

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/Tiratna 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 Tiratna 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 [Tiratna 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](#).

understand, they don't agree upon the meaning of the terms that they use. For instance people might have a discussion about love, but they might mean quite different things by that particular term. Or they might not even have thought about it at all. They might not have a clear idea of what love means. They might just have a vague sort of impression, a vague sort of feeling, as they would say. So discussion under those conditions is really not possible. One can only have a mutual exchange of noises.

Mike Shaw. - What I was thinking was whether it was possible for the language to be more literal rather than metaphorical really. Whether you could have some more clearly defined meanings, I guess, because it seems that a lot of the problems seem to be due to lack of clarity in some way.

S. - Yes, I think this is certainly true and therefore there is a great need for clarity in one's communication. One must be clearer about the meaning of the words that one uses, the ideas that one is putting forward. But at the same time I would say that is not enough. There does need also to be what you called sympathy, or perhaps one should call it empathy. A sort of positive feeling between people who are parties to the discussion, and a willingness to arrive, so to speak, at the truth. So that their discussion isn't a sort of competitive wrangle as sometimes it is. But I don't think that if one develops a sort of cold clinical scientific language, that will necessarily be the solution, because there's a lot that you will want to communicate that can't in fact be expressed in that particular way.

Mike. - If it is possible to actually define language and make it clearer in that sort of way, does that mean language is sort of ceasing to be metaphorical if you did make it clearer ?

S. - Not necessarily - it can become more intensely metaphorical, because nothing so much is a discussion as a good metaphor, or a good simile. Very often something that you've been struggling to communicate in more general conceptual terms for perhaps some minutes

),

is certainly made clear when you use an appropriate metaphor or other figure of speech. - But I think I can sort of repeat in this particular context what I said before, in other contexts, that there's not to be a will to clarity. You've got to want to be clear. I think that is very important. You've got to want to be clear and positive and creative in your own thinking. And you've got to want to communicate that to other people.

Vessantara. - In thinking about this I was trying to clarify my own mind a bit.
- if language is essentially metaphorical or if

you view language as essentially metaphorical, could you see that view as a sort of middle way between the 2 extremes of the absolute identification - say, that a primitive man makes, between the language, the word and Reality, that being one extreme. And the other extreme being a sort of correspondance theory where you have two separate entities, the language and the...

S. - Yes. Yes you could certainly look at metaphor in that sort of way, as a bridge or a middle way, in that fashion. But perhaps I should make one qualification here. When I speak of language as essentially metaphorical, I mean the language which we use with regards to non-material things, that is to say with regard to ideas, thoughts, philosophies, is metaphorical. Because when one says that something is metaphorical, one means that terms which are derived from one's sensuous experience, say from one's kama-loka experience, are applied to experiences which are not of the kama-loka nature at all, which are non-kamaloka experiences. In other words one applies terms derived from one's experience of the material world to the world of thought, even to the world of spiritual experience.

So one doesn't, one cannot, apply them literally. They are

applied in a metaphorical way. So any kind of language which refers to one's anything beyond / immediate experience~ of the material world is

necessarily metaphorical. this Perhaps I should add a warning here - that/assumes, of cOu~55~

283 '~

that language does hav"e it's origins in sense experience. Some traditionalists might disagree. They might maintain that language c~me from heaven, that language has a divine origin. But that's another

derived from matter. One might say to~the extent that language is ~/" one's experience of the material world, to that extent, any use of language

in connection,~ay, with the non-material world or one's experience of that non-material world, will be - in fact must be - metaphorical.

For instance, give you a very, very common expression. We speak for instance of En - light -en -ment. So we are applying the expression light, which is clearly a phenomenon of our sense experience, to a realm or to a sphere which is non-material. We speak of the light of Reality, for instance~ 'The Light of Truth'. But here the term 'light' is used metaphorically. So you can see that just in the same way that light, in a manner of speaking, abolishes the darkness, so truth abolishes - untruth, or the light of truth abolishes the darkness of ignorance.

So even the most refined anti sophisticated philosophical vocabulary will be found on examination and analysis to have a

fairly earthy origin. In other words philosophical language is inherently metaphorical. Religious language is metaphorical. It cannot be otherwise. This leads to all sorts of interesting implications and consequences which we can't pursue now. Perhaps we will on some other future occasion, not necessarily here at 11 Convento this year.

Anyway what else did you have ?

Vessantara.- I just wanted to clear up something else in that discussion. You say at one point, "speaking metaphorically doesn't correspond to the truth, in a sense a "metaphor embodies the truth. This is a quote; 'In a sense, a very sort of highly specialised form, or a very limited form, that is to say, a metaphor under certain conditions, within a certain context, is reality.' And I, a bit further on started asking you a question about that statement. And you then said, 'It's not that under certain special conditions a metaphor can be

))

284 ~ 34

reality, but that a metaphor is a case of reality being under certain special conditions.' Can you clarify that for me a bit ? I didn't..

S. - I think there's a few words missing off the end here, of what I actually said.

Vessantara. - er. As far as I know you then went on to talk about the example of the metaphor of the...

S. - Read that again. The distinction is quite subtle.

Vessantara. Yes. This goes as follows: "It's not that under certain special conditions a metaphor can be reality, but that a metaphor is a case of reality being under certain special conditions."

S. Ah well the difference is quite clear. (laughter) Vessantara. - I can't quite get my brain around it, could you -- help me at all ?

S. - I don't think at the moment I can put it more clearly than that. I think to make it more clear I'd have to take apart and explain more fully what I meant by each statement or each position in such a way as to show how they did in fact differ, but that would take me some time~ I think I'd better leave it for this evening. But bring it up in a few evenings time, preferably near the beginning of the evening's session.

Vessantara. - I'll give it some more thought myself before then.

S. - Perhaps we'd better end on that note then. O~,f~Q.~

285 BI ~ 1

Vessantara; So this evening we have questions on the seventh lecture on the Bodhisattva Hierarchy. We'll start with a question from Devamitra.

Devamitra; In my group we were discussing the difficulty which western people seem to have in offering worship reverence and we discussed a variety of different qualities or terms - for instance, veneration, respect, reverence, admiration and appreciation and I explained that eight years ago I think it was in exchange between yourself and myself we were talking about the difference between admiration and appreciation and as best as I can remember you seemed to be implying that it's much easier to admire someone than to really appreciate them, and I wondered if you could expand the distinction for us.

