at the end. It seems, you know, you, kind of, get through all the positive stuti, you kn~w, then you wade through all this

S: : Perhaps it is better to have the positive in mind. Otherwise the negative might depress you~ unduly.

~a~: ~ou might only get through the negative and then give up

reading the book.

\_\_\_ q.: Because 'ery often, in India, for instance, the negative is treated before the positive. As in the verse (indecipherable) 4; 1/4i, qq

- "Cease to do evil, learn to do good

\_\_\_ purify the mind." I think ~d rather not start on the six basic emotions because these are~he negative major events because we have only ten or fifteen minutes left. So, maybe we could talk over a bit more some of the things . q we have done this morning or even today and yesterday, with regard to the positive mental eq~en~5~

° 'N~q: (noises and scraping) I was looking in

that (indecipherable) and noticed that there was a

difference between the man~ and the mano-vijnana (?) and am I right in assuming that the manas is thought process and the mano-vijnana is the awareness or the perception of thoughts as objects~

: ~he mind, which is enumerated as the sixth sense, is simply the mind as perceiving mental objects which is, as it were, a mechanical process - a reactive process. The manas is,

as it were, the seat of identity. In the Yogachara there is ~in~ecipheraiW'  
distftton.

surely there .... most Western people don't really

distinguish themselves from their thoughts, do they? I suppose com~ from Descartes. T~ere  
is a, sort'~of, tendency to think of .. to not

really feel thoughts as objects in the same ~~yt~ we feel objects in the external world. But to  
see them as somehow part of you.

S: As Guenther points out - Buddhism thinks much more in  
terms of the perceptual situation. You know, the situatuon in which there is a subjective pole  
- mind, and an objective pole - object.

That these two things are not really seperate.

: So, in a sense, your thoughts are part of you, or part of you as the .

S: Your thoughts are present too. Thit, anyway, it would  
not occur to a Buddhist to think in terms of being a part of you or  
not being a part of you.

~ughts really are like another sense field because you can ... in sa~e ways, with visual  
sense, you can directi your

attention on to an object - you can do that with the mind or if  
you don't, then thoughts kind of flo'4 through. ~~~, ~{q

They flow through. 4~&q

-- ~~~' : In the same way q - that objects float across your field of vision. q:  
(indecipherable)

You see a physical object- you  
you know where it ' ' coiesfrom but a mental object (indecipherable

~~~~~° Also, you can shut out the sense quite easily - by plugging your ears or  
closing your eyes ... (indecipherable)

-S: So, in a sense, it is even less part of you. Because the Buddhist view would be that if it really was a part of you -

if it was you - it would be completely under control.

~: You said that ... in the ... at the end of "Shabda"-that

16/page 35 -2

excerpt that S... where does reason come from? Reason comes through the senses. First you have the senses then your thought processes are based on those. Right? So,

logically following on from that, you can keep

(indecipherable) as an extension quite easy to control

them. (indecipherable), but it isn't. Or do you think it isn't easy to control them?

S: Because there are other levels of the mind which is simply the perceiver of objects. Other levels within you, you know, which is activated by objects and bringing about those

particular thought processes.

: The unconscious mind.

S.. One could say that, yes. In that extract

q ~~, q - 'S' ~~~AQ", ~1\q ~q ~ about reason, I wasn't

thinking of reason as a sort of faculty but the, sort of, inductive

process, if you like.

Just one aspect of reason.

-- 'Well, in a sense, there was no such thing as reason. I was thinking, when you sort of, limit yourself to a certain field'

4-7 of experience; you observe; you classify and you generalise. That is

reason - and the reason is limited by its field. If your reason is limited by the material which you take from the sense fields and the field of mind in the ordinary sense then you leave out of consideration all the other fields - all the other levels. So your results are limited. This is what we usually think of as reason. So reason is split off because it represents a, sort of, process of induction, a process of inference from a very limited and narrow field.

~: (indecipherable) The reasoning of a  
scientist or, on other occasions, the philosopher is only concerned

with this part of the mind.

° Yes, indeed.

And they won't accept or can't see that there are any other

~6/page 36 'q 4.3'

levels of mind at all. I related this with discussions ... the other discussions we have had with the teachers of philosophy at the

university, in London, and quite a few friends who are teachers (indecipherable)

— This is what Blake meant by speaking of the mind as the ratio of the senses. Do you see that.

~:jq: The ratio...

The ratio of the senses. Ratio ... R A T I O.

~: 9h, yes. ~Q ~or'°"°i £AsQ9~t4q~~~~ S'r~~~S. - ° He contrasted mind in that sense with imagination, or was the expression of you know, which was based upon -

the experience of the whole man. Reason, in the (indecipherable)

sense as the ratio is based on the experience of

only a part of the whole man - only a segment. This is what I call the split-off intellect.

: That would be a property of the man~s. That would be done

by the ma~. 4°

-: Yes.... Yes....Yes. It does not take into account the other. .the other levels.

° : It only looks in one direction. It only looks

(indecipherable) and looking back.

(indecipherable) It looks in both directions

° S Well, it looks in both directions in a distorted way, in the sense that, when it looks out it construes a world. (?£)...

End of tape.

S: . .actually existing object~~ and when it looks within it construes an actually existing self.

Anyway, what about the general consideration of the eleven positive factors; does one feel that it's of sort of practical utility to go through them and study them in this sort of way?

Puj Very much so.

S: Presumably even just that section would be quite good material for a study group; simply that particular section, that particular list.

One could quite easily go through them even if one didn't do the rest of the text.

(general agreement)

Puj: Just doing them in the study group here, the importance of them; what they are; it's just so far greater than I imagined! I just had no idea how great they are; how high:

Aby. I think that if you did it with a sort relative beginner, it might be better to prepare the material, not to read it sort of straight from

this text, ( ) Sag( ) material is to have a ( talk on it? ). S:  
Right. Yes.

(sounds of enthusiasm)

S: That would make positive mental event a.

??

Sag.(I'd say stages of..)

S: No. They're not.. No, they're aspects of the positive mind, or aspects of creative mind. That could make a very good talk, along those lines, couldn't it? And they are aspects, they are not sort of really graded in a series, hm? Aspects of the creative mind. That's exactly what it is, actually.

-Sag:? (laughter)

-Puj: I think it would be good if we had a ( ) lecture series ( ) actually.

-Aby:? (on that material)

- S: Or even there could be a good article, couldn't there? A good article for the Newsletter. This is the right sort of material, isn't it?

I'll read just a few points which ( ) He's

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      2 485

got a heading here: 'Problems relating to the good (Caittas?)': that's the positive mental events. He (also?) says that 'there are other good caittas besides the eleven in question, and they shouldn't be regarded as an exhaustive list.' In other words, not an enumeration of a fixed and limited number of things. Why a list of eleven? 'Only those good dharmas which have special characteristics and special activities are specially catalogued in the list, the others being devoid of special characteristics and activities and not listed.<sup>1</sup> 'Further, the defiled dharmas which extend throughout the six consciousnesses have a capital importance. Those dharmas which are opposed to them are therefore established as good ones.' (pause) 'Pure dharmas and defiled ones are opposed to each other.' This is interesting. 'Why is it that the former are less numerous than the latter?' The list of the defiled dharmas, the list of the negative mental events, is a much lengthier one than the list of positive mental events; it seems more than twice as long, so why is this? I mean, if the positive counteracts the negative, there ought to be the same list the same number of items.

Puj: Maybe ( ) list?

Sag: ..level of integration..

S: He says, 'Pure dharmas are strong. Defiled dharmas are weak. A small number of pure dharmas is sufficient to act as opponent to a large number of defiled dharmas.' That's also very important point, isn't it?

(general agreement)

Sag: Especially if you think you are going to whip the strong with weak .

S: Because the strong is more integrated, therefore pure! One Nirvan~a is more than equal to the whole samsara! 'Again, pure dharmas being concerned with the understanding of the general meaning of things, are all of the same nature, however extensively they are discussed as spiritual qualities, whereas defiled dharmas must necessarily be multiplied by reason of the particular characteristics of objects that confuse the feelings and desires.' There's a saying I came across - I think I've quoted it before - "There are many ways of being bad, but only one way of being good." And Tolstoy - I think it is at the beginning of 'War and Peace' - says that happy families seem to resemble each other very much, but unhappy families are all different! It's a bit like that. That's also (some of) why the sinners are more interesting than the saints - there's a greater variety of them! I don't know that that is altogether about the saints really. They have something that is very much in common amongst them, but at the same time, they are highly in-

Mind in Bud~hist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      3 486

dividual.

~V: You have said, Bhante, on a number of occasions, that the more developed one becomes as an individual the more different you become from other individuals.

~ Yes, but I also said that at the same time the more similar.

You've only got to look at..it's like what you said then, it's like the I~nlightenment..the manifestation is like..it's like a difference, if you like; like Padmasambhava is different from Milarepa, different from Sakyamini, different from Tsong ka pa.

S: But in a sense, in the Abhidharma sense, at least, there is a greater variety in the negative mental events than there is in the positive mental events, because there's a..the positive mental events, by their very nature, tend to cohere more and more, integrate more and more, whereas the negative mental events have got the opposite quality; they tend to dis-integrate more and more and to stick out and differentiate more and more.

~In a word, it begins to be seen that it was split up into the different pieces and reified.

%t~The positive are more consistent.

) he talks about 'the one' and 'the group', and he talks about..he comes down to the level of reality, ( )multiplicity ( ).

~: Right. Yes. But the oneness of the one is not a bare numerical oneness; he also makes that clear. I don't think he makes nearly as clear as the Tantric tradition does, the richness of the one, but he certainly does suggest that ( ).

~:He seems to be a bit like Guenther, in a way, (

).

SAnd it's ( ) he has very poor eyesight ( ) has that difficulty in reading.

~'rans Wentz quotes a lot from Plotinus, and what I've read (

)

b~(Would all these, alone?) correspond to the Seven Bodhiangas?

S~ Yes, in a very general way. Yes. Though the Bodhiangas (sp?) are very definitely cumulative. These are, as I said, just aspects.

~~hat are the Bodhiangas?

S: Beginning with smrti and culminating with upeks~a. I've given an account of them somewhere.

~'Mind Reactive and Creative.

%: Ah, yes.

~u:The book?

? Yes.

~ Yes.

~p First, recollection: smr~ti.

~ Yes - smrti.

bp'.Second: investigation of mental states (dharma pravicya). Three: e;i~r~Y or vigour, virya. Four: rapture, priti. Fives tension release, prasrabThi. Six: concentration, sam~dhi. Sevens tranquility, upeks~a.

S: I think all of these we have dealt with except pr~Tti oh, not sukha0 Priti and sukha we haven't dealt with.

~bp'. And there was a note underneath - these seven can result in constant creativity expressed in compassion.

--ji'You said that we haven't dealt with priti. Does that mean that it is composed of these eleven mental events?

S No. No. ° ~q:But it's another mental event outside the ( )?

S: Hm. Yes, it is certainly positive, but as ( ) says, there are various positive mental events which have not been included in the eleven because they don't have from the Abhidharma point of view a distinctive specific quality (or?) specific function. I think there are other reasons~ to0~ connected with the Abhidharma's whole scheme of classification.

r).In a way we did cover it with the sort of things that come up with faith.

~ Well, I mentioned it, I introduced it, but it wasn't actually mentioned in the text, because you could say it is included under pras'rabdhi, because, as I said, what is it that pra~abdhi calms down? It is pr~ti, so it could be ~onsidered as included there. There's no pra~abdhi, as I said, without priti; no calming down without something to calm down,

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 17 5 48.

because it is not the result of calming down~that is sukha, it is the process of calming ~wn, so if there is not something to calm down, i.e., prti, how can there be a process of calming down, so priti is, as it were, present where there is pras~rabdhi, where prasrabdhi is present.

~If mental exhausts the whole of the universe, is it meant to..

~ You mean the list of the eleven?

- ~t'Well, the list of all the...

S' Well, the Abhidharma, in a sense, as a whole, in its lists of dharmas both unconditioned and conditioned, is meant to exhaust the whole of the universe, yes.

~u'Well, if one sort of present mental state, should it be possible to analyse it in terms of all these categories?

Oh, yes! Yes. This is the whole idea. This is what is meant by the Dharma vicaya. The second of the Bodhiangas. The Dharmas here are the Dharmas of the Abhidharma, which I rendered there as mental states, so it is reviewing one's mind and then able to analyse it and classify it and understand what is happening in terms of the Abhidharma enumeration, and this is the practical utility of it. At least in terms of the three skilful and unskilful roots - that's in an elementary way of analysing: "Is there present in my mind, craving? Is there present in my mind, anger? Is there present in my mind, delusion? ~' At least that sort of simple analysis. But at least originally the universe as a whole ( ) of the Abhidharma was

practical. I think it is that sort of meditation that Dr. Oonze practised, to the best of my knowledge; this more analytical type of meditation; this is what he was interested in.

So then during the sitting you just follow the rise and fall of the mental events?

~ Yes.

~v: But there was extended an exceptionally extended and detailed knowledge of the Abhidharma necessary for that kind of..

S'. That just helps you to pigeon-hole your own thoughts, as it were. And then if you keep it up for a long time, you get very (competit~ at it, so, though the object changes, the attention remains constant. I mean, vipassana (sp?) is essentially this in principle, though the trouble with the modern so-called vipassana is they embark upon this sort of analysis with very, very indifferent (or insufficient?) preparation by way of samatha, (in practice?)

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      6      p.64      489

S: All right~then. ( )

Texts The six basic emotions...(down to)00when something occurs. (bottom p.64)

S: These last two lines seem to really sum it up. But what about this terms 'emotion'? The translator of the Siddhi renders it as 'defiling passion'. I think it probably better. The Sanskrit is kles'a, and as I explained the other day, klesa means 'that which torments', and 'that which defiles'. So~ 'defiling passion' is really ~uite correct, because the word passion really means 'to suffer', doesn't it?

Does it?

S: Mm0 is when you speak of 'the Passion of Christ' - you don't mean he got into a great emotional state, you mean that he suffered, that is the original usage of the word. So 'passion' is 'suffering', so you could well translate kIesa as 'defiling passion'. But where do you think emotion might not be such a good translation?

~It's too general, isn't it?

S: It's too general. Well, we distinguish good emotions from bad emotions~ positive and negative. Now is that necessarily correct? Do you think there are such things as 'good emotions', 'positive emotions', as we term them? Or should they perhaps have a separate term for them?

~Well, etymologically, it means ('growing out?'), doesn't it?

-S: Right. Yes.

°Ab~~Well, that could be outward..

\_\_ ~ Outward going energy. It probably is better to distinguish between positive emotions and negative emotions, huh? And not use the term 'emotion' simply for the klesas, as Guenther does. Hm? It would suggest to the ordinary person reading the text that emotion was something that (was) necessarily negative, if they didn't study the Abhidharma carefully and study this text carefully they might even conclude that all emotions even what we call 'positive emotions' was in fact something negative. People - some people, at least - are quite prone to take up this attitude towards emotion (and generating positive emotion?)

So it would seem here that we are concerned with the six basic, or six primary, defiling passions, rather than with the six basic emotions. 'Whenever something occurs, the characteristic of being restless will be present. When that happens, the existential state of the mind will be restless. This is characteristic of emotions.'

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      7 4,0

§: This isn't characteristic of metta, for instance, is it?

'An emotion is an ego-centered attitude which makes the mind restless when something occurs.' This is quite correct. Restlessness is characteristic of all these defiled passions, these defiled (      ). That's how you can tell them. If you experience faith, you experience calm and serenity. If you experience non-covetousness, again, calm and serenity. But if you experience cupidity-attachment, or anger or arrogance or any of these secondary defiled passions then your state of mind, your mood, is

restless. priti? ~How does things like (creativity?) fit in, then? Because it sounds almost as it were violent, in a way?

~ It hasn't been enumerated exactly as a mental event. Priti is the development of delight, when submerged, maybe, rather than repressed, energy comes rushing to the surface, and that is associated with a certain amount of excitement, a certain amount of effervescence, which eventually passes away, which calms down, leaving the feeling, the positive feeling, in a very calm and stable condition as sukha, as bliss, which is considered a higher state, so priti would seem to be a passing phase, a phase that occurs when delight is in process of transition to bliss.

( ) 'an emotion' - a defiled passion - 'is an ego-centered attitude which makes the mind restless when something occurs. All right. Let's look at each of them individually.

Texts 9upidity-attachment.

~ This is lobha in..

Not ( )?

S: According to the translator of Siddhi, it's raga, but the two are quite often used interchangeably~ Lobha is more like greed; raga is more like passion. Lobha is more like greedy craving; raga is more like passionate attachment. Raga is in a way a more powerful word.

~y:But you've used that in a positive sense in other connections.

S: That's in a purely Tantric context. In the Abhidharma it's entirely negative.

Texts Taking each emotion..(down to)..produce frustrations.

-S: 'frustration', of course, is Guenther's term for 'dukkha', unsatisfactoriness, pain or suffering.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape I( 491

Text: Cupidity-attachment..(to)..from its own point of view.

~ Yes. Lobha, or raga, sees something as pleasant and it hankers after it, and that thing

may belong to any of the three levels of mundane existence, and the function of that hankering is simply to produce, in the long run, at least, pain and suffering.

Text: Here, the all-knowing master...(to)..(p.66) ..cupidity-attachment. (2~b)

~ You notice that Tsong-kha-pa says 'Cupidity-attachment' - lobha - 'is a hankering after any pleasurable external or internal object by taking it ~s pleasing to oneself.

~~ Would it not be possible to take something that you thought was pleasing to others and still be attached?

S. No, because you may, for instance, take it as something pleasurable to give to them but why do you want to give it to them? I mean, it could be out of a Bodhisattva-like desire to help them and make them happy, but it could be because you were attached to them\* yes? And you want to make yourself happy by making them happy. You don't want to make them happy, you want to make yourself happy by taking them as the means.

Arj: Dp-good-ing.

~: Possibly a lot of do-good-ing comes under this category. You do something '6 you do good so that you may feel good that you are doing it.

Do you think this is a lot with social work?

%: It's probably quite difficult to generalize with so many tens of thousands of social workers, now. No doubt it is true in at least some cases.

? Do you think it is a bad thing, actually, or do you think it is just maybe a stage?

~. Is a social worker supposed to be doing good to others, or is he supposed to be a social worker for what he can get out of it, whether in terms of personal development or in any other way. It seems to me that social work requires a certain amount of wisdom. It is very difficult to know what is good for other people, isn't it? Maybe it is a fairly simple matter - well, sometimes the decision isn't difficult to arrive at, but if they are quite complex matter, especially when you have to weigh up certain factors against certain other factors - for instance, as when you have to, as some social workers do, have to decide whether to take a child away from its mother or not. You have to weigh up the possibility that the child may not be looked after against the if you leave it with the mother, against the possibility, that if you take it away so that it

is properly looked after, the fact that it has been taken away from the mother will have a negative effect on the child. And it is sometimes very difficult to weigh one thing against another in this way and arrive at a decision which is best for the child. And this is the sort of problem that social workers are frequently confronted with, and you need the wisdom of Solomon, as it were\* to sort out these. I mean, just good will isn't enough!

~yAnd perhaps there isn't any final answer to questions of that sort, and there isn't a sort of Yes or No one can simply say - It seems that it would be better if we tried out such and such a course of action.

S: ~en then you have to arrive at what would seem to be the best course of action. And that may not be so clear.

~9~:It's very rare that one finds a situation in real life where it's either/or

( ) to such extent.

S: That is the problem. There are dangers on either side. Not that one.. it's either this or that; clearly one solution is good, the other is not good: this is what I was saying - that it's very difficult to adjudicate because there is so much to be said on each side. There are positives on each side, there are negatives on each side. This is what makes it so difficult. And this is where the practical wisdom is required, which I am sure very few social workers could have, ~o most of them apply a sort of rule of thumb and do the best that they can according to their lights and probably not always happy with what they have to do.

What is this 'combination of the two higher levels into one and calling ~~ (quotes to)path to liberation.'

Are these the arupa dhyanas?

Q. Yes. 1/2'uite clearly, these are not in themselves the path of liberation but how is it that lumping them into one and calling them collectively 'attachment to possible existence' helps one to avoid the error of

mistaking them to be the path to liberation?

Is it like what you said in the Survey concerning Dhyana Paramita - that the Bodhisattva sort of cultivates an aversion to the Dhyanas; he always sort of has in mind that they are not ultimate.

~: Yes, but why call them collectively 'attachment to possible existence'?

~' Well, you can sort of day-dream and get a lot of enjoyment and pleasure out day-dreaming.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      tape 17      10

\$. That's true, yes. The point is that presumably while you are actually in the dhyana state, you don't experience lobha; you can experience lobha with regard to them either in anticipation - thinking about them, ( ) dreaming about them - or retrospectively, when you recollect them. So this is why they presumably they come to be called ' a possible existence'.

You can't experience lobha in ( ) Dhyana state, do you mean?

S: Well, if the six basic emotions are klesas, if a dhyana consists only of positive mental events, and if klesas are negative mental events, strictly speaking they cannot be - klesas - they cannot be any of these negative mental events in the dhyana experience. BUT, the Abhidharma, I think, doesn't go into this~ but presumably there's a very subtle substratum, at least lobha is there as a possibility; it has not been destroyed; but it is not actually experienced or actually manifest.

~Could it be that ( ) your experiences in these two realms is purely as

it were (vip~a?) ( ) 99~t (vipa~a?)?

%: It is. It is the vipa of the effort that you have made, the karma that you have created, but of course, you go on creating the karma and go on experiencing the vipa~a.

? These correspond to the higher ( ), don't they?

S: Yes.

So in that case, in the realm of the gods, there is no lobha present? In these higher realms.

~& No. The gods are not generating karma. The gods are, as it were, in a passive state of enjoyment, reaping the rewards of what they've previously done, but neither accumulating any fresh karma, good karma nor accumulating any bad karma, so that when the karma which caused them to be reborn as gods is exhausted they fall down to the next level, as it were, depending on what residual karma they have to their credit, as it were.

-°~~You are karma, as we said the other day. You are karma, cannot apply to the gods?

~ Except as a possibility, a potentiality. But it is as though the gods are in such a state of bliss, as it were, they are stupefied by that, and are not exerting themselves in any way, not even for the prolongation of that, not actively; it's a state of pure enjoyment. Well, sometimes you experience this~ don't you? In the case of worldly pleasurable experiences, just sort of suspended, almost motionless, in the pleasurable

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 17 11 494'

experience. I mean, I think ones( L5.~. )experiences, at least sometimes, somewhat like this. You know, you're incapable of an act of will! So where is your karma? Your act of will was just taking the stuff, hm? After that you just reaped the vipa~a(sp?) and your capacity for volition - taking karma as volition - is as it were suspended, it's in abeyance until the effect of the drug wears off, and though you can exercise your volition again. The world of the gods would seem to be rather like that. Hm?

Pv~'. (inaudible)

~ Well, if one is engaged in meditation, but tending to regard meditation as an end in itself, then one will be reborn among the gods; this is the usual way of being reborn among the gods.

NO, what I meant was that for somebody who takes some form of drug and experiences one of these..something like this, that seems that it is, you know, almost ( )..

S Well~ I'm only using it as an analogy; I'm not saying that the drug experience is similar to the dhyana experience, etc; I'm only taking it as an analogy that illustrates the fact that you..there can be a state of enjoyment of a vipa~a together with suspension of volition. I am not saying that the two are identical, I'm only saying there's that analogy. I'm not even saying

that they are similar.

PJV! Oh, I thought..

S: I'm not saying that they are not! But I'm citing this experience of drugs only by way of analogy to make clear what seems to be the Buddhist view of the life and experience of the devas.

What I was getting at was taking the drug where it would be similar. I

mean, I was wondering, you, know, whether that is..(where the karma)( ) and it heightened it up until the point that you ( ) taking any particular sort of drug which causes that, and then what happens after that is being like vipaca from past karma.

&, You mean the actual nature of the experience? Yes.

S' One could say that. It is as though in the case of the drug experience you suspend your vision, ( ) also you suspend your volition. So if volition is suspended - suppose volition is paralysed; let's assume that that's what happens in the drug experience - supposing volition is

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      12 495

paralysed, karma is suspended and what is left to you? There is left to you only the possibility of experiencing viparaca, so what determines the nature of the vipaca? Previous karma. If your previous karmas have been unskillful, you can only experience an unpleasant vipaca! It's a bad trip! Do you see this? If your past karma has been reasonably skillful, you'll have a good trip. But if..Because what you've done, I mean, on this analysis, at least, is to inhibit the volition, so that you are not creating karma for the time that you are under the influence of the drug, so what are you doing? You are simply in a passive state experiencing vipaca. So where are those vipacas going to come from? From your own past. So this is certainly one way of looking at it. I mean~ I don't know whether it could in fact be said that the(psycho?) experience, and I'm thinking especially of LSD, does suspend the functioning

~ of the will, but I rather suspect that it has a very definite effect upon it and th~t other aspects of the drug experience are connected with this fact, that the will has as it were been put out of action; it has been stunned, perhaps, or laid asleep, perhaps~ So if one's experience is not to become a complete blank, when in the absence of karma, in the absence of volition, they can only be the experience of vipacas, and, as I said, where are those vipacas to come from? Only from your own past experience. So the fact that the volition is suspended just sort of clears the deck for action - for the action of whatever vipacas are able to arise.

~~9~~It would also explain the apparent sort of loss of awareness of time.

S: Because you are passive and not active?

Yes.

-% Yes, but you can beat that. I mean, the more ( ) you are, the more you lose your idea of time.

~~sr: Sometimes.

&. No, that would mean the loss of the time sense would seem to be connected perhaps with the paralysis of some ( ) part of the brain. Anyway, how did we get on to that? From the consideration of the level of the gods. Yes, this 'possible ex&stence'.

It would seem to me that this author refers to these two higher levels collectively as 'possible existence' is because, as I said, while you are actually in the dhyana states you don't experience lobha, you don't experience 'cupidity-attachment'. It's only in anticipation or only retrospectively that the dhyanas become objects of cupidity-attachment. Even though, of course, there is th~oughout the dhyana experience itself

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      13 496

a substratum of as it were unrealised cupidity-attachment, due to the fact that it is only in abeyance, it has not been destroyed, it has not been annihilated, but it is not actually experienced while the dhyana states are in progress.

f~~: I'm not quite clear about that, ~hante. Could you say a little bit more about it?

S: About what?

,~~ Say that in the dhyana states attachment has not been destroyed. Does that mean to say that after a certain point a highly developed individual does not experience these dhyana states in the way that we experience dhyana states?

5', I'm not sure what you mean by that?

Well, without..

5: Well, it's well known that the standard Buddhist teaching is that in the dhyana states lobha, dvesa, moha, are (fully? only?) suspended; they are not destroyed. It is only vipassana; it is only prajna; which destroys them permanently. So in the dhyana states they are not actually function- i~; they are in abeyance. But they cannot be held in abeyance indefinitely merely by the dhyana state. Sooner or later they will reassert themselves and you will fall from the dhyana state. So that the potentiality of them~is ther~ in the dhyana state, even though they do not actually manifest.

~t. Do they only go completely when you insight; does that also ( ) to the destruction of the asravas, the biases?

~°, No, that is the final insight. But if one looks at them in terms of stages, within the context of the Hinayana, then think in terms of the Ten Fetters. The Stream Entrant destroys the first 3 fetters; the Once- Returner weakens fetters 4 and 5. And what are they?

S: Yes! You see! And attachment to..?

fk't,,(inaudible)

s~: No, its..?

1~'. Attachment to the world of form.

° 1.?

~ No, that's among the first three. No, it's hatped. And the Non-Returner it is who completely destroys them, so Guenther has sort of well said

about this that it shows that to remove intellectual obscuration - that is to say, via the breaking of the first three fetters - is comparatively

easy; it takes only one ( ), as it were, to (b)that, but to weaken

and then finally to break the emotional obscuration is a very much more difficult matter. It takes two ( ) to do that. Yes? So those particular fetters - well, all the fetters, one by one - are weakened or broken, as the case may be, by insight in the sense of penetration into the three characteristics; or four characteristics, even; of existence; that is to say anitya, dukkha and anatta.

The 4th being..? You've only mentioned 3; you said there were 4.

-- The 4th being the (as~bha?) nature. As~bha is reckoned as one of the 4 viparyayas, but not as one of the characteristics, laks~ana. So if you think of insight in terms of understanding the three laksanas, then as~ubha is not included, but if you think of in terms of the 4 viparyayas, then asubha is included.

° ° Pp 1 don't understand the terms.

° S: Aa.. It's all in my Three Jewels, actually! (laughter)

~Dp~Can you just say what the term lobha...?

S'. Lobha? This is what we have been discussing. This is cupidity-attachment.

° Oh!

~ Otherwi~e, raga. 1

-bp Raga. That's what I want. (They are both the same.?)

°~S Well, they are not quite the same, as I said at the beginning, there is a sort of difference of connotation. ° Lobha is more like greed; raga is more like passion. ( ) greedy attachment and passionate attachment. It does all come back to this, perhaps, that you need to do a bit more homework! Yes. Because if one goes to the study of Abhidharma texts, even a quite elementary one, you need to know some of the names of the basic

teachings ( ).

P?: What would you reco~mend, bhante?

~ Well, I think if you read my Survey and Three Jewels, that's..those two (should be? ) quite

enough to provide an introduction to something of this sort. Quite enough.

~~~Maybe you ought to go back to that in your next study group! (

think that would be very good!

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 17 15 498

~'Well, all the study groups, nearly, go back to the Survey.

5: Well, it's (all?) quite basic material.

~?

-S: You see, when I was in New Zealand and again when I was in Helsinki, I took study in the Three Jewels, in fact, in New Zealand I got through the greater part of it, not with the same Order members; but with different groups of Order members and Friends in Christchurch and in Auckland; and on that occasion, or those occasions, and also when I took that ( ) study in Helsinki, and we did it also on weekend retreats, by the way, I noticed that the Three Jewels was not as simple as I had thought it was! Yes! It is not as simple~as the Survey, strange to say, in the sense that The Three Jewels is much more condense~, and this was because it started off as a series of articles for an encyclopaedia, and I was trying to put things as concisely as possible, and I was quite surprised the amount of explanation that some of the passages required; the amount of expansion and elaboration before they became really intelligible! I was really surpr'tsed!

- ~'r. ( ) that somebody had read out half a page of that and you said, "I don't understand that!"

~ That's right! I was really staggered, because it seemed to be so clear and simple! And the same thing actually happened in Helsinki. I did that same chapter - that it, the chapter on The Stages of the Path - and the same comment was made. I think Karuna, who is a quite intelligent woman~ said "I don't follow that at all. I don't just understand anything of that." So I gave a paraphrase, which I really wish had been tape-recorded, a lengthy paraphrase of that page and a half - it was on the two kinds of conditionality, mainly - lasting about half an hour, and it became quite clear to them then\* But I think if this sort of study is done, i~ this

sort of homework is done, then it'll become very much more easy to go into things like the Abhidharma.

-Pp' Was any of the study taped?

~ I'm afraid not, no. There were many, many hours of study. It w~s a pity that wasn't all taped.

