

## 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](#).

## Satipatthana Sutta

Held at: Tuscany. 22nd November 1982.

Present: Ven. Sangharakshita, Dharmachari s Devamitra, Gunapala, Cittapala, Surata, Harshaprabha, Suvajra, Ratnaprabha and Richard Clayton.

S: We're all grouped? (pause) Anyway, are we ready? Are the machines both working?

Suvajra: Yes. Yes.

S: So perhaps we'll start by doing a voice print to help our transcriber. So perhaps you'd go on fl0entiOnior?~ your names, your new names of course in the case of those who 've just received new names, and just saying a few words about yourselves so that the transcriber can identify the different speakers.

Devamitra: I'm Devamitra from Padmaloka, Middlesbrough and England and I've been in Italy for four months now and will shortly be departing for the United States for six weeks. I don't think I have anything further to say.

Gunapala: I'm Gunapala. I've been in Italy for three months.(laughter). I don't need to think of anything relevant to say. (laughter). I'm from New Zealand and when I go back to England I will be going back to Brighton, and working there in Brighton.

Richard Clayton: I'm Richard Clayton. I've been in Tuscany three months from Brighton. I'm enjoying the countryside here

Cittapala: I'm Cittapala and I'm sort of feeling for the transcriber since I'm going to be taking a lot of transcribing.(laughter). I've been out here for four months and not looking forward to the English winter.

Surata: I'm Surata from Brighton. I'm quite looking forward to going back to England in a way. I'm also looking forward to the next few days of study very much.

Harshaprabha: I'm Harshaprabha. I'm really pleased to be so. I'm from the L.B.C. and again very much looking forward to being here for the next seven days.

Suvajra: I'm Suvajra from Manchester. I'm the only Scottish voice on the tape so I should be quite easy to recognise.

Ratnaprabha: I'm Ratnaprabha and I will be returning to Padmalok at the beginning of December.

S: Alright then, on to the Foundations of Mindfulness, Satipatthana Sutta, the discourse of the Buddha translated by I think we'll go through the introduction. It does give us a bit of a resume of material with which probably most people are already familiar. Perhaps it won't be a bad thing for us to revise a little. We need not spend too much time going through it before proceeding to the sutta itself. Alright then, would someone like to start reading. Just read those first two paragraphs.

Surata: Do you want the footnotes included?

S: No. No.

[2]

Surata: "The philosophy of Buddhism is contained in the Four Noble Truths. The truth of suffering reveals that all forms of becoming, all the various elements of existence comprise

of the five aggregates or groups of existence, also called the five categories which are the objects of clinging and are inseparable from suffering as long as they remain objects of grasping or clinging, all corporeality, all feeling from sensations, all perceptions, all mental formations and consciousness being impermanent are a source of suffering, are conditioned phenomena and hence not-self - anitya, mkkha, Anatta. Ceaseless origination and dissolution best characterise the process of existence called life. For all elements of this flux of becoming continually arise from conditions created by us and then pass away giving ; rise to new elements of being according to one's own actions or karma.

S: So this is one might say standard, basic Buddhist teaching. At least standard Theravada teaching. Is there anything there that requires discussion? Anything that isn't clear? Perhaps one shouldn't carp too much at the use of the expression "the philosophy of Buddhism" yeh? Perhaps it's difficult to say what other sort of generally accepted term could be used in this way (pause) The danger, of course, is that someone might understand philosophy in an academic sense and think of Buddhism in terms of an academic philosophy. Maybe something like 'fundamental principle' would have been better. "The Fundamental principles of Buddhism are contained in the following truths". But even that wouldn't be completely adequate, because the Four Noble Truths also concern the practice, yeh? (pause). Anyway, as I said, perhaps one shouldn't carp at the term. (pause). This second paragraph deals with the three lakshanas, and in particular with the second one, that of Dukkha, which is of course the first of the Four Noble Truths. (pause).

Voice: (unclear) suppose the first one had... (unclear)..the first one we looked at Anitya...

S: Anitya. Pali is Anicca, Sanskrit Anitya. That's impermanence.

Voice: He translates Dukkha as suffering. I mean that does seem to be

fairly standard. S: That is fairly standard, yeh?

Voice: Is there anybody else as far as you are aware who translates it as unsatisfactoriness in preference to suffering?

S: I think that is sometimes used. I can't recall that anybody, any sort of as it were well known scholar uses that. I don't think Guenther speaks in terms of suffering. I'm not so sure he speaks in terms of unsatisfactoriness:~'£aI think he sometimes does.(pause). I think to speak of Dukkha simply as suffering can be quite misleading, huh? Because it does suggest that existence is invariably suffering, huh? Which of course it isn't, yeh? And even here it's important to note that the translator says the five categories which are also the objects of clinging are inseparable from suffering as long as they remain objects of grasping or clinging, huh? (long pause). I mean quite often people that have just a very little knowledge of Buddhism will tell you that according to Buddhism everything is suffering, huh? As though no experience other than a painful one was ever possible, which is certainly not the Buddha's teaching, yeh? And consequently they think that Buddhism is a system of unmitigated pessimism. But unsatisfactoriness tends to preclude that misunderstanding - at least more likely to preclude it. Voice: In "The Survey" you give a more sort of generalised formulation of

the Four Noble Truths....

S: Mm.

y<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>Oe~~~a~ I was wondering whether you thought that the traditional for~~of suffering, whether that was useful given this predilection for

misinterpreting the sort of methodolota~cal approach. ...?

~: Thirn. ~ll the other formulations are also traditional. I mentioned several in "The Survey", that they use food and the arising of food, the cess~tion of food, the way leading to the cessation of food, huh? So it is not that these other formulations are iintraditional; that the formulation in terms of suffering is the only traditional formulation, huh? One could sort of fall back on these other formulations which are no less traditional. But it does seem ttat throughout the ages tJ~re has been more emphasis on this particular formulation, perhaps because the question of suffering \"a% for many people a very vital one. They were concerned with the getting rid of suffering. I don' t know ~TheTher people nowadays think quite in those terms. Not consciously perhaps. They'd be more likely to tiink in terms of fulfilment, that is to say, the standard psychological, physcotherapeutic, physcoanalytical encounter group lines.

Gunapala: I was wondering in particular with you, the way you sort of broW;ht out in the middle pat~~ the pleasure principle and the ideal that there is any way of making it appear as a sort of progression, of geing for higher and higher levels of pleasure and so on. It would be more attractive..

S: Th~. dxcept that there would be, the danger would be that peo~le would think perhaps of aiming directly, huh. Jireotly at pleasure, taking pleasure as a goal to be aiarrle~ at, rather than thinking of it as a by- product of an effort. I think probably its better to stick to this formulation, but speak in terms of iosatisfQctoriness rather than suffering because I don't think many peopl~ would disagree. i~cistence usually is fa from satisfactory, hm? Tt's ~asatisfactory at least in certain respects, certain major respects and hat }<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>)t's~M~~lea#something needs to be done about that. But I tahink especiall W#irien speaking to begiimers, there are people who are newly enquiring abou~ Buddhism, one should be verJ careful about speakinaa first of all in terms of oufferinaaar or the cessation of suffering~. It makes Buddhism sound, well, a bit u fering orientated, very negatively orientated, very individualistic, even. You know that ajou are concerned with jour suffering, the alleviation of yaor suffering, huh? Though~, of course, the formula taal on itself doesn't say jour suffering, it just says suffering~. Perhaps tha~ also a relevant point. a~antideva brings this up quite well ain the Bodhicaryavataara. It 's a question of just gettin~t rid of suffering. ~~~o the suffering belongs to is comparatively irrelevant. a~ether its yours or somebody els&,hu~at? It doesn't natter very much. Your aim should be to get rid of suffering, wherever sufferJng exists iii the universe, regardless of hose, so to speak, it is.

Cittapala: M~ of course, in modern Western societ~ one's not actuallj aware so often that suffering does exist, w1alereaa somewiere lii;ae India....

S: Yes, it~ blatant and open and unconcealed. liereaa in the Th~st there are many subtle forms of suffering.

Gunapala: It/s mu&i more dissatisfaction

S: ~isgruntlement...

0~unapala: . . . .yeh

S: li'rustration, bitterneaa, cynicis:fl.

fla~Ujafr~p~l~ Isn't suffering just used for e~perJ~~a~ce? Isn't the First Noble Truth that of an experience?

J: aaell suffering is an ex~)%aarience, yes.

Gunapala: Yes but it could be any experi~nce used for the First aJoble Truth...

ell, try it out and see!

Gunapala: I mean h~a~)p~~e55 is an experi'?nce. .. (laughter).

Ja~: What, the way lCadin,av~ to the cessation of happiness? (laugl~er).

:ell, there certainly is a way leading to the cessation of happiness but its not exactly the one that we actually teach, yeh? I~s the one we teash people to avoid, yeh?

?~napala: It a~ould only work wit~ }~ }~appiness; if you could see that happiness was not satisfactory. (pause).

S: One could, as it were, speak more in terms of imperfection perha~s...

Gunapala: . .. yes....

S: Uuffering or unsatisfactoriness is what you xperience when thinags aren~ perfect, hull? hen the wheel of the chw~iot doesn't fit pr~;aely on the axle. (long pause).

Gunasala: Is the line, "the aa~asD,a1 n~ or clin~ing to the ob:ects", vd~mtever thej may be, is that the a~ort of centre of wfiat he is saTinrn ufferJng is here? That by removing the clin~i'n or grasping to the objects then t~ie suffering ceases?

S: t\m. Yes. The cling~naag is closely connected with cravilga I mean t~lIS particular paragraph discusses the suffering, huh? It points cut that all the five elements of existence, the five aggregates or groups of existence are a source of suffering and tha~t they are technically referred to as ti~e five categories which are the objects of eiinging, yeh? It points out that tkiey are inseparable from suffering. But then adds the very important qualification - "as long as they remain objects of aa~asp~~aa; or clinging" ,jen? I mean t~ere are certain experiences which are painful regardless, but there are other experiences which are painful only in associa~ion ~th craving, huh? I mean, if you cut your finger that/s painful anyway, yeh? But if ya?a~ have to part from soinebody, say, that particular ~xperience is not necessarily laainful. I{~s only painful when tf~ere is craving present.~ So it~ only conditionally paainful, yeh? Or conditionally a source of suffering. So therefore, "the five ~ ?~' ~?~Jar£. categories which are objects of ciinginagftare inseparable from suffering as lflThla 'C~~~~as they remain objects of grasping or clin'gng. (pause). I mean, all corporelity, all feelings and sensations, all perceptions, all mental formations and consciousness being imperm~nent are a source of suffering, a That is to saaaay if one insists, so to speak, on regarding them or trjing to re~a~rr3 them as permanent. (paaise). One could also render Bukicha ii frustration.