S: I don't think that's very easy. When one admires something I think there is a suggestion, at least, of looking up to it in some way. For instance in my talk last night I happened to refer to Michelangelo's David. No doubt it would be quite appropriate to say that one admired Michelangelo's David but would it be appropriate to say that one appreciated it? It would seem that in this connection, appreciation was a somewhat weaker word. Admiration means that you're sort of overcome with wonder contemplating the product of Michelangelo's skill and inspiration, but as I said appreciation does seem something quite a bit weaker at least in this connection. Appreciation seems to be more like a sort of just estimate of something and a just estimate of something can be a comparatively low or comparatively high estimate. Appreciation seems to come a little near to value. You can value something at a low rate or value it at a high rate. Just as you can have a low appreciation of it, or have a high appreciation of it. So it seems to me, initially, that admiration is a sort of general term; in general a more positive term a more powerful term to use that expression, than appreciation. On the other hand I see what you're sort of getting at. One could, for instance, speak in terms of someone having a real appreciation of Michelangelo but what would that signify as distinct from admiring Michelangelo's David? To appreciate Michelangelo would mean, as I said perhaps, that you had a just estimate of Michelangelo; you valued him at his true worth. So from this it would seem that the range of the term 'appreciation' is rather wider. You can appreciate things belonging to almost any level whereas 'admiration' would be definitely an appreciation of something belonging to a much higher level, much higher in fact. And you use, in fact, the word admiration instead of the word appreciation. Admiration conveying a sort of wonder almost, a sort of stupefaction sometimes. Do you see what I mean? I mean these are sort of initial thoughts on the matter, not having really given any thought to it before. I don't remember that particular exchange of ours and the subject certainly hasn't been in my mind since as far as I know. But no doubt it is good to try to discriminate these different shades of meaning. You mention several other words and they seem to constitute a sort of hierarchy though perhaps the term 'appreciation' includes a hierarchy within itself. You can say for instance that you appreciate a child's first attempt to draw or to paint, but you can also appreciate the work of a great artist. But you'd hardly admire the work of a child unless the child was a little David Hockney or something like that - or a musical prodigy like Mozart.

Devamitra; But if you really do appreciate a great artist doesn't

BI 11 2 286

that imply some kind of...that you yourself are on a higher level than if you merely admire?

S: Yes, that's true yes you can appreciate something on a lower level and you can appreciate something on the same level as yourself but perhaps, as you say, when it's a question of something on a higher level than you the word admiration is more appropriate. Though of course when you admire you appreciate but when you appreciate you do not necessarily admire.

Vessantara; Doesn't appreciation often suggest that you understand, to some extent, what was involved in producing say a work of art?

S: Yes, that's also true yes. It has also occurred to me that appreciation does have a connotation of value, because you can talk of your stocks and shares appreciating as well as depreciating. But, yes, perhaps the term appreciation does have a connotation of understanding which perhaps admiration doesn't necessarily have.

Lalitavajra; It has a quality of recognition.

S: Appreciation? Yes I suppose one could say that. One would be recognising perhaps the true value of something.

Padmavajra; I think you have referred in the past to one of Guenther's translations for wisdom being an 'analytical appreciative discrimination'.

S: An analytical appreciative understanding. He introduced appreciative to suggest that there was an emotional element - that it wasn't as it were dryly analytical. I think probably before trying to go any further I'd like to have a session with a few dictionaries to dig into the etymologies of these terms. The Anglo Saxon equivalent of 'admire' is 'wonder' isn't it. We're told that wonder is the beginning of philosophy. Perhaps appreciation is the beginning of ethics. Anyway I think that's as much as I can do for you for the moment with regards to these terms. It's really no more than an initiation of a discussion. There isn't anything definitive.

Devamitra; I wondered if we could come back after you've consulted your dictionaries.

S: But that would take several months because I don't have them here.

Devamitra; You don't have an adequate dictionary?

S: No. One would need to consult quite a good dictionary.

Vessantara; Simon, you had a question about gratitude and reverence.

Simon; And also devotion. I was wondering if you could shed some light on firstly the difference between gratitude and reverence and secondly the connection between the two.

S: Well I think the immediate difference is in the case of gratitude you're grateful for something received. Gratitude implies the fact that you're grateful implies that you have

BI 11 3 28~k

received something from the person to whom you are grateful. But in the case of reverence nothing like that is directly implied. That would seem to me to be the main difference.

Simon; We were looking at the background of reverence, looking it up in the dictionary and it was implying the higher nature, an attitude towards something that is higher than yourself. The reason I was asking the question was that the feeling of gratitude seems to come much more easily than the feeling of reverence. Partly perhaps because of the fact that it's something to do with something you received. It's more immediate.

S: Though of course it has been pointed out - this might have been pointed out by Schopenhauer or by one of the French moralists, that often people are unwilling to feel or acknowledge gratitude because gratitude suggests that you are in certain respects inferior to the person towards whom you are, or are supposed to be, feeling grateful. Do you see what I mean? Because if you've received something from him you are, in respect to that particular thing, inferior to him. He had it; you didn't have it; he gave it to you and you only have it because he gave it to you. So, indirectly gratitude's an acknowledgement in a way of inferiority. So that if you're rather conscious of this whole issue of superiority and inferiority you may well find it quite difficult to feel or to acknowledge gratitude, which is in fact the case with some people. You feel that you have been placed in an inferior position by the person who has given you something. Of course attitudes can differ widely. Some people may be very happy to receive. They can feel genuinely and spontaneously grateful. Others may not be so happy to receive because of the implied inferiority on their part and therefore they may find it very difficult to experience or to express gratitude. So I think it isn't only reverence that implies a sort of superiority using that term, which can be used either within a mundane or a spiritual context. So one might say further that a person who had difficulty experiencing and expressing reverence would very likely also have difficulty experiencing and expressing gratitude.

Antonio; And vice versa. Because if someone who's untogether expressing gratitude would find it very difficult to experience reverence too.