- - We have got one ( ) study tape, that weekend retreat we had when I was ordained, on the Three Jewels. I think we did three chapters from..

~~~~I've got that! I'm still in the middle of..I've got about half way through transcribing it.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 17 16 499

S: Well, there you are! I'd forgotten all about that.

~'.Afld that included 'The stages of the Path'.

~'Yes. Right. There are three sections: The stages of the Path, The Wheel of Life. The Assembly of the Elect.

~ Well, there yii are then! That would be useful for Mitlata, if you can get around to it.

°~! Well, you have. .Mitrata has..there have been some extracts from it in Mitrata, because I gave it to Padmaraja.

~ Oh, from that! What was that?

It was something to do with the fetters. (inaudible)

The tape is in very bad nick. Ten minutes ( ) could take you

two hoursb ( )

& Well, it might be easier if I did the whole thing again, sometime.

It might be, yes. The whole book.

Pp: I think it's really important, in actual fact. I remember we had a seminar it had to be taped, and really good equipment used.

~ Right. Well, this was the great ( ) in New Zealand.

~Well, I mean, we haven't got people who actually know about these things!

Somebody bought some wrong cassettes, and ( ) Pp.1 was thinking more of New Zealand; ( )

~'.New Zealand! I mean, Jyotipala ( ) in Napier, ( ) not sure whether he'll be able to transcribe them, anyway! They are really bad!

Pp. That's what I mean! I think we need to get, we need to have people and equipment.

- ~<inaudible)

S! Anyway, do you see the point about cupidity-attachment?

~n~When lobha has been destroyed, what happens then to that person who has destroyed the first 5 fetters? Do they. are they reborn..?

S: As I have said, the first five fetters are destroyed by the Non-Returner. The Once-Returner. the Stream entrant destroys fetters 1, 2 and 3. The Once-Returner destroys 1, 2 and 3, weakens ~ 4 and 5. The Non-Returner destroys 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The Arahant destroys 1 to 10. This is the Hinayana scheme.

Mind in B ;ddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      17

~:So it's just before Arahant?

S: Again, this is all described in the Survey and again in a slightly different

way in the Three Jewels.

person was wondering what world that/would be born in?

~ What person?

~"The person who had destroyed the first 5 fetters?"

S: He is reborn in what are called the Suddh~v~sa, the pure abodes, which are heavens - to use that term - at the summit of the rupaloka. This is the H~nay~na position about that. One could say in a sense they are not heaven. They are heaven inasmuch as they are ( ) worlds and that they are pleasurable worlds, but they are inhabited as it were only by people with insight, not full insight but with a very great measure of insight. They are as it were suspended ( ) of Nirvana.

we take this literally, or ..it has always puzzled me. Could this be applied to a person who meditates, and with great experience of meditation, developi4g the dhyanic states..

S: Well, put it in this way a person who is.. ~irst of all, the Non-Returner is not merely in a dhyanic state; he's also in a state of insight, yes?

j~~~But he could be a human being in meditation who destroys..gets to the stage of destroying, say, the..

S'. Oh, it is possible for someone in a human body, in this life, to become a Non-Return~, but when the Non-Returner dies, when his physical body drops off, what is his state? His state then is that he is, as it were, reborn into what is called the Suddhavasa,~or one can regard it literally as a world to which he goes, a plane to which he goes, or one can regard it in some other way, but there is as it were a culmination there of the mundane and the transcendental. The mundane is represented by the Suddhavasa; the transcendental by the level of insight which he has attained. So, for instance, supposing you are on earth, you have someone with insight living on the karmadhatu level; well, in that case~ you've got someone with insight living on the rupadhatu level. That's the only difference. There's no difference in principle. And on that level, or in that world, he develops his insight, it becomes the insight of a Buddha or an Arahant, if you like, and when his term of existence in that Suddhavasa is exhausted he doesn't go anywhere as regards conditioned existence; he is not reborn. As regards his state of insight or enlightenment, there's no change that takes place in that at all.

Is that what the Tus~ita heaven is?

5: No, the Tusita Devaloka is different. That is where the Bodhisattvas ( ) before their last rebirth.

P~'. Ah! But I thought you said that was at the height of the rupaloka?

S'. Yes, that is also there. I forget exactly where they come in relation to one another, but there are charts which give you all these details. I think the Tusita Devaloka would be immediately below the Sudclhavasa as far as I remember.

P~ (?)

S. The Abhidharma discusses these things at length, ( ) You get the impression, however literally or n n-literally you take these matters, of a very dynamic system. Do you get that impression? For instance, w }aen certain forces are exhausted you fall from a certain plane or you develop certain ( ) and as a result of that you are born on a certain plane, and so On.

All right. Come to anger, then.

Text: What is anger?.. (to)..frstrations come.

~: So here the definition of anger which is given seems to be the opp~osite to the definition which was given of non-anger. It is a vindictive attitude (quotes to) even a moment of happiness. 'Its function is to serve as a basis for fault-finding~ Do you actually feel it? Yes. If a person is excessively given to fault-finding, however sort of mild and meek in manner they may appear, you may infer that the~e is a lot of anger and resentment there, underneath, in them. '~neverfindievena monent of hapliness.' This is why it is sometW'mes said that anger is so ridiculous. ~:ven in the case of Aupidity-attachoent, you experience some pleasure, some satisfaction, however passing, however ephemeral, however evanescent, but in the case of the indulgence of anger, you experience only pain and suffering and torment yourself. It seems so ridiculous to indulge in alger: you can understand a person indulging in cupidity-attachment, but it is very difficult to understand how anybody could possibly indulge in anger!

°~~~ This is particularly evident when somebody is ~alking over the telephone to someone and they give way to anger. And it is so obvious there.

Can this ales be rendered as hate?

~'- What is the Sanskrit here? Pratigha. I wonder if that is correct? Pratigha is explained differently from -e~ dves~a. Dvesa is more like strong

dislike and antagonism. What are the other words? What other synonyms (are there?) in English? There's dislike, anger, hatred, resentment,

? spite.

S Sp~te.

'4w' Malice.

\$ Mali~e. There are several others, too. Fury. Wrath.

--Resentment is a separate mental event.

S: I know that there are rather fine shades of difference as between all these. I personally distinguish between - as far as the ~nglish goes hatred and ~ anger. I think I've gone into this on previous occasions. Between, hatred and anger. This seems more like hatred than anger.

,-', Pratigha, by the way, is usually explained as differing from, say, dvesa, which is the usual term for the second of the three unekilful roots, is usually explained as differing from it in this ways that dvesa is when you have an attitude of strong antagonism towards a particular person or a pa~ticular thing; a strong dislike. But pratigha is more like when you take ~ld of that person or thing and beat that thing or that person again and again in a paroxysm of fury! That is pratigha. This is how it is explained in Pali, anyway, in the Theravada tradition. So you can see there is a difference, isn't there? Pratigha is more like rage. Rage is also a word, isn't it? Blind rage, blind fury. So that is pratigha. Whether pratigha really is the Abhidharma term here, I'm not sure. I think it is more likely to be dvesa or ~odha, really, rather than prati~a.

How do you spell that?

S' Krodha?

~Pp: ~es,a.

~ Dvesa is D.V.E.S.A. I wonder what the term is here? Let me see.. Oh, here it says pratigha. It says pratigha. Well, where did you get pratigha from?

I got it from the ( )

S, Aah! I think he's probably wrong, then! Because usually the three unskillful roots are most usually related as lobha, dvesa and moha, and sometimes raga, dvesa and moha, so I imagine this is a dve@a, anger or hatred. I'd render dvesa as hatred rather than anger, yes?

~~You were saying there that anger is as it were worse than hatred?

~' NO, I am saying that hatred is worse than anger, as I use these two terms.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      20      503

.-Pratigha is worse than dvesa?

~ Pratigha is worse than dvesa. As explained in the Pali Theravada tradition at least.

So this anger, here, is dvesa?

~: So really it is dvesa or what I would call hatred. So now the question arises - what is the difference between hatred and anger. I have talked about this in a previous retreat; I don't remember which one it was..

It was the (Mitra? ) one, wasn't it?

S'. Do you remember what I said on that occasion? About the distinction between the two?

I think it was something to do with, you can have anger about something, but it not necessarily being a particularly unskillful state, if you are angry about something..

~' What I said was, in effect, that anger is more like a sudden release of energy, in, as it were, opposition to something or someone~ but the breaking through or the attempted breaking through of an obstacle. But hatred is a definite intention to do someone harm, You can get angry with someone without at all wishing to do them any harm; it's just that they've made you feel rather frustrated, and your energy has accumulated and you haven't been able to sort of break through, so you just sort of break through with the anger; you sort of burst out, as it were. That is anger~ But you have no intention of actually harming or hurting that person. That is where anger differs from hatred. ~o I won't say that anger is in itself a skillful mental state, but ( ) one can use the anger skillfully, whereas one couldn't say that one could use

hatred skilfully. Your familiar, surely, with that sort of experience, when there's a blocked energy which has been obstructed by some other person, you just come breaking out, bursting out; you can't contain it any longer; so there is a negative aspect to it in that it does break through rather violently, which may be a bit upsetting for the person concerned, or the person who is the object of it, but you don't really intend to do them any harm. And sometimes you get, you can get really angry, but be at the same time quite careful that you don't do any real harm or any actual damage.

~I~So when you were saying it's ridiculous because there's no happiness involved, only pain and torment; that applies rather to hatred.

~ Hatred, yes.

So this is hate.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      21

~ Hatred as I use the term. I think I correctly distinguish as far as the English language is concerned as between hatred and anger. I think it is certainly a useful distinction for practical purposes, but hatred is never justified, hatred is never skillful, but some skillful use can be made of anger. So one should not necessarily be afraid of getting angry, but I should certainly, if one possibly can, always avoid feeling hatred. Anger, you could say, is not incompatible with metta. You can feel quite warm towards somebody even shortly after getting quite angry with them.

In fact you often do.

~: You often do, yes.

The thing is, it can be linked with quite a few other skillful mental states, though - anger, afterwards ( ) a lingering ( ), almost like there's even a resentment towards that person, for being so stupid why they had to get angry in the first place ( )

..~(?)

'S'. ( ) if you are not careful, anger can lead to hatred. I think with the average person, anger is a much more common thing than hatred, especially paradoxically enough as regards those who are near and dear to you, with whom you live habitually and who therefore are much more likely to get on your nerve or tread on your pet corns, as it were. But that anger is not incompatible in the long run~ at least, or not inconsistent with, in the long run, at least, with genuine metta for that particular person towards whom you have become angry, but you are unlikely to feel metta towards someone whom you hate without actually taking definite measures to overcome the hatred and develop the metta.

- ~v: I had a strange sort of experience when I was thumbing a lift out of Brighton. I stood by the roadside for 1~ hrs, very patiently, and nothing happened at all, so in the end I started swearing under my breath - I really got into it (laughter) But after a while I began to feel really good, it really ( ), people started smiling at me!

They still didn't stop, though! (laughter)

:~: I just gave up. Something came of it~ anyway. I really felt ~ite warm towards them and how ridiculous my situation was

feeling resentful towards them, ( )

It's quite lucky maybe somebody didn't stop, or they'd have been for it! s ~' The three situations of anger, or rather~ hatred, are sentient beings,

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      22

one's personal frustrations, and the situations from which these frustrations come. So what are these? Sentient beings. Yes, surely, one can feel hatred towards other living beings. One's personal frustrations. You have an attitude of hatred towards what? Maybe your own aches and pains and sufferings.

P~'Your sort of state.

S:      Your state. And the situations from which these frustrations come. Supposing - ~ your suffering is due to hun~er. Well, you can then become angry with and feel hatred towards the people who are making you hungry, who are not giving you food, or withholding food from you. Or withholding from you some other satisfaction which you want and the absence of which causes you suffering.

way we look back in the past to find out where all our sort of, you know, our bad state

has come. I think you went into it in the White Lotus Sutra lecture - you can't go back to kind of find the source of your kind of suffering state, like you often hear people: "Well, you know, ~'if my father had been like this and my mother had been like that I wouldn't be like I am now." and sort of really getting into hating them for the past.

~: You just have to forgive and forget.

C '~Really, you cancel that out by saying that "I have been like that once before, or I wouldn't have had that mother and father."

S: Yes, if you believe in karma. You got the mother and father that you've richly deserved!

It really came and hit me on the..my solitary retreat. I was shaving one day, and that popped right into in~~ head, and I wrote it down to se~ as a reference. I was really ~leaded with that.

S' All right. Let's carry on.

Texts The reasons...(to)..other unfounded spheres.

S: so 'vindictiveness falls on self, self hatred, hating those who in the natural way of things should be one's friends, and hating one's enemy, too. So if you do this in the three periods of time, this makes nine. 'And other unfounded fears'. How does the vindictive mind come from 'other unfounded fears'? What are these other unfounded fears?

- Worry?

t.' It's more like paranoia, isn't it? You feel very threatened, you feel

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 17 23 506,.

unsafe, you feel everything, everybody, is against you. And then you start feeling hatred and resentment. And it can be all entirely imaginary. Right. Carry on them.

Text Here the lam-rim states..(to)..getting even with all of this.

if That's quite ~ood definition. 'fierce mind'. An enraged mind which 'intent on getting even with all this'. This is a typical sort of attitude or expression of the antagonistic, the

hating - fierce minds. "I'll get even with them!" Yes? It's also the revengeful mind. Well, why do you think this is? What is actually happening? What do you hope to get I out of it? \iWhen you are intent on getting even?

~Wanting other people to be in the same state as you.

-S' But why should you want that?

S. But why should you want that? Supposing you have been made to suffer by somebody else - what is it in you that makes you want to make them suffer? what, ~'Maybe to make them see that you are suffering.

~~?

S: Mm. Mm. But when you see someone or something as the cause of your suffering, why should you want to make them suffer?

~'Because if you didn't make them suffer, you won't destroy (or, you want to destroy) the cause of your suffering!

~ But is it as simple as that?

~: You think that's the only way that it can be..that your suffering can be assuaged.

~ Hm. I don't think it is as simple as that. I don't think you merely want to remove the cause of suffering. If that cause is a sentient being, you want to make him suffer too! You want to get even. It's not just a question of removing the cause of suffering, it is a question of getting even~ yes?

You refuse to acknowledge that it is your own fault.

S. Yes. Yes. In a way, you want to punish him. You want to get even. Because you could remove the cause merely by getting out of the way! But you don't want to do that! You want to inflict pain and suffering on that person! In fact, sometimes you will keep around,

you will be hanging around, keeping in contact with him, or her, just so that you can inflict more

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      24 507

suffering; so that you can get even! You ~on~~ separate yourself from that person. That's why you can be as attached to your enemies as you can be to your friends! You want to get even. But why is this? Why do you want to get even, as distinct from merely remove the cause of the suffering?

° ~b~ You want the other person to see what, or realise what you see, so that

.....

S: No. I don't know, I think sometimes you do, but I don't think the getting even amounts just to that! ° ~VIt's a bit like the old biblical - well, I don't know about biblical - but it's the 'eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth', ( ) %: So what satisfaction do you get out of that, because it doesn't, say, restore your eye!

Pp It's like you are drowning in a boat and you want to ~ drag everybody down into the mire. .well, drown everybody else, too.

~ I don't think it's that!

be if you've been hurt, you feel inferior to the other person, and you want to get back so that you can then feel superior again.

t: Yes. I think it is more closely connected with that. Yes. Because you want to get even! Well, what does this suggest? You want to get back onto the same level. He's done you down. He's made you suffer. The one who is suffering is the passive one. He is the active one. You are the passive one. You want to restore the balance! You want to get even! So how can you do that? By doing him down! So what is at the root of this is, in a way, ego! Hm? So this getting even is a very sort of subtle state and it's sort of going on all the time, not in a very dramatic sort of way, but just sort getting even with them and I I keeping up your end, you know; not letting him do you ~wn! This is & very subtle thing that is going on all the time, usually.

4ss,; Actually it takes far more will, for want of a better word, to remain passive in a situation where one is faced with anger than...(

S' Well, supposing somebody has caused you pain and suffering, you will only become angry and feel hatred in return and want to get even, if you really feel that he has done you down. If you don't feel that he has done you down, you may experience the pain and the suffering, but you won't feel the hatred in the same way, nor you will experience that

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 17      25 508

desire to get even with him.

So you won't feel done down if you are not thinking in an egotistical way?

S: Right. Exactly.

find it relates quite a lot to this thing about being open, I think. ( ) of not being open is because some people get at you through your being open.

S: Yes. Yes, but if you are really open, as I said, I think, in that discussion, well, how can they get at you?

~le~~~~h~ting open implies that you are an individual, in a sense.

S: Yes.

~And until you are an individual, if you do open, you can experience quite a lot of(suffering?)

S'. Yes, well, supposing somebody abuses you. Suppose you think, "Well, ( ) He just lost his temper. He said some foolish things

but what did that do to me? Nothing! So you don't feel put down. You don't feel that you are in an inferior position and he is in a superior position. Therefore you don't get angry, you don't feel hatred, you don't try and get even. Because you feel even, anyway! Your sense of 'even-ness', or even of superiority, has not been disturbed. But if you feels "Oh, he has called me a fool. Who is he to call me a fool? He has put me down! He has made me a fool!"

Yes? Not that simply he has called me a fool; he has made me a fool, or made me look a fool in the eyes of other people - which is the same thing as being a fool! You know, if you think that other people's opinion is everything, then you get angry. Then you want to make him a fool to get even; to put him down; and if you can't put him down by making him a fool, you'll put him down in some other way; you'll get even in some other way; you'll restore the balance. So this is the sort of thing that happens.

That's quite important, because I've often felt this, and thought, you know, there's a kind of a gap, you know, where it's just going on and you don't bothwr, but then something comes up and - "Oh! I should do something about this!" (laughter) "Shouldn't let this go!"

--'. Yes. 'IShouldn't let him get away with that!" Shouldn't le~ him get away with it.  
Hm.

It seems to imply, Bhante, that it's quite weighty karma's going through this, you know; this kin~ of staying with the person, getting your own

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 17 p 26 509

own back, and a lot of energy going into it, and because it is unskillful

as well ( ) wasted time.

S: This is what happens in the dreaded relationship. You stay together, both

of ~0U, so that a ( ). Well, don't you!

~V:That's somewhat cynical.

S: No, I don't think it's cynical. I don't think I mean it to be cynical. It does actually happen! You see it happening! People who can't forgive each other and go their own separate ways; they've no longer any sort of positive feeling towards each other. Why do they stay together? So that they can continue taking it out of each other and getting even with each other!

There's a sort of pleasure in it. I think..

~ I'm afraid there is!

~"Yes. There is. You kn0~, you.

5: Because there is an attachment deep down underneath of a very unhealthy, neurotic kind.

I remember experiencing this one in one time in a really acute way with somebody. They were really, really annoyed with me, and instead of just forgetting it and trying to brush it aside..I didn't used to get angry, I used to get into a state of..I really felt like killing them, you know, really as bad as that. I never experienced it so strongly. And there was like a real pleasure in that; a pleasure in sort having fantasies about sort of chopping their head off or something like that. (laughter) It didn't become a pleasure, as it went on, it became. I just really got sickened. But there seems to be pleasure in it, at first.

S: Anyway, it is a fierce mind which is intent on getting even with all of this.

Go on then.

Texts \_er does not allow one to settle on the pleasures of this life and reduces immeasurable frustrations in the next life.

° S: 'Anger' - that is, hatred - 'does not allow one' even to enjoy those pleasurable things which are actually available to you. You don't want to enjoy them! You want something painful, you don't want something pleasant! Even you've no relish for pleasure! That is a ridiculous situation of anger and hatred! If you could find something bad, something unpleasant, some fault, then you are pleased, as it were! If someone

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tap~ 17 27 510

tries to cheer you up, or to placate you, you're not pleased. If someone tries to show you why you shouldn't be angry, you get more angry still. Start thinking of them as though they are your enemies, trying to take your anger and your hatred away from you! (laughter)

%~...you've every right to be angry!

& You've every right to be angry. Yes. Sometimes people even say this. "I've a right to be angry! I ought to be angry! I'd be a fool if I wasn't angry!"

It's almost as if they go away because you are angry with them; you are angry with them because they have gone away.

-P~: (puzzled) Eh??

~&~1)idL"t you refer to that as the besetting sin of Christians? Righteous indignation?

~' Righteous indignation. Well, this is a form of anger. Well, could one conceivably say that there could be, ~n certain occasions, in certain contexts, such a thing as righteous indignation? I know previously I've said 'No.', but consider it again. What is this righteous indignation?

Pwj' I think somebody who is sort of leading an unskilful life, as it were, and they had already sort of said..Or rather - No, that's not a very good

example. Somebody had a miocha ditthi and was following that, if you like, W) and thinking it was a spiritual path. I mean, I think you are in every right to point it out. And if they don't. if they refuse to see it, and still go on and still sort of insist on following a sort of false path,

~~' I think you can sort of be righteously indignant, but I think you can be pretty strong with it.

The anger in your sense is not anger.

~, I don't personally see it, though, in that sort of situation. I see it, say, for instance, in the situation like - you just suddenly see someone say, beating a child, and you experience a sort of sudden hot anger which leads you to say something or do something quite drastic to sort of stop that person engaging in that unskilful action. So you could say that something like that sort of hot anger in that sort of situation could ~as be justified as righteous indignation, but I am very wary of it with regard to views and opinions and beliefs.

° ,k<'t.' That's true of that sort of high energy action.

S High energy action. I think that's a good way of describing it. High Energy action. Inasmuch as the action is directed against somebody who

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 17 23

511 is doing something - unskilful and is intended to stop them, it mani

ifests as what looks like anger. Or one could even say righteous

indignation. ( ) high energy action. That often looks like anger, doesn't it?

~~And when it's done with no feeling of getting even or hatred or anything..

S. Right. No. No hatred against that person, but a definite determination to stop them harming the other person.

Anger is a bit like it. It feels like that. Quite angry, in a way, but at the same time, you can see that you've got your best interests at heart.

(end of tape)

512

Bhante (continuing): 50~ ,I would be a bit suspicious of any righteous indignation because someone was indulging in a micchaditti. Patience and persistence would be more called for in that situation. You can't stop them indulging in their micchadittis just like that, you stop them performing an unskillful action involving some third party but you can't just stop them engaging in micchadittis just by a short burst of righteous indignation - you might feel good but it would not do any good.

Abh: Having said that it also occurs to me "who am I to assume that someone has a micchaditti?"

Bhante: Well they might have and you might be in the right but could you in fact stop them following that micchaditti or make them drop that micchaditti by an outburst of righteous indignation. Micchadittis are things which have very deep roots indeed and they require lots of patient discussion in order to uproot those micchadittis. Outbursts of righteous indignation are not going to do anything except reinforce these micchadittis. Because you will get the person's back up more likely? then not - "who is he to tell me what I should believe and what's right and what's wrong?" So I think that if there is to be such a thing as righteous indignation at all I think that it can occur only in a situation where drastic action is required, pretty promptly in order to safeguard the interests of some third party - well even a person harming themselves ... (jet noise)... in the act of committing suicide say to him "what on earth are you doing? what are you up to?" snatch the razor out of their hand or something like that. That would be justified.

But if you come across someone not accepting the Four Noble Truths you say "What... (Laughter).

Abh: I have been with some people, they come up with some foolish spiel

of absolute nonsense in the guise of spirituality. I usually don't say that I disagree but "hum, hum" or maybe I go to the other extreme but I

would like to say "look you are just talking nonsense, mate".

Bhante: Well sometimes one can say that. Sometimes that might even do

some good. But I think to say it in an outburst of righteous indignation

would not. People would only put their backs up further however lazy and lethargic they might be. ... You might stir up some dull resentment which would lead them even deeper into the mire.

Sag: What if someone was misrepresenting the Dharma. Say someone in the Movement was giving a talk and they were clearly confused and misrepresenting the Dharma?

Bhante. Well the question arises just how did they get in the position to standing up there and misrepresenting it?

Sag: Sometimes you get in a discussion group. People get up and start guiding other people as it were, actually what they are saying is false.

Bhante: I think that one should say so quite categorically and try to sort out the matter and convince them. If you can't do it on the spot well afterwards. But let it be known to the others present that you, who presumably command a certain respect on the part of the people present, happen to disagree and at least sound a note of warning that what that person said is not to be taken and implicitly accepted, that there is at least another way of looking at the matter and that it is very much open to discussion, at least that.

Ratnaj: Why do you mention the fact that even if you have respect from other people. Presumably one might not have respect from that person but understand that there is a micchaditti going on with the person who has it.

Bhante: No I am saying that the person who raises objection. In Sagaramati's case, if he or someone like him raises an objection in a discussion

study others will know "well yes he is someone who knows the Dharma". They will have that sort of respect for him and therefore they will take it a bit seriously when he raises an objection and come to understand

514

"well at least this matter may not be quite as the speaker (to whom he is objecting) is presenting it. But at least, as I have said that will strike a note of warning. It is something at least to be discussed.

Now whether one should publicly object to someone misrepresenting the Dharma is another matter. I don't think one can argue in public in that way, at least you can register the fact that there is a least one Buddhist who does not agree. I remember the instance, I mentioned it in my biographical sketch of Anagarika Dharmapala - Dharmapala was getting towards the end of his life and he was an invalid and a cripple and being wheeled about in a wheelchair, he was present at a public meeting, I think it was the opening ceremony of the Muragandakuta Vihara, the funerary Buddhist temple in Sarnath which he had built himself, and a visiting Indian dignitary, quite an important person, was holding forth about Buddhism and started misrepresenting it. So Dharmapala became very angry waved his stick in the air and shouted "sit down, sit down, I won't have the Dharma misrepresented in my temple!" And he made him sit down, just stopped him from carrying on.

But This is very rare. He could get away with it. He was known as a man of somewhat fiery temper and also a man who was really devoted to the Dharma, and also the good friend of many Hindus, that was known too. That wasn't the outcome of any anti-India feeling as such but he would not have the Dharma misrepresented.

But one has to be very sure of one's ground. Be quite sure that the person who is objecting to you is not just looking at things from a different point of view which may not be substantially different from yours, But if it is an actual flagrant misrepresentation, I think that one has the right even to interrupt. If for instance there is someone giving a talk on Buddhism at a public meeting which you happen to go along to and he says something which is quite definitely as a matter of historical fact a misrepresentation of the Buddha teaching, I think that one has the right to stand up and interrupt, to let it be known that there is a Buddhist present who is disagreeing. Obviously it would be difficult to put forward one's

--

515

reasons for disagreeing in that particular situation but at least register the fact of disagreement. More especially if you see that the speaker is definitely ill informed, or is even trying to misrepresent deliberately, just not let him get away with it.

Padmav: I was readding a book by a Christian, It started of - Buddhism is a revived form of Hinduism. The whole of the article on Buddhism was really bad and when I first read it I felt really angry and I was going to write to him but then afterwards I decided I would. But do you think if ~e do see things like that in books...

Bhante: Well yes we should write but make sure that we put our objections very cogently and clearly, with very definite reasons and if necessary with quotations from Buddhist texts. Unfortunately there are many people who regard the Buddhists as the least qualified of all to write about Buddhism because they cannot be objective. Because they are Buddhists then they cannot be objective about Buddhism. It's amazing isn't it?

Anyway let's go on with these quotations.

Dharma~la: "The Bodhicharya Avatara says When one is mentally feverish with hate, the mind cannot experience peace and not being able to gain either happiness or joy one will lose sleep and become very unsteady".

Bhante: Actually through hatred you can lose sleep~ cacityou. It is interesting that when enumerating the benefits of metta, some of the texts ~y that you sleep well, soundly. Metta gives you a good sleep, a good nights rest. In the same way hatred keeps you awake. Because you are scheming and plotting how I can get even with him.

~: The Visuddhi Magga says that you wake up in the morning like a lion. ?: That's with metta.

Bhante: But what do you wake up with, thats if you have been to sleep at all, with hatred.

~: Like an asura.

Bhante: Like a cactus plant.

516

Dh: I have found the couple of nights since I 've been here .... beginning to work on me (laughter) I haven't slept well for a couple of nights and I have caught back on waking up because I felt this fever in myself.

Bhante: Alright carry on please.

Dh: "He who with whatever wealth does kindness becomes steadfast. They are the assailants who slay that tyrant hatred".

Bhante: Shantideva says that if you have to hate something, then hate hatred. Get rid of that.

Vim: "By anger, friends are made weary and even if one attracts them by gifts, they cannot be made to stay. In short, anger does not offer one the lightest chance of being happy".

Bhante: Your anger, your hatred they weary even your best friends. It is very difficult to live with someone who is prone to hatred. Let's go on.

Vim: "The Jataka Mala states if one's face is distorted by the fire of anger, even ornaments will not make it look beautiful. Even if one goes to sleep on a comfortable bed, the mind burning with anger, will be miserable. He forgets what good was done for him and being afflicted by anger he goes evil ways. He fails in fame and achievement and even his prosperity dwindles like the waning moon. Even if he is supported by friends, the angry person will fall into ways not suited to being apcrot. While only thinking about 'how can I get something' or 'how can I harm someone' his intelligence collapses and generally he

violates the moral norm and becomes more and more infatuated.

When through anger he has become accustomed to doing evil acts he will for one hundred years suffer evil forms of life. Even an enemy who is after the evil doer will not be worse than this."

Bhante: So he will fall into ways not suited to being a human. This is quite a terrible state. Through anger you can become sub human, through hatred you can become sub human, like a sort of demon. I have seen this with just a few people. They become more like demons than human beings,

517

not like animals but like demons.

?: How do you use that word "demon"?

Bhante: A being which is based purely on negative and destructive ends and wants only to do harm in a way that quite bad human beings don't.

?: Burp

(long pause)

Bhante: Alright so much for hatred. We can begin to see why the Mahayana regards hatred as the worst of offences. There is a Mahayana Sutra, I think quoted by Shantideva in the Siccasamuccaya that what Geuther terms cupidity/attachment is a far less serious offence in the case of a Bodhisattva than is anger and hatred. Because cupid ity/attachment at least shows, the Sutra says, some affinity for being. You come near to beings, you come close to being through cupidity and attachment but not through anger and hatred, not through aversion. Aversion is a good translation for ~1e~a.~~~

?: Sounds very violent.

~: Aversion is turning away from, hatred is going against.

Bhante: That is true. On then to arrogance. What is the term for this? ?: Maya

Bhante: Mana - often rendered as a flat peak, (?) sort of high mindedness.

(pause) Alright onto arrogance.

Manj: "The Abhidharma samuccaya explains arrogance as follows - what is arrogance? It is an inflated mind as to what is perishable and its function is to serve as the basis for disrespect and frustration. Arrogance is a mental event which a current of the inflated mind making whatever is suitable such as wealth or learning to be the foundation of pride. Here the states, Arrogance bases itself on a nihilistic outlook and gets inflated ~ut the high and low, the good and evil of the within and without and assumes superiority. The statement bases itself on a nihilistic outlook

518

infused because all forms of arrogance come simultaneously with a belief in oneself and an overevaluation of oneself.

Dh: Nihilistic means sort of forever?

Bhante: No. It means negating. I don't know how literally nihilistic is to be taken in the translation, usually 'nihilistic' is used to translate uche devada (?). But its negative outlook is negative with regard to other people. You as it were negate other people. Your attitude is nihilistic with regard to other people because you believe in yourself and overvalue

yourself, overevaluate yourself. This will become clearer when we go through the seven binds of arrogance. Let's do that.

Asv: "Arrogance is seven fold:

1. Arrogance 2. Excessive arrogance 3. Pride of excessive arrogance 4. Egotism 5. Arrogance of showing off 6. Arrogance of thinking small 7. Perverted arrogance."

Bhante: These seven by the way are in the Ratnabibhajana (?) that is to say 'The Precious Garland' we studied on the last study retreat. The translation there is a bit more helpful than the one here. There are explanations. We'll look through those.

Asv: The first is an inflated mind with which one thinks 'look here, I am so superior compared to those low creatures

Bhante' That is to say arrogance is the klesa which you look down on others, you consider yourself superior in relation to others who are inferior. They may in fact be inferior objectively speaking, but you feel, in an overbearing way that they are inferior, that you are superior. But it is the inflated mind with which one thinks "look here, I am so superior compared to those low creatures".

Abh: You feel superior in an inflated way.

519

Bhante: You feel that you can recognise quite objectively that you know something better than someone else does so you may not feel at all arrogant or proud about that, just be quite objective about that. But if you take delight, take pleasure in that superiority then it becomes arrogance. If you become inflated over that superiority. What about excessive arrogance.

Padmay: Excessive arrogance is an inflated mind with which one thinks, "I am better than my peers"

Bhante: But actually you are equal, no better than they, we no worse. But you think you're better, you think you're superior. This is excessive arrogance.

Ratnaj: Also thinking that you are superior to people who are actually superior to you

Bhante: No, this is the next one. Your peers are those who are equal to you. In the law you are to be tried by a jury of your peers. Peers means your equals not your superiors. The House of Lords is superior to the House of Commons but peers as peers are the peers of one another.

Abh: We have the saying: "Without peer".

Bhante: Yes, without equal. Anuttara which actually without feet area(?) but it is translated peerless.

Manju: The first one is based on an actual superiority whereas the second on an imagined

Bhante: Yes, in the first case you're superior to someone, but you feel superior in an inflated way and in the second case you are equal but you feel that you are superior. Now in the third case, what do we find there?

Padma~: Pride of excessive arrogance is an inflated mind with which one thinks I am more exfilled than the other e~ltd ones.

Bhante: You fancy yourself superior to those who are in fact superior to you. This is pride of excessive arrogance. You don't even consider

yourself equal to them, you consider yourself superior to them. No doubt that would be a separate category, but that isn't mentioned, considering yourself superior to those who - oh, that has been mentioned, hasn't it?

~: Being equal to a superior, that would be.

Bhante Yes that would be a separate category. But here, you are considering yourself superior to those who are superior to you. Not who are equal to you.

Asv: It does seem that any such thoughts actually involve some kind of false view.

Bhante: Yes.

Padmav: Isn't there something where you prove that you are neither equal to others nor that you are inferior.

Bhante: Right. This is what is said in the Sutta Nipata .... It is connected with that . Go on to the next one.

Ratnaj: Egotism is an inflated mind with which one thinks, "I am all of what makes up my existence.

Bhante: What do you think that means. It's not a very good translation I think.

Asvs That everything I see is a reflection of me and of nothing else.

Bhante: No, it's not that. I am all of that which makes up my existence. That you take more pride and delight in yourself. I am me. It--s more like that.

~: Sometimes you see yourself in the centre of the universe.

Bhante: Yes. I am all of that which makes up my existence. You identify yourself very strongly with, and you consider yourself very strongly as being, the five skandhas. This is me. I am all of these. The most subtle so far. This is the egoistic sense of self identity.

Abh: You start feeling that your own existence must somehow be more  
521

important than anyone else's.

Bhante: That would make it very majestic.

Manju= Reminds me of a quote from a master of a college "What I do not "  
know is not knowledge.

Bhante That famous verse is supposed to describe Benjamin \$owett. "I am the Mastor  
of Balliol College and what I don't know isn't knowledge".

Padma~: Would that be considered very much in this line.

Bhante: No I think that would come under the next heading.

Ratnaj: Arrogance of showing off is an inflated mind which thinks I have  
achievements, even when one has attained nothing.

Bhante: That's pretty obvious. One prides oneself in achievement even unmeasurable

ones.

Manju: This refers presumably to achievement that you have achieved as well.

Bhante: Yes, because even when one has attained nothing you could think in this way too when one has achieved something. In other cases it would be arrogance of showing off.

Asv: The only attainment is the realisation that there isn't an 'I' or that the 'I' is not anything that one can describe or limit.

Bhante: Well onto the next one.

Ratnaj: Arrogance of thinking small is an inflated mind with which one thinks "I am so small and inferior compared to those who are so exalted and so high".

Bhante: There is a footnote here.

Ratnaj: The implication here is the idea, "The master no doubt is great! I could never reach his height, but look how important I am that I have such a great master!" (laughter)

~hante: You do find this. I don't think that this is actually the explanation or the meaning of that particular form of arrogance but actually

522

you do find that sort of attitude.

Ratnaj: That sounds like quite a classic phenomena over here.

Bhante: Yes. When you get people trying to attach themselves to whoever happens to be the greatest guru around because if they are attached to the greatest guru around then they obviously must be someone of importance. You get quite a bit of that. It's very noticeable. I don't think that is the actual meaning of this form of arrogance. I think it is this sense of superiority disguised as a mock humility.

There is the case which I mentioned on the previous study seminar. The discussion amongst the different monks, the different orders of the Catholic Church. The Dominicans said, "we're best when it comes to learning," the Jesuits said, "well we're best in educational work, when it comes to the question of policy, "but the Franciscans piped up and said, "that's all perfectly true but when it comes to humility, we Franciscans are tops." (laughter)

Asv: Do you think he said that with a twinkle in his eye.

Bhante: I don't know. But if he didn't it was the arrogance of thinking small.

Manju: There seems to be sometimes this kind of feeling that one ought to feel a kind of humility.

Bhante: What is humility. It is, for instance said, in the case of arrogance, it is an inflated mind as to what is perishable and its function is to serve as a basis for disrespect and frustration. So presumably if there wasn't any arrogance there would be respect there would be reverence. But humility, what does one mean by humility?

Humility does suggest a quite negative kind of grovelling, deliberate objection as motivation.

Asv: Is there any sense in which humility may be positive?

Bhante: It is question of how we use the word, or what the word usually means or usually conveys or suggests.

Ratnaj: We were saying yesterday that it was a mark of faith.

Bhante: Do you need to be humble? In the sense of practicing or cultivating humility. Can you cultivate humility. But if you feel reverence which you can cultivate, you will in fact be humble, but you won't be "being humble". This is why disrespect is mentioned as having arrogance for its basis. If you have respect then you have non arrogance as--your basis. Probably it is quite sufficient to think in of respect and reverence and not in terms of humility.

Padmav: Humility suggests to me in a positive sense that you don't even think of being humble. You just are.

Bhante: Yes. There is this famous story about Mahatma Gandhi, drawing up a list of rules for those who were to do with his ashram, and he put right at the top of the list - To practise humility. Someone pointed out

to him that you can't in fact practice humility because if you make it something that is self conscious, well it ceases to be humility. So he crossed it out and he wrote at the bottom - All of these are to be practised in the spirit of humility.

Asv: Would it have been better to put - in the spirit of reverence?

Bhante: ~ell no, reverence can be cultivated, humility can't, but ~verence can. But if you cultivate reverence you don't even need to think of humility, do you?

~: It almost something that people can see in you -that you wouldn't see in yourself.

Bhante: You couldn't see it in yourself. The minute you saw it, it wouldn't be there. Even if it had been there before.

~: Maybe you'd call it humility only in fun.

Bhante: Yes, right.

Padmav: At first it seems quite a high, and I hesitate to use the word, achievement.

524

Bhante: It's a sort of unselfconsciousness.

Padmav: Sort of natural.

Manju: Is it also a kind of basic unconsciousness as well?

Bhante: I think a state of unselfconsciousness, but self consciousness~ in a negative way. It's unconscious in the sense of ... (not clear)

Right carry on.

Ratnaj: Perverted arrogance is to think that it is virtue to make mistakes like someone who is proud about his achievements when he is carried away by a goblin. (Laughter) It is just as the Vinayaganottaravisesagamaprasnavrtti states, To feel proud about what is actually a matter of shame is like feeling pride about what one has done to householders and goblins in one's attachment to honor and riches after one has failed and discarded all disciplinary rules.

Bhante: Some people are very proud of the negative things they do, how many times they got drunk recently and how big a fool they made of themselves on such and such an occasion. They are really proud of this and how they were bottom of the class when they were at school. This you could call inverted arrogance. It's inverted rather than perverted.

Asv: What do you think, Bhante, the author is suggesting when he says "when he is carried away by a goblin".

Bhante: The reference to the goblin has a different meaning in each case. "Someone who is so proud of his achievements when he is carried away by a goblin". He hasn't really achieved anything. He has done something bad, in fact, like being carried away by a goblin, it's a misfortune, a disaster, but he feels proud of it.

Abh: Presumably not a particularly serious one. One that people could laugh about.

Bhante: Well I don't get that impression. No. I mean a goblin would

S24A

carry you off and gobble you up. So that is nothing to be proud of. But you are proud of something which is just like that, something very foolish and stupid that you have done, something which is really disastrous in fact. And you are proud of that, instead of being sorry or being ashamed.

Some people are proud of being rude, of being blunt, proud of not showing any regard for other people's feelings, proud of being brutal, proud of being sarcastic, proud of being cynical. So this is inverted arrogance. Proud of what a mess they have made of their lives. Whereas in the quotation from that particular text\* one feels proud of the harm that one has done to householder and goblins. Of course here it's more in the sense of household deities or local spirits.

Lets go on.

Ratnaj: While this exposition is according to the Abhidharmakosa, the Ratnamala classifies arrogance as follows:

Arrogance is of seven kinds. I shall explain them by distinguishing them. Regarding them, the person who boasts openly that he is equal to or greater than his equal Prom having made the low low and the equal either equal or lower, ought to be known as having arrogance of

sameness.

He who is vile, yet venerates himself and boasts that he is particularly great. Thinking that he is truly ambitious by being lofty, has the pride of excessive arrogance. He who boasts about the five meaningless things called 'constituents of personality,' which are vicious like the coming into existence of pus pots, the sprouts of karma, is called an egoist'. When in fact he has not attained anything but thinks that he has attained something, he is openly arrogant. Praising the performance of evil actions is, by the wise, understood as perverted arrogance. To say, "I am useless," is to belittle oneself. This is known as arrogance of self abasement. This is to put it concisely.

Bhante:           So arrogance is of seven kinds

525

arrogance of sameness.

This used to be quite confusing here in this class system. It is the arrogance of comparing. To compare at all is a form of arrogance. This is what this text is in fact saying.

Asv: Saying both opening is unnecessary, someone who just thinks.

Bhante:           Well perhaps if you just think, it isn't so bad, but if you proclaim it and boast about it and make it a sort of public matter or insist on it, then it does become arrogance.

So it's the arrogance of making comparisons in this respect. To boast openly perhaps refers to what was mentioned in the other classification, in the other text, is inflation. Just to objectively recognise that one is equal or not equal, well that does no harm, but to feel inflated about it, to boast about it, this suggests arrogance. One might say that one can't help comparing. But the invidious comparison, the comparison based on a sense of inflation, a sort of over-wieldy sense of superiority, it is this that is negative. But perhaps even the thinking in terms of comparison is not completely skilful or positive but it is not skilful, not positive in a very very subtle way. But insisting on one's even actual superiority and feeling inflated about it, this is actual crude, gross arrogance which is completely unskilful.

Manju:           Has it got something to do with seeing the value, the primacy of things you're putting your values on as being sort of absolute and ultimate.

Bhante: Well you put value on yourself. You regard yourself as ultimate, as sort of absolute.

Asv: Seems rather difficult step to take, to regard oneself in any respect as equal to or superior or inferior to, sooner or later it will become apparen~ (?) in some connection.

Bhante: Well need it For instance , suppose you, having being

526

trained as an architect, just know that you know something about that particular line of work. So you could well say, "I know, so and so doesn't know" the chap sitting next to you doesn't. But you need not necessarily start feeling superior to him on that account. You just know that you have got that particular experience, you've got that particular qualification. You've just got that knowledge that he hasn't. So in a sense yes, you are superior to him with respect to that knowledge. But you don't dwell upon it or think about it or make anything of it. If you did that would be arrogance. But you need not do that. Sometimes one uses that objective superiority as a sort of compensation when you have been made to feel inferior in some other ~re~pect. Maybe he has made you feel very inferior because he paints very well and maybe he is rather inflated and he has made you feel quite inferior that you can't paint, you're not any good at that sort of thing. So you say to him, "Oh well, I know all about architecture at least". So you can start evening up in that sort of way. There are all sorts of matters in regard to which one knows that one is superior to certain people or one would know if one only took the trouble to think about them. More often than not one doesn't take the trouble to think of them. So it doesn't become -You can't avoid comparison altogether in the course of ordinary life. You have to think, "well shall I do this, or shall I ask him who could do it better?" But that doesn't tell us anything about arrogance if on your part you conclude that you are the better man for that particular job. So I think that boasting openly is introduced to make this sort of point. The inflation is introduced in the text itself.

He who is vile

excessive arrogance .

He thinks more of himself than he deserves.

He who boasts

of pus spots (I think it should be)....



So there are more forms of arrogance or conceit than one would have thought. Alright carry on till the end.

Kam: Arrogance is the cause for being born into evil existence in a later life and, even when one is born in a human existence, it is the cause for being born in a low caste and as a servant. Through disrespect to those who have (virtuous) qualities, one spoils the opportunity of receiving instructions and understanding them. Thus, arrogance creates unpleasantness both here and in the hereafter. The Ratnamala states

Inflatedness leads to an evil status, Jealousy leads to pale complexion Anger to evil looks, and Lack of consultation with learned persons to stupidity-

528

The result among human beings is, First of all, a hellish way of life. The lam - rim state~: Since arrogance in this life is the greatest hindrance in the development of one's potentialities and in the next life is the cause for becoming a servant, it has to be given up.

Bhante: So inflatedness leads to an evil status, arrogance is the cause of being born into evil existence in a later life and even when one is born into a human existence it is the cause for being born in a low caste and as a servant. This is according to the general traditional teaching about the appropriateness of the effects of karma.

Through disrespect for those who have virtuous qualities, one spoils the opportunity of receiving instructions and understanding them. In other words if you consider yourself to be superior to those who are superior

~ you in respect of spiritual qualities, spiritual knowledge and so on, then you make it impossible for you to~ceive instructions from them. If you think you know more than them, when, in fact, they know more than you, then you make it quite impossible for them to teach you. This is a very common attitude these days. "What does he know, who is he to teach me etc, etc.."

Asv: Vajrabedhi had this difficulty in Finland.

Bhante: Yes, he said on a number of occasions, in many letters, that the Fins regarded

it as something very shameful to have to put themselves in a position, as it were, of inferiority. He mentioned, for instance, that as regards asking for ordination, a Finn would regard it as extremely shameful to have to ask for ordination and to have the matter discussed and decided whether he was ready for ordination or not. A Finn would think that he ought to be admitted automatically when he applied if he could produce sufficient marks as it were.

Padmay: It seems as though this is a particular sort of thing in the West, because of what we are brought up with - the Democrat sort of thing.

~iL

529

Bhante: I don't think that it is only that. I think that it is also the way in which we have been brought up to regard religion. We don't usually regard it as something to be learned, do we? Because there are no methods. You can learn the history of it. You can learn ~l about the bible and all that, but you can't learn the religion itself. People are quite ready to respect a carpenter who can teach them carpentry, they are quite ready to respect an architect who can teach them architec- ture, they can respect him as a good architect. But they don't have usually the impression of religion as something that can be taught, therefore something which represents a definite body of knowledge and experience and therefore they don't have the idea of there being certain people who have in their possession, as it were, this knowledge and this s~erience which they are able to teach. I think it has also got some- thing to do with that. I think in the univercities a lack of respect for one's teachers has begun to spread, hasn't it? Compared to (?) I'm not sure what this is due to. It is almost as if it has become a fashion not to respect. This might be more due to the feeling of pseudo equality.

Ratnaj: Could this be due to the fact that people have gone into the university after god knows how many years at school and that really they just don't want to be there. I remember talking about it with Aryamitra, the way that Ananda had gone to college after so many years and that he really wanted to put himself into it.

Bhante: No doubt many people go to colleges~and univer~ities as an alternative to having to go out to work. I don't see how this should necessarily cause you to disrespect quite actively as some do the teachers that you find in college or at university.

Asv: I know when I went along to college and to university I rather hoped that I would find teachers who were and creative individuals and I was very disappointed when I found that this was not in many cases true and it is quite difficult not to be a bit resentful in

530

that situation, especially if other people support that attitude.

Manju: I think it has developed now because you have this in schools and the reason why it happen in schools, I think, is because the sort of things that the teachers are teaching are not generally valued by the society and so, the children pick up from their parents that you know, it's just a teaching, - "I don't want to listen to him or her anyway." - And so they learn to disrespect. They learn disrespect to

tho~e sort of people and it carries over into their university life.

Abh: Also, in many cases, children have a really bad time with their parents, so anyone who stands for authority has to be flouted ... (unclear)... can't flout their parents.

Bhante: But is this so - Do children have such a bad time with their parents?

Abh: They do in some cases, in certain quarters, poor areas ...

Bhante: But that's always been the case. It was the case even more so in the past. I can remember children going to school without food and poor children having to be given meals at school out of the teacher's private resources. There was no state provision then for that sort of thing.

Abh: I don't mean poverty. I mean children who are really badly treated by their parents.

Bhante: There were even more in the past, weren't there.

Dharma~la: I've seen a lot of children in Glasgow come to the Art Centre...

Bhante: But they didn't grow up with that sort of disrespect for teachers.

Manju: There '5 a sort of general ingratitude as well because things aren't valued.

Bhante: Yes, I think it's that. That you are entitled to having every thing provided for you and there's nothing you should be grateful for. And also, as you said, and I think maybe that's the major factor, that society at large, certainly society as it impinges on the growing mind

531

of the child, does not value the things that teachers are traditionally supposed to stand for. The teacher traditionally is supposed to stand for the cultural heritage of the community, something of which the teacher is trying to pass on. Well that is not valued by many people, by society at large.

Vim: Perhaps that's because many people are going to universities and they don't know really why they are going to universities.

Padinap.' It's so big that the teachers are told that they can't assert the authority which students, the young lads, get respect from.

Bhante: There's that also. The teacher has been slightly emasculated. If you clip an student under the ear, well a great outcry goes up and you're a brute; and there's disciplinary action taken against you perhaps and so on and so forth. Indignant parents come to school.

Abh: The child might respect that person.

Manju: I have often thought that schools are based on fear. That children are a bit frightened of the teacher, the teacher is frightened of the head teacher, the head teacher is frightened of the Board of Governors, the Board of Governors is frightened of the Council, the Council is frightened of the Parents.

Ehante: The parents are frightened of the children (Laughter) Anyway perhaps that ' 5 enough for that paragraph. And enough of negative mental events for today. Don't give yourselfk~ big a dose of negative mental events at~a~time.

Session concludes

Next session commences

Bhante: Now what have we today.

Vim: Looks like a lack of intrinsic awareness (laughter).

Bhante: Lack of intrinsic awareness, Indecision and Opinionatedness.

532

Maybe we can get through all of these this morning. Aright page ?2, lack of intrinsic awareness (ma - rig - pa) which is avidya (?), usually translated ignorance.

Padmav: Its not muti (?)

Bhante: No. Avidya (?) Ma is negative. Rig-pa is vidya.

~: Do you know what mudi (?) is then?

Bhante: It's not a word that's commonly used. You might have got it from Conse.

~: I got it from the lists of the Takakusu (?)

Bhante: Tarka cutta is rather astray Takakusu! (?) Alright let's start reading.

Abh: Lack of intrinsic awareness.

The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains lack of intrinsic awareness as follows: What is lack of intrinsic awareness?

It is a lack of being aware to one's full capacity and it covers the three realms of life. Its~function is to serve as a basis for mistaken stubbornness, doubt and emotionality about the entities of reality.

This unknowing is a mental event that is confused about reality as it is.

This lack of intrinsic awareness is a confusedness and a pervertedness. Regarding this state of confusedness, the Acarya Vasubandhu, in his Pancaskandhaprakarana, is of the same opinion as and agrees with the statement of his brother, Asanga, in the Abhidharmasamuccaya.

Dharmakirti, however, talks about pervertedness. Although lack of intrinsic awareness consists of two aspects - confusedness and pervertedness - all authors agree that the main counter-

agent is discriminative awareness which understands the fact that nothing has an abiding principle.

Bhante: That seems very clear, doesn't it? The main feature of lack of intrinsic awareness or U:ij~ seems to be that it is confused about reality as-it-is. First of all, as it were, there's the non-awareness of reality as-it-is. It's as though you can't be simply not aware of it in a purely privat~ sense. The non-awareness of reality automatically plunges you into confusion and bewilderment and embarks you on a course of perverted action. It's not that you don't know and it's left at that. Because you don't know you're in a state of confusion, mental confusion and bewilderment, and on account of that mental confusion and bewilderment you indulge in all sorts of perverted thoughts ,words and deeds.

Its function is to serve as a basis for mistaken stubbornness,doubt and emotionality about the entities of reality. And the main counter- agent is discriminative awareness, that is to say wisdom, parjna.

Padma~: (?) Why is the word 'stubbornness' brought in?

Bhante: I don't know. I don't know how close this is to the original but just taking at its fac~ value, what do you think it means - a mistaken stubbornness. What does stubbornness mean?

Asv: Resistance.

Bhante: Resistance. If you stick to your point...

Padmav: Refusing to acknowledge things as they are.

Bhante: Rigidity, lack of receptivity, the state of being not open, the state of being closed.

~: I think you gave a very good definition for greed, hatred and delusion, in I forget where - the New Zealand lectures. You called this one a stubborn refusedness to accept something which might threaten your ego identity.

534

Bhante: Right. This is very much the case .(?).. struggle (?). Sort of digging your heels in, refusing to budge. Even though you're mistaken, or all the more so because you're mistaken. In several cases in his writings Geunther has a very good description of awareness, awareness in the sense of vidya. We talked about this quite a bit in one or two of the previous seminars and the point was made is that awareness is, as it were, aesthetic.

Abh: is what, sorry?

Bhante: As it were, aesthetic. Because what is the nature of the aesthetic experience.

Abh: To appreciate the beautiful.

Bhante: To appreciate the beautiful. Or one could say simply to appreciate something for its own sake. There isn't the idea of doing any- thing with it. There isn't the idea of making any use of it. In other words there's no selfish attitude with regard to it. You don't want to manipulate it in any way, you just are satisfied purely to contemplate it, to appreciate it, even to become absorbed in it. According to Schopenhauer, in aesthetic experience, and in mystical experience he draws this parallel, there's a suspension of the will, that is to say the

selfish will, the will to live, the blind urge. Do you see this? So according to Geunther, awareness has this sort of aesthetic character,

not that it is aesthetic in the narrow sense, but it can be described in aesthetic terms because it has this purely appreciative character, it doesn't seem to do anything with the object. So when you lose that aesthetic appreciation, when you lose that awareness, you fall into bewilderment and confusion, then you want to do things with them. You want to manipulate them, you want to use them, you want to make practical use of them for the purpose of your own satisfaction. And - that is avidya in dependence on which arises the samskaras. That is the state of

drunkenness in dependence on which arise actions of body, speech and mind inspired by the drunkenness . This being the analogy

535

for the relationship between avidya which is the first of the nidanas of the wheel of life and the samakaras which are the second. So Geunther in some of his writings brings out very well this, as it were, aesthetic quality of awareness, of vidya. It's more than just knowledge, it's usually translated as just knowledge, vidya and avidya is translated as ignorance. But I think Geunther's 'lack of intrinsic awareness' is a quite good interpretive translation, I think of his more successful renderings of Tibetan and Sanskrit terms. You could even say that if Geunther renders prajna as analytical appreciative understanding, he might have rendered awareness as aesthetic, appreciative understanding.

Abh: I was going to ask what is the difference between smriti, vidya and jnana?

Bhantei Not exactly three different kinds of awareness but there are three related terms do share between them to various extents the characteristics of awareness. Jnana is consistently translated by Geunther as awareness. He translates apparently vidya as intrinsic awareness, suggesting, I don't know whether he consciously intends this, suggesting that vidya is the basic, the intrinsic awareness which subsequently, as it were, becomes overlaid, become~obscured. Whereas jnana is awareness as recovered. You see what I mean? That is when you recover your original, intrinsic awareness, whether he intends to make this distinction, but the way he has translated these terms suggests that.

Abh: Jnana is recovered vidya.

Bhante: Yes. Geunther doesn't say that but the way that he translates

suggests that they could be looked at in this way, because he does translate vidya as intrinsic awareness and jnana as simply awareness. So jnana which is awareness is presumably that same awareness of which avidya is the lack, but what is the difference between them? Vidya in the context of avidya is the awareness that has been lost, we don't have it now. Jnana is the awareness which has been regained. So it's the

536

same awareness but vidya represents the awareness that has been lost and jnana represents the awareness that has been gained. If one wanted to work out a system using these terms one could very well say that.

Abh: Yes, indeed, because in the Tibetan Wheel of Life, the first nidana is illustrated by the figure of a blind man with a stick.

Vimaismitra: Where does prajna come into this?

Bhante: Geunther translates 'prajna' as appreciative analytical understanding. As I pointed out some days ago 'prajna' can be distinguished from 'jnana' but differences are sometimes drawn between them especially in the context of the ten Bodhisattva bhūmis, the ten paramitas. If one wanted to introduce a consistent usage, one could say that the 'prajna' which is from the same root 'jna', meaning "to know" could mean two things, it could mean one 'jnana' or awareness in process of emergence and it could mean also jnana in function. So you apply your jnana to something so as to know it, when you apply your awareness to something so as to penetrate it as it actually is, that could be called 'prajna'. But don't take this too literally, I'm just working out a possible consistent usage of the term, it may not square with all Buddhist texts, with the usage of the term in all Buddhist texts.

Asv: That brings out the Buddha's dynamic quality.

Bhante: Yes. Prajna certainly has a suggestion of dynamicity.

Padmav: There is a thing, a vidyadhara.

Bhante: Vidyadhara is a bearer of vidya. Geunther would translate that 'one who has experienced' that is borne within himself intrinsic awareness. The usage is, the context is Tantric, that is one who is initiated into Tantric secrets, Tantric mysteries. What is the Tantra concerned with? With intrinsic awareness, with experience. So Vidyadhara suggests someone with a living experience of the Truth. One has developed that intrinsic awareness or recovered that original awareness. Sometimes Vidyadhara is used almost to suggest a sort of magician.

but that would be on a much lower level. When you visualise Vidyadharas with dakinis and viras and so on in the refuge tree then the Vidyadhara is the bearer of the magician or realisation of intrinsic awareness. This term also underlines the fact that as it were theory and practice ~ways go together. If you are confused and bewildered in thought then you must be perverted in action. (pause) You notice here that the main counteragent is discriminative awareness, prajna, the positive, the ~tive function of prajna. You could say that prajna is jnana in the flaking or jnana in action.

Vim: How do you relate awareness as an aesthetic thing with actually on the practical side when you have got to do things in the world? I mean if you are you are using things for the Dharma presumably that wouldn't put the Dharma across.

~hante: The question is the nature of the use by definition, a selfish use, ego related use you could say. Though as one lives in the world one has to make use of things. So if you were living in the ~rld after you had experienced fully intrinsic awareness you would be continuing to make use of things. But here the overall orientation would not be an egoistic one. You would either make use of things just to sustain the body continuously or to help other people. So this would not interfere with or conflict with your intrinsic awareness. In fact you would be functioning in a completely different way, your functioning would be spontaneous and you wouldn't be thinking in these sort of terms and your wouldn't experience any such problem or any such conflict.

Manju:           Wouldn't it be more a matter of using the things at hand rather than considering the use.

Bhante:           One could look at it in this way also you've got me to take the aesthetic analogy again. You've got the finished work of art and you've got the work of art in the making. Supposing there's the work of art in the making, you have, as it were, a vision of the kind of work of art that you are going to produce. At the same time the concrete

work of art is in the making. So on the one hand you've got aesthetic appreciation which is your appreciation of the vision that you have of the work of art, on the other hand the work of art is in the making. You're making use of certain material, you're making use of certain instruments. That is all within the overall context of your vision of the finished work of art which is as it were present before you. So in the case of intrinsic awareness you have the experience of intrinsic awareness that is, as it were, on one plane, on one level, you could say the plane of the absolute but what is going on on the plane of the relative, as it were, to make that sort of distinction, thinking in terms of that sort of distinction, you're doing your best to make as it were life on the plane of relative existence conform to or manifest intrinsic awareness, just as when you try to create a work of art you are trying to make a concrete work of art conform to your vision of what that particular work of art should be. So all your energies, all your activities, all the things that you do, on the relative plane, are directed to that end, so therefore take place within the overall context of your, as it were, aesthetic perception. But not for your sake, in the narrow sense, not ego-related but they are all directed towards the manifestation as it were of that experience of intrinsic awareness within the everyday world so that the everyday world is completely transformed by that. Probably that's the nearest analogy that one can give. Do you see this? This is what I called in an earlier seminar working within the mandala. You're in the mandala, but you're also working within the mandala. You're not just sitting there contemplating the beauty of the mandala, you're doing that too, but also you're working so as to bring everything around you into harmony with the mandala. That is not an ego-related activity, that is a spontaneous activity on account of the fact that you are in touch with the mandala, that you have experience intrinsic awareness.

Asv: Could the dynamic aspect of that aesthetic awareness be something

quite different from the forms themselves or at least exists on a different level.

I became very conscious of that kind of thing shortly before my own ordination at Keffolds. I noticed that people were moving in a way that was beautiful and that I hadn't appreciated before. They were moving in patterns but one could only see that pattern from a certain point of view.

I think that it only became real if you participated in it. If you remained still then that pattern as movement ceased. If you participated and were active there was a pattern, there was a flow which was not you and yet it was you.

Bhante: Well if it was you and yet not you then that suggests an activity that was not ego related.

Padmap: Could you say, Bhante, that using this term intrinsic awareness, could you say that in the context of what Vimalamitra was saying, could you say that ideal would be a, one's

ideal, in a situation, one's vision in a way of what one is aiming for is an ideal or that would be

more a (sic)

Bhante: Well an ideal usually suggests something which hasn't as yet been realised. Something that you're striving towards or trying to be. But here it is something which you yourself have realised, you've realised intrinsic awareness and through your spontaneous activities which come out of that intrinsic awareness you are trying to bring the ordinary world into line with, into harmony with, that vision that actual experience that you have of the intrinsic awareness. So it is an ideal which so far as you are concerned has actually been realised. So far as the world in the midst of which you are working is concerned and for you in as much as you are identifying yourself with that world, it is still an ideal to be realised. I mean, just in the way, the double nature of Bodhisattva, he is there and he is not there. He is there but at

540

the same time he is moving in that direction. He is in nirvana and yet at the same time he is in samsara working along with other sentient beings towards nirvana. It's rather like that, It's rather like the artist. The artist is completely with the ideal of the work of art which is conceived in his mind. In his mind it is fully realised, let us say. But as far as his work is concerned it is in the process of realisation. There is a most beautiful poem from this point of view by John Davies. I mentioned John Davy the other day, a late Victorian poet, he had a rather tragic and unhappy life. There is a quite beautiful poem, I'll try and find it shortly, a sort of ballad-like poem about a musician, a composer

who died young of starvation, his wife and child had died before him, they die miserably in a garret, and he hadn't had the opportunity to complete all the compositions that he had planned. But they are sounding in his head. He hears them all the time. So after his death he finds himself in heaven and all his works are being performed and he hears all the works being performed, the operas, the arias that on earth he never ~ the opportunity of writing down. So it's rather like that. On the one hand the composer or the artist lives in a world where he already experiences all those things for him in present reality. But in terms of notes can be heard by the physical ear, in terms of word, in terms of ideal it's all still in process of realisation all still in process of being worked out, all still in process of creation.

Not every artist is like this some are very dim to preapprehension, some do not know at all in what direction their work is going, what is going to emerge, but some it seems do have a clear and vivid impression from the very beginning exactly what they want to do or exactly what

they are going to do. It is said for instance, Mozart, before writing a symphony as it were heard the whole symphony, the whole musical composition simultaneously in one moment of time and then wrote it out in time as it were. This is why some composers and some writers compose and write so easily. It's all there. They have to translate it from  
541

eternity into time. It's just like unrolling a great spool that is already there and they already have. They've done the work of creation.

Padma~: It seems more like an experience than aesthetic appreciation of intrinsic awareness. Experience is a much stronger term...

Bhante: Geunther does speak of sunyata as being as such or Being with a capital B. He also speaks of it as the open dimension of being, which is quite good.

Padmav: There's a poem that has been set to music which is very similar to that in conflict called 'Death and Transfiguration' by Strauss (?) about the composer dying. I've heard it, it's very moving.

Bhante: He mi~b,t even have known that poem. Have you heard of John Davidson? I'm not sure if it was Davison or Davidson. I think Davidson. Yes a very well known poet. It's quite a moving poem though nowadays ~ might consider it a bit sentimental, how his wife dies in childbirth, he dies there - abouts in an attic garret, but actually it works, it's quite successful.

End of Tape.

s,

The root of whatever one may gain in this world

Is unknowing. Having seen this, and (then)

Reversing the order is

Said to be dependent origination ratit asamut ada .

543

-2-

Voice(continued): In brief lack of intrinsic awareness is mentioned as the first member of the twelfth fold chain of interdependent origination because it is the root of wandering about in samsara and the foundation of all actions and emotions.

S: This seems quite clear, doesn't it?

Voice: I didn't get that bit er