Citta ala: Thinking in terms of creativity, I v~s thinking in terms of t e examples you brought up in one of your other seminars of a musician and not becoming too conscious of the fact that he was playing. ... (unclear) that maybe in titis instance sort of if you're being truly creative you're not really hanging-on to any moment ?

~~~~~a °a~~ {taa \$\$'~~~~ ~

CONTIWta?SB (~)

S Yes. Or to continue the analogy the musician, the performer: ~r, if he were to sort of linger over on anything that he would play or to stop to enjoy it more he'd spoil it. He'd spoil the music, hm? That's what often people want to do. They want to spoil the music so to speak. They won't let the symphony of life go on. They want just that bit over and over again, hm? They won't let the music continue. They think that little bit is the music, huli?

Juvajra: ~ty lukkha as, as frustration...?

~: imr.

Juvajra: by did you say Dukkha is frustration? Was the

No. I was suggesting frustration as an alternative translation for Dukkha just so one gets away from the idea of suffering and expressing it in terms maybe more understandable or more intelligible to people, hm? It's just another way of avoiding the word suffering, perhaps, in certain situations. Then talking about Buddhism you know to relatively new people, I mean if you were to say to people, "look, you experience a lot of suffering in your life don't you~", they might not agree. But if you were to say, 'well, you do experience quite a bit of frustration don't you?', they would, perhaps, be more likely to agree with that.

Gunapala: We tend to connect suffering with actual physical pain. ~t many people connected with any frustration and dissatisfaction that's usually.. ..(unclear) physical... (unclear) suffering through illness. (pain)

S: Anyway, let's go on because this is only introductory. We don't want to spend too much time over it. Go on to the next paragraph, next reader.

Cittapala: 'All suffering originates from craving & our very existence is conditioned by craving which is a three-fold: The craving for sense-pleasures (Kama). Craving for continued and renewed existence and craving for annihilation (Nirvana) after death (Vibhava-Tanha). This is the Truth of the Origin of Suffering'. ~p~ L(a~~hj~? S: O.K. This is standard Buddhist, standard Theravada teaching. Perhaps the only point that really requires comment is this concept of a Vibhava-Tanha, craving for annihilation after death. Craving that death will be the end. It's as though you've ~ftven up on life. You don't want to be reborn. You don't want to go on living, heh? You have an actual craving for death. And that is as reprehensible in Buddhism, just as much a source of suffering as craving for continued existence and craving for sense-pleasure.

Sovajra: It seems almost worse than the other ~....

ja: Mm, Mm.

Cittapala: Are there many people who suffer from that particularly? Is there any particular sort of current attitude?

j. Well, there are certainly people who believe or seem to believe ~a in annihilation after death and who even derive apparently a certain amount of satisfaction from that. Thinking that that they're not going to live again, hm?

Gunapala: Could you equate that to some of the sort of Christian things, I don't know, er.. things like ?

ja: aaarell, Christianity does believe in personal immortality doesn't it? But on the other hand, with its teaching of { {ea~en and Hell it might have caused people to dread continued existence after death to such an extent that they almost start wishing there couldn't be any existence after death.

COITrTNThB. (6)

And they start thinking annihilation would be better. There are, of course, some Christians, they are in a minority, who do believe that death is the end. I believe. . . . . who are they? I believe its the Seventh 7)~a.y, ~~~ Adventists. They believe that death is the end but that y0~J~ were miraculously brought back into existence by God. I won't be too sure of the details but I think that is the~ attitude. But any~ray, they are exceptional. Thacot Christians believe in the immortality of the soul. That is the Orthodox teaching. But they differ as to whether it is naturally immortal or whether ~aiOd makes it i~ortal by a sort of miraculous act.

T)evamitra: The first two kinds of Tauha seem to characterise more the cravi~ig type, and the third more the hate type...

o: Yes, right....

Bevamitra: .50 it could be this negative attitude towards existence... sort of temperamental difference. ...

S: Yes. (pause). And sometimes it may just be a mood that passes. Some- times you might feel especially disgruntled. Or especially frustrated. As a result of that you might think, "well, it's better not to live at all". Start wishing almost that that could be. Almost hoping that you're going to be annihilated after death. Or annihilated at the time of death so that there won't be any after. In one's blacker moments one may feel like that, hm?

Cittapala: Bocs Bhava-Tanha actually sort of represent a deeper level of craving than Ka~a -Tanha?

S: In a sense it does, yes. Its the hanging-on to conditioned existence itself. ~bich goes very very deep of course. You can go on hanging-on to life even though there isn't much sense of pleasure in it, hm? And much enjoyment in it even! You can, you know, in the midst of suffering go on hanging on to the craving for existence...

Surata: Sort of inasmuch as it's what you know, as it were. In that sort of sense....?

J: IMaS what you know. It's a security. It~ everything, huh? You can't convince of yourself not existing and you want to exist on whatsoever terms almost, huh? The idea of annihilation is terrible to you, frightening to you. it's the worst possible thing that could happen to you to be annihilated. even though, of course, you wouldn't be there to tell the tale.

Richard Clayton: a~uld you say that despite that annihilation, would elements of that still be common to (u:~lear).... people would be an element in of craving for annihilation after death. I mean is....

S: I think that is comparatively rare, huh? I mean I think everybody craves for continued and renewed existence and everybody craves for sense pleasures except those who experience so much frustration they've virtually given ~ But I think comparatively few people actually do crave for annihilation after death, do hope that death will be the end. I think it's~ comparatively rare, huh?

Richard Clayton: It~ not (much?) as the other two, as you were saying. ~re? really fundamental....(unclear) the bottom, the depths of your being and it wouldn't be so with



annihilation? As that sort of distinct and would it?

CONTINTE~ (7)

~: Tell, I'm not so sure. I mean it depends how one looks at it. But if one thinks of the craving for annihilation after death as arising out of a deep seated and repeated sort of frustration of one's craving, well then it would be I think a comparatively rare thing that anyone would be frustrated to that extent, that they think it would be better not to exist at all. On the other hand, there is this concept of Freud~ of the 'death-wish'~ No I have read something about that years ago but I can't recall in detail what Freud says on this subject but that might be worth looking into, j~? what Freud has to say about the death-wish and whether this does suggest that even Vibhava-Tanha is somewhat deeper and more innate than simply you know, Vibhava-Tanha in the sense of frustrated craving or the result of frustrated craving.

Tevamitra: I was studying one of the Majjhima Nikaya Juttas recently in which someone comes along - I think it's the... (unclear?)... and he says to the Buddha, my view is that everything is displeasing. And there's a whole discourse, a whole exchange based on this which takes place and the Buddha contrasts two views - that everything is pleasing to him and everything is displeasing to him. The one being associated with eternalism and the other annihilationism. But he says in that sutta that one who has the view that all is displeasing, to me which seems to be the annihilationist viewpoint, is actually closer to the Buddha's... er. perspective.

aJ: well, presumably he sees the unsatisfactoriness of the mundane....

~evamitra: But I was just thinking in terms of what you were saying, that perhaps this third kind of craving is more rare.

ja ~all, if one thinks of it as something that one experiences as a result of the repeated frustration of one's craving say for sense pleasures or anything else mundane, for success, and so on....

~evamitra: ... rather than the possibility of a death which is something deeper than that?

But on the other hand, one has to consider the possibility of the Buddha's concept of Vibhava-Ta~nha might refer to or include, you know, something like Freud's death-wish. One would have to take a closer look at Freud's death-wish first.

Gunapala. Just thinking about... I would have thought that annihilation after death was quite strong in the world. That it was quite - I mean a lot of people commit suicide and they must be wanting to put an end to their suffering in, in death, though they're probably a minority in the world.' And also old age. I mean that being a minority in our age, but most people when they get quite old quite often look forward to death if they haven't lived a happy life....?

ja~ But it's not absolute annihilation that they look forward to, it's cessation of existence on the present terms. Either they think they'll be reborn and get a new fresh young body or else they think that they'll go on surviving just as a soul or a spirit without a body, they'll just be released from the body, hm? I don't think, well, one might wish to die because one feels that one is very very old and life isn't worth living in that way, but I don't think that is necessarily the same thing as a craving for annihilation, huh? I think usually such people would like to go on living in you know, another way, a better way, hm? Not encumbered by an aged body any more.

Gunapala: So that's quite different to this then...?

Yes. I think that it is distinct from a craving for annihilation. That is more, you know, a craving to be liberated from the limitations of one's

COI-INUEi. (8)

present body or one's present situation in the case of a suicide.

Ratnaprabha: Did not the Buddha before his Enlightenment speak of his sort of weariness for this ceaseless round of birth and death and looking for some way out of it? What's the difference between that sort of viewpoint and the sort of complete annihilation?

j: Well, presumably, when you become weary you are looking for a way out, you hope that there's something positive beyond it? Whereas in the case of the craving for annihilation you're satisfied, so to speak, with the mere cessation of conditioned existence without there being anything positive in the absolute way, any transcendental element beyond that. Whether you can be really satisfied though, I wonder. Whether one can really sort of acquiesce in the idea of complete annihilation. One could have thought there would have been some glimmer of hope, you know, at the bottom of one's mind that there might be some positive form of existence possible that wasn't suffering.

Cittapala: Isn't that the viewpoint of the Existentialists. That there is absolutely nothing after?

S: Well, there are Existentialists and there are Existentialists. It wouldn't be the viewpoint of the Christian Existentialists.

~aala: They must have some craving for life otherwise surely they wouldn't exist. . . (laughter).

Going on from various battles and even forming relationships. There was the famous relationship between Jean Paul Sartre and what was the lady, what was the lady's name? Simone de Beauvoir.

~eva~lra: Most of his novels actually are full of that, aren't they, well, just full of relationships. (laughter).

ell, perhaps one has to fill the void with something. (laughter)

Cittapala: It is a tendency to be attracted to the craving for sensual pleasures is eliminated once you get into the rupa-loka, but not either of the other two?

Yes. As for the three realms certainly, though I think if one enters the rupa-loka then I think one would be unlikely to experience craving for annihilation just because existence in the rupa-loka, in the higher experience, would be so pleasant.

~evamitra: But it's significant that the first two Tanhas are part of the asravas, the three asravas that are destroyed...

yes....

~evamitra: ...and the third one which doesn't appear....

Yes, that's true. An,~w~, let's pass on.

Richard Clayton "The attainment of perfect happiness, the breaking of the chain of rebirths and suffering through the realization of a Tīrthāṅga is possible only through the utter extirpation of the threefold craving. This is the Truth of Suffering, the Cessation".

CO~aTINt%~ (9)

j. Vm, maybe we should consider this for a moment, though it is again standard teaching and apparently quite clear. First one could say that it's not only a question of the breaking of the chain of rebirths and suffering but also breaking of the cycle of rebirths and suffering and limited enjoyments, huh? Otherwise one gives the impression I suppose especially to new people that there is just nothing but suffering in the world, huh? It certainly wouldn't square with most people's experience. I mean there is enjoyment but it has its limitations. And it's not to be mistaken for, you know, unconditioned happiness, not to be mistaken for the happiness of qrvana. (pause).

Cittapala: Is there a sort of good analogy or symbol one can use for trying to describe Nirvana to people. Right? Good. People say, "Well what are you trying to do? I, and we say - well, you might say - "I'm trying to get to nirvana", and they say, "What is Nirvana?"

I feel more and more that it's not advisable to speak or to think even in terms of a static state, huh? Something fixed and definite and final that you attain to. I think it's probably more helpful, I think also truer to speak in terms of a process, a creative process that continues indefinitely becoming all the time more and more creative, huh? I don't think people should be encouraged to think in terms of nirvana or perfection or whatever as a sort of definite goal that you aim at, Mn? At which you arrive and in which, so to speak, you settle down. Where you are, huh? (pause). I don't think in the case of Buddhism it is like that anyway.

Harshaprabha: So is it just part of a creative process that it's like an aspect of an ongoing creative process...?

Yes. I think what one needs to do is to get people thinking in terms of creativity, of the creative process. One needs to make sure that they have a clear idea of that first, hm? And then, you know, try to get them to imagine that creativity sort of infinitely increased and raised to ever higher and higher levels. And then say that Buddhist enlightenment or the life of an Enlightened being is something like that. Or maybe you could say something to people like this. "Well, just imagine your most creative day, hm? You wake up in the morning. It's a beautiful sunny day. You leap out of bed. (laughs). You feel really bright and cheerful and happy and blissful and rapturous, huh? And, you know, you feel so inspired you just write at night, you know, just dashing to your desk, you write two or three really good poems, huh? and then spend maybe most of the morning with two or three of your best friends and have a really intense and inspiring time, inspiring communication." And in that way you can go on throughout the day, hm? And just say, "well, think in those sort of terms that it would be like to spend a completely creative day and then imagine that being doubled and trebled, huh? And raised to higher and higher levels and continuing all the time so that that was your whole life. Month after month you were like that increasingly like that. That could be some approximation to the state of enlightenment, Mn? One can speak in those terms. Rather than that, well, you aim at a state of.... (end of side one). Side two:

not to say dull and abstract, hm? And also it does approximate much more to the truth, Mn? Because I mean the Buddha was certainly not inactive after his Enlightenment.

Harshaprabha: I find it difficult even being happy and positive for long periods... (unclear?).

If they haven't been creative even for a day well they might have been creative or at least positive for an hour, huh? Ask them to think of

[10]

that hour~imagine it continuing the whole day and then imagine, you know, a tremendous flash of imagination that day lasting a whole week....

Cittapala: When you said that initially my first reaction was "Gosh, that would be really tiring". And then I thought not, that this is not quite right.

S: Yes.

Gunapala: I mean, it's obviously doing something which does end up feeling like that.

S: Where you feel that creative? This little introduction doesn't do it very well I think. One has got to, if one speaks of the Four Noble Truths at all, or speaks in terms of basic Buddhist principles that one has got to put them across in a really vivid and inspiring sort of way. That means one has got to be inspired oneself. I mean sometimes when I've heard - was going to say monks from the East but it's not only monks from the East it's also lay Buddhists from the West - speaking about the Four Noble Truths, really one's heart sort of sinks into one's boots hearing the way that they speak. Likely to put people off Buddhism for life.

Ve4ee: Drawn to annihilation.

S: Or else only to attract the quite neurotic

Ratnaprabha: Is this because monks from the East and lay Buddhists from the West are not inspired by what they are doing or is it because they can't communicate their inspiration or what do you think?

S: I think most of the monks from the East are not inspired. They're doing their bit, as it were. They're fulfilling their professional duties. They thoroughly enjoy fulfilling their professional duties because they enjoy that way of life. They enjoy the social position, the respect and they know what the Buddha's teaching is. They, in a way, believe it so they trot it forth. It's not that they've got any deep spiritual experience of it in most cases. So out it comes

sps 11

I mean they tell you with a big beaming smile that all life is suffering. They haven't really ever felt anything like that. They are fat, happy and satisfied in a mundane sort of way. In the case of at least the English lay Buddhists, Theravada lay Buddhists, certainly some of those that I've met, well they're more likely to be as it were a bit more neurotic; they could be actually suffering mentally quite a lot, they have all sorts of psychological problems and

hang-ups so they can speak in terms of all life means suffering £11' with more feeling but at the same time it's~very one-sided.

Cittapala : The other thing which occurred to me when you're talking

about inspiration as a means of explaining Nirvana: I mean inspiration is something which affects other people as well because I've often had people throwing back at me this thing of Buddhism is so self centred.

S: Well, Buddhism has the Bodhisattva ideal.

Cittapala: I was just thinking inspiration in itself , well it's not really very easy to be inspired in isolation, is it? you have to share it really.

S: Yes. All the more reason for not remaining in isolation. Though one can still share it even if one is in isolation because one can at least write a letter to somebody. I~~say on your solitary retreat? you feel very inspired and you want to share it, well you can write a letter to somebody even if you don't post it until after your retreat has ended. Or you write a poem and send it to Shabda. (laughter) - No, don't send it to Shabda, they've got enough! (laughter) That's one of the drawbacks of ordination (laughter). I'm afraid it r

really is.

I've all of a sudden just wondered whether there are some people who really look forward to ordination at least partly so that they can get their poems published at last! (laughter). There's no editorial policy as regards Shabda so anything that's sent in is actually published even if it's a poem, however bad. Perhaps we ought to start thinking of making an exception in the case of

sps 12

poems.

Voice: I thought that had already been done. Hasn't it already been done?

S: No, that was simply a question of space, that if we don't want to exceed a certain budget. ... So if any given issue looks likely to exceed the budget because Jf too much

material then I can be consulted about what to leave out at the time. A lengthy poem probably doesn't stand a very good chance of appearing at once. Anyway, that's by the by. Let's pass on, this is after all only the introduction.

Richard: "The methods of training for the liberation of all suffering are applied by following the Noble Eightfold Path of Right Understanding Right Thought, Right Speech, Right Action, Right Living, Right Exertion, Right Mindfulness and Right Concentration of Mind. The Noble Eightfold Path consists of three types of training summed up in virtuous conduct, (sil~), concentration (samadhi) and wisdom (panna) This is the truth of the wa that leads to the end of suffering.'1

'V'

S: You are familiar with the way~sila, samadhi and p%anna are related to the Eightfold Path? You've worked all this out in connect- ion with the lectures on the Eightfold Path, hmm? No need to go into that now. All right let's go straight on from there.

Cittapala ;"The prevalence of suffering and absence of freedom and happiness is due to man's subjection to the tree roots of all unskill and evil, and all unwholesome actions (akusala kamma) viz. lust, hatred and delusion (lobha, dosa, moha)"

S: Yes. I think craving is a better translation than lust because lust though it dj4~~t usually have a sexual connotation it does tend to have that nowadays. It would be craving and aversion, I think is a better word for hatred.

Gunapala: It's not very common though, is it? I mean 'aversion' people don't use it much in common speech. At least in New Zealand they don't. It doesn't strike very strongly.

sps 13

S: It's not a very emotive word but it does suggest a general attit- ude of antagonism, opposition and rejection.

DEvamitra: It actually seems to me to fit the mechanics of the experience a bit more too, if you see what I mean.

S: Ah yes.

Devamitra: You've got on the one hand the attraction, the craving, on the other hand you've got the experience of being repelled by something if you're averse to it. And you don't always -well, that doesn't seem to be communicat~so strongly as hatred.

S: Aversion in a way is a stronger term. But perhaps not so emotive.

Gunapala: Especially for this will to drive something away, to get rid of something, aversion to it.

S: And it can apply to inanimate things. As hatred usually refers to animate things and to people.

Cittapala: I'm not sure if it's the right point to bring up but I've been wondering how these three link up with the ki?:cLs or whether it, S just a ~omp~e~~~y different formulation which we'll just have to accept.

S: This is a very early formulation. I think it would be said if a list of the klesas were to be drawn up these three would probably head the list.

Cittapala: What then the subsequent members of any list of klesas would they just be variations of these three?

S: In a way yes. YeS. For instance, you could have cruelty ,Hmm? That would be a variation no doubt on dosa, aversion. Or you could have attachment. That would be a variation on lobha.

~arabha: Conceit, could you fit that in with one of them?

sps 14

S: Conceit would no doubt come under moha,hmm? It would be a variation on that.

Cittapala: And then Jneya would that fit in as well?

S: Ah, that's more general. There you've got Jneyavarana distinguish- ed from the klesavarana. So you couldn't therefore include jneya as itself a klesa.

Cittapala: I was wondering in terms of these three here which are actually the root of the wheel of life so as to speak. I was wonder- ing how.. you couldn't..?

S: One could say that moha does find expression in Jneya. I mean one coul~ay that. These different classifications don't always fit very exactly. (Pause) . There is the list of klesas in the sense of akusalacittas given in 'Mind in Buddhist Psychology', a standard list according to that particular Abhidharma tradition.

RAtnaprabha: He says here that these are the ee roots of all ~~.' unskill and evil. What do you think would have~the Pall terms that

would have corresponded to unskill and evil? ~hought that evil usually translated akusala.

S: Yes. I don't think the intention is that there are two different Pali terms which these two translate. I think his using unskill and evil both to translate akusala. H~robably feels that unskilled is a bit more neutral in tone. I mean'unwholesome ' has come to be accept- ed as a sort of general equivalent of akusala but it's not really literal at all because akusala does actually mean unskillfull. (Pause) Anyway let's go on to the next paragraph.

Surata: "Virtuous conduct casts out lust"

S: There one can see the limitations of translating lobha as lust. Because this could be read as being virtuous conduct simply frees you from sexual desire, sexual craving which is certainly not what is meant by lobha. I mean lobha covers much much more than just that. It would be better to say virtuous conduct casts out craving. Carry on...

sps 15

Surata: "The calm of true concentration and mental culture conquers hatred. Wisdom or right understandin#lso called direct knowledge resulting from meditation dispels delusion. All these three types of training are possible only through the cultivation of constant mindfulness (sati), which forms the seventh link of the Noble Eightfold Path. Mindfulness is called the controlling faculty (in~~;iya) and the spiritual power (bala) and is also the first of the seven factors of Enlightenment (satta bojhangas). Right Mindfulness (samma sati) has



to be present in every skilful or karmically wholesome thought (kusala citta). It is the basis of all earnest endeavour for liberation and maintains in us the sense of urgency to strive for enlightenment or nibbana"

S: Hmm. That is quite clear. So virtuous conduct casts out craving. I mean this is a bit schematic. In a way almost a bit scholastic, but one can see there is some sense and meaning in it. That virtuous conduct casts out craving; how does it do that? How does sila cast out craving? Or what sense does it cast it out?

Cittapala: I have read somewhere that the path of sila leads to purity of mind so perhaps if you have a pure mind you no longer have any craving.

S: Would simply virtuous conduct, would simply sila, cast out craving permanently? Sila by itself? I mean, it wouldn't; it couldn't, that's done only by wisdom, hmm? So one has to read this sentence carefully. Certainly virtuous conduct, sila, helps one in controlling one's craving. I mean take this question of food. One might have cravings for food but if an orthodox monk, an orthodox bhikkhu, is not eating after twelve o'clock you are observing sila in that particular way it does check the craving, it does control the craving. In a sense it casts it out. Do you see what I mean? So one aspect of sila is that it inculcates self-control. You don't allow uncontrolled expression to your various cravings. In that way they are gradually weakened even if not actually cast out fully and finally.

Ratnaprabha: Is it usual to correlate sila and samadhi and prajna?

sps 16

S: Yes, this is quite usual, quite traditional. But it is as I say a bit schematic, not to say a bit scholastic. One perhaps shouldn't press it too far. What about "the calm of true concentration and mental culture conquers hatred"? Why do you think hatred is especially mentioned in this connection?

Gunapala: It must be the strongest thing that disturbs our concentration

S: Hmm. Because hatred is a very disturbing mental state, isn't it? You can't possibly meditate if the mind is under the influence of hatred. Though "wisdom or right understanding also cati~~ direct knowledge resulting from meditation" that is to say the Bhavana \taya Prajna d~ls all delusion, moha. But "all these three types of training are possible only through the cultivation of constant mindful -ness(sati) which forms the seventh link of the Noble Eightfold Path" Mindfulness is called a tWat comma there should be a full stop')

controlling faculty (indriya) and a spiritual power (bala) is also the first of the seven factors of enlightenment. ~igh~ Mindfulness (samma

sati) has to be present in every skillful and karmically wholesome moment. ~?~'I~'t~ 4i~ the basis of all earnest endeavour - usually ~'.~Th ~ kr~ ~~~t c[- 'W3C~C +~' It's not translated as heedfulness ~ lera~y~~~f~,e.,e~essness.

usually translated as 'earnest endeavour'.

Devamitra: Sorry ~ 'non-heedlessness'?

S: Yes pamada is heedlessness and apamada is ~nheedlessness i.e. A heedfulness.

Ratnaprabha: Is that the same as the word for striving?

S: Yes. EA rn est endeavour.

Ratnaprabha: Later on in the sentence he uses the word striving presumably from 'with mindfulness strive on'.

~pq~~1/2~a J~r~p~d~~~ S: (unclear) Striving ther~Jbe Ja~KAd~~~ . Anyway this paragraph establishes the importance of mindfulness. Let's go on now.

sps 16

Hashaprabha: "The ~scourse on the foundations of mindfulness, the Sat ipaithana Sutta is the tenth discourse of the middle length collection. The M~k£ma Nik~~ya or the Discourse~of the Enlightened One. It is this version which is translated in the present publication0 There is another version of it in the collection of long discourses, the DighaNik~ ya no. 22 which differs only by detailed explanation of

the Four Noble Truths"

S: That's pretty straightforward. One often finds this happening that there are two versions of the same discourse or same teaching in the Pali canon. Sometimes one is longer and one is shorter. Anyway carry on.

Hashaprabha: "The great importance of the discourse on mindfulness has never been lost to Buddhists of the Theravada tradition. In Ceylon even when the knowledge and practice of the dharma was at its lowest ebb through centuries of foreign domination the Sinhala Buddhist ~rforgottheSatitthana Sutta. Memorising~sutta has been an unfailing practice among the Buddhists and even today in Ceylon there are large numbers who can recite the sutta from memory. It is a common sight to see on full moon days devotees who are observing the eight precepts engaged in community recital of the sutta. Buddhists are intent on hearing this discourse even in the last moments of their lives and at the bedside of the dying Buddhist either monks or laymen recite this venerated text"

S: Hmm. This is all very well. One notices that quite a bit is said about reciting the text but nothing at all about practising it! That no doubt tells its own story. So I'm afraid we'll have to carry on.

Suvajra: "In the private shrine room of a Buddhist home, the book of the Sat ipa~~na Sutta is displayed prominently as an object of reverence. Monaster libraries 0 alm-leaf manuscripts have the Sutta bound in highly ornamented covers

S: I dare say the author doesn't realise the unconscious humour with which he was writing

sPs 17

Suvajra: "One such book with this discourse written in Sinhala script on alm-leaf, has found its way from Ceylon as far as the State University Library of Bucharest in Rumania. This was disclosed while collecting material for the Encyclopaedia of Buddhism when an Esperantist correspondent gave us a list of a hundred books on Buddhism found in the Rumanian University Libraries.

S: Perhaps we need not say any more about that. It tells its own sad story. Alright let's carry on with this part. It's a bit more practical.

Ratnaprabha: "The Mindfulness of Breathing (anapana-sati). The subjects dealt with in the Sati~atthana Sutta are corporeality, feeling, mind and mind objects, being the universe of right Buddhist contemplation for deliverance. The prominent place in the discourse is occupied by the discussion on Mindfulness of Breathing (anapana sati). To make the present publication of greater practical value to the reader an introductory exposition of the methods of practicing that particular meditation will now be given"

S: So "the subjects dealt with in the Sattipathana Sutta are corporeality" -that's rupa "feeling" vedana mind citta and mind objects" dhamma "being the universe of right Buddhist contemplation for deliverance" Universe here in the sense of universe of discourse. That is to say so far as right Buddhist contemplation for deliverance is concerned these four things constitute the whole of existence. The whole field of enquiry. Are you familiar with this phrase a "universe of discourse"? It's a logical term which means the area covered by certain discussion, one could say the subject the area covered by a certain subject.

Suvajra: What sort of term did you say it was?

S: A logical term within a particular universe of discourse within a particular framework of reference. So here the subjects dealt with in the Satipatthana Sutta are these four "being the universe of right Buddhist contemplation for deliverance". Insofar as right Buddhist contemplation for deliverance is concerned those four things are everything. It's concerned just with those particular things, they are its universe of discourse, they are the subject matter it covers, its framework of reference, its world.

Ratnaprabha: So does this mean that all objects of meditation could be included under one of the four categories of the foundations of mindfulness?

S: Yes, yes, it does mean that, yes, because they are the universe

sps 18

of right Buddhist contemplation for deliverance.

Ratnaprabha: Is that just Hinayana meditations or would it cover all forms of meditation?

S: I think in principle it could apply to all. I don't know how it would quite work out in practice. There is a classification given in one of the Evans-Wentz volumes (?phrase) #objects of meditation or subjects of meditation; beginning with, the basic division is, er, subjective objects and objective objects. That is to say, objects for contemplation & ~ 4 ~c which are part of the external world like an image of the Buddha.

One probably could fit all possible er, er, objects of contemplation into these four. And then he goes on to say "A very prominent place in the Discourse is occupied by the discussion on Mindfulness of Breathing to make the present publication of greater practical value to the reader, an introductory exposition of the methods of practising that particular meditation will now be given." We'll go through this just as a sort of reminder.

Devamitra: "Mindfulness of Breathing takes the highest place among the various subjects of Buddhist meditation. It has been recommended and praised by the Enlightened One thus; 'This concentration through mindfulness of breathing, when developed and practised much, is both

Weaceful and sublime, it is an unadulterated blissful abiding) and it banishes at once and stills evil unprofitable thoughts as soon as they arise.' Though of such a high order, the initial stages of this meditation are well within the reach of a beginner though he be only a lay student of the Buddha-Dharmma. Both in the Discourse here translated, and in the 118th Discourse of the same Collection (the Majjhima-Nikaya), which specifically deals with that meditation, the initial instructions for the practice are clearly laid down:

S: Anyway "Mindfulness of Breathing takes the highest place among the various subjects of Buddhist meditation." This is the Theravada view (?phrase). "It has been recommended and praised by the

Enlightened One thus; 'This concentration through mindfulness of breathing, when developed and practised much, is both peaceful and sublime, it is an unadulterated blissful abiding, and it banishes at once and stills evil unprofitable thoughts as soon as they arise.'

11, It is both peaceful and sublime. It is an unadulterated blissful abiding, and it banishes at once and stills evil unprofitable thoughts as soon as they arise."

That description does justice both to the positive and negative sides of the experience, huh. "Though of such a high order, the initial Stages of this meditation are well within the reach of a beginner though he be only a lay student of the Buddha-Dharma." I think the

sps 19

assumption being that, you know, monks find this sort of thing very easy. "Both in the Discourse here translated, and in the 118th Discourse of the same Collection (the Majjhima-Nikaya), which specifically deals with that meditation, the initial instructions for the practice are clearly laid down:" Anyway, let's go on into that.

Gunapala: "Herein, monks, a monk having gone to the forest or the root of a tree or to an empty place, sits down with his legs crossed, keeps his body erect and mindfulness alert. Ever mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. Breathing in long, he knows 'I breathe in long'; breathing out long, he knows 'I breathe out long'. Breathing in short, he knows, 'I breathe in short'; breathing out short, he knows 'I breathe out short'; 'Experiencing the whole (breath-)body, I shall breathe in', thus he trains himself. 'Experiencing the whole (breath-)body, I shall breathe in', thus he trains himself. 'Calming the activity of the body, I shall breathe in,' thus he trains himself. 'Calming the activity of the body, 'I shall breathe out', thus he trains himself."

S: Mm. So this is the text huh? We need not go into this now because we 11 be going into it in the body of the ..... er oh, it is eleven o'clock, perhaps we'll stop now ~or our tea, hmm?

Devamitra: Is Nyanasatta actually a Sinhalese bhikkhu or is he European or-

S: I think he's a Czech.

Devamitra: Czech.

S: I think he is Czech. And he was an Esperantist. I assume it's the same one.

Devamitra: So he's a disciple of Nyanaponika, er, Nyana--the one before Nyanatiloka?

S: Er Nyanatiloka! Yes, probably, yes. I've never met him. I've corresponded with him, again if it is the same one, I assume it is.

Cittapala: What is an Esperantist?

S: Well Esperanto is an artificial language which was devised as an international language in

the last century. It's one of many artificial languages of that kind. It's probably the best known. I think there's a couple of million people speak it in the world or are familiar with it? and he was very keen on that and published some booklets I think in Esperanto. There used to be an Esperanto Buddhist Centre in Wales, many many years ago, before the war and I think after. When I was in Kalimpong I had correspondence with some of their. ...

Ratnaprabha: I see there's something happening in Italy isn't there,

sps 20

I think we've had some pamphlets in Esperanto from Italy in the Order library. We don't know what they said. (Laughs.)

S: I forget who started it. There was a programme about it on the radio a few months ago which I listened to, they were celebrating an anniversary or something like that.

Devamitra: It doesn't seem to... well I remember hearing about Esperanto myself at school but I haven't heard of it a lot recently. I wonder if it's er waning.

S: Well apparently I think it, well, it's, don't think it's very much on the increase. As far as I know it seems to be most popular in Japan, for some reason. There were quite a few Japanese Esperantists.

(Pause for tea.) Anyway, let's pause for a few moments. (Pause for tea.) All right, on page five, that first paragraph.

Richard Clayton: These are instructions given by the Enlightened One to the monks who, after their alms round, had the whole remaining day free for meditation. But what about the lay Buddhist who has a limited time to devote to this practice? Among the places described as fit for the practice of meditation, one is available to all: sunnagara, lit. 'empty house', may mean any room in the house that has no occupant at that moment, and one may in the course of the twenty-four hours of the day find a room in one's house that is empty and undisturbed.

S: This all seems a bit unrealistic. One wonders whether, you know, &

really tried the practice of meditation or even observed conditions around him because in India and I think in Ceylon~too it would be very difficult to find a room in the house that was empty at any time of the day. And in any case the expression does mean 'empty house' He says it may mean any room in the house but it doesn't actually say so. "That has no occupant at that moment" as though you could pop in and do your meditation as soon as you see you know (laughs) you know the room is empty has been vacated-it all seems a bit unrealistic! Anyway perhaps we mustn't be too strict."Those who work all day and feel too tired in the evening for meditation, may devote the early hours of the morning to the practice of mindfulness of breathing." I don't think he's ever been a lay Buddhist. It's not as easy as it sounds. All right, suppose you do work or you've got to get to work  
[21]

and you've got to er have your breakfast and all that sort of thing- so to do it the early hours-plural you notice- is not so easy as it might sound but in principle, yes, I would say it is quite important to make sure that you have a good meditation at the beginning of the day, because if you are busy whether you are working in the ordinary way or any other way you may have difficulty fitting it in. You may feel tired in the evening so I think it is a good principle I think to in a sense get your meditation over with in a manner of speaking or before you do anything else, even adjusting the rest of your timetable if necessary in accordance with that.

Gunapala: I've really noticed that. It sets you up for the whole day. Especially if you're working in an environment where you're going away from the community, if you're working in the outside world. It's almost essential just to keep yourself to some sort of sanity

S: So maybe one has to work backwards. Alright, you have to start work at , nine, say. All right, that means you have to leave say at quarter to nine, half nine and half an hour for breakfast , that means you have to start; your breakfast at 8a.m. Alright you need an hour and a half for meditation. Alright~you have to be up at half past six, well let~ say quarter past six to give you time to clean your teeth and that sort of thing. So that means then again working back one has to go to bed early enough to get sufficient rest. I think this is where most people slip up. They don't want to go to bed, they want to go on reading or they want to have a late night out eh? Which makes it impossible for them to get up early enough to meditate before going to work. Then the whole cycle is set up eh? Do you see what I mean?

Cittapala : It seems to be a problem in the centre that if you are working quite hard and you've got a class which inevitably goes on until 10p.m. and possibly longer, to get to bed early enough.

~:(.~~t~at is so, make sure that one is able to make up for lost sleep, make at the week-end, if that is soon enough. But if classes stop at ten or ten-thirty, that should be enough. I think what often happens, what I've seen happening, is that people are standing around in the kitchen and just chatting, and time passes and sometimes it's twelve o'clock, one o'clock, before they get to bed. And then they can't be fresh and bright at six-thirty or even at seven, in the morning. So I think one has to plan out one's day, one's time, much more carefully than perhaps, well often one does.

sps 22

Cittapala : This is not very pertinent to community living, especially when people are taking responsibility for themselves. I

know at public school we used to have a system of getting people to bed. The leader of the house was just responsible for getting everybody to bed. S : Turning lights out.

Cittapala : Yes, and S : The difficulty is that is, in these days of liberty and freedom and freedom and all that, people don't like to be treated in this way, they resent it deeply as an infringement~and, er, "Well, you might as well be back at public school", they'd probably say.

Cittapala : Yeah, yeah. But, ... I mean, obviously with your peers it didn't really work, in the sense that you

actually forced them to go to bed. It was more just a ... friendly sort of thing and obviously, if a

particular person had a particular reason for being up then S : Swatting for an exam%~?

Cittapala : Something of that nature then (laughter) you know, I mean, obviously, there wasn't any question of sort of forcing

anybody to do anything. But it seems to actually serve some kind of a useful function in terms of, of reminding people who ... tomorrow was sort of coming on quite quickly.

S : But I used to get the impression sometimes, you know, sort of seeing the way people hung around, it seemed quite odd that they seemed unwilling to go to bed m~e they were just talking about quite trivial things, and they were tired, and they didn't want to go to bed. So I used to wonder why this was. And I felt it was m~e because they hadn't had any sort of really satisfying experience, you know, during the day and it's as though the~ unconsciously felt if they stayed up a bit longer something might happen, but of course it didn't.

Cittapala : I suppose the institution of silence after a certain per~od of time stops ...

S : That does help. ye~. But I think one really needs to plan out one's day and one's night so that one is able to do all the things that one really wants to do. The thing is thQWeople just don't ever think ahead sufficiently, well they don't accept full respons- ibility for their own actions. I mean they, ma~~~e they go out late and they stay out late ; don't come back until the early hours and hope somehow they will be all right in the morning. That's not very realistic, eh ? You can't expect to be, eh ?

sps 23

Cittapala : It's okay if you're nineteen (laughter) or something of that nature.

S : Yes, maybe you can do it in your teens, but not later. (laughter) Suvajra : I quite often find after a class that it's quite difficult just, just to go to sleep, I mean, I might be in my room but, you know, just being so elevated ...

S : Yes, yes, yes.

Gunapala : I've started to experience that too. Every night after the puja it took me over an hour to get to - I always heard the eleven o'clock bell strike.

S : Yes. Well, in the case of chairmen, of course no doubt they are permitted to adjust their own programme, you know, being sufficiently responsible. You go to bed late, all right, you get up late, and you meditate late, have your breakfast late; because you don't have to go to work in the morning. You can adjust. That means you're a little bit out of synch with othe~mbers of the community.

Devamitra : That should have quite an effect if you are out of synch with the rest of the community. I, I never used to like that, if that ever happened in a community, even if there was a good reason for



it.

S : Yes. I didn't like it, or don't like it at Padmaloka. Because I have my breakfast at the sort of official time, as it were, some people sort of meditate longer, which is fine, you know I'm all in favour of them meditating longer but, I mean, we don't see each other at breakfast, eh ? which means, well, you haven't seen them for one particular meal. And also a~t's the first meal and your first contact of the day, you've no time to check what they are doing, or to tell them what you are going to do, and you suddenly find, you know, they've shot off somewhere straight after the meditation. Ma~e you, you would have wanted to... tel\$them something beforehand and you hadn't had the opportunity, whereas you could have done that over breakfast. Do you see what I mean ? So it isn't really a good idea to get out of synch with other people in the community.

Ratnaprabha : That seems very difficult though, I mean, doing the Man~i%ohosha practise, for example, does seem to take much longer than most of the others - when there's a full metta and there will be several of us at Padmaloka, say, doing the practise.

S : Yes.

sps 24

Ratnaprabha : Which will surely inevitably mean ... a late breakfast.

S : Em, but if one needs to, sort of, consider that, then I either think 1, Well, look, it's got to be like tha\$nd we accept that" or even shift the breakfast time, or even, you know, get up earlier and go to bed earlier but try as far as possible to have, you know, everybody at least eating at the same time.

A Voice : Uh-huh. (pause).

S : What also happens if, if people who've sort of done everything

later than me, want to see me, well, they want to see me after I've started my work, so, it means I'm interrupted once I've started, which isn't a good thing and I'm sure this happens with other people too. (Pause) Anyway, lets go on.

"The other problem is the right posture for meditation. The full 'lotus posture' of the yogi, the padmasana, as we see it in the Buddha statues, proves nowadays rather difficult to many, even to easterners. A youthful meditator, however, or even a middle-aged one can well train himself in that posture, in stages. He may, for instance, start with sitting on a low, broad chair or bed, bending only one leg and resting the other on the floor: and so, in gradual approximation he may finally master that posture. There are also other easier postures of sitting with legs bent, for instance, the half-lotus posture. It will be worth one's effort to train oneself in such postures; but if one finds them difficult and uncomfortable at the outset it will not be advisable to delay or disturb one's start with meditation proper on that account. One may allow a special time for sitting-practise, using it as best as one can for contemplation and reflection; but for the time-being, the practise of meditation aiming at higher degrees of concentration may better be done in a position that is comfortable. One may sit on a straight-backed chair of a height that allows the legs to rest comfortably on the floor without strain. As soon however, as a cross-legged posture has become more comfortable one should assume it for the practise of mindfulness of breathing, since it will allow one to sit in meditation for a longer time than is possible when seated on a chair.

That's all quite straightforward and quite sensible and ... I think this, this agrees pretty well with the sort of advice that we give to beginners, eh ? (Pause) Anything here warrant

comment or discussion. There is this point that I promised someone to ask Lokamitra about. Someone has mentioned that it's advisable to, to, when one is sitting cross-legged, to change the order, so to speak, of the legs from time

sps 25

S : (Conti.)to time. If you've got say the right foot on the left, say, for the first hour, well, have left on the right for the second hour. I must say that when I was in India no-one ever said anything about this to me, I never ever heard about it. So I wonder, you know, how valid that is for anyone, how important that is. But, anyhow, I'm going to write and ask Lokamitra, and if he's not sure he can then consult Mr. Iyengar. Because it has been said that if you sit only in one P.h:t(%t may possibly affect the spine, or twist the spine. Has anyone heard anything about that ?

Surata : Yes, I think that might be true actually because, I don't know if I've seen his latest book, have you, on Pranayama, S No.

Surata : But he goes into the sitting posture quite, quite thoroughly in that, and, he says tha~especially in the beginning when, when it's quite difficult to get into padmasana, you probably need a little rock underneath.. whichever is the higher knee. I think that's right. Because you, w~en you're in Padina~ana both the knees

don't actual5touch the ground, so instead of having sort of - point contact, you've got a three-point contact. And as far as I can remember, he does say that you should ~cce on alternating. S : Ah, he's speaking only of padmasana, not, for instance, siddhasana ?

Surata : I would think that it would be the same with Siddhasana as well, and, and even the half-lotus.

S : Unless of course one is able to actually get both knees touching the ground, if one can. M~e that's why it wasn't especially mentioned to me. Because most Indians can get both knees on the ground so I don't think they have to bother about it. But if you've, if you're seated one-sidedly, then it's then no doubt it is advisable to alternate. (Loud bang) Because if you're one-sided, very much one-sided actually, that must produce some strain on the backbone, or the muscles of the back, yes ? And if that strain is produced only on that particular side, well, it must eventually affect the whole posture.

Surata: You do see people with a sort of a tendency to one side (or the other).

Devamitra: I actually think that's quite general, and I think it's to do largely with the most popular way of sitting in the Friends, which is not a strict siddhasana, actually, because what happens is

sps 26

that they - for the sake of stability you want to get both knees on the ground, and it does mean you've got to lean slightly over in one direction, it does affect the lower spine. I remember in the early days when I was doing yoga, we did talk about this quite a bit, about changing legs over, and I think that the opinion was that it was best to switch over. Whether or not that came directly from one of our teachers, I can't remember. I mean, it would seem to make sense to me, actually.

S: (As I was earlier) - the principle seems to be to the extent that you are unbalanced in your positions you need to alternate, so that at least one sort of~mbalance is counterbalanced, as it were, by the opposite imbalance. If you lean more to the left for a while, well then

you must lean more to the right for a while , but if you don't

lean to either side in that way, then, presumably, you don't need

to alternate your legs in that way.

Devamitra: Except ~~ it wouldn't necessarily manifest,

you wouldn't see it, necessarily. Someone could be sitting apparently

straight but the base of their spine could be twisted. You wouldn't

necessarily see it.

S: Well certainly this isn't anything in India yogis usually bother about. I've never heard any mention about this at all, all the time I was in India. Even associating with people who did meditate. And certainly not fro~n Tibetans.

Cittapala: Is this because Indian yogis train from a very young age?

S: Well Indians normally do sit on the floor, you see. (That is) except those who are westernized. (Pause). (It's significant) (word unclear) he doesn't say anything about this. (Well there's) that may be simply lack of practical experience (of these things). He's just following the book.

Devamitra: (Though) I mean, the other point about this is that (well) if it does come from the Iyengar teachers, Iyengar does seem to go very thoroughly into all the asanas, and the effects of y'know, of them, the total effect of them ... and posture. He just seems so thorough, and I think his thoroughness is almost unprece- dented. So, it could be that he's uncovered something which .

S: Could be.

Devamitra: (Few words unclear - something about 'not like that').

S: Yes.

Devamitra: If it is the case.

Surata: I'll check up what he has to say about siddhasana completely,

sps 27

'cos I think he goes into that one as well.

S: Yes. It might be an idea in that case if you wrote something for Shabda, clarifying this point, 'cos I've been asked about it several times in recent years.

Surata: I've brought it with me actually if you'd like a look. We could have a look.

S: Oh yes, thanks, yeh.

Ratnaprabha: What's, what's siddhasana?

Surata: It's both the feet are on the floor, but sort of one in front of the other.

S: Or one on top of the other, sometimes.

Surata: Yeh. (Pause).

S: All right, this next .... well I take it that we've covered everything we need to cover in that particular paragraph about posture. I don't find anything to disagree there. It's the standard advice, more or less what we give. Instead of straight-backed chairs of a certain height that allow the legs to rest comfortably on the floor, people have got their own special little - what do they call them? - stools, benches?

Suva~jra: Stools.

S: Em?

Suvajra: Stools.

S: (Pause) All right, let's carry on.

"The meditator's body and mind should be alert but not tense. A place with a dimmed light will be profitable since it will help to exclude diverting attention to visible objects."

S: There's some qualifications needed here. It is more often said that if your mind is quite dull and a bit sleepy, it's better to meditate in a brightly lit room. The place with the dimmed light is profitable in the case of people whose minds tend to be quite distracted. Restless. And in a sense - I think I've gone into this in the seminar on "Dhyana for Beginners", - that disturbances to meditation are said to be of mainly two kinds. First of all there's the disturbance of sloth and torpor. Sleepiness, drowsiness, all that sort of thing, sluggishness. And then that of restlessness, worry, excitability, distraction. So for the first kind of, the first type of person - or anybody who is subject for the time being to that sort of mood or state, is advised to meditate in bright light. Even in the open air. But if it's within the room, in a brightly lit

sps 28

room. Or maybe with a candle burning in front of one, because light is stimulating. But on the other hand if you're of the opposite type, or if you're going through the opposite sort of mental state, or mood, then if you're very restless, then it's better to dim the lights, because darkness has a sort of pacifying effect.

Cittapala: Should that be with one's eyes open, in the first case?

S: If necessary, yes. Though if one's eyes are closed, and there is light, well it'll percolate through the eyelids. If necessary even with one's eyes open. And one is also advised, I mean, if you suffer very much from sleepiness, one is advised to wash the face in cold water, or even just mindfully get up and walk up and down for a little while, and then again sit. These sort of things that one can do.

Cittapala: This is, this presumably is all in the context of (you are)

- if you're on your own, but, er

S: Yes, yes. And if you're sort of, well, meditating in the shrine together and some are drowsy and some are restless, well what can you do, you just have to follow a middle path, not too bright, not too dark.

Cittapala: It does seem that actually sitting opposite one another, this practice we've recently adopted, actually seems to help with both of those.

S: Ah. Yes. Oh that's interesting, yeh.

Cittapala: Y'know, whichever sort of what tendency you have, it seems to sort of correct it. Through just your awareness that other people are there.

S: Yes, yeh. Well it stimulates the k~r- ~4~~c% - ~AYat your spiritual friends will think of you/ Lf they see you nodding (Laughter)~ 1~idgeting too much.

Suvajra: And yawning. (More laughter). (Pause).

Harshaprabha?: Maybe that's why I'm not getting up in the morning. (More laughter).

S: Can't face their spiritual friends. (Laughter). Or maybe they didn't have time to shave, eh. (Laughter). Don't like to appear unshaven. (More laughter).

\_\_\_\_\_: There must be more than that. (Laughter).

S: All right, carry on then.

"The right place, time and posture are very important and often essential for a successful meditative effort."

sps

29

S: Well, that's a truism, isn't it?

A voice: Em.

S: Nothing to disagree with there. Let's go straight on then.

"Though we have been breathing throughout our life, we have done so devoid of mindfulness, and hence, when we try to follow each breath attentively, we find that the Buddhist teachers of old were right when they compared the natural state of the uncontrolled mind to an untamed calf. Our minds have long been dissipated among visible data and other objects of the senses and of thought, and hence do not yield easily to attempts at mind- control."

S: Yes, go straight on, he gives the traditional illustration of the wild calf.

"Suppose a cowherd wanted to tame a wild calf, he would take it away from the cow and tie it up apart with a rope to a stout post. Then the calf might dash to and fro, but being unable to get away and tired after its effort would eventually lie down by the post. So too, when the meditator wants to tame his own mind that has long been reared on the enjoyment of sense objects, he should take it away from places where these sense objects abound, and tie the mind to the post of in-breaths and out-breaths~with the rope of mindful- ness. And though his mind may then dash to and fro when deprived of its liberty to roam among the sense objects, it will ultimately settle down when mindfulness is persistent and strong."