S: Oh yes and also in a more positive instance, if you found reverence coming naturally to you no doubt gratitude would too.

Prasannasiddhi; Although in a sense you could be grateful for something that doesn't necessarily imply that what was given or the person who gave it was superior to you, in a sense.

S: Well there are degrees. In the case of certain things they may be so trivial that though, admittedly, you've been given them, you haven't been placed under any great sort of debt. So you don't mind in the same way, receiving or even expressing gratitude. But if it's something quite important and there's something which very definitely, at least in your own eyes, places you in a position of inferiority, then you may find gratitude very

BI 11 4 286~

difficult to experience and express. If someone just gives you a stamp or envelope which you need well you just feel slightly grateful. There's no difficulty about that because it's a trivial matter. But for instance if somebody was to save your life and instances of this sort have been known the person whose life has been saved can feel quite uncomfortable and even in a strange paradoxical sort of way, resentful. (Laughter) It's as though too great a burden of gratitude has been placed upon them.

So this is why sometimes, if you do someone a very good turn it's advisable not to make too much of it, to do it, as it were, as lightly as possible. So they don't feel they've got to be grateful. And so that they don't feel perhaps their inferiority to you in that respect. For instance if you know something that they don't know, well don't make a great thing of it; don't make a big issue of it; that you know it, and that they don't, and that you're imparting this knowledge to them. I mean this is

obviously unskilful in other ways, but apart from that, one shouldn't so to speak expect too much from people in the way of gratitude, certainly no more than is reasonably due.

Dave Living: Is it easier to feel gratitude if you're generous yourself or does generosity not have anything to do with it?

S: Well it's as though the two things were reciprocal. I would imagine that if you were by nature generous and gave things easily and happily, if things were given to you you'd be happy to acknowledge that and express that. The two things seem to be characteristic of the same type of temperament or character.

Vessantara; Devamitra had a question about hierarchy.

Devamitra: The term hierarchy is one which you use in a variety of different contexts. Already you've used it this evening in relation to Veneration etc. Last night you used it in relation to images and with regards to the lecture we're studying at the moment it's the Bodhisattva Hierarchy. So it seems that the principle of hierarchy is of fundamental importance. But I was wondering is there an equivalent traditional term? And if so are there any expositions of that particular principle because I'm not aware of them.

S: The point has been made that in any particular civilisation or culture where a particular principle is of basic or fundamental importance, in fact of such basic and fundamental importance that it is taken for granted, no word for it exists. For instance in Buddhism there's no traditional term that really corresponds to our word 'tolerance', no word that corresponds to our word 'intolerance'. They seem to have taken all that for granted. It's as though in order to appreciate the tolerance of Buddhism you have to be able to look at it from the standpoint of a tradition, a culture which is not tolerant. Buddhism traditionally does not think of itself as tolerant. It doesn't make play with that concept; it doesn't recommend itself as being a tolerant religion; it hadn't attained that sort of self-consciousness with regards to its own nature. So it's much the same with this concept of the hierarchy. Buddhism, traditionally is saturated, one might say with this concept of hierarchy. It's part and parcel to traditional Buddhism, to such an extent that Buddhists are unable, almost, to step aside and see Buddhism itself as hierarchical. For instance

BI 11 5 287

you've got the hierarchy of the different levels of the cosmos, what I've referred to as the stratification of mundane existence - kamaloka, rupaloka, arupaloka. There is a hierarchy. The path itself consists of a series of steps or stages. There again you get the hierarchical principle in spiritual life itself deeply embedded; in fact the spiritual life is inseparable from that hierarchical principle. In the same way you get a hierarchy of faculties. You've got sutamayaprajna, chintamayaprajna, bhavanamayaprajna - a hierarchy of prajnas. You've got a hierarchy of persons. As with the Aryapudgalas and of course the Bodhisattvas themselves. So it would seem that the concept of hierarchy is an absolutely basic and fundamental one to Buddhism, without which Buddhism as we know it can hardly exist. For that very reason there is no traditional concept, no traditional word or term for this. I mean there are certain words or terms which express the idea of a sequence, in progressive order, of increasing value within a particular (concept?) but no sort of overall general term or general idea covering all these different, more specific hierarchies in a highly generalised form.

One no doubt could make up a term from Sanskrit; that wouldn't be difficult but it would not be a term that had general currency or that was habitually used in that sort of way.

Devamitra: It seems that in looking at the Dharma or seeing the hierarchy that is implied within the Dharma we are seeing it in a way from a slightly different perspective. Even you yourself do present things very often in terms of hierarchy.

S: Well because in a sense we're standing outside traditional Buddhism. We've been brought up in the West. Our conditioning is Western, to a great extent, so that when we approach Buddhism we

approach it, to begin with, as an object out there and there are certain things about Buddhism 'out there' which strike us, which don't strike the traditional Buddhist perhaps 'in there' who has been brought up in the midst of it all, with a different kind of cultural and psychological conditioning.

Prasannasiddhi; Does this mean that perhaps if Buddhism catches on in the west so that people become imbued with it then the term hierarchy will drift out of use?

S: It may or it may not, but I think it will be difficult to deny, as it were, one's history. It would be difficult to deny the fact that that one had in the west.... or Buddhism in the west had gone through that phase of having to grapple with the idea of what we termed 'hierarchy'. I must say I myself after so many years in Buddhism - I have if anything the opposite difficulty. I find it quite hard to sympathise or empathise with this concept of equality, the non or anti-hierarchical concept. It seems very sort of limited and restricting. I find it very difficult how people can actually believe that everything or everybody is equal in the way that they usually do seem to mean. That is equal in all possible respects, so that there is, in fact, no hierarchy. I find it very difficult to understand how they can possibly see things in this way. It would seem that inequality is almost the most obvious thing about life or any form of existence. You can see that even in biology. Anyway that's hierarchy.

Simon; Why do you think this attitude has arisen in the West?