S: The twofold nature of intrinsic awareness:- Confusedness about the relationship between one's action and its result. So that's what confusedness is, it's quite clear isn't it? This seems to be equivalent to or corresponding to lack of practical wisdom; that is to say, practical wisdom in the sense of understanding what is skillful and what is unskillful. The skillful is that which tends to produce happiness. The unskillful is that which tends to produce misery. So confusedness about the relationship between one's action and its results. One isn't sure what action is going to produce what result. In other words, you're uncertain about the law of karma, whether as confined to this life or as extending over a whole series of lives.

Then, Confusedness about the ultimate. This is more like, this corresponds to prajna in the sense of knowing mind as such. So the former accumulates actions that will lead to rebirth in evil existences. If you're confused about the relationship between action and its results; if you don't know what is skillful or what is unskillful; if you don't know which actions lead to happiness and which lead to misery; then, almost inevitably, you'll perform unskillful actions, and you will suffer. But, supposing you're confused about the ultimate, supposing you've no intrinsic awareness? Well, then, even though you're leading a good life, even though you do know what is skillful, and, you know, you perform actions which are skillful, all that you will gain is

happiness within the ~v~. So if you're confused about karma 'to~~t~ tThen~experience misery. But, even though you're not confused about karma,

-if you know what is skillful and what is unskillful,- if you perform what is skillful, even that is not            That will lead only to happy existences but you'd still be unaware of the ultimate. But practical wisdom even isn't enough, we've also got to be, wisdom in the sense of the knowledge of mind as such.

So        the statement that its function is to serve as a basis for mistaken stubbornness, doubt and emotionality means that, on the basis of unknowing, on the basis of lack of intrinsic awareness, all other emotions (i.e. klesas) come into existence. And this is why avidya, lack of intrinsic awareness, is placed first, in the nidana chain.

544

-3-

S(continued): There are various quotations which illustrate that fact. In other words, once the intrinsic awareness has been lost, there can only follow an uninterrupted sequence of    --    -  
\L~~d~~aLnotd confused actions, some of which may be unskillful, others may be skillful, evdn, but even the skillful ones still    (spring)    from the lack of

intrinsic awareness. }3but some there are some skillful ones which can help ~

to undo one's lack of intrinsic awareness    ,~hem,of course,that don't

or can't.

Asvajit:        Is the~ari~r way by which one can recognise that intrinsic awareness is present?

S:        Well, presumably, the lack of bewilderment, confusion and perverted actions.

~a~it: Perverted action?

S:        Th~ll, one won't be performing unskillful action, certainly, though of course one may be performing some skillful actions, and lack of intrinsic awareness may still be present.

Voice: Sounds as if that ----(your horizons)---- if you have intrinsic

awareness your (horizons)

S: Well, in a sense, there's no horizon. This is why Guenther called sunyata the 'open dimension of being'. You can't really, there is no answer to the question "How will you know that you have intrinsic awareness?" Ry what will you judge intrinsic awareness?

Voice: by mind itself. ~nd as such.

S: T~'hat er? Intrinsic awareness is, as it were, a psychological term. ~ind as such is, as it were, a metaphysical or epistemological term. So the difference of terminology is due to the difference of viewpoints.

Voice: Can you associate vidya with prajna?

S: Can you associate

Voice: Vidya with prajna.

545

-4-

S: Well, as I said earlier on, ~na is more like jnana, which is awareness, which is recovered awareness, in the making. Prajna is that recovered awareness in the making; the original ~areness in process of being recovered. One can look at prajna like that. ?o '~rn)'ve got, as it were, to do it the other way round; you've got intrinsic awareness here and it stops, you lose it. You lose it while there's a big gap. Then there comes into existence pra~na which is awareness in the making. And then, you've got jnana, awareness fully recovered.

Voice: T:There does vidya come into it? Is that

S: Vidya is the intrinsic awareness.

Voice: That's already there.

S: That is, as it were, already there.

Voice: Put got lost.

S: But which got lost.

Voice: That's the same as jnana.

S: Yes, that's the same as jnana, but the word 'jnana' is used

Voice: On a different level?

S: No, not on a different level. Jnana is the same level, but it is the awareness that's been recovered by the exercise of pranana.

I think we ought to have a chart. First of all, you start off, as it were, and this is all analytical. You start off with intrinsic awareness, that is to say, vidya. You lose that.

Then, after a while you start regaining it. And there is what we call awareness in the making. This is prajna.

Then, finally, the awareness, the same awareness that you originally had, as it were, is recovered. That recovered awareness is called jnana.

Now, this is my personal explanation which, as far as I can see, agrees with the way in which Guenther looks at, and renders, these terms. My way of putting it may not always square with these words as used in all Buddhist texts. In fact, they are sometimes used in

different ways, but it might be useful to standardise the uses in this sort of way.

Voice: There's no actual difference between all three really. It's just

the

546 -5-

Yes, you could say that.

Y.anjuvajra: In a way, having the three terms emphasises the movement and the function rather than the statically existing thing.

Another Voice: Could you apply this (to)- ? I don't think I have. Could you apply the same thing to time? Jnana might represent out of time. You, like, fall out of eternity into time, and then you make your way back to eternity out of time.

S: Yes, except again I keep saying, as it were, you mustn't take this literally, as it were. (Laughter.)

Voice: I know what you mean.

S: Yes, certainly, if prajna;- you could say, ver~ well, when you speak of awareness in the making etc., well, that presupposes time. But intrinsic awareness, vidya, and awareness, jnana, are if out of time. So you could certainly speak in terms of a falling down from eternity, of progression in time. Then a gradual return to eternity. So you could certainly put it in that way, provided you didn't, you know, take it all too literally. Literally, in the sense of, you know, true in the sense of thinking. There was a time in the past when you were in eternity, but then you somehow fell out of it, either by eating an apple or one

away. Then you got back into it. Put this is quite a useful manner of thinking. provided one doesn't take it all literally.

Voice: flot them hum

Voice: This does to the idea that applies and things like that.

S: Yes. In a sense, you are falling from eternity every instant. This is what I've said in one of the essays in Crossing the Stream. You're ertin the apple every ~nstant. It's not that you fell just once and for all at once, at a certain point of time in the past. You're falling now, every instant. Because, because that intrinsic awareness is intrinsic, it is there, but you fall from it every single instance, you fall from it continually.

Voice: Can one sort of say, following on from that, that awareness, in the sense of fallen, incomplete awareness only exists on the part of

--- 547

Voice(continued): someone who is demonstrating it Guenther says, for instance, that the(?~na)~ only exists where demonstrates it; without that, there is, as It were, no (?prajna). Everything is eternally realised.

S: I'm not sure what is meant by ~de~on5trates~ here.

Voice: Ah.'

?Abhaya: Isn't that a prajna function?

S: Cause then prajna is functioning, that's the transcendental part, which is the true part. You could say, you could put it that way, that the functioning of prajna is the path, or that the path is the functioning of prajna, or that when you develop prajna you're following the path. So that whether demonstrating the path means anything more than that I don't know, without looking up contexts in which Guenther

Voice: Presumably if you have developed prajna then everything that you do is a demonstration of that.

S: ~'mm, mmm. Everything that you do is always a demonstration of something or other. If you have prajna, it's a demonstration of prajna. If you have a conspicuous absence of prajna, well then it's a demonstration of that conspicuous absence of prajna.

Voice: Is prajna a sort of            of jnana, or the other way round?

S: There are levels of prajna.

~h~r~' s suta-maya-prajna, cinta-maya-prajna, and bhavana-maya-prajna. The thing's a standard teaching, isn't it? - of the wisdom that comes by hearing, which is not transcendental, of course; the wisdom that

comes by thinking        not transcendental; the wisdom that

comes from meditation, that is transcendental.

So the first two are the supports for the third.

So you could say that, in effect, that the wisdom one and wisdom two are the props or the foundations not only of prajna in the third sense, but of the meditation which is required to transform prajnas one and two into prajna three.

S(continued): In another sense, of course, prajna is the support of samadhi, because usually there is what is called an alternate practice of samatha and vipassana; of samadhi, of dhyana and prajna. So when, for instance, you build up a certain level of samadhi; with that level of samadhi, with the concentrated energy of that level of samadhi behind you, you try to penetrate into reality, thus developing prajna. You only develop prajna to a certain limited extent, because the source of dhyana, the source of samadhi which is behind you, is weak and limited. So what do you do then? You can again plug yourself into dhyana; or, you can also make the dhyana the object of your prajna. In that way too, the dhyana becomes the supporter of prajna. This is sometimes called the samapatti of samatha. The latter is rather fond of these expressions. In other words, you make the previously experienced samadhi the basis for the development of prajna, for instance, reflecting upon it internally, its basic unsatisfactoriness, and so on. So in a way, as you get further and further up the path, then they reinforce each other, so in the end they become indistinguishable, as if a unity of experience, as samadhi-prajna or prajna-samadhi. As I've said elsewhere, the samadhi becomes the internal dimension of prajna, prajna becomes the external dimension of samadhi; this intrinsic awareness and also intrinsic awareness in action.

Voice: In the thing of the three levels of prajna, the first two being, as it were, still in the making

S: Not in the . I wouldn't say in the making, the basis.

Voice: So where would jnana 9

S: As we used the terms so far in this discussion, jnana is the intrinsic awareness fully recovered and re-experienced, as it were, as the result of the complete functioning of prajna: prajna number three, that is.

Voice: Where does the term mati come in?

S: Mati is a general term meaning intelligence, wisdom, and so on; as far as I know, it doesn't have a precise technical meaning. But it does occur quite frequently both in Pali and Sanskrit. Ishamati, Brahmanamati, Sagaramati, and so on. -And Samati too, mustn't forget hiri.

So this lack of intrinsic awareness; this is the real, quite an important, possibly the most important, of all the basic emotions.

Voice: In the first ~otation there, Through this attachment, that is to ego, he craves for happiness and This craving conceals all defect~. This seems to be

S: I'm not too sure it conceals all defects.

Voice: couldn't that be?

S: It could be that, yes. It doesn't realise defects. But you see a self is, of course, an example, perhaps a prime example, of lack of intrinsic awareness. Because if you add intrinsic awareness you will not see any self. Sort of

Voice: Seems to suggest you'll show an inability to kind of stop the reasoning process of the mind. Lack of samatha.

Voice: It appears to be taken on quite a high level if you see no self.

Voice: I mean, you know, one can still see a self and st~ll be in a fourth rupa jnana.

~: ~ell, yes indeed. T~y yes, it's only the breking of the first fetter which is sakkaya-drsti or self-view, which together with the breaking of the next two fetters, that makes one a stream entrant; and you can have not only the experience of the four ~upa ~nas, but the four arupa jnanas too, and still have a subtle but very strong experience of the self or ego.

Voice: Presumably your self that's expanding and expanding and expanding.

M~ Aa~t~ S: ~That is this te~n in Thli Theravada tradition for the ---(+~~~

Have you come across that? It comes in the Abbidharma . It means become a great, grown a great, or expanded. This is m~,w, one qmJte correctly and in accordance with tradition speaks of meditation as expanded consciousness. But simply to expand consciousness is not enough, if one takes it in the literal sense, unless you respond beyond all limits whatsoever. You expand inf~nitely perhaps. Tn a sense . This is called (?m~hagutacitta). The jhanas are called ~~~tacitta. They are cittas which have become great or have expanded.

Voice: Presumably if there's any awareness of a centre, ther there's still some attachment.

550

-9-

S: Right, because in a sense you expand from a centre. That's your starting point.

All right, on to indecision. W~hat is this in Sanskrit, is

it --- . Read it straight through, then we'll talk about it.

Voice: The mngon-pa kun-btus(Pbhidharmasamuccaya) explains indecision as follows:

~~at is indecision? It is to be in two minds about the truth and and its function is to serve as a basis for not becoming involved with positive things.

Indecision is the mental event in which one oscillates between two extremes

its result.

This indecision creates obstacles for everything positive and in particul~r for the vision of the truth. Put if one sees the truth, indecision is overcome and one speaks of applying oneself to getting rid of those preconceptions which can be removed by seeing the truth.

It seems to me that should really be rendered as doubt and indecision, because to be in two minds means to doubt. And indecision is, you know, the natural result of the doubt. One is the cognitive, the other is the reactive side. It's like the relationship between avidya and the samskaras.

Voice: Avidya would be the cognitive?

S: Would be the cognitive, yes. The samskaras would be the active. So if you're in doubt, if you're in doubt that which of two alternatives is the true one, the right one or the good one, then that will inhibit action. I mean how can you act thoroughly, decisively, vigorously, how can you commit yourself, unless you're sure? Unless you know, as it were?

So what is indecision? Or what is doubt and indecision? It is being in two minds about the truth. Tell, this is more doubt than indecision. Indecision is more like its function; and its function is to serve as a basis for not becoming involved with positive things. So if you don't become involved with positive things, what is the reason?

Doubt? Not doubt in a purely abstract sort of intellectual sense; but an inability to make up your mind one way or the other. And this one sees so much of, this is why, you know, this is sometimes translated as 'wavering'. One is reminded of the Zen saying, 'Whatever you do, don't wobble'. Indecision, or part of it, is the wobbling. So

551

- 10 -

Voice: If one just didn't have faith, that would be a faith of just not doing sort of unskillful things and not positive things, this is just

as it were, and not knowing what to do.

S: I say it's even more than not being able to make up your mind. As I said before, it seems to be unwillingness to make up one's mind. )~~e reluctant because we know, only too well, that if you do make up your mind, then you know, ipso facto, you commit yourself to a certain line of action which perhaps you're not very happy about committing yourself to. It may be positive but it's also, at least in the early stages, rather painful.

Voice: It could also be related to laziness, couldn't it? ~~~ich in a way is a lower form of indecision. I mean, one might not want to make a decision, because a decision will involve action, and will be lazy, or one is lazy and therefore doesn't want to do it.

Voice: It's lack of individuality. You fear being seen or Judged or experienced as an individual.

Voice: It seems to be also to have something to do with stubbornness as well.

Voice: Seems to imply taking in, there was soWethin~ yesterday about seeing yourself through others' eyes.

Voice: That seems to be er, stops you from deciding.

S: Not thinking for yourself, or I suppose not being an individual. An individual thinks for himse~f. o v ou can o~ily begin to make up your mind when you start thinking for yourself.

Voice: It may also be something quite sort of mischievous, where you're malicious in this wobbling, where you take a delight in the confusion caused by your own indecision on others.

S: Yes, that's true. Yes, I've seen people do thes quite a lot. You say, "ell, do you want to go or do you not want to go?" Cr maybe everybody's waiting for you to make up their minds,so they wobble. Well, it gives them a sort of, you know, sense of power. They're keeping all these people waiting and all those people are left undecided as to what they're going to do while you make up your mind. It's usually very weak people who do this sort of thing. There's very few ways in which they are in a position to exercise any sort of power and get any sort of attention. ~ou see children doing it don't you;-"T)o vou want a chocolate or don't you?"- can't make up their minds~so you're left holding the box,waiting for them to make up their mind.

Voice: I think you find those people who don't make up their minds afterwards. They refer back to that point that people have done things, you know, because they haven't made up their minds, they react against them.

Voice: It would be, as it were, skillful in a situation like that to be, as it were impatient, you know, I find that

S: But you should go ahead and not wait for them. The car should go. I mean, it's like Vincent said, a vehicle hangs around waiting for people to come, you know, people who are late and apparently still making up their minds whether they want to go on retreat or not. We've had quite a lot of this in the past, haven't we? You wait an hour, two hours sometimes, and you think, well, you know, maybe I should wait for them and you can't help feeling impatient, and after all, then, you just sort of see the vehicle was going to leave at that particular time. Well, they still keep you waiting an hour, or two hours, keep you in a state of indecision, and maybe it's because they themselves are in a state of indecision, or deliberately keeping themselves in a state of indecision, because that gives them, as it were, sort of power over you. I'm sure this happens in at least some cases.

Voice: It's surprising though that it goes. A person turns up an hour later.

Voice: Presumably they turn up and they think "Oh well, they've gone without me" and put the decision on to everybody else. The fact that they haven't gone, say, on a trip. They sort of make it as if everybody else had made up their mind for them. "Oh well, I've missed out."

Voice: You can't really say that.

No, you've just not to go. Well, if you wanted to go, you'd be there on time.

Voice: Right, yes, I'm thinking about persons' rationalisations.

Voice: Surely, you can't be absolutely sure that people are going to wait for you every time.

S: That's right. You must realise the fact that people are not going to allow themselves to be made indecisive by your indecision indefinitely, and that's very good, that you have to make your mind up one way or the other. If you're not there on time, then you've made up your mind that you're not going. (Others, from now on, will sort of take it in

S(continue~): that way. And you know now that to continue to dither is in fact to have made up your mind. (Laughter.)

In the eH:riy days of t~~e Friends you saw so much of t~is. You ~ere ~lways hcnging around for people, waiting to pick them up, waiting for them to make their minds up, whether they were going to go with you or not. ~ait five minutes, w~it ten minutes, by all means, just in case somebody just happens to be late; but don't go waiting for an hour and then have to sort of go round to where they live to see what is happening. This is also be~ng done sometimes. They knew th?t they were going to be picked up from the centre and they're not there after an hour and then you have to go round to where they are staying and see what has happened, whether they are going to come or not, all this is (? quite disgraceful) . e do it maybe once, even twice, but not more than that.

Voice: Actually I find when I'm in a state of indecision over something I don't like it. It's a state which drains a he3l of a lot of energy and it's a real drag. You come to a sort of crossroads or sometTh~ng,-)That do T do now?- and it's not at all nice.

S: For some things there may be a genuine difficulty. You 'nay hrve difficulty coming to a decision just because the whole issue is so important. And sometimes due to circumstances tremendous pressure is brought on you to make up your mind one way or the other, and you honestly feel that you're not in a position to do that because you don't know enough. You have sometimes, unfortunately, to make up your mind and commit yourself, and others too perhaps, th~s way or that,~on the basis of insufficient evidence, insufficient information, insufficient knowledge. So i£ somebody's in that sort of position, one should on¾T be sympathetic.

Voice: In other words the decision or the need~to decide can be between

(? trivia) or it can be between matters of fundamental importance.

S: I think many people did dither more between, you know, matters which are trivial.

Voice: ~e~umahly if you maka u~ your mind you stick, you know, to that decision.

S: ~hat if it tur~s out to be the wrong decision?

- 12 - 554

Voice: Well, you'd have to stick to it if you were definitely sure it was right.

S: Oh yes'. P~ght.' Some people dither over whether they are going to have a second helping of curry or not (sniggering), and change their mind.

Voice: There's no curry left.

Voice: We've got it for lunch, man.

Voice: The indecision thing where you can have big decis~ons, T often find, when you do have a really serious decision, people really do put a lot of pressure on you and then and they, sort of, really want you to make a decision and they say 'Well it rests on you". I think that's really unfair.

Voice: T:ell, often it's important to them.

Voice: ~e~e~s a lot of what they want to decide in, depending on what you decide, I think that's how that situation arises.

Voice: That's really bad.

Voice: There is something about the presence of somebody in a state of indecision which is quite disturbing.

S: It makes some people quite anxious. It really goes back to their childhood,- because I believe indecisive parents tend to create anxiety in a child. I have seen certain people becoming quite anxious in the presence of indecision in their surroundings, or indecision on the part of other people, even about quite minor matters about really you're not bothered about at all.

But the context here, of course, is about the spiritual decision, the spiritual commitment to the development of the po~itive.

I mean, here in this sort of indecisiveness, it's much more the conflict of the two pulls:- the gravitational pull of the conditioned and the gravitational pull of the unconditioned, till one of them finally wins. At least for the time being in the case of the pull from the con~itioned. In the case of the p~~ll from the unconditioned, when that wins, of course, really wins, it isn't for the time being, it's for keeps.

Voice: The unconditioned also ~n~t win.

S: Kam?

- 13 - 555

Voice: The unconditioned can't win for good of either because, I mean the conditioned can't win for good because it seems as though the unconditioned keeps coming back and saying --- (fades away) ----. If you make a decision that's going towards the conditioned.

S: That's not the final decision, though you may think it is.

Voice: The doubt always creeps

S: It may even be the final for this life, but not for ever. But to what extent, do you think, this indecision is connected with lack of clarity of thought'?

I mean sometimes one doesn't even take the trouble to state the alternatives clearly or to think out what are the alternatives here. You leave it all vague and lazy and confused. So, I think, part of the meaning of indecisiveness or which it is, is this refusal to think things through; is this refusal to isolate alternatives and to even (?succeed) what it is that you have to choose between. Sometimes you confuse and obfuscate that whole issue, or you even try to convince yourself that there isn't a choice to be made. It's all one, you think. (Laugh).

Voice: 'That about the I Ching~ A lot of people seem to get to a point of indecision where they throw the I Ching. Do you see any value of that at all?

~ Well, what happens when you consult the I Ching?

Voice: You consult yourself really.

2: The I Ching hardly ever decides for you. You think you know you've decided something and you're going to consult the I Ching. You're going to leave it all to the wise old man. What does the wise old man say? Well, if you do this, then maybe that, or if you do something

else, then possibly something else. So, I mean, you still have to make up your mind but in the meantime perhaps by consulting the I Ching and, you know, thinking of the answer, you begin to see what the situation is like and you begin to incline to this rather than to that course of action. So perhaps it just sort of helps you to make up your own mind. It helps to clarify your thinking. At least it starts you thinking.

Voice: cup of coffee. Several Voices: (Unclear).

556

- 14 -

Voice: Seems like really the best way to get out of that, if you are in a state of indecision, is to go to somebody who's sympathetic but who's also got clarity of mind

S: That's true. I think sometimes what very often helps people is just to get the issues clarified. That it's either this or that; that you've got to --

Voice: You've got to go to somebody who's presumably constant and not biased.

S: You've also got to go to somebody who will help you to clarify the issues without trying to decide for you. I mean this is what - sometimes people come to you expecting you to decide for them. I think you should very, very rarely decide for anybody and tell them what to do, but you can always be helpful by clarifying the issues, which may also involve clarifying for them or helping them to clarify for themselves what they really want to do. They may really want to follow a certain line of action, but may feel afraid or guilty, then you have to get them to admit that Yes, I'd Like To Do That, and then you can help them sort out that But and ascertain to what extent it is valid. So by the time you've finished, sort of helping them sort things out in this way, they have made up their minds, but not because you've made up their minds for them, but because you've clarified the issue in such a way that they can see for themselves what they really want to do and what would be good for them to do. But never try to make up another person's mind for him or for her.

Voice: You don't ever seem to get any men in the past falling into the error of doing that. You never get thanks for it, in fact it seems to produce quite a negative situation.

S: In effect for what?

Voice: For apparently making up somebody's mind. You say, "Tell, I think this is what you ought to do". In fact, although they may go and do it, they may develop quite a lot of ----(? static)

S: Even if "I think this is what you ought to do"- that isn't necessarily making up their mind for them. They may ask you what you think, but making up their minds for them is sort of pressurising them to accepting what you think they ought to do. I mean if they ask you, you've got a perfect right to express your opinion, to say what you

- 15 - 557

S(continued): think they ought to do, but then you can say, "This is just what I think; you must make up your own mind about it. This is only my opinion for what it's worth."

You have to be careful, because with certain people you can say "Well, this is what I think"- you know this tends to make up their mind for them, because you know they accept whatever you say implicitly as right, whatever you think. In that case you must refrain. You must either refrain from saying what you think, or say it so gently and mildly that they can't possibly take it as, you know, definite incitement to do that particular thing.

Voice: Presumably aren't there sort of, aren't there sort of meditative aids to help one to get ---- ?clarity ---- like mindfulness of breathing if one is

S: The whole of one's spiritual life contributes in this way at least indirectly. It all contributes to clarity of mind. Just try to think clearly, it's as simple as that. Or maybe it's not so simple. Think things out; sometimes they become clearer in the course of discussion with some other person who does think clearly. I also notice that if you try to introduce clarity into the mind of a person who is naturally confused, sometimes they find your clarity very confusing indeed, because it comes up against all sorts of unconscious impulses and assumptions of theirs which they can't rationalise because you're too clear to allow them to do that, but at the same time, they're not able to resolve the matter. So they just get more confused.

Voice: Sometimes it seems more confusing to the person that's trying to clarify because the person says, "Yes, I understand." They don't really understand.

S: roey only understand, if at all, on a very superficial mental level, rational level, but deep down they're saying, "No, lo!"

Several Voices: I find --

That's different -

You were saying that if you're asking somebody to clarify something for you and they say "Oh yes", you say something, and

- 16 - 558

Several Voices (continued): they say "Oh yes, I understand" -

Put they haven't ---

They're understanding at a purely rational and superficial level, not that that's confused.

S: Well you must be of real clarity, which may involve understanding the confusion of the other person and not presenting a superficial, rational solution which doesn't take into account the deeply rooted difficulties or objections of the other person. I mean clarification really would involve dealing with those things too. Not just giving, sort of, a straightforward, commonsense solution, and then telling the other to pull up your socks and get on with it. It's quite annoying to the person concerned.

Voice: I find a lot of this indecision sort of comes -- within me when I want to do, you know, what I want to do. I feel I want to do something even if that, you know, even if that's quite quite healthy, quite positive, skillful; and what I think other people want me to do, or what other people expect me to do, or other than what other people want me to do, and I find that is a real conflict, really difficult.

S: Well, this is because there's a conflict between desire to do what you want to do and your desire to please other people. I mean sometimes you can please them only by doing what you don't want to do. If your desire to please them is very, very strong, you may even, very often, sacrifice what you want to do so as to retain their approval.

Voice: Sometimes, even in situations like that, some of the objective needs. There might be the conflict, as it were, between objective needs and what you wanted to do---

Voice: Yes, that's what

Voice: --know it's best for you etc. It seems as if you have to postpone it.

S: These are also aspects of yourself which need to consider objective needs. But if you go against that you are doing, in one way, sometimes, damage to yourself. In a given situation it's sometimes a matter of very delicate judgment to decide what weight you should give to your own, as it were, desires, and what weight you should give to, as it were, needs of the objective situation. You need to ignore your own desires, also, but you have to do it skillfully and at the right time.

- 17 - 559

Voice: Carry on with the subject.

S: That's basically it is to be in two minds about the truth. This is the ----(?static)---- someone who just thought of it, someone who comes along to the Friends and says, "Well, is there actually such a thing as spiritual development or not? Is it actually possible or not? Is it a mystery or is it a reality? Is it possible to develop?!"

Well, that's something about which you've got to make up your mind and if you don't believe it's possible to develop, at least in some sense or other, you're not going to put into the business of development the energy that will enable you to develop. So that's something about which you've got to make up your mind, either human development is possible, either there is such a thing as the development of man, there is such a thing as a spiritual path or not. What do you've got to do, or is it just a question of eat, drink and be merry?

Is meditation worthwhile? You've got to make up your mind about that. If you're undecided, you're not going to get on with it very well. If you just do it not being very sure, just hoping some good experience is coming along, well, you won't make much progress with it. But a certain amount of conviction, of course, is necessary before one can put all one's energy into something and it's the putting of those energies into something alone

which will give you the experience which will confirm the original conviction. ~Until then there'll always be some element of doubt.

You can't have complete absence of doubt at the beginning, obviously, but there must be a sort of suspension, a willing suspension of disbelief at least to the extent where you can put in quite a bit of your energy, so that you do get some tangible result which then confirms the rightness of the original, at least tentative and provisional decision.

Voice: I think that's quite important in puja, I mean, some people say, "I didn't like that," therefore they shouldn't do them.

keep doing it

Voice: The only thing I want to particularly about because I find that, you mentioned that question may arise for a beginner, you know I mean that comes up all the time, on all kinds of different levels. So, it means that I'm never going to be permanently able to make a decision that that is true or that isn't true.

- 18 - 5~o

S: Till you simply won't be able to put 100% of your energy into it. At least I think somebody might be quite convinced that there is such a thing possible as a logical, you can get over your neuroses, you can become more healthy and more happy. Put spiritual development You may not be so sure about that. 1/4, you may be quite sure about spiritual development, but not so sure about psychological development.

Voice: I don't see it very necessary to not to, just to go into - isn't it rather than make up your mind in the abstract context.

That does it actually involve or what is spiritual development? Think all that out clearly first. Unless you've got a clear idea about it, how can you make up your mind about it? To decide whether there is such a thing and whether you ought to commit yourself to it. So very often the or the difficulties is unwillingness to think things out, you know, the unwillingness to think clearly, to really get down to it.

I think that the British, or should I say the English, are particularly prone to this. They don't think things through, they leave things all vague and muddled, and hope that their knack will somehow get them through; that they won't have to get down to basic issues. I think this

is one of the besetting sins of the English. They won't be clear. In that famous phrase, they hope to muddle through. A great deal of the Puddhists in the country, - I was going to say before the Friends started up or maybe I shouldn't because there's still a lot of themselves, but a great deal of the Buddhism in this country - is just an example of trying to muddle through. They aren't really thinking things out, they just know, really thinking out your position as regards, say, eastern Buddhism, western Buddhism, the three yanas, the arhant ideal, or the bodhisattva ideal. Are you trying to be an arhant or a bodhisattva? Do you know? - You make up your mind? Or have you sort of vaguely kept the two sort of ideas, I was going to say ideals, in different compartments of your mind and one day you think of it, and another day bodhisattva. You don't really understand how they hang together, not even sure if they do hang together, but you haven't given it much thought. You hope that in the long run that they'll turn out more or less about the same thing, perhaps, you don't care very much. Maybe if you're not all that keen about this is an example. I mean, does one really believe in the non-reality of the ego? That is the ego? In what sense is it unreal? That's why one must try to think it out. I mean most English Buddhists would have to say "No". They just sort of vaguely wonder about it sometimes, but this is not absolute - of clear and incisive thought.

Voice: People seem to make an excuse for themselves by saying "oh, there's not much point in trying to think about these things, they're beyond one anyway."

Voice: Or the truth will suddenly descend upon me or be made clear.

S: It is quite true that many things just can't be understood by the rational mind, but you can only begin to penetrate in a non-rational sort of way by exhausting the (rational) resources of the rational. That brings that point of tension as it were, where you begin to penetrate beyond the rational, or to see beyond the rational.

Voices: Sometimes your attitude is, well, don't bother with that because it comes into that category of, you know, metaphysics, things like that. It's got nothing to do in the spiritual context.

S: Very often it's about practical things that you have to make up your mind, you know. So often you can make up your mind about practical things only on the basis of a fundamental principle of your mind about principles.

For instance, should I be a vegetarian or not be a vegetarian? That are the principles involved? Quite a few people are vegetarians just because lots of other people are and they haven't really thought it out very clearly. It's the thing to be, or the thing to do. Their friends are into vegetarianism, well, fair enough, I'm into it too. So why? And this means also if you come into contact with sceptical, unconvinced people from the outside, you can't make much

impression. You can't say why you do such a thing or don't do such a thing. And also there can always be a clear cut reason for everything, but clear~y there can't be; but one should be able to give some reasoned account of such

end of for them. Th~ll, you know in it's

not entirely susceptible to rationality, but there are certain rational considerations which arise, and which can be invoked and coimunicated and serve as a basis for your communication with other persons' enquiries. Put if you just say, "He~l, I guess I don't know, I just sort of meditate, I don't know why I meditate, maybe I'm just a fool."(Loud laughter.) That's the way sdme people ta~c~. They t~iink this is really spiritual and sort of humble; actually they're rather pleased with that.(Continued laierhter. )

- 20 -

Voice: It seems to me, Phante, that tThis text like ~ind In Buddhist Psychology could be a really good hase for

S: It is Vind In Puddhist Psychology.

Voice: Huh.' (T~ud ;iau~hter.)

S: A text like yes?

Voice: TJell, Nind In Puddhist Psychology.

S: You mean any text like this particular one. Is that what ~ou me~n?

Voice: I could mean (further lsmghter) served as a basis, if it was

used as I think this would be very, very good.

S: This is one of the functions of the Abhidhamma, as the author says right at the beginning; unless one understands what is skillful and what is unskillful, what sort of basis for practical action do you have? The Abhidhamma has this sort of positive function to help you clarify your own mind, to sort out what is skillful and unskillful, and act accordingly.

Now you know, for instance, that you've got to do something about indecision. I think probably it would be good if texts like these were used in study groups and maybe it would be possible, well, as I said the other day, certainly for some, at least, of those who have been on this study seminar to take a group, or a class, on the eleven positive mental events. At least you could do that with the help of your notebook, because it is just a question of going through each item, a few lines at a time, and discussing, explaining, talking about them. Something is sure to emerge, even though you may not be all that brilliant as a group study leader, but it'll certainly be useful and worthwhile nonetheless.

Voice: Is the Abhidhamma closely related to the 9

S: Yes and no. This brings one to the basic difference between, in a way, the Mahayana and the Theravada. It's in the understanding of prajna.

According to the Abhidhamma, according to the Mahayana, prajna consists essentially in seeing what we usually think of as the self in terms of constituent dharmas. The Abhidhamma is the systematic study of these dharmas in such a way as to preclude the possibility of thinking of the psycho-physical organism as a self, or in terms of a self.

The Mahayana, on the other hand, thinks of prajna in terms of the intuition of sunyata. It regards the Abhidhamma analysis and

563 - 21 -

S(continued): and classification of dharmas as purely provisional and pertaining to relative truth. It believes that the dharmas into which the psycho-physical organism can themselves be broken down indefinitely. It believes that they don't represent entities, but that they are only concepts, and all concepts including concepts of dharmas must be transcended if sunyata is to be intuited or realised, and that intuition or realisation of sunyata it is which is prajna according to the Mahayana.

Voice: And the Tantra will be whrt?

S: The Tantra? If I want to continue the same sort of line of thought, one could say that the Tantra is concerned with the direct experience of sunyata. The Vajrayana criticism of the Mahayana, - (the Mahayana criticise the Hinayana) - the Vajrayana criticism of the Mahayana would be that its realisation of sunyata, though a realisation as it were, is,

purely mental. This is the Mahayana criticism or Vajrayana point of view. The Vajrayana maintains, or the Vajrayana believes, that there must be a total realisation of sunyata: a realisation which involves not only the mind but also the speech and even the body. Therefore also, the Tantra especially speaks in terms not just of enlightenment, but in terms of attaining the trikaya of the Buddha; the trikaya representing the completely transformed body, speech and mind. It also speaks in terms of appearing as body - which is a rather sort of more poetic way of putting it

than . The whole point of the criticism is in what sense is the realisation of sunyata on the part of the Mahayana a mental realisation (which doesn't mean a rational realisation), to what extent is there a mental realisation; this, of course, can be the subject of much discussion. But the Tantra, the Vajrayana, basically believes in the involvement of the basic energies of the psycho-physical organism in the process of actual experience of realisation of sunyata and they believe that this leads to a much more thorough-going and complete realisation.

9

Voice: Sunyata being an on-going thing anyway.

S: Anyway. There is, of course, a point of view from which one could reject that criticism at the same time. - Vajrayana.

Voice:

S: - Vajrayana - From which one could reject the Mahayana's criticism of the Mahayana. That won't go into that now, but this is the way in which it is generally regarded, at least by the Vajrayana.

Abbayas : Also, point of view from which one could re-think the

the Mahayana criticism of the Theravada

S: Yes indeed. Yes, yes, because, after all, the Theravada is looking at the Mahayana from its own special point of view, in the same way that the Mahayana is looking at the Theravada from its special point of view. One could even say that what the Mahayana criticism is not in fact the Theravada position in that they, the same way one could say that what the Vajrayana was criticising is not the real Theravada position and so on and so forth.

Voice: Each one tends to solidify the Theravada and the intellectual side of it.

S: Perhaps, also, sometimes, the Theravada one has already solidified, at least in certain quarters. There is that possibility also to consider. But if one reads, for instance, some of the very early Pali texts, or what we take to be some of the early Pali texts, like the Sutta Nipata or the Udana, we find very little trace, if any, of what come to be called the Hinayana. You feel that, sometimes as though you're not only in Theravada territory but even in touch with the Vajrayana. Perhaps the three yanas are a useful framework of reference but not to be applied too rigidly to the historical material involved.

Padmavajra: It seems, just looking at that classification, that each one just follows on from the other, that you can't just leap in to you know.

Voice: there's a tendency to want to think in terms of the whole systems or the development of any system as being in itself systematic and homogenous both in terms of time and other ways, it may not be like that at all.

S:~ Right.

Padmapani: It does seem to me through what Phante, that in the Friends we do need to have more

of a, well some of us, to have more of a grounding in the Abhidhamma.

S: Th~ll, I think it would certain~y be usefu~, biit a uro~nd~ng ~n a certatn kind of w~~', beca~iae the !h}~i~hamma can be very dry, and Sa~aramati knows the at least taught in this dry kind of way.

- 23 - S6S

S(continued): One needs to brin~ the drn leaves of the Abhidhamma to life a bit. It real%~ e~n be very, very useflil and even, not 'ust infornative, but very inspiring.

Prdmc.-'va;!ra: This is the beauty of this text, it draws on the texts in the ~ahayana -

S: Yes, right.

Padmavajra: -And it's really right on.

Voice: ~~ need to study the 'bhidharma in the spirit of the Vajrayana.

S: 'ell, in the spirit, first of all, of the Vabayana and then of the Vajrayana. I think we'd better not get on to opinionatedness this mornin~ because it's a very lon~ section; we'll leave it for the afternoon. ;ry further point about this doubt and indecision? Ttat about honest doubt?

Padmavajra: Well, like you just don't know~(about something).

Abhaya: Theonest doubt - you really have tried to clarify all the issues around it; some doubt still remains.

S: It's either because the situation is so complex as to be, you know, beyond your mental capacity, or because there are so many unknown factors involved. Or both. Sometimes you have to make up your mind about things that you can't even be sure of. Well, we do this every day in minor matters, we decide to go for a walk, we don't really know whether it's going to rain or not, sometimes.

Voice: You said earlier on that if we're confused in thought, then you must be *~arYer~* in action, which makes it very much sound like a vicious circle.

S: 'Jell, it is a vicious circle *samsara*.

Voice: A vicious circle is you can't get out of it

S: Tell, with both, you can start with the action in a sort of discipline

-- 24-- 566

S(continued): sense. You adopt the skillful mode of action even though that does not spring naturally and spontaneously from your mental state: but in order to be able to adopt it you must have clarified your thoughts at least rationally to some extent all ready. So again you can get caught up in skillful action just by being associated with a positive group, and in what they do, even though you don't understand it all that well to begin with. It's as though the faith-follower tends to just get caught up in, you know, in other people's skillful modes of action and, sort of, works out the reason for it afterwards, if at all. Whereas the doctrine-follower will want to understand first and then put the, put that into action.

Voice: 'Cause that's just the kind of question (that people ask)

Voice: Because they tend to remain in the vicious circle.

S: If they want to remain in the vicious circle then they won't want to clarify their thinking.

Voice: (Tactics is~ trying to put (you) on the spot

instead of t)~ey're not willing to make any effort but what they're doing is just using their own reason to try do the whole position down.

?: That also raises the question, why do they come in contact with you at all? I mean how does one happen to meet? ~ow does the question arise

Voice: This is the predominant state of mind. I'm not saying it's total, it's a sort of unskillful way of looking at which is the coming (round/ground) and has to be broken through, but then you have to be prepared to deal with this. You can get at the, er, the sort of drive to it~s got to be there in the first place and follow on that rather than getting down into th~s

S: Well, why did you come along at all? You can say, if they have come along to your centre that suggests s'relv voll weren't happy at home, you ~ere~t completely satisfied. Why did you~ come along? ¾~y aren't you at home watching telly? 'jh,~T are you here?

Voice: Sometimes you at the meditation they say, well, concentration, yo~i~ve got to be interested, the fact that you're here, then you~ve got to have some interest. You've got the initial basis of development in concentration~

- 25 - 567

Voice: I think one must have not only a clarity about one's own But also enthusiasm for it, without that however much you talk about it, it doesn't sound convincing. It doesn't satisfy.

Voice: You can't really have clarity without having enthusiasm to be clear.

'~]l, I think definitely cntThus~csm with or without clarity, as it were, wil~ spark off only the faith-follower. I think the doctrine-follower, the more intellectual kind of person, will want reasons first before he does an'tthing, will tend to keen your enthusiasrr at am's length and not be convinced by that.

Voice: I've certainly noticed that.

S: Ye '-~on't be impressed by your enthusiasm, because he rni~ht well say well, you can be enthusiastic about all sorts of things. You can be an enthusiastic Ruddhist, an enthusiastic atheist, an enthusiastic Christian; enthusiasm proves nothing. Me might well take up that attitude.

Voice: Pn enthusiastic scertic.

Voice: That happened in the case of a man in Brighton a bit like that at the moment. I feel in a way that his drive to really know, to realise, is ouite strong, although he's pot responding apparently to what one would expect.

S: iZell, sometimes people;- I mean because the whole thing is very important to them;- they really do want to know, they really do want to make sure.5o they will test you cuite a lot before they give their faith and give their trust, in a way, cuite rightly because after all it's cuite thing. You're, in a way, asking them to change their whole w~y of life. If not sooner, then later, so they want to know if this is going tc cause a great deal of pain and suffering, perhaps for themselves, perhans for other people too. So why should they not make sure what they're really going into? They may be thinking in terms of giving up their :ob, selling their house, stopping their mortgage payments, leaving their wife. They may be thinking all these things, at least these things may occ'ir to them as possibilities. So are they not going to make quite sure, at least cuite reasonably sure, before doing any of these things? So, therefore, ~re~t they going to ~sk you some penetrating, hard questions? One mustn't expect to get away with it easily or li~htly,(it) wouldn't be riagt if one did. If you feel that, you know, even that sometimes people are preparing theoselves or are ready to make too big a change for too little reason,

S(continued): you must even sort of soft pedal things - well think r~a,in". Yes? ?ven have to sort of form that service for them 'hich they sho'~ld be performina for themselves.

Voice: ~eek~~ introduction she almost wanted to,

before the week was out, change her whole lifestyle I didn't know about this, I didn't know what to do about that at all.

S: ;gain, sometimes, again one must cons~der this possibility, this is where it becomes quite difficult, that that may be very genuine and she shou~d not be discouraged from doing it. I think one wil] on] y come to know this after much experience, making a few mistakes.

Voice: You mentioned there a problem that has arisen for me over the last co~T]e of years; ard that is that in placing onese]~f in a position of takin~ a class you are in f'ct goina to lead to a certain (amount) of pain and suffering.

3: ~nd cuite a lot of happine~s and joy too.

Voice: Yes, hit you don't see that in the beginnins, at least I don't. I see that theytve got to go into pain and suffering before they're going to get some result.

S: Some1 people get happiness and joy right from the be~inning, the first time that they ome along. They're so happy that they've found something.

Voice: That's also true, but I, it still keeps coming back to me that at some time, I look back at my own difficulties, I mean ~~~ quite pleased that I got through them, and that gives me strength to my feelings but I'm not so certain with other people. I can, I sometimes c~~~t really convince myself I really want to be doing that.

S: Tell, maybe you tend to think of yourself as a nice person. Yes? Thich means the sort of person who gets on with people, makes them happy;~r, pleases them; not the sort of person who is responsible for any sort of pain or suffering on their part, yes? Or maybe you like to be the nice person.

Voice: That's true, I should look to be a nasty person. (Laughter.)

S: Like seeming to be a nasty person perhaps sometimes. Sometimes when one is being soft with others one is, in fact, being soft with oneself.

- 27 - 569

Voice: 'Cause you're not prepared to take their

S: You're not prepared to take their suffering, their suffering hurts you. You know in a quite sort of ego-related way. Not in a bodhisattva-like way. Maybe you feel a little guilty about it. I'm not saying you, in your case, specifically, but perhaps the kind of person who is in that position. Maybe they feel a little guilty. Maybe they want people to like them, you know, to be pleased with them, not to regard them as a source of pain and suffering. Some people just can't bear that others should think that they're hard or mean or unfeeling or anything like that, or nasty. Some people really like to think that others think they're really good, really kind, very pleasant, good fun, good company. Maybe even, in extreme cases, one is a bit dependent on popularity, one likes to be popular, one likes to be the good guy, the nice guy, the guy that everybody likes.

Voice: Or maybe one's confidence depends on it.

S: Yes, indeed. Anyway, time is up. Leave it there and deal with opinionatedness in the afternoon.

S: Page 74, opinionatedness; is this drsti?

Voices: Yes.

S: Drsti literally means view.

(Loncr pause.)

Al~ ri~nt, let" start on tris.

Voice: kmotionally hrnTI?

Voice: Is it me?

Voice: I ~on~t know, I've no idea.

Voice: Go ahead.

Voice: ~otionally tainted/opinionatedness is fivefold:

1. Opinionatedness regarding the perishable constituents (jig-lta)
2. Opinionatedness regarding extremes (mthar-lta)
3. Clinging to ideologies (lta-ba mchog'dzin)
- A. Clinging to ideologies regarding ethical behavior and compulsive performance (tshul-khrims dang zhugs-mchog 'dzin)
5. Wrong opinion (log-lta)

The first 'opinionatedness about what is perishable', is explained in the mngon-pa kun-btus (Abhidharmasamuccaya) as follows:

8: First of all, just a few words about *drsti* in general. *B'rsti* comes from a root meaning to see. So *drsti* is a sight, a view, a vision, a perspective. It means all that, it means all those things. It means the seeing of things as it were in a particular way, from a particular point of view. The implication being that it's a limited way of seeing things, seeing them from a limited point of view, or a limited, narrow perspective. There is, of course, in Buddhism a distinction made between *sam-sak drsti* and *r'ithya drsti*, you're no doubt familiar with that. Perhaps this is why the author says that *drsti* is fivefold. It is not *saryak drsti* that one is concerned with here but *mitrn drsti*. That is to say that *drsti* which is under the influence of *klesa*, of defiled passion or passionate defilement. There are, of course, very early Pali texts which suggest, and this is, in a way, the sort of view, or rather non-view, that the *bhaddhikas* referred to, that view as such is wrong. That right view or even perfect view is, as it were, a contradiction in terms. There is a text, according to which, the Buddha says the Tathagata is free from all views, which presumably includes even perfect view. But you need perfect view in order to get rid of the wrong view and then you, as it were, throw both away. So the right view, the perfect view, doesn't represent a closed system of ideas to which you permanently adhere. It rather means the, it rather indicates a skillful attitude provisionally adopted in order to get rid of unskillful states. So it is, of course, a *drsti* to believe that one must give up all views without ever having to build up right views. One could put it more paradoxically than that, and say that, you know, all views are

wrong views; but it is the wrong view that one should give up all views. Do you see what I mean?

(Ymrr)

But you do encounter this sort of mentality. Persons who

- 29 - 571

S: (continued)

profess not to hold any particular view, who profess to be open-minded with regards to all views, who profess a sort of intellectual and ever superior flexibility. They want to confine themselves to any particular views they say, don't want to limit themselves to any particular philosophy or any particular religion. They want to be broad, they want to be universal. So this is the wrong view of having no views. It's only a Theravada that has no views and certainly, one should aim at having no views in that sense but the way to have no views is to take one's stand upon right views and practise accordingly.

Alright, let's go on to these five factors then.

Voice: That is opinionatedness about what is perishable? It is any

any acceptance, claim, opinion as dogma, fiction and opinion about the about the five psycho-physical constituents as a (eternal) self or as belonging to a self, and its function is to serve as a basis for all other views.

Carry on straight through the whole of that explanation.

Voice: It is an emotionally tainted appreciation which is concerned with the five psycho-physical constituent as an 'I' or 'mine'.

Such terms as 'acceptance' and so on in the sutras (Abhidhammasamuccaya) are understood as follows:

Acceptance insofar as one is not afraid of what is contrary to every evidence;

Claim insofar as one is involved with objects which are contrary to all evidence;

Opinion as dogma insofar as one has rationalized it;

Fiction        insofar as one is enamored with it;

Opinion        insofar as one makes it the content of one's thinking.

Shall I carry on?

S:        Yes, carry on.

Voice: The reason for speaking about this view as 'opinionatedness about what is perishable', is as the lam-rim states,

~reathing which is perishable is impermanent, and accumulation means plurality. Since the basis of looking and thereby seeing the the perishable as perishable is first transitoriness and plurality, one sees the name of 'view' of perishable~ because of the content that there is no eternal and stable abiding principle to which a thing may be reduced.

- ~O -

?: Perhaps we'd better stop here, because this is rather a long subsection. I think we'd better have that window closed; there seems to be a bit of a draught blowing in. Leave the fanlight open.

End of Tape 19.

S: Perhaps we'd better stop here because this is rather a long chapter. I think we could have that window closed - there seems to be a bit of a draught coming in. (pause) So, 'opinionatedness about what is perishable', and what is perishable is, of course, the psycho-physical organism as analysed into the five skandhas. 'It is any acceptance, claim,

opinion as dogma, fiction and opinion about the five psycho-physical constituents as an eternal self or as belonging to a self, and its function is to serve as a basis for all other views.' In other words 'it is an emotionally tainted appreciation which is concerned with the five psycho-physical constituents as a 'I' or 'mine'.' This is basically what *drsti* is, it is basically what *mith-r-drsti* is - being the 'emotionally tainted appreciation which is

concerned with the five psycho-~physical constituents as an 'I or 'mine'". Basic drsti one could say is that 'I exist, that 'I am' or that 'I am somehow related to' or 'connected' the psycho-physical organism - the five skandhas. So 'acceptance in so far as one is not afraid of what is contrary to every evidence'. So what is it that is contrary to every evidence?

Voice: That you have an ego.

S: That there is an ego - that the five skandhas add up to or contain or are connected with or can be identified with, such a thing as a self or ego. Why 'acceptance' should mean that it isn't quite clear. 'Acceptance in so far as one is not afraid of what is contrary to every evidence.' One is not afraid to accept it, even though it is contrary to every evidence.

Voice: How would it be viewed as contrary to every evidence?

S: Well, by the fact that you experience it, it is not regarded as evidence.

974

Voice: I don't know how .... (unclear)      contrary      (unclear)      contrary to

that.

S:

- Well, presumably evidence would be threefold; the evidence of the Buddha's teaching; the

evidence of the scriptures and the evidence of correct reasoning and the evidence of the Enlightenment experien~'Claim' in so far as one is involved with objects which are contrary to all evidence~;7Perhaps object here indicated the object with which one comes into contact, which one experiences as object. One has identified the five skandas as, in some way or other, as the self. It could mean of course that the, it could refer to the five skandhas. "Opinion as dogma in so far as one has rationalised it." This is very clear isn't it? "Fiction' in so far as one is enamored with it." Maybe the original word is something like maya (?) something illusive, with which you become infatuated, thinking it's

\_\_\_\_\_ real. "Opinion' in so far as one makes it the content of one's thinking." (pause)

Padmapani: Does that mean Bhante, that one sort of consolidates or condenses it into one's being. It's a sort of fixed view or opinion?

S: It constitu~s one's invariable frame of reference. It's more like that.

Padmavajra: You base all your views on that.

S: Yes, you take it fo~ranted, the framework of your thinking, it shows your unspoken set of assumptions. In that way it's more than just the content, it's the continent of your thinking.

Padmapani: So it could be unspoken, unspoken frame.

~: Yes, because it's the opinion as dogma - it's a more explicit, more outspoken expression as it were.

5~?S~}

Voice: The last one seems to be more of a (route ?), a basis

S: Yes - and the first of the five kinds of emotionally tainted opinionatedness seems to represent the actual experience of oneself as an ego, or the actual experience of the five skandhas as being oneself and 'acceptance' is the adherence to that even though it is °..(word unclear) .... contrary to the evidence and 'claim' is becoming involved with external objects or supposedly external objects because one is experiencing oneself as a self or subject and 'dogma' is rationalising all that and producing even a philosophy or religion out of it. And 'fictom' is not only taking it for real but becoming enamoured with it and %opinion~ as taking it as the permanent frame of reference of one's whole outlook.

Ashvajit: These seem to be the things that characterise quite a lot of so called religious

.... (word unclear)

Si Yes.

Padnavajra: It almost plots the rise of a religion somehow. (Pause)

S: Well, first of all you have a certain experience of your self and you stick to that, you refuse to consider any evidence to the contrary and on the basis of that False experience you become involved with objects. Then you rationalise your whole position, you present it as a philosophy or as a religion and then you proceed to become very much

attached to it, enamoured with it and eventually it becomes as if it were consolidated into

.. certain basic assumptions which you never question. That seems to be an outline of the process, the outline of the process. (Pause)

Voice: I don't feel very happy about this 'contrary to every evidence' - I don't think that is quite Correct.

S: Well, contrary to every evidence which presents itself to the right thinking person - not any evidence that you can recognise. Well, obviously not, as it doesn't appear to you as evidence. It would appear as evidence only to someone who saw more clearly than you do. (Pause)

Ashvajit: Could you say something more about how you develop certain opinions and dogma in so far as one has rationalised it?

S: Well, what does one mean by rationalising? I don't know to what extent Guenther's term offers a very modern psycho-analytical term, I don't know to what extent this really does faithfully represent the original Tibetan, but anyway, let's take it at its face value. To rationalise literally means to present in rational terms. It suggests the presentation in rational terms of, a presentation of something as rational of something which in fact is not rational. Do you see what I mean? So this is the kind of process which goes on very much of the time, isn't it? You don't get the real reason out of somebody - he gives you a reason, he explains his

conduct in a certain way - but that isn't the real reason, that isn't the real explanation. So 'opinion as dogma in so far as one has rationalised it'. One doesn't know what is really happening, one doesn't know, one doesn't recognise what one's experience really is, one doesn't really see what one is doing. Actually what is there is an emotionally tainted opinionatedness, regarding the perishable constituents. But one doesn't present it like that, one presents it, one dresses it up as a highly rational affair. So you can do this on a very small scale as when you give a fake, a rationalised reason as to why you didn't do something and you can do it on a very grand scale as when you construct or elaborate a whole philosophy out of certain basic personal weaknesses. (Pause)

Voice: I wonder if you could give an example of that.

(Unclear mumble of voices)

S: Well, I think they all do it. How can they not do it if they're not enlightened - they all do it. I mean some no doubt have glimpses of the truth here and there - sometimes the rationalisations are shot through with what are practically Insights but you can see sometimes

.... the rationalisations very, very clearly indeed. There is a book I referred to some time ago 'The Psychology of Philosophy' which goes into this a little. (Pause) One should perhaps reflect that all the philosophies that we have, virtually, perhaps even all of the religions, are rationalisations, pseudo-rational presentations at least on a certain level, of experiences which are essentially limited - they are not the product of an enlightened consciousness - or anything like it.

Ashvaji: What would you say of someone, of the work in that light, of someone like Nietzsche.

St Well, one mustn't forget that Nietzsche was also a Poet. I think sometimes the Poet comes closer to the truth than the Thinkers - that imagination is a more reliable faculty than is the

reason. Nietzsche certainly has some very penetrating insights, but one of the things that Nietzsche said was 'the will to system (?) will to uncouth (7)' and what did he mean by that?

C \_\_\_\_\_ Ashvaji: In a sense that all views are wrong.

S: Well, a systematically worked out view is bound to be a rationalisation, yes? This is why he wrote, toward the end of his life especially, in the form of strings of aphorisms. Each aphorism represents a sort of intuition, a sort of insight, but he doesn't attempt to string all the insights together and to work them all out systematically into a complete and comprehensive system of thought. That is implicit in his outlook, especially in his (Ravagusta 7) but that again, significantly perhaps, is presented in terms rather of poetry than of thought. (Long pause) All right, let's see what Songapa (7) has to say about it.

Text pg. 75 "The function of opinionatedness is to serve as the basis for all bad views is also stated in the Saotakumaryavadana 'Where and when will a person ever become detached from the necessities of life and tear out opinionatedness regarding the perishable constituents which is the mother of all biases?'"

S: Yes, the Abhidharmasamuccaya definition is that the function of opinionatedness about what is perishable is to 'serve as a basis for all other views'. Here also this particular text says 'tear out opinionatedness regarding the perishable constituents which is the mother of all biases'. So it's this view, this wrong view, about the self, this mistaken view that the psycho-physical constituents are either in themselves a self or contain a self, or a self exists somewhere in connection with them. This view in all its variations is the basis

of all other wrong views.

Ashvaji: What about the view for instance, or the statement, that the self is in Truth or in Reality a no-self?

S: Well, one can say this in two ways. One can take it as a skillful attitude by which adopting or by adopting which, you will be able to progress and eventually transcend all view or you can take it as a dogma to which you adhere and defend and about which you feel egoistic. For instance, I found with regard to some of the Theravadins that they always took up a very challenging attitude with regard to the (anatma va~a X) They always advocated it very vigourously, not to ma violenty, and vigourously not to say viol-ntly, criticised everyone (atAma vaXda ~) but sometimes without understanding very much of what they were talking about, which was rather a pity. So you could see the (anatma varda ?) had become something to which they strongly attach, it is part of their traditions, part (,f their cultural and intellectual herita~e at least. It was what Made them Buddhists, it was what marked them off from those wretched mis-believing Hindus. So this is the sort of attitude they had towards us - so

clearly this is an unskillful attitude. If you have an unskillful attitude towards a teaching F -

which is meant to help you to be skillful, then what will you do? As Nagarjana says, the medicine itself becomes poisiness then where will you go for treatment? I would even go so far as to say that for that limited period, to that lisited extent, what is technically a wrong view may serve a skillful purpose. You may have to discover eventually, but in the F meantime it will have helped you to some extent. But supposing, for instance, that you take, for instance1 the self - you don't feel too strongly about it and you don't think maybe too F much about it but in taking your stand on that you perform certain skillful actions which carry you a little further along the way and maybe just later on you start beginning to feel, to realise that that particular philosophy of a self is, in fact1 not in accordance with the facts, not in accordance with the Truth, not in accordance with Reality - then you start outgrowing it. But until that, until you reach that point it has served a certain useful practical function. Because you as it were, 'sat loo5e~ towards it, you 'sat Loose' with regard to it, didn't make it too much of a dogma. It was more or less, what shall I say, what does Guenther call it?

Voice: An operational concept.

S: An operational Concept which you eventually saw the limitations of, therefore discarded. Some operational concepts are stronger than others - (Buddhists 7) believe that their operational concepts last longer than anybody else's, but only if they are allowed to remain

operational concepts, not if they are treated as dogmas. Unfortunately, you find in some

Buddhist circles, especially the Theravada circles, this very dogmatic attitude

towards right views themselves - so dogmatic it practically turns them into wrong views. The words may be alright, but the meaning has become something different from - the attitude has become something different. If you try to hit somebody over the head with Buddhist Truths it ceases practically to be Buddhist Truth. (Pause)

Padma ani: For the framework of reference which yo~ use until such '~me as you don't need it. —

S: One could put it like that 5~s77)

Voice: (unclear)

S: Right. Right, let's go on then.

Text page 76 ")men osimionatedness regarding the perishable is classified according to its content, there are twenty biases. It becomes twenty by sub-dividing each of the five constituents by way of four alternatives, such as taking colour-form as the self. taking the self as having colour-form, taking colour-form as ~n~~5 possession, or letting the self reside in colour-form and then repeating the same procedure for feeling-tones, ideation, :totivation and perception."

S: That is to say for all the constituents of phenomenon existence ... (unclear word) Let's see what Nagarjana says.

Text page 76 "Colour-form is not the self.~

S: Colour-form is of course, rupa. In other words it is the object of visual perception which is characterised by form in the sense of a definite outline and colour, colour-form.

Text "Self is not possessed of colour-form and colour-form is not existing in the self. Nor is the self residing in colour-form. In the same way, the other basic elements ought to be understood as nothing in themselves."

S: Alright, then carry on, then.

Text "The Madhyamakavatara states, Colour-form is not the self, the self does not possess colour-form, the self does not exist in colour-form, nor does colour-form exist in the self. In the same manner, all four of the basic elements ought to be known. They are considered to be the twenty biases regarding the self. The vajra which knows that the self - that mountain of biases - does

Text (Cont.) not exist, cuts right through and that (imagined) self is instantly destroyed. Obstinateness regarding the perishable constituents dwells on Mount Sumeru and has become its lofty summit."

S: What do you think those last couple of lines mean?

Voice: (unclear) the Abhidharma view of (unclear words) ...  
ultimately

real.

S: Do you think so? 'Opinionatedness regarding the perishable constituents dwells on Mount Sumeru and has become its lofty summit.' What is Mount Sumeru?

Padmavajra: The centre of the Universe.

S: The centre of the universe - also the highest point of the universe.

(

Voice: The pinnacle of the world isn't it?

S: Yes. It's as though opinionatedness regarding the perishable constituents of the  
F

universe is that the (unclear few words) of worldly existence, the

highest point, the pinnacle of worldly existence, the zenith.

Voice: Does that mean belief in the self is the pinnacle of worldly existence?

S: Yes. Another way of putting it would be the essence of all worldly existence. Right

let's go on then.

Text page 76 "These twenty kinds of opinionatedness regarding the perishable

constituents are explained concisely as the two attachments in the form of 'I' and 'mine'. but if you wish to know their concrete nature in detail this can be learned from the explanation in the Madhyamakavqtara, and the Abhidharmasamuccaya

- - 582) together with its commentary. The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains opinionatedness regarding the extremes as follows."

S: Yes, now we come on the second of the two forms of opinionatedness. What about the first? Have we really finished with that?

Voice: I'm not very happy about the (unclear)

Si In what way?

Voice: I can't understand them. I can understand the first one, but I can't understand the second one.

Si Well I look at it with regard to, well, take rupa say simply as body - you could say that body is the self, there's nothing beyond the body, body and self is identical, are identical - what is body, that is self, - what is self that is body - that is one possible view. Another view is that the self is what possesses the body, not that the body is the self but there is something apart from the body which possesses the self, which possesses the body and that is the self. This is the common sense view about the soul for instance, that there is something in addition to the physical body, there is a psychic (7) element which is the possessor of the body, and that is the self. That's one view. The other view is, or another view is, that the self is not identical with the body, nor the body with the self, the self is not the possessor of the body but it dwells in the body. This is another sort of popular common sense view. And yet another one, somewhat more subtle - no, it is not that the self dwells in the body but the body in fact is contained within the self. That is the fourth alternative. All these alternatives are indeed presented by one school of thought or another, in ancient India and perhaps in the modern world too. Can you see the different possibilities?

So you can either have a self which is identical with all five skandhas collectively, you can have a self which is the possessor of all five skandhas collectively and you can have a self

58

which dwells in all five skandhas collectively or a self in which all five skandhas collectively dwell. Then you can repeat the whole process with regard to each of all the five skandhas

individually and that gives one one's twenty views, with regard to, twenty forms of opinionatedness regarding the perishable constituents.

Voice: Which are .... (unclear)

S: Yes.

Voice: Can you say the fourth one again, regarding the body?

S: That is, not that, the self resides for instance, the body, but that the body is

contained within the self. The self is, as it were, bodyless. The self is non-material -

the self is consciousness, and within that exists the body. The self, the consciousness is, as it were, the wider containing principal and the body is contained within it.

Ashvajit: And what was the fourth one again Bhante:

S: Well, that's what I've just said, that is the fourth one.

Ashvajit: The self is the body, the self is within the body....

S: No - you've missed the second one. The second one is that the self is the possessor of the body, the owner or master of the body. The third is that the self is in the body and

the fourth that the body is in the self.

Ashvajit: Ah. There must be a rather ouri~s transition between the second and the third.

S: Well, it's from the second and the first.

Voice: It's all wrong views, so don't worry about them.

Voice: Right! (Laughter)

Padmapani: Bhante, what about, did anyone, did the disciples say talk to the Buddha, and 58)4 describe what it must be like from an Enlightened point of view having a body?

S: Well - this is one of the fourteen inexpressables.

Padmapani: Oh' (Laughter)

S: The Buddha said, this is a very standard list, that it could not be said, first of all, that the life principle was identical with the body or not identical or both or neither and also that the Tathagata existed after death or did not exist after death, or both or neither. In other

words, there are various logical alternatives for a number of .... (words unclear)... but they are inapplicable to the Enlightenment experience. If you are Enlightened and you have, as it were, a physical body, no statement as to the relationship between your Enlightened state, your Enlightened being and your physical body is appropriate. The Buddha

said even during his life that the Tathagata is indescribable not to speak of after death. I mean, when he's standing before you, as it were, in or with the physical body, you can't really say what his relationship to that physical body is, because that would be to take Enlightenment on the one hand and the body on the other, as two terms within the same universe (CSd V2 I

..I~~~~ ~a~~~~~i) which they are not.

Ashvaji: What about the conditions .... (few words unclear) .... Can one not even say that of the Buddha? That what he says, what he teaches, or what he does is conditioned by something, or yes, is conditioned in some sense or other~

S: Depends what you mean by conditioned, because his physical body is conditioned, but that does not effect the fact that the relation between what we call his physical body and what we call his state or experience of Enlightenment is inexplicable.

Voice: (few words unclear) the conditioned mind can not see anything other

then ....

Sj Conditioned mind?

Same Voice: I think of it as easy to see in terms of conditioning.

(General sumbling and over-speaking)

S: Sometimes you can't even see that.

Same Voice: Yes, well at its best.

Padmapani: Again these things could have been related through the Buddha's olos~  
disciples in meditation or something that (few words unclear)

S: According to the tradition the Buddha himself spoke about these things quite frankly,  
and made them clear.

Voice: Sometimes people bring them down to the same level, they say that all things are  
beyond logical (unclear word) They say, 'Well, that is a rationalisation'. In a sense the  
Buddha had to explain it in terms of rationality.

S: Yes, but rationality used, as it were, poetically.

Voice; Yes, yes.

Ashvajit: In order to point to something beyond the rational.

S: Yes, right. Well, let's go on to the next form of opinionatedness.

Text page 77 ~The Abhidharma.~ainuccaya explains opinionatedness regarding the extremes as follows: 'What is opinionatedness regarding the extremes? It is any acceptance,

claim, opinion as dogma, fiction and opinion which is completely biased taking the

586

five original elements as external existence or as non-existence, and its function is to prevent gaining certainty through the understanding of reality as it comes

through the middle way. It is an emotionally toned appreciation of the self as it is conceived by a nihilistic view in terms of absolute eternalism or absolute

nihilism.'

S: So what does this represent? Opinionatedness regarding the extremes. "It is any

acceptance of claim, opinion as dogma, fiction and opinion which is completely