S: This is quite a good illustration, isn't it? This is the traditional illustration.

Cittapala: But they're assuming that one doesn't go to sleep.

S: Em?

Cittapala: Assuming one doesn't go to sleep (word unclear).

sps 31

meditation, so I could actually get on with it.

S: Yes. But could anyone get hold of a decent book on meditation and actually start practising by themselves? Because one does find that when people have been, are meditating on their own they often become full of doubts whether they're doing it the right way, and that tends to inhibit the practice, and the book can't cover every contingency. Quite apart from the question of the keeping going by oneself, without any contact or encouragement. I suppose some people could do it. So I tend on the whole not to look with any great favour on books on meditation, sort of teach yourself how to do it type of thing.

Cittapala: But also in the sphere of meditation, or teaching meditation, some of these, the a~c~n+S in the commentaries and things, I've only come across after quite some time. And I suppose unless one's specifically talking to somebody about meditation, which in fact doesn't seem to happen very often, or studying something of that nature, you actually come across.

S: That's really the sort of handbook for teachers of meditation, containing all this sort of material which they can then include in their talks to beginners as necessary.

Ratnaprabha: There were, what, three Mitrata, weren't there, on meditation.

S: That's true, yes, yes.

Ratnaprabha: By Kamalasila and I think with someone else which have got a lot of very useful things in them.

Devamitra: There's also three compilations from various material in an early Shabda, which was made by Dharmapala ... for people teaching meditation. It was produced after a convention at (Abk~1 rati ), I don't know if you recall that?

S: I don't, actually.

Devamitra: It is in one of the early Shabdas. I used to (words lost by interruption - something about 'refer to it').

S: Perhaps we have to revive this material, or bring it out in booklet and little pamphlet form.

Devamitra: But it is very useful if you're teaching.

S: Em, ah, em.

Devamitra: Because he's pulled together quite a lot of different points.

S: Yes, yes.

S: No, sleep is analogous to concentration, eh. The calf, y'know, gives up its efforts, eh. . .to get away from the posts, but in the end gives up and lies down, goes to sleep. In the same way, y'know, you give up your efforts to escape from the in- and out- breathing, and you just settle down and become more and more mindful. Not that you go to sleep. (Long pause).

Suvajra: Is this one from the Pali texts or from the commentaries?

S: I think it's from the commentaries. I won't be sure of that. I don't think it occurs in (different ones). Yes, this first verse from the commentaries are from Buddhaghosa . But there are other illustrations more specifically for the different stages of the practice. (Pause).

Cittapala: Do you think that there is a case for having a meditation booklet available to beginners at centres, which could include some of these traditional accounts of, y'know (words unclear).

S: I tend not to favour books on meditation. I think it's much better if people can learn, y'know, directly from somebody else. don't think books on meditation should be reading material. I mean on the other hand, perhaps one needs t brovide some written material. But of course when Subhuti's boo comes out that contains a quite detailed chapter on meditation in the FWBO. That should be sufficient, I think. I don't think he includes these similes.

Suvajra: Does it include an explanation of actually how to medi- tate?

S: Not how to meditate, but certainly describes the stages of the

practice. I think one can hardly learn

to meditate from a book. But, I think, if there are books on meditation it does suggest or at least encourages the idea that well the main thing is to read all about it, eh.

Cittapala: You don't think you could write it in such a way as, and

state, explicitly enough, that...

S: You could, but whether people would actually take much notice of that, remains to be seen. I don't know whether it is a need to - have beginners expressed a need for this sort of thing?

A voice: No.

Cittapala: I have come across it on occasions, but then I'm not very familiar with beginners.

Suvajra: I don't think it's a need with people who~r%c'round the Centres, but I know I felt it was a need before I actually came in contact with the FWBO - that there was a decent book written on

Surata: What year would that be?

Devamitra: Phew, blimey ...

Surata: Any idea?

S: Well it's about six years ago.

Devamitra: Something like that, yeah.

Surata: I think- (interrupted).

S: Maybe these things need to be reprinted, there's a lot of late people, they just don't know them.

Devamitra: Yeh.

S: They haven't got complete back numbers of the Newsletter, or...

Devamitra: I know which Shabda that's in, I could come down to Padmaloka and do something about it.

Suvajra: I have got it on the list I made of the articles from Shabda.

Devamitra: Sorry, you've got ...?

Suvajra: I've got it on the list I made from articles from Shabda.

S: Maybe there is a case for some of these things being reprinted. There are some quite useful articles in old editions of Shabda - not only on meditation, on communities and so on. Not to speak of my own book reviews. We don't want things to be sort of buried there indefinitely and not made useful. A lot of work has gone into some of those.

Gunapala?: Yeh. I have heard people say that the old Shabdas were better material than our new, our newer ones.

S: Ah this is Newsletter we're talking about now, and not Shabda?

Suvajra: No, Shabda... (interrupted by a few indistinguishable voices).

Devamitra: I was talking about Shabda.

S: Oh, sorry, I thought Newsletter, yeh.

Suvajra: Shabda.

A voice: Well both (word unclear).

S: I don't remember Shabda (now).

Cittapala: Presumably ~t~t%£~ could be used quite ...

S: Oh, yes, yes.

Cittapala: ... efficiently.

S: Yes, yeh. One could easily bring out, well if one had the money, five hundred copies- and they would sell, no doubt. Maybe that's something that could be looked into.



Harshaprabha?: Sort of Shabda and Newsletter ', 'b'; ~"~~

S: Yes. I mean, I was thinking more of bringing them out as just little booklets, which would sell for 50p. But one could consider

sps 33

a sort of anthology of material drawn from Shabda and from the Newsletter. You could - my mind is racing ahead now - but one could perhaps think in terms of a sort of follow-up companion volume to Subhuti's book on the FWBO, arranged in sections; articles on communities, on meditation and so on, hmm? Could be very useful. But a lot of that material shouldn't be sort of just buried and inaccessible. (Pause) Anyway, let's pass on. No doubt someone's made a note about that, hmm?

Rathaprabha: There is one question I'd like to ask about, teaching meditation - don't know if this is the right place to ask it. I was wondering whether you felt that Order Members teaching meditation should be people who sort of are really at home in dhyana, you know, who are really good meditators, or whether it's sufficient just to, sort of know the techniques well.

~~'Hmm. Well it's better if the teacher, of course, is at home in dhyana, that's obviously much better. But on the other hand, if you're just dealing with beginners, it's probably enough if you have some experience of meditation yourself and at least very familiar with the technique. You may find that some of those that you're teaching get on with it better than, than you do. They may have more natural aptitude, so to speak, than you, or even more time, hmm. But I think, one must be very very careful though~that you're not teaching meditation against a background of, well, vsrt~ al lack of experience of what it's all about yourself

I think one must be very careful of that. One must you know, leave sufficient time for preparation for taking a meditation class. You know, not go into it in a sort of hurried or worried, flustered sort of state, out of breath, and all that kind of thing. One won't be able to do justice to the situation then. I think everybody knows that, who's ever tried to take a meditation class.

Cit~pala: One of the Order Members at the LBC was saying that he found that taking beginners' meditation classes actually, prompted him to improve his practice in a way, so... just the sheer responsibility of having to teach meditation to other people, made him put a lot more effort into. ...

S.: Yes, it's not just a question of, you know, teaching the technique. It's much more than that. (Pause) A~e't's pass on....

34

sps

(10) "When practising Mindfulness of Breathing, attention should be focussed at the tip of the nose or at the point of the upper lip immediately below where the current of air can be felt. The meditator's attention should not leave this 'focussing point' from where the in-coming and out-going breaths can be easily felt and observed. The meditator may become aware of the breath's route through the body but he should not pay attention to it. At the beginning of the practice, the meditator should concentrate only on the in-breaths and out-breaths, and should not fall into any reflections about them. It is only at a later stage that he should apply himself to the arousing of knowledge and other states connected with the concentration."

S.: Em, he doesn't give a very systematic account, does he, - he starts off with the fourth stage, then mentions the third and then mentions the first and second without giving any details, eh, hm. (Pause)

Ratnaprabha: So he's not implying that one's attention should be focused at the tip of the nose throughout the practice. then?

S.: He seems to suggest that that is possible. I think he isn't very clear, I mean perhaps he hasn't. ...himself, had much experience of meditation, eh. (Pause) It might seem extraordinary that people would translate texts, or write about meditation without much experience, but it does, I'm afraid, happen in the East quite a lot, eh. I mean, it's all sort of in the air; everybody's assumed to know, so practice is sort of taken for granted, which it shouldn't be, hm, This paragraph certainly doesn't give the impression, you know, he's familiar with the actual method of practice himself. (Pause)

"In this brief introduction, only the first steps of the beginner can be discussed. For more information the student may refer to the English translation of the 'Visuddhi Magga' ('The Path of Purification', pp. 285-317) by Bhikkhu Nanamoli, or to 'The Way of Mindfulness' by Soma Thera and to 'The Heart of Buddhist Meditation' by Nyanaponika Thera."

S.: Em, yes. It doesn't require any comment, I think.

(11) "The lay Buddhist who undertakes this practice will first take the Three Refuges and the Five Precepts; he will review the Reflections on the Buddha, Dhamma, and Sangha, transmit thoughts of loving kindness (Metta) in all directions (Laughter), recollect that this

35

sps

meditation will help him to reach the goal of deliverance through direct knowledge and mental calm; and only then should he start with the Mindfulness of Breathing proper, first by way of counting."

S.: (Unclear) (Laughter) (Unclear). I mean, they're not really (local?) Not a very great familiarity with these things, I mean - it all seems a bit mechanical.

Gunapala: I wonder how long that takes? (Laughter)

S.: It reminds me - I was reading in - in a book (I forget exactly what it was), describing a great er, Saint - someone writing about Anandamayi - about a taiWe had with - Anandamayi being a famous Hindu yogi whom I also met and spent some time with in my early days. But writing about it this person says hat , "after taking a brief dip in the Absolute, she said..." (Lughter). Do you see what I mean? Yeah? It's a bit like this here, you know: "he will review the Reflections on the Buddha, Dhamma, and Sangha, transmit thoughts of lovingkindness in all directions, recollect that....", you know, as though that (in) a minute or two he broke into it, he (unclear) .~~~Y' the case I'm afraid, eh. "In all directions", you notice, with regard to thoughts of lovingkindness, em. "And only then should he start with the Mindfulness of Breathing proper", eh, hm. It does seem a bit mechanical. So1.,The lay Buddhist who undertakes this practice will first take the Three Refuges and the Five Precepts", eh? And how is one to sort of translate this into our concrete exper-iential terms? It's as though, you know, the practice of the Mind-fulness of Breathing has its fullest significance within the context of actual commitment, eh? to the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, and some feeling for~hem, eh? - and within the context of emotional positivity, eh~%w~ich is what Metta really stands for, hm. And taking it as a means of, or not just concentrating the mind, but of eventually gaining Enlightenment.

Gunapala: It's interesting that, the - you know, though they probably only do it, just reflect on lovingkindness, Metta, in all directions, for about three minutes or something - it's interesting that in the texts, probably, and where they've got their inform

ation, the Metta has been placed before the Mindfulness, you know- that you should be in this state of Metta before you do the Mind-fulness of Breathing, it almost seems to...

sps 36

S.: (Interrupting) Right, yes, a state of emotional positivity.

Gunapala: Yeah, almost comes before it.

S.: Yeah, hmm. (Long Pause) But I think I've mentioned before that, eh, Buddhists in the East seem to regard Metta Bhavana as something that is very easy and hardly worth bothering about. This may be partly because they're somewhat more emotionally positive, perhaps, than people often are in the West, but, em, I think it's more and more likely that they've lost a sort of sense of the real importance and significance of the Metta Bhavana, hm.

Harshapr~bha:           Have you got any ideas why that is the case?

S.:       I think there was an over-emphasis on, sort of, scholasticism, and understanding, in a certain sense, knowing the different categories of the Abhidharma; that was considered, it seems, more important and more directly relating to the spiritual life. It's also of course, that anybody could do Metta Bhavana, even without knowing the Abhidharma - without even being very literate, eh? -

there couldn't

be much in it, if anybody could do it. It's almost as though that was the attitude of some people. (Pause) And some monks in the East, seem to regard - that is Theravada monks - seem to regard Metta Bhavana as essentially a practice for the lay man, it's so simple and easy. The monks need not bother with it, so to speak.

Cittapala:       How's that weighed up with the Karaniya Metta Sutta?

S.:       Well, they chant the Karaniya Metta Sutta - well again, I mean, it seems they don't really take it very seriously. Em, it's a very popular Sutta for chanting. Perhaps, one shouldn't be too surprised after two thousand five hundred years, eh? I mean, what Christian takes seriously the commandment to turn the other cheek? I mean, everyone's familiar with it; most people are - certainly Christians who go to church, but who does take it seriously? It's as, you know, something that's accepted, something that's said. But, you know, it becomes so familiar that one doesn't think in terms of acting upon it. Something of that sort seems to happen with the Metta Bhavana. Everyone agrees that Metta's a good thing but it's taken so much for granted that, you know, there's no actual effort made really to practice it seriously. Everyone assumes that he is

sps       37

radiating Metta, eh? I mean, this Sinhalese monk once said to me, in London, you know - this was before the FWBO was started up - he said to me - he was very much into - well, he was

just an academic, - no interest in the spiritual life whatever. He

was a 40; he wanted to start a Buddhist college. But anyway, man~about what he said to me one day whilst.... there had been some discussion

about meditation - and he certainly never meditated himself - he said - well, in the sense in which we use the term - he said to me: "Sangharakshita, what is all this talk about meditation? We Sinhalese monks, we're always meditating". He seems to mean by that, "Well, we're always in a pretty, sort of good temper, satisfied frame of mind, and that's meditation,"hm?

Gunapala: Peaceful and calm.

S.: Yes, yes. (End of Tape side)

## (12) COUNTING

"The Buddhist Teachers of old recommend that a beginner should start the practice by counting the breaths mentally. In doing so he should not stop short of five or go beyond ten or make any break in the series. By stopping short of five breaths his mind has not enough room for contemplation, and by going beyond ten his mind takes the number rather than the breaths for its objects, and any break in the series would upset the meditation."

S.: Em. The purpose of counting is just to prevent the mind straying away, you know, from the concentration on the process of breathing. ... So you shouldn't stop short of five, that is to say, you shouldn't count: "one, two, three, one two three" - shouldn't count any number less than five, eh? Though it is usually consider~ ten, is desir- able. Whereas there, you'd have, as it were, less room to m@je about in, - you'd feel a bit cramped, eh? You can probably see what it means, eh? If you're just counting 'in, out, one', and "in, out, two", "in, out, three", and then you go back to one, well, it doesn't give you enough space. But if you go beyond t~n ~, you have to start thinking too much about which number you're actually counting, em? Though again, I have found that, in Tibet, some Tibetan Yogis, they do count indefinitely. They don't go "one to ten", "one to ten", they just go on and on and on, into even the thousands, eh? That is a different method, but this is not the traditional Theravada method. I think this, the Thera~damethod is better, c-certainly

sps 38

for the beginner.

Suraja: There's another method that they use at the Samatha Centre in Manchester. The method of counting up to 'nine', then from 'nine' back down to 'one'.. and then from .. up to 'six', and 'six' back down to 'one', and then to 'three' and back down to one

S.: Em, yeah. I think the disadvantage here is that you're so preoccupied with the counting, that you lose the concentration on the breathing. ut there are many different ways of, you know, doing this practice. There's another Thai way I found which I did myself for some time. They combine the, in and out-breathing with the pronunciation of 'Buddho'. ~c,~ 'Buddha', eh, but 'Buddho'. I mean again it's something to tie the mind down even more, and to prevent it from wandering, eh? But the danger is that you're so sort of preoccupied with you know, counting and repeating these words, that you can't really concentrate on the breath, eh? So it's best, no doubt, to count just from one to ten as we in ~act do.

Ratnaprabha: Is it possible to use a Mala for doing the Mindfulness of Breathing?

S.: No. I think it's not desirable. I think then you'd tend to wander, em. You know, then it would be too easy for you, you'd just be telling ten beads on the Mala, and then your mind would wander off because, you know, you hadn't to keep such careful track of the counting (later?) (Long Pause) Anyway, on to the next paragraph:

(13) "When counting, the meditator should first count when the in- breath or the out-breath is completed, not when it begins. So taking the in-breath first, he counts mentally 'one' when that in- breath is complete, then he counts 'two' when the out-breath is complete, 'three' after the next in-breath, and so on up to ten, and then again from one to ten, and so he should continue."

S.: This is one method. Another method is of course the one we use: counting at the end of each in AND out breath, not each in OR out breath, eh? If one is counting at the end of each in or out breath it becomes a bit, as it were, crowded, eh? One's trying to do too much, so to speak, in a short time.

Gunapala: He's actually counting 'one, then breath - you breathe - you breathe in, you count, what, another number, 'two', probably....

sps 39

.you breathe out, and then you count again. That's what he's suggesting.

S.: Yes. That's why I think he mentioned at the beginning, 'one'

to 'five'. It means five of these doubled counts, eh, hm? (Long Pause) There's the possibility this other method is mentioned apparently in connection with stage two.. "If one takes both the in-breath and out- breath as one, it is better to count only up to five." But that does still give a much er,. . .well, not enough room for contemplation, as it

says earlier on. It's best, I think to do the double count, both ways,

'one' to 'ten'. Will someone read that third paragraph?

(14) "After some practice in counting at the completion of a breath, breathing may become faster. The breaths, however, should not be made longer or shorter intentionally. The meditator has to be just mindful of their occurrence as they come and go. Now he may try counting 'one' when he BEGINS to breathe in or breathe out, counting up to five or ten, and then again from one to five or ten, and then again from one to five or ten. If one takes both the in- breath and out-breath as 'one', it is better to count only up to five.'1

S.: What about this question of breathing becoming faster, - do people generally find this, eh?

Devamitra: I find the opposite (unclear)

Voice: (Unclear) Y~'~

S.: Yes. This is what is in fact generally said. Generally it is - he seems to have got a little mixed up - that when one counts according to the FIRST method, breath becomes slower, when one counts according to the SECOND method, breath becomes faster.

Ratnaprabha: Sorry, what were the first and second methods?

S.: The first method being counting at the end of each in- and out ~ c,~+g b~~~. breath ~ In the first case breaths'ems~ to slow down, in the second

it seems to speed up. Or is the experience not universal?

Devamitra: My experience is that - as I do the practice rather my breathing just seems to become more and more tranquil and less and less (bare?) and therefore I assume that it's slowing down~

sps 40

gradually through~~ut the practi~e.

Cittapala: If it speeds up that would suggest that you're getting excitable, not excited perhaps but you're being stimulated.

S.: Well, it could be that one is being stimulated in, so to speak, a positive sense.. that energy is being released. That is possible, eh?

Devamitra: But is that actually your experience, that in the second stage your breathing... increases?

S.: I think it HAS BEEN. I won't say that it is, but it certainly has been. Here it speaks of the breath becoming faster, apparently in the first stage. Well, I certainly haven't found that happening. If it does happen at all it seems to only occur in the second stage, and I think this is what is in fact usually said. But anyway, the main point is that the breaths ~however, should not be made longer or shorter INTENTIONALLY, hm? One merely is to watch and count. If they HAPPEN to become longer or HAPPEN to become shorter, that is to say become slower or quicker, one should just observe the fact, and not do anything about it... (Unclear)...meditator6.~s.to be just mind- ful of their occurrence as they come and go.

Gunapala: But, if.. the practi~e here is explained different to how we do it, in this first case.. isn't it? It is, yes, I've read that right.

S.: In the sense perhaps that he speaks in terms of counting at the end of each breath, whether in or out, though in connection with the second stage he does mention the possibility of counting at the end of each in and out breath and it is that method which we follow.

Gunapala: We do, yeah. It certainly is a bit different from the first two.

S.: There are quite a number of variations on this practise. (Pause) Anyway, let's carry on:

"Counting should be employed until -one can dispense with it in following the sequence of breaths successively. Counting is merely a device to assist in excluding stray thoughts. It is, as it were, a guideline or railing for supporting mindfulness until it can do [41] without such help. There may be those who will feel the counting more as a complication than a help, and they may well omit it, attending directly to the flow of the respiration by way of connecting the successive breaths."

S.: I think when we're dealing with beginners one must , has to be a bit careful if people say, or they claim that counting is more of a complication than a help, eh? This may just be unwillingness, actually to concentrate. I think the counting becomes genuinely a complication, rather than that, only when one has b~me in fact, deeply concentrated, and it naturally falls off and one need not continue. But the beginner, I think who claims that he finds counting a complication or a hindrance, should be regard~ith some scepticism.

Devamitra: Quite a lot of beginners do, in my experience anyway, say that they find that they do get into quite a concentrated state quite quickly anyway.

S.: Yes, yeah.



Devamitra:. ..and they want to discard the counting you can say not between perhaps. ...

S.: Well, some beginners do seem to get quite well into meditation, quite quickly, no doubt as a result of having BEGINNER'S MIND, but they, they're very rarely able to stay there. So they shouldn't be encouraged to dispense, you know, with the - to consciously dispense or deliberately dispense with the counting; except if you are in a very concentrated state, then really you know, counting is~ hindering the maintenance of that, well by all means drop the counting. Well, it will drop off naturally - don't FORCE yourself to count. But you have to be quite careful with the beginner, who THINKS he - who's really got no IDEA about concentration, who THINKS he's concentrating, but he's just sitting there and in fact his thoughts are maybe wandering and he feels RELUCTANT you know, to count the breaths because there's a resistance to concentration itself. We have to beware of him saying that, you know that counting is a hindrance to concentration. He hasn't yet experienced concentration. One should be able to distinguish these kinds of (unclear)...who's who and which is which. (Pause)

sps 42

#### (15) "CONNECTING

After the counting has been discarded, the meditator should now continue his practice by way of Connecting (anubandhana), that is by following mindfully the in- and out-breaths without re- course to counting, and yet, without a break in attentiveness. Here too, the breaths should not be followed beyond the nostrils where the respiratory air enters and leaves. The meditator must strive to be aware of the whole breath, in its entire duration and without missing one single phase, but his attention must not leave the place of contact, the nostrils, or that point of the upper lip where the current of air touches."

S.: This seems either to be confusing the third and fourth stage or skipping the third stage completely; see what I mean? But the traditional (unclear) . . does clearly distinguish these two. Looking is the third part, as we know, - follows the course of the breath mentally down into the lungs and up. That is a separate stage, and then, having gone through that, well, one does keep the attention fixed on the tip of the nose, you know, just where the breath impinges, as it enters and leaves the nostrils.

Ratnaprabha:He does actually earlier specifically EXCLUDE that third stage, he says: "The meditator", on page seven, he says: "The meditator may become aware of the breath's route through the body but he should not pay attention to it."

S.: Well, this is when he's speaking apparently of stage four. So it seems to exclude that experience of the whole breath body, AS A STAGE ALTOGETHER, though it's clearly enumerated in the tradition. Again maybe he's not over-familiar with the actual practice. (Pause) What he says is correct as regards the fourth stage, but he does miss out the third stage... This does again show that it's not very desirable to rely upon books on meditation. They're not necessarily written by people who've got very much experience of meditation. Anyway, let's go straight on, hm?

(16) "While following the in-breaths and out-breaths thus, they become fainter and fainter, and at times it is not easy to remain aware of that subtle sensation of touch caused by the respiration. Keener mindfulness is required to keep track of the breaths then. But if the meditator perseveres, one day he will feel a different sensation, a feeling of ease and happiness, and occasionally there appears before his mental eye something like a luminous star or a similar sign, which indicates that one approaches the stage of Access Concentration. Steadying the newly acquired sign, one may cultivate full mental absorption (jhana) or at least the preliminary concentration as a basis for practising insight."

S.: Hm. (Pause) This middle bit, "if the meditator perseveres, one day he will feel a different sensation, a feeling of ease and happiness". It's as though one gets into a different gear. I expect everyone's familiar with his sort of experience, as though you no longer have to make such an effort. Everything is flowing much more naturally and easily. You feel a sort of buoyancy, as it were. Might even feel as though you're floating, or expanding. "... and occasionally there appears before his mental eye something like a luminous star or a similar sign..." There are all sorts of experiences that one may have at this stage of this kind. "...which indicates that one approaches the stage of Access Concentration." (Pause)

Harshaprabha: Could you explain what Access Concentration is?

S.: I'm not sure whether - I mean he doesn't give the Pali terms - I'm not sure whether he uses it to mean 'appana samadhi' which is full (Jhana) or whether he's referring to 'neighbourhood concentration', which is 'upacara-samadhi'. It could be FULL concentration, but I'm not sure of that because he does speak of prelim... "at least the preliminary concentration", afterwards. Maybe by preliminary concentration he means 'upacara-samadhi', and maybe by Access Concentration he means 'appana samadhi', but it isn't altogether clear.

Ratnaprabha: 'Appana Samadhi' is full concentration, is it, did you say?

S.: Yes, yes.

Ratnaprabha. He seems to be distinguishing three things here. .

S.: Yes, yes.

Ratnaprabha: . . . Access Concentration, what he calls 'full mental absorption', which he just calls 'jhana' and 'preliminary concentration'. And he appears to put these in order of Access Concentration at the bottom, then preliminary concentration, and then full mental absorption.

S.: He could mean by 'Access Concentration' . simply the stage corresponding to the subjective stage corresponding to the gross mental object, in which case Access Concentration wouldn't even be 'neighbourhood concentration'; in which case again, the order would be - his order would be: Access Concentration is the most elementary, then preliminary concentration, and THEN full mental absorption. hm?

Suraja: But would you get a "luminous star or similar sign" with gross - concentration on the gross object?

S.: Not exactly WITH it, because when by, -when you've got that, you know, luminous' star or whatever it was, then the preliminary concentration would dissolve - it would pass into at least neighborhood concentration. (Pause)

Suraja: He speaks of here: "steady the newly acquired sign". It's almost like he's saying you should leave the breath and actually concentrate on your sign.

S.: I don't think that is to (relate?) in that sense, or at least it shouldn't be. One steadies the newly acquired sign by sort of - continuing one's practise of the Mindfulness of Breathing, eh? If one starts attending to that sign, well that becomes a distraction. One steadies it by, you know, getting all the more deeply into the Mindfulness of Breathing practice itself. You may or you may not understand that. One doesn't.. again it's a bit literal minded, as though you sort of put out your hand and steady it.

Suraja: Yeah.

S.: Well no. You steady it through increased practise. (Long Pause) Anyway, let's go on

(17) "The practice of mindfulness of breathing is meant for both calm and insight (Samatha and vipassana). Direct knowledge - being the object of Buddhist meditation, the concentration gained by

the meditative practice should be used for the clear understanding of reality as manifest in oneself and in the entire range of one's experience.

S.: Hm. You can see where he says quite clearly that mental states are impermanent and so on. In that way, the concentration one has gained from the mindfulness of breathing becomes a basis for the development of actual Insight. I think we've gone into this quite thoroughly, haven't we, connected with the Mitrata Omnibus and Eightfold Path lectures.

Ratnaprabha: I don't think we've gone into exactly how, specifically in the Mindfulness of Breathing, one would gain Insight. At least if we have, I've forgotten it.

S.: Well, it doesn't differ in principle, you know, from the procedure in any other practice. One starts up reflections pertaining to any one of the three laksanas.

Ratnaprabha: So at this point one stops doing the Mindfulness of Breathing...

S.: (Interrupting)...or the 'Viparyayas'. Er, yes and no, because at this point - I mean if one has gone through the whole practice, well the mind is concentrated as a result of that, hm. And then one takes up, sort of directed thinking in which one's thinking is now under one's control. It isn't just a sort of, more or less involuntary process, hmm? And so you start up your thinking, you start up your reflection, in a constructive way - with this concentrated mind, to attain a clearer understanding of say, 'dukkha', 'anitya', and 'an8tta'. Formerly, you had the, you know, intellectual understanding, but you try to deepen that now, to clarify it. Or any other, sort of, aspect of Buddhist, as it were, philosophy, that you want really to see clearly into, such as, you know, the four kinds of Sunyata, or the one mind, or whatever, or the you know, the conditioned co-production.

Gunapala: We seem to divide them up into different practices, don't we? - So, sort of do the Mindfulness of Breathing, and then do the Six-Element practice - something like that. Through mindfulness of breathing, we're just concerned with becoming concentrated and getting into a clear mind...

sps 46

S.: Yes. We tend to take the mindfulness of breathing just as a concentration exercise which essentially it is, but it can be the basis, either for further concentration or dhyana experience, or for the development of Insight, hm. So the six-element practice represents a going into say, a reflection on anatta, hm? Do you see what I mean?

Gunapala: Yeah.

S.: One can of course, develop concentration and mindfulness in the course of doing the six-element practise or one can develop it be fore- hand. By doing either the mindfulness of breathing or even the Metta Bhavana, and then in that already concentrated state, take up the six-element practise. Then one does find, if one does the six- element practise by itself, well, you do get quite rapidly concentrated, just doing that practise, eh, hm? As well as developing, you know, some measure of understanding if not Insight.

Gunapala: It seems like we'll go on to this in.. .when we're studying the foundations...

S.: Yes, possibly, yes. But one has got different sorts of methods of meditation, I mean, really they're all part of the same system, so to speak, they're really continuous, eh? That's why I have spoken of in terms of, a system of meditation. I think there was an artic~e in the Newsletter on that, wasn't there? Or was it called 'Method of Meditation' with the five main practises as a sequence?

Su~aj~: \_\_\_\_\_ Not in the Newsletter... in Mitrata Omnibus, or the early

Mitratas. There was the series of the five different meditations...

S.: No; somebody wrote an article.

Su~ajA: Ah yes, that's right, yes.

S.: I think it might have been Subhuti.

Su~aj\$: Subhuti.

S.: Was that Mitrata or Newsletter?

Su~aj~: No. It was in the Newsletter, the one on meditation, when Tyd-y-ddol was just around.

S.: Ah, yes, yes. (Pause) Anyway, let's go on. I'm sure we're going to finish the introduction this morning:

(18) "Though penetrative insight leading to Nibbana is the ultimate object, progress in mindfulness and concentration will also bring many benefits in our daily lives. If we have become habituated to follow our breaths for a longer period of time and can exclude all (or almost all) intruding irrelevant thoughts, mindfulness, self-control and efficiency are sure to increase in all our activities. Just as our breathing, so also other processes of body and mind will become clearer to us, we shall come to know more of ourselves."

S.: Hm. It is significant that he says, "intruding, irrelevant thoughts, mindfulness, self-control and efficiency are sure to increase in ALL OUR ACTIVITIES." There's no suggestion of possibly, a change of your activities coming about. There seems to be a characteristic emphasis, or lack of emphasis, in everybody practically, except the FWBO, eh? I mean, you can go on practising meditation and practising meditation. It doesn't seem ever to bring about any change in the way that you live or the work that you do, or your life-style generally. You just carry on as before, doing everything more and more efficiently, hm? This is what the Maharishi, you know, says quite clearly, explicitly, eh. I heard him say on the radio in an interview, if you practise transcendental meditation, and you're a millionaire, well your - the result of your transcendental meditation will be, you'll become a millionaire twice over, eh? He actually said this, - I mean, if someone had told me, I might not have believed it, but I heard it with my own ears, eh? But this is almost suggested here, eh?

I mean at least it's not explicitly stated you know, that the practice of meditation may actually bring about profound changes in your whole way of life. Maybe he thinks it's dangerous to mention that, but I would think more likely it hasn't occurred to him.

Cittapala: Well, presumably.. that is rather dangerous stuff to start pushing at people, because if they don't start looking at your lifestyle, which inevitably looks a little odd to them, to start off with, maybe they wouldn't like the inference that they may have to change - they may end up changing and becoming like you. (Laughter) That's OK so long as you stay over there.

48

sps

S.: Not exactly inspiring, eh? (Laughter) Maybe it is more inspiring to think in terms of, you know, being a millionaire twice over.

Devamitra: But surely, I mean, if you've got any intelligence and you're interested in Buddhism because you think you want to achieve Enlightenment, and you look at the kind of lives that Enlightened figures have actually led, it IMPLIES that change, doesn't it? I mean you can't, I don't see how you can not acknowledge it somehow.

Cittapala: But there'd surely be quite a lot of people who come along to learn how to meditate, don't initially com~along because they want to change themselves in that sort of a way. They just want to become more efficient...

S.: (Interrupting) No, they want to achieve peace of mind perhaps, but they think in many cases that, that can be attained without any actual change in themselves. That it's a sort of a.. meditation is a sort of trick, sort of technique, em. If you can learn that, well you can get peace of mind, regardless, almost. I think some people do see it in this way.

Gunapala: This is the way he's definitely putting it across, that you'll have a happy, more worldly life - a happier, more worldly life - if you do the mindfulness of breathing.

S.: That may be somewhat mitigated by the coticluding paragraph. So let's read that, em...

"It has been said by the Buddha: "Mindfulness of Breathing, developed and repeatedly practised, is of great fruit, of great advantage, for it fulfils the four Foundations of Mindfulness; the four Foundations of Mindfulness, developed and repeatedly pract- ised, fulfil the seven Enlightenment Factors; the Seven Enlighten- ment Factors, developed and repeatedly practised, fulfil clear- vision and deliverance'. Clear-vision and deliverance, or direct knowledge, and the bliss of liberation, are the highest fruit of the application of mindfulness."

S.: Hm. No, there is no suggestion that lifestyle might change, eh? But perhaps it is not advisable to emphasize that too much. . you know, to new people... Of course, in Buddhist countries, they tend to assume because they're Buddhists, they're born Buddhists even, that they,

sps 49

they're automatically changed, eh? And th~t tends to make the assumption, the unskilful assumption. (Pause) Anything that requires discussion there? Or in fact anything that we've gone over? We've gone through this introduction rather rapidly, but I think that's just as well, so that we can, you know, get on to the actual Sutta, all the more quickly. Maybe this introduction, just serves to re- fresh our memories about certain things, eh? Seems to me to be a bit of lack of FEELING, eh, hm?

Ratnaprabha: And lack of clarity as well, I think....

S.: (Interrupting) Some lack of clarity, em yeah.

Ratnaprabha: .. His description of the meditation practice, if one DID try and follow it, would be very confusing. He doesn't give a step by step account of one good method of doing it. He prevaricates and does - he gets the order out of sequence, and all sorts of things.

S.: Yes, yes. And he's not clear about the different levels of concentration, terminology - isn't clear. He doesn't give you "one, two three" - well this is the Pali, and "one, two, three - that's the English equivalent, eh? (Long Pause)

Gunapala: This last bit where he Wad that, you know, if you do practice meditation, it'll help your ordinary life, more or less, in one part there. Do you think that has any benefit to humanity, or any benefit to people, divorced from the spiritual point of view?

S.: Em?

Gunapala: Whether it has any benefit, whether it's sort of just... sort of ties them to worldly existence even more strongly - by people doing meditation with the wrong approach like that?

S.: Well, there's no doubt that if you do practise mindfulness, you know, practice mindfulness of breathing, you DO become more self- controlled, more efficient, in your activities, at least in YOUR SKILFUL ACTIVITIES, eh or activities that are at least neutral, but you become INCREASINGLY UNABLE, eh, to perform any unskilful activities, because you just see how unskilful they are, eh? So one really can't, or one shouldn't miss out that qualification, em

that mindfulness doesn't make you just more efficient in EVERYTHING [50] you do REGARDLESS. It SUGGESTS that everything you do is, COMPLETELY SKILFUL, but in most cases that would certainly not be the case. How can one assume that? One's almost flattering the reader, by sort of assuming it would appear that all the activities, his activities, are completely skilful, and that he need give none of them up. Perhaps it goes back to a sort of, you know, quite artificial distinction between the layman and the monk, em,.. where the layman is a I~~~" well, it's alright for him to do this, that and the other because he is a layman, eh? So, it's quite possible for him to practise mindfulness of breathing and just become more efficient in everything he does; because he's a layman he doesn't NEED to change anything. In other words it considers being a layman, like being a monk, something which is just sort of external. Do you see what I mean, em? Just a sort of role almost, without any sort of psychological or spiritual significance. You're officially a layman, so you know, so that's - that it's alright for you to do certain things which aren't prohibited for the monk - which are prohibited for the monk BECAUSE HE'S A MONK, eh? There's no sort of insight into the fact that, well, there are certain things which HOLD YOU BACK, eh, in your spiritual development. In other words, there's no thinking in terms of spiritual development, and what helps you and what holds you back, but in terms of being a monk or being a layman. And if you're a layman, well, sort of in a sense, everything goes. I mean, provided you observe the five precepts, eh. So you know, there's no need for you to think in terms of changing your activities, changing your life. That seems to be the backbone of the fault here. Do you see what I'm getting at, eh? The thing is it's quite difficult for us to sort of get ourselves into that sort of frame of mind, that very EXTERNAL way of looking at things, em. You know a bit like I mentioned before, that well.. that you know, the remark of that monk



that "We Sinhalese, because we're always med- itating", as though a monk is an honorary meditator. Do you see what I mean?

Gunapala: It does seem a very strong 'us' and 'them' - the monks and the laity, and the laity seem to be able to be excused for their worldly sort of life.

S.: Yes, yes, right. As though a spiritual effort is not expected of the lay person. And the monk is ASSUMED TO BE MAKING IT, just because he is a monk, eh?

sps 51

Ratnaprabha: Did I understand you to say, that if one successfully practised the mindfulness of breathing, one would become more and more aware of unskilful mental states, and less and less able to practi ~hem~

S.: YES, CERTAINLY.

Ratnaprabha: Simply through that increasing mindfulness?

S.: Well, certainly that must be so, if you see more and more clearly what in fact you are doing. And also, the mindfulness of breathing would make you more sensitive, psychologically sensitive. There's certain things YOU WOULDN'T BE ABLE to do anymore. I mean for instance, to take a... how shall I say, you know, local example: if you were practising mindfulness of breathing, you couldn't really after a while go out and shoot birds on a Sunday morning, could you?

Ratnaprabha: Well, I was thinking say, of people who seem to be able to be very concentrated in what they do but yet can engage in very unskilful acts in this apparerutly concentrated. ...

S.: (Interrupting) Ah, but concentration is not necessarily skilful, em... because there can be, I mean there is you know, not only 'samma-samadhi', there's 'miccha-samadhi', hm~ I mean, the example which is usually given is of a cat, yonow, watching a mouse-hole, which is concentrated to greed, eh, So, concentrating can be }tean~

present in an unskilful mental state as well as in a skilful one, eh~ But in the case of mindfulness and awareness, it's not just that you see what is present before you, but you've some consciousness of pURPOSE AND GOAL, EH~

Ratnaprabha: I see.

S.: And you can see that certain things, certain activities, are INCOMPATIBLE WITH CERTAIN ENDS, eh, em? But in any case, the practice of mindfulness does make you more sensitive, doesn't it? I mean, people find that. (Pause) In other words it isn't a purely psychological quality, we shouldn't think of mindfulness in exclusively psychological terms. It is a SPIRITUAL quality, em.

A Voice: But is it possible for somebody...

(End of Tape)

### Tape No.3 of The Satipatthana Sutta 23/11/82

S:...you shouldn't think of mindfulness in exclusively psychological terms-it is a spiritual quality. (Pause). Cittapala: V5 it possible for somebody to practice mindfulness purely as a psychological-er-with a psychological end in mind-i.e. concentration,for instance.Somone like a boxer or somebody of that nature who wanted to become very concentrated in his skill? S:I think he could to begin with-it might well(pro-olve?) after some time he'd find it more and more difficult to be a boxer. Cittapala:Similarly-simply because-through his senior connections of his activities he'd become more and more sensitive. S:I think-er-yes,yes-he would become,as it were,for himself more sensitive-not more sensitive to other people-all that sort of thing-but you know,certain things-he'd be sensitive that doing certain things would upset him1 disturb him.He wouldn't be able to do them after a while.I think that would be the case with boxing which is,after all,violent and does involve the disability of your-as it were,done intentionally- taking someone's life-seriously damaging somebody else. Devamitra:In a way that's quite similar to the example I mentioned last week of the guy I met in prison who was used to beating up other prisoners and prison officers-after he started meditating he found himself actually in the process of about to smash somebody and stopped himself- it was after he'd taken up the practice of meditation.

S:It could be that mindfulness also inhibits these more impulsive or instinctive reactions-you just become more aware of what it is in fact that you are doing-whereas before you just didn't stop to think. Gunapala:That's what happened in the case of this prisoner- all that stopped him was the thought of "What am I doing?". Devamitra:He actually said that when he was pulling his fist ~~~ck this thought came through his mind 'IWhat am I doing? " and he stopped. (Long Pause). Surata:I know people that have said that to me before-that they just found themselves getting more and more (unclear)- I suppose it just brings out more and more (confident?). S:Or they feel that,you know,their external conditions and circumstances don't permit them to-to say the least-they think that don't permit them to change. (Pause).One other thing (this unclear?) might not reckon to (Continue?) working and if I don't continue working,well,how can I keep up the mortgage repayments,and of course I've got to keep those up. (Pause). Surata:Families as well-you start to think about maybe not living with their families-it's almost unthinkable. S:Yes,yes almost unmentionable. (Pause). Surata:One thing I was wondering about is,em,this bit about mindfulness of breathing takes the highest place among the various subjects of Buddhist meditation-you said that was specifically a sort of Theravada view.What would be say a Mahayan ieuw?Where would the emphasis be? S:It depends on the School.The Ch'an people might say,well, the koan form of meditation is the highest.A Tibetan Buddhist- well if he was a Nyingmapa-would say the Atti-Yoga was the highest and a Kagyupa would say the Mahamudra was the

S: (Continued)...highest. T(Long pause). Cittapala:Are the Seven Enlightenment Factors actually treated as a specific practice or is it just through the,er. ...? S:No they're not treated as a specific practice they're almost a sequence of states leading to enlightenment they correspond roughly to the positive Nidanas,or they're also regarded as qualities or attributes of enlightenment so that if you have all of these-these seven-then you are enlightened. Cittapala:So if you are practising the Four Foundations of Mindfulness then these seven will natur~(ly sort of follow? S:Yes.The more you cultivate the Four Foundations of Mindfulness,the more these would be expected to grow.It's a~b,~~t ana#ous to the Eightfold Path-'cause the word'anga' is~here -the Bodhi-angas-the factors or limbs-so they can sort of be regarded as developing successively,but they can also be regarded as co-existing. (Long Pause). Devamitra:~h1;~ view of the mindfulness of breathing as being, in a way,~the ultimate practice from the Theravada point of view-has this come about purely because of the Theravada interpretation of the Pall Canon or the way they put it together-because I notice that reading one of the sutras addressed to Pa~~the Buddha says that of great benefit is mindfulness of in-and out-breathing-and then you get right at the end of the sutra a list of various practices including the practice of the Four Brahmaviharas and I think there are about sixteen practices,some of them obviously Vipassana practices,but the practice which is given the greatest emphasis is actually the mindfulness of breathing-and it seems the way that that sutra is structured,that that is the emphasis the Buddha himself is giving. S:Well within this sutra the Buddha said "This is the only way,monks,for the purification of being5.~~One can say this is a well-known procedure in India-a word called (prasanga?) or praise-you praise something,maybe even extolling it as the best and honouring more to encourage people to practice it. Do you see what I mean? Devamitra:Yes-so it's more of,well,a skilfu eans. S:It's more like a skilful means-yes it is- t is considered a very important practice and the Buddha himself is supposed to have been enlightened,according to some traditions,by practi~ing the mindfulness of breathing.But mind you-but again the question arises,well-best for whom?I mean there is the teaching about the different temperaments and different methods of meditation being better suited to people,you know, of thIs or that temperament.You cannot say absolutely that one method is the best under all circumstances and for all people;presumably no-one can.Some people like to feel that the pract~ce that they are doing is the best,and it encourages them.That\$ould be (unclear). Cittapala:Can you generalise,though,about Westerners and say that the Metta Thhavana is probably more important for them? S:Most beneficial.I would say after-what is it?-18 years back in the West- would say probably the Metta Bhavana. We have always phas ised both the Mindfulness of Breathing and the Metta Bhavana in our beginners' meditation classes and we have tended to do the (unclear)...the Mindfulness of Breathing first because people find that more acc~ible- I think fewer people have difficulty with it. I think after 18 years of experience I'd probably say that- probably-the Metta Bhavana is more needed;that's not to say that it's objectively more important-but more people seem to

5\$

S:(Continued)...need it.It seems there is such a lack of emotional positivity in people's lives-that does seem an integral part of spiritual life that one is emotionally positive. Cittapala:For anybody involved in (I suppose?) as a friend or a mitra it would be easy to combine both practices,but if you are also trying to have a visualisation practice and possibly six elements and going for refuge... S:More r~~(e~4.; thcv -don't you (unclear)...concentrated experience of the practice. T?atnaprabha:I do get the impression that quite a lot of Order Members mainly practice the Metta Bhavana and their visual- isation practice and rarely do the Mindfulness of Breathing- perhaps only on retreats.Do you think that's a bad thing in any way? S:Well-it isn't good to drop the Mindfulness of Breathing. If you've absolutely got to make a choice,probably that is quite a sensible one.(Pause).Not a bad choice anyway.' (Laughter). Cittapala:Would there be any merit in,sort of,doing it sort of twice a week or something of this nature? S:Oh yes,certainly,that would help.Oh yes. (Pause). tSound of a handbell). S:Lunch is on time today,well,practically~minutes late. Wrlight then0So I think we'll go onto the sutra itself to- morrow.

SPS.

S: . . Page eleven. Who's going to start reading?

~vamitra: ... "The Foundations of Mindfulness". Satipatthana Sutta.

"Thus have I heard. At one time the Blessed one was living among Thhe Kurus, at Kammasadamma, a market town of the Kuru people. There the Blessed One addressed the bhikkus thus: 'Monks', and they replied to him~ 'Venerable Sir,' The Blessed One spoke as follows:-"

S: The opening is, of course~ the traditional opening of a sutta. "Thus have I heard " etc. The speaker is supposed to be Ananda, who according to tradition recited all the teachings that he remembered, all the teachings of the Buddha that he remembered to the monks at the so-called First council after the Buddha's passing away. The Kurus are the people living near the direction of what is now Delhi. That is to say North West India. And there the Blessed one adressed the bhikkus~ "Thus monks"~ and they replied to Him, "Venerable Sir." So what does this suggest? What does this tell you about this particular teaching?

Voice: That it was given to the Bhikk~~s.

~: Yes~ but how? What way?

Voice: . . it wasn't requested...

S: It wasn't requested. The Buddha himself spoke. The Buddha himself took the initiative, which suggests that it was something that was - not exactly on the Buddha's mind - but was something that he thought was important to communicate to the Bhikkhus. He wasn't simply speaking in reply to a question put by them. He called them together~ so to speak.

Gunapala: . . from the passage . is He actu,ally living.. He's

living with ~hikk\$us. . ? Ic~ ~~ ~(Q~)~?inC~ ~ik~4&~ n~ odd~~~Q? 9~tA?~ ~nc~n~j?

S: We're not given any details, but judging, you know, by what happens on other occasions according to the Pali texts the Buddha must have been staying in the midst of a small settlement of Bhikkhus~ They probably had little huts, you know, dotted about, you

know somebody's park of someb~dy's garden, some might have been living under trees. So they're all living within call of one another in this sort of way. And no doubt they were going into Kammasadamma ever~day for their alms. So its as though the Buddha called the BhikkWus together and started them.

In some suttas we find the Buddha telling Ananda to go and collect all the BhikkA1s together because he wants to speak to them. That might be wh~n there are more of them living over a larger area. But it could be that if there weren't so many the Buddha Himself just .. calls them together, if there's only just a few dozen perhaps, and wh~n they've assembled and settled down then he speaks to them. So this seems to be what happened on t% resent occasion.

Suvajra: If they were living together in this sort of way would they normally meet every morn% every day?

S: No~ there's no suggestion anywhere that they did. But they did of course meet twice a month on the occasion of the full moon day and the new moon day. Not from the very beginnin~ the Buddha instituted that practice after some years. But then of course it Wcc~~&customarV. There's no indication that they met together every day. Not . certainly not of the (inaudible) I mean they may well have had contact, daily contact but there was no formal meeting. Alright lets go on.

Devamitra: "This is the only way monks for the purification of beings, for the overcoming of suffering and lamentation, for the destruction of suffering and grief, for reaching the right path, for the atta~inment of Nibbana, namely the four Foundations of Mindfulness. What are the four?"

S: So, "The only way" in Pali is ekaya~a Though it is not quite.. (it is) eka- yano Bhikkhova.. monks, which means "There is only one way which is the Path".

Devamitra: So what was the other one?

S: The Buddha says here in the Pali, " Eko yana Bhikkova Monks Bhikkova which means 0 Bhikkus. "0 Bhikkus Eko yano the Marga, the path is one way... or a one (?) path. Probably it would be best translated as the " There is only one way". The English doesn't quite correspond to the Pali.

So what is the significance of this then? What is the force of this? How literally must one take this? By what sense must one understand it? That the four foundations of Mindfulness are the only way, the only way to Nirvana. How does that square with the fact that the Buddha has given other teachings as well?

SPS

Cittapala: ... central element of all his other teachings of which the other ones were mainly different elaborations of this..

S: . Because the word for mindfulness is sati~ and the sati is the seventh anga of the so-called Noble Eightfold Path. So there sati is only part of the path, but here it is as though sati in its fourfold formulation is said to be the whole of the path. So is this not a contradiction?

Gunapala: . It does seem a bit strange that one limb in the Noble Eightfold Path which was dedicated to mindfulness

where studying it we saw that mindfulness was right through the ~-o~ tC)t. That there was a thread o\$mindfulness tha¼ ou needed on all the limbs...

S: On the other hand you can also say that there is a thread of concentration. There's a thread o energy. There's a thread of generosity. Do you see what I mea ?

Ratnaprabha: It's said, isn't it~ that the Five Spiritual Faculties that mindfulness is the 'balancing' factor, sort of a central one... that underlies all the others, in a sense, is necessary with all the others.

S: Yes.. right. yes.