BI 11 6 289

S: Well there are historical reasons for this. I can only sort of j~gt give a few hints. It requires exhaustive investigation. One might say there are true hierarchies and there are false hierarchies and it would seem that in Europe in the 18th Century or by that particular time, especially in France, the sort of social and religious, that is to say, ecclesiastical hierarchy that they had was a completely false hierarchy. It did not correspond to any actual facts or realities, and that eventually there was a great upheaval which we call the French Revolution. And that false hierarchy or that set of false hierarchies was overthrown both in church and in state. But inasmuch as they had had to negate what was in fact a false hierarchy people have had as it were to asser~or they did assert, not true hierarchy as against false hierarchy but rather no hierarchy or anti hierarchy or non hierarchy against false hierarchy, and in this way you get the famous slogan or part of the famous slogan of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity'. I think this is what happened. I think this is probably the basic historical reason that all through the 18th Century - Perhaps it goes back even earlier than that - especially in France, especially the philosophers, the philosophes, especially the encyclopaedists, they were very much concerned with what had become, which may originally had been some kind of genuine hierarchy but which had become something completely unreal, something completely false, which was no longer fulfilling the function it was supposed to fulfill. Court favourites were appointed to bishoprics and archbishoprics without even the faintest pretence to piety. In this connection there was one particular French king - I think it was Louis XVth who when the name of a certain courtier, a certain person, was proposed to him for Archbishop of Paris he demurred 'it was too much'. He said, 'No, no the Archbishop of Paris should at least believe in God~' (Laughter) So that indicates how far things had gone. And in the case of poor Louis XVIth who had his - well he was guillotined, he had apparently no idea whatever about government, no particular interest. His real interest was making locks; that was his sort of hobby. That was what he was really interested in. He spent quite a lot of time making locks. In other words he wasn't a king, he couldn't rule, he couldn't govern. These are just very extreme examples but, I mean, there was no real hierarchy anymore. The social order did not reflect any genuine hierarchy, nor did the ecclesiastical order of things. So I think we've inherited quite a lot intellectually from that period. That 18th Century leading up to the French Revolution was a very important period and we're still feeling the effects, politically, socially, intellectually, spiritually, in all sorts of ways. So we almost inherited a sort of anti hierarchical tendency. Not just a tendency of opposition to false hierarchies but an opposition to hierarchies as such. I think that has been rather unfortunate. One can understand people at that time not being able, perhaps not even being willing to distinguish between a genuine hierarchy and a false hierarchy. They didn't want to give a false hierarchy any sort of quarter at all, any sort of reason for existing at all, any sort of possible rationalisation, but in calmer times, in fact if times are calmer, we shouldn't have to do that.

Kamalasila; This is something that seems to come up quite a lot. We were talking a few days ago about the fact that the enlightenment of the Buddha and his Arhants, so called disciples was identical.

But at the same time it does seem to me that there must be a

BI 11 7 290

hierarchy of Buddhas . Is that correct? (Laughter) Do you want me to explain what I think?

S: Well let me just say one thing first. A hierarchy of Buddhas suggests sort of big Buddhas and little Buddhas. There is some slight justification for this in tradition. I think it's the Zen tradition because I do remember a little saying which goes, 'The bigger the heap of clay the bigger the image. The more the passions the more the Buddha.' or the more the enlightenment. But anyway that's just by the by.

Kamalasila; Well it seemed to me that in respect of their activities as Buddhas some Buddhas seem to be superior. Well the key example is Sakyamuni Buddha. His activity as a Buddha seemed to be much much more than his disciples and I wondered if it was perhaps in respect of his skilful means; or in respect of skilful means generally that you could say that some Buddhas were superior to others.

S: I would say that by very definition that could not be possible because skilful means are said to be identical with compassion and compassion, again, with wisdom. But of course it could be that depending upon the conditions, that obtain some enlightened persons are able to manifest their wisdom and compassion more than are others. Because circumstances are important. You are circumscribed by circumstances or by conditions to some extent. One particular Buddha, to use that term, may have a very sympathetic audience, another Buddha may not. So it's not that the one Buddha does or even that he's able to do more than another, it is simply that he meets with a more favourable reception, so to speak. In the case of the Buddha and his Arhants one has to recognise of course that the Buddha had, in a way, pre-empted the field. It's not easy to follow in someone's footsteps. Again I remember a little sort of illustration. Suppose I ask you to take some ink and just throw it and make a blob on that wall. You can do it very easily. But supposing I ask somebody else to take some ink and make a blob exactly where you've made it, well that's difficult. ♦But look how easily you did it. You see what I mean? So it's a little bit like that. Don't take it too literally (Laughter). But attention always focusses on the pioneer. We don't actually know when it comes to the point, whether the Buddha actually did more than Sariputra or Maudgalyana. I mean their preachings to us are not recorded in the Pali canon, or only to a very limited degree, a very limited extent. The focus of attention is on the Buddha because he is the founder, he's the origin of it all but it may be that they went on very extensive Dharmaduta tours and taught the Dharma perhaps to even more people than the Buddha did. We don't know. Do you see what I mean? So I think we have to be quite careful not to sort of jump to conclusions. For instance when the Buddha was no longer there, after the Parinirvana, Ananda for instance came into prominence very much. He was even criticised by some people for going around the country with a band of five hundred disciples just like a Buddha. This was considered by some people not very proper. But it does seem from this and other accounts that Ananda after the Buddha's Parinirvana did function in many ways very much like the Buddha himself. And what about Bhikkhus who went off to remote regions? We don't know what they did but we do know that in subsequent centuries Buddhism did flourish there. They must have done quite a lot of work. So we have to be quite careful and

BI 11 8 291

not to jump to conclusions too quickly. Perhaps the whole question or issue isn't quite as simple as it seems.

Kamalasila; I suppose in the back of my mind was something which I think you probably said once - that enlightenment just represented the furthest point we could see and that beyond that there was even more to be developed.