biased taking the five original elements as external existence or as non-existence." This is

perhaps a bit foreign to our way of thinking but it was the way in which the ancient

Indians thought. Taking the five constituents as eternal doesn't so much mean taking them as permanent and unchanging, something which I think hardly anyone could possibly do, but

taking them as absolute, taking them as Ultimate Reality one could say. And taking them as non-existent means regarding them as completely false, as having no existence whatsoever, as being totally illusory. These would seem to be the two opposite views, the two

extremes - taking the five constituents as Absolute Reality and taking them as complete

unreality - whereas the middle way would be that the five constituents have a conventional existence in as much as they arose in dependence upon causes and conditions, they have a relative existence. So to see conditioned existence as conditioned is the middle way. To

see conditioned existence as the unconditioned is one extreme, to see conditioned existence as totally non-existent is the other extreme. Apparently the ancient Indians had a

fascination for regarding it either in the one way or in the other, and Buddhism had to draw their attention to the truth of the middle way. This is the metaphysically .... (word

drowned by noise) as it were.

Abhaya: Do you think that western philosophers have the same sort of tendency to see things

in one way or another?

58(?) S: Possibly, yes. The tendency is either to absolutise or to completely negate - not seeing

in terms of conditionality.

Padmapani: In a way for most people to live a mediocre life you usually find that people with a strong attitude like that, they demand attention. It's almost although, in our western culture, if someone has got a strong attitude they're more likely to be listened to, than somebody who has got a I'm trying to separate mediocre from the middle way.

S: This is true, you see, if, you notice this with a majority of people, if you can be very confident, very emphatic, very certain, even though it is in a neurotic sort of way, you create a much stronger impression, they're much more likely to believe you. But, if you are, as it were, more careful in what you say, and introduce a number of qualifications and exceptions and suggest that yours is only a certain way of looking at things they may be helpful but you're not really regarded as the absolute truth. That will make a comparatively feeble impression. It is absoluteness that people want.

Voice: One way or the other.

Si One way or the other.

Padmavajra: They like to be told what to do.

Si Well, that is the practical aspect of it.

Padmapani: Well that's where mediocracy lies, doesn't it?

S: This is why you find that those who have great self-confidence, a great belief in themselves - even though that may be totally baseless - do manage to attract, quite often, quite a large following but those who are tentative and hesitant, and perhaps more sincere in their search for truth may not do so at all. The loud-mouth evangelist, who is supremely confident, however weak the foundation for that confidence may be, is likely to be a successful evangelist.

588

Padmavajra: His followers don't have to think then, do they?

S: Right! Well, as Cardinal Manning said after a (unclear word) with the Pope, 'I don't have to think, the Pope does my thinking for me'. (Laughter) So to get people to think for themselves and to guide them to certain conclusions at which you have arrived is a much more delicate process than simply telling them. Very often they want to be told - otherwise why should they swallow all/the things they are told by different people, different authorities, both spiritual and secular? Why should they swallow everything that Guru Maharajra tells them for instance, or everything that some political leader tells them or some Trade Unionist tells them, or some pop star tells them, or some T.V. personality tells them. The Buddhist attitude is definitely very much the attitude of, as it were, relativism - it sees into the complexity of the situation, how many different factors are involved, and trying truly to understand it, not to take refuge in the easy absolutism of things, either positive or negative. This is why people ask you sometimes, 'What do you think of such-and-such, what do you think of so-and-so?' They expect an immediate snap judgement. It's always good or it's always bad, he's right or he's wrong. This is like for instance when people - ask me about Trungpa. They either expect me to say that Trungpa's a complete hoax or they expect me to say Trungpa's a great Bodhisattva. It isn't like that. I mean, after all, Trungpa is a human being, he's a very complex person and there are all sorts of different sides to his character which you have to try and sort out and give due weight to and arrive at some sort of balanced view which might take you quite a long time to express and which certainly won't add up to saying that either Trungpa is a hoax or that Trungpa is a great Bodhisattva, or even somewhere exactly inbetween. It might be more complex than that. But

S: (Cont.) people want you to absolutise, they want you to present things, very often, in terms of black and white, when they're not satisfied with a dull grey.

Padmapani: It seems to me though, Bhante, one can, the person who wants an answer one way or the other - they can often be quite satisfied with talking, if there's very positive emotion there with it . ...

S: It's the certainty that they want. They don't mind so much what they are going to be certain about - it's the certainty that they want. Do you see that?

Padmapani: Yes, yes.

S: If you think, what sensible person could possibly believe that (farago ?) of nonsense presented by some teachers and some sects? What sensible person, you might think, could possibly believe all that. But that's irrelevant. It's the certainty and security that they want. It hardly matters what they believe, to them. (Pause) Just like some people hardly bother to what sort of group they belong to, so long as they get some sort of comfort, some sort of security, some sort of warmth, some sort of companionship.

Padmavajra: There's another sort of syndrome here, people often say to me, "What's the Buddhist view?" on such and such.

S: What's the party line, as it were.

Padmavajra: Yes. I came to the conclusion, well, there is no Buddhist view, I have to say what my view is, as a Buddhist.

S: Or you can say, well look, these are the Four Noble Truths - well work it out in those terms for yourself. (Laughter)

Padmavajra: Well, that's a particular thing that I get from my parents. "What do you Buddhists think about such and such?" "What do you Buddhists . "

S: Again you're supposed to have the instant answer - what do Buddhists think about hanging? What do Buddhists think about Watergate? (Laughter) What do

Tape 20 page 15 590

S: (Cont.) Buddhists think about the landing on Mars? What do Buddhists think about abortion? What do Buddhists think about sex? You're expected to have an instant snap answer ready, just like that. And this is what really gets some people, if you can produce it, if you're sort of a Mister Knowall, with all the answers, well, quite a few people will really like that.

Voice: You just saying that, I was thinking, sort of having been in positions like that where you just feel like saying not very much, but know that they'll take it in the wrong way - well, what do you think about that - (no thought about it ?) (few words unclear)

S: You have to understand that what you are dealing with basically, very often, is with an insecure person who wants security, and uncertain person who wants certainty.

Voice: In a way they're asking you to sort out their minds for them.

S: Not even that. They're asking you to give them certainty, certainty is security. They're not bothered about their minds being sorted out, thought it might be muddled and confused, they want certainty.

Padmavajra: I think also people want to know where exactly you stand so that they can put you in some reference.

S: That too, yes - quite an important point, that they want to absolutise you - are you black or are you white.

Padmavajra: They don't like it when you won't be classified.

S: Right - or when you won't tell them what you do or what you are.

Ashvajit: I have met one or two people recently though who have asked quite penetrating questions of that sort, but who have admitted in the end that that kind of certainty was not actually what they expected or wanted.

S: Well, one can certainly meet some people like that.

Tape 20 page 16 5,1

Padmavajra: I've a great reluctance sometimes, with some people, to say what I do. I feel like saying, "Well, what's it got to do with you?"

S: Well, the reluctance is not the reluctance to describe to them how you pass your time but the reluctance is a reluctance to be categorised.

Padmavajra: I often feel that (hitching ?)

S: They're not interested in what you do, they're interested in categorising you.

Padmavajra: Yes, right.

S: They're not in the least interested in what you actually do, they have to be interested in you, but they're not interested in you, they're interested in categorisation because in that way they can escape from you, they can get away from you, they can pigeon-hole you, you know, put you into, as it were, some pre-existing box, some pre-existing category and then dismiss you and not have to think about you, not have to be concerned with you.

Ashvajit: like the old caste attitude.

S: Right - very much so.

Padmavajra: When you say you're a Buddhist though they just don't know what to do - like a punch below the belt.

S: Unless they've already categorised a Buddhist as this, that or the other - a Buddhist is an ascetic or a Buddhist is a food freak or whatever - a Buddhist is into black magic.

Padma~ani: I found that when I went into hospital, they wanted to know who I was. I said "My M~e~ before I was ordained was (David Featherby?)" And they said, "Well, what religion are you?" And I said, "I'm a Buddhist." And he said, "A Buddhist, what's that?" (Laughter) And I explained, and they got really annoyed, they wanted to know all about it, they wanted to categorise me down.

When I said that I was Buddhist and a vegetarian, they couldn't have that, they wouldn't allow that.

Tape 20 page 1?

S: I do know of people who have had difficulties in hospitals before. In one or two cases the hospital authorities have refused to describe them as Buddhist. I think there's a little chart or something that hangs at the foot of your bed, at least in some hospitals, which give all your personal data so any passing priest can glance at it and know whether you belong to his flock or not, whether you're one of his branded sheep (Laughter) So, they refused to put 'Buddhist' in one or two cases.

Pa~mapani: That's right. When I told them I was a Buddhist they just didn't believe it in a sense. And the priest would come round, the priest came round every week when I was in the hospital, and he would just sit there, and we'd talk about the Roman Catholic Church, belief in God and I said, "Well, I'm not interested in all that stuff." When I started in actual fact convincing him I was a Buddhist he ceased to come anymore.

S: He wasn't interested in you. -

Padiapani: That was really interesting - he didn't come anymore but I knew he'd been round the rounds, he didn't come and see me.

Voice: It's saJ that dogma can cut oneself off from warmth.

Padmapani: I mean he was quite a nice man. In the beginning he was really -warm, when he knew that I might be interested, but when it came to, that I had to put it to him after that, the third time, that I wasn't interested at all, he~ased to come, even though I quite liked the chap and I think he quite liked me.

S: ~eyvery likely did~ but then he thought he ought not to. -

Right, let's carry on with the lam-rim's explanation. (Pause) There's just one point though - the last few lines that were read, 'It is an emotionally toned appreciation of the self as it is conceived by a nihilistic view in terms of absolute eternalism or absolute nihilism.' - but nihilistic view seems to be used in two quite different senses doesn't it? Guenther in the first case seems to use the word 'nihilistic' quite wrongly.

Padmavajra; Why is that?

S: Nihilistic view in terms of absolute eternalism or absolute nihilism.

20/18

593 Asvajit; Well isn't that just wrong view. In the first sense he uses nihilistic as not leading anywhere.

S: Presumably. (pause) It's perhaps just wrong view. It's a bit misleading to call eternalism a nihilistic view. Anyway carry on.

' The lam-rim explains these two latter views as follows:

The opinion holding to an extreme is an emotionally toned appreciation that sees the self, as conceived by the nihilistic view as being absolutely eternal or absolutely nihilistic since there will be no subsequent existence.

Therefore since these bad views make a person fall into the extremes of eternal existence or eternal non-existence, they are the primary obstacles for seeing the middle path which has nothing to do with eternalism or nihilism."

S: That's quite clear isn't it? In ancient India there was this view of the self, the eternalist view of the self as something which persisted unchanged from life to life. And the nihilistic view of the self which held that the whole psycho-physical organism was totally annihilated at the moment of death and didn't survive death in any sense. These were the two views of the self. One eternalism, one nihilism as applied to the continuance of the psycho-physical organism beyond death. One that it continued unchanged (at least) the cyclical part and the other that it did not continue at all.

Dharmapala; In the 'Survey' you link this to the Christian view as well.

S: Yes, because the soul survives bodily death, the same soul. I've also said sometimes that there are three contexts for this view of existence and non-existence or eternalism and nihilism. One the ethical, the two extremes. That is to say the extreme of self-indulgence and the extreme of self-torture. Secondly what I call the psychological, that is to say the one I've just described. That the self exists unchanged after death or the soul exists or that it is annihilated together with the physical body at the moment of death. Thirdly the metaphysical context of the view. That is to say that mundane existence as such is ultimately real - eternalism, or that it is totally non-existent - nihilism. Do you see any connection between these. Do you see any connection, for instance, between self-indulgence and the belief in mundane existence as ultimately real.

\_\_\_\_\_ One enforces the other.

S: Exactly, and in between the extreme of self torture and the belief that mundane existence as such is totally unreal, totally non-existent.

Kamalasila; Isn't extreme asceticism associated with eternalism? 20/19

S: It can be in the sense that you torture the body so you can release the spirit or the soul which you can then conceive as something separate unchanging and continuing after death. But asceticism - self-torture - broadly speaking or generally speaking seems to be connected with a sort of self-hatred. You want to destroy yourself - and in the same way you can want, as it were, to destroy mundane existence. So the rationalisation of that is it's not really there. That's the best way of destroying it. Do you see what I mean? This reminds me of a girl who came on retreat in the very early days - I've referred to this case before, some of you might have heard about it and she was a member of the Reading University Buddhist Society. I'd been there a number of times, given a number of lectures and she came to classes in London and she came on retreat eventually, in the very early days. And she was very into Buddhism and she had a special fascination for the Anatma teaching, that is to say the no self and no soul teaching especially of Theravada Buddhism. So in the course of the retreat she told me that she suddenly realised why she was fascinated by this particular teaching - why she was attracted by it. So I asked her why is that. So she said, 'I've realised I'm attracted to this teaching that says that there is no self, no soul because I hate myself. I would rather I was not there. I want, as it were, to negate myself so I like, as it were, to be told in reality there's no you, you're just not there. It seems a sort of culmination of my natural rejection and negation of myself, my self-hatred.' And that gave me great food for thought because quite a few of the English Theravadins I've known seem to fall into this sort of category. They seem to hate themselves. So if you have this attitude of hate you want, as it were, to negate, you want to negate yourself. If you hate existence you want to negate existence. If you hate life you want to negate life in an unskillful manner. So the culmination of that is to say well it isn't really just there. It doesn't really exist at all. They try to wipe it out in that sort of way.

Padmavajra; It's just dogma.

S: Yes, it can give rise to a whole philosophy which completely negates existence, completely negates life. Declares it worthless, meaningless and totally non-existent in reality, which is not the Buddhist view. Very often this is considered to be the Buddhist view, that Buddhism negates existence, that it rejects existence. It's not so.

Padmavajra; It seems to be really important, this relative and absolute truth teaching.

S: Well it is a question of a middle way. A quite simple almost common

sense matter. That you have these two concepts - existence and non-existence - Reality and unreality and you treat them as absolutes. According to Buddhism so far as what Buddhism calls conditioned existence is concerned or relative existence is concerned, there are no absolutes. It's neither existent or non-existent, nor both nor neither. It is relatively existent and what does that relatively consist in? It consists in the fact that every- thing conditioned, everything phenomenal, everything mundane arises in dependance on conditions and in the absence of those conditions, ceases. So this is something that can be experienced. That sort of world is not completely real but neither is it absolutely unreal. It's there to be experienced. One can be involved in it, one is involved in it but it is not to be mistaken for absolute reality. As something existing in an ultimate sense. This is the middle way. It's as simple as that. This is all just commonsense. If it's explained clearly to anybody they'll at once understand it and find it quite reasonable and acceptable. This is the way in which Buddhism sees the world.

Vimalamitra; Some people do take quite a simplistic view of the teaching of the middle way. They don't have to take on right view. That is an extreme.

S: Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ They also say it's a compromise.

S: But the two extremes as regards to these are clinging on to views as though they did fully express absolute truth and adopting a dogmatic attitude towards them. Being possessive with regard to them. That's one extreme and the other is not considering it necessary to have any views at all, not even right views. Not even skilful views. Those are the two extremes. Someone tried to catch me out after a lecture in India by saying that since Buddhism taught a middle way shouldn't there be a middle way between truth and falsehood and that speaking the truth was an extreme. So I said no the extremes are exaggeration and minimisation and stating things exactly as they are without exaggeration on the one hand and without minimisation on the other - that was the middle way and that was speaking the truth. This is how people try to catch you out.

Padmapani; Taking it very simplistically does this link up the person with a strong sense of rejection - a hate type.

S: With a strong sense of rejection in the sense of himself being rejected by other people or himself rejecting other people?

20/21 596

Padmapani; Him rejecting others. Wouldn't this be tied up with the Tibetan representation of psychological types - the hate types and the greed types. Could you tell me about them?

S; It's not Tibetan. It's found in Buddhaghosa. Buddhaghosa's description of the three main caritas. The three main temperaments or types. That's Buddhaghosa in the Visuddhi Magga. There's the craving type - the lobhacarita, the hating type - the dosacarita and the deluded type - mohacarita. I've gone into this very briefly in a lecture. I can't go into it in detail now but I'll just roughly indicate the nature of these three types. The basic question is what brings about this differentiation of types. I think it's Buddhaghosa who says that the craving type or the greedy type is the person who finds life more pleasant than painful. That's the starting point for the formation of this kind of temperament. Presumably therefore he's a person who has performed skilful actions in the past and who is now reaping the consequences in the form of pleasant vipakas. So in his environment, in his experience there's a predominance of pleasant vipakas so for him existence is predominantly pleasurable. So there is the greater temptation, the greater tendency for him to become attached, for him to become greedy. for him to become craving. So various descriptions are given. Supposing for instance he's a monk because Buddhaghosa speaks mainly within the monastic context with regard, for instance, to these realins he will favour robes which are brightly coloured - bright yellow robes for instance if he is of the craving temperament and when he eats, for instance, how will he eat? He will eat rather nicely, rather grace- fully making his rice and curry into balls of just the right size and popping them into his mouth. And if he sweeps the room he will do it in nice smooth strokes and not leaving any dirt in the corners. And when he walks he will walk putting his feet down quite gently and he'll walk along in a smooth and graceful sort of manner, and he'll wear his robe neatly and correctly. These are some of the characteristics of the craving person according to Buddhaghosa. Does this add up to a sort of picture?

And the person who is of the hate temperament. He is a person in whose experience pain predominates over pleasure. For him existence is definitely more painful than pleasant and puts him, as it were, into an angry mood, a mood of irritation and resentment. So if he is a monk he tends to favour darker robes, rather like the Burmese ones and, strange to say, the Burmese are rather angry very often in temperament especially the monks. And then when he eats he will just sort of scrape the food together and toss it into his mouth in an angry sort of way and if he sweeps the room he will sweep with hurried strokes. He'll do it in a hurried hasty sort of manner rather impatiently and when he walks he will stride along digging his heels into the ground. These are some of the characteristics

20/22 59~

I remember. I think there are some other.

That about in comparison to the greed type who wore his clothes neatly. Does he wear his clothes sort of shabbily.

S: Well he will just throw them around, not shabby, but will just throw them around him anyhow. You're supposed to wear the upper robe four inches shorter than the lower robe and all that sort of thing. He won't bother about that, he'll just fling the robe around him not bothering if it's incorrectly worn.

Then the deluded person is one in whose experience pleasure and pain are pretty equally mixed. So he sometimes behaves like a craving type person sometimes like a hate type person. That's part of his deludedness. So this is Buddhaghosa's description which is quite classical for the Theravada - the three basic types. These are crude types. There are three corresponding more refined types but we won't go into those. He doesn't describe them anyway. (Pause) Except that as far as I remember the other three types are the faithful, the wise and the intelligent. When the greedy type becomes more refined he becomes the devotee. The person with great faith and devotion. When the hate type becomes refined and more developed he becomes the wise and when the deluded type becomes refined and developed he becomes the intelligent.

Vimalamitra; So it seems like the deluded type - the difference between intelligence and wise - wise seems to denote a marked increase of faculties.

S: Wise in this context means one who wisdom - prajna - who penetrates into the truth of things, who cuts through. Sometimes it's said - Conze has written a little article about this, that the affinity between hatred and wisdom. Hatred sees the faults of the hated object or the object of hatred. In the same way wisdom sees the faults of conditioned existence itself.

Asvajit; In so far as the development of prajna then is the aim of the Path is it better to start off in a more uncomfortable fashion?

S: Yes hm Intelligence seems to differ from wisdom here in being a more, as it were, versatile faculty. If you see what I mean. Whereas wisdom is definitely that which penetrates through the conditioned to the Uncon- ditioned.

\_\_\_\_\_ Why aren't there any Bodhisattvas of intelligence?

S; Who says there aren't? Intelligence as distinct from wisdom. Well what

20/23

about (Aksiyamati) - you can regard him. Mati is intelligence rather than wisdom.

Vimalamitra; Can you go more into the difference between wisdom and intelligence?

S: Do you mean in the sense of the Sanskrit terms that I've been using or the colloquial English terms? The difference is whatever you choose to make it, in a sense. Wisdom in the sense of prajna, taking it strictly in that sense - is the faculty which sees through things, which sees into things, which sees things as they are in reality. But intelligence is not quite the same. When I called intelligence the more versatile faculty what I meant was that it was, in a sense, more creative. It could do other things besides simply penetrating into reality. Perhaps for instance it could communicate something of the content of that penetration.

Asvajit; It suggests something that's able to synthesise - not simply to dissect.

S: I mean a standard definition of intelligence is 'the creative use of concepts'. In that way wisdom would be the faculty that brushes aside concepts and penetrates to the things themselves, the realities themselves. But intelligence is able to make a creative use of concepts. Either in the ordinary sort of way or to express what wisdom sees when it has brushed aside all concepts.

Vimalamitra; So the enlightened person has got all those.

S: yes, the Bodhisattva certainly should possess intelligence in the sense of being able to make a creative use of concepts otherwise he couldn't communicate the truth in that particular way.

Vimalamitra; He'd also have to have wisdom to penetrate to the truth anyway. Abhaya; Is there a Bodhisattva of intelligence?

S: Well there is a Bodhisattva called (Aksiyamati) which means indestruct- ible intelligence.

\_\_\_\_\_ What good is faith then. How does that help?

S: Well without faith you don't get there and after you've got there you don't need faith. You've got something else. You've got Karuna then. Karuna, as it were, takes its place. The Buddhas don't have faith. They

20/24 599

don't need faith.

Padmapani; I've realised the list you gave me was not the list that I want (laughter) The list I was asking for was the one you gave in the series of lectures in New Zealand. It was the Tibetan psychological roots of greed, hatred

S: No you're thinking of those three definitions of the three unskilful roots that Sagaramati referred to. They came out in the course of the 'Door of Liberation' seminar didn't they?

Sagaramati; You said they had a Tibetan source but you didn't actually mention which source it was.

S: i think it must have been a text in the 'Door of Liberation' in which case they came out in the course of that seminar.

Padmavajra; It sounds curiously like a Guenther translation of something.

S: No I don't think they were.

You mentioned them in your own New Zealand lectures.

S: I said they came out in the 'Door of Liberation' seminar. (I) having previously read that bit of the text.

Sagaramati; No I was ordained on the 'Door of Liberation' seminar. You must have thought of those just before I was ordained. I was ordained just

- before you left for New Zealand.

S: I don't remember. I have got various small translations from the Tibetan published in India. I might have got it from one of those in that case. I don't think it was Guenther.

Padmavajra; I thought it was the 'Jewel Ornament' when I first heard it.

S: No it's not the 'Jewel Ornament'.

Sagaramati; I thought it might have been the Sarvastivadin Abhidharmakosa.

S: No it wasn't that. It was definitely a Tibetan source though maybe based on an Indian source and as far as I recollect, yes it mu~ have been one of those if it wasn't the 'Door of Liberation'. It must have been one

of those little texts which I got from India.

Asvaji; I wonder why we ask for definitions, sort of rational explanations for emotions, of emotional types. (Is it that) we don't recognise in ourselves when those emotions

S: Well perhaps it is another instance of this desire to absolutise or he's that type~, I'm this type etc etc. Then you can pigeon-hole, you can categorise. You can dispose of people, dismiss them. Well he's Aries, I'm Pisces etc etc though of course obviously one goes into it more deeply. It's much more complex than that. There are Pisces and Pisces and Aries and Aries and so on. But the popular usage of the different categories is of that kind. If you hear about someone, well he's a Taurus, you think you know all about him and that's that. You've finished with him, dealt with him, classified him, docketed him.

Padmapani; I just wanted to know because I was using a sort of operational concept (~edbylauhter) creative intelligence,

S: Well you can listen to the New Zealand~d~ lecture and get it directly from that. It is available isn't it. It can be listened to even though we're not sending it out into general circulation.

Sagaramati; I could almost repeat them in a way. not word for word but..

Padmapani; Alright see me afterwards.

S: Enough about that second form -'emotionally tainted opinionatedness~'. Let's go on to the third one now -'clinging to ideologies'. I'd like to know what the word in the original is for ideologies. Anyway let's read it.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains clinging to ideologies as follows:

What is clinging to ideologies? It is any acceptance, claim, opinion as dogma, fiction and opinion to hold the five psycho- physical constituents - as far as they are occasions of an opinion about them - as the supreme, the principle, the particularly sublime, and the

absolutely real. Its function is to serve as the basis for becoming even more enmeshed in wrong views.

Clinging to ideologies is an emotionally tainted appreciation which overvalues other wrong views and the constituents of the personality.

The terms such as 'supreme' are here understood as follows: Supreme is the thought, 'How wonderful things are!' Principle means there is nothing over and above this.

601

Absolutely real means to hold something as superior and to claim that there is nothing like it.

The lam-rim states,

The opinionatedness of clinging to ideologies is an emotion-ally tainted appreciation that is concerned with the constituents of the personality of the viewer as they are seen in any one of the three opinions - opinionatedness regarding the perishable, the extremes, and wrong opinion. Thus, opinionatedness is also the cult of what is seen in the light of the ideology.

Its function, which is to serve as the basis for becoming even more entwined in wrong views, means that clinging to ideologies prepares the tendencies of not getting away from evil views in the here and the hereafter."

S: So what do you think ideology represents broadly speaking without trying to discover what the term is in the original. Guess what it is in the original.

Asvajit; Well any particular sort of stand that one takes.

S: An ideology is surely something more intellectual or pseudo-intellectual. You talk about communist ideologies.

\_\_\_\_\_ Systematised views.

S: Yes, I mean you can take a stand with regard to them but the ideology itself is a sort of - not exactly a system, perhaps a more coherent set of opinions which is strongly held. You talk about say Nazi ideology and Fascist ideology. Any other examples you can think of of that sort of

- usage of ideology.

\_\_\_\_\_ All forms of nationalism.

S: No, the actual usage of the term.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Using more exotic language, life) can be an ideology.

S: Right, yes, exactly. So what then is this particular form of opinionatedness. The situation seems to be that first of all you have an opinion, let us say, a drsti, which represents a certain limited attitude which is emotionally tainted, which is under the influence of the kiasas and then you rationalise this into a particular philosophy, let's say, into a particular ideology let's say. So that's the next stage of development.

20/27 602

The next stage or concretisation and then you proceed to be attached to that and that is the third of these forms of opinionatedness - that is clinging to ideologies. First you cling to the limited perspective represented by the drsti, then you formulate that limited perspective as an ideology and then you cling to the ideology. So therefore it is said that 'its function is to serve as the basis for becoming even more enmeshed in

wrong views'. Do you see the different stages?

Vimalamitra; So this is a more concretisation of...

S: Yes, the different stages by which you become more and more entangled. For instance, to give an example, suppose someone feels very inadequate, very insecure, very unsure of himself. So for that reason he either formulates or he is drawn to say some form of, let's say for the sake of illustration, fascist ideology. He then proceeds to become attached to that which strengthens of course his original attitude on account of which he ~mbraced that ideology in the first place. So he becomes more deeply entangled, more deeply enmeshed than ever in opinionatedness, in drsti, in wrong view.

Dharmapala; He takes up fascist ideology as a sort of group so that he can feel secure.

S: Yes, I'm only giving this ideal as an illustration. He might embrace Catholicism in much the same way.

Dharmapala; But the idea is to feel security in the group.

S: Well not just security in the group but because it makes him feel big and strong. That's the sort of ideology it is.

Kamalasila; It's the next step. He doesn't only do it because of the thing of security but because it's the next sort of commitment, as it were, to his view.

S: Yes.

Sagaramati; He commits himself to his view and then it becomes a stronger view.

S: Exactly so he gets more entangled, more enmeshed. (Pause) So therefore this means that even with regards to Buddhism itself, even with regards to the Dharma we must be careful that we don't, as it were, embrace it for

20/2~ 60~

the wrong reasons. Obviously there will always be a slight mixture of

wrong motivation. Be careful you don't embrace it for the wrong reasons and then cling to it in such a way as to reinforce the original weakness on account of which we embraced it in the first place. As for instance the girl whose case I mentioned might have done in the case of the anatmavada - the no-self and no-soul doctrine - had she not come along on retreat - she might for instance have gone to take up say philosophy and she might have even written her thesis in the anatmavada and got more deeply into it than ever - she might have ended up as an authority on the anatmavada teaching of Buddhism and done research into it and written a

number of books on it and become very well known for that. It could have ended up conceivably in that sort of way. Her whole life would have been devoted. . her whole life would have revolved around her basic neurosis and her basic rationalisation.

Asvajit; There must be many people like that.

S: A number of scholars are like this I would say. I mean what does cause one say to specialise in the sex life of the fly? (Laughter)

Padmavajra; Are there such people?

\_\_\_\_\_ ' Yeah, that's just made me think of a thing I heard on the radio about a bloke who set up studying the sexual organs of the dog flea for twenty years and they still don't know how they work. (Laughter)

\_\_\_\_\_ That's just a case of openings - if you wanted to go into higher research.

S: There is that too but then there are quite a number of openings - always. I was hearing in the radio the other day that it's still not too late to apply for a college place depending on what subject you apply for. If you want to apply for arts or drama or creative writing or anything of that sort, that's out but any technological subject. If you want to apply for maths, engineering, physics, chemistry - plenty of places. It's not too late. So all those openings are there but apparently people are not taking them up. So no doubt what is available, what you hear about, that does play a certain part in it but devote yourself to that particular subject that you mention for twenty-five years on account of an accident. It seems a bit too much.

\_\_\_\_\_ I'm not trying to split hairs but when I got involved in my research I got involved in a particular aspect of a particular atom. Now

20/29 604

that wasn't by any choice but if I'd have carried on then that would have been my life's work

because already I was one of the six people in the world who knew anything about it. So you very quickly become very specialised and then you've burnt your bridges. You've got to carry on.

Vimalamitra; I mean in a fly's sexual organs there are so many constituents anyway you could spend your life on it - going through various bio-chemical

S: We'll leave the fly's sexual organs if you don't mind!!(Laughter) Personally I didn't even know a fly had any. (Laughter) I hadn't taken any interest in the subject whatever. (laughter) Anyway how did we get into that? Oh yes I cited the example of the, or referred back to the example of the girl who was fascinated by the anatmavada teaching and speculated what might have happened to her and how she might have ended up and what sort of career she might have had if she had not come along on our retreat.

END OF TAPE 20

605

Bhante: (continuing)... career she might have had if she had not come along to our retreat.

Ashvajit: It is very difficult for anyone without contact with the Dharma not to develop wrong views, in fact almost impossible. Any view you take reinforces that position.

Bhante: Yes, and is a product of your existing mental confusion. No doubt it is all shot through with gleams of intelligence, not to say occasionally even intuition. So there is hope even for those who don't come actually into contact with the Buddha's teaching. It is not all unrelieved wrong views even Though an element of wrong view is mixed up with almost everything, everything of as it were an ideological nature. Anyway let's go into the next topic (?) - clinging to Ideologies.

Kamalasila: (reads): (p.78)

Clinging to ideologies concerning ethical behaviour and compulsive performance is explained in the Abhidharmasamuccaya as follows:

"What is clinging to ideologies concerning ethical behaviour and compulsive performance? It is an acceptance, claim, opinion as dogma, fiction and opinion which holds

the five basic constituents and the foundation of ethical behaviour and compulsive performance as pure, capable of deliverance from the emotions, and certain to liberate. Its function is to serve as the basis for uselessness."

It is an emotionally tainted appreciation that sees as pure and free a code of behaviour that is conditioned by bad views - for example, compulsive behaviour such as wearing certain apparel, adopting mannerisms of speech, and whatever comes out of these.

Bhante: Carry on until the end.

Kamalasila: (continuing)

606

The Lam -rim states,

"Clinging to ideologies of ethical behaviour and compulsive performance is an emotionally toned appreciation which is opinionated regarding washing away sins, deliverance from the emotions, and certainty of becoming disgusted with samsara by following ethical behaviour which renounces morality, compulsive observation which insists on formalities, and modes of behaviour and mannerisms of speech and whatever may result from them".

The statement that its function is to serve as the basis of uselessness is self explanatory.

Bhante: Well actually we've got a 'Guentherism' here - Ethical behaviour and compulsive performance. It's sila and Vratna.

Sila - Vratna-paramartha is the first of the - no sorry the third of the ten fetters, isn't it? So sila is The same word as ethics, morality. It stands for ethics as formulated as rules and it means clinging to Those rules as ends in themselves, thinking that the, as it were, mechanical observance of those rules would ensure one 's eventual liberation. Vratna is the more difficult term. Vratna means literally vow. It's an old pre-Buddhist, vedic word meaning a certain kind of observance, religious observance, brahminic observance. You could say almost popular religious observance and it's the regarding such things as ends in themselves, regarding such

things as capable of leading to deliverance, the attachment to them as such. So it's more like ethical formalism and conventional religion, this would probably be the best way of translating them in an interpretive sort of way. It's clinging to ethical formalism and conventional religion as ends in themselves, Thinking that the mechanical observance of ethical forms and the mechanical observance of conventional religion will suffice to bring about one's liberation or deliverance from conditioned existence. Guenther uses the word 'compulsive performance', or the word 'compulsive'. That is in a way a bad translation even as an interpretive translation, but there is an element of compulsiveness, isn't there, in this

607

ethical formalism and religious conventionalism. There is a sort of compulsiveness in the keeping up of the ethical forms that you don't really think about or perhaps even believe in and the conventional religion that you keep up but don't really believe in. You continue to go to church though it's become a mere observance. So there's something compulsive in it. You continue to go along to the centre even though you don't get anything out of it anymore and in a sense don't believe in the value of it anymore.

Padmapani: It seems to imply that one has lost the experience which keeps one going.

Bhante: of course it would be that in certain cases there was no experience, you know, to begin with anyway. Tsong-ka-pa mentions the practice of washing, ceremonial ablutions, that is a kind of conventional religious observance in India, taking a dip in the sacred river, believing that will wash away one's sins, being attached to that particular view, regarding this as the way to salvation. But I think that, broadly speaking, what is meant here is simply clinging to ethical formalism and the conventional religion. I have said sometime that the first three fetters represent the fetters of conventional morality, no was it conventional morality?

yes, conventional morality, I think I said popular religion and academic philosophy. Or rather better number two, academic philosophy, vicikiccha, doubt and indecision and popular religion, the clinging to ethical formalism and conventional religious observance. So to break the three fetters means to actually in effect to free oneself from attachments to, attachment to morality, philosophy and religion. One could look at it like that, if it doesn't give one too much of a shock.

Sagaramati: How would the view of the self fit in with the conventional view of morality?

Bhante: The self expresses itself in compulsiveness, doesn't it. Can the self, in a sense, be anything other than compulsive in its behaviour,

60S

It has, as it were, continually to reinforce itself, it has to go through The same actions. The samsara itself, the wheel of life itself is an expression of compulsiveness.

Sagaramati: So self view is a compulsive mode of. ...

Bhante: It's the basis for compulsive behaviour, yes, which expresses the view of self and at the same time reinforces it.

Manjuvajra: Doesn't this also refer to the fact that you can't save yourself?

Bhante: Possibly yes. Possibly if you are trying to get to heaven, trying to liberate yourself, deliver yourself by one or another of these practices, you believe that there is a permanent self, a real you to be liberated, to be delivered.

Manjuvajra: Cause it says 'holding the five basic constituents as the foundation.'

Bhante: Yes, right. Then it's taking them as real and then holding to Them.

Abhaya: Sorry, what was your terminology for those three. There was popular

religion...

Bhante: Well, I changed it a bit, didn't I. I don't remember what I originally said but the first is silabbata-paramasa, you can say conventional religion perhaps would be better than popular religion. Attachment to conventional religion has to be broken and then academic philosophy. I think I also said popular psychology. That's right, I reduced these three to popular religion, academic philosophy and popular psychology.

Sagaramati: Popular psychology would be the self view.

Bhante: Yes, yeah. I think that's better - conventional religion, academic philosophy and popular psychology.

So get yourself out of the hands of the priest, get yourself out of

609

the hands of the ideologue.

Audience: What?

Bhante: The ideologue, is that correct, is there such a word? And get yourself out of the hands of the shrink. (laughter) You' ll be practically, well not liberated, you'll have broken three great big fetters then.

Abhaya: Ideologist.

Bhante: Yes or ideologue. I think there is such a word. Ideologue.

Abhaya: It didn't sound like a personal word (aside in background: you ideologue!) it sounded more like an abstract noun.

Sagaramati: Ideal ogre.

Ashvajit: One who specialised in producing ideas endlessly.

Bhante: But you see what I mean, don't you? That so many people are attached to quite sort of .... ethical observances for, as it were, quite

negative reasons. I mean, why don't you go and throw a stone through

someone's window? Not because you are really convinced that it's an unskilful thing to do, but you are afraid of the policeman.

Anyway this particular form of opinionatedness is opinionatedness which consists in clinging to ideologies concerning ethical behaviour or as I've called ethical formalism and conventional religion. Both of these collectively, or jointly, correspond to the first fetter.

Padmavajra: Wouldn't the modern Theravadins fall into this?

Bhante: I'm afraid they do, rather heavily in many cases. What makes you a monk is to wear the yellow robe and to shave your head, do these two things, don't eat after twelve, then you are a monk. It practically doesn't matter what else you do, in effect. But this is what I would call ethical formalism. It's even worse than that because wearing the yellow robe, shaving your head and not eating after twelve o'clock, according to the Theravada~~ itself, are matters of conventional morality,

610

not matters of natural morality and are karmically neutral, neither skilful nor unskilful in themselves. But if in a Theravada country you don't wear the yellow robe or you wear a robe

of a slightly different cut or colour, then you are made to feel as if you have committed a major offence.

Ashvajit: That is a really crude manifestation of group behaviour.

Bhante: Hin. For instance there was an Indian Bikkhu whom I knew, who spent a number of years in Ceylon and he happened, on one occasion, to have a serious or severe cold in the head. And he was staying up in the hills in central Ceylon, so being an Indian he just got hold of a small woolen cap and he was wearing that. And there was a tremendous

outcry, a tremendous hullabaloo, photographs of him appeared in the paper - "the shameful monk who wears a woolen cap, and people hooted after him in the street and thereafter for years he was known as the cap wearing bikkhu, he was nicknamed 'the capwearing bikkhu,' and it was regarded as something completely disgraceful to do. So this is really extraordinary if ethical formalism in the guise of Buddhism goes to extremes of that sort, but it's quite common in Theravada circles. They're a bit more relaxed now, this happened twenty years or even maybe thirty years ago, a bit more relaxed now, but one has to be really careful of ethical formalism.

Padma~ni: It is almost.. You get the impression that something is being kept down, that its trying to get at something which...

Bhante: Well why are you ~mid of breaking rules? It's because you don't trust yourself. If I don't keep on observing the rules well then where will I be? What will happen? It is almost as if you think that all hell will be l~t loose and maybe it will!

So ethical formalism is a fetter and this is clearly stated by the Buddha himself and conventional religion, the sort of compulsive performance of various conventional religious ceremonies, this is a fetter. So, in a sense you have to break away from morality in a sense~

611

And in a sense you have to break away from religion, as ordinarily understood, before you can begin to follow the PaTh. This is a quite radical way of thinking, and break a way from

philosophy too, and breakaway from psychology too, certainly western psychology, certainly from psychotherapy and psychoanalysis and all the rest of it. You can't even hope to evolve unless you get away from all them, until you get away from all them. So putting it in an extreme form but perhaps that is quite literally the thing to do.

Alright let's go on. Anything further to understand here. And clearly the function of that sort of clinging is to serve as the basis of uselessness. If your thinking in terms of gaining liberation, gaining deliverance from the samsara, then clinging to conventional, clinging to ethical formalism and clinging to conventional religion are completely

useless.        You're just wasting your time. That is just the truth of the

matter.        (pause).

You may just as well break of this. You may not advance on the path of liberation if you continue clinging to ethical formalism and conventional religion. So you might as well break out. Or better still use those things or even abandon those things in a more creative way so as to get truly onto the path. (Pause)

I remember, this is one of those little incidents in my own career which were in a way quite turning points, little incidents sometimes are. When I was at the Hampstead Buddhist Vihara towards the, I think towards the, what shall I say, no it was after the end of the first year, about the beginning of my second year there, I started to let my hair grow just a little bit long. Until Then I had always had it shaven. I started to let it grow just a little bit long... And it was really astonishing the effect that that produced, in not just Theravada circles, but Bud-hist circles, even Zen people got a bit upset, broad minded Mahayana Buddhists got a bit upset. So then I thought to myself, "Aha! What has started happening already in British Buddhist circles? Ethical formalism. We haven't been going more than a few

612

years. The Buddhist movement isn't more than a few years, a few decades old, and already this has started creeping in". So I therefore let my hair grow longer and longer. And all sorts of reactions set in. Some people liked it very much, others didn't like it at all, and one evening, after a lecture, several people came up to me and spoke about The length of my hair, which was about maybe two and a half inches long by that time. One person came up and said, "I really don't know why you are growing your hair so long, it is really upsetting everybody. We don't know what it means." (laughter) And another person, a woman, came up to me and she whispered, "I really do like that gorgeous, sexy hair." (laughter) Those were her e~cact words. So these were the two opposite reactions and I found this very, very interesting that people reacted in these different ways, that the length of my haJx- was a matter of such concern, such deep concern to so many people. Even Mr Humphr~ys, who is supposed to be so broadminded, sort of tut-tutted a bit about it, though he didn' t actually say anythi~ to me, but I came to understand that he wasn't very happy about this deviation from the norm by someone whom he had admonished personally to regard himself as the Buddhist equivalent to the vicar of Hampstead. (laughter) So there you are, one must really watoh

this, this ethical formalism, well it's not even ethical, this pure formalism creeping in.

Padmavajra: what happened when you started to take your robes off?

Bhante: Well I didn't just take my robes off! (laughter) I wore civilian clothes.

Well again some people liked it very much, some people said, "We prefer you like that, you seem more human..." etc, etc. Though they might have felt that for the wrong reason, you know, quite clearly. Others were deeply disturbed by it and felt that not wearing the robe was equivalent to giving up Buddhism. They saw it in that light, which was really, I mean if you come to think of it is really extraordinary. So

613

I regarded that little incident of the hair as a real sort of turning point and this is one of things I made a very serious mental note of, that that sort of thing must be counteracted. And that's why when I started up the Friends or after the Friends was started up, then I set my face very seriously against things of that sort. Even within the Friends occasionally a bit of formalism creeps in, as wehn someone says, "Well we never do it like that," or "Bhante always did it like that" or even when someone tells me, as has happened once or twice, "Bhante, we don't do it like that, we do it like this". And afterall it is myself who originated doing that, doing things in that way to begin with, but it's as though I am, occasionally as far as some people are concerned, not sort of permitted to deviate from things which I myself have established. So I have to turn around and say, 'well after all who made the rule, if it is a rule? It was just my way of doing things at that time. Does it mean that I am to adhere to that indefinitely?"

i~atnajyoti: Didn't something;~like that come up on the mitra retreat?

Bhante: I don't remember.

Sagaramati: That was about ordination.

Ratnajyoti: That was why I said it, because something had come up, you said "Well I made that rule."

Bhante:       What was that? What rule was that?

Ratnajyoti:    I can't remember what it was about.

~hante: Was it about age, or about length of.. (someone suggests hair) time associated with the Friends. It was something of that sort. Oh no, it was that all the Order Members who knew you ought to be consulted.

Ratnajyoti:    Ah, that was it, yeah.

Bhante (continuing): and then I said that at the beginning there were no Order Members to consult. I had to make up my own mind about who was ready for ordination and who wasn't. There were no order members to begin with, before the first ordinations took place. So if I

614

don't happen to know a certain person it is just a certain, as it were, matter of convenience or, you know, additional safeguard that I consult those who do know, if I know someone individually quite well and well enough for that particular purpose, well, in a sense, there is no need to consult, though obviously one likes everybody to know just what is happening.

Padmavajra:    I don't want to side-track too much but feeling in this term "the way we do things" we have our meditation classes in a certain way and do you think that there is at all a danger in that becoming you know a sort of

Bhante:        I think there is. One must look at things from time to time, at least at the beginning of every session and say, 'well, is that the correct format still for the class, bearing in mind the sort of people that are coming along now?' And so on. It may well be that it isn't

the best format and you come to that conclusion. At least ask yourself at the beginning of every session whether it is. And if a new centre is started up, do we have, in this new centre, to do things in exactly the same way That They were done in the old centre, or is a different kind of format, a different kind of approach more suitable in this instance, in This situation, in this new situation. It is even good just, for a responsible person to vary the way of doing things a little bit from time to time. I do this myself, I don't always take the puja in exactly the same way. I don't mean though that someone should start doing things in his own way, making it his medium for individual expression, not to say individualistic expression; we don't want that at all. But there is no harm in varying things somewhat from time to time, just to make it clear that there is not just one, only, right way of doing things, that there are alternatives. Even the ordination I don't always do in exactly the same way, as you might have noticed. It's partly for that reason, or mainly for that reason. So we don't want to develop the attitude or to give the impression that this is the right way to do a certain thing and

6L5

that is the wrong way to do it, in a rigid way. It may well be that a certain way of doing things is the best in the circumstances but we must be open to the possibility of there being other circumstances in which that wouldn't be the best way of doing things and we must be open to the possibility that there are other as it were permissible variations which can be employed from time to time, just so that nobody gets the idea that there is just one right way of doing certain things, whether it is conducting a meditation class or holding a puja or giving a lecture, or whatever. A certain margin of creative variation is not only permissible but desirable. So that is what I sometimes say, if you start off a new centre, if you are in that position, just look at the situation with a completely open mind, draw on past experience, yes, but don't feel under any obligation to follow any existing pattern, just consider what would be right, what would be good, what would be helpful for this situation, for these people who are coming along and if things have to be done on an entirely different way, so much the better, no harm at all. I mean you might decide if you go and start up a new centre somewhere, you might decide after careful consideration and study of the field that the familiar, as it were, traditional FWBO pattern of beginners' class on Monday and advanced class on Tuesday and yoga on Wednesday and discussion of Thursday after a lecture, followed by order meeting on Friday and a retreat on Saturday and Sunday is the best pattern, you might decide that. But you might decide that that kind of centre even is just not on in that sort of situation. The best thing to do here, the best way of contacting people and getting to know them and getting them involved is to start up a vegetarian restaurant or just to have a community with people in residence leading their own lives. Attract people in that way~ Or you might think the best way of doing it is to start off a business, or you might think the best thing to do is just to go from door to door, knocking on people's door and just giving them a pamphlet and trying to talk to them, or you might think the best way to do it is to go to some open space, the local equivalent to Hyde Park

61E

corner, and get up on the traditional soapbox and hold forth, or to have a stall in the market on market days, there's all these other possibilities which you should consider. Not just, as it were, mechanically almost compulsively go on repeating every where you go the same old standard pattern that worked so well, or so we like to think, at Sakura and Archway all those years and years and years. Consider the situation quite a creative one, where you can just decide for yourself as though the movement was completely new and nothing had ever been done before. I mean the chances are that you may well conclude that the standard

pattern, or a recognisable variant of it, is the best but don't come to the conclusion automatically.

Oh, we've gone overtime. We have still got quite a bit to do, how far have we got? ~perhaps we'll have to end there, because it is six fifteen.

Clinging to ideologies or wrong opinion. Well perhaps we had better leave that till tomorrow, that's a quite lengthy one, it seems to need a certain amount of discussion, especially some of the non Buddhist schools of thought are mentioned. Alright let's leave that.

Any query about what we have done so far. We've got a bit off the beaten track today, don't know who is responsible for that. It is amazing how quickly the time goes.

Dharma~la: I don't think we've got really off the track. I think This is really spreading it away from the text maybe, but it's still on the same subject.

Padmavajra: I think it~s quite a relevant Thought actually, this one over our actual approach to presenting Buddhism in the FWBO.

Bhante: Sometimes I say that one might well consider that the best thing for an individual order member to do would be just to go to those places where he can meet people and just talk to them on an individual basis, go to some place like Trafalgar Square in The month of July or August, maybe go everyday, just spend the day there, with some sandwiches, and just talk to whoever is around, not with any preconceived idea of handing

them Buddhism as it were, but just in a friendly way to get to know them. If you do come to any exchange of communication and if there is something of Buddhism in you it will come across anyway, you don't have to think about it in any self-conscious way. If it's there it will come out, in a natural sort of way, a spontaneous sort of way. Just go around just to talk, to get involved with people and to communicate as best you can and as truly as you can and that's one very good way of getting people interested.

~admavajra: It seems that Sukhavati is moving away from the well-tried and tested formulae. From what I have heard Subhuti sort of

Bhante: Well Sukhavati is not a centre yet, so we'll have to wait and see but it is to be anticipated that things will be done there in a more comprehensive and maybe even more creative way than was possible before and all sorts of new possibilities could be considered just because the facilities are so much greater, at least for that reason. You have got so many more people there, you've got a whole community. It's as simple as that.

New Session

Bhante.. Yes, we're on the fifth and last form of opinionatedness, which is simply wrong opinion, that's page 79. So let's get started with that. Who is going to read?

Sagaramati (reads):

"It is an emotionally tainted appreciation which sees the relationship of cause and effect of one's action and (the relationship) of earlier and later life as non-existent."

Bhante: What about the quote from the Abhidharmasamuccaya? The section begins with that paragraph.

Sagaramati (reads):

"The statement that its function is to serve as a basis of uselessness is self explanatory."

6£8

3hante: You are still missing something. It starts off with:-

The (?) -pa kun - btus (Abhidharmasamuccaya) explains 'wrong opinion' as follows.

Sagaramati: I was going to get onto that.

~hante: That is where 'wrong opinion~ begins.

Sagaramati: Sorry, my wrong opinion (commences reading)

"The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains 'wrong opinion' as follows:

What is wrong opinion? It is the denial of cause and effect and of action and its result, and it negates and does away with what is. Wrong opinion is an acceptance, claim, opinion as dogma, fiction, and opinion which holds on to error. Its function is to eradicate the good, to cut off the root of what is positive, to make the root of what is evil healthy, and to get into evil but not into the~positive."

Bhante: Carry on with this then.

Sagaramati: (reads)

"It is an emotionally tainted appreciation which sees the relationship of cause and effect of one's action and (the relationship) of earlier and later life as non-existent. Regarding

this the lam - rim states,

A perverted opinion is an emotionally toned appreciation which denies causation as to former and later life, the relationship between one's action and its effect, and holds that Siva or prakrti are the causes of sentient beings.

Bhante: Siva meaning roughly god, prakrti meaning nature. So it 'S clear what 'wrong opinion' is in general. Basically it's a denial of cause and effect, of action and result and on that account it eradicates the good, cuts off the root of what is positive, makes the root of evil healthy - that is rather a strange expression, certainly not healthy in skilful sense - and get~ into evil. but not into the positive. Well

619

let's go into the four forms, the four kinds of wrong opinion, that will probably make the matter clearer.

Ashvajit (reads):

There are four kinds of wrong opinions:

1. Denial of cause 2. Denial of effect 3. Denial of agent 4. Denial of what is in front of one's eyes

Denial of cause is to see good actions, bad actions, etc, as non-existent.

Bhante: What is meant by 'as non-existent'?

Ratnajyoti: Non-existent as a cause.

Bhante: Non-existent as a cause, yes, as in fact good or as in fact bad. This is the sort of Indian idiom. Not that one literally sees the actions themselves as non-existent, as

inapplicable, as meaningless, (pause) One sees, that is to say, the distinction between good actions and bad actions as a meaningless distinction therefore one has no ethical norms. For instance, in the Fali texts, this sometimes takes the form of saying that one does not recognise one's mother as one's mother and that therefore one should have a certain attitude towards her, a certain ethical attitude nor, in the same way, one's father as one's father. One is no better than an animal to whom mother and father are just two other animals. There are no ethical relations in other words.

Ratnajyoti: It would be clearer if it just said denial of cause is to see skilful action and unskilful actions.

Bhante: Well It's denial of the fact that there are such things as ~ilful actions and such things as unskilful actions. But to describe them as non existent, if you took it literally, would be very misleading indeed, but that is the Indian idiom.

Manjuvajra: One often gets the impression, in some areas of Buddhism, that one shouldn't make the distinction between good and bad. Is that completely false view?

620

Bhante: Well on what level? on what level?

Nanjuvajra: Is this looking from above down, as it were?

Bhante: In a sense. But even when one looks from above down, one will still see skilful and unskilful. The mere fact that you look down, what does it mean, looking down? I mean seeing, as it were, another level. So when you see another level you see what pertains to that level, what is appropriate to that level. Therefore you see skilful and unskilful. Or at least you seem to others to be seeing, you~~seem to others to be looking down and to be seeing skilful and unskilful or you seem to others to be talking in terms of skilful and unskilful. Whether you, yourself, see things ultimately that way, that is another matter.

Manjuvajra: So the texts, or whatever, that talk in terms of not seeing good or bad are talking

from the point of view of the mind of an enlightened being?

Bhante: Oh yes, very much so. Though even from the standpoint of the mind of someone who is enlightened, there is such a thing as skilful and unskilful as far as the unenlightened are concerned. Or why should the enlightened person recommend certain courses of action and not others? Or at least appear to do so. So there isn't a complete ethical indeterminism on all levels even for the enlightened person.

Abhaya: I think that's a pretty rife miccha ditthi actually.

Bhante: Well probably spread in Buddhist circles, or Western Buddhist circles at least for a kind of pseudo Zen. This is what Alan Watts called 'beat zen'. Whereas 'square zen' is going to the other extreme, insisting on all the rules, regulations, paraphernalia, rituals of traditional Japanese Buddhism or Japanese Zen.

Manjuvajra: I think that the qualification you made seems to, is quite important, for me anyway. I mean it makes me see the Buddha in a very  
621

different way. Rather than seeing him as a sort of judge that determines, you know kind of determines almost, in an isolated way, that this is a skilful action, this is an unskilful action. It seems that...

Bhante: No it's not that he sees the skilful and the unskilful in the abstract, but that he can see more clearly than the unenlightened person, what would be the skilful thing for that unenlightened person to do, and what would be the unskilful thing.

Ashvajit: To do in what sense?

Bhante: To perform, to act of course.

Ashvajit: A piece of advice that will lead him in the direction of greater. ...

Bhante: Yes, I mean not that he has, in his own enlightened mind, neatly drawn up, you know, a list of rights and wrongs, good and bad things to do, but he just as it were, looks at that particular situation, that particular person, and he sees what for him would be a step in the direction of enlightenment i. e. what for him would be the skilful thing to do. Per~p~ there are several skilful things that person could do, and presumably the enlightened mind sees all that much more clearly than the unenlightened mind of The person concerned.

What's number two?

Ashvajit (reads):

"Denial of effect is to see the positive and negative as having no consequence.

Ehante: It's as though one could look at this in two ways. One could say that it is the consequence of denying that there are such things as positive and negative actions in any sense or one could say that it is the view that there are such things as positive and negative actions but not in the sense that they have any particular kind of distinctive effect.

622

Ashvajit: Bad actions are as good as good actions.

Bhante: In terms of consequences, or maybe there are no consequences at all according to somebody's view.

What about the next one?

Ashvajit (reads):

"Denial of agent is to see father and mother, previous and later worlds as non existent.

Bhante: This connects with what I said before - to recognise father and mother means basically to recognise ethical relations. And previous and later worlds is to recognise the

possibility of rebirth into other realms of existence, conditioned existence, in accordance with one's skilful and unskilful actions.

But why is this form of 'wrong opinion' called denial of agent do you think?

Ashvajit: There is something which brings about a situation.

Ehante: Which brings about an ethical situation or a situation that has ethical significance. In a way it is the denial of the ethical agent, if you see what I mean. If you do not recognise ethical relationships, if you do not recognise that you have an ethical relationship say, for example, with your mother and father, that they are not just two other human beings, or even two other animals, no different from any other human beings, no different from any other animals. If you don't recognise, as it were, a special duty to your mother and father in as much as they are your mother and father, if you don't recognise that you have a moral responsibility towards them, that your relationship with them is essentially ethical, then you do not regard yourself as an ethical agent, as an ethical personality, you do not regard yourself as capable of ethical actions, therefore not as an ethical agent. So the denial of cause is like refusing to recognise that certain actions are ethical actions. Denial of effect is refusing to recognise that ethical actions have ethical consequences. Denial of agent is refusal to recognise oneself

623

as an ethical being.

What is the fourth one then?

Ashvajit (reads):

"Denial of what is in front of one's eyes is to see the attainments of the Buidhas and Arahants as non existent."

Bhante: This is frequently referred to in the Pali texts, this sort of wrong view along with the others, the refusal to recognise that there are in the world beings who have attained

liberation, deliverance, enlightenment or whatever else one may choose to call it. In other words it is the refusal to recognise not just the possibility that such a thing as enlightenment can be attained but the fact that there are, individuals who actually have attained it, it isn't just an abstract ideal, it is not only a realisable thing, it is a thing that has been realised in history by other human beings.

Ratnajyoti: Refusal to accept the proof of it.

Bhante: To the extent that there can be a proof, but certainly to refuse to recognise the fact of the existence of such beings, more highly developed than one~elf, not only more highly developed but actually enlightened such as Buddhas and Arahants. So it is to see there attainment as non existent, to see them not as Buddhas and Aranants but as ordinary unenlightened people. It's the refusal to recognise the concrete possibility of enlightenment. Because if you don't believe that anyone has ever gained enlightenment you won't be very strongly motivated to gain enlightenment yourself, if you believe that it is a state that nobody has ever reached and nobody at present has attained.

Ashvajit: This has bought up a lot of strong feelings in me, I don't know why, connected, I think, with my parents. I wonder whether in fact one has any ethical responsibility to, as it were, enlighten one's parents?

624

Bhante: Ethical responsibility.

Ashvajit: Supposing one ...

Bhante: No, just a minute. The word 'ethical' not 'spiritual'. You see what I mean. There is a recognition of oneself as an ethical being and therefore having an ethical relationship with the people with whom one is most closely connected. Now that doesn't involve anything so advanced as it were as leading them towards the path of enlightenment, you may not be thinking in terms of enlighten- ment at all, but you have ehtical responsibility to recognise that they are your parents, that they brought you up, that they took a lot of trouble, that you should, in inverted commas, feel grateful towards them, that you should help them, that you should look after them in their old age, this is what is meant. The ethical life is essentially a life devoted to ethical relationships, isn't it, or giving an ethical quality to

relationships? So with regard to whom does one practise that, you begin with those to whom you are most nearly connected.

Ashvajit: If one has that feeling, one attempts to give it equally to everybody.

Bhante: Yes, but if you can't treat your parents ethically probably there's not much chance that you will treat anybody else ethically. That your training ground as it were, you don't even leave home until you are twelve, fourteen or sixteen. What are you going to do all that time? Your ethical training as it were starts there. So if you've grown up without any feeling towards your parents or any sense of ethical responsibility, if you have grown up without any experience of ethical relationships, you are unlikely to extend the network of your ethical relationships so as to include all the other people with whom you have come~into contact. (Pause) In other words it's almost as though the family to use that term for a moment, the family in which you grow up is, at least if it is a healthy family, a sort of training

625

ground for you as regards the maintenance and cultivation of ethical relationships. It's like when the parent says to the child, "well, you shouldn't do that to your little sister, she doesn't like it, it hurts." Well what is this? It's a training in an ethical relationship. I mean the little boy might like to treat his sister roughly and cruelly but he is taught, he is trained not to do that. In other words he is trained to regard her as another human being not just as another wild animal. But even wild animals don't always behave in that sort of way. In other words he is trained to be an ethical being in relation to his little sister. So in the same way the parents train him or her to be an ethical being not just a little animal in relation to them as the child grows older. I mean they don't always do it very successfully but this is in fact the ethics of the situation.

Abhaya: So you could say, in fact that your parents are contributing to your present position, ethically speaking...

Bhante: They've socialise you. This is the main function of the parents and the family, whether the nuclear family or the extended family, is to socialise this little animal that is born, to socialise as positively as possible, not in the sense of getting hold of him and beating him into submission and forcing him.-to do all sorts of things which he doesn't want to do, but bringing him up in such a way that he can be a member of the human community. The fact that the human community, that society at large has got certain very negative features at present in some parts of the world, at least, shouldn't blind us to the fact that the normal state

of affairs is for the parents to socialise the child in a positive and healthy sense to take his place ideally in a positive and healthy society. What is happening at present is that many children are being imperfectly socialised and another aspect of that whole question is that perhaps some parents feel that the society for which they are socialising or supposed to be socialising the child isn't the sort of society for

626

which in fact a child should be socialised. They have ceased to believe in the society, some of them at least, for which the child is being socialised. But still this is a temporary breakdown and it shouldn't be allowed to abstract the more, as it were, normative aspects of the situation. Do you see what I am getting at?

Manjuvajra: I think that quite a lot of parents nowadays bring up their children on the idea that they shouldn't put anything on the kid, they shouldn't try to control it or teach it anything.

Bhante: That simply means that you are letting loose a little animal on society and you have him at home too. Admittedly there are difficulties, the fact that society is imperfect and even in certain ways quite undesirable and negative, unhealthy doesn't mean that one should give up all attempts to socialise the child in a positive and constructive way. Perhaps as the child grows up one can talk to the child and maybe explain these things, help the child to see what is happening, what is going on, and that just because society isn't perfect it doesn't mean that he has got to be necessarily negative and destructive. For instance you notice when, so I gather from newspaper reports at least, that criminals, especially those who are of the pathological type, not only have got no ethical sense with regard to society at large but no ethical sense in their personal relationships either. I think a person who is capable of ethical personal relationships will also be capable of adopting an ethical attitude to society at large, which doesn't mean that he may not take, on certain occasions, considered action against that society. But it will be taken not sort of blindly and reactively like an untrained child or a wild animal, it will be taken as the action of an ethically responsible individual doing the best he can, in an aware and mindful manner, for himself and other members of his society.

Sagarajati: You hear of laws amongst criminals. Because you are brought up in a criminal environment but you still have ethical and

627

moral (?)

Bhante: That is where, perhaps in the case of the non pathological criminal, but it is also notorious how quickly criminals squeal on one another, how quickly they let one another down and all that kind of thing.

Manjuvajra: There is a little proverb, isn't there - when someone is entirely unethical, you say that they would sell their grandmother for sixpence, which you can reflect on, going back onto the family.

Bhante: So it does show that the family, using the word very loosely for either a nuclear family or an extended type family, is, from an ethical point of view, quite important. This is where, or should be where, you get your ethical training and surely the type of training you receive within the family when you are quite young affects the whole of your subsequent attitude towards society. This connects up with what we were saying the other day about education and the attitude of children towards teachers and the fact that teachers don't enjoy the same respect in society now perhaps that they used to and the fact that parents encourage children in some cases to disrespect teachers. It means that the parents' ethical training of the children does not extend to inculcating a respect for the teacher i.e. what the teachers stand for, so of course there is trouble. So if the parents inculcate a negative and destructive attitude towards

society, or if their negative and destructive attitude or, at least, careless and indifferent attitude rubs off onto the children, well that does not bode well either for the life of the family itself or for the larger life of society.

p~mapani: I remember you saying that on an early keffolds retreat, about how in the Victorian times the idea of the hero was very in vogue. Now there is this trend towards always breaking things down which is reflected in people's attitudes towards things. They want to break things down rather than build things up.

62S

Bhante: Well there is a positive breaking down, breaking down with a positive attitude as well as breaking down with a negative attitude.

Well what we seem to see nowadays is the breaking down with a negative, a purely reactive

attitude, not any, one could call, constructive breaking down. Some of the great Victorians were great iconoclast. Carlyle was a great iconoclast in many respects, so was Ruskin, so was Darwin.

Ratnajyoti: What's an iconoclast?

Bhante: One who breaks idols, that is to say who destroys things that other people worship and attach great value to.

Sagaramati: I got the idea of Carlyle being quite the opposite. He was always going on about heroes - Goethe, Wagner.

Bhante: But don't forget that this was opposed to contemporary, the popular Victorian thinking. He brought this way of thinking before the public, but it certainly wasn't fashionable when he began doing this. And he denounced the age for its lack of taste, its indifference to spiritual things. But his attitude was that of the angry prophet, bewailing society for its materialism and greed, its mass culture and its indifference to the great individual, the genius or the hero.