Surata : Without the mindfulness you.. the other sort of threads as it were, would be actually quite tenuous.. wouldn't they.. would be difficult to put to one (?)

S: Yes. yes.. But the same presumably of 5ay~virya~ energy. You need energy to practise mindfulness. Perhaps, you know~ one really can't you know, any one of the aspects or factors, at the expense of the others. Perhaps the Buddha is seeing the whole path under the aspect of mindfulness.

Devamitra: He does seem -as far as I can recall- to make similar comments about the Thwb~~S' n cAb~~ SL&liLIS and welll again it's just the sort of skilfull means that you were suggesting yesterday..

SPS

S:

- Yes. .... It also may have something to do with the kind of

people that He is addressing. I mean I hav~'t consulted the commentary - I don't even know if its available~ perhaps it is- but there might be some referc,~nce to the state of mind of the Bhikkus that the Buddha addressed on this occasion.

Devamitra: How useful is the commentary in actually getting a better feel for particular suttas?

S: I think the comment as well as.. these are the commentaries

ta~t are usually attributed to Buddhaghosa. they either give quite a bit of historical information on certain occasions, or its

just a technical analysis of terms which is not very ~U~ul. The Pali commentaries are not, so to speak, very imaginative usually. They don't sort of draw out the spiritual meaning of the sutta very well. They are a bit scholastic.

Devamitra: Presumably they must have been compiled considerably later than the suttas themselves?

S: Well, they weren't actually compiled in Pali until the time of Buddhaghosa, which is at least a ~o~~~~&years after the Buddha. But it does transmit many ancient traditions especially of a sort of historical nature, information about kings and provinces and so on.

Devamitra: So this would have been a continuation, or would have been... ~ the material would have been drawn from an existant oral tradition?

S: There is said to have been~ommentaries in Sir~alese which is said to have been translate~ into Pali. And those Sinhalese commentaries are supposed to be based on traditions handed down since the introduction of Buddhism into Ceylon. in the days of Ashoka.

Ratnaprabha: Could one rela~this ekayana in any way to the one way point of view of the Mahayana and the Hinayana?

S: Well, the term is the same. It's the same word, ekaya~~~ in both Buddhist.. Sanskrit and in Pali It is the same in a sense1 it does sort of emphasise the point that there is just one way.

SPS

I mean sometimes one encounters people who say ~ 'Well there are different ways to the same truth' That looks very nice, it looks you know, quite liberal, but if one thinks about it carefully, one sees really that its nonsense. You're overworking an analogy. I mean the analogy being that, you know, I suppose it's a city, there's Rome, and all roads lead to Rome. Roads from different directions. So the sort of suggestion is that all the different religions, all the different spiritual teachings, though they are so different they all~ you know ~end up at the same spiritual goal. I mean, the paths are many, but the goals are only one. But that would seem to be over-working that analogy. Because if the goal is Nirvana, if the goal is reality, if the goal is Enlightenment, well, the nearer you get to that the more your paths must approximate surely. One mustn't be misled by the analogy that all roads lead to the same city. Do you see what I mean? It isn't as though you have a number of completely different paths and at the last moment they somehow or other they all merge in the same goal.

Cittapala: .. As if you've been misled by the sort of

S: Yes. yes

Cittapala:...~layout of the path of different roads coming in...

S: Yes, right. Yes. Because, after all, human nature is the same .. the goal is the same .. if the goal is the same then the requirements for reaching the goal will be the same. I mean, for instance, can you say that well, "in one path truthfulness is, you know, a part of the path, truthfulness is necessary for reaching the goal but in some other path well you could get on perhaps without, you know, truthfulness. So, if you're thinking in terms of reaching a spiritual goal, a Transcendental goal, surely the same qualities will be necessary in all the cases, that is to say, for all human beings. It'll be the same qualities that have to be developed. In other words, they would all have to follow the same path. There can only be one path. Do you see what I'm driving at?

Cittapala: It's almost as though you have to go down all those roads.. to Rome.. at the same time..?

SpS

S: Yes.. which is the same thing as saying that there's only one path, there's only one road. So this is emphasised very much in the Buddha's Teaching, that there is only one way, there's only one path, in the sense that there are certain ethical, certain spiritual principles



which everybody has to fulfil, which everybody has to practice and apply who wants to achieve that particular goal, who wants to reach that particular end. I mean the path which is made up of those particular ethical and spiritual qualities may have a number of different formulations, perhaps you can look at it from different points of view, but nonetheless, it's one path. What I sometimes call the 'Principal Path' which people sometimes mistake for 'Principal Path'

but it's not principal path. The 'Principal Path' means or could mean - the chief path amongst a number of paths but it isn't that it's the Principal ~th~ that is to say, what the path is in principle eh, as distinct from specific presentations of the Path. There is as it were, a Principal Path, which finds expression in the Eight-Fold Path, the Six Paramitas and so on...

Cittapala: Have you come across any formulations as such in other religions which seem to have this 'Principal element' in them?

S.: Well, not in religion generally - in their sort of basic forms one might say. For instance, take the case of Christianity which (unclear) ... What were the main stages of the Path to, you know, whatever goal you regarded as the ultimate he probably wouldn't be able to tell you - not in the same way as an instructed Buddhist would speak of the Eight-fold Path, the Three Trainings. But nonetheless in Christian Mysticism there's a quite well-known sort of formulation - well-known at least to Mystics who do seem to hold a specific path in a more definite sense. And there they speak of the three stages of: Purification, Illumination and Unification, eh? Do you see what I mean? Purification from sins; illumination of the understanding; then Union, Unification with God - not God in the sense of unification with God as such but unification with His Will. So that your will is in accordance with the Will of God. So clearly there is a sequence of 4 v

conception of a Path with successive stages. (Practitioner Theresa?) has a conception of the path in what she calls the Seven (Waters?) which are clearly Seven Successive stages. But these sort of teachings are not part of what one might call - describe as ~standard~ Christianity.

[61]

They're definitely part of a more mystical aspect of Christianity which aren't generally current.. which have been held in some suspicion by the Church, one might say, at certain times. (Pause)

Cittapala: Do the Sufis have any kind of concept of a Path?

S.: They certainly do. They've sort of a number of ways of looking at it. Yes, they do. But not.. Islam as such doesn't. Islam speaks in terms of 'The Five Duties' eh.. as a pious Muslim but they don't seem to add up to a path at all. The Five-Duties being: alms-giving, the Pilgrimage to Mecca, the Five Daily Prayers, the observance of Rama-dan....

So the thing that is important to understand is that the Dharma represents in a way THE PATH. in the sense of the sum-total of all those ethical and spiritual requirements which any human being has to fulfil in order to reach what Buddhists call Enlightenment.

Gunapala: There's the little line here - "for reaching the right path". It's insinuating that you

need mindfulness to reach the right path if seems for the attainment of Nirvana.

S.: It doesn't.. the text doesn't actually say so but I imagine, that that means the transcendental Path... that is to say the Path beyond the Point of No Return.

Gunapala~: I mean, I didn't know whether we said yesterday but someone said that you need mindfulness to do any skillful act...

S: Yes.

Gunapala: So in that context you could take it quite literally that mindfulness would be the main thing for getting us from A to B - if you require it for any skillful act. Because without it you just don't go anywhere.

S: Well~ that's easy enough isn't it? Perhaps we ought to look a little bit more into the question of mindfulness. In the sense of the actual term. Perhaps I ought to have had my Pali dictionary but it's been borrowed. But anyway I think~I can remember whatever is necessary. The word of course is Sati. The Sanskrit equivalent of which is Smr ~i. An alternative translation of Sati is recollection. Recollection is in some ways preferable because it makes it clear that the primary meaning of Sati is to remember. But if you simply translate it as mindfulness or awareness it suggests that you are aware in the sense of being conscious of or knowing what is happening here and now in the present. But Sati definitely has the original meaning of memory almost. Certainly recollection. So recollection has this sort of double meaning. The English word for recollection has the double meaning of remembering or calling to mind and also being mindful in the present. Do you see what I mean? So in this way recollection is probably a more faithful rendering of Sati than Mindfulness. Mindfulness does justice to only one aspect of the term not to the aspect of remembering. So then the question arises, well, what is the importance or what is the significance of memory in this connection? Or memory in the spiritual life?

Gunapala: To me it sometimes seems to be my enemy. It seems to get in the way, the fact that I can remember so much. It's just, you know, it gets in...or especially if it gets out of control....

S: But look at that for a minute. What does it suggest that you remember such a lot? Or why do you find it sort of unpleasant to remember such a lot.

Cittapala: Presumably because what you remember is unskillful...

Gunapala: Not always...

S: Not always.

Gunapala: Irrelevant quite often. Or I mean they can be quite striking things in the past or maybe remembering things like projecting into the future so that you never are here and now, you're never mindful of, well, especially meditation. You should be concentrating on the breath or on your practice. And all you have really is you~ being being stretched into the past or into the future. This is my memory of what I am going to be like in the future or what I was like in the past sort of pulling me away from what I should be doing now.

S. I don't think it's quite so straightforward as that because even here in the present how do you come to have the conception of what you should be doing? I mean~ if there is only the present how does this conception of what you should be doing arise?

Surata: You'd have to remember?

S: You'd have to remember. Because if I say well I should be doing this, what does it mean - I should be doing this?

Devamitra; You're drawing a comparison with past experience.

S: Yes, you're drawing with past experience but it's not as though you are saying well~ if I want to achieve this, that or the other in the future, I should be doing this now. So this involves an element of projection into the future and it also involves recollection of the past. In other words, without memory you can't think of yourself as a developing individual. You can't think of yourself as an individual at all without memory.

Devamitra: So that memory is an offshoot of reflective consciousness

S. Yes, memory is - I'm not sure one should call it an offshoot but it certainly is associated with reflective consciousness. Which

comes first it might be difficult to say. Do you see what I mean? The two things are closely connected. One can hardly imagine reflective consciousness without memory or memory without reflective consciousness.

Cittapala ; Certain animals have sometimes quite a developed memory.

S: But what is memory? ~as going to say what is an animal's memory - but what is y0~ know to begin with? Does an animal's memory ~C(V in the same way that or 5 works? Or is an animal really conditioned to associate say pleasure with a particular experience or pain with a certain experience. I'm thinking of say "Pavlov's Dog". Did they develop memory? Or was something else happening?

Cittapala: No doubt a biologist would say that it was just the development of that mere association in some sort of neurological way... (unclear)

S:(inaudible)..It's the same sort of thing but more complicated perhaps we better not go into that but do you see what I'm getting at about the connection between reflective consciousness and memory and

therefore awareness and memory~

Gunapala: This is what our mindfulness is. Being able to recollect the past in this way.

S.No. I'm not saying that. What I said was that it was very difficult to form the notion of an evolving individual, the developing individual without bringing in memory. I mean, how can you even think of yourself as evolving as developing if you cut out all the recollection of the past and all anticipation of the future, and leave yourself with just yourself as you are now. However aware you are you can't think of yourself as developing. Because developing involves an element of time and progress through time. And the consciousness of that which involves memory.

Richard Clayton: (Few words inaudible) A positive experience of recollecting continuity.. it's frustrating when you just a bit of this and a bit of that. It can make one anxious. But if one can recollect a series of events that are important to one~continuity seems to be very beneficial and positive and leads you in the right direction, if

you like.

Devamitra: It does actually suggest an appreciation or understanding of cause and effect.

S..Yes. And also responsibility. In other words, it's as though memory strengthens the sense of individuality - I'm using the word individuality in the positive sense - and I mean leaving aside for the moment any question of the metaphysical status of that individuality that is to say whether it is void or not void. Well, I think we can leave that for a moment. Do you see what I mean?

Devamitra: It's a bit like what Weininger says in "Sex and

Character". . He associates memory and genius. Memory is a necessary quality of genius. Without memory there can be no genius

~~enius in the very broad sense of the term ~n appreciation and understanding of things on a deeper level.

S: I was reading a story by Dickens which was quite interesting from this point of view, one of his Christmas books. It's called "The Haunted Man" - has anybody read this? Well, it is quite interesting it's not the greatest as a story, though it is very good still being by Dickens. But the theme is this: the hero - if you can call him that - the main character in the story is a learned man, a chemist~ a teacher of chemistry, a professor of chemistry. There are a certain number of very painful experiences in the past which keep haunting him and even take the shape of a sort of 'doppelganger'. He has some quite strange experiences in this connection which Dickens describes very vividly. But anyway~this 'doppelganger', this ghost strikes a bargain with him and he's given the gift of forgetting the past. Not only that, he's also given the gift of taking away from other people with his touch their memory of the past. So for a short while he goes about touching people and they lose memory of the past. But then Dickens describes the effect on this man and on the people he comes in contact with - the effect of forgetting the past. And the effect is that they become very mean and selfish and what we would call negative because so much of what is good in them is bound up with their past, with their recollection of the past, with past happenings. For instance, there's a couple, a very ordinary~in the story, a working-class couple as we would call them, with a large family and when they - this sort of elderly man and his wife -they

lose their memory of the past and see each other only as they are in the present. He sees her as fat and, you know, ugly and past her best and she sees him as bald and common and there's nothing attractive. Because their memory of their struggles and difficulties together and their youthful time together, th~ir courtship - all that has gone. They don't remember it. They're left with only the present. So according to Dickens in this story positive moral qualities or the developement of the positive moral qualities, positive attitudes to~ards human beings is very much bound up with memory. These qual~ties we developed gradually in the course of years of association. Ifrwe forget these associations and we're just left with the present reality which might inspire in us different feelings. So according to him, memory is inseparable from, you know~ certain ethical qualities. Certain ethical qualities are inseparable from memory.

Cittapala: Seems a little bit pessimistic on Dicken's part. I wouldn't like to have the other feeling of .... you know, a bit more than if one could wake up in a sense, one would be a pure being in a sense.

S: Well, it depends how much one wakes up. Because if one really wakes up in the highest sense/well presumably one would feel full of metta towards all living beings but on the ordinary~ as it were, human level it doesn't happen like that. Take away memory and you take away associations. I mean this also connects up with the point we've made many and many a time over the last few years: that is that friendships take along time to develop, but if you've been in assoc- iation with someone for a long time well, you've experiences in common which you can look back on together. And this sort of cements the friendship. Do you see what I mean? But then again that depends upon memory. If the memory was sort of suddenly wiped out of all this, the good times you had spent together with somebody, well what would be left of the friendship? It would be just you looking at him and him looking at you and it would be minus all those associations of the past which of course had, you know, revealed you to each other to some extent as well as being experiences which you had shared together

objectively.

Gunapala: In meditation when I'm trying to leave this behind and get into a state where I'm fully concentrated without this memory of the past or the future in this way. I can see your point. A very

uo(~ -in this sort of flow or being able to have something quite expanded in a sense, but then also there seems to be another angle to it as it were, as if we've got to do both at the same time....

S: Well, not necessarily at the same time but certainly when you meditate you've got to eliminate any thinking about the past or anticipation of the future. Otherwise you are not concentrated but it's as though once you are out of your meditation you then have to look at things with that meditation itself within that wide context, that is to say, your overall development of an individual~ but at the same time of meditation itself it's as though you can't afford to think in those terms - well at least not if you're doing Samatha practice; if you're doing Vipassana practice that might be a different matter. I mean it then might be appropriate to just review your overall development and the way the past connects with the future~ the way Karma bears fruit, that could then be a form of Vipassana but it would get in the way of the development of Samatha.

Suvajra: What about using memory during the Metta practice?

S: Well, sometimes one needs to get things started. I've mentioned this from time to time. For instance, in connection with the second stage of the practice if you've got a near and dear friend well it may be that you can just think of them or just imagine his face but not much warmth of feeling springs up. So one of the ways in which one can get that warmth of feeling going is to try recollecting the happy times you've spent together. Do you see what I mean? Just sort of recreating, experiencing those situations again in memory and that will help you recapture the feelings that you experienced then and once you've recaptured a bit of feeling then you can develop it more and in the present. So memory is useful here!

Richard Clayton: So memory is not a cold, conceptual sort of thing, it's actually quite a warm thing.

S: Well, memory is emotionally coloured. I mean, probably every memory that you've got is emotionally coloured or emotionally toned. You could remember your childhood but you don't remember in a sort of photograph~c: way the scenes of your childhood. You recall or you even re-experience the emotion associating with those scenes and those happenings.

Cittapala: That comes out very much in life stories - how~rapped~F people get....

S..Yes, indeed. Well, they lose all sense of time so that means they must be really wrapped up in their stories.

Cittapala: Do you think that from that point of view that there is then quite a positive value to going into your life story like that in some detail. It sort of might give you a sense of continuity and being able to begin to see threads?

S" I think that sense of continuity or sense of what we might call not only psychological but moral continuity is absolutely essential to the idea of oneself as an individual. An animal presumably hasn't got that. Well, again as I said earlier on it's closely connected with reflective consciousness. Because you can remember yourself in the past and then you can also think well that was 'me'. You can be quite aware of yourself as though you were another person and you can judge and evaluate and assess but an animal can't do that.

Cittapala: Are there any sort of traps which you can fall into in this like, for instance, a photograph~~ sort of cold approach..?

S: Well, that would happen only if one was in the present quite cut off7 alienated from one's emotions and not able to experience them. But

again to mention Dickens, he started to write his autobiography at one stage and he got so far and got stuck because the memories were so painful - some early childhood memories. He just stopped. There was a definite sort of blockage and he was quite aware of what was happening. So what he did was he started writing a new novel but he made an autobiographical novel and he incorporated a lot of his early experiences, including those very painful ones, into that novel which was "David Copperfield". But since he was able to write about David Copperfield as though David Copperfield wasn't himself he could sort of distance those sufferings. He could bring them up but he could them up within a sort of manageable context. He could disguise certain things. But the main things were there. And his parents appear in "David Copperfield" but not as David Copperfield's parents. That's the disguise as it were. I mean he could sort of say what he felt about his parents and get that off his chest but he was saying it about

his parents. He was simply saying it officially, as it were~ about two characters in his novel - the parents of his hero. So he came to terms with his past - with those painful episodes in his past in that way and experienced it as a great relief.

Cittapala: Do you think then that knowing about somebody's past is perhaps one of the essential features of a deeper friendship?

S: I think so. I think also if you're getting to know someone then in the course of getting to know them better if you want to know them better and you want that they should know you better you do, I think, quite spontaneously disclose bits and pieces of your past from time to time. So that they do get to know you better. Because you don't consist only of the present. That is to say~ the present present! You exist also in the past.

Suvajra: So it's really quite an important thing to recollect your past.

S: Yes. And to allow yourself to be recollect. You probably know -I don't know whether you were present - but there have been occasions when chairmen have told their life-stories to one another and I think they have told them to a much fuller and franker extent people have on this occasion. And I know that in a few cases~ in~particular c&,~~ it ha& a quite cathartic effect for that particular chairman to have been able to tell his life story in such depth and with such total frankness. Which he felt he hadn't been able to achieve in his life before. And he could achieve it only in that situation because he felt he could trust those particular people. He could really confide in them.

Ratnaprabha: What do you mean by saying that we exist in the past as well as in the present?

S: Well, there are certain things let's say which you have done in the past which in as much as you've done them, even though it was in the past,.. (unclear) why you are the way that you are. It may not be obvious but if you disclose what you did in the past well, it may be obvious, or more obvious, to other people, hmm?

Devamitra: Presumably that would be one way of explaining,... (unclear)

S: Well you, I understand the Vipaka better if you understand their respective karma. I mean,say,if you understand what people have been through you can understand better I think what they are like now. Or why they are the way that they are now. If you learn for instance that they had had a very difficult childhood or that they had had an unhappy marriage~or something of that sort. Perhaps they had a very unpleasant and demanding job for instance for many year~, well you do know them better~then you understand them better.

Cittapala: I find that one of the features of family life is that you can build up a much more all-round picture, because you quite often get quite a one sided one from the ~erson concerned

S: Yes yes, well there are certain things which often one sort of blacks-out and doesAt care to remember. But sometimes one's relations remember them only to~ well and they are very ready to come up with the appropriate stories in and out of season (Laughter). I remember even when I was an adolescent EVEN my father had a whole fund of stories about my childhood~ things I had completely forgotten.

I can still remember him telling these things, these stories, but I cannot remember actually doing any of these things bout which he used to relate the stories.

Surata : It works the other way as well. I tried to find out things about my childhood rom my



parents and they had forgotten (laughter) There are some are 5 where it's very difficult to get any information out of them at all~... They'd just totally forgotten.

Suvajra: Is there a (section?) in the Pali between what we've been calling here re-collection or mindfulness and awareness (only as being ?) in the present and ....

S: Well there is the expression (Sampajan%~) ~ich is translated as (lear comprehension... Later I'll be giving the next paragraph... we get~ "Oh the clearly comprehended and mindful". There's the compound term Sat~~Sanpajan~~which is often translated as mindfulness and clear comprehension. Sampa~an%~fr~lso includes a sort of mindfulness of purpose eh, which is as it were, the counterpoint of memory.

If memory refers to the past, awareness of purpose or consciousness of purpose refers to the future. We don't have a proper word for that in English do we? Let me explain what I mean. It's bearing your purpose in mind. I mean for instance, suppose you decide to do something or to achieve something and you continually bear that in mind, you never forget that that is your purpose - though forget isn't quite the appropriate term here because it doesn't refer to the past it refers to the present and future. You maintain consciousness of what your goal is, you don't allow yourself therefore to be deflected from the goal. Supposing you set out for a certain destination you bear in mind clearly all the time that you are bound for such and such a place and you're not going to linger, you're not going to turn aside, you're not going to be distracted or diverted in any way, you've got your goal clearly in your mind. That is the quality about which I'm talking. So clearly it can apply not only on a material plane but on the spiritual plane as well. So that is Sampajanflc& in the sense of clear comprehension of the goal, it's that sort of quality.

Ratnaprabha:- Is that Sampajan%~with the second half of it bein~ like the JHANAS.. '

S. It's simply JANNA

Richard: So what would be the, what would be your criteria, as it w~re~,whic~h~ you base your recollection, would it....? It seems im~o~0r~antu~ coming in,,, exactly what (~ recollect?)

t

S. Yes, yes, yes.

Cittapala: uhuh... so that Sampajan%%is almost like a filter in a sense, is it? I.

S. It isn't that in itself, but it imp~es some such mechanism eh? In the case of the

Bo~~~anga's ~.. it appears as Dharma Vic~iya. Do you remember the Bod~Cangas the Seven Bodh2 angas The first is SatL, which is mindfulness and the second is Dha~~n~icA~a which is usually translated as Investigation of the Dharma. Dharma, here, usually being understood to mean the teaching. But actually this doesn't seem quite correct, an alternative, and to me more reasonable explanation is that Dha~-ma~s here refers to mental states, which is of course a well

P~2

known meaning of the word Dharma, and Dha mticaUa is the Investigation of mental states ~ to sort out which are skillful and which are unskillful. So that the former can be cultivated and the latter, you know, rejected. Do you see what I mean? So that if one looks at it in this way you first of all survey the whole field. You become aware of, in this case, the contents of your own mind, the contents of your own consciousness and then you start investigating, well, which thoughts, which feelings are skillful and which are not. Which are conducive to Enlightenment, which are not. So this would be a sort of awareness of purpose introduced on the basis of the general awareness. So in this sense our mindfulness is or develops into a sort of stream or filter. That's the next stage. Because you try to become first of all you're aware of what is there in the mind and then you're aware of what is conducive to the goal and what is not conducive to the goal, so that the one you can concentrate on developing and the other you can if need be eliminate.

Richard: So sort of writing would be very helpful in doing this, would it? It would be a sort of filter, unless you're able to sort out those experiences...?

S: Yes, like writing down one's dreams. One has to fix them. Once one has fixed them you can consider them more, . more correctly eh?

Cittapala: It's not as if you can actually throw them away, I mean it's the unskillful at first that you have to, it's almost

sort of strangle them, in a sense, so that they don't have any life force in them...

S. Well you have to withdraw your energy from them eh? It may of course happen naturally as you put more and more of your energy into those things which you see are more conducive to

the of the goal which you have set yourself to attain.

Suvaira: What are these three terms then. Sati, Sampa~anna,

and dharmaic~~~, er... the're almost like progressive ~tages of mindfulnes.. you could say?

S: One could say, though I'm not so sure that it is actually presented in that way in that the Pali texts - but certainly one

could look at it in that way, yes.' With Sati coming first, then Dharm ica ~ and then the Sampalanna (It would be?) Sampag[annain that particular sense. Sampa~anna also has a sort of general(sense?) which is of pretty much like that of Sati, they're not not to clearly differentiated.

C~~~apala: Is then this 3rd of those 7.... being able to chose the skillful and cultivate it?

S: Well the third suggests a sort of 'goal orientation' eh? I mean, if you have a goal orientation you have to be very aware of yourself as moving or not moving in that direction. So your awareness takes that form yes. Not just seeing what you are doing but whether what you are doing is conducive to your development in a particular direction... eh?

Richard: Are there any ways that you can suggest in which one can improve ones memory and one's~ability of recollection. To recollect and retain (instead of?) making mistakes which presumably if I'd.... If I had a better sort of retention and memory I wouldn't be as open to making those mistakes again?

S: Well why does one not remember?

Richard: Presumably you don't want to, it's part of it....

S: It often happens you don't remeber things because you ~not interested or you can't link th~m to anything in which you are interested. I mean some people have an amazing memory for telephone numbers (Laughter), you know, motor car registration numbers. I noticed this especially about my American friends. Maybe it's the way they are brought up in their particular civilisation... they seem. You know, tell them (apparently?) you tell an American your telephone number and he just reme~ers it, even though it has six or seven figures. (Laughter).

Gunapala: (Inaudible) - laughter.

S: I mean, I don't even know... reme~er the registration no. of my own car. Even though I've had it two years now. I mean it's beacuae I'm not interested in cars (laughter), but you know...

Devamitra: Doesn't that; .... I don't think that necessarily depends on an emotional interest. I mean I'm gifted with that

w/(/.

kind of memory and er. I definitely don't for instance have any interest in the  
&A 1 ~ tell you what it

is (laughter)

S: You must have one these photographic memories, which are very useful.

Ratnaprabha: Why did you say unfortunately?

Devamitra: Well it doesn't seem to come into c>~~~~ho,~when I would always like it to.  
(laughter) I remember silly things like that. I know that the telephone number is 38096, I've just glanced at it once or twice that's all, you know. If I wanted to photograph that in my mind (picks something up) I could do it, but it would take time.

Cittapala: But presumably it's not a question of actually sort of developing the memory so that it er, it is a sort of photographic record of all your mistakes previously. It's more a question of actually developing it so that you are within the context of a causality/conditionality framework. So you can see ii&~ things connect.

S: Yes, yes. Again this is where memory in the wider sense

is important. You don't remember presumably because you don't connect, but if, I mean, still it doesn't happen very much because, well, if you don't connect because you don't have memory in that wider sense, well how do you learn to connect? You're still faced with that sort of problem eh? Why doesn't one connect.

Gunapala: I think the emotional undercurrent is the most important thing for me remembering things in the past, whether it be suffering or bliss. There're the two strongest memories, I either happiness or sorrow ... strong.

S: I mean I have been writing my memoirs as most people know. I have written one volume and last year I was working on (another?) volume. I noticed how one remembered; it's as though what one recalls are sort of quite strong feelings, eh~ whether positive or negative and it's as though that feeling illuminates the surrounding area. So it, because you experience that feeling in a certain situation the feeling itself was quite strong and because it's strong and you really experience that situation

it lights up the situation in which you experienced that feeling originally~, and that lighting up is your remembering of all the details. All linked together with your feeling. That is the sort of Gestalt, to use another term, is the sort of unifying factor in a situation. So you need, to remember you need to get back, I think to your feelings. I think it's very difficult to remember otherwise when you're trying to remember your own past. You have to make some sort of contact with your feelings. And then that gives you the key or the clue to the whole situation, you then recall it. I think if you are suppressing your memory of the feeling, then you won't have anything, as it were, to 'light up' the situation in which you originally experienced the feeling. Hence, you won't remember very much - unless you have of course this sort of photographic memory, that's a separate sort of phenomena it seems.

Richard: Could you say that if you had, if you had a lack of energy in the present, you know, generally speaking, that say a lot of that energy was locked up in the past'.

S: It could be. It could be. Unless you just undernourished or something like that, or suffering from T.B.

Cittapala: And if you were trying to develop, sort of more positive, open, fresher sort of feelings and you're aware that a lot of your feelings in the past have been rather murky or sentimental or (somehow?) like that, perhaps as soon as these feelings sort of come up you sort of chop them off or repress them so consequently you never make an association in terms of memory.

S: Yes, yes, yes. But it does seem, judging by our experiences with people telling their auto-biographies or telling their life stories, much of what they remember is bound up with quite strong feelings.

Devamitra: I think, it also says, in a completely different context, if you were (in the?) script in the theatre, you don't actually sit down and swat it out, you pick it out through association with the inter-play between you and the other performers. And usually there's quite a lot of feeling being injected into that.

S: Um Pause.

So what emerges from the whole discussion is that we mustn't think of mindfulness just as a sort of spotlight focussed on something in the present. I mean~~~, it has to sort of range up and down in time, you know, back into the past, forward into the future, and that gives you your sense of continuity as an evolving and developing human being, an evolving and developing individual, and of course, without that there is no spiritual life.

Cittapala: Could it be seen that that spotlight is, has to

be sort of something warm.

S: Yes.

Cittapala: I was wondering is there any significance in the term foundation?

S: Well it is Sati - patthana. And Patthana means establishing, literally prasthannu in Sanskrit. It's the foundation.. er It's the four establishments of mindfulness or building up of mindfulness or making firm, even,. The four makings-firm of mindfulness.

Gunapala: It seems the same sort of meaning as  
a buildings.

S: Yes I think one could say that, yes~

Gunapala: It's what the rest of your spiritual life is based on.

S: Yes. I'm just trying to think of another term, that in connection with the Boddhicitta. The Bodhicitta is divided into -- - Pranidhi-citta which is (Leś-r and Prastha-citta or Establishment- citta. It's the same word, the Sanskrit equivalent, because practicing prasthan-citta consists in the practicing of the Six Paramitas or Ten Paramitas. So they, - that practice constitutes the actual establishment of Bodhisattva life.

So 'establishing' is probably better than 'foundations' because it's not so much that these four Sati-Patthanas are things established but it's more that they are things which are in the process of being established ...

Cittapala: If you (can ?) see it from the point of view of growing er, it's more like a sort of filling out, bringing to fullness.

S: Yes.

Richard: The expression 'De'j-vu' that is when something in the present stimulates your emotional ... You feel something emotional (that?) has happened in the past.

S: .... Which you don't remember ? We 1 it is said that a ~e%~-vu' experience is based on a pre-cognited dea hich you have forgotten. This is one explanation which has been giv n. I've mentioned this spoke on this before.

Richard: What does that mean pre-

S: A pre-cognited dream is a dream in which you have foreseen the future, but on waking up you have forgotten it. But when actually that thing happens or you encounter that thing about which you have dreamed it seems very familiar because, yes , you have experienced it before in that pre-cognited dream but you can't remember when~ because you have forgotten the dream. This is the explananation which has been given. It's the only plausible one that I'm acquainted with.

~arabha: There is a psychological explanation , i~s to do with long and short term memory.

S: .. what's that ?

Ratnaprabha: It's that we have a long-term and a short-term memory and that our experiences go initially into our short-term memory and then there's some sort of filtering process and some of our experiences will go into our long-term memory and we'll remember those of a longer period. But we'll remember in very great detail the

very short term. But sometimes according to this explanation an experience may bypass the short term memory and go straight - well not bypass altoge

ther - and go straight into the long-term memory . So its in the short-term memory and in the long-term memory simultaneously. Then we always review our °Q~f)Q~&~0St0 see whether they sort of remind us of anyt\Q'ng from the past. So we compare our present experience with our long-term memory and we find it's already there ,because it went straight there without passing trough our short term memory. Do you see what I mean ? So we find that it's already there so we feel that it's happened previously. But accor- ding to this ~eory it's simply a little fault that developed in the mind and the way the mind deals with experiences...

S: I rather distrust these mechanical models for psychological experiences but anyway no doubt it has to be considered anyway eh (T~aughter) umm I'll get you to explain it to me again when we're back at Padmaloka (Laughter).

Devamitra: So you would actually perhaps give a little more credence to 'dej'a-vu' experiences than that particular explanation. One must actually think that it is quite possible that there was some sort of experience in the past that's been cognated

S: Yes, I would at least consider that possibility.

Cittapala: Myself quite often the tendency to actually be in the same situation again and again like a recurring habit almost. It's really very likely and (..their ? ).... quite often I find myself in the same conversation with different people but the whole thing was familiar somehow as if a couple of years ago, as if the whole thing had done a complete circle in my life and it seems like I've been in this place exactly the same sort of conversation about the same thing maybe using the same words again -- you know, as if it's just some sort of repeat, another part of a ...

S: Well this is one of the advantages of memory. This is one of the ways in which memory can contribute to the development of the individual, because looking back you can see that these sorts of cycles have taken place, that you got yourself into the same situation

y}

again and again and again. It very often happens in relationships. And then what happens if it happens in the case of relationships you start thinking, well it must be something to do with me - I mean because it is a pattern which is repeating itself for me, which perhaps I'm repeating. Whereas before it was just if you hadn't had that recollection you might of thought each time it happens that, well, it's just the fault of this other person - it's the fault of ... circumstances. But then you see looking back that that pattern repeats itself again and again. So then you start suspecting, well, maybe you are making it happen again and again. Maybe it perhaps corresponds to something in you. Then you start looking deeper within yourself and that way perhaps you learn something, you put something right. And that way you grow.

Cittapala: I don't know if it's a bit of a red herring, but these precognitive experiences, would that be anything to do with consciousness being out of time in some sense. So that you were actually found experiencing ...

S: Well this is the conclusion I draw - I mean the conclusion I draw personally from precognitive experiences in general is that consciousness is not limited by time.

Harshaprabha: So maybe it could also relate to the 6L (do 5 ...

S: In what sense ?...



Harshaprabha: ... in the sense that you could just start being in such a state that your, you know, waking, dreaming, meditative states were stuck were beginning to merge with one another... into one stream, so to speak.~ Suppose it's your state of mind that stays in such a strong state almost continually that in all the Bardos ... the death Bardo you're just fully aware all the time.

S: Anyway, any further point about that paragraph. Actually it is praci~~ally tea time. So perhaps we had better .. unless ....

Cittapala: I just sort of wondered whether the er, actual formula for purification of beings etc.down to Nibbana was actually aimed at anything in particular or whether that was just a normal way in which the Buddha used to describe the goal or path to the goal.

S: It seems to be more or less a standard description. But the purification of beings is an interesting expression (pause) as it doesn't suggest annihilation, it suggests, in a manner of speaking~ that there's something left. Because when you purify something you conceive that the thing itself continues to exist afterwards in it's purified form. Maybe that isn't to be pressed too much, but it is interesting that the Buddha does speak in that way. There is a Sutta in the Majjhima-Nikaya dealing with the Seven Stages of Purification but thats the only place in the whole Canon, as far as I know~ where the Buddha does speak in those terms. Speaks of the spiritual life itself as a series of seven stages of - purification.

Cittapala: Do you happen to know where it is ...?

S: Yes, it's in the Rathavinitasutta, can't tell you which volume it is.

Suvajra: Were there any further aspects you could recall from the dictionary ...

S: From . . ?

Suvajra: . from the dictionary on Sati ?

S: No. I think the main point was the link of Sati with memory - which the translation as mindfulness does not really bring out.. from that point of vie his translation of Sati as recollection is better.

Suvajra: It's not somehow stressed anywhere really in books on Buddhism at all.

S: Then there is the English word recollection is used in the spiritual sense if one takes the meaning of  
[081]

recognition literally its a re-collection - it's a bringing together, a gathering together what has been scattered so it suggests a sort of process of integration - collecting together the scattered parts of yourself. And again that is connected with the memory because you can see a thread of continuity, of individuality running through all your memories.

Suvajra: Then the~ quite close together, sort of~ re-collection and concentration.

S: Well you're sort of bringing them together in the process of remembering and you see them more and more as the manifestation of a single, developing individuality.

Devamitra: It actually suggests (..?..) sort of arranging them to gain a higher perspective. (and interpretation ?).

Cittapala: These three stages Sati ~ Dharma~icaJ~ and Sampal l-a~na

S: If I may stre that these terms do not form a series in the original Pali texts but still one can arrange them in this way quite usefully.

Cittapala: It/s a story reminds me of an image of a lens gathering scattered light and focussing it upon one point.

S: Yes. In this sense,of course,concentration is an intens~ficat~ ion of mindfulness, or an intensification of recollection. It narrows the field more and more for a particular purpose, but nonetheless a widening of the field from time to time has its advantages from the spiritual point if view. It's as though you narrow the field to deepen your experienc ut you widen it to increase the breadth of your vision. I men perhaps it is very important that you should have very intense experiences from time to time when your consciousness of nothing else but the experience itself ~ but it's also important no doubt that from time to time you take a broader view and you see even these intense experiences within a broader perspective. (pause)

Anyway, we'll leave it there for the morning tea break...

Sattipattana Sutta: Tape 5 Side I

S: I was thinking after our previous disscussion one could,would even,say that the individual is just the one who remembers,remembers the past and anticipates the future. You may remember that in one or two lectures ,I forget which ones,I describe or tried to define the individual. Do you remember?The individual is one who is aware. The individual is one who is emotionally positive,who is responsible. I think those were the three main attributes of the individual. But perhaps to those one could add memory,even though memory is closely allied

to awareness and responsibility. But perhaps it is important enough to be separately enumerated? The individual is the one who remembers and who anticipates. (long pause) One can't really imagine any human life at all without memory. I remember reading not so long ago a description of someone who was losing his memory, he couldn't complete a sentence because halfway through the sentence he forgot how it started. He forgot what he'd begun to say so he couldn't complete the sentence. So that would suggest that logical thought is impossible without memory. Perhaps that thought itself, reflection itself, is impossible without memory.

Gunapala: Does memory, eh, is it commonly thought that memory will automatically, for everybody, fade as you get old? I meet a lot of old people who...

S: A lot of old people do suffer from faded memory. But on the other hand, a lot of old people don't. It would seem not to be inevitable.

Devamitra: Well I think I was just wondering if perhaps people choose not to remember.

S: Yes, I think also as you get older you cease to care about certain things and therefore if you don't think about them you don't remember. Most old people, I think, say that they remember very vividly things that happened, you know, when they were young, but that they don't remember very easily things which happened to them the previous week. That doesn't seem to have anything to do with memory as such but to be more that when you are young your impressions are more vivid. and when an impression is more vivid you recall it more easily. In a sense there is more to be recalled and as you get older you experience things less intensely, therefore your impressions are less vivid, and therefore you find it more difficult to remember.

Gunapala: I've met one old lady, in her eighties, who said she went through periods when everything seemed to fade, as if she was getting close to dying. Her whole life seemed to fade away and it was really disturbing her, the fact that she couldn't even remember the names of trees. She lived in the country and everything started to fade and then she would start to gain her memory again. Sort of going through almost bouts of this loss of memory, for months sometimes.

S: It can be something to do with our general emotional state, maybe our physical condition.

Devamitra: I remember my grandfather dying. He was incredibly haywire, he couldn't even remember who my father was, his eldest son. (laughter & unclear)

pala: Yes things like that, you can forget your own children. My mother... her grandmother, didn't know her daughter when she died (some words unclear). She came into the room one day and said 'Oh, who are you?' to her daughter. She'd been living with her daughter for years, her daughter had been caring for her for a long time.

Cittapala: Perhaps that has an emotional basis something like that, I don't know but sometimes if you're very dependent on somebody you may actually

Cittapala: (cont'd)...resent that (some words unclear) in which case you may decide on an emotional basis you don't want to know. You refuse to remember.

S: Also, in connection with the approach of death, it is just as well you start forgetting. Because if you have a vivid and uninterrupted memory, right up to the time of death, then death could be experienced as a sort of quite a abrupt and sudden and startling interruption of that continuity, of that series. But if your recollection, if your memory is going and you no longer, sort of, you know, remember the whole series of experiences which causes you as you to a great extent, then there isn't that sort of disruption. Death is, the approach of death, is more gentle, more gradual. Do you see what I mean?

Suvajra: How do you reconcile that with the practice of trying to develop memory then or develop your individuality? If you're doing that establishing a strong continuity with individuality throughout your life, how do you reconcile that with...

S: Well, because if you've been doing that for practical and for spiritual reasons, well, death won't come sort of suddenly and abruptly, mm? as it comes to the ordinary person who dies with memory. Because you will have anticipated that, presumably you will have borne in mind the fact that you were going to ~dis. And not only that, you will practice awareness and hopefully remain aware during that whole experience. Whereas the ordinary person who dies in full possession of their memory, who hasn't been thinking of the possibility of death, and doesn't succeed in maintaining awareness through that experience, it does come as a terrible shock and a jolt, as something very disorienting and disturbing. But presumably not for someone who has had some experience of the recollection of death and who can maintain some kind of awareness and mindfulness at that time. It seems almost as though forgetfulness is nature's provision, that is to say the lower evolution's provision for cushioning the shock of bodily death. From a spiritual point of view you don't necessarily want to do that, not in that way anyhow.

Guna~ala: There seems to be a rise and fall of Humanity in most people's lives, the humanity sort of reaches a peak somewhere, that's if they live a full life and die of old age. They sort of gradually build up and then they sort of die down again towards death, almost become like chi~rem again. The death process comes towards them into their life, this gradual fading away - and then probably back into another body. The whole is more like a wave rising and falling.

S: So one could also say that, eh, just as there's no individuality without memory, so there's no history in collective terms without collective memory, without tradition. Do you see what I mean? I mean in a culture, it's not only important what you're doing now, it's also important what previous generations did. It's very difficult for you to ignore previous cultural achievements. Your own to ~great extent are built on those. So it's as though what memory is in the case of the individual, tradition is in the case of the group.

Ratnaprabha: Could one then speak in some sense of a sort of developing individuality, as it were, in cultures? So that some cultures have got more sort of individuality than others because they have more history...

3: More sense of continuity.

Ratna-brabha: And perhaps also some of the qualities as well.

S: Perhaps one could. Though of course clearly one mustn't press the analogy between the individual and the group too much. But nonetheless, there does seem to be a certain general resemblance in this respect.

29

Harsha~rabha: Are there any cultures that come to your mind, sort of stand out?

S: Well the cultures with the greatest or the strongest sense of continuity and therefore the greatest innate strength are the oldest ones. Perhaps even the Indian is the oldest surviving one.

Richard: Would you say that in the West now, the sense of tradition and the awareness of that is devolving, as it were? And if so/ what are the implications of that?

S: Devolving?

Richard: Well they're not seeing the worth of tradition, aren't actually contributing to it.

S: I'm not so sure about that, because it exists on different levels. For instance, institutions have their histories and therefore, their sort of collective memories. And therefore their sort of individuality. For instance, if you think of an institution like say the Catholic Church, there is a very strongly marked, not as it were an individuality, almost a personality, because of its long history, its virtually a thousand-year old history. Citta-ala: Would you say that the demise of institutions or even cultures is, coalesces about through a lack of, of memory?

S: Well no doubt the two are associated, but which is cause and which is effect is a difficult thing to say. We did mention what might happen, say, in the case of England, or in the case of English culture, if people in England forgot, say, the Romantic Poets or forgot poets generally. Well what would that suggest? That would suggest presumably a weakening of the English cultural tradition itself. Certainly in the literary tradition or the poetic tradition. That you are no longer conscious of your antecedents or conscious of your roots.

Citta-ala: Well, I was wondering, I'm a bit sceptical actually, myself, about how aware the average person, in England and is of those elements...

S: The average person is hardly aware at all. But then the culture-bearers, so to speak, are the minority. The minority are the culture bearers. This has always been the case, it seems, certainly within historic times.

Guna-ala: It's only a thought, but I would have thought it wasn't all that important to have a strong culture. I would have thought that an ethical society would have been much more important than remembering poets. If ethics can be communicated through poetry, well then...

S: I'm not saying poetry is more important than ethics. I'm just giving it as an example of continuity on the collective level, as it were.

Guna-ala: I thought it connected with humanity quite strongly, you're connecting it with humanity or...

S: Well, not necessarily, but I'm saying that if one can think in terms of collective identity in any sense, then that collective memory is necessary to collective continuity. So that in respect of literary tradition and literary individuality, in say, the case of England, if people, that is to say the people concerned with literature, forgot, forgot the Romantic Poets or forgot Shakespeare, well that would suggest that in the present itself, literature was collapsing.

Citta-ala: And the values which -- channel.

S: Yes

Citta-ala: So in a sense it's important for us to connect up with that cultural heritage.

S: Well it depends upon how you define your own individuality. You will want to consider part of your own individuality, your heritage, only that which contributes to your own individuality. You see what I mean?

Citta-ala: So you mean, you don't sort of elevate sort of some of Tennyson's poems just because they're traditional English poems?

S: Exactly. For instance, there might be some of Tennyson's poems, like his 'Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington' that you don't want to recognise as a part of your heritage, as an English Buddhist at all. Because they don't contribute to the development of individuality in your sense. So you don't recognise Tennyson, as the author of that poem, among your spiritual ancestors.

Devanitra: But you could recognise another poem by Tennyson...

S: Yes indeed.

Devamitra: . which would be in harmony with your...

S: Oh, yes indeed.

Devanitra: with your spiritual aspiration.

S: Yes, there might be some poets who've written quite a large number of poems that you've found in harmony with your own spiritual aspirations. So that poet, sort of in a more general sense, can be regarded as one of your spiritual ancestors, as an English Buddhist. Do you see what I mean?

Ottaviana: Perhaps we could bring out an anthology...

S: Yes indeed, I've often thought of this. But that's one of the things I haven't got around to. Maybe someone else will do it. You could certainly do that. For instance, Christmas Hymns has brought out an anthology of English poems. I think he calls it, significantly, 'Fools I Remember'. It's quite interesting. Because of the fact that he'd remembered them, they were poems that had stuck in his memory, they told you quite a lot about Christmas Hymns. One of the things they told me at any rate, that he was, at bottom, apparently to the contrary notwithstanding a rather sentimental sort of person really. (laughter) Because his selection from the Romantic poets tended to be of their weaker sort of work, if you know what I mean. Or rather I regard as their weaker work. He tended to go in for the 'pretty, pretty', and rather sentimental. Quite a lot of Rupert Brooke for instance. So clearly, since he is a Buddhist, at least of sorts, he would not have remembered poems which had no connection, at least indirectly or emotionally, you know, with the fact that he was a Buddhist. So he would be, as it were, identifying his spiritual ancestors, in a way. Maybe it wasn't surprising to find Rupert Brooke among them but there were a lot of other things. For instance there wasn't a single line of Pope or Dryden or Byron, nothing at all astringent or sort of intellectually clear.