S: Yes. There's another point for instance. This is to refer to Buddhist tradition - we know that the Buddha came from the Sakya clan or tribe which in terms of the caste system is a Kshatriya clan or tribe, and we have in the Pali canon or elsewhere records or at least accounts of all sorts of previous Buddhas. And we get what might seem at first sight the amazing statement that all Buddhas or those who are to become Buddhas in that particular lifetime are born into either Kshatriya families or Brahmin families. They're not born into Vaishya families or Shudra families. A reason is given for that and that is that it is those two castes which are predominant in society and it's further said I remember, that when the Kshatriya caste happens to be predominant the Buddha to be is born as a Kshatriya. When the Brahmin caste is predominant he is born as a Brahmin. So what does this suggest? This is, of course, a discussion in traditional terms. It suggests that if someone gains enlightenment and is already, so to speak a member of the dominant community he's more likely to be listened to. So there's that also to consider. How people will see you. If you, say before your enlightenment, belong to a rich and powerful family and you have many friends, you are well known, you are well educated, well respected, the chances are, in a sense quite wrongly, that more attention will be paid to you, and therefore you'll have more opportunities of Dharma work than if you were born very much lower down in the social scale. Even though you are no less enlightened. So I think this factor enters into things also quite a bit. I mean on another level if you for instance have been to Oxford or Cambridge, you got to know all the bright young men who were there at the time, and that maybe two or three years later you've got a little volume of poems that you want to bring out. Well you've got some old college friend who is the managing director of a publishing house or you know the sort of thing. Or he's got a little press of his own. There's no problem for you getting our little volume of poems brought out. Another pal is on the staff of some newspaper, you get a review, he's an old friend of yours, etc., etc. But supposing you hadn't been to Oxford but you've got the same sort of little volume of poems. You can send it to twenty, thirty, perhaps a hundred publishers and it'll come back every time. In fact you won't ever get it printed. Perhaps you'll have to print it or distribute hand written copies among your friends, or something of that sort. This principle, unfortunately, operates at all these different levels.

I remember that when I was at Yale that is to say when I was spending my three months at Yale, I knew a student who was quite a wealthy young man. He came I think from the Rockefeller family. He had his own private plane even though he was a student. And he wrote poetry and he said he was planning to have a volume of poems published. I think it was the next year. So I said - I was very innocent in those days 1970 - (laughter) Do you think you'll have any difficulty getting your poems published? He mentioned a certain famous publishing firm and he was planning to get them published by this famous publishing

BI 11 9 292

house. I said do you think you'll have any difficulty getting them accepted? Oh no, he said. My grandfather owns that publishing house. So that's how it goes. Do you see what I mean? All these points have to be taken into account.

Vessantara; So what of Kamalasila's point that if you describe enlightenment as a sort of horizon and that of going on developing beyond that would that not suggest that some Buddhas are more developed than other Buddhas?

S: Well no, it just brings into question how you define a Buddha. You might say in those terms there are no Buddhas because a Buddha is not someone who has arrived at a certain fixed point. A Buddha is someone who is, as it were, in motion, who is as it were progressing all the time. But then again

when you talk about Buddhas progressing in that sort of way but I mean haven't you got out of time? So doesn't that rather alter things? One has to take those sort of things into consideration too. If Buddhas whether big or small are all equally as it were beyond or out of time, not to speak of space how can you really speak of one being as it were farther on the path than another? You can't. Even the sort of concept of the path or image of the path seems to fail there. (Pause) We seem to be a little more metaphysical this evening.

Kamalasila; This one's about - another one about sleep, and I just wondered if there is any value in reducing one's sleep in the context of meditation. Sometimes you hear about this. I know other Buddhist groups sometimes have quite long retreats where they have very little sleep. Personally I find this quite difficult but I just wondered what you've got to say about this.

S: Well quite a lot of people do find that the more deeply you get into meditation the less sleep you need. I think this is almost a standard experience. But this does not mean that if you reduce your sleep forcibly, or does not necessarily mean, that if you reduce your sleep forcibly that you will necessarily go more deeply into meditation. I remember when I came back from India and was at the Hampstead Buddhist Vihara retreats were being held at a meditation centre that the Hampstead Buddhist Vihara then ran a bit of and there I found the teachers were deliberately cutting down sleep, not for themselves but for their pupils, and I studied the effects of this and on the whole it wasn't good. Because it seemed to be one of the factors precipitating in the case of some people a sort of nervous breakdown and unfortunately - this was under the auspices of what I called the so-called Vipassana technique in one of its more rigorous or uncompromising forms - this represented a sort of effort to make people sort of break down in the hope, and it was really no more than that, that at the same time that they had the breakdown, they would also have a breakthrough. I think it can't be denied that occasionally that does happen. But I think the consequences for those people for whom it doesn't happen are so unfortunate none can't employ this general method. It rather reminds me of the old Chinese story about the origin of roast pork. There is a story that once upon a time in China, believe it or not, they didn't have roast pork. Well what happened was that one day somebody's house was burned down and they happened to be keeping a pig there. So when the

293 BI 11 10

owner of the house came to rake over the ashes he found the singed fragments of the pig exuding a delicious smell. So in this way he discovered roast pig. But unfortunately what happened was that the people, the friends with whom he shared this delicious delicacy with were so taken by it that they all started driving their pigs into their houses and burning them down! (Laughter) Until some sensible person discovered a way of roasting the pig without burning the house down. So this is what the so called Vipassana people seemed to do. They burned the house down in order to get, or in the hope of getting roast pig. They bring about a breakdown in the hope of precipitating a breakthrough, and I saw some really quite dreadful examples of breakdowns. First of all people were not allowed to speak and they remained in their separate cells. There was no personal contact except very briefly with the teacher, the person running the course, and of course sleep was gradually reduced. I'm not sure whether food was, I think food wasn't, but sleep certainly was and people were advised to try to cut it down to, at the most, three or four hours a night and you know what does happen usually due to sleep deprivation. Sometimes people started hallucinating and they had all sorts of quite weird and unpleasant experiences, and these were all interpreted-and this was the practice in this particular tradition- interpreted as experiences of dukkha, that is insights into dukkha. Well the dukkha was certainly there but as far as I could see there was no insight. So I think it should be rather a case of sleep decreasing because you're getting more deeply into meditation rather than of reducing sleep in the hope of getting more deeply into meditation. Though this is not to say that you might not be well advised, well, just to reduce your sleep a little. I think on a meditation retreat I think you do actually need less sleep but you may just be habituated to a certain amount and sort of automatically tend to carry on in that way. So I think at least a small deliberate reduction in the hours of sleep is certainly not out of place. Of course one should be on the watch for any tendency to have more sleep than is strictly required anyway.

Kamalasila; There is that phrase in the scriptures, meditating in the first and the last watches of the night.