~~~~~i: Does that mean when one reaches such a low ebb of sort of negativity, Bhante, in say the society through the media it starts taking an upward swing again towards, you know, forming sort of hero images and sort of like the warrior?

Bhante: I think it is very difficult to generalise, because, in a way, all these things are going on all the time. It's a question of the relative degree of emphasis. Anyway to get back to the original point, the denial of the relationship of say father and son or mother and son, the denial of the ethical relationship in that sort of way is very important because it affects the whole of one's subsequent outlook

and conduct. So from a wrong opinion, this is the important point, to refuse to recognise oneself as an ethical individual and to refuse to behave in an ethical manner towards, or to treat in an ethical manner, those with whom one might be expected to have had the longest ethical association represents the application of any extreme wrong view. As I said earlier on, if you can't treat your parents decently who can you treat decently? If I mean its through your parents that you receive your basic ethical training, if something has gone wrong with your ethical relationship with them then it means that something has gone wrong with your basic ethical training. I think this is the situation of many people today. Something has gone wrong with their relationship with their parents, perhaps it went wrong almost from the beginning, something therefore has gone wrong with their basic ethical attitude, their basic attitude towards society itself. They have had no practice in ethical relationships.

I mean and also to give a child ethical training requires quite a lot of skill, it requires quite a lot of time. Several primitive people, far in advance of ourselves in many respects, take this very very seriously. It isn't just a question of being heavy handed with the child and saying, "you musn't do this," or, "you musn't do that," and punishing it vigorously when it breaks the rules. It's much more a question of just getting the child to behave in a certain way but if you possibly can in a natural and pleasant manner so that the child wants to behave in that particular way and that also means showing an example. And you see the Indians are really excellent in this respect, they really do know how to train children in a very natural and easy and affectionate way without all the heavy handedness that we tend to associate with that kind of thing.

Abhaya:        They always seem so much brighter and happier too.

630

Bhante' It means always being very patient with the child and trying to get the child to see why he or why she shouldn't do a certain thing why it isn't very pleasnat or desirable to do it. It means maybe sometimes reasoning with the child, being firm but being very kind and paying attention to how the child is developing in this sort of respect, whether the child is becoming an ethical individual, which doesn't mean a child that knows what the rules are and he is going to get rewarded if he keeps them and punished if he doesn't but a child who develops, as a result of his training, a certain ethical sensitivity, you know a certain sensitivity about other human beings, which means a positive attitude towards other human beings. So that the child gradually, naturally wants to be kind, wants to generous, wants to share, wants to be considerate and is a happy and affectionate child.

Padma~ani: So a basis of this healthy happy, human...

~hante: Indeed, yes. So if you consider that the child at that very impressionable period, the most impressionable period of his or her life is with the parents, especially with the mother for so many years, right up to twelve, fourteen, sixteen. Well if the child hasn't developed as an ethical individual during that period there is not much hope that he subsequently will. So parents have this great responsibility which nowadays only too many of them neglect. It's partly the fault of the parents because the society for which they are supposed to be training the child doesn't appear a very attractive ~ciety and some parents may think, "well why should I train my child for that sort of society". But if you don't train your child as an ethical individual it means the breakup of family life in the positive sense, it means also the breakup of personal relationships because in subsequent life the child won't be able perhaps to enter into personal relationships as a responsible, mature, ethical individual or enter into them in a selfish, irresponsible, childish fashion and will not

631

be a very positive member of society, assuming there is a positive society of which he can be a positive member, but even if there isn't a positive society or even if society is very imperfect, it's a very dangerous and very irresponsible thing to bring a child up with a predominantly negative attitude towards society as such. This is really sowing the seeds of disaster for the future and I think this is what has been going on at least in Britain over the last one or two gene~tions. I think probably that I belong to the last of the generations, that is pre-war generations, that was brought up in a reasonably positive way with regard to society and I think that the post-war generations not so. I don't know how it is in other countries. I think that other countries~ may be worse than Britain and others better. I think that even if you look around amongst our own friends, many of them are deeply affected by this negative attitude towards society which has got a certain amount of justification if you look at society from a spiritual point of view but sometimes the negativity, well, is quite unskilful, and there are still many aspects of society which are not all that bad or which in some cases quite good and we mustn't think it a sign of spiritual superiority and spiritual advancement that we can be very scornful about society and its drawbacks and imperfections. That would be a very short sighted attitude and a very complacent attitude.

Kamalasila: This makes the house-holder's life quite a positive challenge.

Bhante: Yes, if you have a completely negative attitude to society there is no place at all for the householder's life, from a spiritual point of view. If you have a positive attitude towards society it means that there is a place for the householder's life in the positive sense and if there is a place for the householder's life, if you have a positive attitude towards that, there must be a positive society,

632

or at least a society which is positive to some extent, to provide the wider context for the householder's life itself and the more positive the society the more positive the householder's life can be, the less positive the society, the less positive the householder's life can be.

Padmavajra: So we have to accept that we are in a society no matter how bad it might be and use it. It is no good to kind of, particularly Thinking in terms of the Friends, we can't break it down.

Bhante: It isn't skilful to adopt a completely negative and destructive attitude towards the society in the midst of which you live, however bad that may be and however much in need of improvement it may be.

Ashvajit: It seems to be quite a problem at Pundarika from all that I hear. They have a lot of 'skin-head' types and young people who seem from what I hear to be quite negative and I wonder how much of that is actually so or how much is generated by the attitude of, you know, 'we are spiritual superiors

Padmavajra: No, not that at all, mate.

Sagaramati: I say that is stupid, that. If you stood outside and had milk bottles thrown at you, I don't think you are adopting any superior spiritual attitude by thinking that person to be unethical.

Vimalamitra: They are just a bunch of wild animals.

Ehante: They've been insufficiently socialised.

Padmavajra: Well they are people whose upbringing has been...

Bhante: Disrupted.

Ratnajyoti: Well they are quite good examples because in some of them, not all of them, but in some of them you can see that, in a way, they are basically quite sort of healthy children.

Phante: They are healthy young animals, but they are not yet healthy young human beings because they haven't been socialised.

633

Sagaxamati: You have only got to see, I mean Lokamitra has had contact with some of their parents, and their parents were just complete (idiots)? I mean they're not human so I mean how can they rear human children.

Padmavajra: Well that's not to say that we walk around thinking we're spiritually superior, not at all, I think we're very good at Pundarika at being quite integrated.

Sagaramati: In fact if anything they have a reasonable relationship with us. They have a better relationship with us than they do with some of their parents, I think.

Bhante: Yes. Well some of the little kids I saw around there, some of the little

mischief makers and window breakers seemed rather pathetic, as though were almost in need of a decent firm but kir~y father at least. They had outgrown the need for mother.

Vimalamitra: That's probably why they keep on, because they get some kind of relationship with the Friends there. I think they rather like it.

Padmavajra: Well Buddhadasa told me that when he was caretaker,' he said

he felt the kids, they wanted for someone to take them and give them w

a really good sort of, a little dig but with a friendly sort of ~

there, and he sa~ he did that often and they used to really, they used to enjoy it, that's what they wanted.

3hante Anyway let's leave that I think we have said enough about it. let's carry on after 'Buddhas and Arahants as non existent'. Maybe we should talk about that a little more. Because nowadays it is a fact that probably the vast majority of people, even many r~l'igious people or people who consider themselves as religious, don't in fact consider that there are in the world any beings who are actually what one might call enlightened or that there is such a thing as, you know, a level of higher spiritual attainment which not only is it possible

634

to attain but which living people, at least in Tibet or India, have actually attained. For instance in the Catholic church there is still this ideal, if one can call it that, of saintship and saints are still being produced, right down into the twentieth century but you don't find anything like that in ?rotestantism, do you? Maybe this is perhaps one of the reasons why we have more ex-Catholics around than we do ex-Protestants, proportionately, because the Catholics at least have kept alive the idea that such a thing as saintliness is a possible in the twentieth century as it was in the twelfth, as it was in the second. ~ut Protestants look back to the age of the apostles and there doesn't seem to be very much in between, except the dark ages of Catholic supersition and papal supremacy and all the rest of it. You have got Martin Luther (laughter) who threw an inkpot at the devil and had many esteemable qualities, but a saint? a saint?

Robert:           Doe~'t Billy Graham think he's pretty hot stuff? (Laughter)

Bhante:           Yes, maybe, but we are talking about saintliness. I mean it was a real eyeopener to me and to several other people to see the face of Billy Graham staring at us from a billboard, from enormous posters, all over London, with those eyes which looked quite demented. Yes, do you remember this? It was quite extraordinary. He was going to appear in London for some great religious meeting and there were enormous posters on bill boards afl over the place and he had these staring, sandpackled (?) sort of eyes, demented is I think the appropriate word.

Abhaya:           Sandpackled?

Bhante:           Sanpaku is a Japanese word. It describes eyes- which are completely surrounded by white, which are wide open and the white of the eyes shows all the way around the iris. There was a book published some years ago called 'Are you Sanpaku?!.

                  But this, to come back to the point, is why perhaps we have  
635

such difficulty very often in explaining to people what Buddhism, what the Friends are all about. Because people don't think in terms, not only of evolution, but of the possibility of actually attaining some higher, more enlightened state of human existence. So perhaps we have got to realise that There are these very basic issues that have to be clarified first before you start talking about meditation and all that sort of thing. But there is another level of development which does exist which is attainable, which has been attained and that this is a practicable possibility for human beings. Because people unless they have read writings of say Teilard de Chardin and one of two other more esoteric figures of that type, they will be unlikely to be familiar with this kind of thinking, in view of their general sort of Christian especially protestant background. They may think in terms of, 'believe and you will be saved,' but of growth, of actual development, no they won't. They won't naturally think in that sort of way.

Padmavajra:    Did you say that before we even talk in terms of meditation, growth we should, you know, say...

Bhante:           We should make sure that before or when when we talk about meditation that people do have clearly The idea that meditation is not - just a way of making you feel at peace with yourself and happy and comfortable on the level of the development at which you already are but that it is a means, an instrument for a further development, for the attainment

of a state, even the permanent attainment of a state which is considerably beyond the present average human state. This means bringing in the whole idea of evolution and growth and development in a radical sort of way.

Padmavajra: Do you think this is quite an important point when we are in a beginners' meditation class, we are taking it or someThing, and we are describing what the purpose of the meditation is for, and

636

M.B.P. 22 what...

Bhante: Well it depends, you know, what I mean how, it depends to what extent the beginners are beginners. You may feel it necessary just to speak in terms of getting a bit of piece of mind and just leave it at that for the time being. But sooner or later, especially if they come along regularly, you have got to make it clear that it isn't just a question of a more peaceful and happy state of mind on one's present level. It's a question of rising to a higher level and as it were consolidating one's existence there. It's a question of permanent growth, permanent development; and that brings in the idea of the higher evolution-almost of a new mutation of the human species- but conducted by each individual, not of the species as a whole, collectively. Otherwise they may think that they know what you are talking about, and you may think that they know what you are talking about, but actually they won't be knowing what you are talking about, and you won't be realising that, or perhaps you'll be talking at cross purposes.

Someone: Sorry, if what?

Bhante: If this question of development and evolution to a higher level is not made clear. Because usually if you talk about growth and development, what do people think in turn? Just becoming a bit more happy, a bit more peaceful, a bit more relaxed but any radical change in your state of consciousness, any radical change in your whole outlook, your whole level of development, they are not going to think in those terms unless you make it absolutely clear. All they think in terms of growth is sort of growing up, just becoming a bit more of a human being. Well it also includes that at its lower levels but it goes beyond that at its higher levels.

Ratnajyoti: There's a good example of that in that 'Padma,' the interview with Craig. At the end he says, if he found that he was being drawn away from his friends, he would leave.

637

Bhante: Yes, that is quite interesting. One cannot but be drawn away from one's friends if they don't develop. I mean not that you will no longer be able to communicate with them, but you will no longer be able to communicate fully because there is something in you with which they just cannot be in contact in as much as it hasn't been developed in them.

Padmavajra: I think that it is quite important in our regular's meditation classes to have talks now and again and we really emphasise that, where you get into things like, 'well why are we here, why do we come here,' and be quite sort of straight, and I think that can have quite an effect. It might frighten some, though.

Bhante: For instance people go along to church but why, on the whole, do they go along to church? It's in a way to reinforce their existing attitude, their existing way of life and to receive a certain consolation or a little temporary outlet to enable them to go along as before, but they don't think in terms of any radical change, except of course in some of the more extreme protestant, almost pentecostal movements and they think of the change in a rather dramatic almost sensational manner but as far as I can see as not necessarily involving that sort of development that we think in terms of.

Sagaramati: T.M. seems to be geared to that sort of view. It helps you along in your business.

Padmavajra: Helps you to live in the twentieth century.

Bhante: Well maybe it does, but maybe that is also an aspect of the whole thing. One needs at least to survive in the twentieth century and if T.M. helps you, well that's great. But you need to do more than survive, you need to, whether in the twentieth century or any other, you need also to grow and develop and it does seem that T.M. doesn't

help very much there.

Ashvajit: It seems to be a terrible travesty of the word 'transcendental' as well.

Bhante: That's true. Because one is asked quite often about transcendental meditation and we ourselves use the word 'transcendental' but it almost suggests that they are already way up there, so one has sometimes to tactfully suggest that transcendental meditation in that sense isn't all that transcendental in our sense. It's sometimes not very much more than therapeutic.

So denial of what is in front of one's eyes is to see the attainments of Buddhas and Arahants as non-existent. This is the view whether consciously or unconsciously of so many people today and that's a wrong view. So also to put it more positively, you know perhaps this is one of the advantages, one of the functions of having say festivals and celebrations because then one can speak of the attainment of the Buddha or the attainment of Padmasambhava or the attainment of Bodhidharma and it becomes important, I think, to stress the fact that in the history of Buddhism there are so many people who have attained who have actually experienced these higher levels. And to draw the attention of people not only to the path but to these various examples of the actual attainment of the goal of the path or what, as far as one can see, is the goal of the path. Maybe there is something even further on but at least one can say that here are people who have attained levels very much higher than the level of ordinary humanity.

Alright let's go right on from there.

Padmavajra (reads):

"Although, generally, there are many wrong views, the wrong views that deny the relationship between action and its results and (the relationship) between previous and later worlds are the worst of all because they eliminate

everything positive."

Shall I go on?

Bhante: Yes, go on.

Padmavajra (continues reading):

"Now, if the five kinds of opinionatedness are summarised,  
they fall under affirmation and negation. Their internal differentiation are:

1. the twenty ways of opinionatedness regarding the perishable;

Bhante: These have already been described.

Padmavajra (continues reading):

2. sixty two bad views;

Bhante: As detailed in the Brahmajal~ Sutra, for instance, in the Digha Nikaya.

Padmavajra (continues reading):

and 3. fourteen indeterminate ones.

Bhante: These are the views about the identity of the life principle and The body, whether the Tathagatha exists after death or does not. I mean if one adheres to any of these alternatives, that becomes a wrong view.

Padmavajra: (continues reading):

"The sixty two 'bad views' have been explained in the

(p.80) Brahmajala Sutta. To list them all individually would go

too far, so they are not put down here.

Bhante: I sometimes point out the fact that the Brahmajala Sutta is the first Sutta of the Digha Nikaya, in Pali. The Digha Nikaya is the first Nikaya in the Sutta Pitaka. The Sutta Pitaka is the first of the Three Pitakas - so what does that mean? That when you open the Tripitaka, the first thing you come across, the first

640

thing you come across, the first Sutta that you read, deals with wrong views! It's as though you have to get these all out of the way first, before you can make any sort of progress at all, have any access to the Dharma - have any access to the spiritual life. It may be coincidental, but one likes to think that the old compilers of the oral tradition knew what they were about when they included this particular sutta, and placed it right at the beginning, right in the forefront of the Tipitaka.

Asvajit: It's a very satisfying thing to read.

Mark Barret: What is it called again?

Bhante: It's the Brahmajala Sutta, in Pali. It's the great net - the great net in which all wrong views are caught. That is, all wrong views existing in the Buddha's day, among Sramanas and brahmanas. He catches them all in his great net.

Nanjuvajra: Brahma..

Bhante: j -a-l-a, -jala.

Padmavajra: It's written down here in Sanskrit.

Manju: Oh, I see.

Bhante: So, apparently the corresponding Sanskrit collection, of the Sarvastivadins, was arranged in the same way.

Asvajit: Would you say that it refutes all possible false views?

Bhante: I don't know, that would perhaps be going too far - I said all the wrong views which were extant in India at that time around shramanas and brahminas - perhaps in principle it includes them all, but no doubt there are all sorts of variations. I'm sure that nowadays we have more than 62 wrong views!

Asvajit: Perhaps they could all be categorised?

Bhante: That's a bit.. Lets go on, then.

641

radmavaj ra (reads)

(p.80 paragraph 4) 'The fourteen indeterminate views life force' (P.5 paragraph 6, P.81 paragraph 1) 'a Tathagata will appear and will neither appear or not appear at the time of one's death'

Bhante: This is a quite different interpretation, and is probably incorrect. The original "choto skoti" (?), in this respect was that, there were four views, four possibilities: that the Tathagata, the Buddha, exists after death - that is to say the disappearance of his own physical body; does not exist; or both; or neither.

Mark: Can you say it again? - That his....

Bhante: There are four possibilities: one, that the Buddha exists after death, after the death of his physical body. That's one possibility, which is rejected. That he does not exist after the death of the physical body, that also is rejected. That he both exists and does not exist - in different senses - that is rejected. And that he neither exists nor does not exist. In other words the Buddha cannot be thought about in those terms at all - To try to think of him in any of those four ways, or to adhere to any of those four views, is a wrong view.

Padmavajra: It's quite interesting. You said this is a wrong interpretation - it's got 'at the-times of (one's) death' - 'one's' is in brackets.

Bhante: Yes. That is presumably inserted by the translator.

Padmavajra: But 'appear' is a bit, er, misleading, isn't it.

Bhante: Mm. But one is going from Sanskrit to Tibetan, and from Tibetan into English, but undoubtedly the view as recorded in the Hinayana texts, Pali and Sanskrit, is as I've explained it.

Vimalamitra: That's pretty bad, isn't it.

642

~njudvaja: What about, in the Sutra of Golden Light, where it says that the Tathagata's like. .15, e~....

Bhante: M-hm, well what Tathagata is one concerned with here?

Manju: The one of the Mahayana.

Bhante: Er, yes, one is concerned with the Dharmakaya - so one is concerned with a

level above time. One is not concerned so much with the human historical Buddha figure. It's more like the principle of Buddhahood.

Manju: This refers to the historical figure, doesn't it.

Bhante: Yes, Yes. Because these speculations arose originally with regard to the historical Buddha, Sakyamuni. His disciples wondered, apparently, whether he would exist after death - or not, or both, or neither, and the Buddha himself, according to the Pali texts, rejected all four views, and said that he was not to be thought of in any of those four ways: that even during his lifetime he was incomprehensible, what to speak of after his death.

Padmavajra: It's like that verse - it reminds me of that verse in the Diamond Sutra

Bhante: ~. Alright, let's carry on, then, with these fourteen.

Robert (p.8 paragraph 2)

"The two which deal with the body and life force are the views that the body and life force are either one substance or different ones"

Bhante: ~. It's the body and the life force, the jivitendriya, the life-faculty. Well, this is a matter which still troubles modern thinkers - whether life, or mind, or whatever one likes to call it, is identical with the physical body or not. The Buddha rejected

both views.

Sagaramati: Personally, I can't help falling for the one that it's not.

It's not identical with it, because to say that it's identical with it - when you die, I mean to say that it's - you know, when you die, obviously it's - if the life force was identical with it, it would end there. If anything goes on after the physical death, it must be that it is different from the body.

Bhante: But it might be answered that there is the sort of seed or potentiality of the physical body present.. Also, what is ~? There's also that. Thinking over some Buddhist texts, it does seem as though the actual position is that one always has a body. Mm? What does 'body' mean?

Vimalamitra: There' S certainly a difference between a dead body and a live body. A live body has something in it, a dead body doesn't.

Bhante: I was talking to somebody about this the other day, and I was making the point that - as you say - that if you encounter a dead body, you don't feel that the person himself or herself is actually present, do you? (general 'no') No. Even though the physical body is there, it looks just like that person, you don't feel that you are in the presence of that person. All right, then put it the other way round. Supposing you have the experience of encountering someone who is dead - without their physical body. Do you in fact experience them as a sort of disembodied spirit? ('No') No, you don't.

I'm not referring to seeing their ghost. I'm referring to a purely as it were mental experience. Do you experience them as a sort of disembodied intelligence? - No, you don't. Well, how do you experience them?

Asvajit: As having a body.

Bhante: As having a body, yes. It's quite strange, isn't it. If anyone' s ever had any such experience, they'll know - you experience them as having a body, but not a physical body. But they have a body. They are complete - just as you know them during their life time. Its simply that the physical body is not there - but they have a

64)

body. They're not just a sort of -mind- not just a sort of ghost in a way, not just a spirit. So what is that body? So in the case of a Buddha, a Buddha also has a body, but that's his kaya.

So, as I said, thinking over some Buddhist texts, it 's as though you always have a body, but the nature of that body differs.

So whether the body (here of course, Presumably, the physical body is meant) is identical with you or not - is very difficult to say, how can one say? You could say that the physical body is not identical with you, but Physical body does not exhaust the possibilities of body. Body is not essentially Physical body. Physical body is just a kind of body. What body is, this is quite an abstruse philoaphical questio~ But if one looks at it in that way, well, one can see that body and life cannot be spoken of as identical, or as different.

Sp&aramati: It is said that when people have the experience of leaving the body, they can still actually see. That's also puzzled me. You know, you haven't got any eye...

Bhante: Yes. Right.

S~aramati: (?). . .stream of consciousness.

Vimalamitra: ..... .psychic body

Bhante: You can have the experience of withdrawing from the physical body, but you feel, nonetheless, that you're quite complete.

Padmavajra: Isn't there a term, 'consciousness-principle'?

Bhante: There is a term, in the Pali Texts, manomayakaya, which is the body made of mind. That is this body which is supposed to be equipped with subtle senses - it is those senses, which are supposed for instance to see at a distance, to hear at a distance, and so on. I think that the main point that emerges here is that body must not be thought of simply as physical, or material, body. Body is a sort of principle of configuration, one might say.

Padmavajra: PrinciPle of

Bhante Configuration.

Padmavajra: What does that mean?

Kamalasila: Sort of outline, isn't it?

Bhante

Manjuvajra There needn' t be a material medium.

Bhante: Right. Exactly. Yes. Body itself does not necessarily have to have a material medium.

Manjuvajra: YOu talk about the 'body of policemen', don't you.

Bhante: Ah, that's a rather different usage, isn't it.

Manju: There's a slight analogy, in that It's a kind of....

Bhante: a unitive element. Yes.

So if in fact there is no distinction between Samsara and Nirvana, when you realise the non-duality of Samsara and Nirvana, you no more cease to have a body than you continue having a body. It would be incorrect to say that you still have a body, but it would be incorrect to say, also, that you no longer have a body. So, in the case of the Buddha, his K~ya, his Nirmanakaya, is the body about which you can say neither that he does not have it

nor that he no longer has it. That is his kaya , his Nirmanakaya.

Padma~ani: It's almost as if one has a body, but it belongs to the past.

Sp~aramati: Ah - according to the Theravada, that 's true. The physical body is due to your past karma.

Bhante: Yes, the physical body is a vipaka. And your senses are

vipakas. Your body, the experience that you have in dependence upon the body and its organs, is your past catching up with you, you could say. I mean, just as we said the other day, in the case of the 'trip', the 'bad trip'; you know, it's your past experience catching up, or

646'

your Past karma, rather, catching up with you - rather more quickly than usual.

Padma~ani: It must have the effect the other way, in the sense of karma, also the physical body now is producing the body of the future.

Bhante: No, it's not the physical body that is producing it, it's the mind that is producing it.

Padmapani. Sorry, it's the mind °. the karma. It's creating, in actual fact, a body, if one doesn't get Enlightened, for a future body. It must work both ways.

Bha~rLe: Yes, yes, surely. This is exactly what Buddhism says. And not to believe that is wrong view (laughter).

Padmavajra: Ah! This reminds me. Yes. I remember you saying that .er.... oh no. Doesn't matter.

Asvajit: Could you repeat that . . . (?) Padmapani?

Padma~ani: I said, we 'd been talking about the past body, you know, If you've got a body it would be from the past, in the sense of . . er -

Bhante: It's from past volition, past...

Padma~ani Past volition. So I said, if that's karma, you can have it going into the future, you know, your karma is producing.. more karma

Bhante: Your preant body is the product of past karma. Your present karma will produce a future body.

Padmavajra: I remember you saying once, that the Buddha accumulated so many merits, that he was able to gain the Samboghakaya.

Bhante: Right. Yes. Right. It connects up with that too.

Padmava.ira: Ah, that ' s great.

Bhante: Alright, let's carry on.

Robert Gerke' (P.81 paragraph 3.)

t\

'1These views are claimed by the Samkhya and the Madhyamika works which comment on them

Bhante: Do you know what these schools are? The Samkhya is one of the schools of Hindu philosophy they taught a dualism of purusa and

prakriti, of spirit and nature. The Carvakas are the materialists, the Nirgranthas are the Jains. The Vatiputriyas are the Pudgalavadins, the personalists.

Padmavajra: They were founded by a bloke called Vatiputriya, were they?

Bhante: Possibly. .... the Vatsis could be just a tribe, well they were a tribal People.

Manjuvaira: What view do the Jains hold in this particular context?

Bhante: From the Buddhist point of view, they would hold a view of eternalism or regard to the soul. And the Carvakas would hold a view of nihilism.

Mark: Are they not Hindu?

Bhante: Yes, one could not call them, strictly speaking, even Hindu, because they were complete materialists.

Sagaranti: Aren't there listed at the beginning of Trevor Lig 'S 'The Buddha'? He goes

through each one.

Bhante: That's true, he does, yes.

The Samkhya is the most important of these schools, in a way, outside the Buddhist fold.

Padma~ani: I've heard it said that there were similar connections between the Saikhya and the Alayavijnana.

Bhante: Er, no. No, I don't think so at all.

S~aramati: They are said to be the closest philosophy to Buddhism.

Bhante: The Samkhya is, indeed. The Samkhya, generally, is said to be close to, or closer to Buddhism than any other contemporary system of

648

thought, and there's a certain amount of speculation, because the founder of the Samkhya school is, traditionally, Kapila, who is connected with Kapilavastu, the town where the Buddha was born and grew up. The word saankhya literally means counting, numbering, enumerating, and they tried to count, number or enumerate the elements of existence. It was they who first, as far as we know, thought in terms of the five elements, and those who thought in terms of the five physical senses and the mind as the sixth sense. Then they conceived a sort of super-mind, and they tried to enumerate all the different elements of existence, in a way that is a bit reminiscent of the Abhidharma, although it's a very early and a bit clumsy attempt of that kind. But they did retain their importance for quite a long time; And no doubt they contributed at least something of the general sort of intellectual framework, I won't say of early Buddhism so much as, through which early Buddhism tried to express its own distinctive message and its own distinctive ideas, its own distinctive vision.

So the Sakhya is, historically, of very great importance in India, though it doesn't any longer exist as an independent school, it's been absorbed by the Yoga, and the Vedanta.

But It's a school that, in my opinion, well repays study.

Vimalamitra: Were they around before the Buddha?

Bhante: Oh yes, very much so: though the Sa~nkh~ teaching probably wasn't fully systematised until a long time after the Buddha. It was systematised in a work called the Sankhyakarika (?sp), attributed to a teacher called Isvarakrishna. There are also some very ancient Samkhya sutras, sutra here meaning 'aphorism', not 'discourse', called the ~anchasikha (?) sutras (sp.?). (That is ... some years. .... (inaudible)

Padmavajra: The Vatsiputr1.ya were after the 13uddha?

Bhante Yes. Of course.

Padma~ani: Why do you say, Bhante, that it would be quite good to go into

6~4~~~4

that? Or did you?

Bhante: If one is interested in the development of early Buddhism, and the thought-world of the Buddha's day. If one is interested in such things, well, one should certainly go into the Sankhya. If not, not!

Padma~ni: Is that mentioned in Trevor Ling' s book?

Bhante: He has something to say about the Sankhya.

Anyway, let's go on. 'these views'

Dharmapala: (reads, p.81 Paragraph 4)

"these views are called 'indeterminate' an unchanging eternal substance".

Bhante: This is correct, except possibly with regard to the Vatsiputriyas, I think their position is more subtle than that. Even the Carvakas hold the same view, except that they believe that at the~ time of death that permanent, unchanging substance is simply annihilated. It's not eternal, but there is an individual personality that is unchanged during life.

Dharma~ala: continues:

"When one questions whether misses the mark".

Bhante~ If one thinks in rather naive realistic terms, then if one is as it were a spiritually minded person, and one is told, well there is no such thing as a soul, no such thing as an unchanging element in man that continues after death, such people become upset thinking well, then there's no such thing as spiritual life. Life becomes meaningless. Alright, go on--to the Ratnamala quotation, then.

Dharmapala: (continues reading)

"When asked knower of everything."

Bhante: The silence was the explanation, because if he spoke, he would have had to adopt one or another of the four alternatives. Well, all four alternatives were out of the question, so therefore he remained

silent, and this silence shows that he really did understand. It wasn't a silence of ignorance or a silence of confusion - or a silence of suspension of judgement - it was a silence of knowledge.

Padma~ani: That's classically looked upon as the Ariyan silence?

Bhante: No, the Ariyan silence is simply the silence of vitakka and vicara; the Ariyan silence is equivalent to the second jhana. Perhaps one could call the Buddha's silence an Ariyan silence, it certainly wouldn't be an un-Ariyan silence (laughter), that goes beyond the second jhana. It's the silence of the enlightened mind.

Anyway, any general Points about wrong opinion, or about opinionated-ness in general?

Padmavajra: Yes, there's one wrong opinion, I don't know if it comes in here, which often people say to me, when they come to the centre, they say, 'well, the Buddha didn't deny God'. And having never read the sutta where he either didn't deny it, or denied it, or whatever, I feel a bit on dodgy ground.

Bhante Well, the Buddha did certainly say, and This is included in the Brahmajala sutra, for instance, and in other Suttas, that the view that the universe was created by Isvara, God, is a wrong view. This is quite clear. The Buddha doesn't go into it in very great detail anywhere, simply because it does seem to have been a view that was not very coinon or popular at that time.

Mark 3arret: Isn't what it says at the bottom of page 79 to that effect?

Bhante: Yes. But there's no reference to the actual suttas. The two extreme views are, that the universe was created by God, and that the universe came into existence by chance or accident, or necessity. But the Buddhist view is that, as far back as one can see, one finds only a concatenation of causes and effects, without there being, right & the beginning of the process, a supremely wise and all powerful creator who gets the whole process going. Also Buddhism doesn't hold

that there was a Point, as it were, in the past, when it suddenly all originated just by chance, or as the result of fate or destiny. The Buddhist way of looking at things is quite different.

Dharma~ala: Does Buddhism say that conditions were Present and the universe came into being?

Bhante: No, well, Buddhism says that as far back as you go, or however far back you go, you cannot find a first point. That's the first thing to understand, perhaps, that Buddhism doesn't admit a ~erceivable first point. The emphasis being on perceivable. In other words, wherever there is your perceiving mind, there must be an object: subject and object go together. So to try to see, with regard to the world-process as a whole, the universe as a whole, a point where that universe no longer exists, is like trying to be a subject without an object. So, to ask for, to speak in terms of the beginning of the world, the beginning of the Universe, or to say that the beginning of the universe is owing to the action of God, all these views presuppose that there can be, as it were, a subject perceiving without an object there for it to perceive. So long as you think, there is a subject and there is an object. You cannot but continue to perceive a Universe so long as you are a mind. So, however far back you go~you'll take yoUr mind with you - there'll always be an object there in front of you. There'll always be a universe there in front of you: You'll never come to a point where the universe suddently disappears and you find yourself with nothing.

So, every attempt to account for, or every attempt to explain, the origin of the Universe, in an absolute sense, is based on the assumption that the mind can, as it were, runback in time, and come to a point where it will not be confronted by an object, i.e. the universe. Buddhism does not believe that - the only way of getting rid of the Universe is by getting rid of the mind.

Asvajit: In other words, the Universe as it were, that one confronts, is mind.

652

Bhante: Er, no. . the universe that one confronts is the object of mind. Mmittedly the Yogacarins go on to speak of that object as itself - no mind, but as a percept, you can say, but the Theravadins wouldn't; and this veiw, that there is no ultimate Point of origin, this is

shared by the Theravadins too. So one doesn't need to commit oneself to any particular philosophical way of looking at that position. This is the view of all schools of Buddhism whatsoever, though they may explain it in somewhat different ways: that there is no ultimate first beginning - no perceivable ultimate first beginnings to the world-process. This is common ground to all schools, there's no disagreement here whatever. No school of Buddhism believes in a Creator. No school of Buddhism believes that things are related by chance or by accident, or result of destiny.

Vimalamitra: Seems much more in line with the kind of physical idea of planets forming from gases. There's no kind of particular definite point

Nanjuvajra: This is quite similar to the modern theory of the emergence of the universe from a 'black hole' - just a sort of point in space which kind of vanishes. It's a point in space where there is - you can't really say there's a space there, or no space.

Bhante: Or both, or neither, presumably (laughter).

Anyway, let's go on then, to the Twenty Proximate Factors of Instability, and make a start on those this morning, and try and finish them in the afternoon, then we really will be well on our way. There's all sorts of fascinating, er, things. Who's next?

Vimalamitra: (reads, p.82)

"The Twenty Proximate Factors of Instability are

20. Desultoriness."

Bhante: These are the upaklesas, the secondary defiling passions. Or, as Guenther puts it, 'proximate factors of instability'. Let's whip

through them rather quickly, shall we?

Vimalamitra: "Indignation. The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains

indignation as follows 'is near at hand'".

Bhante: Do you think 'Indignation' is very good? (voices 'No') What's the Sanskrit here?

5~aramati & Others: Krodha.

Bhante: Krodha. It's readiness to strike. It's essentially that - so what does that suggest? 'Vindictive intention which is associated with anger when the chance to hurt is near at hand'. So, you want to hurt somebody. You're angry, that explosive energy of anger is there; there's also the intention to hurt. The instrument for hurting is ready to hand, and you're prepared to take that up and actually inflict the injury. Whether you actually do so or not doesn't matter.

Asvajit: 'taking hold of a knife' could be understood quite literally, or in terms of verbal retaliation, I imagine.

Bhante: Possibly... Though I'm not sure, it is the actual infliction of a serious physical injury, it seems to suggest that. Let's carry on, and see if we can understand it better from the following explanation.

Vimalamitra (reads P.83 paragraph 2,)

"The nine chances leading to actual Physical harm".

Bhante: Mr. You see the difference? For instance, one does in fact become more and more angry when you see the instrument for inflicting harm, inflicting injury, does in fact lie ready to hand - this as it were infuriates you, makes you more angry, and you become then very ready to seize that particular instrument, and inflict that particular harm.

Mark So in that sense that's how it's proximate or secondary.

Bhante: No, I think it's secondary, or proximate, in the sense that it's a further development. The basic emotion, as Guenther calls it,

654

is basic in the sense that it provides the pre-existing foundation. You are in a state of anger and hatred, and wrath, and fury, and then you just happen to see a stick or a knife nearby, and when you see that there's a sort of access of rage - you seize it, and you're ready to inflict the harm and suffering. That is the *u~aklesa*.

Vimalamitra: It's almost as if when you see the knife, you've got this kind of tension of anger there, you see the knife, you see a way of releasing that tension.

~hante: It's not only releasing the tension, but actually inflicting the harm.

Padmavajra: You've got the hate, and now you've got the means.

Bhante: I think that putting it in that way sort of underlines something that we've been talking about - that is, one looks at something psychologically instead of ethically. Do you see what I mean? If you think, say, of anger, or this particular *upaklesa*, in terms 'of releasing tension', you're looking at it, as I say, psychologically. But actually, what you are doing is preparing to injure, preparing to inflict suffering. Which is an ethical, or rather a non-ethical, action. I think we do tend very often to interpret the things that we do in purely psychological terms, ignoring their ethical significance. Which usually means their effect upon other people.

Asvajit: Is that because to continually bear that in mind in society as it exists today is so very painful?

Bhante: I think it's partly due to the influence of psychoanalysis, and all the various offshoots of the psychoanalytical movement, including the various growth movements, so called. It's a sort of a pseudo self expression, almost. If you let off steam, it'll do you good - but what about the people at whose expense you let off

655

steam? That is not usually considered. If they happen to be around, well, too bad. So the mere fact that one can think of, or refer to, anger in that sort of way, you know, anger when your about to seize a knife, as if representing a relief of tension, means that we've lost sight of the ethical perspective. You're not just relaxing tension, you're Preparing to do somebody else an injury! But we very often don't see it in that way. In other words, we see it, as I say, psychologically, rather than ethically.

Asvajit: It's the way that the Hegelist (hedonists?) look at it, isn't it.

Ehante: Well, they don't look at it psychologically at all, because they don't believe in a ~syche, do they? Theirs is a quite different point of view.

Sagaramati: Buddhists... killing somebody or not. .. (inaudible)... that's sometimes discussed without any sort of relation to the man who's killed.

Bhante: Yes. Right. If one thought I'm sure one could find many examples of this sort of thing. We even came across it, in one study seminar, in connection with metta. Yes! It seemed to be news to some people that metta meant good will towards others, an actual wish that they should be well and that they should be happy. Some people seemed to be under the impression that you just used them so that by directing your metta towards them, you could make yourself feel good (laughter), and that the real aim of the exercise was to make you feel good: not to encourage you to have a positive attitude towards them, so that you could, when occasion offered, actually help them as an expression of your metta. So again, a psychological rather than an ethical interpretation. No doubt the psychological is important,

and without the psychological, the skilful psychological, you don't get the skilful ethical. But you mustn't think of the

656

psychological, in the sense of the state of mind, as being an end in itself irrespective of whatever fruit it produces in action. So you get the impression, in this sort of metta-bhavana Practice, that you're just using the other person, and wishing him well, not because you really wish him well, but so that you can feel good as the result of wishing him well. Whether good things actually happen to him, you just don't care at all. So the feelings, the good feelings that you get, is purely incidental as it were.

~rk: I can remember having done the metta-bhavana, coming out of whichever room I was doing it in, and seeing the person, one of the three people, and sort of feeling really annoyed with them.

Bhante: Well, there 's that classic story which I told years and years ago. In fact so long ago, I think I can venture to repeat it. I'm afraid it was an imaginary story that I sort of invented, about somebody who was a great advocate of metta, but was the most aggressive and difficult person imaginable, editing a Bud~hist newspaper and writing all sorts of furious article~s about everybody he possibly could and the telegraphic address was Metta, Colombo! (laughter). So I wrote a little sort of skit in my very early days, allegedly about this gentleman, which was published and chatted over by bhikkhus all~~over the place (laugha), and the little story was to the effect that so-and-so was practicing, you know, metta, in his room every morning, and radiating metta - you know, this was the popular expression, you radiate metta, you sit down every morning, you radiate metta. So one morning, this gentleman was sitting up on his bed, radiating metta to the four quarters of the globe; and the s~vant boy happened to come in with his morning cup of tea which he took after completing his metta-radiation, and tripped over the carpet, and the c~~p fell. So the person practicing metta was reafly annoyed. He seized hold of the boy by the scruff of his neck and started thrashing him and said, "you idiot! you fool! Can't you see what

657

I'm doing? I'm radiating metta!" (Laughter) So this is the sort of ~ing that happens, isn't it? (sounds of agreement) You're so annoyed when you're interrupted in your radiation of metta that you become really angry.

Padmavajra: That does happen, I ....

Bhante: That does happen, I know -

Padmavajra: When I'm doing metta at no.5 or somewhere, and I'm really into this you know metta to the whole universe - somebody might make a noise, or you might hear somebody running up and down the stairs - and I feel really annoyed! Twit! You know, I'm really getting into this!

Bhante: So again, it's the psychological rather than the ethical.

Sa~aramati: It's interesting that the citta - niyama is as it were lower than the karma-niyama. It's almost like, thinking in terms of the cittaniyama (without ?)... feeling the ethical (unclear)

Bhante: But, there is a very strong tendency of this kind, (to do something so that (?) I feel good, which, sure, that has its place too, but there is this other side, this other aspect, at least ~~ from the Nahayana point of view, abov~ all from the Mahayana point of view, of - what about other people, how are they feeling? How is it with them, how is it for them: how does it affect them?

There are these two aspects, these two dimensions.

Vimalamitra: Well, there are the two dimensions of yourself and, you know, egolessness.

Bhante: Or, as Dr. Guenther says, 'the Bitandential demension of being'. (chuckles)

Padmavajra: There 's no excuse really, because, I mean, you've got the first stage for feeling good about yourself.

Bhante: This is why it's quite a good thing that people work, in

658

the sense of doing things to help run centres. Because at least, having to do things for other people, and help keep the centre going for other people, forcas~them, however unwilling they may sometimes be, to recognise that ethical aspect of things.

Vimalamitra: It's an awareness of the rest of the world.

Bhante: Yes (pause)

Not to look at things just psychologically, to the extent they effect them and their particular state of mind. I mean, there are other considerations.

All right, let's carry on with that last paragraph then.

Vimalamitra (p.83 paragraph 4)

"In explaining anger offers no problems."

Bhante: Hm. I think the overall distinction between anger, to use Guenther's term, as a basic emotion, and indignation, as being the same anger as a proximate factor of instability - the distinction between the two is quite clear, isn't it.

Dharmapala But this last little section it says that indignation is the immediate act of ha.....

Bhante: Well, probably it's a question of, where exactly does one draw the line? You start off with your state of anger, let's say, or hatred, and that develops, that grows, and you

want actually to express that and cause actual harm. So where do you draw the line between the basic emotion and the proximate factor - is it when you're ready to seize the stick, or when you actually seize it? Well, that may be a matter of opinion, but that the basic emotion grows into the proximate factor in that way, or develops in that way, is quite clear.

Dharma~la: I can see that clearly, but I can't see how they can say that it's the act of harming, which presumably comes next.

659

You know, you've got anger..

Bhante.. Well, you've got really three stages - you've got anger, you've got seizing the weapon, and you've got using the weapon. You could presumably have three different words for each of those three things; or you could use one word to cover one and two, and the other word to cover three, or one word to cover one, and the other word to cover two and three - it just depends on the way you look at things, presumably. So according to the first account, the first word has been used to cover one, and two, but not three. The other accounts seem to look at it in a somewhat different way.

Abhaya        The Klesas are proximate aren't they - this is the secondary Klesha, isn't it. The first one is hatred, the basic emotion,...

Bhante:        Well, it's the same Sanskrit word, apparently, khrodha, in both cases; Guenther translates as anger in one case and indignation in the other - neither of which seems very appropriate.

Abhaya. We would prefer the translation hatred, wouldn't we? Because didn't you define anger, as far as I remember, in a psychological wayi~

Bhante: Yes, that purely explosive energy that sort of broke forth. Anger seems more like that. Hatred would seem as I said then, something much more settled and confirmed, and with a definite intention to injure. So hatred is the intention to injure. Indignation would seem to be not only the intention to injure, but the taking in hand of the means of inflicting injury, and according to some accounts, apparently, indignation (as Guenther calls it) also involves the actual infliction of the injury - carrying it one stage further.

Abhaya: So the first one is dvesa

Bhante Isn't it khrodha?

660

Sagaramati: No, this is khrodha, according to the..

Bhante: Oh, I see, that was dvesa, was it? So dvesa would be anger, and this would be hatred. Min. And perhaps, if one wanted to distinguish, if one wanted different words, for the intent to harm, and the seizing of the means of harm, and inflicting of harm, one could use the word rage or fury, to speak in terms of hatred, ~, and ~: hatred is when you have the intention to ha~,rage when you seize the stick, and fury when you use it. One could perhaps differentiate in that sort of way, if you wanted to assign a distinct term to each stage of the Process.

(Pause)

Abhaya: So 'indignation' is a very weak..

Bhante: Yes, It's very weak. (break in tape)..

Prat~~ha, as I mentioned, according to the Pali explanation, is not only hatred, but becoming

enraged and furious, and blind with fury in fact, and inflicting the injury, as with a stick, again

and again, on the object of hatred, in a sort of p~xism of fury. ¼ Right, let's go on and finish off resentment before lunch. Then

in the afternoon, we can go on to sl~yness-concealment. (laughter)

MaMuvajra: (reads, p. 83)

"The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains resentment as follows .... and resentment comes in its wake".

Bhante: That's very clear, isn't it? Resentment. It's when you brood over an injury. 'It is not letting go of an obsession which develops through association with the anger which underlies it.' There's a line, I think it's in Tam O' Shanter, when he speaks of his wife waiting at home for him - he 's off at the pub of course - 'nursing her wrath to keep it warm' (laughter) - nursing your wrath to keep it warm is rc~cntment, i~n't it? You br~od over it, you've obsessed with it, you don't want to let it go. You want to be  
661

angry, you want to go on being angry. You almost enjoy being angry.

'And its function is to be the ba~sis for non-endurance' - you won't sort of let go whatever has happened to you, whatever has been done to you. You won't forgive, you won't even endure it, you won't tolerate it. So you cherish that feeling of snger and hatred, and you sort of brood over it' you nurse it, you cultivate it.

Abhaya. Nurture it.

Bhante: Nurture it, develop it! (laughter) well, people do this, don't they? 'It is an intention in which one will not let go of the continuous feeling of resentment, and in which one retaliates measure for measure' - if you can, very often people just feel resentment without being able to do anything about it. 'Its function, not to tolerate, is easily understood'. Resentment seems to be a very widespread unskilful state. People resent the sort of situation that they're in, where they're unable to do anything about it. They resent maybe their job; they resent, maybe, their domestic situation.

Mark: It's like the case of people posing problems, which they aren't willing to solve at all: it's resentment.

Padmavajra: Often, people feel they have a right to feel resentful. Look what the world's done to me - I've been born!

Sagaramati: That's the cherishing of it.

Bhante: Mm. Yes. Well, why do you think it is that people don't like to be robbed of their resentment?

Abhaya: Is it that they want attention?

Vimalamitra: They don't want to change.

Manjuvajra: There's a kind of maintaining one's own ego-sense, of superiority.

662

Bhante: Yes, you keep your end up. Even if you're not actually to express your resentment and do anything against the object of it,

at least the fact that you are feeling resentful means in a way - it may be in an indirect way, or a rather ineffective way - you're

getting~back at the object of your resentment. You're keeping your end up: to some degree, you are supporting your own ego.

Manjuvajra: Is it non-forgiving then, resentment?

Bhante: It's non-forgiving, yes.

Sagaramati: Isn't it sort of - I always see it as sort of a memory, of a Painful situation.

Bhante: Oh yes, it often involves that.

Sagaramati: You have that memory, you experience the pain.. Bhante.. and you can't get rid of it.

Sagaramati: You can't let go of that painful situation.

Bhante: ~m, well, 'can't', that very often means that you don't want to. You cherish the recollection. As someone said, it's like

sucking a hollow tooth to make it hurt - you go on doing it.

Padmavajra (shudders)

Padmavajra: It's a really self-destructive thing this, isn't it? I mean not in a positive way of self-destruction. To keep misery upon misery.

Bhante: So why do people do it?

(Pause)

Sagaramati: I don't know, I sometimes see it as some thing to do

with recognition. Somebody mentioned, what was it attention. It's almost like being, maybe as a child, you get hurt or something, you

don't get attention,...

Bhante: - and you sulk.

663

So I think once you've allowed yourself to get very far into it, or very deeply into it, there isn't any short, simple, easy way of getting out of it any more. It's like the chronic alcoholic: he's allowed things to go too far. So resentment is something that needs to be checked in the early stages, you know, like depression. (Pause)

Or like serial infatuation, if you allow it to go on too long, you cease to be able to do anything about it. (Pause)

Sagaramati: There is one way to stop this happening, that is immediately you think there might be resentment, either in you towards somebody, or somebody has it towards you, is to bring it out into the open.

Bhante: That's true, yes. The sooner you can do that the better. But sometimes you may be afraid of doing that, because the resentment may be so strong that you may be afraid that if you take the lid off it, well, you may become so angry you may even do that person an actual injury. Some resentful people are quite afraid of this, or at least they say that they are. I think in, perhaps in some cases, that is the position. So perhaps they have to be helped by even a third party being present or intervening, playing some part.

Or sometimes it happens that they're afraid of the shock it may produce on the other person - the other person might be still thinking that the first person loves them, etc, etc, but is quite oblivious to the fact that resentment has been building up, maybe for years - well, if you suddenly take the lid off, and just express all this resentment to that other person they're going to have a terrible shock! They thought that you were loving them all the time, and they're quite unconscious of the fact that the resentment was building up in you. So some people are quite scared about this, they think if they express their resentment towards the other person, then the other person will just not, himself or herself, love them any

664

more.

(pause)

Sometimes it's just a rationalisation, - but not always. So again perhaps sometimes it helps if a third party intervenes, and tries to explain things to the other party, at least initially.

Kamalasila: That's not the only way of getting rid of it, though..

Padmavajra: Doy you think if you had a regular spiritual practice, - I mean, sort of, every day, - particularly metta, and kind of keep working on it from that sort of end, it could, kind of, begin to be...

Bhante: It could, in the long run, but sometimes it happens, or very often it happens, that a person who is very sort of deeply eaten into by resentment, or eaten up by resentment, just can't get into anything. They try to, but their thoughts of resentment, their feeling of resentment, just keeps coming up, again and again.

I'm talking of a fairly serious case now. Probably if it was just momentary resentment, or not very lasting or very settled, it would suffice to have it out with that particular person, as soon as you could. That would probably be enough. But if it had built up over a number a number of years, I think you wouldn't be in a position to get into any regular spiritual practice.

I think quite a few of the women who've come along to us, especially older women, with whom we've had some difficulty, have been women with an accumulation of resentment; and in several cases, all our efforts have failed - it seems that there's not really anything that one can do to help, unless perhaps one spent all one's time just with that one person working with them and on them, if indeed they wanted that. It seems as though they've gone too far. There's nothing that one can do. Which is a very sad state of affairs.

Asvajit: It seems to be something that poisons and affects their whole life (?)

665

Padmavajra: Or you can't get your own way in something. So you think

Bhante: Mm. Yes. You look back to the situation in which you couldn't get your own way, and feel annoyed, and even angry, and then resentful about it. You go on turning that situation over and over in your mind, again and again. You feel more and more resentful, you in resentment.

Padma~ani: Is it seen in these terms, annoyed, then angry, then resentful?

Bhante: I think you can sort of build it up in your mind if you want to. I think if you do build it UP, it's probably because there is this underlying as it were substratum of anger there in the first Place, or otherwise why should you build it up?

Padma~ani: annoyed is first, before anger ?

Bhante: Mm. Maybe you've got an angry temperament. (Pause)

Asvajit: It really is a vicious circle, isn't it - there isn't any way out of it

Bhante: Mm. Right.

Sagaramati: The only way out of it is to try and develop metta.

Padmavajra: Just stop!

Padma~ani: Well, what is the way out? (Laughter)

Bhante: Well, I do know people who experience very strong resentment, and in one or two cases they seem quite unable to get out of it. In one case it's gone on for many, many years. They begin to feel they have a right to be resentful, and they ought to be resentful.

This is one of those mental states that the longer you allow yourself to remain in it, the more

difficult it becomes to get out of it. (sounds of agreement). It is cumulative, rather like depression.

6~6

(Pause)

Bhante: Anyway. Not a very pleasant subject, resentment, but no

doubt something that has to be faced up to and dealt with whenever necessary. All right, let's leave it there.

(break in tape) (new session begins)

sly Bhante: We go on to ~ness-concealment. What is that in Sanskrit?

Padmavajra: Nraksa.

(much general pondering over the word)

Bhante: Mni. mm. oh, MRAKSA.

(pause) (general fumbling)

Alright, lets try to get through as many of these as we can. They're all described rather briefly.

Padma~ani (reads, p.84)

"The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains sI ~yness-concealment as follows evil form of existence later on"

Bhante: Nm. That seems pretty clear, doesn't it? It's sometimes translated as hypocrisy, but it doesn't seem to be really quite

that, does it? We don't seem to have a single English word to cover it. ('Are the lights on through there by the way?') (sagaramati goes and turns them off)

(pause)

The sort of situation that is referred to is a situation in which you feel guilty, if that is the correct word, of performing some

unskilful action of body speech or mind, but you tend to cover it up. You tend to be reluctant to discuss it with your spiritual friends,

because you know that your spiritual friends will urge you to give up that unakilful activity -'to make a clean break with it': and

you've reluctant to do that. But what happens is, of course,

that if you do that, and if, especially, you avoid your splrftual

667

friends, the unskilful activity becomes stronger and stronger; and it becomes more and more difficult for you to make, as the text says, a clean break with it, and feel relieved. What do you think is the, as it were, opposite quality?

Padmavajra: Being open.

Bhante: Being open - but even more specifically than that?

Voice: Committment

Bhante No, not commitment.

(Pause silence)

- in a specific traditional way.

(pause)

Manjuvajra Confession of Faults.