Cittapala: Perhaps this could give some food for thought to the compilers of the next F.W.B.O. poetry anthology?

S: Probably the last anthology told us much more about the poets than it did about the individual poets.

Devamitra: Because of their selection?

S: Yes, although even so it was a compromise between the two editors and it reflected the results of a very long drawn out battle between them. I think they're going to bring out separate anthologies. (laughter). I've already been asked once about various poems. But certainly I had thought about doing that long, long ago, because there are many, very powerful expressions of impermanence in English literature. I mean, there's that well known song I think from one of Shirley's plays which is in Colgreve, 'the glories of our blood and state are shadows, not substantial things', 'There is no armour against fate', 'Death lays his icy hand on kings'. That's all good Buddhist stuff, (laughter), very powerful, very vivid expressions of the truth of impermanence.

Devamitra: You don't know from which play it comes? S: I don't, but it's in  
Golding's Golden Treasure

Ratnaprabha: I've got some Golding here.

S: Good.

Richard: You mentioned these culture bearers. Are they either/or the authors or the artists  
or the people who appreciate...

S: I think they're all together, because the critics in some ways unfortunately, they do play  
quite an important part, because the critics very often tell you what really is your heritage, they  
define your heritage for you. So sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly. For instance, to give a few  
examples, T.S. Eliot, a critic, has habitually depreciated Milton and not to say  
misrepresented Milton. He was not one of T.S. Eliot's favorites by any means. It might be  
partly for religious reasons, T.S. Eliot being a very strict Anglo-Catholic, and Milton being  
practically a free thinker, and also Shelley was not a favorite poet of T.S. Eliot or similar  
reasons, one may say. So in his treatment of say, our heritage, let us say, he would play down  
the importance of Milton and the importance of Shelley. Other critics have corrected that, I  
think. There's a lot of interest now in Milton, which I think T.S. Eliot would have been very  
surprised to see. There've been a lot of books written about Milton recently and his poetry  
whereas T.S. Eliot, one almost feels, well, Milton is finished, that he's got nothing to say to us  
anymore but that certainly doesn't seem to be the case now. So the critics also lay their  
rights on the line, so to speak, in a negative way as it were, telling us what is our  
heritage. For instance, Matthew Arnold plays an important part. Matthew Arnold, read a  
very well known volume of selections from Wordsworth. Matthew Arnold said, in effect, this is  
the real Wordsworth, this is the best of Wordsworth, so that was taken as Wordsworth by a lot  
of people for a long time. Then it began to be seen that that wasn't the whole of Wordsworth,  
it wasn't even the best of Wordsworth. There was more to Wordsworth than that. Do you see  
what I mean? So then there's a sort of process of re-assessment, re-definition of what  
Wordsworth's contribution was, and therefore, of the way in which, or the extent to which he's  
one of our spiritual ancestors.

Devamitra: So they can actually eliminate, the effect of the critic can be to eliminate on  
quite a subjective basis, just for those reasons.

S: On the other hand, a discerning critic can resurrect someone who has been forgotten  
and drew attention to the significance of his work when it's been overlooked. I mean, this has  
happened with Blake. Blake wasn't

S: (cont'd) -really appreciated until the present century. He certainly wasn't appreciated in the  
last century. His prophetic books were more or less dismissed by everybody except  
Swinnerton. I think Swinnerton was the only one who seemed to have any insight into what  
Blake was really trying to say.

Richard: Are there any people, presently, currently, who are considered to be culture  
bearers in a higher sense, connecting us with our tradition allowing tradition to...

S: Well, ordinarily, all the writers and all the critics are doing this all the  
time. There's certainly a lot of activity at the present time. What its value is only time will  
tell. I'd certainly like to see an assessment of English Literature, especially English poetry from  
a Buddhist point of view. Sort of identifying our spiritual ancestors in English Literature, who  
seem to contribute something to our development or have something to say to us.

Devamitra: I noticed, you will remember you did select for me a number of poems from  
Lawrence for reading. And it's interesting to note that most, well, a good many of the poems  
that you selected don't appear in popular anthologies of Lawrence at all, and in fact in some

cases by editors they're the very poems that have been dis~issed.

S: Well,sometimes,~y choice was not on purely literary grounds. The interest of the subject matter,or what it had to say,and sometimes I think some poems have been eliminated from popular selections, either because the editor didn't agree with what ~e was saying and perhaps I did or because though the thought was interesting,the literary expression wasn't all that good.~hereas ~erhaps I gave more weight to the content than the former I took maybe Lawrence more seriously as a thinker,as someone with something that was worth hearing,.

Citta~ala: Perhaps this idea can tie up with your.. the things you mentioned yesterday about connecting with teaching?It could be an angle which could be of interest.

S: There are some things,so~e jokes,that I find deeply offensive. For instance,the things glorifying relationships and where women are unduly idolised.Aud idolised is really the word,where you get some young man on his knees saying "Oh my idol.. etc.etc."Poems written along those sort of lines ~ould clearly not feature in my anthology ,how--ever good they might be as poetry,because their whole attitude is so totally unacceptable.And where ~C~5 glorify ~ar,for instance.However beautiful they might be in some respects one couldn't include them in one's anthology.

Guna~ala: It would be good,bhante,if you could do that ,especially for people that didn't have a strong background in poetry and literature.

S: I have been a bit surprised how weak some people's background is,and in the broadest sense,how uneducated people are.I don't mean they haven't been to school or university.I mean that they aren't actively participating in their own cultural heritage,using ~W~~~n the quite conventional sense.Do you see what I mean?They are not participating looking at it in the broadest sense,in the cultural heritage of humankind.they're not acquainted with the best that has been thought and said.

Citta,~la: I think that goes back to school,a complete lack of vitality with which a subject was presented.

S: I can remember in my teens reading a lot of poetry and I really

S:(cont'd) enjoyed it but there's one poet I didn't read and that was Tennyson and that was just because of the way in which one particular poem had been taught when I was quite young.It put me off Tennyson for many, many years,though I was very fond of poetry in general and read almost every poet I could lay my hands on,but I steered clear of Tennyson.It must have been for that reason.I can remember,I've written about it in the suppressed chapter~of my early life,I can remember exactly how I was taught this poem,I've given a description of the poem "The Lady of Shalott~", (unclear)The good lady who taught it was doing her best but she clearly had no feeling for poetry whatever.

(Pause)

Suvajira: We really need a series of culture bearers in the F.W.B .0., don't we?

S: Yes.That is to say,people who are filters.If you take literature (unclear) many other aspects of western culture.If you just take English literature,say English poetry,we need people who can filter,who can give you some sort of guidance - well,you~d find this inspiring or you'd find that inspiring.You don't want to waste your time reading stuff that is only going to revolt you,perhaps,or just not inspire you.So from amongst all those things that are admittedly good from a literary point of view,you've got to concentrate on those poems which one can identify as being part of one's own sort of cultural~cultural~spiritual heritage,as an English buddhist or western buddhist.



Gunapala: Yes study groups on literature, or studying a piece of literature would be very helpful, specially for people who are good readers but find it difficult to wade their way through it.

S: And of course a lot of things are on tape. A lot of plays and poems are on tape. One doesn't even have to read. I mean Foyles has got quite a good selection of tapes of English plays and poems, selections from poets read very, very well, often by famous actors.

Ratna-rabha: And you can often borrow them from the local library.

S: Yes, you can. So you know, if one isn't visually oriented, quite likely to listen to things, one can certainly, you know, become familiar with English literature. I mean, novels are on tape, as I can read. I do find that this is a bit of a problem with people from New Zealand because New Zealand doesn't have, I think I hear proudly say this, (I am) much of a cultural tradition of its own. You can't really feel well, this is part of my culture. "Well there isn't much of Maori culture left at all. On the other hand, England does seem pretty remote, doesn't it? Even though you speak English and maybe you do read Gulliver's Travels at school. But on the whole England seems remote and English culture may be a bit quaint in some cases, at least until you come to Scotland. So it isn't always easy to make the necessary connections.

Gunapala: And people that go to plays and listen to classical music and things are a very small minority. I mean, it's something you do if you're a bit bored on Sunday in London.

S: Well, not much reaches New Zealand anyway, it's a bit off the map, more so than Sydney is, for touring companies.

Gunapala: If good companies go to New Zealand they find it a waste of time, people aren't interested.

S: The audiences are small.

Devamitra: All the performers come to England too, there's lots of New Zealand musicians and actors in England.

Gunapala: They leave New Zealand.

Devamitra: And Australia.

S: Well in all countries there is an art gallery but there's hardly anything really sort of worth looking at. I mean, people have done their best to put together a collection but, I mean, if you were living in New Zealand you couldn't actually see many examples of foreign paintings. They're just not there, you have to go abroad to see them.

Gunapala: I think what Devamitra said, most of the good artists leave New Zealand, good poets, good actors, literature and so forth. Most of them leave and go to more cultural countries.

S: Well just the same in the case of England every body tries to go to London. London acts as a sort of magnet, drawing and attracting all the talent, or most of it. It's very difficult to have a sort of regional culture in England, regional cultural centres, as you have in say Germany, where there's no real capital, culturally speaking.

Gunapala: Culture's more spread out...

S: It's more spread out. Anyway, hang on a minute.

bong pause

S: There's actually a lot more that could be said on the whole subject of as it were collective memory, but perhaps we'd better not go into too much. But perhaps just two little points that occurred to me that I could just mention for the sake of completeness so as to get the picture on that. One is that in the case of many institutions or in the case of the group generally, one of the ways in which the collective memory is maintained is through anniversaries. Do you see that I'm getting at? Eh, for instance as recently as the beginning of this month there's been a famous anniversary, anyone remember which one it was?

Ratna: Guy Fawkes

S: What does Guy Fawkes commemorate?

Citta: Parliamentary Institution.

Ratna: A Catholic plot against (unclear)

S: It reaffirms Protestantism (unclear) it is dying out. Certainly that aspect of it which is dying out. It becomes more Ecumenical. And the anniversary of the ascension of Queen Elizabeth I used to be observed, it was observed for at least a couple of centuries for that reason. It meant that England was definitely a Protestant and not a Catholic Country. ~~~ #j ~~~s? S: Well, just to clarify (unclear) your history lessons in New Zealand (laughter). Guy Fawkes was a Catholic in the reign of James II, and James II had succeeded Elizabeth I, and he was a Protestant. And Guy Fawkes was a Catholic gentleman who was involved in a plot to blow up the king, when he was attending Parliament, together with all the members of Parliament, and to establish a Catholic regime. The plot failed, it's called the Great Gunpowder plot. Some people, especially Catholics, think that it is a pure myth and that nothing like that ever happened, but that's part of the Catholic interpretation. But anyway, the anniversary of the plot, or the failure of the plot, the anniversary of the day on which Guy Fawkes was

wasn't apprehended in the eh, sort of dungeons underneath Parliament with many barrels of gunpowder in the act of setting light to a trial that led to the barrels was celebrated or is still celebrated and a Guy, a sort of figure representing Guy Fawkes - that is where the word 'Guy' comes from - is burned. I remember celebrating Guy Fawkes night with great enthusiasm, but I didn't know the historical background. It was just, you made a guy and you burned it with the accompaniment of fireworks. Small boys make guys and they sit with them on the footpaths and collect coppers, you know, the coppers being for fireworks. They ask you to spare a penny for the old guy. They probably don't realise what sort of, eh, historical occasion they're celebrating, but I remember at school, when I was not more than seven or eight, learning this verse or rhyme "Please to remember the fifth of November, gunpowder, treason and riot." So in that way, by celebrating anniversaries, some kind of collective continuity, some kind of collective identity is maintained. That's one way. Then of course, another way is by the, though it's connected with what I've just said, paying tribute to, or even worshipping ancestors. (pause) I mean, ancestor worship, you know, is a means of strengthening the tribes' sense of continuity and identity.

Guna: Like Westminster Abbey?

S: You could say that. It's there where kings and queens are buried and all that sort of thing. And also there is the Poet's Corner - that is a sort of ancestor worship. The ancestors are commemorated, the cultural ancestors, the (unclear) ancestors or just ancestors are commemorated. Anyway, that's all by the way, but it all goes to show how important memory is in the life of the individual, in the life of people who connect. But perhaps we'd better get back to the text.

Guna~ala:     Herein.in this teaching,a monk lives~contem~latin~ the bo~y in the body,ardent.clearly comprehending and mindful,,ha~ying~o~v~ercome in this world covetousness and greed;he lives~contem~latinP tJi~e~fe~elings in the feelings,ardent.clearly comp,rehendin~ and mindfulqhavin~ overc9me~ in this world,covetousness and greed;he lives contem~lating consciousness in consciousness,ardent,clearly com~~rehendin~ and mindful~hav?n~ overcome in this world covetousness and ~reed;he lives contem~~latin~ mentQl qbject5 in mental cojects ,ardent,clea~~rl~cgmpryhe~~nu4ng~and~mindful,hayin~g overcome in this world covetousness and greed

S:        So this paragraph Setb out what the four foundations of mind- fulness are,aad al-so an attitude of mind with which one develo~s them.So the four foundations of mindfulness are:the contemplation of the body,of the feelings, uhen consciousness a~nd then mental objects.So there are two no~es here;let's look at the notes on contem~lation of the body and contemplation of consciousness.The first note simply 5 ays 'The reference of the ~hrases 'contemplating the body in the body,feelings in the f~elings etc. is meant to impress upon the m~ditator the im~ortance of remaining aware(mindful)in the sustained attention directed on a single chosen object one is still keeping to it,and has not strayed into the field of another contemr~lation.For instance, when conteia~ating any bodi~y proo~ss a meditac~r may unwittingly be side-tracked into a consid~ration of his fe~elings connected with that bodily proc~ss.iie should then be ~clearly aware that he has left his original subject and is engaged in the conte~lation of feeling.

[091]

"And then in the case of the second note Mind, Pall: Citta, also consciousness, or vijnana, in this connection are the states of mind or units in the stream of mind of momentary duration. Mental objects (Pall: dhamma) are the mental contents or factors of con- sciousness making up the single states of mind."

So,     'herein,i~n this teaching, a monk lives, contemplating the body in the body.' First of all, lives. I think the original is 'he dwells. Eh, if one takes the word lives, or even if one takes the word 'dwells' literally, it suggests that this is not just to be practised when one is, as it were, sitting and meditating. It's to be made, eventually at least, a part of life, a part of one's experience all the time.

(long pause)

We won't go into the meaning of these four contemplations at this stage because they are all dealt with in detail separately,you know, later on. But we'll just look at the way in which the mindfulness or the contemplation is to be practised. Because the text says, or the Buddha says 'herein, in this teaching, a monk lives contemplating the body in the body.' that is to say reflecting on the body, being aware of the body, 'ardent'. Now this word 'ardent' is very im

portant.        It suggest, eh, well, what does it suggest? Ardent.

Richard:        Keeness.

S:        Keen, keenness, enthusiasm, energy, interest. It's a quite strongly emotive word. So, what does that tell us, the fact that the Buddha has used this term here?

Ratnaprabha: It's not just an intellectual exercise.

S: It's not just an intellectual exercise -- one must be, so to speak, emotionally involved.

(long pause)

Suvajra: What is the word that it translates here?

S: I can't remember what it translates. It could be a word connected with (tuppas?). That is quite possible, but I won't be confident of that. It's some such word, clearly~

(long pause)

S(cont.): Which also has the suggestion of warmth, as indeed has the word ardent itself. So, it's a warm mindfulness, a warm aware-ness, not to say a hot one.

Gunapala: Ardent has, I don't know, I don't come across the word much, but ardent sort of rings a bell of quite a lot of energy,eh, determination almost.

S: Yes, it's all those things, it's emotional drive.

Cittaapala: I always associate it with, sort of, eating things up in a way. Consuming

S: Yes, burning things up. (Pause) It's not a word we often use nowadays, is it, in ordinary speech? It isn't exactly an archaic word by any means but we don't usually speak in terms of ardour or someone being ardent.

Devamitra: I think it might be more in use in the (unclear). I seem to recall it was certainly part of my vocabulary.

(end of side one)

(side two)

S: The noun seems to be comparatively rare,

Devamitra: Ardour. Yes~

(long pause)

S: Anyway. 'he lives contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending and mindful'. The mindful is 'satta'. The clearly comprehending is 'sampajanna'. So, part of what he clearly comprehends is the meaning and purpose of what he is doing while he is practising in this particular way. (pause while an aeroplane flies over.) In other words, it's very important when one is engaged in any religious practice or spiritual practice not ever to lose sight of why you are doing it. Otherwise it becomes silabbata-paramasa. Do you see what I mean? It becomes a fetter. The practice is meant to liberate you but if you start becoming forgetful of why it is you are doing the practice at all, then it doesn't have the function of liberating you, it simply becomes another fetter.

Cittapala: This must be quite a bit more deep-rooted than one naturally, or at least I naturally assume.. .

S: What is?

Cittapala: This attachment to to ritual and mere observance of practice.

YD

S: Things can very easily become just habitual. In a sense you want them to become habitual, in the sense that you are able to go on doing them regularly without any sense of strain or effort or without having to make a, you know, a special decision each time. But, on the other hand, you do need to bear in mind constantly, why you are engaged in a particular activity, you know, in the case of spiritual practices.

Cittapala: Is there a case for having some sort of quite definite way of reminding oneself at the beginning of a meditation practice, quite specifically?

S: Well, one can recite certain formulae, but then the recitation of those formulae themselves can become mechanical. It seems that one must maintain one's enthusiasm, one's ardour, then you may not in so many words, discursively remind yourself what the aim and object of your practice is, but the fact that the enthusiasm is there will mean that you are still sort of goal oriented. You haven't you know, become involved in the doing of the exercises and practices for their own sake, so to speak, mechanically. Mainly it's a question of maintaining ardour.

Richard: If you are aware that you are just about to start a (unclear) and you were feeling mechanical not enthusiastic etc, do you think it is better not to do it and simply find something else to do?

S: No, I think we've got to be quite careful about the conclusion that because you don't feel in the mood for doing something it's better not to do it. Although, even if you are not in the mood, do it and recognise that you are not in the mood but nonetheless you are doing it as a discipline, for the sake of continuity of practice. For the sake of, you know, your ultimate goal.

(long pause)

But it does suggest that it's difficult to sustain your awareness of the goal in the absence of sort of feeling for the goal. (pause). In the absence of emotional involvement.

Cittapala: In certain sports, to go on from Devamitra's sporting analogy, they sometimes have sort of rituals. Sometimes they are just linked up to warming-up exercises, sometimes they are just sort of specifically emotional. Sort of gearing up....

S: They have cheer-leaders and things like that in the States. Don't you have, sort of, what is it?

Devamitra: Cheerleaders

S: And you have bands, with drum majorettes, or whatever you call them.

Cittapala: But the actual players themselves will go through some- thing like the , well like the Kiwi rugger team. (unclear.. laughter).

Gunapala: New Zealand sportsmen, before they go on, before a foot- ball game do the Haka, which is a wardance.

S: Oh. (laughter).

Cittapala: We used to do a similar sort of thing in school in Sussex. I'm not so sure it was very skillful, because it was very bloodthirsty. (laughter)

Devamitra: Quite tribal (laughter)

pause

S: "So, herein, in this teaching, a monk lives contemplating ~he body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending and mind- ful, having overcome in this world, covetousness and greed~

What is the significance of having overcome covetousness and greed?

Pause

Voice: If you haven't overcome these two to a great extent you wouldn't be able to do your practice surely.

S: Mm. They represent destruction of emotions and covetousness and any sort of greed with regard to worldly things Grief perhaps, at having separated from worldly things.

Devamitra : It's the principle underlying the Eight worldly Concerns.

S: Yes, yes~

(long pause)

E~&~'apala: The small line "in this world", is that pointing directly at samsara, the suffering of the world?

S: I think it is more a Pali idiom. (Vidam?) loka means 'here itself' in this world itself, eh? In other words, it's here you've got to do it . Not in some future world. ' Here itself ' we would say, rather than 'in this world'.

Cittapala : Could you expand on that, the covetousness and greed being principles underlying the Eight Worldly Concerns?

S: Well, that's what Devamitra said.

Devamitra: Well it just struck me that way. Basically the principle seems to be that you're impelled toward something and repelled away from something else. So that you've got em, (unclear) So you've got two of the Concerns, say Faith and Blame.

S: They are the forms of attraction and repulsion.

Devamitra: They are just the working out of the principle. It just seems to me this is the same principle expressed slightly differently. Well, it's just out of that. context. It's the same principle expressed.

S: But you must have overcome your feelings of attraction and repulsion with regard to worldly things.

(long pause)

Devamitra: Would you comment on that expression 'the body in the bod~'

S: Yes, according to the notes, this is just for the sake of the (one word unclear) and similarly in connection with feelings, consciousness and mental objects.

(another long pause)~

S: Alright then, let's go on to the contemplation of the body.

Harshaprabha: Firstly Mindfulness of Breathing.

'And how does a monk live, contemplating the body in the body? Herein monks, the monk, having gone to the forest, to the foot of the tree or to an empty place, sits down with his legs crossed, keeps his body erect and his mindfulness alert.

S: There's a note at the back. Well, you're literally setting up mindfulness in the front. We can talk about that in a moment.

"But herein monks, a monk having gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree or to an empty place."

One must bear in mind of course, the monks' original living conditions. They are mainly wanderers, others lived in little huts, during the rainy season, sometimes at other times. So one goes to practise the Satipatanna, goes to practise meditation, so to speak, k

S: cont: either into the depths of the forest, or to the foot of a tree or just to an empty place. Anywhere where it's quiet, anywhere where one is not likely to be disturbed. He sits down with his legs crossed, he keeps his body erect and his mindfulness alert or established in front of him. In other words, he's just undistracted, he's just mindful, without, as it were, turning to this side or that, or as the expression has it 'with his mindfulness alert.

Ratnaprabha: So you say that, establishing mindfulness in front of one is i.e. ying that you're not turning your awareness from side to side?

S: That seems to be the suggestion, yes, that you're undistracted. Some commentators do say that it refers to actually, i.e., being mindful of the in and out breathing because that is, so to speak, in front of you. So, establishing your mindfulness in front means, they would say, establishing your mindfulness on the process of in and out breathing. But it probably doesn't mean anything so technical as that. You must remember that it's also said that the bhikkhu when he goes for alms, should keep, should look down and keep his attention fixed about six feet ahead of him and not look to left or right. Eh, this seems to be some association with that. In other words, i.e., just looking straight ahead, or looking down, not looking to left and right, seems to be associated with the maintenance of mindfulness and awareness.

Gunapala: Do you think that's going too far? How literally, how much should we put into practice ourselves? I don't.

S: Well, it was certainly taken quite literally in the Buddha's day, even today in some



Buddhist countries monks do walk, or try to walk, you know, like that. But what's the idea, mm?

Suvajra: Not to get distracted from your purpose?

S: I would say it was all the more necessary nowadays. I mean, supposing you were on the underground railway in England, especially going up the escalator. Is it necessary to look from side to side? (laughter) or would you do better just keeping your eyes down.

Gunapala: Well, in that case, I do keep my eyes down (laughter). Even when I'm out in the country, when I'm walking into town, em, I like to look at the .~...

S: It really depends on what you are looking at and why you are looking at it. (pause). I mean, I suppose the basic reason for that sort of practice is just not to let the mind wander, not to become distracted, and not to be led astray into unskilful thoughts.

Cittapala: I was quite interested by the fact that you said, eh, the other day, that it was a Zen tradition that people sat together to meditate and actually in Tibet, sitting meditation was a much more singular occupation on the part of the monks.

S: Mm, much more~ I won't say people never meditate together, but it does seem, well it does seem to be very much the exception, even if it happens at all. In the Buddha's day one does read that, the Buddha himself and many of the monks, sitting and meditating together, doesn't one? That's how Ajatasattu and Jivaka found them-, twelve hundred and fifty monks and the Buddha meditating in a clearing in the forest..

Cittapala: But that was on a full moon night?

S: On a full moon night, yes.

Cittapala: ..which happened twice.

S: Yes.

Cittapala: I was just wondering whether it seemed that, since we'd been drawing, or the FWBO has been drawing on various different traditions, why it was we ended up with this particular emphasis on communal meditation?

S: Well, to begin with, because it would take a lot of time to teach people individually. It's easier to teach people meditation in classes, in groups. And it does seem that people are helped by meditating with other people, at the beginning. Having been conscious of having other people around doing the same thing. It does seem to encourage people.

Cittapala: But, in the Sutras they are quite often, in these descriptions, it seems that they go off on their own to a mango grove. They're told to go to a lonely place.

S: Perhaps they were more able to keep up that sort of effort on their own.

1/4

Gunapala: There's solitary, I mean, in Buddhism's history, solitary meditation seems very strong in most traditions. I know Milarepa, reading about the people around Milarepa, bricked themselves up in caves and were extremely solitary.

S: Well, perhaps it is interesting that among all the traditions that emphasise meditation, I mean the Ch'an or Zen is probably the best known, and perhaps they've been strongest in this particular area, and they did practise what we call group meditation quite considerably, rather than solitary meditation. There may be some significance in that fact. It's as though, if you're going to meditate on your own, you need really to know what you're doing, to have a lot of impetus, a lot of determination to keep it up for a very long time. (pause). I also think that maybe, in the case of early Buddhism there was in some ways, quite an emphasis on you know, solitariness and I think possibly for two reasons~ First of all because that emphasis has to be seen against the background of the Indian family. Because most of the people who went forth as Bikkhus, or rather as (parivrajakas?) went forth from quite a large family, what we would call an extended family. And an Indian family can be very much with you, it's difficult to get away from it. So, perhaps people did appreciate very much just being on their own, living on their own, meditating on their own, you know, going for alms on their own. And perhaps they were quite careful of, at least unconsciously, to avoid setting up anything that reminded them of home. Also there was the fact that there- was plenty of wood, plenty of space, there was the forest. You could just go and sit in it, you wouldn't be disturbed, it was there.

Gunapala~: I know, with our experience here, I mean, though we're not alone, we're in a group, the fact that to some extent we have removed ourselves from the world, we have gone, in some sense to a forest or....

S: Or to an empty place which has been vacated for us.

Voice: to an empty place, in this way. This is where we are alone in one sense -- we've separated ourselves from the world.

1/2-

C

S: I think aloneness basically means separation from the world, not necessarily separated from other people or certainly not separation from other people treading the same spiritual path.

Richard How important do you think it is to spend some time in solitary-- not for an extremely long length of time but say 6 months or a year?

S: I certainly think solitary retreat is important for people because, em, even if one does belong to a spiritual community, it is quite easy to start thinking of that as a group or treating that as a group, even though a very positive one. It's very easy to start functioning in that situation as a group member rather than as a true individual. So if you go on a solitary retreat, well, you can sort of take stock of things, take stock of yourself, assess yourself and your attitude towards the group or spiritual community that you have left. Are you really able to get on on your own? Can you really function, at least for a short time without the support of other people? If you can then it's more likely that you are an individual and can be a member and truly a member of a spiritual community.

Richard: I'm thinking of a time period, perhaps three months six months, even more, maybe even a year -- or is that going beyond just seeing whether you can be on your own. Or is there something in that which it is important to explore, experience at some time or another?

S: It is very difficult to generalise. I would say that most people don't need more than a month or so on their own at a time. Some people, if you feel you would like to spend longer than that on your own and meditate, then that's good. But I think a month is quite a good period for most people at a time.

Richard: I believe you spent a year in Cornwall, or Devon?

S: I wasn't completely on my own. There was someone else with me most of the time,

but even that was quite interesting.

Richard: So, did you have a particular purpose for doing that? I mean, did you....

jy

S: Oh yes, in fact I wrote about it at the time in Snao~a. Why I wanted to get away was that I had been then running the FWBO for six years, the first six years~ Before that I'd been having quite a heavy programme of lectures and classes in London before I started the FWBO. So that was eight years, so all my energies had as it were been geared to a regular programme, a programme determined, you know, mainly by other people's needs, or the needs of the situation when setting up the Movement. So I felt for a while I wanted a holiday as it were from that. I wanted a situation in which I could let my energies flow freely in whatever direction they wanted rather than into pre-established or pre-determined channels. That's why I moved away. Not just to be on my own. (unclear)

(long pause)

And that is also an aspect, you know of going away on solitary retreat for anybody, that you determine your own programme in accordance with your own needs, without having to consider others' needs or the situation. Then you can meditate when you want to meditate, read when you want to read, eat when you want to. You are entirely free to determine your own programme, the order in which you do things and so on.

(long pause)

Would you like to read the next

Richard: Ever mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. Breathing in a long breath he knows 'I am breathing in a long breath.' Breathing out a long breath he knows 'I am breathing out a long breath.' Breathing in a short breath, he knows 'I am breathing in a short breath.' Breathing out a short breath he knows 'I am breathing out a short breath.'

S: These facts illustrate the fact that he does become completely aware of the breathing process. Breathing in and out a long breath, according to tradition, refers to the first stage of the practice, where you are counting after each in and out breath that you do in that particular way. And breathing, the short breath in and out the short breath refers to counting at the beginning. Presumably because there is in many cases a natural tendency for the breath to become a little longer in the first stage and a little shorter in the second. You notice that the text itself doesn't make any mention of actual counting. That is based on the tradition, probably on the oral tradition. I've often found that the details of the practice [101]

S: ... are not included in the , in what has become the written tradition (unclear) There are a lot of things that are too complicated or detailed (unclear) or vary too much to be committed to writing. So this paragraph refers to what we know as the first two stages of the Mindfulness of Breathing practice.

(long Pause)

I don't think there is anything we~ find much discussion in so let's go on to the next paragraph.

Surata: ' "Experiencing the whole breath body, I shall breath in", thus he trains himself. "Experiencing the whole breath body, I shall breath out", thus he trains him- self. "Calming the activity of the breath body I shall breath in", thus he trains himself. "Calming the activity of the breath body, I shall breath out" Thus he trains himself. '

S: So, this paragraph refers to what we know as the third and fourth stages of the practice. Experiencing the whole breath body I shall breath in and out. The breath body means the whole volume of the breath within the body -- within the lungs. The total quantity of the breath. You sort of mentally follow the breath as it goes down into the lungs, as you inhale, as you experience it there. You feel it in the lungs. And then feel it slowly being exhaled, expelled. In other words you experience the whole breathing process. You know like the rise and fall of a wave, this is how it is sometimes described.

Gunapala: 'I shall breath in, thus he trains himself' -- you don't practice it like that, as it's written here. I mean he's almost saying 'I shall breath in', as though he's like, deliberately controlling the breath.

S: Well, this is exactly what one shouldn't do. One shouldn't control..

Gunapala: But, as you've said, it's probably not taught like that. It's how it's been written.

S: But this representerits our overall intention, not that before- hand, as it were, you say to yourself, now I'm going to do this and then do it. Sort of holding yourself in check until you actually do it. I mean this is definitely the wrong way to do the practice although perhaps some people do understand thi\$ray~

Richard: Would this breath body have any connection with this eh, Upanishadic term the breath body which you brought up?

S: I think not, probably because the word there would be prana, which is not exactly breath -- yes, it's breath, but breath of a somewhat different sense. More like a subtle counterpart. Here it is just breath, except that breath isn't mentioned, eb? That's why it's in inverted commas, this 'experiencing the whole body' but the traditional explanation; interpretation is that this refers to the breath body in the sense of the total volume of the breath. The whole mass of the breath as it were. No, I don't think there is any reference here to the Upanishadic prana(mayagosh?).

Suvajra: Calming the activity of the breath body is something at the fourth stage?

S: Yes, this corresponds to the fourth stage, when as the breathing becomes more and more refined, concentration becomes more intense and so on.

(long pause)

Richard: You mentioned before the importance of going through each stage. I mean sometimes I've sat down and I've found that I want to just start becoming aware of the breath without counting. Do you imply that there is greater depth even though one might be able to gain concentration, there wouldn't be a greater depth?

S: Yes, I mean if you are a very experienced meditator you may well be able to start off from the fourth stage but I think going through all four stages you do gather a certain,~quite a bit of momentum. Even though you may be capable of, you may be reasonably well concentrated starting in the third or fourth stage even. So, unless you are really quite experienced, unless you have been doing quite a lot of meditation and get very quickly and easily into a concentrated state, it's certainly best to go through all four stages. But, I mean, it may be that you need to spend less time and the earlier stages naturally merge in the later ones. There's no need to resist that, no need to prevent that happening.

(long pause)

(o~

Any, then there follows the famous analogy of the skilful turner A

or turner's apprentice. Maybe someone could ... what is the term

Surata: (turn?) (laughter)

S: Well just read the paragraph and see whether it does work out in these terms.

"Just as the skilful turner, or turner's apprentice, making a long turn knows 'I am making a long turn' or, making a short turn knows 'I am making a short turn'. Just so a monk, breathing in a long breath knows 'I am breathing in a long Wreath'. Breathing out a long breath knows 'I am breathing out a long breath'. Breathing in a short breath knows 'I am Wreathing in a short breath'. Breathing out a short breath knows 'I am breathing out a short breath'. Experiencing the whole (breath) body, I shall breathe in~ Thus he trains himself. ' calming

the(breath) body I shall breathe out', thus he trains himself. 'Calming the activity of the (breath) body, I shall breathe in', thus he trains himself. 'Calm- ing the activity of the (breath) body, I shall breath out', thus he trains himself.

S: Well, you can understand it better without the illustration actually. What is the long turn or the short turn that the turner makes? How does it work out?

Cittapala: There's a professional turner over there. (laughter)

S: Is this a modern term used, a short turn and a long turn?

Gunapala: I don't think so

S: Oh. Oh dear.'

Gunapala: I think now that we have motors, eh, I think in the Buddha's day, turners did deal with a tread, a foot. I mean I've seen them in pictures where they use the~r feet and to make a long turn you'd have to probably, I mean, you must...

S: Well what would be, what is a long turn? What are you turn- ing and in what sense is it long?

Gunapala: Well it's the diameter would be eh...

Cittapala: Yes, there's two things which it could mean. You've

got a long rail and you can go from one end to another and you are peeling off a strip of wood, so you might end up with a very long peel. On the other hand, you might just do a smaller cut which takes off a short peel. But the other thing which I noticed from ~~~(k.'C~~, there used to be bodgers in the Berkshire hills and they made the Windsor chairs; Lhat is all the parts are turned except for the seat. And the way they got the thing working was by using a sapling which they tied down to the ground and then they let it go back. Its natural elasticity then turned eh, providinthe force to drive a wheel which then turned the actual lathe itself. And it might have been something to do with, it might refer to some kind of mechanical way in which you apply and the amount of power which you put on.

S: Yes, so if you made a long turn you could pull it right back to get the power. The

commentaries don't explain things of this sort.

Surata: But the other thing is you have to keep the speed of your traverse, as it were, constant, otherwise you would make marks on whatever it is that you turn. So you, you've got to be quite aware that you're not going to go half way and then have a breather and then carry on 'cos you'd end up with a mark. So you'd have to know you could get from one end to the other.

S: Perhaps it refers more to something like that. They probably had a very simple, very primitive process of turning but you had to know whether it was going to be a short turn or a long turn; you'd know exactly where to stop, otherwise you'd make a mark if you stopped in the wrong place. And clearly a turner needs to have his eye on the job, and that's the main point of the illustration. But books on Buddhism never tell things like this, though the illustration is supposed to help you in understanding what is to be illustrated. Generations of Buddhists have copied this with not the remotest idea what it entails! (laughter) Still maybe they have done a bit of turning themselves.

Suvajra: They probably never had three turners in their study group!

Ratnaprabha: The Buddha seems to use lots of carpentry analogy...

io~

S: Oh dear! (laughter) He was criticised for always talking of potters and wheelwrights instead of discussing philosophy properly. (laughter) (pause) Well, we've got to the turner or turner's apprentice. I think perhaps sometime later we come on to other illustrations. I think we'll have even the butcher and the butcher's apprentice.

Ratnaprabha: I don't think we've got three butchers in the group!

S: We've got one ex-butcher! (laughter)

Devamitra: Does this suggest that perhaps. .... my sense of humour running wild.

Ratnaprabha: Is there any particular reason, do you think, why the first two stages are described in rather different terms from the second two stages? The first two, it says he knows 'I am' breathing in the long breath, etc. In the second it says, em, 'experiencing' 'I shall breath in'. It seems to me to be rather a different sort of emphasis. Do you think there is any



reason for

There might well be, but it is a different kind of thing. It is not a thing that is

~ - - - -

These suggest that there is quite a difference between anticipation and experience.

S: When you are experiencing the whole breath-body it is more of a total experience one might say, it's more than an awareness, so to speak, from the outside. You are identifying yourself much more with the breath.

Gunapala: I mean, from my experience it seems like you just have the awareness there, concentrating on the breath and the breath, even in the third stage here where it says 'I shall breathe in' the breath comes in like a wave and then fades away and you're still sitting there with the same sort of awareness when the next breath comes in and fades away. This sort of 'I shall breathe in' doesn't seem relevant.

S: No. You don't always say to yourself. In fact if you're deeply concentrated there is no mental activity, you're just aware. So it's not to be understood as though one's repeating so to speak, those words before each in and out breath.

Cittapala: Do you think the, er, well I'm not sure but I think it's Buddhaghosa's analogy to the four different stages, er, I can't remember all of them now, but in the first stage it's a

swing. - . - ' .. ~ ~ ~ ~ . . ~ . ~ .

~ . ; " ... ~ . t - . ' ~ S: Ah yes. ~ ~ .. - ' . ..

Cittapala: Do you think they're useful?

S: Yes, I think they are, especially that for the fourth, er, fourth stage. In a way, you are so~ing a piece of wood and

you keep your eye on the wood, not on the sword as it moves backwards and forwards, but on the spot where it's cutting into the wood. I think that's quite useful.

(Long pause)

Anyway, let's go on to that last paragraph of this section.

"Thus he lives contemplating the body in the body internally or he lives contemplating the body in the body

externally, or he lives contemplating the body in the body internally and externally. He lives contemplating origination factors in the body, or he lives contemplating dissolution factors in the body. Or he lives contemplating origination and dissolution factors in the body. Or his mindfulness is established with the thought 'the body exists to the extent necessary just for knowledge and mindfulness and he lives detached and clings to naught in the world. Thus also monks, a monk lives contemplating a body in the body.

S: Let's look at the notes while we're waiting

sps (o~

S.: So firstly there is contemplating the body in the body internally or there is contemplating in the body, in the body externally or both. Well you've read the note on that: note four:\*

\*('Internally': contemplating his own breathing; 'externally': contemplating another's breathing; 'internally and externally': contemplating one's own and another's breathing, alternately, with uninterrupted attention. In the beginning one pays attention to one's own breathing only, and it is only in advanced stages that for the sake of practising insight, one by inference pays at times attention also to another person's process of breathing.)

So this may seem rather strange that one should pay attention to somebody else's breathing. The note itself seems a bit uneasy about it. It says "in the beginning one pays attention to one's own breathing only, and it is only in advanced stages that for the sake of practising insight, one by inference pays at times attention also to another person's process of breathing".

It's as though the commentator has almost forgotten what the real purpose of the, you know, of paying attention to the breathing of another person was, eh? It certainly doesn't form part of the actual practise as we do it. We never practise awareness of other people's breathing, do we? In any case, if you're practising in solitude, you could only be aware of it mentally in the sense of thinking about it. So what does it mean? What does it suggest? That, you know, you are asked to be aware of both - breathing of other people.

Gunapala: It does suggest to me an outward-goingness of your awareness, in your situation, that you're meditating in; by concentrating on someone else's breathing you have to expand your consciousness as it were into space, expansion....

S.: You would in a way, but that is never incorporated into any, ~method of practise. It's just ignored. One just practises you know, as regards one's own breath.

Devamitra: Could it not simply be intended in some poetic way... just indicating - or taking into awareness of the fact that there are other living beings.

S.: Ah, this is the only sense I can make of it, except that one could understand it quite differently that it's your own breathing process that you contemplate either as it were, from within or from without. You can either sort of experience it from within or look at

sps lo~

me ant in it from the outside. It could be that sense.

But on the other hand, it could be that - you may remember that in some of the visualization practises, you know - you recite the mantra yourself in the earlier stages, but in the later stages you imagine other living beings also reciting it. So it could be, that at ~ later stage of this practice - that's when you're concentrating

more on the development of insight. You sort of recollect that just ~ ~ ~ "t~ as you breathe A and you have a sort of experience or realization of

everybody breathing in or breathing out in that way you intensify your feeling of solidarity with all other forms of life. It could be that; but that type of practice is never actually done so far as I know~ But it could be that it is a sort of natural result in the long run of doing this kind of practice. You realize that every other thing, every other sentient being, every other organic being

ti~Th~4'A

depends upon breathing in, just as you are.

Richard Clayton:~tit also give you a basic feel for the whole process of breathing (unclear) see it around you. We all share the same air, etc.

S.: Hmm, yes.

j~Q

#Mtaa~la: My experience of A \ concentrate\ at times has been that~first it seems to be - becoming very focused and~it's almost as if I start expanding - it doesn't happen very often but I was wondering whether it might be pertinent if that was occurring - if one was feeling more and more expansive~ then you could reflect that as you .....

S.: Hmm, yes.

~,~~t£)~~b O&~~'&~~~

Devamitra: If this fresh interpretation of is actually what was originally intended - it would seem that within the practice~ that within this particular practice of the mindfulness of breathing, you do have an in-built corrective against a one-sided approach to one's spiritual practice. Gives it a much more balanced sort of feel.

tS

S.: Yes, well, Perhaps it N that the Theravada

tradition whom we mainly derive the mindfulness of breathing practice~who~mainly transmitted it, do only stress the mindfulness of one's own breathing and mindfulness of breathing of other beings is never even mentioned in any account of the practice, though

sps loct

there is this line in the text itself.

Suvajra: In the first one you've mentioned there, that you can see the breath(. .)from the inside or from the outside. How would you....

S.: I've mentioned that just as a possible way of understanding these words.

Suvajra: Well, how could you possibly do that then, see the breath from the outside as the inside. ...

S.: Well, you could as it were, you know, imagine yourself ~tanding outside yourself and looking at yourself and see~ing your own breathing process. You could conceivably do it in that way.

Voice: Wouldn't you stand the risk of becoming rather alien~ated?

S.: But you're doing it the other way too! You're experiencing yourself as it were both subjectively and objectively.

Suvajra: It does seem quite strange. ~The thought of seeing the breath as being well, internally and externally breath - in the Universe being breathed in and breathed out of our bodies - really appeals to me.

S.: Hmm. Well, certainly here also the phraseology is rather strange in a way: 'He lives contemplating the body in the body internally or he lives contemplating the body in the body externally.' It's in the

people'~~r~ath. body - nothing is said actually of other You see

what I mean? Presumably it was the same body that was spoken of before.~ut nonetheless the note does suggest that there is a sort of tradition about being aware of another person's

breathing pro- cess - thoug~hey clearly don't know very much about it.

Devamitra: Unless that is just his own particular interpretation... 5.Y:e~ think he must have based himself on some text or some tradition.

Suvajra: It's in the commentary.

S.: It IS in the commentary.

sps ((c

Suvajra: But it just says - just what you've said there, that...

S.: Hm. YEs. Perhaps by that time, even they weren't quite sure about it (Pause)  
Anyway, lets go on, eh?

"He lives contemplating origination-factors in the body, or he lives conteinplating dissolution-factors in the body, or he lives contemplating origination-and-dissolution factors in the body."

That is to say, he sort of contemplates those factors on which on the presence of which breathing takes place or in the absence of which they don't take place, eh? In other words, he contemplates the breathing process as a conditioned phenomenon. Th~at is to say,

the element of insight so to speak creeps in here or is introduced here. You realise the essential fragility of the breathing process - it is dependent upon certain factors-in the absence of those factors it ceases.

"Or his mindfulness is established with the thought: 'The body exists', to the extent necessar ~ust for knowled e and mindfulness and he lives detached and clings to naught in the world. Thus also, monks, a monk lives contemplating the body in the body.V

In other words, he's just aware of the body,- he doesn't enter- tain any ideas about it; doesn't think about it; doesn't become the object of any cross-series of reflections.

Gunapala: This element of having a body, of having borrowed the body as it were, for the use of knowledge and mindfulness - you working in the world for the good of the world - sort of detached, not cling- ing to it~eing my body but just a body for the use of...

\_\_\_\_ careful of this sort of attitude of detachment, of impersonality doesn't become just a sort of alienation from the body. At least, projably for people in the West, certainly some of them must watch quite carefully. You must continue to experience &

~though you are detached from it.

Gunapala: We don't put this into our practice as well, this last bit...

S.: No, no. it's as though a little bit of an element of Vipassana is incorporated~ ~or us this is represented by say, the Six Element practice which is certainly more thorough, more way of practising the same thing. cON~C~~~~~

sps

Gunapala: Is this tradition for dt~ you deliberately teach the mindfulness of breathing in this way?

S. The usual way in which the mindfulness of breathing is taught is that as we do it; people normally stop there as it were - but we go on, not so much to practising in this way but to the Six Element practice, eh?

Ratnaprabha: Did the Buddha actually intend to teach separate Samatha and Vipassana practices, or did his ~~~~~t~~~5~ as the mindfulness of breathing~t~~d to always have a Vipassana element in them?

S.: Hmm,hmm. Well, it's difficult to be certain but one would imagine that the Buddha tried to always teach a complete method of

teach0'~~~amatha practice. He'd only presumably on those occasions when he saw someone wasn't capable of developing insight. (Pause)

All complete systems and methods of meditation must include a Samatha and Vipassana element, eh? (Pause) Also it's not just a question ~f) This is what the monk does when he's sitting in the forest or at the foot of a tree, etc. I mean, having practiced the mindfulness of breathing, he sort of develops a sort of~general attitude towards things. Do you see what I mean? This is perhaps why this particular part isn't part of the actual practice whi(e are ~itting. I mean having practiced the mindfulness of breathing, the four stages and all that, well, you have a ~eral realization, a general understanding that our breathi~~ processes are a precarious sort of thing. You don't necessari~~efl~~ct on that at the time of sitting, but that's the sort of awareness you carry around with you all the time, eh? Do you see what I mean? That's the general attitude you have towards the ~ sexists to the extent necessary body, ~ Lt ~u,

just for knowledge and mindfulness, eh?

This is suggested by the fact that the next section begins.

"And further monks, a monk knows when he is going,.. when he is standing..." as though the transition back to ordinary life so to speak has been made, eh. But that you carry into this same awareness of the fragility of existence and a ne~SO(t0~attitude towards your body as the result of your practice of the mindfulness of breathing, eh?

So perhaps this last paragraph of this section, doesn't refer so much to what you actually do when you're doing seated meditation. It refers more to a general attitude that you develop and maintain as a result of that. Do you see what I mean?

sps

Devamitra: That's interesting in that, that element which carries over or which is taken away from the practice is the Vipassana element.

S.: Hmm. Well that seems to be as it were, mentioned when it says:

"Of his mindfulness is established with the thought"

So that means or suggests a continuity of mindfulness but associated with the thought or a reflection, as it were.

Anyway, time is up, so we've covered at least one section.

The Satipatthana Sutta

S: Section two, the postures of the body eh, would someone like to read the first paragraph ?

Devamitra: "And further monks; a monk knows when he is going 'I am oin ' he knows when he is standin 'I am standin he knows when he is sitting, 'I am sitting'; he knows when he is lying down, 'I am lying down' for just as his bodyis disposed so li~ knows it."

S: So, this clearly refers to er~ the tli~ when he is er,no longer necessarily in the forest or gone to the foot of a tree or an empty place eh. No longer sitting down, no longer meditating

so to speak eh. What I've said in one of the lectures and on other occasions about integrated and er, alienated awareness is relevant here, no doubt.

\_\_\_\_\_ I was going to say ... (unclear) ... a physical body and being aware of what it is doing, in a way I suppose you could say being their aim ... (unclear) ~~~~ 1/4 ~~~i~  
~~~~e~