S: Well different people find different times suitable. There are again various factors to be considered. What are the quietest times of day or the night? There's also the question of climate and temperature. Your own personal feelings. Some people really like an early morning meditation. They like meditating as the dawn breaks. Others prefer to meditate in the evening perhaps as dusk approaches.

Kamalasila; It's just that that phrase seems to suggest that there wasn't much time in between for sleep. Do you see what I mean?

S; Monks did of course rest in the afternoon. They had a little siesta. One mustn't forget that. Again people's needs vary. One has to ascertain what one's own genuine needs are. I think usually perhaps people need a little less of all these things than they usually think. So I think a little deliberate reduction is certainly in order on a meditation retreat. I mean for instance it would be

BI 11 11 294

unreasonable for anybody to go on a meditation retreat and then object that the timetable didn't allow them more, or as many as, say nine hours in bed. Maybe the person leading the retreat needs to keep his ear to the ground and make sure that people are getting enough sleep, but no more. I think I've mentioned before that the amount of sleep that one requires seems to vary with one and the same individual, depending on the kind of activity with which he is engaged. I myself have found in the past that if I was engaged in more, as it were, imaginative creative activities, especially if I was writing poetry, I tended to need more sleep. And sometimes the difference would be as much as a couple of hours, which is quite a lot. But once I stopped writing poetry or whatever it was then at once the need for sleep was reduced quite drastically. Anyway what's next?

Abhaya; I was wondering Bhante whether it's possible to trace the origin particular Bodhisattva forms, in the Mahayana literature. I mean we know quite a bit about Avalokitesvara but what about the others? I know you've mentioned Manjushri and the Mahagovinda Sutta. Is that it?

S: That is not regarded sort of officially as contributing to the origin of Manjushri. This is a little theory of my own. Please don't state it anywhere as fact. This is not to be established. It's more a hunch at the moment than anything else. It's true that at least in English we don't have very much material of this sort available but I believe, in fact know, that some of the French scholars have done quite a bit of work in this field especially with regards to Avalokitesvara and Tara. I can't remember the names of the authors but there are some quite substantial fairly old volumes of studies on the origin and development of these two Bodhisattvas. I suspect there may be material on other Bodhisattvas in the writings of those French Buddhist scholars. I would have to look up bibliographies. For instance, in the case of Avalokitesvara there's a thick volume, or possibly two thick volumes called 'materials on the study of Avalokitesvara' or something like that, giving all the texts from different Buddhist scriptures illustrating the development of the image, if you like, of Avalokitesvara. But it would be good if some of this could be collated or if people knowing French could even translate some of these things. One would probably need to find copies in libraries; they're all old or mostly old, out of date, out of print books. But it's certainly something that would be worth going into.

Dipankara; Is there some connection with figures such as Amitabha, Vairocana, in Iranian mythology?

S: This does open up quite a big field of research, speculation, or whatever, because it has been opined by scholars for a long time, that the Mahayana has connections with Central Asian Manichaeism. They opine this mainly because in Manichaeism, as in Iranian religion generally, the symbolism of light is very common but I don't think that is enough to establish an historical connection - because Amitabha is the Buddha of Infinite Light and no doubt in Manichaeism one has various figures that are

embodiments, as it were, of light. But then light is a universal

sort of symbol. In the Pali Canon the Buddha, describing what

BI 11 12295

happened at the time of his enlightenment, says, "There arose in me a vision, there arose in me light." This is *chakkon upado aloka upado*. So this is a universal experience of higher spiritual experiences, mystical experiences, being accompanied by a sensation of light, which is not material light but a light of another kind. So the fact that the symbolism of light is found in Iranian religion especially Manicheism, and in Mahayana Buddhism, is not sufficient to prove an actual historical influence. But it is quite possible nonetheless that there are connections of that sort. They have yet to be investigated.

Padmavajra; Were you intimating that when you said that in the Amitabha's Pure Land there is a description of jewel trees and they're not Indian?

S: Yes. I mean I can't remember the references but I have come across descriptions of jewel trees in Iranian myth and legend. But again all this requires more systematic exploration. I don't want anybody, sort of quoting just hints and suggestions I've thrown out as though they were established facts. One must be very careful in that way.

Abhaya; Yes. I have another one about Vajrasattva. You say in the lecture, and I quote, that 'he's usually represented as completely naked' and when you were talking about the visualisation practice of Vajrasattva I think you've always said that one should visualise him as clothed, as wearing the silks and jewels of a Bodhisattva. I just wondered why this was, why there is this sort of discrepancy? Why you say this in the lecture, not in the visualisation practice.

S: I'm not sure. Yes sometimes Vajrasattva is represented without any clothes or ornaments at all, and sometimes with clothes, rather scanty ones, and ornaments. Whatever sort of practice I've given, whatever sort of Vajrasattva practice I've given has been a practice which comes from the tradition I have myself received. So probably that is the simple explanation, though maybe more often than not Vajrasattva is unclothed rather than clothed. I happened to receive the clothed form. It's probably simply that. But I will look into it a little more and just see.

Lalitavajra; I have a question also related to Vajrasattva. This regards the mudra where he holds the vajra in his right hand, because I've read in one Tibetan source that this symbolises skill in means.

S: Well usually the bell itself symbolises skill in means. I'm not sure whether there is an actual mudra symbolising skill in means and that that bell is held with the fingers in that mudra. It may well be so because this whole field is so rich and complex it's really quite difficult to say one way or the other. But yes it is possible at least in some Tibetan traditions, it is like that. The bell itself certainly represents skill in means.

Lalitavajra; Because in the introduction to the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sutra Thurman talks a little bit about the vajra and the vajra bell; and he quotes a verse from one of the songs of the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa, saying that the father is the skill

BI 11 13296

in liberative technique and the mother is wisdom. I thought that he tied the symbolism up there with the bell as symbolising the female aspect and wisdom, and the vajra in the right hand

S: Usually of course wisdom is regarded as female. Prajñā itself is feminine, and one has Prajñāparamitā represented as a goddess, always, but that's not to say that sometimes, in some contexts, the same symbolism may not be reversed. Again the field is very rich and complex and one must beware of generalisations or at least of overgeneralisations because one is likely to make some general

statement and then find well there is some obscure text, or some very recondite tradition which forms an exception to that.