Bhante: Confession of Faults. Yes. So, in a way one could say that slyness-concealment is the exact opposite of confession of faults. Because if you confess your faults you make a clean break with them and you feel relieved. But if you slyly conceal them, you don't make a clean break with them, and therefore you don't feel relieved, they go on growing, accumulating, and it becomes more and more difficult

to tear yourself away from them. And what does the Abhidharma 'V

sammuccaya say? - 'What is slyness-concealment? It is to perpetuate

a state of unresolvedness.' - Unresolvedness'. 'Because of its association with dullness and stubbornness, when one is urged towards something positive'. So in what sense is it to perpetuate a state of unresolvedness? What is that is unresolved?

Abhaya: A part of you wants to confess it, and another part keeps holding back.

Bhante: A part of you wants to move towards the positive, a part of you doesn't.

668

Dharmapala: A Part of you sees that you have that, another part is saying, "no, I don't really" .... (?)... covers up.

Bhante: Yes, you're not really facing up to the fact that there is that unskilful activity going on, and that that unskilful activity is obstructing the realisation of the Positive. In a way, it's not unconnected with vicikitsa, is it? Doubt and Indecision.

Dharma~ala: In that respect it is like hypocrisy.

Bhante Yes, except that hypocrisy usually suggests the deliberate adoption of a mode of behaviour, the systematic adoption of a mode of behaviour, in such a way as to conceal one's real intentions.

So in a way, hypocrisy seems something more deliberate, something more calculated: in some respects, something worse - as though a hypocrite doesn't really have any spiritual friends to begin with! He's not on that sort of track at all, but here the sort of context is that you have got out on the spiritual path, or at least you've have professed to set out. You have spiritual friends. Those spiritual friends really do have your welfare at heart. But, you are conscious of the fact that you have committed certain unskilful actions, and you try to conceal those, or you tend to conceal them, or you're reluctant to confess them, because you know that your spiritual friends, seeing that those unskilful actions were obstructing your progress, would urge you to give them up, so as to clear the path to positive states - but you're reluctant to do that. You don't want to give them up. So you tend to hide them from your spiritual friends. Or, if the spiritual friends even tax you with them, you might even go so far as to deny that they were there, or to try and explain them away, or to rationalise them in some way or other: this is where the stubbornness comes in. And you don't really see what you are doing, you refuse really to face- up to the situation: hence the dullness. That's how dullness come in. So ~-ness-concealment is 'to perpetuate a state of unresolvedness' - you've neither on with the spiritual life nor off with it - "because of its association with dullness and stubbornness when one is urged towards something positive. S~ness-concealment has the function of preventing one from making a clear break with it and feeling relieved".

Padma~ani: How would one deal with a person, Bhante, who had this s)(yness~concealment? You could see, in actual fact, what's good for him, but he would resent maybe even your coming round or even seeing him.

Bhante: It's very, very difficult. I think the most important thing is, that by hook or by crook, almost, I was going to say, by fair

means or foul, you get that Person to feel that you are on his side: that you are not against him. I think this is the most important thing. Because if he feels that you are against him, he will continue to conceal: he will continue to Pretend. He must feel that, whether rightly or wrongly, that you are on his side, that you are with him. Otherwise, I would say, you just

haven't a hope with him. This is, I would say, as far as spiritual friends are concerned, one of the most difficult mental states to deal with. It ranks almost with the resentful person and the anxious person. The person practicing ~mess-concealment is very, very difficult to deal with, just as it's really, very difficult just to reassure an anxious person, and very, very difficult to dispel some one's entrenched resentment. In the same way, someone who is stubbornly practicing s~ness-concealment is almost impossible to deal with. You can only have some access to him if he feels that you are on his side.

Otherwise, because such a person wishes to conceal, the chances are that he or she will even break off contact with spiritual friends. Hence the importance of keeping up the contact with such a person, and making him feel, or letting him feel - even rightly or wrongly - that you are with him, that you are on his side as it were. Again, such a person may well feel very guilty, may feel very much on the defensive. All this makes him much more difficult to approach: within our own experience, we 've had a few examples of this sort of Thing, and such people are really difficult to handle. You can't get near them, even, very easily.

Padma~ani: It's almost as though there's a whole network of situations where the person can say something, and you can go into that whole area, and not be anywhere near it.

Ehante: And this especially is the case where someone is involved with some unskilful action or other, and in his heart of hearts is de~~rined not to give it up. This is what makes the situation so difficult. Such

671

a person is really closed - is not at all open, at least with regard to that one, as it were, sacred area, which non-one is allowed to enter, which non-one is allowed to touch; and very often the

Person will be very, very reluctant, very unwilling, even to discuss that particular matter. Will feel threatened, in some cases, extreme cases, even by the possibility of discussion, and will go to any lengths to avoid that.

Padmapani: So that person coming into contact, say, coming into contact with the movement, with the Friends, - that would be his positive side, presumably? You know, he'd want to be in touch; at the same ~me there's so much of him that doesn't want to be involved.

Bhante: Well, this sort of situation, ~yness-concealment, probably won't be present from the beginning, but will develop later on. Because, when he comes along, well, he'~ just a new comer, he's just a beginner, not much is expected of him, not much is expected from him; but suppose he has become involved with us, ostensibly accepted certain standards, or perhaps even has publicly committed himself - it's then that the rub begins: then the rub begins to be felt. And then, perhaps he discovers that there is something in his life which is incompatible with his involvement, incompatible with his committment, but which he is in fact unwilling to give up. So that becomes a very sert of sore and sensitive area which he is not willing to discuss with anybody, not even with his spiritual friends. His spiritual friends may see that he's not making progress, he's not getting on as he ought, he's not doing what he might reasonably be expected to do - why? There's something wrong, there's something holding him back; so they try to look into it, they try to probe, to investigate gently. But he shrinks back. He is not willing to bring that factor out into the open, might even become resentful about it being investigated. So he starts trying to cover it up, pretending it isn't th~re - rationalising it, even justifying it. And then the spiritual friends

672

can do very little - the only thing you can try to do is just to try and retain that person's confidence, at least in other areas, and make him feel that you've not against him, that you are in fact on his side.

Padma~ani: It seems like the only way you earl sometimes do that is to just let the person do what he want to do, or what she wants to do.

Bhante: But the difficulty is that if there is that particular factor, which is holding that person back, if they continue to be held back while others are going forward1 then they will become increasingly out of touch.

So this is, though apparently not all that important, is really quite a dangerous u~akThsa: quite a dangerous 'proximate factor of instability?, And as I siad before, very difficult to deal with, very difficult to handle.

(pause)

So the habitual attitude of openness, and non-concealment, and confession of faults, this is very, very important.

(pause)

And I'm going to be talking quite a bit about confession in the course of the series of lectures on the Sutra of Golden Light, because the whole Sutra revolves, virtually, around this idea of confession of faults - and the chapter on the confession of faults is the central one, isn't it? ~ - the golden Drum, when struck, sends forth these confessional verses, which form the nucleus of the whole Sutra.

Manjuvajra: Do you think it would do us good, to just sort of confess your own particular faults?

Bhante: What is the difference between confessing and admitting? Is there a difference?

A voice: Yes.

Bhante: What do you think that difference is?

673

Padmavajra: Confessing is, well, admitting that they've unskilful, admitting's just saying, well, I've done that.

Bhante: Right, yes. In other words, admitting is Psychological, confession is ethical, and spiritual.

To confess is an ethical act, even a spiritual act. Just to admit something has only, in itself, a psychological significance. So a confession is a confession of an unskilful action which amounts

a failure to live up to the ideal. the ethical and spiritual ideal.

Abhaya: One of the points that seems to be emerging these last two days is the difference between Psychological and ethical.

Its a (unclear)... distinction.

Bhante: Formerly, we've been thinking about (or I've been thinking about) the distinction between psychological and s~iritual, but it seems that there is this important difference too. The Psychological and the Ethical. Perhaps that isn't surprising because we have talked quite a bit about Karma - and the whole text is concerned with skilful and unskilful mental events, which are the bases of skilful and unskilful mental activities, - er - activities of body speech and mind. (pause)

Asvajit: That's not to say that confession doesn't have its psychological side, isn't that so? It has a psychological side that is also ethical.

Bhante: Yes, but the ethical doesn't exclude the psychological; but the psychological does not necessarily include the ethizal. If you confess to an unskilful mental attitude, then that is obviously

Psychological, in the sense that it is a mental attitude - something pertaining to the psyche that you have confessed, or, if you confess an unskilful action, well, there was intention, there was a psychological element involved there, but, when you confess in the sense of admitting that you've done something which is recognised - which you recognise - as unskilful, then you as it were invoke a norm:

your confession is the act of an ethical individual. This is what makes it a confession. It's basically a confession of a failure to live up to your own proclaimed ideal: it's a confession of a failure to live up to your own ethical and spiritual standards. Not anybody ~lse's, but those standards which you have accepted for yourself, and which you happen to share with other members of the spiritual community, in par~ticular with your spiritual friends.

Padmapani: It seems to be quite a vicious circle, here, when it says 'becuase of it's association with dullness and stubbornness' - you can be doing the confession of faults, then, having shyness-concealment, you're not really confessi~g.

Bhante: Yes, well, there are two things, I think in the Christian tradition, there's the general

confession - I think the other is ° called, maybe it should be called, particular confession?

Abhaya: No, there's no distinction.

Bhante: No? ah. In the church of England you've got a general confession, which you all repeat together, but that's a sort of blanket confession. 'we have erred and strayed from.. ways like lost sheep, and there is no health in us' - well, that's very general, isn't it? Whereas when you confess, genuinely, or fully, then the confession should be particular, specific, concrete. If you just say to a friend, even a spiritual friend, "Well, I don't think I'm all that developed, you know", well, that doesn't amount to (laughter) a confession! If you say, "Well I sometimes do do unskilful things, you know", that isn't a confession. But if you say, "well, this morning I became really angry with so and so, and that was quite unreasonable, and I feel very sorry on that account, and I'm not going to do it again if I can possibly help it" - that is a confession. That is what I call then, the particular confession.

Whereas, when you recite the Confession of Faults in the ~-Fol~~-Puja,

675

that is a general confession. That is not enough. You repeat that just, as it were, to keep you in the general mood of confessing. Do you see what I mean? So you musn't think - well, its alright, if you have done something unskilful in the course of the day, it's quite a good thing to call it to mind when you recite the Confession of Faults in the context of the Sevenfold Puja, and mentally confess that specific failure, but I would say that if it's something fairly serious, that isn't enough. One ought to confess it to someone among ones personal friends - either another Order ~mber, or one's Kalyana Nitra - and so on. Do you see what I mean?

(pause)

Vimalamitra: How do you judge whether it's worth confessing?

Bhante: If you've got any doubt, confess - because the reluctance, or the doubt itself, is probably an expression of s~yness-concealment'. (laughter) Well, isn't it? - If it isn't a fault, why not tell it? If you're doubtful about whether you ought to confess it or not, well, confess it on the spot. If there's someone around willing to listen. (pause)

The more open you can be, the better. I mean, I've known people who, after many, many years, have brought themselves to confess something or other. Sometimes it was something really ridiculous that they need not have bothered about. In other cases it was something of a quite serious nature, which had weighed upon their minds, not to say weighed upon their consciences, year after year, and they experienced a tremendous relief in being able to confess it. Sometimes, even if it isn't a matter of (a- ~-j/~)

S: ...action of body, speech or mind- If it's even something that you've had to keep to yourself, even when it hasn't been, you know, of a particularly unskilful nature, even to be able to talk about, to confess, as it were:- such a thing is a source of relief, though possibly in this case only psy- chological relief.

But to come back to what I said earlier on, Confession of Faults is an ethical action, and is possible only on the part of an ethical individual, a person with ethical norms, ethical ideals, spiritual ideals. Hm? And it must be particular, it must be specific, concrete.

That's mraksa. Doesn't the word itself sound a bit sort of 'wrapped up'? Mraksa. (a giggle) It doesn't have a very open sound, does it?

-Aby:It does sound a bit muffled.

~-S Muffled. Mumbly. Yes. Mraks~a.

Mark:It's as though you're speaking with food in your mouth

S: Yes. No nice open vowels. ( giggle) The Tibetans say 'chab-pa. (a Laugh)

All right, What about Spite? (Loud laughter) What is spite in Sanskrit?

(Mumbling) Let's see what the definitions say.

-'Spite. The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains spite as follows: 'What is spite? It is a vindictive attitude receded b indi nation and r entm

art of an er and its function is to become the basis for harsh and stron words to increase what is not meritorious and not to allo ne t fee h '

S: Mm. Carry straight on to the end.

"It is the urge to use harsh words of disagreement, due to anger and resent-

ment when others raise one's shortcomin s because one has no °nt to make a clean break with evil and et it cut of ne' thnis,...spite originates from believing vice to be virtuous and from over- evaluating ideas...so that in this life one cannot feel happy, and in the next one unpleasant results are brought about.

S: Mm. So spite seems to be analogous to indignation, doesn't it? Indignation and

resentment jointly. hi? Because its function is to become the basis not for injurious action but for harsh and strong words, hm? But the text itself goes beyond that, do you notice that? The text is not completely in agreement with the quotation from the Abhidharmasamuccaya; it goes beyond that. 'It is the urge to use harsh words of disagreement due to anger and resentment when others raise one's shortcomings, hm?', because one has no intention to make a clean break with evil and get it out of one's system'.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar

Tape 23

p2 677

S: Do you see that? Hm? Probably one could say - I mean, using the word 'spite', which isn't a very satisfactory one,- that there are two kinds of spite: sort of spite in general; as when you use harsh words, due to anger and resentment; and a more specific kind of spite, when one uses harsh words, on the basis of anger and resentment, in this particular situation: when you are taxed with your shortcomings, with your faults, and instead of confessing them, instead of making a clean breast of them, you indulge in sly#'cde-concealment, and when that, perhaps, is tackled, when you're taxed with that, then you start becoming angry and even give vent to harsh words, hm. You can see how all these are interconnected. So the quotation from the Abhidharmasamuccaya seems to give a description of spite in general, (I mean, using the word 'spite' as appropriate) whereas the text; that is, the Tibetan text; goes a bit further and speaks more in terms of that spite which arises when the person practising slyness-concealment is as it were charged with that, yes? Or when that person is charged with his shortcomings, hm? And one finds this often happening! As when you say to someone, "Well, look! Don't become angry about it!" if they are getting really angry and. ."What me! Becoming angry! I'm not getting angry! Who is getting angry?" This is the sort of thing that one hears. Well, this -is 'spite', as defined by the Tibetan text, hm? What would be a better word? Do we have a better, more appropriate,, word in English?

it fits more in the definition of paranoia; you know, being.01Why am ~~-Again,

I being (simply?) accused of something and you're ?

3: Yes. Yes. Yes.

< \f'':Yea, but Paranoia's a more general term and includes lots of other things.

S: Well, first of all there is the harsh speech, which is due to anger and re- Isentment, and then there is the harsh speech wich is due to that anger and

resentment in particular which is occasioned by one's being taxed by others with one's shortcomings.

%\~Reaction?

S: That's much too general.

Pp'. Sort of defensiveness, isn't it?

S: Yes, it's an angry self-defensiveness. You start blustering sometimes; you become confused, angry. Well, you feel in a very weak position because you know your position is indefensible, yet you have to defend it, hm?

Yes, it's almost as if after this..you know, the experience of self-concealment is brought into the open by the other person, you almost as if~

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 3 678

maybe, know, in actual fact, that you are guilty, yet you have to defend that.

S: Because a very common ploy in this sort of situation is that you act the injured innocent, hm? Yea? You act all hurt; you're misunderstood; the other person doesn't understand you~ this sort of ploy, this sort of manoeuvre, comes into operation. Haven't you noticed this? Yeah? (Mm sounds) Ah!

seems to me that any kind of play along those lines is psychological only. -It doesn't have any real sp..

S: (breaking in) Oh, yes! Yes, but. unless it's within a context of supposedly spiritual friendship, hm? I mean~ this could happen, huh? For instance, supposing one Order Member says to another, "Well, look. I didn't quite like the way you, you know, took part in the discussion at the Order meeting the other day. You really seemed in a very unreasonable frame of mind. What's it all about?" And then, perhaps, the other Order Member says, "No. I wasn't in an unreasonable frame of mind. I was very reasonable. I don't know why it is you always misunderstand me! You're projecting!" Yes? -This would be an example of that kind of thing, you know, within a spiritual context.

- M~~Thi. is sly concealment, isn't it? Not spite.

S: Yes, the spite is there; one feels sort of angry; but one can't sort of burst out with it. I'm not saying it's, you know, a form of spite, but it's another ploy adopted by sly concealment pretending to be all hurt by -such a false accusation and claiming to be misunderstood by that particular person.

~~~3pite would perhaps manifest itself in saying, "Well, who the hell do you think you are!?"

S: Yes. Yes..even that. Whereas, you know, if a person starts acting all hurt, -and so on, in this sort of situation, you know, sometimes you can see that they really are quite angry but they are not coming clean with the anger. They are again covering it up; there's a second layer of, you know, sly concealment, you know, pretending to be all hurt and that you misunderstand them and they haven't got any friends and so on and so forth, hm.

%&Spite seems to be a really bad word for it, doesn't it? To me it doesn't convey that at all.

P',~:No, it doesn't.

~Spite seems to be sort of real nastiness, with no cause whatsoever, as it were.

S: Well, I did even hear about an Order Member some time ago who, in a situation

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p4

(S:)Sof this sert~      - said, "You know, no-one in the Order understands me. The only person who understands me is my girl-friend." (He laughs) It speak. for itself, doesn't it. (laughter) Anyway, it was some time ago.

~'~id you say there wore two kinds of spite?

S:      To., in the sense that spite - you know, using that word, or taking that word as the -operative term - spite which is an expressio~ of anger ~d roientment in general, and spite which is an expression of anger and resentment occasioned by the fact that somebody has chargod you with certain shortcomings, drawn your attention, or tried to draw your attention, to faults on your part that you are not willing to admit, to confess.

°~~There was a tradition, wasn't there, in early..in what..well, there is a

tradition in Buddhism where monks go up to..

~s      Oh, very much so. ~, I mean, it has become rather formalised, but, er, in Theravada countries; and, in fact, strctly speaking, throughout the Buddhist world, wherever there is a fairly well kept up monastic life; the pupil is supposed to go every morning and evening to the teacher aid confess any shortcomings committed either in the course of the previous night or in the course of the previous day and ask forgiveness for those. In other words, every twelve hours. This is the sort of customary practice. That is to Say, before going to bed at night and just after getting up in the morning, you are supposed to ask your teacher's forgi~eness for any faults that youlve committed or, if you are conscious of actually committing certain faults, to confess those. And then there is, according to the old Theravada tradition, the fortnightly confessional service, w~ich seems to have followed upon, in the very early days of Buddhism, the fortnightly service (for want of a better term) of meditation and chanting of Dharma-verses. But confession has always been regarded as of great importance in Buddhism, I mean, throughout the centuries, from the very earliest times, and right down to the present day- and in all forms of Buddhism. I don't think you'll find there's a single form of Buddhism anywhere in the Buddhist world, anywhere in the ~ast, where some kind, some form, of confession is not practiced. This idea of psychological and ethical and spiritual open-ness is considered very, very important.

f~iJ~There are thirty-five Buddhas of Confession, aren't there?

S: Tes, who preside, as it were, over different sections of the list of rules, so if you have..you know, if you've committed a broach, say, of a rule belonging to one set, then you confess that to the Buddha presiding over that set. This is a Tibetan, perhaps originally Sarvastivalin, practice, not

a

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p5

(S:) S: found elsewhere. Anyway, I'm going to talk about all these things, I hope in 1010 detail, in the course of one of the lectures in that series.

--- Couldn't you get a case, though, where people can be so kind of °r..where they're picking at your faults all the time, so that it's you know, I mean, it gets to a point where you just oan't..you can't get on with anything without getting "Oh, you're doing this wrong!" or "You're doing that wrong!" or "This is a manifestation of this (or that)."

S: Well, there are two things to be said here. One is that the spiritual friend, whose responsibility it is to point out faults, must do this in a skilful manner. I mean, his pointing out of faults in somebody else should not be, you know, in itself an unskilful activity. Sometimes, pointing out other people's faults is a form of sly ~c~ealment with regard to your ow" faults. You, as it were, get in first Do you see what I mean? Hm? So it may sometimes happen that somebody is always getting at you, or even that a number of people are always getting at you and pointing out your faults for basically unskilful reasons on their own part, so that creates quite a difficult situation, because if you try to deal with it, or to rebut not so -much what they say but the; way that they say it, you can be accused of sly -misooncealment, stubbornness, du2~ness, and all the rest of it.

-- \~vt'Because you have actually oo~mitted that?

S: Yes, and you may be quite aware that you've committed that, niaybe even quite ready to confess it.

V~At the same      time you know that something's not right on the other side? so

Mm. Yes. ~rt it requires great sort of skilfulness all round to ~ort out --

a situation like that, and you may just have to call in some much lore ex

perienced person that everybody involved does regard as~ you know, a Kalyana Mitra in relation to all of them, otherwise you can get, you know, very entangled and there can be all sort. of charges and counter-charges, -you know, mutual recriminations and so on~ leading to a very negative and unpleasant situation, huh? ~ut also there is the point that - this is point two - that there are some teachers who do this deliberately to, as it were~ confuse the student and make him very, very conscious -not only of his own shortcomings, but of the fact that he is, as it were, a sort of mass of faults. This is, especially if they feel, or they find, that the student is somewhat egotistic and rather pleased with himself, or even proud of himself. I think in the ~en tradition they do this a lot, at least in certain instances. They only point out somebody's faults, but this is quite, in a way, dangerous thing to do~ because you can destroy a person's natural self-confidence, and you must be quite sure that, you know, you are helping someone to break through and not merely breaking him down, so this sort of technique should be resorted to only by those who are, you know, quite experienced teachers and who very, very definitely have the welfare of that person at heart, huh? Otherwise, even a small number of people can almost destroy somebody by constantly picking on them and pointing out their faults; it can become, you know, a means of systematic discouragement~t, hm? It's only very robust pupils who can really stand up to that sort of treatment and benefit from it, and the skilled teacher will know who can. In fact, very few people can - in the early stages, at least.

It seems to denote almost like an escape-goat; a person who becomes a scape-goat somebody's negative energy.

~ We do notice, even within our own Movement, that there's a slight tendency, from time to time, for somebody to be made a scape-goat, and sometimes they even have to be rescued. This has happened, I think, two or three times: that somebody has been made, not very, very strongly, but to some extent, at least, somewhat of a scape-goat. Hm. And they are sometimes related, maybe, to a number of other people, are, in a sense, weak (weak in inverted commas); weak in the sense that they are not able to defend themselves against attacks (because that's what it often amounts to) of that kind, and sort of accept the attack. Occasionally, of course, they may even invite it; there is that also to be considered. So some people appear to have, you know..some people appear to go around with, you know, a notice pinned to their backs: "Please Kick Me"~ and usually, if you go around as though with that sort of notice on people, you know, will oblige.(laughter)

--Well, what would that be indicative of?

S: Well, you can guess! Masochism. Self-hatred. Self-contempt. Guilt. ~tc.

~'How about the slightly different situation which arises when somebody comes up to you and says, "Oh~ you're always picking fault with us!" and you really haven't been aware of...

S: (breaking in) Be very suspicious of this word 'alvayst'! You know, in the context of the dreaded 'relationship', huh..

° ~ii:(breaking in) I wasn't thinking of that.

S: flo. You weren't. But I am referring to it as an example. Yes? In the context of the dreaded 'relationship', the minute you hear the other person saying (your better half, or worse half, as the case may be): "You always

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p7 6.2--

(S:) do that!" or "Yo~ always say that!", it's highly significant, ha? Because yo~ may, in fact, have only said or done that particular thing once or twice, but the retort is, or the criticism is, "You always do that!" Now what do you think that suggests? (Pause) You know, within the more..what shall I say?...the more, er, intense atmosphere of the dreaded relationship, you know? (Start with that first.) If someone says, "You always do that!" when, in fact, you don't. (Pause) Have you noticed this happening? I mean~ (sounds of agreement) someone says, "You always do that!", "You always say that!" ~but actually, in point of fact, you very rarely said it, or perhaps you've said it only once or twice, or, occasionally, never. Hm?

--~ Well, people are projecting their own negativity on to you.

~'.They've come to the end. They can't... they're sort of cornered, and so it's a sort of last-defence, perhaps.

#s. Yes, but why does it take that form?

0

~Because they are projecting their thing onto you.

S: I think not necessarily, or maybe..(drowned by)

-- It's as though they're trying to make..

%:(speaking at the same time)..it must be actually in them.

S. Mm?

° :~It must be actually in them.

5: Could be, but it seems to be more than that, to me.

--y0~.prep up their image.

-- ~~Prying to make the other person a real sort of constant punisher, when in fact it's only happened a few..

~S: (breaking in) You. it's also a form of absolutisation, isn't it? Yeah? "You're always doing that!" huh? You're seeing the person that you are speaking to only in terms of that

particular quality, as it were. Well, supposing he has, just once, said "Well, don't do that", but you say, "You're always telling me that!", you're absolutising that person's action,

completely identifying that person with that action. So what does that suggest, do you think? What does that mean? Why do you do that? (pause)

r~!It's a mistaken association of a particular personality trait with a visual trait, or something like that.

tS: Mm, but why do you do that? You're identifying the person-..whereas if you say someone is always doing it, it means he's doing it repeatedly.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar p 8 683

Well, you want that person to be like that.

Ss Ye-es, perhaps you do. (pause)

You want something to sort of kick.

Si It's as though..er..it's as though your reaction, just with that..that °t.. the thing that that person said, even though he said it only~once, is out of all proportion. He's only just said once "~n't do that..t and then you say, "You're always telling me not to do that!" That means, your reaction was very, very strong; out of all proportion. It seems to you as though that person has said that thing to you again and again and again. Now why your reaction should be out of all proportion, that probably is quite a complex matter, and, you know, could be, you know, for different reasons in different cases~ but this seems to be the reason: that when someone says, "You're

~ always doing that!" or "You're always saying that!", that's really a danger signal, because it means (whatever the reason may be) that their reaction is out of all proportion, yes?, to what you've actually said or done, and that therefore you mustn't expect them to behave in a rational manner, and you yourself should not treat them or deal with them or speak to them on the assumption that they are in a rational state of mind. Hm? Yes?

~~What is a rational state of mind?

S: Well, objective, huh? Yes? Hm? Better to say, you know, reacting to what you say, er~ you know, as it is; that is to say, just a single statement which you just made on that one occasion, not reacting to it as though it was the hundredth time that you'd said it, hm? (pause) I'm sure every- body's had some sort of experience of this at some time or other; either

~~ have said this sort of thing themselves - "You're always saying this!" or "You're ~ doing that!"- or have - had it said to them! Or both. But it is definitely a sort of danger

signal, you know~ whether on one's own part, or, you know, on the part of others.

?4i: That isn't quite what I meant.

~: Mm?

--L~t'5 as though..some people have, on cocasions, I've had people say to me that when they've been with me they've felt as though I've been criticising them, whereas I haven't really. .er. .I certainly haven't been conscious of doing that.

~In that case, they really are criticising themselves. And they are projecting that onto ~ou. They feel guilty, in other words, and you've become, as it were, their conscience; their accusing conscience. perhaps they feel,

~ind In Buddhint Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 9

(S:) perhaps they even believe, that you have in fact, you know, spoken to them in that sort of way, or they might even say they pick it up from you; they might even say they pick up a disapproving attitude, as though you know what they have been doing or thinking or saying, whereas in fact you may be completely unaware of all that, hm? I mean, it's like the..the person who has just committed a crime and who sees a policeman~ I mean, the policeman might be just innocently strolling along on his beat, but tile person who has just committed the crime, you know, thinks that with. if the policeman stops. "Oh~ he's smelled a rat! Re's suspected me! Is he going to speak to me? Is he going to arrest me?", but he might just have stopped for no par- ticular re?~¶cn at all, hm? Or the policeman looks at the person who'~ committed the crime, and he feel. dead sure that the policeman know. some- thing about it: "Re knows what I've..Re's become suspicious!", thought hasn't crossed the polioeman~s mind at all; it's just like. that person looks like any other in~ocent passer-by, hm?

~That's sort of real paranoia in that one..in that example.

~: Not so long ago it happened that someone wrote to me and said that he'd had a dream in which I had appeared and told him that he should follow a certain course of conduct, and he felt that I must have been thinking about that and that therefore he's picked it up, 50 could I confirm that I did. .I wanted him to follow that particular line of conduct. So I had to tell him that I just hadn't thought about the matter at all, so he certainly wan't picking up anything from me. But perhaps the situation was that he had felt that way in himself, and has projected, you know, that onto me, as it were, in the dream, but it had nothing, actually, to do with me at all.

Y~: Was it a good..was..In his Case, was it a good mode of conduct?

S: It was asbiguons, hm? Yes. I think he preje~ted it because he maybe wasn't sure himself, you know, whether to follow that or jtot, but, you know, if it you know, was

attributed to me, as it were, well, you know, that made it sure, yes?

--'. Because I had a dream...

S: (breaking in) I'm not referring to you, no.

No, no. I had a dream in the old days where you popped up in my dream - at that time I didn't particularly like you (laughter) - but I found that the conduct that came up in the dream in actual fact was the conduct that I followed, and I saw you very much as . well, in those days, the guru-figure, but it was helpful, you know, and in a sense it was almost as if that rep-

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 23 p 10

resented my better side of me, and following that conduct actually did )Lelp.

S: Yes, I think in the case of this particular person it might have been - I can't be sure, but it might have been - good if he'd followed that particular action, but I rather think that the idea of following it came into his mind as a result of somewhat negative factors, possibly feelings of guilt, huh?; it involved giving up something, so this was, as it were, him OR me, hm~ but actually, as I said, I hadn't thought about the matter at all. I hadn't thought about him in connection with that particular line of action.

~A~'Yes. I remember having a dream of.. (burst of laughter)...saying, more or less, "No! You mustn't do that!"

S: I hope you didn't! (laughter)

Anyway, confession in dreams doesn't count! (laughter)

~~~It can help, though!

S: It can help, sure! Well, if you do confess in dreams it means, really, that the sort of feeling to confess - has reached quite a deep level. Anyway, let's go on. I think that's all with regard to 'spite', as it's been called here. ~~~o~s! Oh, we're doing very well this afternoon~ aren't we! What's that in Sanskrit? Irsya?

Several: Irsya. (in a variety of pronunciations)

Si No. Is it? Oh, yes: Irs~ya. (background chatter) You notice, all these rather unpleasant states are rather tongue-twisting? We've had mana; vicikitsa, dr.s.r.; krodha; apanaha (ip?); mr~s~a; prad~as~a; irsya; and we're going to have matsariya next.

T~ey sound like really evil diseases, don't they? They sound like really bad diseases.

Si But: s~addha~ priti; yes? alobha (ep?); samadhi..hm? prajna. (Pause)

Anyway: Jealousy. Let's hear the definition of that.

The Abhidharmasanuccaya explains jealousy as follows: 'What is jealous? It is a highly perturbed state of mind, associated with aversion, hatred, which is unable to bear others' excellencies. by being overly attached to gain and honour. Its function is to make the mind unhappy. and not to allow one to feel happy.~

S: Mm. Yes. Carry on.

It is a highly perturbed mind which is unable to bear excellencies of ~rs, because of its attachment to wealth and honour. This brings about,

Mind in ~nddhi.t Psychology seminar p 11 .06

both here and in the next world eat U lea. antness. In this if th e

cxistenc ,~

Si I'll just go outside for two minutes while you mull that over. (Pause) (vL~~ /~~ ?4 6,~  
Wa~ that from when I came in?

Yes.

S: Ah.

~~That was jealousy and ( ? )

Si Well, make a note of the main points, then. I mean, what are the main point.. Let's just recapitulate.

Distinction between envy and jealousy.

Si ~vy and jealousy. That jealousy comes in, you know, when it is something of which you already are in possession; envy comes in when it is a matter of something of which you are not~ you know, in possession, but would like to be. And jealousy, again, refers to persons rather than to things. (Pause) Maybe someone later on could write out what they remember of that discussion and the main points so that we don't lose it altogether. You know~ with a good memory and ready pen. (pause) But, as I said, it is a very negative and very destructive feeling indeed, but one which, I mean, is..is.. is always..in..which almost inevitably arises, you know, in connection with.. well, er.. towards any kind of relationship in which

attachment figures strongly.

What is mentioned here is envy, though, isn't it?

S: Yes. In fact, it is envy, though Guenther uses the term 'jealousy'.

? So he doesn't even really bring jealousy into it?

Si He doesn't, actually. Let's go a bit into envy..a bit more into envy. 'It is a highly perturbed state of mind associated with aversion hatred, which is unable to bear others' excellencies, by being overly attached to gain and honour.' I mean, you see somebody - I mean, the example here which is given is somebody - who is in possession of gains and honour. You attach great importance to these things, so when you see that person in possession of gains and honour when you are not, you can't bear it, hm? And that feeling that you then experience; that emotion that you then experience; is envy, which is a very sort of painful feeling, though probably not as painful or as sharp as jealousy.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 12 687

4 it's a sort of feeling that he's got something that you feel you deserve.

S: Mi. It's almost that, or at least 'would like to have'; and, as I said earlier on, you feel a sort of grudge, almost a sort of hatred, against him for being in possession of that gains and honour, hi? (Pause)

All right. Let's go on to avarice, then. Matsariya in Sanskrit.

Si Matsariya.

---? How about the other one; the getting rid of it? It seems quite. er. well,

it seems quite simple to get rid of sort of envy..

S: By means of rejoicing in merits, hi.

~Right. But jealousy seems almost like similar to resentment.

~ Well, jealousy seems to stem; I mean, if my analysis is correct; from a basic insecurity. You have no worth in your own eyes; you do not feel that you are a lovable or worthwhile person; so you depend upon some other person to give you a sense of your own worth; your own worthwhileness; hi? Instead of loving yourself, you know, you depend upon another person to love you, so in this way, you depend for your whole emotional security as a person,

as an individual~ upon another person~ upon another human being, so supposing some third party threatens or appears to thee at en to take away not just that person, that person OR whose love you are dependant, but that love itself; so if there is the threat of that love itself being withdrawn, being taken away from you, being transferred to some other person, then you begin to feel as though you have no worth, no value, hm~~ and this is a very, very

~, uncomfortable state of mind, an unbearable state of mind, and the emotion to which it gives rise is the emotion of jealousy~. So you feel fear, and hatred and aggression in relation to that person that you see as a threat to YOU, inasmuch as he may steal away, not just the person that you love, but the person who loves you and on whose love you are dependent for your feeling of worth-whileness and worth as an individual, hi? So, you know, by losing that person and by losing that person's love, if they happen to be stolen away, you just lose, virtually, your whole self-identity; you feel as though you are being destroyed; or you feel that you will be destroyed; so jealousy is a sort of fear of being destroyed, almost, kind, through withdrawal of one's affection which has now been transferred to some third party. So when, for instance, you, say for instance, you kill the wife who has been unfaithful to you, well, this is such an extreme step, but it is only in that

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 13      ~6

way that you can reassert yourself and regain, at least temporarily, your sense of self-identity - it's the only thing you can do, to kill! That's.. I mean, to take somebody else's life is the sort of extreme, you know, affirmation of your own individualistic identity. So you feel that the woman has taken away your individuality, so what do you do? She's taken away your life. O.K. You take away hers. Hi? This is what happens. It's a very dreadful situation, you know, whether it's between man and woman, or between any other two kinds of people.

Asvi    It's very strange that that situation can be so powerful, because at a moment's clear, really clear sort of inspection will make one realize that that is not the situation.

S:      Xi. But you can't be reasonable. Another situation in which, you know, jealousy arises is with regard to children, in relation to the parent. I mean, children experience intense jealousy with regard to one another, I mean, especially the older child when the younger child comes along. It can be completely a traumatic experience, because, sometimes quite literally it seems, at least to the unsophisticated child, that all Mummy and Daddy's love and affection have now been transferred to this little stranger, and whereas before I was in the centre of the picture, I was in the centre of the stage, receiving all the love and all the affection and all the attention; I'm now relegated, so it seems, to the periphery; I'm not getting it! The child might even feel, "I'm not getting anything!" So it experiences intense jealousy, even to the extent, sometimes, of trying to make away with the

little stranger, the new arrival, the usurper. So if the parents aren't, suddenly know, and sometimes even the best of parents      t can't succeed con-

~ pletely - then that child may grow up; you know~ the older child; with

strong feelings of resentment, and so on. Sometimes they may be covered up; you know, the child can't..isn't even allowed to sometimes to admit to these, and can't admit to the feelings of jealousy hiiself or herself, tends to cover up those feelings by over-protectiveness towards the new arrival, hi? Yes? A sort of over-demonstration of love and affection.

I lve seen~at with one of my nephews. A younger child has been born and it's not as if he l 5 trying to hurt the child, but he' 5 sort of going out of his way to be nice to him, and it's really horrible, you know, and I just ~nd of go there and I feel totally helpless. I just try and give him a lot of affection. Xy sister and brother-in-law have been very unslilful about it all. And they even tick the other. you know, the older boy..off; they really shout at him a lot, and I don't like that.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 14      ~9

S:So usually jealousy arises ii those situations where, for one reason or a- nother, there is enotional dependenee, and you are really afraid of the withdrawal, for any reason, of the..not Just the person, b~t the love, huh?, on which you've come to fepend for your feeling, virtually, of self-existence, and certainly for your feeling of worth. And you'll do almost anything, you know, to avoid that situation, and, you know, retain solebody '5 love and therefore your own feeling of worth-while-ness and even of existence.

°4~r,But in what sense can you have a person's love if you are not really an individual? I mean~ you can't really give love?

S: You can't! Again it's rquesjCive and infantile, because it's as though, you knew, in the adult or pseudo-adult situation, as though you never had been nade to feel worth-while originally, you know; or helped to feel worth- while onginally; by your parents, and you are still dependent upon sone- body; upon sciebody's love; to flake you feel worth-while, and to give you a feeling, you know, of self-existence. So you could also say that it' s only the infantile person who can be jealous; a nature person cannot feel jealousy; it's only the infantile person, - the innature person, who feels Jealousy, he? That's not to say that you can't feel very upset, or very sad, or very pained, you know, when you lose sciebody who is near and dear to you, in that sort of way, but you won't be sad or urset because you were dependent upon them loving you, you know, for your own feeling of feeling of security and worth-while-ness and so on, hn?

one situation, you'd recover quite quickly, sort of thing, but in the other, it would be something that would really linger o~,

~S'. Yes.

;~:..until you got another person..

;S: You'd have to get another person, huh? I mean~ you do that almost auto- natically, and as quickly as possible.

.50 you get this 'rebound' situation.

- - S' Mn. Mi. Yeah. Mi. (Pause)

In a discussion up North, recently, we were talking about qualities nqative and positive, and it was pointed out that it is sometimes very difficult to to accept..or it has a quite strong effect on you. .when someone points out one of your 'worths', if you like, or some good point,to you. It seems to be quite a difficult thing for a lot of people to receive.

Si To point out your worth?

Mind in Bnddlist Psychology seiinar Tape 23 p 15 690

S: To point out your worth!?

~:Yes. In any way. It sort of seems to bring out a treiendous sort of wave of ciotion. - It does in Ic, certainly..depending OR what the situation..

- %°. Well, why does one think that is?

don't know. .there's..

-&: What is actually happening?

- bp: I think it' 5 sonething to do with this thing going back to chilfihood.. ~°. Mn. Yes.

ibp:Aid being iade to fecl..of worth or not.

S' Mi. It means you're not accustomed to coping with appreciation. You don't know how to handle it. Hi? Or maybe what happens is that when you were siall - maybe, say, in this sort of hypothetioal instance - you ~ wanted to be appreciated, but you weren't; or at least, you felt that you weren't; and you probably felt very upset. So when you are appreciated, you not only feel naturally happy, but it brings up, it tends to bring to the surface, all those feelings of unhappiness that you had when you were small on account of your feeling not appreciated, and it's those that you find difficult to handle or difficult to deal with in the present. Soietiiies you might feel, if someone praises you er appreciates you, as though you, you know, if you weren't careful, you'd break down. So why is this? It's presunably because of the we~ling up of all those feelings of regret and unhappiness at not being appreciated, you know, when you were small, as well as, of course, the fact that you are not accustomed to handling appreciation; you're rather awkward and clumsy, huh? If soietne thanks you for doing something, really sincerely and warily, you don't know how to take it; you're not aoust~med

to that sort of appreciation and so on, hi?

- ~~~:Mi. Yer. The last time that happened to me~ I certainly got this tremendous feeling just sort of came up and I just felt like tears were come into my eyes, and I sort of grabbed the feeling and it stopped.

:~~~. Mi. Mn. It's as if to say, "Well, if only I'd had this appreciation when I was younger!" It's the measure of how badly one wanted it when one was young, or when was perhaps very small, but one didn't get it and always felt hurt and upset that one didn't get it, but now you are getting it, then those sort of feelings tend to come up to the surface; sometimes, you know in a quite embarrassing kind of way. You might have done something~~ you know, quite ordinary, but it has been much appreciated; or someone

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 16

-- might have drawn attention to a good quality that you have, in a quite ordinary, matter of fact, way; but it affects you very strongly, you know, for those sort of reasons, I imagine.

~~ sort of little theme has been occurring to me while you've been talking, is that of children drawing pictures. And I wonder how often, instead of really encouraging and praising the child as it draws a picture, the parents wait for the child to finish the picture, take it away, and show it to their friends and say "Oh, how clever my little Johnny is!" or whatever.

S:      "How clever my little Johnny is!"      Rn?      Yes.      (pause)

btt~:Mind you; if you'd been writing it on the wall, then instead of getting appreciation, you might get a clout.      (amusement)

S:      Oh!      ~here did that come from?      (Loud laughter)

Talking about children, it does seem...you know, we've talked about children a few times in connection with these negative emotions...it really sort of says, you know, as far as Buddhism goes, we ought..we've got to grab as young as possible, if we're going to..

S:      Well, you can only 'grab'...I mean, there's only one way of grabbing children really young~~, and that is by being a parent!      (Laughter)      Yes? Well, it's all right being a grand uncle who comes along once or twice a year and pats the kids on the head and gives them a bag of sweets each, you know, or something like that, but, you know, that sort of influence; though, you know, no doubt very skilful; isn't very effective, you know. It has.. it's a twenty-four hour job, you know, especially when the children are very small, as, I'm sure, at least one of our friends present can tell us! Or two, possibly. Not more, as far as I know!      (Loud laughter)      Or as far as they know!      (Loud laughter)      One and a half!      (Pause)      But, I mean~ it does go to show, though, and if one..you know, one has to get hold of children as early as possible; it's only the parents who can do that; and that's why, you know, such a

tremendous responsibility rests on the parents. And this is why I feel, you know, if one is going to get married and if one is going to have children, it must be the sort of weighty and responsible decision of quite mature people. To see teenagers rushing into marriage not really, you know, knowing why and what it's all about; that's really pathetic! ~specially where children are involved. This is why I have said once or twice recently - don't take this too literally and be too alarmed, as I believe one or two people were! - that I did envisage; just thinking aloud; I mean, even dreaming; I did envisage the possibility of

Mind in 3uddhis~ Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 17 492

say, mature Order members, by the time they've reached the age of say about thirty-five, having, maybe, spent ten or twelve in the Order, you know, coming to a mature decision that their best contribution to the Movement would be to get married and to bring up two or three really sort of well-brought up, and skilfully trained children.

Abhyi Two or three! That's surprising! Definitely two,~the last tie I heard!

S: Well! I'm only dreaming! (Laughter) Only speculating! But, even th.n~ you know, one can't - guarantee anything, because the child comes along with its own little genetic inheritance; it comes along with its own Karma; and you may be the ideal person; tactful, skilful; but you may give birth to a little terror; a little monster; a little Jaok-the-Ripper..(Laughter).. despite all your training and your skilful behaviour, well, there's no guarantee, even ~o. So in that way one wakes up from the dream.

P~But why should they be born, you know, in that set-up? Why should they seek re- gizi birth in that set-up, if they've got t~~he two ideal parents?

S: Well, the reason for that is hidden deep in the mysteries of Karma, which, the Buddha said, only a..the workings of which, only a Buddha can fully

understand. He might have been, you know~ born as your child out of spite! (Laughter) "I'll show 'em!" But the hap-hazard way in which people go into marriage and parenthood is really, you know, very, very regrettable!

~~If one thinks in this way, I mean, how do people. . .people would stop having children completely.

Si I don't think so, necessarily! Don't forget that the ancient Indians tradition, at least among the upper caste and certainly among the Brahmins, (4K

that you studied maybe twenty, twenty-five years, as a celibate student<sup>3</sup> you married then; and then you had children! By that time the husband was possibly thirty-five, or forty, even forty-five, and the wife was generally very, very much younger, and it seemed to work, hm? So if one thinks of, you know, of marriage and parenthood, you know, at all; or if anybody

does3 then one should think, perhaps in these sort of terms, in this sort of way; not think in terms of one's first youthful infatuation leading straight, you know, to the church-gate , you know~ to the pealing..to the merry pealing of (he langhs)..the merry, mocking pealing of wedding-bells and all the rest of it, so that you are a father before you've ceased to be a child yourself, which is ridiculous! (pause)

Anyway, that's getting a bit-off the beaten track! Rm? Let's go on to avarice.

Mind in Buddhist ~sychology seminar      Tape 23      p

-The Abhidharmasgauccaya explains avarice as follows:      "What is avarice? It is an over-concern with the material things in life. stemmin fron over- attaohment to wealth and honour, and it belongs to(passion? ) Avarice

thing. of lifcq

-      S: Avarice sceis, in a way, rather too strong a word; but anyway, go on. Read right through to the end of the section.

:~Avarice is the state of mind which, by being both overly attached to wealth and honour, holds the material things of life to be all that Oountr and is unable to give them up. In this and the next life, it brings about much unpleasantness.', The OandrapraJpa sutra~statesi 'If fools are attached to this body, which is rotting away. or to life0 which ii shaky and has no power of its own and therefore resembles nore a dream or apparition. they

do iany inappropriate things and come under the power of evil. They are

carried awa y on the carriage of the Lord of Death and wander about in Hell. And so the sentient beings who get int~~a~~anio hold to the basis of their quarry. Should they overcoie~~ whatever attachment to the cause~~t~ey have and get rid of their attachment1 they~~would become powerful.' And there are many nore such statements.

~S:      So it' 5' an over-conoern with material things in life, steiming from over- attachment to wealth and honour and it belongs to passion, lust. Avarice functions as the basis for not letting up in one's concern for the material things of life.' It doesn't seem to be quite averile, though the author of the Tibetan text does say: "Avarice is the state of mind whioh,

--      by being overly attached to wealth and honour, holds the material things of      - - life to

be all that count and is unable to give them up." No. Avarice is more like a sort-of a

-- :~~Hoarding.

S: . compulsive - hoarding, and utter inability to part with anything even in the interests of one own life. I mean, the miser can starve him- self to death, even though he's got plenty of money, hm? So avarice seems not to be the word. What do you think would be the word here? It's more like an accumulating, isn't it? A heaping-up of material things.

? Materialism.

Si XBteriaUsm! Yes? (Pause) It rather reminds me of that notorious and controversial (ur~) cartoon some years ago, of the trade-unionist, which created such a furore and which members of the printers' union of

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 23 p 19 694.

(S:) of the paper concerned refused to set up. Do you remember that?

(No~ say a few)

S. This was Oh, a few years ago. I forget the details, but it was a cartoon by (~s½tfb and it nitrif showed a sort of cardboard figure, you know, in a dark suit, rather stout, with a big open mouth and sort of gross features, a hand stretched out and a heart cut out - Just an empty space where a heart should be - and there were many other features of this kind (he laughs) these big boots for tramping on something or other.. So this suggests to me:

(You know, whether it does really represent the typical trade union attitude or not.) this sort of attitude. A sort of money-grubbing attitude. This sort of worldly greediness. It's that kind of thing. Materialism. Or even more than that. What could one call it?

there an element of ambition in it?

Si That doesn't seem to be suggested.

does by 'honour'; 'attachment to honour'.

S: Honour. That's true. Well, that's ~restige.

~v~ The assumption that these things are necessary. .material things are necessary and right.

S: Mm. Y~~~ It's 'wanting to have it good', you know, in the sense that 'good'..

in the sense of 'good' - that famous phrase "You've never had it so good".

~bp'. (it's the time when?) a lot of trade union view, you know, that they..they want what their rights are, and that's what they do a lot of their fighting for.

~. Sounds typically an asura-like quality!

S: Mm! Indeed! Yes! Yes. Yes. I think when trade unionists quarrel over differentials, this is where the honour, the prestige, comes in. It's not just a question of the money! It's a question of the prestige, the position, the status, you know, relative to other workers. There's a bit of dispute going on at present in some quite important group of factories as to who should press a certain button; whether one group of workers or another; and there's been a strike over this. Neither would give way. And there's two different unions involved, apparently.

~P~. That's a matter of principle.

g% Yes. That's a matter of principle, they say.

~~It becomes quite irrational, on the shop-floor.

Mind in Buddha Psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 20 695

S. Mi. Yes. Strikes don't seem to be rational things, very often. There is a positive side to that, as I mentioned the other day, hm?, but there's also, ~doubtedly, a negative side too. So this avarice~ really, represents just a generally materialistic sort of attitude towards life. hm? An avid search for possessions and prestige. Advertising appeals to this sort of attitude, doesn't it? All the time! It's reflected there.

~.'Give and take' just came to mind, really. This is what seems to be lacking in those sort of situations. You don't want to give, you want to hold on to what you've got, and take more~ but you don't want to give anything.

S: Mm. Mm. Yes. .Mm. (throughout above)

? Also can sort of..to those people who don't like believe in impermanence.

S: Mm. That's true, too. Yes. Yes.. They don't like to think it's ever & going to be taken away from them.

? Well, it goes back to that. .er. the people who don't take into account a future life..Just concerned with their own collecting clothes and food and more clothes and more food..

S: Mi. Indeed it does, yes. Your attitude very much is as though those things could

never be taken away from you. That once you managed to get them, well, you've got them for good. That seems to be the attitude.

:~:Afld there's always something else to get, once you've got. A bigger car.. .~s~: It seems that status is almost more involved than anything else!

Si Well, if you're reasonably well provided with the basic necessities of life, I mean~ what is there left except status, yes? Hi?

~t.+ You see trade union leaders often dressing up in a way which would not be expected of people from such a class. They no longer wear the clothes and have the habits and manners...

S: Well, they look like civil servants!

~Yes. (Pause)

~°It's funny; there's very few think of society now...people seem to be quite well involved in this particular mental state, or else to sort of have nothing to do with it. There doesn't seem to be a kind of.er..

°%: Mi. This is a quite dangerous state, connected~ with what I was talking about in the morning! Yes? Well, that is to say: there are two kinds of people; either those who are fully involved in current society, including its more negative features, or those who have, you know, a completely negative

Mind in Buddhist psychology seminar      Tape 23      p 21 °°6

S: attitude towards society at large, on account of those negative features, and admittedly negative features, and see it only in terms of those negative features; don't see any good in it at all, apparently, in some cases.

Perhaps that's due to indoctrination of television and radio and newspapers; if you really are into it, you..

S: You get a good living in society by knocking society, in some cases, don't you? Hi?

~~ It would be good, if as a result of that conflict, there was some honest discussion as to values, but it doesn't seem to happen..not very often. People continue to knock each other. (Pause)

S: Anyway, as this does seem to represent just this general materialistic attitude towards

life, this very limited attitude, very conditioned attitude, you know\* with which we are only too familiar. the Ohogyam Trwigpa thinks t~taw~' Do you think this is a sort of.. sort of attitude

- -- about, with regards..the so-called spiritual life. .when he thinks in terms of spiritual materialism?...the same sort of attitudes, going into...

S: I think that is very likel~, from what I remember of that book; yes. I mean~ it's rather~to, or analogous to, the rich Hampstead hippy; if you know what

I mean, hm? Yes? (soUds of agreement) You used to see quite a few

of them, you know, stomping around. (giggle) You know, in their very

expensive geer which they'd bought from these very expensive Hampstead shops. You've only got to pick up the Bast-West Journal, too, to see a lot of that.

9: But on the other hand~ if one wanted to be unkind,(and, you know, perhaps this is not the whole truth); Trungpa himself is doing very well on his, you know, 'anti-spiritual-materialism' . .(he laughs) . .so one must watch that, tOO~ if one becomes as it were a professional 'anti-spiritual-materialist'! Again, you're making, vittually, a living within Society, by knocking

society! I mean\* ~ishnamurti used to do this! He was the Arch-culprit here, in my view! Yes? Hi? I mean, he..he.. made a living, as it were, you know, as..as. .as a guru, huh?, by..by knocking the idea of being a guru, huh!

(Sounds of illumination and agreement and amusement)

I mean, he wrote all sorts..he wrote dozens of dozens of books about how ridiculous it was to do things like write books! Hi? Huh? And, you know, he gave dozens and hundreds. .even thousands of lectures about how ridiculous it was, you know, trying to say anything about the truth! It's the same sort of thing, in a way! You know, in a more subtle sort of way.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar

Tspe. 23

p 22

(S:) I think you have to be very careful! This..this sort of attitude, huh?, can manifest itself in all sorts of subtle and gross ways, hi? That you do something with the appearance of not doing it! Hi? (sounds of agreement)

~his is a form of sly --concealment! Yes? I mean, you run down something to disguise or

conceal the fact that you are guilty of that very t~! Hi? I heard Krishnamurti, you know, speaking very scornfully, (and very truly!) about those who rotted underneath the Bhagavadgita; but what about those who rot underneath the copies of the talks of Krishnamurti! There's plenty of people rotting there, too! And he provides them with something to rot under, hi?

Jyo: Do you think someone like that is unaware of what they are doing? Or are

Si I think, in Krishnamurti's case, he was quite unaware of this! I mean, judging, you know, by all that I've read of his writings and talks, and what I've heard about him and seen of him, I think he's quite unaware of it! Or was he quite unaware of it! He's dead now.

? Really!? Oh!!

SI Mi. Are you saying 'really' about him being unaware or about him being dead?

No. He's dead.

S: ~. yes. I think about a year ago!

Abhy: Less than that.

Si Less than that~ hi. Towards the end of last year, I think. I think. ~" Oh, I thought it was only about three months ago.

No, it was longer ago than that. (Pause)

So I think, whenever one is making any criticism, or pointing out any sort of fault, one must be very careful that one is not, in fact, concealing the fact, that one is oneself guilty of that particular fault. I think one has to watch that all the time!

If you are aware that it is your fault, is it still any point in pointing it out?

Si I think it would be better to stop; at least for a while; until you can speak with a clear conscience and more honestly. Stop~ at least for a while, and remain silent about that particular fault, until you are in all honesty convinced that you no longer possess that. Or, if you do have to, well, make it clear that.. "Yes I am also guilty of this! I share this fault. This is why I understand it. So please don't think I'm just knocking you! I mean, I feel that you also have this fault, but don't think- I'm pointing it out

under the impression that I'm free from this; I'm not; I mean, this helps me to understand better the fact that you are guilty of this fault, you know.

We are both of us guilty, so let's try and get rid of it together." That would be a much better sort of approach. And you can take it for granted that with regard to almost any fault that you care to name you are probably guilty of it too, at least to some extent, so, in a way, this should be your

standard approach: "Look at the sort of things that we do!", not "Look at the sort of things that you do!" (sounds of agreement) I mean, in the case of the unenlightened, if you even make a point of saying this every time, you can't really go far wrong, yes? (sounds of agreement) If you say, "Look; we ought not to be so dishonest with ourselves.", you're on pretty safe ground, because you're sure to be dishonest with yourself some-

times! Yes? (Laughter) But if you say, "Look; you shouldn't be dishonest with yourself!"; that's quite different. It, as it were, tacitly, places you in the position of being the person who is honest with himself, and who is now telling -- -- off that other inferior person who is not honest with himself; but you must say this sincerely; it must be not just a form of words that you use insincerely - you must really feel this; that you are also a guilty party, but, you know, you .you see a bit more than the other person, so, O.K~, let's try and work it out together. It's not 'You and Them', or 'You and Him'~ or 'You and Her'; it's Us. And this is also more in keeping with the 3odhisattva approach, hm? (Pause) I mean, you know, you are just concerned with the elimination of unekilful mental states, and whether you're .whether they're there..your states or my states, it's vir- tually irrelevant; let's work together to eliminate unakilful states from the world. (Pause)

All right. Let's go on to 'deceit'. It'll be a good one to finish with for the afternoon. What does it say in Sanskrit?

? M~aya.

S. Oh! Maya! Oh, maya! That's a very evocative word, isn't it! Anyway, we'll see what the Abhidharmasamuccaya says first.

The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains deceit as follows: "What is deceit? It is

a display of what is not a real quality, and is associated with both ~assion,

lust, and bewilderment, erring being overtly . 5\* Overly.

Overly attached to wealth and honour. Its function is to provide a basis

for a preferred life-style.

S:      Mm. Yes. Go on to the end of the description.

:      Through the (Power?) of being-overly attached to wealth and honour, dece+t

makes one pretend to be a virtuous person. For exaiple, a ~v~crite,ifit although his mind is not at all under control and trained. gives the app- earance of bein~ quiet and well-trained0 wi~-eintentionofdc°°

~i'~:5

'S      ~ is quite clear, isn't it? And it also makes it quite clear why the Sanskrit term 'Maya' is used to describe this particular state. What does maya mean? Maya literally means a sort of magic display, which is a deceitful di5p1sy~ hm?, because the magician conjures up and makes you see something which is in fact not there, so it is a sort of trickery, so in the same way, one conjures up and makes you see in him qualities which are not in fact there; so this is not just deceit, it's more like trickery, pretence. Well, it's iore like pretence than deceit. So'it is a display of what is not a real quality, and is associated with both passion-lust, and bewilderment-erring, by being overly attached to wealth and honour8, hm? You make a false show, a false exhibition, of those qualities which will win you wealth and honour, even though you do not possess those qualities, because you are very much attached to wealth and honour, and want to win them, huh? So'through the power of being overly attached to wealth and honour, deceit makes one pretend to be a virtuous person~, because, you know~ by pretending to be a virtuous person, by assuming the appearance of -- being a virtuous person, you can win wealth and honour. 'For ex- ample, a hypocrite, although his mind is not at all under control and trained, give' the appearance of being quiet and well trained, with the intention of deceiving others'. (Pause) This is reasonably clear, isn't it?

(sounds of agreement)

'~v:      Isn't it a little bit strange that he uses..the author uses..'overly att- ached', huh? Surely any attachment to wealth and honour is actually a..

~: I don't know, because to put on this great performance, which. .1 mian, which subjects you to a certain amount of strain, and which some people go..you

know, which some people keep up, you know, year in and year out, I mean, means, surely, that you are, you know, are very, very much attached to.. to wealth and honour, if you go to all that trouble, hm? (Pause) But read on, then. We go on to something about life-styles.

-Here the PaRcask~dhapranadhi sp? explains - ~- deceit as the displa of what is false and the Lan-rim 5 ?' - ex lains it in the same manner. The statement that it is basic for a perverse life-style means that there

is no other or better way to lead a perverse life than to pretend.

S: Hi. Because, you know, you have to be, as it were systematic, don't you? If you want to win worth and honour, and if you have to pretend to possess certain qualities in order to win wealth and honour, it means you've got to keep up the game, huh? You've got to appear like that all the time! That amounts virtually to the adoption of a whole false life-style, hm? Of making your whole life a sort of continually enacted lie. This is where the 'perverse life-style' comes in. Do you see that? (sounds of agreement) You have to keep up an image of yourself as a virtuous person or a self-controlled person, or a wise person, or a reliable person, or a trustworthy person, or a loving person. You have to keep it up all the time! That means you have to live continually in a false sort of way; you have to adopt a perverse life-style! Hi?

All right, so what are the five perverse life-styles? Let's go on to this.

First of all, - - - - hypocrisy then flatter. Three over-raised - ° Four: evaluating by possessions. Five seeking wealth by wealth.

S: S-. Hm. Right. Explanations..

-Hypocrisy means, as stated above, that while one has no virtuous qualities one pretends to have them and puts up an outward appearance so that others will not see through him.

S: Hypocrisy, as defined here, is the sort of systematic pretence; it's not just being hypocritical on the odd occasion; it's the whole hypocritical way of life, consisting, on the whole, in the deliberate and continuous adoption of a life-style that is not really yours; which is not really you. So while 'one has no virtuous qualities, one pretends to have them and puts up an outward appearance so that others will not see through him'.

How about the kind of strain that develops when you do a job that you don't really like doing because you have to pretend to be somebody? Would this come under this category? In other words, the

S: Well, what would be an example of a job where you had to pretend to be something, as distinct from just doing a job that you didn't like?