S: But when for instance, when people are going or when they are standing, don't they know that they are going or that they are standing - I mean - don't take ~V the text is saying for granted ; I mean is it possible to not be aware of what one is doing.

Devamitra: Well, errm

S: If you're standing up surely you're aware that you're standin~\$~ ?

Devamitra: Well actually~I mean I have certainly had the experience of walking along daydreaming~ nd sud dely waking up- about five minutes later er and you know you just are'nt aware of where the last five minutes have gone - I do presume that other people have had the same experiences of this.

\_ People do walk into lam~sts.

!Iq

Several voices and laughter all unclear

S: Well it's not necessarily that thy're unaware that they are walking but that they're not looking in the right direction eh ?

: Bumping into a lamp~ost you mean.

S: Yes, there must be some element of unawareenes#ut nonetheless one is aware that you have a body moving along.



\_\_\_\_\_ It's probably meaning fully aware, fully aware of whether one's body is standing, or sitting, or moving or

S: Not just er, aware of it but in a way experiencing it, this is where the question of alienated awareness comes In- not just

coldly observing the body you're actually consciously experiencing a,

it ehh, Do you see the difference.

Cittapala: Doe~this mean you should only try to do one thing at a time so to speak? -you know perhaps just walking ...

S: It does ideally err, I think, yes : I think it is advisable that one does try to do one thing at a time.

Cittapala: So literally you mean when walking from A to B you should just concentrate on walking and not think about what you're going to do when you get to B or any other ...

S: Well if, if you make a conscious decision to think ~bout something while you're walking that is a convenient time to do it, that's fair enough. You don't always have to be engaged in that particular p~tice, you can do something else eh But you should not sort of just er forget what you're ~actually doing and not be ~~~ what you're doing, as it were, accidentally- your mind just drifting away eh. You can take a conscious decision that you're going to utilize that period of walking just to reflect

upon some ; of course you're a~are you are

walking with the periphery of your cdnsciousness even so.

\_\_\_\_\_: This happens quite often -doesn't it- that you'll walk with

~ periphery of what you're doing, even when

/jffi

we're driving a car say. Quite often we're thinking about something else 1/4 a part of us is aware  
~\~

S: Some drivers even say that one drives better that way.

It's more total

S: Your responses are automatic. But on the other hand, one does sometimes find people who are driving, becoming so absorbed -you know- in the conversation that they don't keep their eye on the road in the way that they should - so there really is a thin dividing line eh.

Maybe your awareness is never on one thing~~ well it's not very often - it's always

S: Hmmm

\_\_\_ It's always

S: What does one mean by one thing ? eh Because is the body on~~ thing~ though in a sense it is and in a sense it

isn't eh. ~c' direct your total attention to the body?-in a sense you can. But the body consists of parts which presumably if you directed your attention towards one of these parts~your attention would be more intense. But there is a limitation anyway; you can only direct your attention perfectly to an infinitesimal point . See what I mean ? So in a sense, awareness is always peripheral to a degree, eh.

Devamitra: That is actually quite a confusing point. I would imagine reading texts like this , it's extremely difficult to make that kind of sense of it.

S: Because if, if awareness reaches a certain degree of intensity it merges with concentration eh.

It reaches one point then doesn't it ?...

S: Hmmm. Yes.

If you~putting all your awareness onto one point

S: Let us say that along you don't want to ~~OL)~walking

concentrate because that would be incompatible with the process of walking eh. But to come back to this question of doing one thing at a time. I think that on the whole that is quite an important rule eh, that you do one thing at a time. In a sense you can do one thing at a time if you want to do it at all well eh. Unless one is doing something so simple that you can do it with the minimum of attention. For instance, it is well known I think that, I don't really approve of serious conversations

at meal times eh - I'm not happy ~'~~ ~ you're with~business lunches,~when eating your attention should be mainly on the process ~ eating, not (~' ~' on some other serious subject eh.~Xotome abstruse philosophical

subject or some complicated business deal eh ! It means you have to give your attention to your food and to the process of eating on that occasion. Maybe a little gentle conversation is alright but nothing that demands real intellectual effort eh or real concentration in the long run. ToV~much of that and it could give you indigestion or possibly ulcers. And you shouldn't

be dashing back~and forwards between two or three different jobs Q ~ tt.~~ ; ~O~ it's not easy to ~concentrate on any of them , or be really

aware of what one is doing - trying to write a letter , trying to conduct a telephone conversation , trying to give instructions to someone else at the same time. One shouldn't be in that sort of situation.

Suvajra: Hmmm, it's so difficult though.

S: Hmm, especially for the Chairmen.

(Laughter)

.I~~~ ~~~~ \_\_\_\_\_ For a lot of people Q their mind is sort of thinking continually

and they find it very difficult to ever, to give themselves to anything to get involved in something they've decided to give themselves

to, because it's as

('1\$

if their mind has decided to always give itself to thinking ... (unclear)... A lot of people find this.

S: Well of course they experience that in connection with meditation.

\_\_\_\_\_ Well anything else (pause) most things in their lives it seems.

S: Is this so, I mean is this everyone's experience?

Sometimes I've experienced it with work, when I need to be concentrating on a machine, machine work say, which is quite dangerous if you're not concentrating on it. If your mind is determined to be thinking and wandering off all the time and not concentrating on what you're doing .. .er.... it's very difficult it's very difficult to stop it going its own way. Pause.

It seems like er, from what I've heard that some people find it a lot more difficult than I do.

S: Hmm

\_\_\_\_\_ Especially outside meditation~workin~ and trying to go to sleep (laughter)

S: What is this uncalled for, unwanted mental activity (then hmm ? If it's unwanted by the conscious mind at least, why do people's minds go on working in this sort of way ?

: Habitual...

S: Sorry ...?

\_\_\_\_\_ Habitual patterns .. .worrying, going back into the past and worrying and anxiety... (unclear)..

S: So many people have worries and anxieties then ?

Suvajra: Allsorts... even with me it's just things that have been left unfinished...

S: Hmmm. . .yes...

Suvajra: . . . so that when you go on to the next task, you're still carrying over a part of it. You can't put your mind onto the next task competely.

S: Yes. What does one mean by unfinished.? What has not been finished~ Is it thinking about something (pause) some unresolved problem, or is it a question of emotional frustration.

long Pause)

Suvajra: You start doing something and you do~t actually do it properly...

S: Hmm .. Hmm..

Suvajra: You don't actually give yourself wholly to it... so when you move on to the next thing you have the actual feeling that, that its unfinished. So you still carry on doing it in your mind, while your doing the next thing which aggravates the cycle.

S: So it seems the only solution to it really is a determined effort to put yourself fully into what you are doing now eh?

:~What I understood some people telling me about it was that their minds became so active during the day that er it was impossible to slow it down or stop it when they ... (pause) its as if they're wind became very active in thinking about things, reading and studying, t~r mind~ere very active and then it took them sometimes four or five hours before their mind would slow down enOUGH~it would be two o'clock, in the early hours of the morning before they could even get to sleep and... you know... this has been happenning for years and years.

S: Well it's understandable if your mind has been very active or has had to be very active

during the day as when you're studying, that you should find it difficult to switch off quickly . that is understandable as when you're a student perhaps. It's not so understandable if your not a student and not studying in that sort of way , but nonetheless at the same time there is this incessant mental activity interfering in a way with everything that you do; and preventing you from concentrating on any one thing.

sps (11

Devamitra: I must say that my experience has&been that I've been disturbed when I've been doing ~lot of study - when my mind's been active in that sort of way - it's usually in other things. I used to quite often find it difficult - say after a class when you've been over-stimulated in the evening - just through communicating with other people. I think actually what really gets me going that way, is just communicating - well, just talking with other people. It's as if there's just so much coming in , in the course of the exchange that it takes a long time to sort out before you go to bed.

S.: Well, that's quite natural, yes..

Devamitra: But that's the sort of thing that keeps you awake, that

certainly kept me awake \~~ ~\ - - nights - But T've

found if I've had a quiet day, where I've been mainly reading or studying, that it's~ad that sort of effect on me.

A

Gunapala: Yes, it does seem like there's #ot of different minds almost. I mean it's a strange way of looking at mind or minds - but it almost seems like that - that people's minds work in very differeO~ ways.

Ratnaprabha: I must say I'm surprised usually by the opposite. I talk to somebody about what goes on in their minds but how similar it seems to...

S.: Similar to?

Ratnaprabha:To my own experience. I assumed that my own experience was so unique and that nobody el~e had the sam~ terrible problems of mental chatter. It seems lots of people do - quite similar experiences. (Pause)

Cittapala: Do you think the Mindfulness of Breathing is a good practice if one's suffer~£ng from this sort of thing, to do?

S.: Well, certainly it is the sort of classic for distraction - what has been described as 'supra-mindful' distraction. Certainly when ~o~ractice the ~ndfulness of ~reathing, you become more aware of (if you weren't aware before) how incessant , how intense this mental chatter is.

Cittapala: I find it almost like a Bronco...

sps

S.: A B.....?

Cittapala: A Bronco, a horse. As soon as I try to control my mind, when it's suffering from that sort of tendency - it becomes even more agitated.

S.: Well, it's like the carp wh~~Lh struggles before finally giving up, lying down and going to sleep near the boat. (Long pause)

Harshaprabha: Sometimes mental chatter can be a cover-up for allowing our feelings to come through.

Ratnaprabha: I find that devotional exercisesAa~better remedy for distraction, than fulness practices and a puja, for example - I often find that if I want to do the fl'indfulness of ~eathing, then I can often do it most successfully AFTER a Puja, or possibly AFTER the metta bhavana.

S.: Well, this does suggest that the mental chatter is at least, to some extent due to emotional frustration, or emotional, that is to say, lack of fulfilment perhaps rather than frustration, hm?

What you're actually searching for mentally is some kind of emotional experience, eh? You feel emotionally unsatisfied or empty so the mind just goes on chattering away Although in that case it would be an expression of frustration. (Pause)

Devamitra:Do you get the impression that in fact this is generally

- ~ what this is symptomatic of?

S.: I don't know about generally but I'm sure that is the case with~you know, quite a number of people. It's difficult to generalise. It's not, you know, a subject I have any large amount of statistical information on. One can only go by impressions, that sort of thing.

But no - no doubt I mean, there is a parallel between mental chatter and actual chatter, explicit verbal chatter. I remember in this connection, I've mentioned this case before - I think it was years and years ago. I knew somebody when I was in India. It was an English woman who lived in Canada - or a long time. She was very, very old. When I first met her, when she came to Kalimpong she must have been well on into her seventies. I knew her for at least 10 years, until I came to England. She had this extraordinary characteristic of always talking. She just couldn't stop. She was a compulsive talker, yeah? And to cut a long story short, I came to the  
[121]

conclusion after knowing her for some years that this was a sort of continuous attempt to get something off her chest, huh? To confess something, which actually she couldn't ever bring herself to confess; though she did get pretty near, both with me and with another sort of friend of mine. We put two and two together. We came to the conclusion that she had something to do with the death of her husband, some years before. She was a doctor, and he being very, very ill, she got a bit fed up with him. She may well have assisted him into the O~~

world. (Laughter) It was this, that she was, as it were, always on the point of, you know, communicating but never actually did, eh? So she just had to go on and on and on talking, eh? You see what I mean?... always approaching the point of confession, but never actually reaching it, eh. So I wonder whether there is any parallel between that sort of and mental chatter. You know, you never allow yourself to come to the point, whatever the point may be. It just goes

on and on and on. And maybe it has got something to do with lack of emotional fulfilment, Aemotional satisfaction. Can you imagine

yourself indulging in mental chatter or any other form of chatter if you were fully, deeply and totally emotionally satisfied? (Laughter) (Long pause)

There is that well-known comparison - the bee that buzzes around the flower, eh, but as soon as it alights on the flower and burrows its way to the centre and starts extracting the honey, all the buzzing stops. (Laughter)

Do you see what I mean? It's a little like that perhaps, eh? So perhaps it's not so much a question of trying to concentrate the mind, eh, when the mind is indulging in this habit of chatter, but a question of finding deeper satisfaction which will still that buzzing, that chatter in a natural sort of way. It's not just a question of concentration. It's also perhaps both a question of enjoyment...

It's quite active - something quite active.

S.: In the case of, you know, meditation, you do eventually break through, through that level of enjoyment in the meditation itself;

and then there's no problem about thoughts or controlling stilling the chatter because you're just absorbed in the enjoyable

, ~~~ture of the experience itself, eh? Or if you're listening to music, ~~~v£I~~~ you're very much enjoying - very often then there's no problem of

mental chatter or reading a book in which you become deeply absorbed



and which you enjoy or - a~good conversation.

So it does seem as though there is some connection perhaps, even

sps

a sort of correlation between mental chatter and absence of enjoyment, absence of emotional satisfaction or fulfilment, eh? (Pause)

Ratnaprabha: You say that in meditation eventually one would break through to the level of enjoyment, that the mental chatter would cease. Isn't it usually described as the other way round. You simply need to subdue mental chatter before y~u break through to enjoyment?

S.: Yes, you do to some extent, eh? But I think you have to subdue the mental chatter to some extent to break through to the level of deeper concentration and even of enjoyment but it's as though you're holding the mental chatter back, you're deliberately sort of reining it in - it's still there in a sense. You're still having to c~£Ac~ r~ it, you have to do that for a while so that you can break through to some deeper level of concentration and enjoyment, and indeed when you break through you need to bother less with the mental chatter, need to bother less with dealing with it and

eventually it will subside, and then you as it were become absorbed in that deeper more enjoyable level of meditation.

So maybe when you find that mental chatter is going on, perhaps you should ask yourself, "Am I enjoying the situation in which I at present am, and if not, why not? What must I do about it, eh?"

Cittapala: You mean the over-all situation?

S.: Mmm, the over-all situation. Supposing you're talking with someone and you find that your mind is wandering - what does that mean? It means you're finding the conversation boring or dull, so if you become aware of your mind wandering, and you become aware of mental chatter going on, you shouldn't perhaps just try to suppress it, you should just ask yourself first, at least, "Well why is this happening? Am I not enjoying this conversation, eh? You might not be enjoying it because the other person is doing all the talking. ... (Laughter)

So this - happens, so when you become aware of that you - well you must then make an effort to break in to the conversation, eh? You see what I mean? Or you may become aware that the subject is not that interesting, or maybe the other person is going on, you know, too much about it, so then you can either tactfully, you know, change the subject or even say: "Let's talk about something else". Introduce a subject in which you are interested. (Laughter) (Long pause)

sps 7~5

S.: But perhaps this is something that needs to be explored. Well, I don't know that we've ever raised or discussed this question before, you know. the sort of connection between mental chatter and emotional frustration.

Gunapala: It does seem to link for me spot on because unless you're emotionally engaged in something you do have this chatter, and when you are emotionally engaged in something - giving yourself totally to it, you're concentrated in a sense, and therefore you find is quite still and there in what you're doing.

S.: HMM. The danger of course is that one is habitually in a situation which one doesn't perhaps find interesting and which you can't really put your energies and therefore, you're not enjoying it, and therefore mental chatter starts up and if this is your actual work which you're doing every day, you develop a sort of habit of engaging in mental chatter which you may find very difficult to get out of afterwards - a sort of compensation, like daydreaming; not even a compensation, it's almost a sign of protest against the sort of work that you're doing - your lack of emotional fulfilment and involvement

/~LI 5

S.: .... So if you look into the matter sufficiently, you may end up questioning the very nature of the work you're doing and the sort of life that you are leading. I mean a satisfying life would leave no room for mental chatter, because whatever you are doing you should be doing because you want to do it. You become absorbed in it. You have no difficulty in concentrating on it, and you enjoy it so there is no mental chatter.

Devamitra: But one would assume that if you were living a spiritual life that it would be emotionally fulfilling whereas I think that, well, a significant number of us do find, well, that it's just not like that, that we are emotionally frustrated, that there is mental chatter and so on.

S.: Perhaps, if it goes beyond a certain point, it would suggest that there's too big a gap between ideals - which are only mentally realized and where one ACTUALLY is, that you're perhaps forcing the pace too much. It might suggest that; or at least you know, you're not taking sufficient care to remain in touch with sources of emotional satisfaction or of inspiration. One doesn't necessarily have to go outside the spiritual life, so to speak, to find those sources of satisfaction and inspiration. Maybe one can find in poetry or music if not in Puja and so on, or communication. I mean, once again this brings in the question of Reality Principle/Pleasure Principle. Perhaps the whole question of mental chatter suggests too great an imbalance between the Reality Principle and the Pleasure Principle. I mean that's only a speculation.

Cittapala: Do you think mental chatter is sort of predominantly, for want of a better term, 'Head-type' of a person's activity.. Are there equivalents to mental chatter for people who are sort of 'thought-orientated'?

S.: Well, some people fidget and twiddle. I mean presumably that's the same sort of thing. (Laughter) They're always twiddling buttons and things of that sort.... scratching the side of their nose, playing with their own fingers, twisting rings on their fingers...

Surata: Smoking

S.: Smoking

sps li;w

Ratnaprabha: In animals this sort of behaviour is said to be a 1~t~ cc~\xsL~ sort of sign of very severe conflict going on I believe. - - --

ctisplacement activitySo do you think it's the same with...

S.: I think it is.. Well, I'm sure it is because human beings-I've observed this, if people are drumming on the table it's the same thing and I can remember specific cases of this.