Simon; I was wondering what the significance was of meditating on the wrathful aspects of Bodhisattvas, for example upon the wrathful aspect of Avalokitesvara or Manjugosha? Why would one visualise the wrathful form rather than the peaceful?

S: This question is connected with the whole nature of the Vajrayana and the four, as it were, successive stages of the vajrayanic path, or the four different kinds of Tantra or Tantric practice. You probably know that there is a distinction made between the higher tantras or higher tantra and the lower - or if you like the exoteric and the esoteric. You've got the Kriya Tantra and the Upaya Tantra and the Yoga Tantra representing the external tantra and then the Anuttara Yoga Tantra only constituting the higher, the more esoteric Tantra. It's only within the Anuttara Yoga or the Anuttara Tantra, that one gets wrathful deities whether Buddhas or Bodhisattvas or other deities in Yab Yum. So one has to sort of see this question of wrathful forms of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas in that particular context. And one might therefore say well why is it that it's only the Anuttara Yoga Tantra that you get wrathful Buddhas and Bodhisattvas? Well one can't really answer that question without understanding something about the nature, the general nature, or the Anuttara Tantra itself, and that of course is quite a difficult sort of thing to go into. But one might very broadly speaking, and I don't think this is a traditional explanation - one might say that the fact that one visualises Buddhas and Bodhisattvas in a wrathful form, has got something to do with the arising of energy, and of course, the Vajrayana generally is very much concerned with that. Some people find the visualisation of or meditation on a peaceful deity rather as it were insipid. You could say that their energies or their emotions are rather crude; it takes as it were, a lot to stimulate them, a lot to stir them up, so they're much more stimulated, much more inspired, by these visions of wrathful, apparently demoniacal, blood drinking forms. I can see it happening already. (Laughter). These beautiful smiling Taras and Avalokitesvaras don't affect them in quite the same way. I suspect - this is my own interpretation - it's got quite a lot to do with that.

Prasannasiddhi; But on the other hand you aren't allowed to visualise the wrathful forms until you get to Anuttara Yoga Tantra?

S: That's right.

BI 11 14297

Prasannasiddhi; That seems to contradict Presumably you do first wrathful ones first.

S: Well actually what happens is that in Tibet very often people do go straight on, in a manner of speaking, to the Anuttara Yoga Tantra. Most initiations, in a way quite wrongly, one might say, which are given in Tibet, that people take at all seriously are Anuttara Yoga Tantra initiations. I begin really to suspect in a sense in a manner of speaking, whether they are even higher. This is of course very heretical. But no doubt they are higher if you go through all the steps and stages in regular sequence but the vast majority of people in Tibet just don't. So I think therefore that the Anuttara Yoga Tantra initiations as given in Tibet and nowadays in the West are in fact not really Anuttara Yoga Tantra initiations at all, because for most people practising them the Bodhicitta hasn't arisen, neither do they have any actual experience of Sunyata. So when you meditate and visualise on wrathful deities well what have you got? Where are you? Really? You're not where you're supposed to be. So, therefore, actually, people think they've got the highest of all initiations and maybe that helps keep them going, but actually, perhaps in practice, in real fact, they've got something much more basic and much closer to their actual needs. This possibility does raise all sorts of intriguing questions but we won't go into them now.

Padmavajra; You mentioned the Tantric path. How relevant is this to us in terms of the development of people's practice in the movement? That division into the four grades of Tantras?

S: Well I think it's a question of how one understands it. I mean leave aside the fact that theoretically the Vajrayana is supposed to be way beyond even the Mahayana, leave all that aside. Take it all much more matter of fact, everyday sort of fashion. Usually the Kriya Tantra is explained as that Tantra, that type of Tantric practice, in which external ritual action predominates over meditation. So you might take it, you might say, that this kind of tantra represents the type of spiritual practice suitable for a comparatively extrovert sort of person. Within a purely ritual context, yes it's more ritual say than meditation but one could look at it more broadly and more widely and say that for a person for whom the Kriya Tantra in a manner of speaking or what the Kriya Tantra stands for was suitable would be a person who needed more external activity. This sort of person who needed to work in a co op. That's the Twentieth Century equivalent of lots of ritual. It's external, it's concrete, it's practical; you do things and there's a minimum, comparatively speaking, of meditation. But then you come onto the Upaya Yoga Tantra or Upaya Tantra where the two are evenly balanced. You are sort of neither one sidedly extrovert or one sidedly introvert to use the modern terms. You do as much meditation as you do external work, of one kind or another. But then in the case of the Yoga Tantra, well you're as it were completely introvert, you're absorbed entirely in meditation. There is no or very very little, external activity¹ whether of a ritual nature or any other nature. You are a full time meditator. Anuttara Yoga Tantra goes even beyond that in the sense,

well you are still a full time meditator but the meditation that

298

BI 11 15 you do is of a particularly esoteric nature or advanced nature. But you could look at it in these very general terms. It is also interesting - and this is some thing I've meant to follow up but I never have so I thought I'd just mention the point now - that traditionally there is a correlation - this is in the Vajrayana itself - between the four tantras, the Kriya, Upaya, Yoga and Anuttara, and the four castes, and it is sometimes said that the Kriya Yoga or Kriya tantra is suited for the Shudra, that is the person who is psychologically a Shudra, and the Upaya for the Vaishya and the Yoga for the Kshatriya and the Anuttara for the Brahmin. So here, clearly, the different tantras are correlated with the needs, say the psychological and spiritual needs, of different classes of persons.

Steve; You said that the Kshatriya class is associated with meditation - are they not the warriors?

S: That's true, but then what did the Buddha say to his disciples - you are warriors because you are fighting for Sila, Samadhi and Prajna - It's a question of turning the battle from outside you to inside you. But the Kshatriyas have got that quality, they've got that fighting quality, and it's that sort of fighting quality that you need when you take up meditation. You've got to fight Mara.

Steve; But aren't they more like the extrovert people in the other

S: No. I think when they correlate the four castes with the four tantras they are taking the four castes as typifying certain character types, and the Kshatriya as a character type is some- one with, perhaps, tremendous energy and as it were fighting capacity. And in the case of one who takes up the spiritual life this is now, as it were, turned within. He's got tremendous virya, so he's able to practice full time meditation. In other words the real hero is the meditator not the co op manager.