~~~~-. Well, in the job that I did, as a teacher, I think is very much like that; you had to adopt a certain personality..you know, you had to be a certain type of person, to be acceptable to your colleagues and to the children, and that..it wasn't just a matter of getting on with the job, you know, you had to pretend to be something you maybe didn't feel you were.

S: Well, if it's done for the sake of wealth and honour, according to this definition, it

becomes a form of hypocrisy leading to a perverse life-style.

That's the defining characteristic, in a way, isn't it?

S: Perhaps that's a comparatively mild example.

-°V%M'I mean, I feel this a bit when I'm taking Yoga classes and I think it comes up a bit even ..it can even tend to come up if you're taking meditation, or beginners' meditation. You've got to..well, almost put on a positive front sometimes, if you're not feeling too up to it.

~: Mm. Well, this is why I've sometimes said that it is important in the case of those who are taking meditation, that they should be in a genuinely positive mood, and that there should always be, you know, somebody that you can fall back on if necessary, for instance, you're just not feeling up to it~ so that you don't have to assume that outward appearance of being in a positive mood when in fact you are not, hm?

? The other week, I took my first meditation class at Pundarika, and I was in a fairly positive...It completely did me in. I just felt like I was on show! And I don't. I, personally, don't think that people should take meditation classes for quite a long time. I don't really want to take..

S: It depends what was involved, you know, in feeling 'on show'. Well, what made one feel that one was 'on show'? huh?

I don't know. It was like I was feeling..

Si I mean, maybe you were simply taking a meditation class.

? I tell you! During the puja, a part of me was sort of saying 'Right! This is really going to kill them! This is sort of going to be a puja to end pujas!' That sort of attitude. I didn't feel very good. (laughter)

Si Very likely it wasn't! (laughter) It doesn't necessarily mean that you shouldn't take any, you know, or that in a sense nobody, almost, tiki~ (except Buddhistas and Bodhisattvas) should take meditation classes or lead pujas. I mean, all that it means, if you're taking, say, a meditation class or leading a puja - more so if you are leading a meditation class - is that you are somewhat more experienced in meditation than the people who've come along; that's all that it means; and that you can show them the ropes; that's all, hm? And if necessary, one can make it quite clear that that is all that one is doing and that that is all that one is, hm? Which doesn't mean being apologetic about being there and presuming to take the class at all! That would be the other~xtreme.

That's probably the case, especially when it's not the beginners' class but the other one, where you haven't even got to explain anything to anybody.

S: Well, you just happen to be leading. I mean, you take it in turns to lead; you're just a convenience; you're just the bloke who rings the bell. You've no pretences to superiority, yes? I mean, you're just ringing the bell so as to let everybody else get on with their meditation! (He laughs) So that they don't have to bother about those things. I mean, there's no sort of assumption or implication that you are superior just because you are sitting up front ringing the bell for everybody else! If anything, it's the other way round! You're like the office boy who brings the tea (Laughter) While the others are getting on with the real work! (He laughs) You know, one can look at it like that, too. You know, especially, say, when it's only Order Members present and somebody happens to be leading; there's surely no question of superiority involved at all, especially when you all take it in turns.

It's not with Order Members I don't.

S: Or even if it's a question of monks or beginners: it's simply that you're a little bit more experienced than everybody else; you're just in a position to show them the ropes! In three months time...six months' time...a year...they might have, you know, shot past you. You know, one should be quite aware of that too! So the positions are really very relative, hm?

Could be out of inflation of just being ordained, or something like that.

One could feel really

( a number of people speaking at once)

After being ordained, and having your kesa on, sort of you feel like meeting the world, you know, as a.. "They stand for something", but you're not very sure that they are! In a sense.

Oh, I don't mind wearing a kesa! I'm not saying (Laughter)

Sag: I mean, some people have said that. They feel quite cheap standing there with a kesa on; then there's people might look...

S: Well, you know, there's also one might say the ethical aspect: people can call you to account, now? Yes? After all, on your word, you're supposed to be a committed person, yes? Well, obviously, I mean, admittedly, some times people misunderstand what commitment means, what commitment involves; but it means, now you're accountable, and maybe you feel a bit uneasy about that! (sounds of agreement and amusement) Yes?

(S:) You stand there as an ethical individual; you're not one of the herd any longer; you've no excuses to fall back on; and you know it, and everybody else knows it, now! You know that they know! (Laughter) You can't afford to slip up! It won't be overlooked. Not that you're expected to be perfect; but you're expected to behave in a reasonable, at least a human, and considerate and mindful manner, hm? At least that! There's no escape now!

? ? (breaking in) It can be quite a shock to one's system: the day before you were irresponsible; today's well..

S: You can't sort of get away with it as a newcomer or a beginner or 'only a mitra' yes? No! No longer! Now you're an Order Member! You're accountable! Not only to the Order - the Order may let you off very lightly - but the public won't! Yes?

? Well, I don't..I don't find

S: The former mitras won't, who, you know, who maybe have asked for ordination, but are not yet apparently considered worthy. But you were! There must be something very special about you! You'd better live up to it! (Laughter) Or else!

? 9 ...your kesa, and.. "Oh..Oh! I've only had it a few days!" ? .."..few years!"

,) This seems to..this hypocrisy here..: talks about keeping up one's image of oneself..seems to refer very much to the..the glamorous life-style of the actor or..er..you know..where there's a lot of show; a lot of pomp.

S: But, I mean, the actor is not a hypocrite! I mean, not as an actor! Everybody knows he acts the part of Macbeth. He doesn't really think that he really is Macbeth; that would be insanity! (Laughter) Everybody knows it's.. it's, you know 'old So-and-so', who's, you know, playing the part of Macbeth; who did Romeo last week, and Lear the week before..everybody knows that! So it's not hypocrisy! Even if he does feel very much into the part at the time! Hm? So this is rather different thing. Maybe, I mean~ the profession of actor is unskilful, but it would be unskilful probably for a different reason.

(babble)

Manj: Would you like to go into that; because I've got an actor friend in Cornwall and he's often talked about it.

S: I think. I mean, I haven't any sort of systematic thoughts about this..I've one or two sort of stray thoughts. I've had a bit of contact with actor~.

One thing I have noticed - I noticed this in connection, first, with a friend

of mine in Bombay who was a very well known Indian film actor (I won't mention his name but he was known, at that time, -he's a bit past it now~ I think - as the Indian Clarke Gable!) and what I noticed with him was that quite often he didn't know when he was acting and when he wasn't acting, hm?, so it involves, in a way, - a loss of sincerity: in the ordinary relationships of life, you don't know whether you are acting or not! You act so easily, you know, when you're in front of the footlights, or you're, you know, you're under the arc-lights (if you are making a film) you act so easily, huh?, that when you come off the stage or out of the studio you carry on doing that sort of thing, and even when you speak to somebody, you don't know whether you are acting or not. And that is a very, very dangerous and difficult

F situation to be in, I think. The actor ceases to distinguish between acting and reality.

Another thing is that the actor assumes all sorts of characters, identities; he ends up virtually having none of his own, huh? Hi? Yes? He becomes much too fluid as a personality. You know, he becomes somewhat dissociated, not to say disintegrated, huh? hm? Do you see what I mean?

Yes. Is this why they're quite frequently insecure?

S: Possibly. Also, the actor, surely, is an exhibitionist! Hm? I mean, why does anyone want to be an actor? Why does anyone want to stand on a stage in front of several thousand people? hm? Why? There would seem to be, you know, in many instances if not perhaps in all, you know, an element of exhibitionism. And what is exhibitionism? What are you doing when you indulge in exhibitionism? For whose benefit is it? Is it for mother, you know; as Cintamani has suggested?

°~' I don't understand.

S: Well, are you just a little boy, showing off in front of your admiring mum?

---Oh, I see.

Ss In fact; is this what is happening? I mean, I won't go so far as to, you know, suggest that, but certainly it does seem interesting, at least, that there is this element, apparently, of exhibitionism, in the actor. So therefore the question arises, well, what is exhibitionism? What is actually happening? What is he in fact doing? Why does he wish to exhibit himself in this way to an audience? Doesn't there seem to be something immoral about it, is it a

S' way? Not immoral in the puritanical sense, but, you know, ~esnKt there seem to be something unskilful or unwholesome about it?

seems to be..to have actually a certain lack of dignity, although actors are supposed to be..er..people to, you know. .to be dignified people?

-S'. They can act dignified. Which is another matter.

think drama as an art form, though is, you know, is really good; it's really effective. And if you're going to have drama..

S. Well, effective in doing 'what?

~Mm. Well, in putting across ideas; even in sort of inspiring people. I mean it can be just kind of dull entertainment, but it can be quite inspiring as well, and you need actors to do that.

Tape 24.

S' Yes. Well, if you're thinking in terms of communicating something which is greater than yourself, you know~ something in which you believe, and something to which you are dedicated, then you become, as it were, a medium or an instrument. Then you just have to be careful that, even then, there doesn't enter into it any element of, you know, exhibitionism; just as~ you know, when you do anything which is essentially skilful, you have to be careful that no unskilful motivation enters into it. Just as, even if you take a meditation class or lead a puja, you have to be careful that no theatrical element as it were enters into that, and you just, for instance, take the puja.

I mean, even if you give a lecture, if you are not careful, an element of theatricality can enter into that, yes?; an element of acting; an element

of rhetoric - you know, which is much the same sort of thing.

---d you think that's bad?

S: Mn, I do, actually. I think it's, you know, from the deepest point of view, quite unskilful. Mi.

%'t£:Well, it's very difficult to talk~ without getting involved in rhetoric.

%.- Well, speaking as one who has given many thousands of lectures, I'm quite aware that there is this sort of possibility, and that it is quite an unskilful thing. It is very. .the temptations to be theatrical and to act, when giving a lecture, are very great. And, you know,

anyone who, you know,

thinks in terms of giving lectures should be very aware of them, the more especially if you are a good speaker. If you are a bad, speaker, you're so bothered about saying what you have to say (he laughs), you know, you've no time or energy left to act, or to think about acting or creating an impression.

Mind in Buddhist ~psychology seminar      Tape 24      p 32 707

~~I would have thought the opposite, actually. I'd have thought that sort of familiarity would have made it easier.

S'.      It will make it easier to open up, but I don't think it would make it easier for you to act, hm?

Maybe I was mixing opening up with acting.

S.      But certainly, to be able to open up and let it flow forth; really pour out, if necessary; is a really good thing. It may sometimes be difficult to distinguish this from acting; you may not always, you know, even quite genuinely, know whether you're just really opening up or whether you're just putting on a big act, and it may take you quite a~ you know, quite a long time and quite a bit of experience before you can sort these two things out. You may not be sure afterwards - 'Now was I really being very sincere and open and opening up, or was I just acting?' You just don't know, sometimes!

~AaA~      To some extent, if there are people that you know in an audience, would it be possible to see, almost immediately, if you are acting, just by their response? Just by their sort of sitting there

S-'      Yes. Right. Yes. You might see a (he laughs) sarcastic smile! If they know that you are someone who, you know, gets angry quite easily and has quite a bit of difficulty with their metta-bhavana, when you're giving your beautiful description of metta, (he laughs) you might see a smile cross their faces, and that will pull you up a bit.

Anyway, let's get on to the explanation of the second, (~drowned by noises). a.

Flattery means to talk smoothly by using words ~ agreeable to the opinions of

--ers for the sake of wealth and honour.

S:      Well, it's more than just flattery. It's just saying what is agreeable to people, saying what they'll like..that they like to hear; buttering them up; humouring them.

~~: Not necessarily even their good points?

S-.      Not necessarily. I mean, they may not be necessarily saying anything about them.

Flattery is sayings "Oh, how beautiful you are! What beautiful eyes! What lovely hair! How clever you are! How spontaneous you are! What fun you are!" etc., etc. Yes? But also you can butter them up by agreeing with their opinions. If you know, for instance, that they don't like Mr. Wilson, well, you run Mr. Wilson down, yes?, so as to please them and create an agreeable impression something out of them. It's going along with people falsely, for some selfish advantage; it includes that, too.

-b~.: Boot-licking?

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 24      P 33      708

~      Boot-licking. Yes. That's a very good example of it. There's, you know, an even coarser army expression (drowned by loud laughter) which Robert seems to know, even though he's never been in the army! Probably learned it from one of his friends.

~~People might do that to you all the time.

S Pardon?

~Well..

& Well, they might ~ to! I don't know that they do, actually.

? Oh, you've got lovely eyes!

I think. .no, I don't think anyone ever says that! (laughter)

? They told you you'd got sexy hands! (laughter)

-S:      That's true, but I didn't take it seriously. (Laughter) And that was only -once, and that was ten years ago. (laughter) I don't think that's flattery! I think that's sincere appreciation! (Loud laughter) I think -she really meant it! (laughter)

All right. Let's go on quickly, because it's nearly time for supper.

--Over-praising is: in the desire for Someone else's property. first to flatter I.

-him and then to praise what he owns.

6-.      Have you ever come up against this sort of thing, or across this sort of thing? You first of all flatter somebody, to put him in an agreeable mood, then you praise something that he

has. You say 'OOh, isn't that nice! Really lovely 1 I really like that!' So you've already flattered him and pleased him and put him in a good mood - well, he's almost bound to give it to you! Yea~? Or to agree to some, you know, proposition or proposal of yours. So this is over-praising.

~\~u:~It's a business thing, isn't it?

S-. Mm. Yes.

Definite ( ? ) expecting. You get it..I've had that. You get the feeling that someone, you know, someone's completely disregarding you and they're just getting on with their own thing.

- .pp:You notice this very much with salesmen. Very much so.

~ Although they don't praise what belongs what belongs to you, they praise what they want to sell you, don't they?

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 24 p ~4 709

-But in a conversation, when you're talking, they'll always agree with you, you know..

S. Mm. Ah. Yes.

in a way, they'll praise up those things..

~ Well, they're trained to. They're trained not to disagree. Well, the customer is always right! Hm? That's a well-known slogan, isn't it?

Yes.

S: I mean, there's also the slogan, 'there's a sucker born every minute', bUt~

you know, (laughter) . actually the two go together, (laughter) one is

the obverse of the other. 'The customer is always right'; 'there's a sucker born every ii~ute': (laughter) they're both true; the one supports the

other. (Pause)

All right. Let's go on to the next one.

~aluati~ possessions means that one puts down p.:nother by sayi~ he is so gree&v. in order to gain somethin&.

Mm. Can you give an example of this?

-Well, you go to the kitchen and you see that there's one slice of bread left and somebody else is..~s..

& about to snatch it.

evj: ..just about to eat it..

~ You say, "illell, that's a really gr~edy thing to do!" (Laughter) Huh?

~ Only a greedy person would have the last one.

Si Yes. Munch, munch. (amusement~ Well, you don't do it as crudely as that. You make them ashamed so that they just leave it, sAd then, when they have gone away, you just quietly take it. (Loud laughter) I won't s~ that I've seen this actually going on at Sukhavati, but sometimes I've felt that sort of attitude in the air! (Laughter)

S eki wqal~th b wealth means that b havin' become com letel obsessed b - wealth, one brags about what one has attained previQusly in front of others b~~s~~rYI was blessed in such and such a way by this great person."

~: What would be an example of doing that sort of thing? One brags about what one has attained previously, in front of others, by saying, 'I was blessed in such and such a way by this ~eat person.'

---Hoping that the person you're talking to will oblige..

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar Tape 24 P~5 tj~0

~ Yes. Yes.

~~~~Well, when you're looking for a new job, or something, if you are looking for an increase in status, you will exeggerate or play up your past. .er..

S: Right. positions..

promotions.

S ..and emoluments.

V~Well, it's like you saying..er..say you've got the imaginary Civil Servant..

'Mr. Wilson gave me this!', when y~'re sort of talking to..you know..

S: Mm. and at once your, you know, prestige goes up. V~'What are you going to do?'

S Mm. All right. Carry on to the end.

In brief, g#ng to house from house for alms because one is attached to wealth is not in keeping with what is explained in the teachi~, and this is said to be a perverted life. If you do not want to lead a ~perverted °f then cast away the opinions of others~~and~~in solitude. preserve the rules ~discipline without - - - fooling~~~yourself.

S'~ So the author now is transferring this, as it were, to the monastic context; the context of the monk who goes from house to house for alms a~d advises him not to do it because he's attached to wealth, etc., etc., otherwise it'll be a perverted life.

So what have we done this afternoon? We've done ~5~y~~concealment~, 'spite'..or did we do ~sly~concealment~' this morning?

No. This afternoon.

A

6% So ~sly~concealment', 'spite', 'jealousy', 'avarice' and 'deceit'. So

these do seem quite ri~e, in the experience of most people, hm? And to-

morrow we come on to 'dishonesty', 'mental inflation', 'malice' ~d so on. We seem to be having rather a good time with all these. (P~use)

- - M~u'. Is there just two more days left?

% I'm ~fraid so. I think we'll be able to get through them all.

°\A~~:Two more days left? d-hat's today?

~~~p: It's ~hur~day today. We've got ~nday and Saturday.

~ Tomorrow evening we have the private ordination. Saturday evening, not S~t- urday morning, the public one.

Can you tell me the programme for tomo~&row. Is it £~oing to be the same? S-. What time have ~ou been- having the meditation? We could h&ve the private

ordination s~ the same time, or a little e~:rlier. Say 8.30. think that would be better.

~:Mm. Ye~. It gets quite late.

S: And in case you haven't noticed, there are some white flowers growin~ in ~he vegetable garden; some white dahlias and some rather nice spiky ones. I noticed three or four of them. They'll do for both dsys.

- P~d about Saturday. What time will we be having the..can you tell me the routine for that?

& ~ell, Saturday we'll have the study as usual, huh? We could say 8.30, too? What do you say? Do you think that wou~ seL-3m to be alright? S.30? And we can have the somewhat special puja, not only because it's in con- nection with the ordination, but also because it's the end of the study

~ retreat.

S~I think ( ? ) the Puja.

S'- Th~t would be quite good. I'm just wondering. I'm just wondering. There's ~oing to be a few extra people for the public ordination. I'm just wondering whether we shouldn't\* have it in that bigger room upstairs that we~2were usi~ for a shrine during the mitra retre~t, and ~aybe we should ~ave the puja- there tomorrow, so that we can use the downstairs shrine for the private ordination. I'll talk to Ratnapani about that. That might be better. Otherwise, if we get even thie~ or four extra psople it could be quite crowde~. -So anyway, I'll let you know tomoi~ow. In that case it ~ould mean decorating th- two shrines.

~:If you'll let ~c kA w tomorrow, I'll detail soinebody for the work-period.

S: Anyway, any point about. .~y general point about what we've done thi~ after- noon, or even what we've done to ~ate, before we close. ~What sort of general impres~on do you get? There se~m to be rather a lot of these quite un- skilful mental states, don't there? It'n rpfther a. comforting thought that they can be coulterected by just a~fe~ of the positive mental events.

--With jealousy, then love (

~ Well, to want love and to ~eed love in that sort of way is neu:'otic. T~a-t is to s~y, to depend on somebody elses love for your own feeling of existence, for your own feelin~ of identity and worth - that is nerotic, but a~part from t'~at, I'm quite sure there is a sort of h'~althy human need just for the ~ood- will of other people. I say 'good-will' rather than 'love'. Yes?

? ) spiritual friends givi~..

~ Well, not even that, but, you know, just healthy companionship within the group, but, you know, sometimes it's quite difficult to distinguish the two and see where one ends and the other begins. One doesn't want to take, you know, a completely negative attitude. No doubt there is such a thing as a neurotic need for love, but I think there's also a healthy - or relatively healthy - need for companionship and warmth, especially in the case of those who aren't thinking very definitely in terms of personal development. I mean, if you are thinking in terms of personal development, then you should think much more in terms of, you know, spiritual fellowship, not so much in terms of - you know, warmth within the group. Though even that sort of desire or need for, you know, warmth within the group and companionship within the group, I mean, is quite positive in its own way, on its own level, hm? It's something on which you have to build, not something of which you have to get rid completely. You can't build on what is neurotic; you just have to get rid of it.

W: It seems to me that, you know, in connection with the Friends, that you're always going to have a quota of those people around in the Friends. They're

not Mitras, but they're Friends.

S: Yes! Indeed!

~: And one shouldn't necessarily look upon everybody -s, you know, who should be a Mitra.

S: ~r, no. I mean - if everybody did wish to be a Mitra, that's fine, but, you

- know, there always will be, as it were - outer circles of people who are more loosely connected, less involved, who just keep up some contact. Fair enough, you-know: there must be these different degrees; that's inevitable.

ep: I was going to say that that's not the case with the Mitras. They're actual - perhaps, thinking of becoming eventual Order Members..

& Not necessarily. I think this point hasn't been made sufficiently clear. I mean - there may be some who don't think in terms of, you know, becoming Order Members; who are, maybe, quite happy with their Mitra status. Or there may even be some who, you know, think in terms of becoming Order Members, but aren't thinking too much in terms of commitment so much as in terms of promotion within the group - that's how they see Ordination, in some cases. They see it in terms of a higher status, not in terms of a more radical commitment. So there may well be some people who remain Mitras, I won't say 'for ever', but indefinitely, in the sense that they do not have a present thought of, or perhaps even understanding of - commitment.

Pp: A~i So for those people who do feel that, and in actual fact, over a long period of time, don't get satisfaction, they'll probably drop out, or leave drastically.

& Well, what do you mean by 'not get satisfaction'?

Pp: Well, not get satisfaction from the fact that they want to be ordained but they are not ready to be ordained.

& Hm. They may well, you know, drop out. It's quite difficult, sometimes, to handle such people, because, I mean, by virtue of the fact that they ask for ordination with the wrong motivation, they cannot understand why they've

been refused, especially if they've been coming along regularly, are always

in attendance at jumble sales, never miss Bhante's lectures, always pay up,

etc.; they just can't understand why they are not considered worthy or why they are not considered ready. So they may feel quite disappointed and disgruntled. 'I've done all the right things, but look, I'm not getting what is

due to me~ I'm not getting promotion. Why not?' BUT~ in such cases~

they just don't have any real idea about what going for Refuge or what

commitment means at all, and one must be quite aware of this fact that there

can be (in fact there are) some people involved with the Friends for quite

a few years and who are quite devoted, but who have not any idea about wh~

commitment means and what spiritual life means~ and some of them have asked for ordination. And\* quite genuinely, are unable to understand why they are not being given it. Some may sort of, you know, reconcile themselves by thinking, 'Well, we just have to wait, and it's a sort of test. And, you know, everybody has to wait for about a year or two. Or maybe Bhante's a bit whimsical, or something like that. Or maybe somebody in the Order, you know, didn't like me.' They may just sort of rationalise it in that sort of way, but are unable to see th~ ..you know, they're not able to see what it's all~ about, and that's why, you know, they're not considered ready. Hi?

Pp: I mean, if one can see that, though, Bhante, in that person, er..I mean, wouldn't it be in actual fact better to take them aside and...

& You can't make them see what it is they don't see! That's the difficulty! -?~Oh, I see!

&Hm? Yes? You say, "Look! There it is!" ~No. Don't see anything."

They may think that they do; they may use all the right words - they use the word spiritual, they may pick up the word transcendental - but they don't know what they mean! They haven't a clue! They haven't an inkling! Not that they've only some understanding! No! They haven't any at all!

- Tape 24 p 39 714

S: And you must be very skilled to - or even, not even very skilled; moderately skilled - to detect the fact that they are using these words without any real understanding of their meaning. Hi? They're using all the right words, yes! They want to please you, yes~ You talk in terms of commitment; yes, they'll talk in terms of commitment, too. You'll, maybe, knock relationships;

well, they'll knock relationships, too, yes? But they are not really with aware you. Only in the group sort of way. So~ one needs to be very of these

things. (Pause) And very often, you know, they say all the right things, do all the right things, just because they want to belong to the group; which is O.K., but it's up to you to distinguish that sort of wish from a genuine desire to commit themselves; that's your responsibility, you know, to sort things out in that way, you know, those who are responsible for agreeing or not agreeing whether someone should be ordained. So someone can be doing all

~ the right things and being really quite a good person, but not be considered ready, and sometimes they can feel genuinely disappointed and hurt and just not understand, and you can't explain it to them, also. So they just have to hang on. And usually they do hang on, because, you know, if they have quite a positive attitude to the group, because they just like the group and perhaps they can't give it up, even; you know, it means quite a lot to them, as a group, so they do hang on. And in some cases, eventually, they may come to see what it really is all about, and what commitment really means~ and what being an Order Member really means. If they stay on long enough, they probably will come to see this. Well, this has happened, in one or two cases. But with great difficulty some people see this! Despite all their loyalty and devotion to the group, and the fact that they've been around, in some cases, you know, a few years. Other., they see it very quickly, within a few weeks they've cottoned on to what it really is all about, even though not very perfectly, and maybe not in full practice, but they've sense~, you know, what I call, for want of a better term, the spiritual element in the Movement. Whereas certainly others might have been around for years, and they are quite oblivious of this, in fact, even though they use all the right words, including the word 'spiritual'. It's as though they don't have the faculty, don't have the particular 'organ' needed to perceive that particular kind of object, i.e., the spiritual. One must, you know, be very sharp about this. Otherwise, if you're not careful, then you end up even with people in

the Order who just have no idea what the Order is all about, actually; no idea at all. But anyway, that, luckily, hasn't happened yet.

f)SF:Hopefully never will.

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 24      p 40

715

S:      Yes.

Anyway, let that be all for today.

(There follows a discussion on when to have a silent period the following day)

°~ridey Morning.

S: Dishonesty.      (Laughter)      (Pause while people settle down)

All right. Let's start reading, then.

The Abhidharma-samuccaya explains dishonesty as follows: 'What is dishonesty? In one's desire for wealth and honor one makes evil good by associating

with both avarice and bewilderment. It provides an excellent council.

& Carry on, then.

It is the intent to conceal one's shortcomings from others because one is so attached to wealth and honour. Nowadays people like us try to keep a secret but when others find out our hidden secret we become meek and reticent. Ultimately we deceive ourselves.

-S' Carry on to the end of the section; it's quite a short one.

-One should think about this matter over and over again as stated in the Bodhicaryavatara: 'I am constantly living under the watchful eyes of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas who have unlimited vision. Think in this way I should consider self-respect, devotion and

apprehensiveness.' These two, deceit and dishonesty, hinder the obtaining of good counsel in this life

~ and in the next one, and they set up various forms of unpleasantness, such as not meeting spiritual teachers in the Mahayana. Therefore these two are counted among the four bleak things referred to in the saarivarta.

~: Right. Just go through those four 'bleak things'.

-The four bleak things. One: To lie to one's teacher. guru or monk. Two: to produce regret in the minds of others who have no regret. Three: to speak words which neither praise nor glorify nor exalt those who truly seek the Mahayana Path. Four: to praise others with dishonesty and deceit and without a pure feeling.

S Hi. In what way do you think dishonesty differs from sly concealment ? ?

S Sly concealment is associated with dullness and stubbornness; dishonesty is associated with passion-lust and bewilderment-erring. It's connected more

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 24      p 41      716

specifically with a desire for wealth and honour, hm? It is the intent to conceal one's shortcomings from others because one is so attached to wealth and honour, hm?

~: It's as if you're not really...you don't know what you are doing, really. The other one - it's almost like you evidently know what you're actually doing.

S: Yes. Yes. (Pause) And the antidote is, as it were, to consider that it's really in fact very difficult to keep anything secret. hm? In a way, it's a purely practical consideration; leave aside the watchful eyes of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Usually, people are not taken in to the extent that one sometimes thinks, mm? Yea? Especially, perhaps, worldly people, you know, who've got quite a bit of experience of the world: they can usually tell if

~: somebody else is concealing something or keeping something hidden; they are not such fools as one sometimes supposes. Hm? (pause)

~: So would you say it's as if you should realise that you don't..er..

& That you don't stand a chance of concealing. You don't, in fact, even..er..

deceive others; sometimes you do, but usually, in the long run the truth comes out. I mean, for instance, just think, well..think of the Watergate case; think of this Lockheed Bribery scandal that just, you know, started to come out the truth does come out in the end. Very often, anyway. One certainly can't rely, one certainly can't count on the fact that the truth

will never come out; sometimes it does in most odd and surprising ways. (Pause) Also, in the case of sly~~ concealment, is to perpetuate a state of un~ resolvedness, etc., when one is urged towards something positive, but here

it seems there is no question of one being urged towards something positive - it's something broader, more general, hm? (Pause) One conceals one's shortcomings, one's weaknesses and mistakes, for the sake of some worldly advantages that is the comparatively straightforward situation here and that is termed dishonesty. (Pause) But it has, in certain respects, much the same effect as sly~misconcealment, because dishonesty (like the deceit, the previous. or negative mental even~, also) it hinders the obtaining of good counsel in this life and in the next one, and sets up various forms of unpleasantness such as not meeting spiritual teachers in the Mah~a~na. Therefore, these two, that is to say, deceit and dishonest~ are counted among the four bleak things. What are these bleak things? To lie to one's teacher, guru or monk, especially, perhaps, about the state of one's own mind, which will prevent one receiving help from them. To produce regret in the minds of others who have no regret. What is this~

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 24      p

717

do you think?

'?To make people feel guilty.

S      Well, if they've done something unskillful, why shouldn't you make them feel guilty? It's sort of sowing the seeds of unnecessary doubt. Supposing they have done something quite skillful, and you say things like, "Well, I mean, we can't be quite sure about your motives. Do you really know that you did it with the best of intentions? Was it really a skillful action?" And you set people wondering and doubting; you sort of undermine them in this kind of way, this sort of pseudo-psych-analytical sort of approach, hm? Do you encounter this sometimes?

(Sounds of general agreement)

~I don't quite see the connection.

No, I don't.

S~~ Hm?

~How is that connected with being dis.. Do you mean, is it implied that if one has a basically dishonest attitude, one is likely to be..find oneself in the position of..

~      You may do this; you may do this: you may undermine others in order to, you know, bolster up your own position, for the sake of, you know, a certain worldly advantage.

Presumably that is the connection.

~Well, it's dishonest, isn't it?

S- It is dishonest. ~y~\$Cm

You know, to go up to somebody and say, 'You know, are you sure that what you are doing is skilful?' It's like, you know, you're just sort of lying, in a sense.

-So it's to produce regret in the minds of others who have no regret. I mean, they've done, perhaps, a skilful action; they've no regret about it; they're happy about it; and then you raise a certain doubt in their minds as to whether in fact it was a really skilful action. You start making them wonder about their own motivation, etc., etc., when perhaps they were quite happy with it before and quite rightly happy with it before. So this is an act of dishonesty, in this technical sense~ on your part, hi? And usually, you know, people try to undermine others in this sort of way, you know, for various negative reasons - either you want..you know, you don't feel too good your-

self; you want to bring that other person down; maybe you feel a bit jealous, even, or maybe you want to put yourself in a superior position

Mind in Buddhist Psychology seminar      Tape 24      ~ 43 ?~

vis-a-vis that person for the sake of~ you know, of a certain worldly advantage.

So it's a form of undermining somebody's confidence.

S      Mm. Yes. Itot their false confidence, but even their genuine confidence; and some people's genuine confidence even, can be undermined; it isn't all that firmly established, it isn't all that strong. And so one must be very careful not to indulge, you know, even unconsciously, in this sort of dishonesty. (Pause) Sometimes people do it because they think it shows their own sort of superior insight and understanding of human nature and penetration into psychology and all that sort of thing. It's a very easy and cheap little thing to do, to cast doubts on other people's motives, you know, when the motives seem, at least i OR the surface, to be quite positive

~      and skilful, hi? It's a very cheap sort of wisdom, as it were. (Pause) Or if you say things like, 'Well, yes. I guess the action was pretty skilful, but, you know, you can't be too sure!' You know, things like that! (amusement) 'At least be open to the possibility that it might have been quite a negative motivation'(amusement) and if they say, 'No. You know, I don't think it was negative at all; I'm sure it was quite skilful!'

'Now you're not being open!' (amusement & agreement) That sort of thing.

-?~r~? ~~~eth~~~ must .b~~~~e~~ surely, when somebody will have thought t~4t they've

& Oh yes, indeed! Yes. But we're discussing, you know, the other possibility: that in fact their adopting that sort of attitude is dishonest. Surely, yes, somebody can- perform ~n unskilful action under the impression it is skilful, and that may have to be pointed out; that is quite a different situation. I think, pcsaibly,~ there is nowadays, in some circles, at least, far too much of this pseudo~psycho-analytical approach, and it's quite often used in an undermining sort of way.

719

S: It's very easy to sort of suggest that somebody's motivation is unskil- 44 ful without their really knowing it. So easy to do this sort if thing in

a blanket sort of way, without any real grounds for doing it, without any real evidence of unskilfulness.

Padmapani; I went to dinner with one or two people who were into the Laing therapy - R.D.Laing, and in this house we came into the middle of this conversation. And in this conversation, it was incredible, somebody was saying, there was an argument going on, on actual projection, and the person was sort of almost acting, saying, 'I don't think it's my projection. I think it's your projection.' And then they started getting into each others projections. The whole thing was just sort of, really amazing, tremendous....

S: Well, it's just'knots!'

\_\_\_ But these people are supposed to be followers of Laing.

Sagaramati; I've seen this even at the Centre, although only in a mild sense. But definitely, one of the most obvious things to throw at some- body when you're feeling a bit ( ) is actual projection.

Padmapani; What can you say to that sort of speech?

Asvajit; Well, one can say, 'What is it that you're really seeing?' Instead of saying either yes or no. Often throw it back in that way; suggesting that you have something to defend. If you say, 'That is your projection', then you're denying it in the way that you think is the strongest possible way but why are you denying it so strongly? One can take that into

Sagaramati; Well you know people don't even consider it. It becomes a label you have at the back of the head that when a red bell goes 'attack' out comes projection. It's almost an automatic process.

S: They take it that they're stating a fact, whereas at best they're giving an interpretation.

Sagaramati; The word projection has got a sort of, has got connotations of understanding, because it's psychological.

S: Yes, in terms that you have understood the situation, seen into it quite deeply.

MBP/24 72~O 45 Vimalamitra; But this is usually associated with, like a lot of power behind it; it's not kind of open communication. It's more like they're trying to convince themselves and they say it so it's right. So it's all kind of pushed right across to you rather than communicated, or suggested. As if both of you are not trying to get at the real truth.

Padmapani; I find it's not so much the thing of saying projection, although I think that's quite a normal one that's used. It's more like this thing of the Middle Way. You come across, certainly in the past, come on an attitude of say poitivity and wanting to get things on and then you the person who says 'No maybe you know.' It's a bit like applying the brakes to the situation. It's a sort of, there's understanding in their mind of this thing which is called the Middle Way which is a sort of mediocrity.

Sagaramati; So by you being too positive, they feel inclined to sort of....

Padmapani; apply the brakes.

Sagaramati; Yes, which they would see as the Middle Way.

S: Or which they present as the Middle Way.

Padmavajra; Often things, like in what Padmapani is saying, is with people's enthusiasm for something, which might be their inspiration. Often people will come along and put the brakes on.

Padmapani; Oh yes that's a good example.

S: I think that's a rather different thing because you usually put the brakes on somebody's enthusiasm when your own energy is not equal to that and you're just afraid of things getting so 'energy-full'. But that you just won't be able to keep things up, won't be able to cope, so you put the damper on other people's enthusiasm.

Padmapani; Do you think that's a form of dishonesty?

S: I think it's getting near to it, but I don't think quite in this sort of sense.

Abhaya; It's more, as Kamalasila says, like keeping even.

Manjuvaira; It's like in a race, you don't want to be left behind.

721

Asvaiti; Thy do people find other people, or think of other peoples' 46 energies in terms of a race? One can't acquire energy by sort of running

faster.

S: No, I think if someone is low on energy, they find themselves in a very difficult situation; if they're working with other people who have a much higher and greater energy. So the almost automatic reaction is to try to damp down other people's energy so that too much is not demanded of you. It would seem to happen quite automatically. Sometimes of course your ---damping down of other people's energy expresses straightforward resentment and disgruntlement. It's your way of getting at them. It's an expression of ill-will basically. But sometimes again it does happen that somebody just does not have the same energy as other people and is

just not in a position to be as energetic as they are and is afraid of being called upon to be as energetic, knowing that he or she just can't keep up; So their natural defence against that is to try to damp other people's energy down by discouraging them in one way or another. Maybe in sometimes.. this principle of the Middle Way is falsely invoked - 'Don't let your enthusiasm carry you away' yes? or 'Be a bit calmer follow the Middle Way' or 'Don't be over energetic' but the net result is to damp down your energy.

&

V w Sometimes it may be that you are over enthusiastic, you are allowing yourself to be carried away - but that's another situation. I think what we've been saying, also a little earlier on, also ties up with what we were saying yesterday about psychological and ethical. For instance, when you, in effect,

undermine somebody with your pseudo-psychoanalytical approach, you're not u

really, you're so immersed in pseudo-psychoanalytical cleverness that you are not really considering the possible effect upon that person. In other --words you're not adopting an ethically responsible attitude towards that person. Do you see what I mean? You just go blindly plunging ahead with your pseudo-psychoanalysis without a thought of the effect it might have on him or her.

Asvaji; Which if they're really so low on energy that they may feel at the same time or half realise that you're sort of invulnerable there anyway. But that doesn't really excuse it I suppose. It doesn't make it ethical.

S: I was thinking yesterday after the session about this whole question of psychological and the ethical. For instance, we speak of individuality in the true sense, in terms of awareness. One also speaks of individuality in terms of responsibility and it's in connection with responsibility that the ethical dimension enters. But I think even so it's very very easy to

MBP/24

forget the ethical and think exclusively in terms of the psychological. 47 For instance, I've mentioned the 'four dimensions of awareness', Do you

remember those? That is to say awareness of self, awareness of other people, awareness of things, awareness of Reality. So what is awareness of other people? If one isn't careful one thinks of awareness of other people exclusively in psychological terms. That is to say you think of just being aware of them, seeing them, looking at them, or even sort of gazing into their eyes as in the communication exercises. But awareness of other people also involves, or includes, an awareness of the effect which your actions, or your words even, will have upon them. It's not just a question of you watching them or even being aware of them and seeing what they are like, or where they are at. It's also being aware of the effect that you have on them, that your actions have on them, that your words have on them, even your thoughts have on them. In other words, the awareness includes, awareness of other people includes, or implies, the adoption of an ethically responsible attitude towards them. It isn't just a psychological awareness without ethical involvement. Do you see what I mean? But if we're not careful we could take it very easily in that sort of way.

Asvaait; Awareness of others is not awareness of others as objects, as it were, but of others as individuals or potential individuals.

S; Well, even more than that, because it is not enough just to even be aware of them as individuals in this psychological sort of way. Even that isn't enough. Because if you really become aware of somebody else as an individual, and if you are already aware of yourself as an individual and you are aware also of relationships between you, then you are aware of the effect that you have on that person, that that person has on you. And then you feel a certain responsibility for the effects that you have on them and that is the ethical dimension of your awareness of them. But very often we lose sight of this, and think of awareness of other people in a purely mirror-like sort of fashion.

Padmavaira; Again this seems to be quite a high sort of state.

S: What does?

Padmavaira; This way of seeing people or having an ethical view towards beings, rather than psychological.

S: Well, you need the psychological, to use that term, too because you need to see them, you need to see also what the relationship is etc.etc. But that

48 by itself is not enough.

Manjuvaira; I don't see why it necessarily has to be particularly... of a particularly high state.

Padmavajra; It does to me.

Vimalamitra; It's more simple in a way and in that way it's more difficult. It doesn't sound so complicated~as itself, it just seems.

Padmavaira; What it says to me is that one, or we, shouldn't try to. that I shouldn't try to walk around with myself being the centre of the universe, and in a kind of very selfish way.

S: But it isn't even just that. I mean you can be quite aware of other people but you're, as it were, aware of them as objects, or even as individuals, quite separate from yourself. You're not aware of the network of relationships between you. You're not aware of, you do not see that certain things you say affect the other person, injure the other person or help the other person; all that you do not see. But when you do see it and act upon it, then the ethical dimension, as I've called it, comes in. But even if another person is the centre of your( attention; for that person to be the centre of yourattention in a purely, as it were, psychological way, it's not enough. Like, for instance, when you're in love you might be aware of that person all the time, or at least of your projection, aware of whatever is out there all the time, but you may be doing and saying things that are affecting that person in a way that you're completely

oblivious of (BREAK IN TAPE)

Well in the case of the Bodhisattva there is this altruistic dimension; that he is aware of the needs of others as well as of his own

needs. And you can't really separate the two.  
at its best and the Mahayana at its best say this.

And both the Theravada  
I mean it's really quite

a ridiculous travesty to say that the Hinayana only thinks in terms of self-f salvation and the

Mahayana only interms of other-salvation. This is really not true. It's true that the Theravada does emphasise Wisdom in the early stages of our spiritual life, self-salvation, and it's true also that the Mahayana does emphasise the altruism of the Bodhisattva to a considerable degree, but both are quite well aware that the two aspects are really in- separable. But anyway speaking of the Mahayan~ brings us to the third bleak thing, which is'to speak words that neither praise nor glorify, nor explicate those who truly tread the Mahayana path.' The text says that these two, that is tqsay deceit and dishonesty are counted among the four bleak things,

724 MBP/24

which we are now considering. But I wonder which out of the four bleak

49things do correspond to deceit and &i~shonesty?

Padmavaira; To praise others with deceit and dishonesty and without a pure feeling.

S: Is it that one, number four9            Anyway what does it mean; to speak words that neither praise nor glorify nor explicate those who seek the Mahayana path?

\_\_\_\_\_; What does explicate mean?

S: 'To make clear',doesn't it?

Asvajit; Well, if you're not doing any of those things, if you don't have that attitude towards those who are truly great, truly worthy of looking up to , well then, it suggests that you have an unhealthy attitude.

S: It's sort of negative deceit, or negative ( ) and concealment.

Do you see what I mean? It implies a (        ), you cover up something unskilful on your own part, but here you are, as it were, covering up by ignoring, by not- drawing attention to something skilful on somebody else's part. As it were, you're pretending it isn't there. So that is a kind of dishonesty if you see, for instance, those who truly seek the Mahayana path, let us say the true spiritual path, you should be rejo;cing in their merits, you should be, as it were, telling everybody about it, but you don't - you keep quiet. That is a form of dishonesty, you

could say. It's certainly a very bleak sort of thing.

\_\_\_\_\_; Is it partially idle speech?

S: No, you don't speak at all when you should speak

\_\_\_\_\_; But ( ) means that you're speaking something.

S: Ah, that's true... You don't speak what you should speak. \_\_\_\_\_; It's being a bit cool.

S: Yes, it's being a bit cool, right. It could mean words which are on some other subject altogether, or it could be words that apply to those who truly seek the Mahayana path. But it's as though when you do speak about them you don't speak about them as truly seeking the Mahayana path,

MBP/24 725

you say something else which is ( ) or idle. You don't draw 50 attention to what is the most conspicuous feature, as it were, about those people; so this is a form of dishonesty.

\_\_\_\_\_; You can see this a little bit round the Centre or something. You see somebody who is really sort of taking off, really beginning to develop, really feeling great, and you might say to someone, 'look at that person, at the way they're developing' and the other person might say, 'I don't really think so'

S: 'Are they really?'

Padmapani; That might even be a subtle form of jealousy.

\_\_\_\_\_; Well, whatever it is.

Asvajit; Maybe they feel it threatens their own worth.

S: So it really amounts to a failure to rejoice in merits. If you fail to rejoice in the merits of those in whose merits you should be rejoicing you're practising a form of dishonesty. It's a passive sort of lie. If you're keeping quiet about the fact they are truly seeking, maybe following the Mahayana path, or the true spiritual path, or whatever, if you keep silent about that when you know about it, and when it would be appropriate for you to speak about it, draw attention, then, you're practising a form of dishonesty. It's an omission rather than a commission.

\_\_\_\_\_; It could even occur when people start attacking that person who is really growing.

S:

\_\_\_\_\_; You maybe know the real truth about the matter but you could be so sort of afraid of that, about what everybody else would say, that you don't say anything.

S: And then of course; 4. to praise others with dishonesty and deceit and without a pure feeling. So this could be to praise them when they didn't deserve praise, out of dishonesty and deceit, and also even when they do deserve praise to praise them in a way that wasn't sincere, that wasn't really heartfelt. Or it could be to damn with faint praise. Let's go back to these Bodhicaryavatara verses; this idea that you're constantly living under the watchful eyes of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas who have

726 MBP/24 unlimited vision. How does one feel about this?

S: What do you mean by uncomfortable from a metaphysical point of view? You can't honestly believe in that Buddha or Bodhisattva?

Sagaramati; Well, I find it hard to ( ) in a sense. I tend to think of when the Buddha Aied or whatever, then he goes beyond the form of. ... To say that is going (beyond)

S: Not necessarily because when the Buddha was alive, and still not susceptible to the ( ), he could still see you.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; I think to go back to the bit where we covered self-respect our own ideal, living up to ( ) It sort of fits into there. Having this sort of attitude, would be like living under the eye of the ideal in a way.

S: But suppose you did literally believe that, how would you feel about it; Buddhas and Bodhisattvas were actually watching you all the time, saw everything that you did? How would you feel about that?

\_\_\_\_\_ ; God!!

\_\_\_\_\_, Well I think it's really the calm of it constantly clear calmness of Buddhism, being a(four) ( ) thing and having been widespread as the Buddhas is really the same thing.

Sagaramati; The thing is it doesn't allow to bring in ,as it were, (little~ unskilful action. In a sense I see it.. you either have to be completely and utterly committed to the skilful and allow absolutely nothing unskilful to come in. In other words disregard tho~e elements in you that mightn't be very evolved. It's not as if though every little wee thing, as it were, that comes up you have to stand on.

Asvajit; Why take that attitude?

S: But if you do take that attitude with regard to the Buddhas and Bohisattvas, who you believe are watching you, or seei~g you all the time, does that not suggest that you don't really see them as Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.

Asvajit; It suggests that you see them more like a monarchy.

MBP/24 727

S: Taskmaster - because if they're really Buddhas and Bodhisattvas wouldn't 52 there be compassion there? It's as though really you're a bit like Cardinal

Newman who 'believed in god but doesn't trust him1. I think actually it's very very difficult toweed out this sort of attitude. That even though the buddhas and Bodhisattvas see you doing all sorts of unskilful things, they're not going to do anything to you.

Asvajit; Yes but you have to take the attitude in the first place to penetrate into that and to get into that realisation

Sagarmati; The whole thing about penetration is feeling, I would say.

Padmavaira; It goes back to what we were saying when.. .that they're upset for your sake, they're not going... they're not offended or anything like that but they see that you've harmed your own development.

S: They're not personally offended. I often thought it'd be like having a really good friend all the time. Practically, far from making you feel kind of it would make you feel great - that they're just walking along with you.

Sagaramati; It's funny you should say 'taskmaster'. In a class earlier I have got a

S: A Buddha or Bodhisattva is not a taskmaster though I must admit that the pictures that you sometimes get from Pali and Theravada writings does present the Buddha as almost~rather schoolmasterly elderly gentleman in yellow robes, who went around ticking people off for not osberving the silas; it's a bit like that. This is a picture one does sometimes get. But if one

truly thinks about the Buddhas or about the Bodhisattvas, in this sort of way, watching over you and seeing everything that you do, you can't really think of them in that sort of way. They're not going to sort of come down on you like a ton of bricks, or anything like that; they're not going to get angry with you. They're not going to withdraw their compassion or anything like that. They may see all sorts of unskilful things, but at the same time they're completely with you. It's not that they, as it were, approve of the unskilful things, or are indulgent with regard to them - not at all. But at the same time there is no personal disapproval. I think it is that fact which one finds very difficult to accept or even to imagine. But it means that you can completely trust them whereas in fact we don't. We've memories of God lingering, in other words, we don't perfectly trust them.

MBP/24 718

\_\_\_\_\_, I've never really found that.

53

\_\_\_\_\_; I've never found that.

S: Well, you're relatively guilt-free people then.

Padmapani; I think the Bodhicaryavatara is basically a work of faith and inspiration, and people who are of that inclination, they don't see it in those terms. That's the way I see it.

S: I think the majority of people with the Western view and Christian background do feel a bit uncomfortable about even the idea of even the Buddha watching them and seeing them 'all the time. Because they can't help, at least unconsciously, remembering God, who is the judge and the punisher. Whereas the Buddha is not a judge or a punisher. That's all left to the law of karma. That is not the Buddha's function.

Abhaya; This is why I used to object quite strongly to the Golden Light except in the puja; I used to react quite strongly to it.

S: What particular part of that? Where the Buddhas watch over you?

\_\_\_\_\_; (indecipherable)

S: Forgiveness, well I'm going to talk about that in my lecture. Well that is quite a question. In what sense do the Buddhas forgive? This is what the text says; 'May they forgive' - what does that mean? I'm not going to go into that now but it is a question.

Padmapani; It's interesting to know that the people who do feel guilty about the idea (forgiveness) with christian connotations need to get back

to ( ) and roots. I mean I'm reading the 'Apocalypse' by Lawrence and he says quite a lot about that. You know the sort of idea of people who are quite blocked off writing articles or writing scriptures which

° are basically of an Nihilistic outlook.

Abhaya; One has to acknowledge that it takes time for that sort of conditioning to wear itself out. It needs really working at. It's still very much there

Padmapani; Yes, he says that two thousand years of christian conditioning and it's not going to get back on (pagan roots) get back to a healthy stage after that stage.

MBP/24 721

S: I think one has to be careful about how one speaks about this because

54 you as an individual have not received two thousand years of christian conditioning. It's just a manner of speaking.

Abhaya; It's not so clear cut as that, is it?

Padmapani; Is it in a sense? Because there is a sort of like.. collectively. sort of pushed on into you which you were brought up in. You know its just encrustations.(sic) Do you see what I mean? You get century after century~

S: But you individually get century after century? You have only a few years.

Padmapani; But you're brought up in a society which

S: But that is only to say that you were subjected, not for centuries but for a few years to a quite strong kind of conditioning. But you're not subject to centuries after centuries of this, that or the other, which is the way sometimes people speak. and seem to think and think literally.

Vimalamitra; Maybe they kind of subconsciously... whatever it is-- Jung's idea...

Sagaramati; I have had the 'experience of much:more in terms of my old man. He was a very strict disciplinarian. It was as simple as that. Not God.

Padmapani; Maybe he was God.

V Sagaramati; Maybe he was. And he didn't ( ) bother to find out, he had this attitude of

S: Well, you tend to see the Buddha as a father figure.

Sagaramati; No, I didn't say that (Laughter) when these feelings arise

S: That's what I meant.

\_\_\_\_\_; How about previous births. If you believe in karma don't you believe in rebirth?

S: Yes, and you don't know how you were ( ) You might have been living

K

730

MBP/24 in a very pagan society. You might have been in a communist country, in a Muslim country, or even a Buddhist country. I think that this comes back

55 for the moment to the question of not minding to be watched. I think it is very difficult to really get the feeling of the fact that the Buddha, or Bodhisattva as such does not judge. Yes? It's very difficult not to think of the Buddha or Bodhisattvas in this sort of way; A disapproving, in a personal sort of way of the unskilful, and approving of the sort of skilful. In a -sense they don't care. If you know what I mean. In a sense from their point of view all these things that seem so important to us, little ( ), are so utterly trivial, they just, in a sense, again in a sense, it doesn't matter one little bit.