Surata: I can remember on early retreats that I used to find that I was sometimes experiencing incredible tensions in my legs and I just wanted to get up to run around.

S.: Run away, I thought you were going to say.

Surata: Oh, maybe run-away! But just this incredible sort of energy

~~hat n~ede5\ to be ~ S dissipated.

Cittipala: In one's... sitting meditation one~%eall~ absorbed and one can sit for quite long periods and not feel at ~ll cramped and many other times it seems that one has to sort of jump up and move every fifteen minutes.

S.: Yes. Well, this is the significance of this sequence, in the sequence of the positive nidanas of Sikkha succeeded by Samadhi. Is it not so? Does not samadhi follow directly upon sukkha?

Suvaj ra: Happiness, concentration...

S.: Hmm, yeah. So is that not significant in the present context - that you become naturally concentrated when you're happy. In other words, when you're happy there are no wandering thoughts, there is no mental chatter.

Suvajra: It's almost like the happiness there, (Something to do with the Pleasure Principle?) ... and then you start on concentration ~ which leads you to the reality principle.

Ratnaprabha: Does this mean most of us need to concentrate first on the Pleasure Principle side of our lives before we can really get down to the ideals?

S.: Well, it depends what one means by, "really get down to ~

sps 1/4

Because I mean if one is too much split between Reality Principle and Pleasure Principle I think there's so much conflict that you can't make very much progress. Reality Principle is here and Pleasure Principle is here. You just manage to touch the Reality Principle but you're so concerned to ~ep in touch with the Pleasure Principle at the same time and keep a firm grasp on that that you can't really lean too far in the direction of the Reality Principle - they're so far apart. If you pull them both together then you can happily (be) in touch with both. I think one has to be quite cautious here because the pleasures of which one is speaking are more (>'~& °1Y\~~~ intense than pleasures of a more refined kind, which are compatible with spiritual life and spiritual progress. It does not mean that one should have a good ~st round at the flesh-pots! (Laughter)

Gunapala: I could see how... art and music would play a big part, because most people do find ~lifting and positively supportive~

S.: But you know if one is finding the spiritual life unenjoyable, then one can~keep oneself going by force of will and some kind of intellectual conviction. But you ~an only do that for so~ong. I don't think you can carry on doing it indefinitely.

Cittapala: You get the impression in the initial stages of people's involvement with the FWBO is that they sort of have a little bit of Reality Principle and then a little bit of Pleasure Principle and they sort of oscillate between the two extremes rather than actually trying to bring them together.

S.: Well, the question arises, how can one bring them together? Or even, what does one mean by bringing them together? One could say in the context of meditation they will come together.

Devamitra: But if you don't actually experience meditation as pleasurable, then there's no possibility of that...?

Cittapala: Would this indicate, perhaps, the importance of such activities as . . . your going to concerts and things such as this?

S.: Well, again one has to be quite careful and quite mindful otherwise it just becomes a distraction and you forget the meaning and purpose of this type of thing. I think -also it's important that

spiritual meditation should be pleasurable from the beginning. That's why I think with beginners you shouldn't have them sitting long periods and getting very uncomfortable; lots of aches and pains. Otherwise you get the impression that meditation itself is difficult and not very pleasurable. I think it's quite important that beginners and people generally should have the impression that meditation is a pleasurable activity, as something which you enjoy. Not just a hard grind. So therefore, I think with beginners, you must be careful to keep the meditation periods short. Make sure that people are enjoying it - that they- are not suffering too much discomfort from their posture.

Gunapala: I do find without some sort of little lever, as it were, to become - happier or more positive before my meditation, it's very difficult to get into my when I've gone into the shrine room and sat down - work at it with my eyes closed if I'm in a distracted state and I've got my eyes closed - well, then, I find it really difficult.

S.: Some people find that if they read poetry every day it keeps them in touch with their emotions and they find meditation then more easy, or more easy to get into.

Gunapala: I mean most of us do find meditation quite a struggle..

S.: I think it's not such people find meditation a struggle. It's more that the conditions under which they try to meditate, that is to say, their conditions throughout the rest of the day are not very conducive to meditation. I don't think it's so much meditation itself that people usually find difficult. Do you see what I mean?

Gunapala: Yes. It's what's setting you up for your meditation.

sps

Harshaprabha: Maybe work does need to have an element of concentration in it?

Sangharakshita: Well, not only concentration. I mean at least an element of ..... if you can have some positive emotion and can carry over and feel pleased and happy to be meditating.. not after an enjoymentless day when you have to struggle with the meditation, hrrrn That isn't a very inspiring prospect.

(Long pause.)

Harshaprabha: Especially if you've got.. to go to a beginners class or support a beginners class.

Sangharakshita: I don't see why that should be especially painful; perhaps it is, I've never supported a beginners class. (Laughter, long pause.) Well, we seem to come up with this question of pleasure, which we have discussed quite a bit at the beginning of the course, I believe, didn't we?

Gunapala: We saw it as being the middle way or you did.'

Voices: Yeah.

Sangharakshita: ~LLL', (unclear) yes. (Long pause.) Anyway, let's carry on... (unclear)... this section.

Cittapala: "Thus he lives contemplating the body in the body internally, or he lives contemplating the body in the body externally, or he lives contemplating the body in the body internally and externally. He lives contemplating origination-factors in the body, or he lives contemplating dissolution-factors in the body, or he lives contemplating origination-and-dissolution factors in the body. Or his mindfulness is established with the thought 'The body exists' to the extent necessary for knowledge and mindfulness. And he lives detached and clings to nothing in the world. Thus also monks a monk lives contemplating

Sangharakshita: There's a note on contemplating the origination-factors and... and so on; it says: 'all contemplations of the body excepting the preceding one, have this practice of origination--ignorance, craving, karmas, food, and the general characteristic of ~~~~ALA' Hrrrn. The other words contemplation of the body.. you know.. involves essentially a recognition of the body's contingent character, its coming into existence in dependence upon causes and conditions, and it will go out of existence when those causes and conditions cease; so, it's ~~~~~\Cu~ ignorance and craving~brought the body into existence, its karmas, its food, and

Voice: What's the English translation of 'kamma'?

Sangharakshita: It is 'karma', that is to say, one's previous actions, hrrrn, of

~#r ~%1/4~ %Thb~&&\*~o'vN ~ M~c;t~C'1/2V~ ~

Q 1/4vwvY\O~ %cY ~%~ 1/4 C (~Ac1/4r% \k~1/2

dQ

sps

a skillful or unskillful nature. (Long pause.) So, this is in a way a sort of... you know. . vipassana practice, an insight practice. One is aware that.. .... the body arises in dependence on causes and conditions, the most general ones being ignorance and craving, and then more specifically the particular karma that has

brought about the existence of a human body, your human body of a certain kind. And then that human body brought into existence as a result of karma, is sustained, and depends you know .... food. (Pause.) I mean, this is a sort of reflection that one can do while eating in a way: that you are, you know,

Putting petrol into the engine, you know, perhaps, three times a day, four times a day, five times a day, otherwise it doesn't ca~ry on r~~~i"~ hum; so it's a conditioned thing, bIIIIn, you see every day how dependent upon causes and conditions for its continued existence it is. You may have your doubts about craving and ignorance. You may even have doubts about karma. But you can 't have your doubts about food.' You can see for yourself the body is sustained and dependent upon food. So it's, uh, clearly a conditioned phen~~on. It isn't an ultimate reality.

Though of course we sometimes treat it as though it was an ultimate reality. (-Long pause.) Once again, it would seem to be not only a question of one's own body, but other bodies too. (pause.) One contemplates them as contingent, as arising and continuing... continuing to exist in dependence on causes and conditions; this not being absolute--as having no real own being. (Pause.)

Patnaprabha: So in this case the internal and external, you think, is literally one's own body and other people's body, rather than regarding one's ~~~ from the inside as it were, or standing outside it (Sangharakshita: ':ktin) looking at it

Sangharakshita: Hrr~n I think that is more likely. (Pause.)

Ratnaprabha: Does that support the o~i~tator's idea that the same is true of the previous contemplation of the breath, that when it says 'internal and external', that also means one's own breath and other people's breath?

Sangharakshita: }~t~n, poss~ly, hnin. (pause.) It would seem that it's more helpful to regard other people's bodies as contingent than simply to regard other people's breaths as contingent, nrrrn, because if one, you know, thinks of other people's bodies as contingent, dependent on causes and conditions, well, presumably that lessens one's attach~t to them. It's a bit in line with the asubhabhavana. But in the case of breath that connection isn't quite so clear, though I suppose one could reflect that other beings, other bodies, are dependent on breath for their continued existence--and that might cease at any moment. (Very long pause,

apparently while Sangharakshita searches the text). Of course the text says, "Cr his mindfulness is established with the thought 'The body

i~o

exists' to the extent necessary just for knowledge and mindfulness. And he lives etac e an c ings to nou t in the ~~rld."

Hrrn. What does this suggest? (pause.) What could he be really saying here? (Pause.)

Cittapala: It might go back to what you were saying about people w ~~ o ,~~, overly concerned with being.. .with their ..... one just regards the body siitply as a vehicle. for.. spiritual development. (Pause.)

Gunapala: In that way you' ll start to see other bodies as well, as being just as iirportant as your own body. And going further than that, seeing the material world as, as being just as Thportant too; I mean you, you. . .it seems to be extending your feelings toward the material world for the development of, of mindfulness... knowledge. (Pause.)

Sangharakshita: Also, the, where it says, "Or his mindfulness is established with the thought 'The body exists'," hrrn, it is not put in the form 'My body exists', there is no question about mine, no question about I, it's just 'a body'; but not in the sense that you are alienated from your body, yeah? But that you have a sort of insight into its i~~personalit~~~, you see it more in terms of an i!personal process, you don't identify yourself with it. (Pause~) No doubt that' 5 very difficult to do because people do have this consciousness very strongly--'It's my body'. This is why you look after your body, and nobody else's. (Pause.)

Gunapala: Yeah, but uh I know with the emotional content with something, anything, (unclear) you tend to care for it...

Sangharakshita: Hrrrn, hrrrn, hIm.

Gunapala: . ~¶fl~y~it back to the emotions again~~~~ ~~~v'~ feeling for another person seems to break this down...

Sangharakshita: I think you have to be gtiite careful of what sort of feeling hIm? because when you sort of fall in love you can be very careful of the other person. But why is that? You are sort of projecting a portion of yourself, an aspect of your subconscious to that other person; so, in a sense, you are caring for that person as an extension of yourself hIm?, much as a mother does in the case of a baby, hrrrn? It isn't genuinely disinterested, en, it's your wife or your girlfriend, huh? Do you see what I mean? Just as it's your baby.

Gnnapala: You grow attached... (Sangharakshita: Yes) ... rather than detached.

Sangharakshita: Yes, so in a sense it's not a genuine caring for an other person. (Pause.) But in those cases where there is a genuine caring for ar&~ther person, and I'm not saying that there can't be some element of genuine caring, both for your own child, or for your own wife, or even for your own girlfriend, under exceptional circumstances. But, to the extent that that objective caring

[131]

is there, well, you know, then your awn sense of ego-identity does become lessened, satewhat reduced. But , apart fran the instances I mentioned, the child, the wife, the



girlfriend, or husband, or boyfriend, as the case may be, hmm? (pause) actual caring for other people is quite rare, isn't it? Unless you do it in a professional capacity as a doctor or nurse; I mean most people don't really care much for other people--caring in this sort of sense. Do you see what I mean? They don't really feel enough for other people to want to sort of look after them, or do anything for them, or really help them, hmm? That's comparatively rare actually. You sort of care for someone only when you know, you know.. .only when you've got a definite, vested emotional interest in that person; not otherwise, hmm?.. . You don't care for them because, you know, they need care. You care for them because you need them! (Long pause.) Like, you know, a precious piece of china you're fond of, it's worth a lot of money, you dust it very carefully.

Cittapala: (told you) it's quite difficult to, um, um, to actually enter into that sort of relationship, sort of objectively caring situation; it's almost as if you were sort of held off. (Sangharakshita: Yes.) I mean not that I have had great experience of it, I must admit.

Sangharakshita: I don't think.. . Maybe it's not so much being in that situation but just seeing particular occasions on which, you know, you can really be helpful. (Whenever) someone needs help or needs care, you just give them that. (Long pause.) But I've mentioned that in connection with the fact that I've observed... in communities, at meal times, people tend to look after themselves hmm? which is not even the case in ordinary, as it were polite society. You look after your neighbour, to some extent at least, even if it is only out of politeness, without any feeling; but in communities one often sees a lack in this respect. You know the sort of thing I mean? (pause.)

Suvajra: If there's no food somebody'll just make some food for themselves. (Sangharakshita: Hmm.) (Unclear.)

Sangharakshita: Even though as I mentioned in the lecture, someone not well and no-one caring for him. Women are sometimes in this respect better than men; but then it's just an extension of their sort of motherly feeling, and though that is objectively useful in its manifestations, it is not exactly what one is looking for.

Gunapala: It just seems so...I mean to feel a genuine feeling of...

(Sangharakshita: Hmm, hmm).. .that you cared for another person as like... you would for yourself a genuine feeling that yourself-the same sort of feeling that you would-like to do something for

someone else.

sps

Sangharakshita: Yes. (Unclear). Also I think maybe in our modern sort of civilisation, in our modern sort of society, in the case of men, there's a sort of almost social inhibition... that a man doesn't care... for people in that sort of way, that's what women do! You see what I mean? I think we've also got to fight that. For instance in a community someone might come in really sort of tired, sit down.. . and, well, it would be unlikely that some other community member ie a man, would say, "Can I get you a cup of tea?" Hmm I mean a woman 'night, quite naturally. But a man just doesn't think in quite that way usually. The sort of feeling isn't there to go and get someone who is tired, you know, a cup of tea. You might probably think, "If he wants a cup of tea, he'll go and make himself one." (Laughter.) Do you see what I mean? That's more natural I think, or usual, let's say, in the case of a man. A woman would more often than not just go and make a cup of tea, and bring it without even asking. She can see a cup of tea is needed, and she is happy to provide it, hmm?, or coffee, as the case may be. (Long pause.) Well, I've even found in some cases that men resent doing things for other men,

it's uh, I mean,...not only not very willing, but actually resentful if they find themselves in such a situation where they have to do, so to speak, you know, little things for other men; as though it puts them in a sort of inferior

in a woman's uh position which they don't like. (Pause.) So I think we've got a lot to learn in

this sort of area... caring for other people. And that is essential in the community. Otherwise the community feels bleak and cold and uncaring, and you start looking outside for your home comforts. It isn't just a question of when someone's very ill, hmm? You should be caring in this sense all the time, not waiting until they've got dysentery or something like that. (Pause.) Perhaps if you'd cared for them a little more they wouldn't have got dysentery... in the first place.

Gunapala: I haven't given it a lot of thought, but it seems quite helpful to think of... for me to think of other people's bodies as, as being... well... treating them similar to my own, as it were, and that... that I should try to develop a caring attitude in this way... (Sangharakshita: Hmm)... as if people are myself... that there is... an extension of this I, as it were... the world is mine in a sense. It's a good thing to develop... (Sangharakshita: Yes, yeah)... This attitude that the world is mine, and that I should look after it. And in this way sometimes there is an element of being attached to it, rather than detached. You are attaching yourself to the world.

Sangharakshita: In a positive way; well I point out that... one of the dakinis, one of the consorts (of) one of the five Buddhas, is Mamaki, which means 'motherhood'... the one... she's... the... consort, female Buddha if you like, who regards all beings, or everything as hers, as her own. Do you see what I mean? She doesn't make any distinction between what belongs to her and what belongs

sps

to others; between herself and others.

Gunapala: It's interesting to see that it's a woman projected in this way as well. (Laughter).

Sangharakshita: Perhaps one shouldn't take that too seriously. This is after all the transcendental level and we know another love is such that it (can) stifle and kill, hmm?

Ra~ha: Do you think it is a better direction... to approach... to getting over limited ego through regarding everything as one's own, rather than regarding oneself as non-existent, sort of thing.

Sangharakshita: Oh, I think so Yes, yes, especially for men, isn't it? I'm not sure what effect that would have on their, you know, overflowing maternal instinct, which sometimes is quite difficult to curb anyway. But certainly I think in the case of men it would be good to develop this attitude more; rather than exclusively the attitude of, well, I mean, nothing is mine. (One) could just as well think...

perhaps even better... that everything is mine, in this sort of sense. (Pause.) I think it is interesting that - this is a slight digression, maybe. In a family where you have a house keeper, in men's circumstances, where you have a house keeper who is of course a man, I think after a while in some cases he starts feeling the strain, hmm? Because the house keeper has to look after other people, and in a sense it isn't natural for a man to function in that sort of way, hmm? Not on the ordinary psychological level! So that if he remains on the psychological level I think he starts reacting against having to look after people in that sort of way after a while. He must definitely rise to a spiritual level, develop an attitude of spiritual care, if he wants to be able to continue to operate in that way. Do you see what I mean? I've noticed that house keepers don't seem to last very long. There may be other factors involved also, but I think this factor is relevant, too.

Cittapala: It seems a sort of fill-in job, rather than a ...

Sangharakshita: Htrn, yes. If someone is free for a few weeks, he may fill in as house keeper, till he gets something better. (Laughter.) But housekeeper actually is a very important job. Also, people have reported, especially I think in Sukhavati, that they tended to spend quite a lot of time with people, or people tended to spend quite a lot of time with them. People would always be drifting into the kitchen for a chat, you know, a bit of consolation. They felt a bit that they were being regarded as mother. Some didn't mind; some did mind, huh? (Laughter) But you don't often find a man with a strongly developed caring attitude towards other people, especially other men.

sps

I think it's relatively rare. The fact that it is rare, perhaps reflects on Conditioning in this respect. I'm talking about the West and especially about England. These remarks don't apply to India. They probably don't apply to lots of places. (Long Pause)

Suvajra: What about the Vihara? Did they have things like house-keepers?

S.: Oh, yes. In the Buddha's day, or soon after there was a distributor of food, a distributor of meal tickets. (Laugh) (Pause)

And in all big monasteries you have the cooks, especially the head cook. After all we're asking women to get over their conditioning, but men also have to get over their corresponding conditioning

Gunapala: It does sound very positive. It's a sort of conditioning which is very attractive - to develop a caring attitude for a

S.: Well you can't really have a happy, or fully satisfied community life without it. (Pause) And that means that you will be drawn outside the community for certain things (in that case), because you won't be finding everything you need within the community. You may not think very consciously in those terms. You may, you know, you just may want to get out. You feel vaguely dissatisfied with your community in certain respects; there is something missing, something lacking, that you feel you need sort of unconsciously you, move out or move away in search of it. You may start over-eating, sucking sweets.

Gunapala: I think for a lot of men it has been this lack of comfort, and I don't like to use the word femininity - something aesthetically more pleasing, whereas the community sometimes has or tends to be army-like, so that (S.: barracks) .. yeah, a bit too hard.

S.: Oh, in the past that was unavoidable in some cases, you know, - the question of money played a part too; but caring doesn't cost anything.

Gunapala: That's right, yeah... (unclear)

S.: You notice, I mean I certainly notice - don't know whether

sps i;,w~ ~

other people do? - that if you're served say, by a man, he serves you quite a different way from what a woman does. Have you ever noticed that? ~.... (unclear - laughter) A man would be more likely to just bang it down in front of you, whereas a woman gives it gently. Do you see what I mean~ probably doesn't even put a cup on a saucer. I noticed the difference, especially during the recent women's study retreat at padmaloka. I didn't have to tell them, or remind them about my tea time. They had all that worked out, and up came the tea on a little tray, with a little cloth, etc, etc. It didn't used to happen you know, when just the men were there. But I notice it does...has started happening here in the course of this course. So perhaps there is hope, you know, for the men in this respect. (Laughter) Even give me a little cloth on the tray.. extraordinary. I don't think it happened last year, no. It didn't happen last year. It has happened this year, so no doubt there has been some improvement in this respect, or a little more mindfulness, even.

Gunapala: I think it definitely is connected with this feeling of caring (S.: yes) or positive feelings for the person you are giving the cup of tea for, and therefore wanting to give them something a little bit more (S.: Do it ntely)- give yourself with it, with . bit more (S.: Yes) Giving a cup of tea and give yourself as well.

Cittapala: The only trouble about that is,.. you may not like personally like little clo\$~s on your trays . . .but I suppose,

you know, you just have to be that much more aware if somebody might.

S.: Yes, indeed', It's what's you know, generally regarded as a sign of thoughtfulness and care. In India they wouldn't put a little cloth on your tray. Of course, they're just not familiar with that sort of way of doing things. Well, they don't even have trays very often. But they'll certainly give you the tea, serve you the tea in a way which suggests great caring on their part. I mean,.. tea in India... they, in certain circles, to show their generosity so to speak, they over-fill it s~at it, a lot of it, runs off into the saucer. Or they put lots and lots of sugar in it. You have to sort of accept that. Or somet-Ames when they bring the tea to you, they'll carefully lift the cup off the saucer and pour what was in the saucer into the cup. And in some cases, they'll even sort of cool it for you by blowing on it. (Laughter)

sps /5(t%

Devamitra: This is all an expression of caring?

S.: Yes, yes. So you might not even like that sort ~ thing. (Laughter) You accept it for what it is - a\$expression of caring. But obviously, if they know you well enough, they'll be sensitive to the way you like things.. different fro heir particular way of doing things. In India people even lea ned to put the milk into the cup before pouring the tea, which~hey don't do themselves. But I had this almost everywhere I went... (Unclear) ... Lokamitra had told them about it beforehand (Laughter - unclear) ... great fear of Lokamitra. I used to get my tea in this sort of way... which I never got before, hmm? (Pause) So when you try to do somet~ing in a caring way, you do try to please the oth~person. It's not necessarily doing it in your way, according to your ideas of caring; carinct~ means considering an objective need, or even an objective liking or disliking - it may not be (actually, a matter of need). (Long Pause)

You know, we got into the question of caring from the con- sideration of ther peoplels bodies, I think, hmm? (Pause) I mean, they may be~continaent phenornena, but there's no reason why we shouldn't treat them carefully, and up to a point, as though they were your own body.

Gunapala: I think the main point comes from.. happiness, detached... (S.: Yes, yes)...if we're not careful, that we don't just sort of detach ourselves from other living beings.

S.: Then your attention isn't exclusively directed to he care and nourishment of your own body. You have some care or the bodies of other people, too, for bodies in general. (Long pause)

Gunapala: For me, so far, it seems like.. mainly as the Hinayana approach.. there is a lack of looking towards emotions, or posit- ivity - they have taken that for granted (S.: Yes) . . as if that is there, and haven't mentioned it.

S.: Yes, haven't felt any need to mention i~specifically.

Gunapala: Maybe that was the case.

S.: It would seem to have been, hmm? (Long Pause) But someone mentioned about f~mininity in the community with regard. ...

sps

Now that this course is drawing practically to an end, only a few more days left - I mean how have people found it in this respect? Have they missed the feminine element? I don't mean feminine element as necessarily attached to the ()\siological woman, but feminine element in general as a sort of psychological feature. Have people been conscious of any lack or has it been there anyway?

Gunapala: I've felt it in myself, - it started developing as if I am starting to develop a more...more care for other people, more feeling for other people. And so, in this sense (Unclear)

.with femininity.. I'm starting to feel for other people in the way we've been talking (S.: Hmm, hmm)

Cittapala: Appreciating it in others, other men.. you can see it more, sort of sharply...

Gunapala: I mean, I never had so many gifts on my birthday before. (Laughter) I got lots of cards and chocolates and lollies - so that does stand out - than in most communities in the past, you know. Most people don't remember that it was my birthday, or, if they do~ you know, it was just 'happy birthday'. They never go out and paint me a card or actually put a lot of effort into it. So this really stood out.

S.: Hmm. That's again.. women are much better at this sort of thing usually, - they usually remember birthdays and send cards much more than men do.

Cunapala: I sort of relate femininity to this type of thing.

S.: It's all to do with relating and communication - the personal touch, as it were. (Long Pause) Well, in a few minutes someone is going to have a wonderful opportunity to express caring.

Gunapala: You mustn't forget the cloth.' (laughter)

S.: I only want one cup of tea, not eight. {laughter}

Ratnaprahha: Make sure it overflows into the saucer:

sps 11 I~w2

S.: Perhaps we'd better not get on to the next section until after we've had our tea. (long pause)

Devamitra: You've been talking about the .. (pause) well the absence of these sort of qualities amongst, °. well amongst men men order members specifically for quite a while now.

S: Oh dear, I hope I haven't been repeating myself too much!

Devamitra: You've seemed to really make the point of it very strongly at the convention two years ago.

S: I'd forgotten about that, did I?

Devamitra: Yes. You've actually.. you've actually .. gone into it many times since I've heard you make so many. I just wondered °gf during those two years, when you have been emphasizing it a lot, if you've seen any signs of improvement?

S.: I did. I must say there has been some improvement. It hasn't been spectacular. And it clearly .. people find it quite hard, that is to say, men find it quite hard .. h'mm? But there has been some change° But there's room for a lot more.

Devamitra: (It's just that N I've heardy~uOn1~~~Ut~ this

is the first time I've (actually) heard you say there has things have changed a little bit .. (laughter). At the end of two years (unclear) .. labouring under this sort of problem of developing these caring attitudes and (you can't (unclear) in inverted commas). Just a little bit encouraging that there's a slight improvement!

Suvajra: I've often noticed that men don't (usually) get an opportunity to express caring.

S.: You mean that woman get in there first with their cups of tea?

Suvajra: No, no, no; but (the) men will reject a cup of tea if it's presented .. you know .. too carefully .. not just a cup of tea, but if you show a caring attitude, you quite often get a

sps 1/4)

you know

S.: They might think you're gay.' (much laughter) (He's careful) therefore he's feminine; therefore he's (ef)feminate; therefore there's something a bit doubtful, you've got to be a bit~careful of him So, if you do offer them a cup of tea in that sort of way, you know, 9ent~, graceful, (unclear), you might just get a grunt or something of that sort. (laughter)

Chittapala: Well, that's traditionally what women have received anyway. (S: pardon?) That's traditionally what a woman receives for her pains, ~n any event.

S: Yes- but, yes, yes. Well maybe she'd take the grunt as a compliment; (laughter) a grunt of appreciation. (pause)

Devamitra: Yes, if they treat you like a woman it means you ... they think that you~e, you know ... slightly (one word unclear).

Gtw~~~ I suppose that would mean in effect, you know, the fact that one has to be much more open to people trying to develop this caring feeling excepting that the men. (S.: They over-do it sometimes) A few tentative moves in this area, like blowing on your tea.

S.: I thought you were going to say, 'blowing you~a kiss'? (laughter)

Chittapala: That's certainly happened on this course:

S.: No doubt from a safe distance. (laughter) (reply unclear) (ignore laughter) You'd better not tell them that when you get back home. (laughter) Anyway?

Ratnaprabha: Does anyone not want tea?

Devamitra: I would like...

S.: Does anyone not want to be cared for? (laughter)



S: Part 3. 'Mindfulness with Clear Comprehension'

Harshaprabha: "Mindfulness with Clear Comprehension.

And further, monks, a monk, in going forward and back, applies clear comprehension; in looking straight on and looking away, he applies clear comprehension; in bending and in stretching, he applies clear comprehension; in wearing robes and carrying the bowl, he applies clear comprehension; in eating, drinking, chewing and savouring, he applies clear comprehension; in attending to the calls of nature, he applies clear comprehension; in walking, in standing, in sitting, in falling asleep, in waking in speaking and in keeping silence, he applies clear comprehension.

Thus he lives contemplating the body in the body..."

S.: This reminds me of something that we discussed some weeks ago, it must have been in connection with a question and answer session. Yes, this, this question of the additional~think fifth

method of controlling thoughts, h'mm, in controlling unskillful mental L~ t~~~~e~C~~  
~Ax~~~~~ \w'~T~~ ~~~t~ states. One asks oneself, 'we 1 why am I doing this!'. Do you remember that? (h'mm)

Suvajra: I remember us discussing it.

S.: Do you remember that situation in the village? You find yourself involved in something and maybe you, you've been involved with not much awareness, and maybe it's a bit unskillful. You just suddenly ask yourself 'Why on earth am I involved in this? Why am I doing this?' As though suddenly your eyes are~#ened; so this clear comprehension is (pause) that sort of understanding of why you are doing something, its meaning, its purpose. (pause)

Gunapala: The list is just all activities of life basically, isn't it? (S.: Yes) It runs through a list of activities.

S.: Right, yes, bending and stretching, wearing robes, carrying bowls, all these things, eating, drinking, chewing, savouring, attending to the calls of nature, walking, standing, sitting, falling asleep, waking, speaking, keeping silence, h'mm. You know what you are doing, which '~\o~~)½Z~ or includes knowing why you are doing it; the meaning of the action (h'mm). (pause)

[141]

S.: I mean one can take as an example, just eating, hm? - eating drinking, chewing and

savouring, hm? You know why you~o this. You know why you're eating. You're eating to sustain the strength of the body; eating to keep yourself in good health; eating so that you can practice the dharma; eating so that you can develop spiritually. ... So this prevents you from over-eating, or from indulging unnecessarily. It reminds you of the purpose of eating. The purpose of eating is not to satisfy our unskilful or neur-otic cravings, hm?. The purpose of eating is something objective - to sustain life so that you can get on with the spiritual practice and so on...

Ratnaprabha: Should we try to do this all the time, or is this a specific practice that helps us to. ...

S.: I think the suggestion is that one should be doing this all the time. That is the practice in a way. All your activities should be purposeful, of course not in a narrow sense. Hmm? There must be room for playfulness, or spontaneity. Not that there is a very rigidly defined goal to keep us strictly to the path - leading directly to that. You mustn't see it quite in those terms, hm? (Pause) But~ if one's aim is something like Enlightenment, it's important that all one's activities should be seen as having some bearing on that, hm? - as somehow related to that. So inasmuch as that is the purpose of one's life, it is the purpose of all one's activities. All one's activities should be related to that in some way or other, as for instance that of eating, (hm?)

Voice: I mean I can see how the pleasure of eating too can apply to the goal (S.: Hmm) in the sense that you need this pleasure...

S.: You need the pleasure element as well... (unclear), to sustain your life, your enthusiasm or interest.

Voice: So that food should be tasty...

S.: Yes, well presented - well served.

Voice: It's all part of why (it's like that) for the goal...

S.: I think that if food is well presented and well served, you require.. you rely less and less on sheer - on mere bulk, on

sps

quantity for your satisfaction, because you derive a certain satisfaction, aesthetic satisfaction

from the way it is presented,- all that. Do you see what I mean? Or do you think this is being a bit unrealistic? (Hmm?)

Cittapala: Well (unclear) there's a rage in France called 'Nouveau Cuisine' which presents infinite, infinitely small amounts of food - almost as pictures on a plate. And you feel as if you've not eaten anything... (unclear)

S.: It doesn't work then, does it?

Cittapala: Well, I suppose that just reflects ~~ impression of it. But it seems, you know, watching~people in the restaurant where I was eating, that they were perfectly satisfied to be paying large amounts...

S.: Perhaps they had a good meal before coming... (Laughter)

Cittapala: I hadn't thought of that.

Gunapala: It's just the fact that eating for pleasure as well... could be understood...

S.: But it does; I'm sure it makes a difference to your overall satisfaction of a meal if, for instance, there's a clean table- cloth on the table and a bowl of flowers and the crockery is attractive and well- designed, aesthetically pleasing; and you're not getting your satisfaction just out of the food. (Pause) And if it's served by, you know, attractive-looking people, nicely dressed - I mean that also presumably makes a difference, in very pleasant surroundings - a little music in the distance. Maybe that's carrying it a bit too far.

Gunapala: I mean I think that's probably why, I mean I know a lot of people that like to go out for a meal - say on - say they might have an Order evening, or just ~couple of fr:~~;ids will go out for a meal. I'm sure, quite often, it's because the pleasure in being served, and having nice table-cloths, and flowers and nice cutlery and food presented well - light music in the background, candlelight.

sps

S.: Someone ought to have all that in one's own community. ~La~ghter)

Voice: If you can understand that it is needed, or desirable, or actually conducive.

S.: Obviously there is a question of expense also. But one can at least, if one can't afford to - snowy white tablecloths, flow- ers, at least the table can be clean; things could be neatly arranged. At least that! which is also aesthetically satisfy- ing. I mean, (it took a) long time, though again it was partly due to financial difficulties, to do a bit of decorating in the Sukhavati community, hm? ... even though it was a question of expense to some extent. . .but people seemed to be taking a long time to getting around to making their own living conditions, even moderately pleasant and agreeable.

Cittapala: (It's a) question of priority. It's quite interesting when we came here (S.: Hm?) how quickly some people would manage to make, you know, what was an apparent pig-sty, into something that was really nice.

S.: A little boudoir, almost (Laughter) Yes, and as you pass by people's doors, and have a little glimpse through half-opened doors - it's amazing what you see inside - it's just like home. (Laughter)

Gunapala: I've heard people say, you know, they'd never lived +ke~~ ~v'~~ Th~4k& L11~~ so well in all th~r lives...never felt so much at home (Un~lcar).

They've got everything just neatly arranged.. everything they need. They really feel satisfied with their accomodation.

S.: That's very interesting, because one would have thought that those from communities could have lived in that way before, in fact (unclear).

Ratnaprabha: We don't have so much clutter here, I think that helps alot. (S.: Hmm, yes)

Gunapala: Of course we 've got no way of going out and getting thin~s which would be cluttered, either. (S.: Yes, right.) We're only left with the basics.

sps 14¼

Harshaprabha: The surroundings are much more be~utiful as well, there's less...

S.: The general surroundings? Yes. That's true, (Pause) Anyway, any further point arising out of that section? You see, one even falls asleep with clear comprehension. How does one fall asleep with clear comprehension?

Richard:        You know you're tired...

S.: You know you're tired. You know when it's time to go to bed, hm? For instance if you know that you've got to be up in the morning at 6:30 for meditation, you know, your clear comprehension takes the form of making sure that you get to bed in good time so that you have sufficient sleep and don't feel tempted to lie in in the morning. (Pause) Waking; speaking; keeping silence; you speak with a purpose. You don't indulge in idle chatter. Nor do you keep silence when speech is appropriate. (Long Pause)

Hang on for a minute and we'll go on to section four. Before we go on to the next section, there is this question of, you know, clear comprehension in general, hmm? That is to say, in the midst of a, say, multiplicity of activities, not to lose sight of one's overall goal and purpose, hmm? This is what clear comprehension essentially consists in. For instance, when you're working in a co-op, it's very easy to forget why you are working in a co-op. It's very easy to forget that you are working in a co-op because you want to practise right livelihood, or perfect livelihood even, - because you want to follow the Noble Eight-Fold Path. You want to follow the Noble Eight-Fold Path because you are aiming at Enlightenment, hmm? (Long Pause - to check if recorder is operating)~V:I think it's alright actually, you can carry on. . It is recording, it was actually recording- Sorry I interrupted you)

S.: Anyway, it wasn't anything more than that, hm? But that is an important point (Pause) that one shouldn't lose sight of one's over-all goal and purpose, it is quite easy to do that.

Surata: You mentioned this before. It's like this thing of whatever you're about to do asking yourself whether it's actually 4;c~vNTh~c~i)!/4 for your growth and development

S.:        Yes, yes.

Richard:        It's a bit more directed.

sps        ii')?

S.: Because I can remember someone saying, might have been in a "reporting-in", that he was working in one of, I don't know whether it was, Friends Foods, in London or West London, or whether it was West London, or Croydon, or, anyway, someone was working in something or other 'foods', hmm? and he'd been packing beans day after day, and it sort of suddenly dawned on him after he was... "well, why am I packing these beans? How did I sort of get here into this situation?" and he started thinking, "well, I joined the FWBO" - I'm not sure whether he was an Order Member or not, I can't remember, but the reason was to gain enlightenment. "What's packing beans got to do with it? How did I find myself in this position? I had the idea of gaining enlightenment, but I found myself packing beans. What's the connection?" Hmm? So he had to sort of think it all out, hmm? He found that he'd lost contact for the time being at least with his original purpose, his original goal. He'd forgotten about that. It became more and more immersed in the co-op, more and more immersed in the food, more and more immersed in packing beans.

Gunapala: I think keeping an extended comprehension or view on our over-all goal is very difficult. To have immediate goals seems to be the way most of us operate and that we...

S.: Yes, yes, yes. One just needs to review those from time to time.

Gunapala: Working in this co-operative towards right livelihood, you know and tend to connect it all the way to enlightenment. fr~\s &~~&~vw ~~V'~.

S.: Oh, one needs to do that from time to time, otherwise, if you forget the over-all reason for your being engaged in that particular activity~ ~ the course of following that particular activity you may do things which are quite incompatible actually with your ultimate goal. Do you see what I mean? I mean, for instance, take this question of packing beans, hmm? Well, you may~ust forget about right livelihood and enlightenment, and you ayj ust concentrate on packing beans. You may just concentrate on packing as quickly as possible, packing as many packets as you possibly can in the course of a day, and make it very, very, speedy, and make yourself quite out of touch with yourself and your emotions and are unable to meditate, hmm?