Greg; For the record you couldn't say what psychological types in the other castes would be?

S: No, I have seen this correlation but I don't remember the details. How are we doing for time by the way?

Vessantara; It's about ten.

S: Time is also a fetter!

Devamitra; You've spoken quite a bit about the dangers of settling down into the FWBO ♦iftto and ♦FWBO sort of lifestyle, and it seems to me that settling down~ft into the FWBO was 5 m to matic in

articulate of the onset of a deepening of the third fetter. I wondered if you'd care to comment on that.

S: I don't think that literally one can settle down into the FWBO. I think that would be a contradiction in terms, although I have used that expression myself. It's more that you settle down into the concomitants of the FWBO. Do you see what I mean? For instance one of the concomitants is ... well I won't say the community ... but the building in which the community usually lives. You can settle down there, which means

BI 11 16299

that you aren't really living in it as a member of a community. The community itself has in fact ceased to be at least to some extent, a community. It's just well almost just a substitute for home. So in that way one settles down. Not in the FWBO itself but under the appearance of being involved in the FWBO you are in fact settling down into things which aren't really in accordance with the spirit or the meaning of the purpose of the FWBO. You are taking things which are means as ends in themselves and that is, one might say, the essence of that particular fetter. That you take things like ethical rules or principles, religious observances, you start treating them as ends in themselves. You forget that they are all intended to help you to grow, to help you to develop in the direction of Enlightenment. In the same way when you, in a manner of speaking, settle down into the FWBO you forget, so to speak, that things like communities and classes and meeting with your friends, are not ends in themselves - they point beyond themselves, they're all leading you beyond themselves in a certain direction. But you've forgotten that. You're just as it were taking your ease in those things themselves.

Devamitra; You've also commented as you did some years ago I think once after you'd returned from India, about some of the older Order Members becoming a bit staid, and I think you also used the term settling down in relation to them as well, and they weren't people who were just sort of obviously going through the motions of living in a community etc. I think you referred to the chairmen actually.

S: Yes. I remember saying something about having the impression that people were a bit staid. I remember it got some people quite worried. I think what I was trying to get at was that people seemed lacking in life, lacking in vitality, lacking in adventurousness. There wasn't much of that sort of spirit of going forth, or in a manner of speaking, conquering fresh fields. It was more like staying around the home base and getting a bit settled in, or a bit 'dug in' even. Not necessarily in a negative sort of way but not in a very imaginative sort of way. Do you see what I mean? I think it's quite easy to get into a sort of routine which may be a quite positive routine, even a quite necessary routine and then after a while you're no longer able to see beyond that routine. I think this can happen if you stay attached to, or belonging to or living in a particular centre for too long, for too many years. I think you begin not to see beyond that, you don't see the wider movement, not to speak of the wider world.

Devamitra; Isn't that an aspect of the third fetter?

S: I think one could say that, yes very broadly speaking. But staid also suggests a rather sober or over-sober unduly sober in a rather unimaginative slightly stiff way of doing things, lacking in flexibility, lacking in adventurousness. As I've said lacking in imagination. It suggests a certain amount of rigidity. At that time I think people were over concerned to find out exactly what 'staid' meant rather than trying to understand what I was actually getting at by using that word. It's very easy to get tied down by a round of duties which are perfectly good duties, and duties that need to be done, but if that goes on for too long, or you allow it to go on for too long, or you don't take proper precautions, you tend to become unable to see beyond that round of duties.

S: I mean for instance around centres there are quite well established ways of doing things and they're all good things - that you have beginners' classes and regulars' classes and study groups of various kinds - the structure is quite good, it is quite well thought out, it functions quite well. But I think even in that positive and quite useful structure you shouldn't become so absorbed, or so immersed, that you are no longer able to think of alternative ways of doing things, or additional ways of doing things, or become unwilling to sort of try to venture into new fields where those sort of structures to which you are accustomed, good as they are, are not appropriate, and where you have to devise fresh structures and find out new ways of doing things. (You know) without being aware of it you tend to shrink from that sort of possibility.

Prasannasiddhi: Do you think things have improved since you made that comment a few years ago?

S: Well, certainly people have been more worried about being staid, whatever it might mean. But I think things have improved generally, so I take it they're improved in that respect too. One isn't surprised when one sees people becoming a bit staid as they get older, but one is surprised when one sees how staid the young ones sometimes are. I think I'd like to see a much more adventurous spirit in the movement as a whole. I don't want people to sort of, go out trying to be adventurous prematurely or trying to sort of, run before they can walk, or fly before they've got any wings worth speaking of. But nonetheless I hope for instance, to speak more concretely, I hope not everybody who is being ordained in Tuscany this year is thinking in terms of going straight back to their own original centres and remaining there indefinitely. I think that would be rather unimaginative. I know quite well that there is quite a lot to be done in the centres from which you have come, and I know that it would be good for you to be there for some time at least after ordination ~as it were, to get used to being an Order member, to functioning as an Order member, but sooner or later I'd like to see people to be looking much further afield and thinking in terms of going to new places, where there is no FWBO, no centres, no communities, and starting up something - rather than settling down, you know, in an almost cosy sort of way in an established situation. And it does seem that quite a lot of people tend to think in those terms. I mean I don't want people to go to the other extreme obviously. Also of course sometimes people indulge in daydreams - of going and setting up a centre in Spain or, you know, wherever it is, or a centre in South Africa or wherever. But it's only a day-dream, it's a sort of compensation, almost, for just carrying on in the old way. They are not really serious about it, because if they were serious about it, well, they'd be starting to make active preparations. They'd be, for instance, learning Spanish if they were going to Spain, or they would be learning Afrikaans if they were going to South Africa, and so on and so forth. So I'm not referring to just day-dreaming, or anything of that sort. And also of course I don't mean to provide people with a sort of rationalisation for restlessness, and of course I don't want them to go out unprepared, but at the same time people do have to watch themselves, because especially as you reach, or begin to reach, a certain age, there's a tendency to settle down. Even though you are not married and you