Vimalamitra; But the whole point of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas is to kind of to be kind of doubt of that, not get involved in

S: Yes, not to approve one little bit of them, and disapprove of another little bit. But to get you out of the whole mess and part of the mess ~s, from an even higher point of view, that you bother about this little bit, that this bit is unskilful and that bit is unskilful. That is the point of the mess. So you begin to see this, or are forced to see this in this way, only after some time.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; It seems to me that Buddhas and Bodhisattvas are everywhere and they are holding little ladders up, for people to climb up. They're not sort of It's like in the wheel of life - the white half. They're holding ladders as you go up. They're not sort of standing there miles and miles up there looking down and saying, 'Hmm'; there's actual contact.

S: Anyway, let's go on to mental inflation.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; Can I ask a question left over from yesterday? In this connection, when you were describing in the monasteries, the pupil going to the teacher and (confessing) and you

said 'asking forgiveness'. What I wanted to ask was; what did you mean by 'forgiveness', and why do the teachers have to forgive?

S: Well, what does one mean by forgiveness? Perhaps we ought to go into this 'what is forgiveness?'

Asvajit; It seems to me to be more an experience than something one can talk about.

S: When you forgive someone what happens? What do you do?

MBP/24 ; Acknowledge.

56 Sagaramati; Ah, you won't put on that ( ).

S: Right yes. You won't retaliate. You for-give, you forgo.

Asvajit; Also, it strengthens the position of the one who confesses in a way because he's said 'I acknowledge that you're not the sort of person who is likely to come back'.

S: Yes, but usually we think of forgiving in the sense of excusing someone from the consequences. In a sense it doesn't (prove) that. Because if you say 'you forgive someone' it means that you've no intention of taking it out of them in return on account of what they have done. But you let them off. But you let them off because they've seen for themselves that what they have done was unskilful. There's no need to punish them, and so your forgiveness means that you recognise that that person who is confessing has recognised that he has done something unskilful and you, as it were, announce to him or communicate to him the fact that the unskilful action he has committed has had no effect upon you, in the sense that you are not going to react; you are not going to punish; you are not going to retaliate. And that is made clear, so the whole transaction, as it were, is wiped out, is cancelled, it ends there. There's no vicious circle set up of action and reaction, offence and retaliation, or you know, offence and punishment.

Vimalamitra; It's as though that suggests in your mind you might be thinking that if other people knew about it then they would react.

S: Yes,yes.

Vimalamitra; You say manifest it.

S: The teacher may of course in th 5 particular case say to the pupil, 'Well what you did was very unskilful' and in order to prevent you or in order to help you not to do that particular thing again, 'I suggest you take such and such practice' or 'you dO such and such thing'. There's not a penance in a sense of punishment.

\_\_\_\_\_, In a theoretical sense, if somebody is accepting the consequences of their actions and almost as if you go about being confessed, whatever you have done and they're put in a position that if there is anything, if they are going to react they sort of do it then more or less. You put yourself

7a~

MBP/24 in the position of accepting it, any reaction that they might give you.

57 5: Yes, and when they see you're ready to accept their reaction, they just can't react and that means they forgive you.

Padmapani; Last year, I think it was at Pundarika, you related this to a service, some sort of service, whereby we sort of forgave each others' sins or not sins, forgave each others faults for the whole year or something.

S: I've spoken on... yes I've spoken about that some time previously.

Padmapani; I got the impression though that there wasn't all that much attention paid to it and consequently people didn't really forgive each other.

S: It means you wipe the slate clean. And when for instance you say that the Buddha's forgive, it~really means that Buddhas are in a constant state of non-reactivity. When you say 'may the Buddhas forgive', well, the Buddhas are forgiving all the time. It's more like 'may I realise that the Buddhas are forgiving all the time'. I mean in the little ceremony which one goes through, say every morning and every evening with the teacher according to the Theravada tradition asking for forgiveness, you say; 'what- ever faults I have committed of body, speech and mind, please forgive', and the teacher actually has to say (Kamame,Kamame) which means 'I forgive'. Also it differs from the Catholic confessional and absolution and so on that the teacher doesn't forgive offences against God , on behalf of God. No, he's only forgiving offences committed against himself. He's speaking for himself.

\_\_\_\_\_, What, the person who confesses? Who's speaking?

S: The person who gives the forgiveness. He's giving you his own forgive- ness in respect of any offence you might have committed personally against him.

Abhaya; Does that mean ( ) offences that you may have committed against other people.

S: How can he forgive those? I mean you're living with the teacher, in contact with him all day. You might have said or done something offensive, something unskillful. It is for those things that he is forgiving, the teacher's personal forgiveness. Suppose you committed an offense against

MBP/24 the rules of the Order or the community, then that has to be dealt with

by the Order or the whole community. So here I mention it to make it clear, that the teacher is functioning here in a very different way from,

say, the Catholic priest in confessional.

Vimalamitra; ( ) base for a very good relationship

S: It's purely a personal thing, as it were, between these two people. For instance a breaking of one of the precepts is not regarded as an offence against the teacher. It's not even regarded as an offence against the Buddha. It's an offence committed against yourself.

Sagaramati; Wouldn't it be against your ideals?

S: Against you~ ideals, yes. Well against you as the holder of that ideal.

Abhaya; In that sense you've got to fo'rgiue yourself. (general agreement)

S: In the case of asking the forgiveness from the teacher, you may at that time confess any offence committed against the precepts but you're not ask- ing the teacher forgiveness for that.

Sagaramati; It's more like you have to ask forgiveness from someone else? It's more like you have to communicate it.

S: You have to communicate it, yes.

Sagaramati; To communicate it you need someone else.

-- S: Yes, the teacher is the person with whom you are in regular contact and he will advise you of what to do in that sort of situation. But he doesn't sort of personally forgive those offences.

\_\_\_\_\_; Supposing the case arose wher for instance you broke the second precept; you stole something from somebody or other, Even though you might be ready to confess it, and

if they're no longer around to confess it to. By doing the next best thing that would be confessing, as it were, to the person whom you respect most, and by bringing it out in front of them would be the next best thing.

S: Well, it may be even the best thing.

\_\_\_\_\_; Well, if the other person was around then surely you'd go...

7-4

MBP/24 S: Not necessarily.

59

\_\_\_\_\_; Maybe not.

S: I mean they might not know what to do about it. Or they might take it very lightly in the wrong sort of way. They might not think it was a very serious matter. They might not be able to accept your confession as a confession. They might accept it just as an admission

your ideal.

\_\_\_\_\_; Surely you'd make confession to

S: No, we said the other day that for a confession to be a confession it has to be the recognition that you have done something unskillful. But supposing the person, from whom you had stolen, did not have that conception of skillful and unskillful, you could only then admit to him that you've taken something that belongs to him. He couldn't appreciate your confession as such. Because he would not believe that it had obstructed you in the following of your spiritual path. So you would be admitting to him that you had stolen but you would not be confessing to him that you had stolen and confession is more important than admission. But you could confess that to your teacher, or to some other fellow disciple. So, if you could confess to the teacher, would be better than merely admitting to that particular person. If you could confess to that person too, well no doubt then it would be equal to confession to the teacher. To confess to the teacher would be better than merely admitting to the actual person that you had stolen from. To the extent that confession itself is better than

admission. Anyway let's get on to 'Mental Inflation'.

\_\_\_\_\_ ; (~;~ ~ft~\*fl6) ) isn't it?

5tfl sOhmo:7\$~e it's ?~~;~£a'Sa~irationj - infatuation..

END OF TAPE 24

MIND IN BUDDHIST PSYCHOLOGY TAPE 25

S-: All right, let's read it then.

Voice: "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains mental inflation as follows: What is mental inflation? It is joy and rapture associated with passion- lust because one sees as excellences the prospect of a long life and other fragile good things by trusting one's youth and good health. Its function is to provide a basis for all basic and proximate emotions. It is an inflated mind which is ~ull of joy and rapture in view of health, abundance of pleasure etc. It is the root of unconcern by generating all other emotions. The Adhyasayassmcodanasutra states, an inflated mind is the root of unconcern, never treat a poor bhikkshu with contempt or you may not find salvation in an eon. This is the orderly procedure in this teaching. The Suhallakha states, look at the vain glory of your social status and appearance, your learning, your youth, and your power as your enemies."

S: Course this word 'mada' is quite interesting, you find in the Pali texts that a list of three, I think, or even four madas or objects or qualities in respect of which you can become as it were intoxicated, infatuated, inflated. One which is always mentioned is youth. You're intoxicated with your own youth. Do you know the sort of thing~~that it means? You can be intoxicated& also with your own (good looks ?). You can be intoxicated with your own health and you can be intoxicated with your own fate, with your own prosperity. So when one's intoxicated in this way what actually happens? You're so sort of pleased with yourself on that particular account, so pleased you're in good health for instance, so pleased that you're strong and healthy that you become unmindful. And in that unmindful state you may do anything. (unclear words.)

Voice: What interpretation ... (unclear words)...

TAPE 25 pag(~~.~

S:: Prosperity, very simple .... (unclear words) .... so the danger of it is that its a happy an& joyful feeling that puts you, as it were, off your guard, that makes you unconcerned in the sense of heedless, careless.

Voice: It's a bit like .... (words unclear) .

S:. Yes, it's what happen~ when things are going well with you, when you feel good. You become careless and you can see instances of this very easily. it shows itself as a sort of disregard of others, con- tempt for others that people who are young can enjoy their youth, sort of revelling in their youth, they become very sort of careless even sort of contemptuous with regard to old people, their trouble and their difficulties.

Voice: Or even scornful.

S: Even scornful, yes.

Voice: It seems to be very apparent now.

S: It's a kind of egotism also. You feel a sort of pride, a certain satisfaction that you're young and others are old, and you're healthy while others are unhealthy, or even you're rich and others are poor. You sort of rejoice in it and feel complacent about it in a very negative sort of way and an unskillful sort of way. And the feeling tends to make you be careless and unmindful and therefore you are

like (words unclear) .

Voice: Surely the way you can (words unclear)

approach the ..... (words unclear)

S:. Then it is more like a quite objective rejoicing in your own merit.

Voice: (words unclear) ..... youth ....(words unclear)

Voice: (words unclear) ... sort of relying on that.

TAPE 25 pa~

S: You place a certain trust in that, yes, indeed.

Voice: And when it goes, you try and perhaps get it back like, perhaps.

Voice: Isn't it (words unclear) .... I was just thinking of the

idea of (words unclear) .... what you were saying, Bhante, about it would be quite good to have a lot of young people in the Order, I was trying to follow

S: I was thinking, of course, of mindful young people.

Voice: But this is, what I'm trying to say, is that can't .... (words unclear) ... youth and health (words unclear) ... etc intelligence. You know, exuberance.

S: . (words unclear?) .... call it e~(word unclear).

Voice: Can't it go in any direction? I mean, couldn't it be sort of channelled?

S: In order to be able to channel it one must be mindful and the essence of mental inflation is that it is unmindful or that it tends to unmindfulness. It's not simply of, question of possession of youth, good looks, etc. It is being infatuated with them or with oneself. It is this which is intoxication and inflation and unmindfulness. So therefore the possibility of channelling is precluded by the nature of the state itself.

Voice: Yes (words unclear?) .... one could see that somebody like that could ....

~-: If you're simply young and energetic you can direct your youthful energy in a skillful direction, but if you're intoxicated with your youth and energy the question of directing does not arise, yes? (laughter)

Voice: I just think people like that ... (further laughter).

S: ... (words unclear) ... fall in love.

TAPE 25 page

Voice: Is that what they call .... (words unclear)

Voice: What are we - boring lot of people

Voice: A person in that state would see the others as being rather boring if he were exuberant.

Voice: No.

Clots of voices)

&: Very often people who are in this inflated state, they don't bother about other people very much, except to the extent that they compare themselves favourably with other people and rejoice in their superiority in this or that respect. Rejoice in the fact that they are younger, more handsome, more energetic, etc., etc., more healthy, more intelligent.

Voice: (words unclear) ... attitude.

S: Indeed yes. Also one would especially beware of mental inflation when one is in a situation of success. When things are going not very well .... (unclear) ... care for them (unclear) .... failure even disaster all the time you're unlikely to become inflated, but when things are going very well, when things are going your way, when you're successful, everything seems to be going smoothly, that may lead to a sort of inflation which again leads to a sort of false self-confidence and then you may start making mistakes and you see this in the case of sometimes quite famous people at the peak of their career - something goes wrong and it's this very often. They've achieved success but it goes to their head, they become inflated, they become careless, not so attentive, not so .... less as before as they make mistakes. I think one also must be very careful of this sort of mental inflation when you're doing something that normally you can do it very well and you're so convinced that you can do it very well that you start becoming careless and don't take proper precautions, prepare yourself properly.

'r~PE 25 page

S;: (cont.) You think you can do it without thinking sort of thing. So you start doing it without thinking. It shows. You start making mistakes quick enough.

Voice: Yes, even in our context, when things go well this inflation does come about and then when you fall it's really horrible.

Voice . (unclear) ... in our context?

Voice: Well, not just, it's not just the world, it's us as well.

Voice: It's certainly us surely.

S: Well, some people can become quite inflated with their success or other success in meditation, that they're getting on quite well, sailing through higher mental states whereas other people are not able to do that. But I think it is pretty clear what mental inflation is. Why does the sutra say 'an inflated mind is the root of unconcern. Never treat a poor Bhikkshu with contempt or you may not find salvation in an aeon'?

Voice: Sounds like a curse.

Voice: ..... (unclear)

S: Who do you think the sutra is addressing?

Voices: ..... (unclear)

S: No, I don't think it's the lay people - well it could be. I was thinking of something else.

Voice: ... a monk?

S: No, I think its addressing a bodhisattva. It is a Mahayana Sutra, presumably it is addressing a bodhisattva. 'Never treat a poor bhikkshu with contempt.' It could be addressing a bodhisattva - don't think that here you are a bodhisattva, Buddha in the making , looking down

TAPE 25 page 6 740

S~(cont.) upon the ordinary poor Hinayana bhikkshu, or it could also be addressing the laity who are intoxicated with pride of new success, and the good looks and riches and so on; don't be so intoxicated with these things that you look down on the poor bhikkshu with that old,

ugly C. (unclear?) A lot of the energy and strength that you

have with no risks whatsoever, don't be so intoxicated with those things that you treat him with contempt. One could look at it in both ways, either as addressed to the bodhisattva or would be bodhisattva, d'r to the laity. Warning the bodhisattva not to be so inflated, so mentally inflated with his pseudo-bodhisattvahood that he looks down upon the ordinary bhikkshus who just practise the precepts. And in the same way we could say it is addressed to the laity, 'Don't be so intoxicated with worldly things that you look down on the poor bhikkshus who have none of those things. You could put it into both of those ways. All right, let's go on to Malice then.

Voice: "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains malice as follows: What is malice? It belongs to the emotion anger, lacks loving kindness, pity and affection, and has the function of treating others abusively." "It is the desire to treat others abusively without loving kind feelings towards living beings. Here the various synonyms beginning with lack of loving kindness are explained according to the commentaries which say that 'lack of loving kindness' is one's own inclination to treat others abusively. 'Lack of pity' is the inclination to induce others to treat others abusively. 'Lack of affection' is to be pleased when one hears or sees others acting in such a way. Its function is easily understood."

S: Apparently it does not refer just to speech - 'abusive' might suggest that. It belongs to the emotion anger, lacks loving kindness, pity, and affection and has the function of treating others abusively, the other badly eh? So one has an inclination to treat others badly, or your own inclination is to induce others to treat others badly, and

741

S: (cont.) you're pleased when you hear of or you see others acting in such a way, that is to say, treating other people badly. A very unpleasant mental event. It almost amounts to a

sort of ... a sort of (unclear) ... other people.

Voice: (unclear) .... Sanskrit (unclear) .....

S: That's good, that's cruelty, ahimsa.

S: Is it treated as being other people treating other people badly or is it treated as being other people being treated badly?

S: I think this amounts to the same thing. People who enjoy such sorts of things as torture, or people who enjoy watching others

..... (unclear) what is getting satisfaction.

Voice: I was thinking from the point of view of (unclear)...

S: I think the suggestion here that you're pleased that somebody is being hurt. To what extent (unclear)? ... violent treatment, these sort of feelings are?

Voice: They remove the cause, might (unclear) .... such an attitude. They, I think, remove one's (unclear) ... for them.

Voice: Well in a way its sort of saying all society approves of peoples behaviour but I mean until things like that (unclear)...

S: I mean to what extent can it be regarded as a safety valve. Or are even safety valves really very (unclear) .... There might be a safety valve from a social point of view but are there such safety valves really from the point of view of the individual.

Voice: I'm sure (unclear) watching all this  
negativity going on ..... (unclear)

Voice: (unclear) ... incredible ..... (unclear) ....

TAPE 25 page 8 742

(conversation almost completely inaudible)

S: There used to be things like public hangings, but we don't have these anymore.

Voice: Saw something a while ago (unclear) an incredibly violent film full of all the  
worst possible things and yet I came out of it feeling completely purged, so I'd been cleaned  
out by the film.

Voice: But it did have sort of other connotations didn't it?

Voice: It wasn't a, from what I picked up, it wasn't indulgent, it was a kind of complete pain,  
over-riding the ..... (unclear) .....

Voice (unclear) the guy who got, I thought it was  
absolutely symbolic . . (unclear) .

Voice: . (unclear) . obviously using  
violence is symbolic.

S: Towards the end of Hamlet there's also a number of violent deaths occur, I don't think it could be said even in the context of the . (unclear) . . . . . that Shakespeare .

Voice: One has to (unclear) the whole context in which violence is portrayed or shown is of great importance.

S: It is of significance perhaps that a greek tragedy where death often occurs, the actual death always takes place off stage. The actual murder, the actual assassination always takes place off stage. It is never actually depicted on stage. There's no reason why, no reason at all why the Greeks shouldn't have depicted, they could have depicted but . (unclear) most ..... (unclear) as it were, and they were probably very bloody-minded on occasions but they placed it in an artistic context . (unclear?).

TAPE 25 page

S: (cont.) Perhaps something to think about. There's a fact effect, the fact of violence is there but you do not sort of recognise as it were, the perspective of it, of violence. It's not as if the Greeks were particularly addicted to violence, probably get ..... (unclear) ...

much more frequent (unclear) but~nothing portrayed.

Voice: Sounds as if they didn't need it on the stage.

S: That's right, yes, but when you do get it on the stage, when you do get it on the stage 0000000 I think that this isn't progress . on the stage because the introduction of it, the intro- duction of that element of (unclear word) 000 experience of malice as it were would disrupt the (unclear) ..... to undo the effect of the whole play (unclear) . tragedy was to

.. (unclear) and that involves a different

sort of story being enacted on the stage or perhaps on the film-screen. In a way, in a way its more real on the stage because actors become

persons . (unclear) 00000000 000

Voice: I've noticed in films in which violence is shown that one sort of has a sort of aggressiveness such that, one sort of thinks about something else, has a lot of very beautiful scenery in it, very colourful, sex - which are quite elevating and then towards the end of the film the scenery seemed violent and one felt as if one had opened oneself to the beauty of the play then suddenly one was punched in the face. It was quite a sort of savage and destructive and pagan, although one knew it was just film-making and didn't really happen.

S: Well, there's many film makers I'm sure just indulge their personal fantasies and a lot of people have shared values.

Voice: It also seems to bring in hard cash as well.

S: It's what people want but then perhaps it isn't. I mean, does that mean that there's a strong component of malice in the make up

TAPE 25 page

S: (cont.) of many people. I would suppose that to be SO.

Voice: (unclear) is real. You know, I think most people who see violence feel really kind of hurt by it. They want

S: They go to see the film and accept its known to be a very violent film Do they go wanting to be hurt? Are they masochists?

Voice: Maybe they feel that's a bit more real, get a feeling of reality. Maybe because it does

S: Their ..... (unclear) .... is for real as it were.

Voice: Maybe it brings out a part of them that they don't (unclear)

Voice: It may even bring out positive parts they don't usually see. A real feeling of compassion for who ever's being ...

S: I rather doubt that. (laughter)

Voice: It might be that they go along to these films, these latest films, blood and gore, maybe, they just go along to see blood and violence. .... (unclear)

S: It all seems pretty unwholesome, doesn't it? (unclear) Well, let's go on to shamelessness. (laughter)

Voice: "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains shamelessness as follows: What is shamelessness? It is not restraining oneself by taking one's perversions as one's norm. It is an emotional event associated with passion-lust, aversion-hatred, and bewilderment-erring. It aids all basic and proximate emotions. It is a strong tendency not to restrain one's shortcomings by taking oneself or an ideology as the norm. For instance, when a bhikshu is in a situation where he might have to consume alcohol and he refrains from doing so by thinking, 'It is not for me to do', he takes himself as the norm and this restraint from

evil is self-respect. The opposite is shamelessness."

TAPE 25 page 11 745

S: So shamelessness is the opposite of what we studied earlier on, which Guenther rendered as shame. This is the opposite of hiri. But the basic feature is not restraining oneself by taking one's perversions as one's norm. It's not simply the performance of an unskillful action. It's taking, in effect, the unskillful action or the habitual performance of the

unskillful action as the norm, as though it were something good, you may say it was one's principle.

Voice: You might say 'Oh well, that's just me'.

S: Yes, it's like saying 'That's just me, I always do it this way. As though that is something which can not be questioned. You should be taking something skillful, you should be taking a principle or ideal as the norm. Instead of that you take your own perversion as Guenther calls it, as the norm. This links up with the fact of obstancy - that you're not going to change. You've no intention of changing, because you've made your perversion the norm.

Voice: Based maybe ..... (unclear) on a misunderstanding of what the norm is.

S: I think the suggestion is that you, in a sense, know what the norm really is but you refuse to see that, you resist. I mean, even against your own better judgement or ... (unclear) ... your perversion is the norm. I mean, this is something which is sort of basic, that is unquestioned, every thing else is judged by that as it were.

Voice: (unclear) self.

S: Yes, but that is where the problem comes in. In other words you reject anything which is incompatible with the perversion which you

have accepted as your norm (unclear) ... because I don't care, that's the way I always do it, that's the way I am. Everything else will have to fit into that it might be that someone's always

very hot tempered, they don't say, 'Oh well, that's an unskillful attitude I've got to get rid of'. That's me, I'm just hot tempered

S-: (cont.) by nature - you just have to accept it, you have to get used to it, take me as I am, I'm not going to change, I can't change.... is taking one's perversion as one's norm. Or even saying 'It's good to be hot tempered, it's right to be hot tempered, I've got a right to be that way'.

Voice: I've got no time to be like Pete.

S: No, that's an excuse. That's not shamelessness, that would be sort of rationalisation.

Voice: Or ..... (unclear)

S. (unclear) .... This is a strong subjective tendency that we ought to .... (unclear) ... not to restrain one's ....(unclear) 0000 by taking one self or our .... (unclear) ... as the norm.

Voice: Doesn't this apply to something like smoking?

S: Yes, quite. I think - this just occurs~to me - I think that the

author here is .... (unclear) .... of the Gulugpa and takes the instances of a Bhikshu in a situation where he might have to consume alcohol with the wine drinking Nyingmapa in mind. (laughter) The Nyingmapa was often like, you know . (unclear) .... someone who was' in a situation where he~ght have to soncume tobacco.

Voices: ..... (unclear) .....

Voice: ..... (unclear) You might actually offend

somebody ..... (unclear)

S I don't know because then another norm comes into operation. Surely it is one of your norms not to hurt the feelings of other people. Sometimes it's a matter of adjusting or weighing one norm against another, but one thing I would think, I think one should be

ver#areful about invoking this norm as it were, this ... (unclear) .... that you should not hurt other peoples feelings. If it's a matter

TAPE 25 page °~7

S:- (cont.) which affects yourself, you have got no right to be hurt whatever. If they are hurt because you don't smoke, would that (unclear) ... so what? You're not to consider that. For instance if you're a vegetarian, some one knows that you're a vegetarian, knowing that you are a vegetarian they invite you to lunch, knowing that you are a vegetarian they deliberately give you non-vegetarian food and then if you wish to refuse that they say or they suggest their feelings are very hurt. If this is so they're putting pressure on you and you've got not only a right but a duty to refuse. Whether they're going to be hurt or not, they've no right to do that sort of thing. J3ut supposing they just didn't know? Supposing you'd forgotten to inform them? Supposing with genuine devotion and a lot of trouble they've prepared food and it included meat, well then you might consider it better to partake then not to partake. That's the difference of the situation. But don't let oneself be subjected to undue psychological pressure, not to say emotional blackmail on the you're not supposed to hurt my feelings, you're supposed to be a Buddhist, sort of thing. Like the young lady who went to a Bhikshu and said, 'If you don't marry me I'm going to commit suicide, you're supposed to be a follower of the Buddha and very compassionate, come on them ..?...

Voice: Is that a true story?

S:- Huh?

Voice: Is that a true story?

S: It might have been.

Voice: ..... (unclear)

&: Yes, indeed, yes.

Voice: ..... (unclear)

Voice: It's almost certain to have been a true story.

TAPE 25 page

S:: Well, you know, it's by taking oneself or one's ideology as the norm, not just yielding to pressure, you know, from other people. You know, I think it's sufficiently obvious what shamelessness is. It's almost making not only a virtue, but, you know, a principle out of some weakness of one's own, while making everything else revolve around that. On to the next one, which is the opposite of er, er ...

Voice: Decorum?

S: Decorum, mmm0 Well, let's read that one.

Voice: "The Abhidharmasumuccaya explains the lack of sense of propriety as follows: What is lack of sense of propriety? It is not restraining oneself by taking others as the norm. It is an emotional event associated with passion-lust, aversion-hatred and bewilderment-erring. It aids the basic emotions and the proximate emotions. It is a subjective tendency not curb, restrain evil by taking others as the norm. Again, concerning this, when one is tempted to do evil (and restrains from doing so) and thin~s, 'It is not proper to be frowned upon by others who are worthy of respect, such as teachers and the gods, who look z to the mind of others' - one thus avoids evil by taking others as the norm. This is decorum. The opposite of this is the lack of sense of propriety. The flatnamala states: Shamelessness and lack of a sense of propriety means not to exercise restraint in view of oneself and others. The Bodhisattvabhumi states: self respect is a Bodhisattva's self restraint in the knowledge that any indulgences in impropriety is not his way. Decorum is this restraint in fear and respect of others. Both the

lack of self respect and the lack of the sense of propriety and ~l of the emotions and are the causes of all evil. If one does not want to refrain from evil, one can not protect oneself against it. Therefore, both the earlier and later Abhidharma

works state that the lack of self respect and the lack of propriety it

are said to be on the same level as

S: and correspond to all unhealthy attitudes

TAPE 25 page ~49

Voice: (cont.) "... Although more could be said, this will suffice.'1

S: Here again, it seems, the question of the ethical comes in, doesn't it? The lack of propriety amounts to not caring what others think in the negative sort of way, yes? And we're sort of quite accustomed to thinking of not caring what others think so though it were necessarily something positive and praiseworthy. This makes it clear that it isn't. You see what I mean? (~plies of yes, yes) There is a sense in which one should take notice of and care about what other people think, about one's self, about one's contacts, one's behaviour, not just anybody1 not just the other members of the group as such, but in this context, those who are wise, those who have one's ..... (unclear) ... those who share one's ideals. You should care what they think. In a sense even as an ordinary member of society, up to a point, one should care what other people think. But this certainly goes against much of current, as it were, pseudo liberal thi~ing.

Voice: ..... (unclear) 0

&: Not caring what other people think?

Voice: Yeah, actively not caring what other people think.

Voice: Individualist rather than .00(unclear) 000

S: Yes, going out of one's way to show one doesn't care what other people think. This often passes as being individual. The disregarding of other people, showing contempt for them 0 for them. (long pause) But if one has no sense of what is becoming, to use that word, as regards oneself, what is becoming or unbecoming for one to do, if one doesn't care what other people think it really means one has got no sense of oneself as a responsible, ethical individual, doesn't it? If one does not want to refrain from evil, which is what the ethical individual wants to do, one cannot protect oneself against it. If you have no sense of what is proper for you to do or not to and no sensitivity to what other people think about your actions, good or bad, it means

TAPE 25 page 16

S: (cont.)you've really no ethical individuality - you can not but perform unskillful actions. You can not but generate unpleasant consequences for yourself. Therefore both the earlier and later Abhidharma works state that the lack of self respect~~nd the lack of propriety are said to be on the same level as, an~ correspond to, all unhealthy attitudes. What do you think the root of this is? The root of this failure to see that something is becoming, that something is unbecoming. The failure to see that certain things should not be done because they are disapproved of by the wise, that certain things should be done because they are approved of by the wise. What is the basic root of all this, do you think?

Voice: Lack of faith.

Voice: (unclear)

~: I'm thinking in sort of more ordinary human terms, because this is where it starts.

- ( Voice: Lack of respect for others.

S: Even more basic than that. Why don't you respect?

Voices: .....o (unclear) .., you don't love them.

S: But~why don't you love them?

Voice: Lack of respect for one's parents.

S: Lack of respect for one's parents, mm. I think it comes down to something still more basic, which is you don't love yourself. I mean this is the basic root psychologically, you don't love yourself. So you don't really think of 'what would be good for me, what is appropriate for me' You don't love yourself. You can't, you don't feel that other people might like you because you don't love yourself, yes? You do sometimes find this, that certain people are not convinced that, for instance, you do really, you know, care about their welfare, that

TAPE 25 page 751

&~. (cont.) you are concerned. They can't believe that. Why? Because they don't love themselves. So it would seem to me to~come back to this ...(unclear word) metta towards yourself. Therefore you cannot truly wish well towards yourself, you can't consider what would be really good for you, truly ~ood, and you can't believe that other people really do care about your welfare. And therefore you can't care what they think of you and about what you are doing. And no doubt this feeling of, this inability to love oneself in the sense of feeling metta towards oneself, it does go back, in meditation at least, to one's experience with one's own parents.

Voice: It seems that there's a tremendous responsibility on my parents.

S;: This is something that I felt yesterday, when I felt that in the . (unclear) .... that you know .... that I was thinking after the session that only a very brave person would dare to become a parent. And there's the matter of doing things in full knowledge and awareness. You need to be very brave and responsible person to become

I.

a parent. Some people have even said to me . (unclear) ..... when they think about becoming a parent, the responsibility of it just

terrifies them. Perhaps one shouldn't think too much about it otherwise, you know, you might paralyse yourself and be just darting from one Dr. Spock book to another. When later Spock disagrees with earlier Spock then you are really in the (unclear) ..... The gospel according to Spock changes from year to year practically.

Voice: ..... (unclear) .... one has a relatively extended family

O 00 . (unclear). ....

S: That's why I think that people, you know, who feel or find themselves deficient in these two skillful mental events have to look very carefully into themselves and ask or try to see whether in fact they are not deficient in self love in the sense of metta towards themselves. But they don't care sufficiently for themselves. Again

TAPE 25 page ~2

&: (cont.) it's, in a way, the psychological as distinct from the ethical, the ethical as distinct from the psychological, it's not enough to see yourself, in a sense know yourself in a sort of coldly, you know psycho-analytical sort of way. It's not enough to introspect, and analyse and o..o.o....o it's also even more important that you love yourself. One can always, the problem you cannot be an ethical individual unless you love yourself. And that sort of self love, in the sense of metta towards yourself is, I think, comparatively rare.

Voice: Is there any way that a person can ..... (unclear)

. anything you can do to help them help themselves? Does it do any good to share your love?

S: I think it does, though very often they find it very difficult to receive that, or recognise that to be~ with. But quite a few people came round to loving themselves only by way of coming to recognise the fact that other people do love them and they feel 'I can't be so bad

after all'. But if you can really con~nce someone that you do wish them well then I think that can be a cons~derable help in getting them to love themselves. I think it's virtually impossible to do this in the so called romantic context. I think it must be done within the context of friendship. I don't think one can do it within the context of the relationship in the ordinary way, that is something with a difference from goodwill. It's being involved. It's not, it's definitely metta that the person thinks you're giving them not love in the ordinary sense. Because they can seize this in an egoistic kind of w~.

Voice: ..... (unclear)

S: They can seize this, that is, they can seize the love in an egoistic sort of way. That won't help them to love themselves, that will compensate them for not loving themselves. You see that? You see the difference?

TAPE 2~ page 19 75--~

Voice: I don't0

S: Instead of learning to love yourself, perhaps sort of being aware someone else has got genuine goodwill for you and in this way coming to feel genuine goodwill towards yourself - as a sort of void that you experience, you feel sort of &empty and you see somebody else's love so as to fill that void and make you feel all right, at least for the time being. But you don't do anything about yourself or about that feeling of emptiness yourself.

Voice: ...oo. (unclear)

S: Exa~tly, yes. You go looking for a substitute, but if it so happens that that metta is not withdrawn, because having, being metta, in a sense it can't be withdrawn but if it is no longer available, if that particular person is no longer around for no particular reason connected with you, then if with the help of that person you have developed your metta towards yourself, you are much more able to stand on your own feet. So there is a distinction that the - your gradual 6¼ \$ response to somebody's metta developing metta towards yourself as you come to realise that another person feels that you are genuinely worthwhile and simply greedily grabbing somebody else's infatuated love for you as a compensation for the fact that you just can't love yourself.

can't compensate for the inner emptiness that you feel. These are two quite different things.

Voice: .. (unclear) o... sometimes after a retreat, when you get back, you feel a certain coming down. It's almost as if, it seems .~..~.. (unclear) . you've had a good feeling towards

(unclear) ~... and you come back into the world as it were and even if generally people are developing their level of metta .... 00 00 (unclear)

S: In the one case you learn to love yourself by being with someone who does love you, using love in the sense of inetta, but in the other

TAPE 25 ~age 20 7.54

&: (cont.) you, as it were, let the other person love you instead of loving yourself. You let him or her do it for you. You don't learn to do it yourself, for yourself. There is dependence then on that other person's love ..... (unclear) 0 where as in the first case, even if you did feel, you know, not worth very much to begin with, you learn from the other person that you are, in fact, of some worth and begin to appreciate your own worth and to love yourself.

Voice: What if someone is taking this second attitude and takes your metta? Is there anyway that you can, what can you do about that?

S: I don't think they can only take your metta without mistaking the metta for something else. Even, some people, they even take your metta which is not, let's say, romantic love, as its less unfriendly as a lack of interest in them as something very cold and impersonal, they may not feel it as metta at all.

Voice: They're very insecure, one imagines 0

S: I think it may be that such people may not be sensitive to your K?)% metta, they may not feel it. They may even think that you're a rather cold person, not very interested in them,

not very concerned about them. The metta is in a sense rarified, it's not quite on their wavelength. Even though you show it by ..... (unclear) .... and actions that you have goodwill for them. It doesn't really, it's not what they want, they want love in the other sense, to fill their aching void. So, in a way your metta means very little to them. It means very little to that sort of person in that sort of situation.

Voice: They don't seem open either emotionally or intellectually even because unable to read the signs even at a mental level.

S:~ Indeed yes. They are able to read the signs at a mental level, they just don't feel your metta. Anyway, we've got on to this from consideration of ..... of self love, we got on to that because I said that shamelessness and lack of sense of propriety

--TAPE~25 page 21 7\$5

S: ..... are basically from the fact that one does not have any genuine metta towards one's own self. And therefore, you know, one is not really interested in one's own development ..... you're not really interested in your own welfare. Alright, let's go on to gloominess.

Voice: Pmuga-pa.

S: What is this in ..... (Voices: S~yona) Oh: Oh:

Voice: S T Y A N A

S: This isn't gloominess. I think it more, it definitely becomes clear from the Abhidharmasamuccaya what it actually is, let's read that whole section through and then consider it.

Voice: The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains gloominess as follows: What is gloominess? It is the way in which the mind cannot function properly and is associated with listlessness. Its function is to aid all basic and proximate emotions: it is a very subjective tendency in which physical and mental heaviness and sluggishness dominate. Concerning this the Atanala states, 'Gloominess is any lack of activity due to heaviness of body and mind'. The Abhidharmakosavyakhya states, 'What is gloominess? It is heaviness of body and heaviness of mind. It is a state of physical inertness and mental inalertness'. The lam-rim explains it in the same manner. The statement that its function is to aid all of the basic and proximate emotions means that all of the emotions increase in intensity on account of gloominess. Therefore the Adhyasayasamcodarasutra states, 'Who rejoices in sleep and sluggishness will have a distorted view of the world, as when body fluids, air and bilious fluids become excessively present in the body. whoever rejoices in sluggishness and sleep will be dulled just as food which has turned bad is not healthy. When the body is heavy, the complexion will be unhealthy, and even one's speech will become incoherent.

TAPE 25 ~age22 156~'

Voice: (cont) And whoever rejoices in sluggishness and sleep will be dull and take no interest in the dharma and will shy away from all virtuous qualities. And since brightness leaves his life, he will remain in darkness.??

S: Gloominess is not the correct translation. The Abhidharmasamuccaya says this is the way in which the mind cannot function properly. The literal meaning of styana is something like stagnation or stiffness or paralysis, and that's why it says that is the way in which the mind cannot function properly. How can you function properly when you're stagnant, stiff, paralysed? It's that sort of thing.

Voice: Is it perhaps, is it like the state of (earth ?)

S: The fact that there's heaviness, it's not just heaviness. It's stagnation, or paralysis, it's different from heaviness. Heaviness may contribute to it or it may be an (word unclear) ... sort of heaviness, but it's a sort of listlessness. ~ull really means literally almost exactly listlessness, as when you're sort of, you know, paralysed.

Voice: It's like when you have a piece of metal in a strong magnetic field, very difficult to move it around.

S: It's inertness, yes, it's inertness also.

Voice: Blocked?

S: Blocked, it's being blocked.

Voice: . (unclear)

S: Mmm, yes. It's not only just blocked, but they've been blocked so long they've become petrified. It's what they can't move anymore. It's that sort of thing. Closely associated with listlessness, its function is to aid all basic and proximate emotions, all kleas, and kiasas because what can you do? You can't do anything about cultivating

TAPE 25 page 23 757

S: (cont'd) the positive. You feel heavy, you want to sleep, you can't do anything, you feel bound, you feel listless, you feel stagnant, nothing happening, torpid, slothful, sluggish, more than that. Even that suggests a certain amount of minimal movement. At least you're able to stretch your hand out wearily for another chocolate. (laughter) In the sense of styana you can't even do that. You're so paralysed.

Voice: I know there's a ..... (unclear) ... in the beginner 1~seminar this is listed as the worst of all for getting into meditation. You couldn't get into it.

Voice: You couldn't even think about meditation.

S: Right, yes.

(Confused talk)

Voice: Why is it only a secondary cause and not a first one? I

wonder why (unclear) °... this is a secondary and not basic.

S: I think in some cases that they both present secondary and tertiary formations. Yes? Of the basic emotions. In other words more complex forms because you probably have to pass through quite a few other negative mental states before you get to styana.

Voice: Before you graduate.

S: Yes, right.

Voice: ..... (unclear)

S: Yes, indeed.

Voice: How would you get out of it?

Voice: Someone come along and give you a big boot.

S: It is very difficult for you to get out of it by yourself. It's

S: (cont0) like the state of acute alcoholism, you've gone so far you're no longer in a position of being able to do anything about it. You require the intervention of somebody else. This is one of the great advantages of spiritual friends, that they help you when you can't help yourself. So one should be careful not to allow oneself to get into any of these, as it were, so far as your own efforts were concerned, own unaided efforts were concerned, in .... (unclear) states. When you can no longer retrace your steps, no longer undo the harm that you've done yourself, without help. Even then when you get outside help with great difficulty. A lot of assistance on

your part. You know since you almost don't want to be helped. w

-Voice: It feels like a living death.

S: Sometimes people say, I mean, 'I don't want to be helped'. There's nothing that you can do. I'm finished0, (They're speaking as when they're very, very depressed ?) but sometimes when they're very very angry at least for the time being they speak like that, or when they're very anxious or very resentful. They've gone so far into this that they can't get out of this themselves and even resist your efforts to get them out of it. In the case of the person suffers styana he probably won't have, he won't even be able to resist your efforts to get him out of it. He won't even be able to react to you in that sort of way. It's just like trying to lift a great heavy weight, to get him moving a bit, to buck him up a bit. There's just a great lump of resistance, there's not reactive resistance. How do you think a person gets into this state? Styana.

Voice: ..... (unclear)

S: Mmm.

Voice: Also the actual fact, karma from the past.

&:: Yes, it could be that too0

Voice: A very bad upbringing because of that0 Maybe not even an ethical upbringing.

Voice: I think 0 (unclear)

S:: You're not worth doing anything about? Mmm?

Voice: It seems like that person in context of the .... (unclear) quite difficult to get them out of it, so far as the healthy group is concerned. Probably have to sort of maybe go along to some of these encounter (unclear) .... sort of like ..... (unclear)

S: That might be got at by the ..... (unclear) .... body.

Voice: ..... (unclear) .... yes if it was a really bad case of stagnation then its almost sort of the muscles being contorted~

S: .... (unclear) .... state of apathy .... (unclear) ... feeling of apathy.

Voice: ... . (unclear)

S: Well, let's just quickly do the next one because it's the opposite of styana. It's ebullience. What's that in Sanskrit?

Voice: ..... (unclear) .....

S~ (Aduksa ?) Yes, a sort of recklessness, ... (unclear) unsettled state of mind. It is compared to the disturbed state of

(unclear) ..... (laughter). All right, let's read that section ~hen.

Voice: "The Abhidharmasamuccaya explains ebullience as follows: What is ebullience? Is it restlessness of mind which is associated with passion lust that gets involved with things considered to be enjoyable. Its function is to obstruct quietness. It is a very

TAPE 25 page 26 '60

Voice: (cont.) subjective tendency which becomes involved with craving and running after what has previously been seen as pleasurable experience. Regarding this, the Ratnamala states, 'Ebullience is an utter restlessness in body and mind'. The Pancaskhandaprakarana says, 'What is ebullience? It is the unsettled mind.' The Lam rim elaborates this by stating, 'Its objective reference is a pleasant and enjoyable object. Its observable quality is a restlessness of mind and a move towards its object. And since passion-lust predominates, ebullience proceeds in the observable quality of craving. Its function is to hinder the mind from settling on its reference.' It is not proper to think that every instance of the mind going out towards something is a case of ebullience. This ebullience is a preponderance of cupidity attachment and there are many instances when the mind goes out towards its object by way of other emotions which are not passion-lust. Since a mind can go out towards its objective reference without there being any emotions involved, every going out towards its object is not a case of ebullience."

S: It seems a weak definition in a way. It's not just restlessness it's more like excitement and turmoil and hilarity and loss of energy, scattered, unmindful energy.

Voice: It reminds me of energy, the image which came to my mind was (unclear) ...  
(Voices: No, no.)

Voice: ..... (unclear) It's more like a snowstorm 0 0 0 0 (unclear) .. 00 0 00.

S: It's like an unmindful liveliness. You can take the English word rather literally.

Voice: Would that be, sort of say, be likened to the Indian idea of the three ..... (unclear) .....  
Would it be sort of reference to the central one (unclear) 0

761

S: A bit like that yes. A ..... (unclear) ..... person is certainly restless, unsettled, turmoil, passionate.

Voice: Would it be what you might call speedy?

S: Yes, yes, but the reference is with regard to pleasurable objects, huh?

Voice: AH: .. 0 0 0 0 0 000000 (unclear) . 0 0 0

S: Ye~ yes, yes. You're looking for those pleasurable objects .. (unclear) °..... a person in search of a good time, always looking

in a, for fun, yes? It's also the treasure seeker.

Voice: It seems to be linked with mental inflation.

S: Mmm, yes. A bit sort of intoxicated by the pleasurable objects which you encounter. You want to encounter them again, you go looking for them, searching for them, you're reckless, excited, anticipating them. This is like the state~o? aTchild in a sweetshop, a greedy child let loose in a sweetshop and told that he or she ~n have anything that he or she wants. And they get so excited, darting from this to that and don't know what they really want, in a very sort of excitable, hilarious way. They can't make up their minds what to settle upon. Or an adult in a fairground or an amusement arcade you know.

Voice: Sounds like . (unclear) (laughter)

S: ..... (unclear) ..... night on the town. You know, not knowing ° ..... (unclear) ..... first.

Voice: Could even be a books" hop.

S: Could even be a bookshop, yes. Usually when I venture in a book- shop there seems to be a heavy atmosphere of greed, as it were. Not a light-hearted darting from this book to that.

762 TAPE. 25 page 28

Voice: Oh man. There's the 'Way of the White Clouds' .000(unclear) 000

5: ..... (unclear) 000 (laughter) So you can see how gloominess and ebullience are contrasted, they clearly are opposites. When they haven't reached extreme development you can sometimes see them in more moderate forms alternating in the same person ....(unclear) . very dull, gloomy, heavy, listless, you know, during the day. Come the evening they go out and they get abullient, they get excited, they get hilarious and all that sort of thing.

Voice: It's like a manic depressive.

S: It's like that yes.

Voice: ..... (unclear)

S: Perhaps it is, yes.

Voice: Like in a pub, isn't it? People in a pub. The only time you see them really very happy, genuinely happy ..... (unclear)

Voice: It's like going on the assembly line in the car factory, working all day. You go back home, put on your flash clothes, have a few pints, watches the telly, goes to bed and then next day just goes on.

Voice: I wouldn't say that was a ..... (unclear) .... surely .00(unclear)

Voice: The second one was irrelevant, the first one is a

(unclear) 0000000

(Confused talk)

Voice: You get this in the case of artists. When they're working they're full of energy, vigour and vitality, you can't hold them down. But when they're not inspired they're really awful.

&: Ebullience also conveys the suggestion, sort of, feverishness,

~2ae2 76~

~: (cont.) doesn't it. The sort of feverish pursuit of pleasure. Its function is to obstruct quietness. How can you possibly be quite in that sort of mood~

Voice: I think it can sort of ..... (unclear) .... in meditation. Your mind becomes a bit excited,

that tends to be followed by a o (unclear)

S: It's still as 000 (unclear) ..... as styana, obstruction in the sense of being obstructed. A sort of mental and spiritual or a state of permanence like mental and spiritual constipation. Nothing can come out and nothing can ... (word missing) ... block and it sort of hardens and solidifies inside you. It's like styana isn't it? There's no movement anymore. It's a very extreme state people very rarely ever get into it. It's quite extreme, though one can see the sort of tendency quite often.

Voice: Perhaps it's the embodiment of (unclear)

S: .... (unclear) 0 Well, tell us.

Voice: There's a woman who when she's out working, out with friends, at a pub 0000000 (unclear) ..... really drepressive, a real misery to be wth, just dead.

Voice: What is the opposite then?

S: Pardon.

Voice: What is the opposite?

S: You're speaking about ebullience now? The opposite of  
.... (unclear) 000000

Voice: You mean the (cognitive?)

S: What is it (co~nitive ?) comes from? Its positive counterpart would be priti or

something like that. Or even viriya, even energy.

TAPE 25 page 30

764

Voice: Presumably that's concentrating on

S: On the good rather than on the pleasant. Not to fly from one thing to another but remaining settled upon one thi~g.

Voice: Seems to be extremes of control, one is no control. (Yes, that's true) - absolute control. The priti, the energy would be there but sort of controlled, concentrated.

Voice: Isn't ebullience more out of control?

Voice: Ebullience?

Voice: Yes . (unclear) 00 .

S: Having a good time.

Voice: Priti implies a kind of concentration, kind of an external where as viriya with priti can concentrate much more on the internal or much more on the .... (unclear) Yeah, much more on what's all ready there rather than going out

S: Yes. Talking about viriya, this reminds me of the fact again of this psychological and ethical that we often, though we speak about viriya in terms of the pursuit of the positive we often think of viriya just in terms of energy and feeling the energy coming up and feeling good because you've got lots of energy. We don't think so much of energy, viriya, in ethical terms. .. (unclear) ... this is the thing directing it in such a way as to be of benefit to other people. We usually think in terms of the experience of being oneself full of energy, feeling good because of that. We seem to think of it more exclusively in psychological terms. Do you see that? Not of viriya as harnessed to ethical ends and in a sense we got to (unclear ?) ... you know, whether these ethical winds are our own or for our own sake or for those of others or ~th. But again this is the psychological emphasis of energy as in itself a good thing, as

TAPE 25 page 31

it were, regardless of how it is used. You know, 'I want to get my energies out' people say, as though that's an end in itself? Well what do you do with your energy? You don't seem so concerned with that. If you get your energy out, well, that's that. You don't need to bother about anything more. You see the more we mention these things, these instances about the distinction between the psychological and the ethical, it seems as though the whole sort of psychological you know, in inverted commas, I was thinking is thoroughly sort of, self indulgent and self centred. I mean, this is one of the ways in which Tibetan Buddhism is so striking, the ethical emphasis is so very, very strong and usually in terms of the Bodhisattva Ideal, because it works out on all~orts of levels and all sorts of quite concrete ways.

Voice: You can take it to be ethical, you've got to put your energies beyond yourself, much more into relationships outside yourself.

S: But you mustn't think that those relationships are there simply in order to help your own self development. ~ you see that? The other person is helping himself or herself just in the same way and to the same extent that you are aiding yourself.

Voice: Therefore do you have to see just what's there?

S: Well, no. It's more than just seeing, it's actually devoting yourself too.

Voice: (unclear) 0 concern for people.

S: As well as for yourself.

Voice: It doesn't negate yourself.

S: No, no.

Voice: Balancing

TAPE 25 page 32 766

S:- - Very often people speak as though it does 'I've got no time for

others, why should I bother about others?' 'I've got to get on with my own self development. If I get asked to do something for others, well, no, this means I've got less time for my own self development'. Very readily people tend to see things in that sort of way. As though the ..... (unclear) ..... is not a separate consideration to which you have to give the same weight as it were, as you give to your own well being, and your own progress and your own development. Otherwise, if you don't do that your outer ethical relationships which paradoxically means you can't give up. Because you need to be an ethical person to develop, you need to be, the er, needs of others into consideration of the existence of others into consideration if you are to develop, but not simply as a means to your development. Do you see the difference? You don't practise metta bhavana just so you can get to higher states of consciousness. You practise metta bhavana because, as it were, it is an intrinsically good thing that A the other person should be helped. Y~)r

Voice: Basically comes back to the idea generally of having a Hinayanistic view trying to develop Mahayanaistic view.

S: I think that's a bit simplistic in a way. As regards Hinayana - Mahayana, it just a question of relative emphasis. They both, in effect, see that you can't separate your own well being from the well being of others.

Voice: I meant in a generalisation so that it puts you in a direction of selfishness.

S: Well, both Hinayana and Mahayana have got the, what we call the self regarding and the other regarding aspects.

Voice: Maybe the .... (unclear) .... its just loving people just for that. Just because you are

S: Otherwise there is this tendency just to use others and your relationships with others, your attitudes towards them, simply for the sake of your own development. It's as though one has to ratify, this is speaking in relative terms, that others have as it were, a value of their own.

Voice: You can actually wish that somebody else is happy because you ..... (unclear) ..... so in a sense it seems quite skillful though it's not.

S: Well, this is not completely skillful. Not as skillful as it might be. You're just, you're not treating the other person as relatively speaking an end in himself, but as a means to your end even though you define your end in a positive and as it were, a spiritual fashion.

Voice: It almost suggests this psychological thing as a treading on people to get out of Samsara. You're just using others.

S: You're not even treading on them, you know, it's even more subtle than that. You regard other people as objects for the development of your metta. So that by developing metta you can develop as an individual and become enlightened. Well, what about them? Just using them?

Voice: Paradoxical in a way, isn't it? If you are .... (unclear) ... others you can't get out of Samsara.

Voice: If you enter the spiritual life for the wrong motives ....

..... (unclear) ..... I can imagine somebody going on for quite

a while keep coming against the same thing again and again. (unclear)

Voice: Would you say that the ethical is the spiritual life?

TAPE 25 page 34 768

S: I wouldn't equate the ethical and the spiritual. Because it's what I spoke about others being .... (unclear) .... themselves but there is a higher point of view where you don't, as it were, even think about others in that sort of way at all. But access is through the ethical not bypassing it. Many people are, maybe the majority of people come along, for instance, to the Centre looking for what would be good or helpful for them. This is all right up to a point. There are very few come along wondering what they can do to help. So that is an imbalance and has to be corrected sooner or later. You can't go on indefinitely using the Centre just, you know, for your own benefit, in that sort of narrow and almost selfish sense. Even though you may start off like that.

Voice: ..... (unclear) .... keeps coming along with that attitude

before ..... (unclear) . pretty sure quite .... (unclear)...

S: If they had at least a glimpse of what you were doing and liked it their first reaction was, well, 'I'd like to help'. That would be very very positive indeed. Some people are around for year after year just trying to take, trying to grab and not thinking in terms of what they can do for others. It's not the place or the institution, it's other people.

Voice: It's very parasitic isn't it.

S: Mmm. Anyway, perhaps we ought to end on that slightly more cheerful note (laughter). Does that mean there'll be silence from now onwards?

Voice: A question though.

S: Any points to raise before we go?

TAPE 25 page 35 769

Voice: Is there silence - did we agree to have silence right up to the public ordination. That's what I thought we agreed to. We didn't?

S: We agreed to have silence all day today except for the study. I don't think anything was settled about when it ends. Do that if you like.

Voice: You did mention that you felt it would be a good thing to have silence on the last night.

S: Not the whole day certainly.

-Voice: ..... (unclear) .....

S: We could have some silence in the morning. It wouldn't be a good thing, I think, to have it the whole day.

Voice: Shall we have it up to the first study tomorrow?

S: Yes, that's a good idea, up to the first study tomorrow and then as from the study no more. Only one little thing I wanted to say. That is, ..... (unclear) ..... tomorrow about using the big upstairs shrine, this evening and tomorrow, so from now onwards for the rest of the retreat we'll use that for the pujas and meditation and the private ordination will be in the downstairs room. So is some one would like to do a little extra decorating etc ., etc.,

Page 93 - followed by laziness. There's one or two points I'd like to make before we start on lack of trust. One or two points that occurred to me at the time but got a bit lost as it were on the way. In fact I might even say that I think this is probably the first retreat on which I've sometimes found it difficult to get a word in edgeways. (laughter) But here is one or two words I wasn't able to get in, as it were, you know, at the time. (laughter) Connected again with this whole question of the psychological and the ethical.

TAPE 25 page 36 .770

&: (cont.) I was thinking about it in connection with that phrase of (Guenther). I don't know what Sanskrit or Tibetan term it translates, but it's what he calls or something that he calls Bi-tendential value of Being, with a capital B. What do you think he means by that? Has anybody got any idea at all? Being with a capital B, Bi-tendential

t Value of ~eing.

Voice: Going two ways?

S: Yes, that's pretty good, going two ways.

Voice: Samsara - Nirvana.

S: No. It's Being with a capital B. You've transcended apparently

the level of conflict.

Voice: Wisdom and Compassion.

S: Yes, right - wisdom and compassion. That he (unclear) up  
-the Bi-tendential value of ~eing. How exactly do they come in? It's  
as though the psychological has reference to oneself, the ethical  
to another. Not that the two are completely exclusive because you

7 also come into the picture when there is a reference to an other. But why is it even that  
we think and speak in terms of self and other, subject and object? It's because of this basic  
and original, so far as ordinary experience goes, irreducible dichotomy of self and other, of  
subject and object. It's within this framework, within the framework of this dichotomy that  
the whole of our experience and the whole of our thought takes place. But according to  
Buddhist thought, according to Buddhist philosophy for want of better, especially according  
to the Mahayana philosophy, especially in the sense that Mahayana brings this out more  
clearly., That's to say more abstractly than the Theravada in what Guenther calls Being. In  
the realm of ultimate reality there is no subject/object division. I think that is commonly or  
generally understood. It's as though on the level of 'ct( o~ -- -

-rc