So you make the packing of beans an end in itself, which isn't desirable. So one has to, you know, bear in mind the over-all goal

sps

in order to avoid doing that. Or you may be, you know, concerned with some other area of work, and you may be very concerned with putting that properly. And you may get annoyed with other people because you feel they're not pulling their weight, or they're not helping. You may get angry with them. But does that help in the long run if you are thinking of enlightenment?.. that you get angry with other people, even if it is in the interest of the particular job that you are doing? Supposedly if you are, in the case of that job, in the interests of your future enlightenment, hmm?

Cittapala: It seems that in planning out things it's possible to work logically back from enlightenment, (rather) .. but at the same time you've got one or two sort of objective r'~'o such as trying to provide food for yourself... (S.: Yes, hm, yes) and things like this which seem to go, doesn't it? I mean to actually... a co-operative, one of its desires is to make a lot of money (S.: Hm, yes.) and to make a lot of money you have to really put yourself into work, say, for three or four years, and to keep your feeling for the goal (S.: Hm, yes) or enlightenment a feeling. It v9~esn't matter how often you tell yourself "I'm doing this for enlightenment" to actually have a feelincr that I'm working in this co-op to .. producing more, .. for the welfare and so forth...is another story, you know, seems almost impossible.

S.: Well, perhaps one should se a shorter term goal. I think people can feel they're working for a 5 rt of spiritual purpose, more easily and say, they're working to send themselves to

Tuscany, or to send somebody else to Tuscany - that is a shorter-term goal. Something that you actually see in the process of being realized, and you can see also the objective spiritual benefits, either for one's self or for other people.

~~,una~ala:I've found that works especially if I'm getting a centre open or decorations, or supporting a specific area like that. In the past that's worked quite well.. I can keep my feelings involved with it and see it through quite well.

S.: So one does need immediate goals - not too immediate - between the ultimate goal and the aim of which you are at present trying to achieve in a narrower sense. (Pause)

sps

Richard: Seems to have been a very ..one of the essential Practices in the success for the Aid for India campaign...

S.: Hmm. In what way?

Richard: Well, setting targets and encouraging people to keep up to them.

S.: Yes.

Richard: It seems that you can actually stretch yourself quite a bit further than what one originally...

S.: Yes. If the target is too distant and impossible you won't feel like stretching yourself but you feel, "Well, you're not going to get there" - even if someone in Aid for India says, "Well, come on, £50 million we're going to raise! Well, no one's going to give LA)~LO ~~~( themselves to raising £50 million because they~ be able to believe it can be done but if someone says, "Oh well, half a million!1, they could do that.. that is feasible, hm. Well we are~oin~ that actually! In fact we're doing more than that. You may not be able to think very seriously in terms of building your 'pure land' in the sky, so to speak, as ~~~~~? did. There was from the time that he was Bhikkhu (Dironkaya).. If someone says, "well, build a Sukhavati; build a happy-land here on earth. Turn your fire station into a Sukhavati", well, you could just about do that. That was just about done. That really did stretch everybody concerned. Just about managed it absolut~ly by the skin of their teeth. But it was something that they could conceive being actually done, that is, most of the time!~ ~ome of them could conceive it being done~ Others just didn't even think about it, - they just plodded on doing whatever job was to be done, hoping, you know, it would be open someday! So of course it was!

So you need sort of proximate goals - maybe a series of prox- imate goals - stretching all the way from where you are now to en- lightenment itself. But just from where you are now to contemplate enlightenment is probably too much!! It's too nebulous, in a sense too vague, too abstract, even. Whatever it may be in itself. That's why perhaps it's better to think in terms of Stream Entry or in terms of setting-up a Centre - think in terms of bringing out a book. These are all proximate goals which we can set for ourselves, which

we can achieve. And that sort of achievement creates optimism and

sps 1%

confidence. You can set yourself further, more demanding goals. In that way you make progress. So goal-setting is important. Target- setting is important. Even though one does not want to be, you know, goal-oriented in too narrow, or exclusive or compulsive a fashion. (Pause)

Devamitra: I gue~that's all an aspect of the stage by stage teaching

S.: Yes.

Ratnaprabha: So what would be this compulsive goal orientation? What could go wrong if you're over-goal-oriented?

S.: Well, the achieving of goals for its own sake becomes important tokou personally in a neurotic sort of way. You need that constant re-assurance, hm?

Devamitra: An ove#pendence on success.

S.: Yes, yes, yes. Or being over-upset by failure. That's the corollary.

Gunapala: We're always upset by failure, usually always uplifted by success.

S.: Yes. But that is natural, but not beyond a certain point. If you're devastated by failure, that shows there is some wrong element there, or i~ success makes you w~ excited, that shows that some- thing's wrong. You're attaching too much importance to it!

Cittapala: Would you say it is fair to say that possibly the lack of sort of organizational



ability - if there is one - in some of the Friends' operations, have been due to lack of realistic target- setting and sort of being able to estimate whether one is achieving one's goals or not?

S.: Yes, yes. I think it may be lack of objective criteria. (Pause)

Cittapala: Seems to be quite a difficult skill to acquire.

S.: Say in the case of a business you've got a very effective rough and ready criterion and that is whether you're making money!

sps

The Proof that you are making money is that you can hand over money every week or every month to your centre, the centre to which you are affiliated. (Long Pause)

It is, I think, good to set oneself tangible targets. I mean, for instance, if you're going to embark on a course of study, say to yourself, "In the course of a year, you're going to get through 30 books!" which you've selected in advance and which cover a certain field and, you know, set yourself a target of reading them all carefully in the course of one year. And at the end of the year when you've done that, you'll have a certain sense of satisfaction, a sort of Positive feeling of achievement. You'll be encouraged to carry on in that sort of way. (Long Pause)

Gunapala: It seems to me to be getting at a clear comprehension that stretches further than you know, that it is stretched at least if not to enlightenment, - that there is this expansion into the future and probably into the past so you have this expanded view of where you are going, what you have done, where you have been - a vanishing point.

S.: Yes. Yesterday we talked about people telling their autobiographies - their telling their life-stories, yeah? and I had it in mind to say at the time but it got lost somewhere in the discussion, when I listened to peoples' life-stories - and of course I've listened now to, how many people on the course? (Voices: 28), twenty-eight life-stories (Laughter) and it really was quite extraordinary that, in almost all cases, if not in all cases, the way in which people's progression in the direction of the Friends seemed inevitable, almost from the fact they were born, huh, as though there was a sort of implicit goal, a goal implicit in everything that they did which gradually became clearer and clearer to them as they progressed - as they became older, or they experienced more of life. What they really wanted to do became more and more clear to them.

Devamitra: Do you think that in a way would imply a previous connection with the Dharma or do you think that, perhaps, you know, you could see that trend in most peoples' lives, if only they'd had the opportunity of coming into contact with the Dharma?

S.: Well, one could say that it's a trend in human life, in human nature, in human existence itself. But you could be quite easily in some cases, tempted to feel that there may have been a previous

sps

connection to the dharma. I mean, I think it was Vajrananda, in reporting-in, referred to his brothers. I think he'd got seven of them, something fantastic like that! He says there's not one that's straight - straight meaning conventional - not one that's conventional among them. And he can't help wondering whether they hadn't all been together in a previous life and all born, sort of reincarnated together as brothers, you know, in the same family. (Long Pause) But very often you don't understand the path that your life is taking until after, when you look back and review it, and you can then see in retrospect where it was all leading but very often you don't see it at the time. Perhaps you don't have any idea at all at the time but it seems very clear afterwards in many cases. (Pause)

Gunapala: To me it seems the only way we can know where we're going, the only sort of view of the direction we're heading in by looking at our...

S.: Yes. It's as though one's life has a sort of direction of its own almost independent over your conscious volition sometimes, but when that direction does emerge into consciousness then it becomes intensified and you pursue that direction even more rigorously, because now you have a clear comprehension of it. One could say, in the case of all human beings, the implicit reason for their existence is to grow, to evolve, to develop. (Pause)

Ratnaprabha: Do you think people ever actually try and fight this direction when they are beginning to become aware of it? They don't like it and try and move in the opposite direction?

S.: I think in some cases they do. Sometimes, one can see the struggle going on. Sometimes they are aided and abetted by circumstances, not to say other people, who don't want them to move in that direction.

Gunapala: You often see people with a hook in their throat as it were, and they can't get it out and they can't swallow it. That's quite common.

S.: Yes, sometimes they remain in that condition for years.

Gunapala: Very often it's usually the FWBO stuck in their throat...

S.: Or the Indian equivalent of that comparison is that it's like a snake that swallows a frog. He can't vomit it up because of

sps

S        his curved back, but at the same time he can't really get it down. It's just sort of stuck there. In this case the r=rog is the FWB0 or maybe the snake is the FWBO and he won't go right the way down - vomitted it up. (Pause) Anyway, let's go on to the Reflection on the Repulsiveness of the Body. Read all that section 4, we can consider it as a whole:

Gunapala: 4. "The Reflection on the Repulsiveness of the Body And further, monks, a monk reflects on this very body enveloped

by the skin and full of manifold impurity, from the soles up, and from the top of the head-hair down, thinking thus: 'There are in this body hair of the head, hair of the body, nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinews, bone, marrow, kidney, heart liver, midriff, spleen, lungs, intestines, mesentery, gorge, faeces, bile, phlegm, pus, blood, sweat, fat, tears, grease, saliva, nasal mucus, synovial fluid, urine

Just as if there were a double-mouthed provision bag full of various kinds of grain such as hill paddy, paddy, green gram, cow-peas, sesamum, and husked rice, and a man with sound eyes, having opened the bag, were to take stock of the contents thus: - This is hill paddy, this is green gram, this is cow-pea, this is sesamum, this is husked rice. Just so, monks, a monk reflects on this very body enveloped by the skin and full of manifold impurity, from the soles up, and from the top of the head-hair down, thinking thus: There are in this body hair of the head, hair of the body, nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinews, bones, marrow, kidney, heart, liver, midriff, spleen, lungs, intestines, mesentery, gorge, faeces, bile, phlegm, pus, blood, sweat, fat, tears, grease, saliva, nasal mucus, synovial fluid, urine.

Thus he lives contemplating the body in the body..."

S.:        These are the famous 32 parts of the body. It's to be recited like a sort of Litany, you know (Kaisar, Loma, Dantu, Taccho, Naccho) and you say these over and over again to yourself on certain occasions. So the 32 parts of the body. So what's the purpose of this reflection on the repulsiveness of the body? Does one really feel it's repulsive anyway?

Gunapala:        Didn't even know what some of these things were. (Laughter) I didn't even know...

Devamitra: I must say, when I think about it, I do think it is, yes...

S.:        Hm, hm. They don't really seem very nice, some of them - do they? You've got pus and sweat, grease...

sps

Cittapala: But if you look at them just objectively, why should they be nice or nasty?

S.: But is one meant to look at them objectively?

Ilarshaprabha: I don't know.

S.: It seems to be a case of, you know, bending the bamboo the ~ther way. Do you see what I mean? You're not actually seeing them objectively; you're seeing them in this way. If you see them as re- pulsive. The thing is you usually see them as over-attractive. You concentrate more on the attractive aspects of the body, ignoring the un-attractive. The idea seems to be to get you to adopt a more neutral as it were, a more truly objective view by drawing your attention to the more repulsive aspects of the body, or what one would normally experience as more repulsive (Pause) . I mean sometimes the Theravada tradition gives the impression that the repulsiveness of the body is real, and the attractiveness of the body is unreal, is a sort of illusion. But one can't really see things in those terms be- cause attractiveness and repulsiveness are both quite subjective terms, hmm? In the ultimate sense you should be no more repulsed than attracted, hmm? I mean, for instance, years ago, I had staying with in~ in Kalimpong, an English Buddhist who was a doctor, a medical man, and he was reading through the Visudhi-Magga and he came across Buddhaghosa's explanation or description of the process of digestion. And Buddhaghosa was describing the process of digestion, I think it was under the heading of the contemplation of the loathesomeness of food, hm? - that you know, you toss these great lumps of coarse, heavy matter into your mouth and then these coarse, heavy lumps would descend into the stomach and all sort of unspeakable things happen to them there. And then Buddhaghosa goes through the whole process, the whole disgusting process with great gusto, which really puts you off food - puts you off eating. Well, this doctor friend of mine became really indignant with Buddhaghosa. He said, "Well, Buddhaghosa just hasn't understood the digestive process. If you really studied it you would really understand it is beautiful, it's a beautiful process." He didn't see it as disgusting at all. He was absolutely fascinated with it. He thought it was wonderful and beautiful. Do you see what I mean? So if you ~~~~~ in terms of the repulsiveness of the body, that is a subjective even a one-sided attitude, but you cultivate that really, I imagine, to counter-act your usual attitude - which is one of attraction for the body - one's own or other people's... think- ing it's wonderful and beautiful and all the rest of it.

sps

Richard: I think it's quite a positive sort of - it's sort of how all these parts of the body work together just to take care that that function continues to work well.

S.: Do you think this sort of approach works with people now-a-days? This is very strongly insisted upon in a one-sided way by the Thera- vada tradition; because especially these words, "Just so Monks, a monk reflects on this very body enveloped by skin and full of manifold impurity", hmm.

Cittapala: I think it does work at least in my experience. When we went to a hospital, on a

hospital visit to a lung hospital, where people were suffering from cancer of the lung from smoking an~ showing people the diseased lungs, the catarrh and so on and so forth which had come out of people who had died from this. It really had quite a significant effect upon people who'd seen it.

S.: Yes, especially smokers

Cittapala: Yes, and they could actually identify that they were seeing was actually inside them...

S.: I can remember when I was in my early teens, I used to go along to a Baptist church. There was a sort of young boys' Yeekly meeting. And I remember on one of these occasions they had a talk by someone, I think it was a medical student. But he'd got hold of a medical book with all sorts of pictures vividly coloured, of all different kinds of venereal diseases. lie showed us these and this was supposed to put us off sex, hmm? - by showing us the horrible consequences of sexual promiscuity and all the rest of it. I don't know what effect it had on people in the long run (Laughter). But I suppose one can adopt this sort of approach in certain cases. (Pause) But I think I'd be careful it doesn't result in a general cynicism (Pause). I mean medical students are well acquainted with the impurity of the body, they ..quite a dreadful

(END OF TAPE 7 Side 2)

i

THE SATIFPATTHANA SUTTA SEMINAR

S        your e trying to see, in a more generally objective way, that there is another side to the picture.

Gunapala: I must admit, since becoming a Buddhist, and, walking into a butcher's shop, or walking through a market where there's you know, stalls stacked high with fish and lobsters, oysters, different types of meat, animals, carcasses hanging up, that I ve had, the experience of almost vomiting, and feeling really sickened by it, just the smell, especially, I've .... I can hardly, you know, I ve had to get out quite quickly, I feel almost suffocated by     the stench of it and in that sense I'm really repulsed. But that's not always been my experience, I mean as a child, and in my teens, you know, I was always experienc)r)     , dead animals - we used to kill our own sheep ... and I've handled dead animals, things like that, alot as a teenager, but since I ve become a Buddhist, I do find....

S: But what, what is it that you're more sensitive to, or what is it that you're finding, as it were, more repulsive? Is it the actual blood, is it the actual. . .dead body, or is it the idea that they've been killed for human consu:nption? Is it the cruelty, or what is it?

Gunapala:     , I couldn't ... all I got was the feeling.

S: Yes.

Gunapala: ... and the thought that I was about, almost about to be sick, and I couldn't actually, in one part, I couldn't

walk in the direction I had planned to walk in, I had to turn off and go around it - because I thought I was going to be sick.... and....

S: I can remember as a boy, when I used to go out shopping with my mother, I wouldn't go into a butcher's shop, even then - long before I'd heard about Buddhism, I just didn't like the smell.

Gunapala: It was the smell. ...

S: It is something to do with I with shed blood, I think But why one should find shed blood unpleasant, well that's another matter. I mean, not everybody does... animals don't and perhaps primitive human beings don't - or do, I don't even know.

Gunapala: Well, as a child I didn't, and as a teenager I didn't.

S: I certainly did as a child, and, I mean, I could go into a butcher's shop now, but I'd have to steel myself to do it.

~finitely an unpleasant experience that I'd sort of go through with if it were necessary in the line of duty, so to speak, yes?

Gunapala: All I can think of now, is that I must have been able to relate some feeling to what I saw on the benches, you know, I would see a pig's head or something, and I would have some feeling for that pig, you know, to see it there with just its head really upset me - and so forth, and with all the other animals like that, so, that I could relate some feeling ... for them... in that way.

S: Well of course one is meant, in the case of this type of reflection, to apply this to the actual physical bodies of other people that you're likely to be attracted to, very strongly, in order to mitigate that attraction. (Then again) if you're the man, well, or it applies or is meant to be applied, to the bodies of women, to lessen your sort of sexual passion. But does one find it works in this way? (Pause)

C,

Suvajra: Yes.

S: I mean, the classic sort of approach is the, well .... one thinks that, well, this woman isn't really attractive, she's really all ... well, a bag o~ impurities. (Laughter) I mean, one canY\o~ deny that those actual things are there. One wouldn't probably like to handle them separately. Would one like to hand ... her liver, or handle her gorge, whatever that is (Laughter) .... If women hav a gorge (Laughter) ... (If any one of us have got that). But would one like to, sort of dabble one's fingers in her ... navel mucous, or something? (Laughter) ... Etcetera, (few words hidden by laughter). But one apparently likes to take the whole bundle . -. in one's arms, you know. (Laughter).

You know, does it work to reflect like this, or is it ev~a skillful thing to do?

Suvajra: - ... I've done it, and I found it's ... it worked remarkably quick.

S: That's what puts you off women then! (Much laughter). (Really don't mean that, really) (Laughter continues)

Suvajra: I have to (few words unclear) . every morning. (Laughter) (Pause) Within, within just maybe, two or three times of doing it... it actually worked.

S: Because, acutally when one is in contact with another person physically, one doesn't actually come into direct contact - you know with all these organs, one comes into contact with the skin, usually, and that is often quite pleasant, yes? So it requires an effort of imagination to, to realise that one is also in contact with these other ~hings - and if that particular person was to die on the spot, well you'd ... well you'd just, you know, drop them as quickly as you possibly could, probably, yeh? (Pause) But, again, is this a skillful way of looking at the matter? One might even question that. Some people perhaps, certainly would

~ala: .... but what would our attitude be towards that person if we saw them in this way? What would our feelings be

S: But (virtually) bodies as you would recount them and as you are attracted by them aren't just bodies?

Gunapala: That's true.

S: I mean, clearly, - - , even though there is the strong urge, say for physical contact, all that sort of thing, it can't be just the physical body. Otherwise, presumably you'd be just as attracted by it after death, which actually you aren't eh? I mean,th ere is such a thing as revo.... what do they call it, necrophilia - but that9s rather d~fferent - usually regarded as a



perversion, yes?

Ratnaprabha: Well, presumably the fact that people like to look at pictures of naked women, for example, would imply that a very large part of it is just the physical appearance of a body ... and.... sensations.

Gunapala: But that, that picture has some sort of, almost... image of life in it...

Ratnaprabha; I suppose so.

Gunapala: Yeh? - Where a dead body, a person who's left their body, ... it's quite cold...

S: Well it's rigid ... (few words unclear)..~

Gunapala: .. rigid... there's no life left.

S: It's a quite different sensation from a living body.

But, but surely, that's a little bit of a sort of sickness in any case, it's a sort of fantasising, which if you actually enjoy looking ... at pictures of naked women, to that extent.

(S

S: As distinct from reality.

C     Yef~

Ratnaprabha: Well - yes, I was saying that it does imply that a lot of people do look at women just as bodies.

S:     Well, I suppose the majority of men do, eh? When you hear this complaint from women, sometimes, - they don't want to be seen as objects. But actually this is the way in which most men ... regard women, they regard them primarily as women, and no doubt women regard men in much the same sort of way. But from a Buddhist point of view, a spiritual point of view, one should~Keasingly try to relate to other people as, well, more as people, more as individuals - or at least potential individuals. I mean, the more you relate to them just as bodies, or just as members of the opposite sex, or just as sex objects, the less you're relating to them as individuals, and the more you're just using them just to satisfy your own particular... needs. Mmm?

Gunapala: It's more relating to them as a spiritual being

S:     Or at least as a potentially spiritual being.... I mean admittedly in the case of some people that's difficult, because it's difficult to see the spiritual potential .... very often, Umm? (Pause)

Gunapala: But... surely any life or whatever is inhabiting the body, is the spiritual being. You can relate to that.

S:     Is it there so ~bl enough for one to be able to relate to ? It's there in a pig, presumably it is there in a stone. It is there in every human being we believe, but sometimes it is not so tangibly present that you can actually relate to it concretely. It is more a matter of using your imagination. (long pause) Maybe this sort of reflection is useful when you are getting a bit too carried away. You know by your attraction to somebody else on

a purely physical plane. But, I think, at the same time, you should try to see them, not ~ust in terms of a physical body

/60

but ... even in terms of, er, mind, in terms of, er.. - well one hesitates to use terms like soul and spirit, but, yes, an emergent individuality, eh nascent individuality, eh? (Pause.) I mean, sometimes people, want to be regarded in that sort of way, of oourse, eh. (Pause) (There is this sort of thing) in the, in the Buddhist scriptures, or at least the catl[n~taries - of the yo~g man who who fell in love with a, a bhi}iihuni, with a nun. She happened to be an arahant, which was rather unfortunate for him. Especially he was attracted to her beautiful eyes, eh? So one day he tries to take hold of her hand and tell her how beautiful her eyes were, so (she said), 'Oh, you think my eyes are beautiful, fine, you can have them!', she tore them out and put them in his hand, eh! Of course, as soon as she'd done that, he dropped them in horror, eh, em! (Laughter) So that shows it isn't just that particular part of the

physical bodies, eh? That part (is the, is the) contact and expressiveness of something, yen?  
Do you - do you see what I mean, eh, ? (Pause)

~unapala: It's quite, (I mean,) it's quite strange, I mean - it wasn't her eyes, necessarily,  
that he was relating to, even

S: Yes, that's what I mean,

Gunapala: Yeh

S: . (Pause) But, no doubt this sort of reflection is, y'know, useful or necessary in the  
case of people who are the victims of a very crude, very power-ful physical attraction, eh?  
F~, it's useful if they can just take a look at, y'know, another aspect of what it is that they're  
attracted to. But I don't think that can be regarded as the whole story by any means, eh?  
(Pause) In the long run, it is probably better if you try to see, y'know, the - the other person as  
a person, as an individual, (or) potential individual, rather than just reduce them to a bag of  
inpurities, which no longer attracts you or interests you, eh? (Pause)

Gunapala: What is meant, when we go onto the second, paragraph, by, looking into a  
bag of grain, by, , being able to see the different grains?

S: ~Il in the san~ way you analyze the body, eh? You see the body as a sort of a sack-  
like skin containing these thirty-two different

parts, em? In the sart~ way that you could have ~ sack in the ordinary sense, which you  
could open and see it contains all these different grains, em? In the same way, you sort of  
open the sack of the body - 'Oh, this is the heart,

these are the lungs, this is the blood.' You analyze in this way, you break down  
[161]

in this way. In the - in the case of the illustration - the elertent of unpleasantness doesn't  
enter in, eh?

Gilapala: That's right

S: , do you see what I mean? So from that point of view it's not a.. sort of perfect  
illustration. Here it's, in the case of the illustration

it's just the analytical appreaun, em? The breaking down of the body into actual physical  
constituents, eh? (Long pause) I mean , there is the point that sometimes we, we are a bit  
~are of oertain sorts of unpleasant features of, say, other people's physical bodies, but if the  
interest in them is sufficiently strong or the desire for physical contact with them sufficiently

strong, we just overlook or ignore those unpleasant features even though we may be conscious of them? Our desire sort of overrides them. But sometimes that consciousness is present to some extent. (Pause) I mean, somebody might have bad breath, or BO, or something of that sort, but if the sexual desire is very strong, well, you just ignore those things, they're sort of overridden as it were, but you're not always unconscious of them. (Long pause) But what about regarding one's own body in this sort of way, what effect would that have? Regarding one's own body as a sack of impurities, eh?

Ratnaprabha: Presumably it would only be of use if one was ... overbalanced in the other direction of getting into one's body, particularly....

S: Yes, (was) over concerned with it, sort of pampered it and looked after it too much, eh? (Then we would) realise, well, it wasn't worth looking after in that way, taking so much care of, eh? (And), just had to be kept going, y'know, in a quite objective manner, so that it could function as a basis for the realisation of Enlightenment. (Pause)

Suvajra: It's quite the opposite way of the Tibetan's way of looking at it.

S: In what way?

Suvajra: The precious human body.

S: Yes, it is precious at the same time. (Pause) Or when Tibetans~, say, reflect on the preciousness of the human body, I mean, this is to be regarded methodologically rather than doctrinally, because they're trying to make you realise the uniqueness of your ~£~~. And trying to get you to act upon that, to realise that, to make use of it.

76~

Ratnaprabha: How can one make this distinction between methodological and doctrinal teachings? Obviously in some cases it's obvious that what's being taught is simply a method, but in other cases, presumably, we could also fall into this trap - of regarding what was just a method of practice, as being some sort of fundamental teaching.

S: Can you give an example?

Ratnaprabha: You were saying earlier on with the suffering business, .....

S: Yes, that's very true, yes.

Ratnaprabha: And in regarding the suffering as being basic to human existence, when perhaps the emphasis on it was in fact just a methodological approach.

S: ~ll, the emphasis is not even on suffering, it's not as though the emphasis is, as though you are, from a methodological point of view, to regard the whole of existence as suffering, it isn't even that, eh? I mean you can regard experience, conditioned experience as potentially suffering, but never actually regard it as suffering, eh? The methodological approach consists in for certain specific practical purposes, fastening your attention to one aspect of something, for the time being ignoring other aspects. So to the extent that you concentrate your attention on one aspect, you're regarding that aspect as the whole, eh? Of course you're only doing that methodologically, you're not in principle doing that, you do not really regard that aspect as constituting the whole.

Ratnaprabha: Do you think one could extend this to all Buddhist teachings, that to the extent that they're word formulations, they are in a sense

S: Well you could in as much as the Ultimate Truth is inexpressible, yeh, so not to be contained in any formulation. Any formulation is by very definition one-sided, and therefore only an aspect. And therefore doctrines themselves ~ )

doctrines methodologically speaking (Laughter) One could take that view,

that there is no Ultimate Truth which can be contained in any formula, eh? That ~c~\NtG~ can give expression to the whole truth. One could say that, the Madhyamika

in fact does. Perhaps the Buddha himself did. It seems likely that he did from certain sections of the 'Sutta-nipata' like the 'Atthaka-vagga'. In other words don't take things too literally, try to get at the spirit of what is taught, and fasten one's attention on that rather than on the letter. This is something I've certainly noticed in the course of this course, and I've noticed it, of course!, before, many a time, that often people's approach to the Teaching is very literal

mind, do you know what I mean? Of course one has to understand the letter before one can understand the spirit, because usually the letter is one's means of approach to the spirit. But having understood the letter one should try to understand the letter non-literally. Do you see what I mean by that?

Voices: EM

S: It's rather like, when you've read that last paragraph about all the different kinds of grain. I mean someone who's rather literal-minded might ask - '~ll, why did the Buddha not mention maize?' (Laughter) Do you see what I mean? And then one might have to explain, well to answer the question on its own level, one might say - 'Well, maize wasn't grown in India in the Buddha's time.' They'd probably be quite satisfied with that answer. Some people are very literal minded.

Ratnaprabha: But presumably there are some teachings that we can take more literally than others. I mean, I remember you saying that, in a sense, that every word of the Dhammapada, for example, is literally true.

S: Yes, yes,

\_\_\_\_\_ So how does one distinguish between these two types of teachings?

S: Well, there is a traditional distinction, y'know, teachings that require interpretation and teachings which don't. I mean when the Buddha says that hatred never ceases, this would seem to be literally true. I mean, I say literally, I distinguish between literally true and ultimately true. If you see what I mean. Because ultimately there's no ceasing, because there's no arising etc, etc, etc, etc but we won't go into that eh? So, therefore, I did say 'literally true' and not 'ultimately true'. On their own level they do not require interpretation. You can just act on them, you know, straight-forwardly. Anyway, let's go onto Section five.

Surata: "The Reflection on Material Elements 'And further monks, a monk reflects on this very body, however it be placed or disposed, by way of the material elements. There are in this body, the element of earth, the element of water, the element of wind. Just as if monks, a clever cow-butcher, or his apprentice, having slaughtered a cow and divided it into portions should be sitting at the junction of four high-roads in the same way a monk reflects on this very body as it is placed or disposed by way of the material elements. There are in this body the elements of earth, water, fire and wind. Thus he lives contemplating the body in the body.'"

Isn't

S.: Yes, I think we approach the six element practice, don't we? We've got four out of those, those six elements, eh? It isn't actually stated that they do not belong to one but that is clearly implied. There are suttas in the Pali Canon where the Buddha says, "'Tis not yours or mine, give it up!" , and goes A

through the elements, and (inaudible) (Pause)

Cittapala: Presumably the reason why he's a clever cow butcher is because of his, ~LW - a lot of traffic caning past him, so he can sell all his pieces of meat.

S.: No. I think he's a . . . I think that it means that he's clever in actually chopping up the animal into its, er, constituent parts - I think that is the meaning.

Gunapala: Yes, it's a skill - doing it clearly, I suppose... .That means he's got his co~ith you

know, his cow divided up into meat pieces, and laid out, sort of you know - your chops there, and your rump there and whatever (laughter). It's all neatly laid out.

S.: Ox, ox-tail there, em?

Gunapala: Yeah.

Cittapala: But at the risk of being literal-minded (Laughs), why is he sitting at the junction of four high roads?

S: Well, -there seems to be an analogy, though I don't quite see the point of it between the four elements and the four high roads, yeah? But maybe that is a

place where a lot of people and a lot of traffic passes, and therefore... better prospect of a sale, em? (Pause) Incidentally, this also shows that the ancient Indians ate beef. So some sociological significance because a lot of Hindu, especially Brahmin (lore) vehemently disclaim this, that the ancient Indians ate beef, eh? because you know, the cow is a sacred animal, etc. etc. and no modern Hindu eats beef, em? But this clearly shows - the matter of fact way in which the Buddha can use this comparison, suggest that cow-butchers were quite common, eh? (Laughter) In this indirect way, the Pali scriptures do tell us quite a lot about social life in the days of the Buddha. (Pause)

Gunapala: Yeah, the fact that he uses an analogy, of a carved up animal - it seems quite strange to me.... he doesn't seem to think it's wrong or anything like that - it's a bad analogy.

S.: Well, it's as though it - that would have been a very familiar thing presumably.

Gunapala: Yeah.

5 Ps

S.: And he used it because it was a very ordinary part of daily life, eh? (Pause)

Suvaira: Do you think there's any reason for him not enumerating, or five, in the first little bit?

S.: Oh!

Suvajra: It's a mistake.

S.: No, I think it must be em, a printing error.

Ratnaprabha= Five was there in the Pali text society ... version of this.

S.: Yeah... Yes, it must be a printer's error, em, must be Mara at work.

Cittapala: Is there any particular significance to, when you're doing the six element practice, to going through stages in, the particular sequence in which they're mentioned here?

S.: Em, earth, water, fire, air, eh?

Cittapala: Yes

S.: Yes, because it is a progression from the comparatively gross, to the comparatively refined, ah? Earth being regarded as the grossest of the elements, eh, and then water as the next grossest, and so on.

Voice: Because I find, with my sort of Western scientific attitude, that - I find that fire, is actually a more refined element than air. Because I see elements as being catposed of, well, molecules and this sort of thing, which is essentially the same as earth and water, whereas ..... is, seems to be a much more common constituent of the Universe.

S.: ~at is fire anyway?

Cittapala: ~~hat is fire?

S.: Yeah.

Voice: Er, well it's the catination of... it's the process of catustion which is oxidation.



S.: I must say I hadn't thought of the matter in those terms, but it does seem to

sps

me, just thinking about it, that - this may be my Indian conditioning, or Buddhist conditioning that air is more refined than fire. I mean, though, on scientific grounds, you may be more correct.

Suvajra: I don't think he is actually. (S.: Eh?)

Cittapala: What?

Suvajra: I don't think you are, more correct in scientific~ally saying that.

Cittapala: What, fire?

Suvajra: Em, that air is more that fire is more refined than air.

S.: What does one mean by fire... (inaudible)

Cittapaia: No, not fire itself, no but I thought that fire represented as... energy. It does represent energy in that it's syrtolic of energy is fl t it? in that it's ultimately caning fran the Sun... in those terms.

Suvajra: I mean, the way I think of it is that, before anything can reach the stage of being... a gas or a ... or air molecule, that it has to have been liberated through a certain process of fire. If it's cooled down, it'll start solidifying - i~ it's heated up again, it'll start releasing back into its earlier form.

Surata: It's a sort of product of change or state, i~ti t it-fire?

Gunapala: Transforming.... (unclear)

Ratnaprabha: I think it can be quite confusing to take things too sc't~ tifically literally, because there are four states of matter in science, and one of them, called plasma, is actually what exists in a flame - and it is, in that sense, a higher state, in the sense that it has a higher t~perature than the other forms. But I don't - I think that the elements here are not really meant in quite that sense of sort of, the solid, the liquid, the gas and the plasma. So what it's trying to get at is more to do with experience of... of the world and the way you experience objects.

S.: Yes, yes, right. This is the four primary ways in which we experience the world, huh? Well, this is in a sense pseudo-science, em?

sps

Richard: Seems that, whereas the last practice, takes one ~ay from certain, em, ego-onentated view of one' S body, this one puts, can put you back in touch with your body, but is a-7 in a real sense.

S.: Yes.

Richard: In - its relation to nature and so on.

S.: (Word unclear)... yourself, well, your physical body's a part of nature, which you've t~rporariiy appropriated for, you know, to your particular purposes. You've borrowed it, quite literally. Your gestalt has, you know, seized hold of these. . portions 0£ earth, water fire and air, to body itself forth in a physical form.

Richard: Can you just explain the word 'gestalt'?

S.: I don't know that I could - it's a very . . very vague word. It's a sort of - well, what can one say, it's the pattern eh? the pattern, I suppose one could say it's the... 'Gestalt' literally ir~ans the 'whole' eh? It's the idea of the whole or the pattern of the whole. Em, section four of course, ignores that ir' a way, that possibly or that aspect, eh? Because ~hat holds all these thirty-two parts of the body together, as a functioning physical body, eh? It' S a gestalt, it' S a sort

the idea of the whole, which is sort of, er, pulling them all together so that they constitute a ... a catr~ pattern, constitute an entity, an organism, and function in cooperation with one another, em? And it's that we sort of - well, popularly call the soul, I suppose, which disappears at the time of death, so there's nothing to hold them together, they disintegrate. So you could say, yes, the 'gestalt' means the idea of the whole of a thing as distinct from its constit~nt parts, em? (pause) There is a gestalt for the ~~~O, a sort of idea which holds all these people and activity together, and makes them, as it were one movement, one organism, eh?

Cittapala: Could you link that up with the, the differentiation between the, sort of the rupakaya and the... there's the mind-body, and the body-body?

S.: The manomayakaya - perhaps you could. It's going into it with a rather different feeling. For instance there is this, er, Kirlian photography. They - they've managed to photograph the sort of astral counterpart of physical bodies - for instance leaves, eh? And it is as though that represents, on that particular level, the gestalt, em, of the gross physical body, the gross leaf, or whatever it is. . what holds together all those particles in that particular arrangement, em. (Pause)

sps

Gunapala: Why do you think the analogy of the cow is put in here, with the cow all cut up in front of the apprentice or cow butcher?

S. This means just, er - I mean as one mentally, as it were, divides the physical body into what would turn into earth, what would turn into water, and so on, just as the butcher cuts up the cow into the appropriate joints, eh, em? It's an illustration for cutting up, of analysis. You do mentally with your own body what the cow-butcher does literally with the carcass of a cow, eh, em?

Gunapala: I see (Pause).

S.: The analogy is not very exact, I must admit. It's a bit rough and ready, but the - the point which is being illustrated, the point of the analogy is this business of chopping up, dividing, analyzing, eh?

Ratnaprabha: It does seem that this is again not a meditation, sitting meditation practice, because it does say that the monk, however he be placed or disposed, reflects thus on the body.

S.: Yes, em.

Ratnaprabha: Is it possible, do you think, to be continually regarding the body in this way, as the, er...?

S.: Well, is it possible, to continually experience Insight, eh em? Well, yes, surely, because, I mean, once you've gained Insight, by that I mean, 'Insight' with a capital 'I' - Insight operates under all conditions, whether you're meditating or not. Even if you've got Insight, you cannot practice or experience samatha. You cannot experience the dhyanas, under all

conditions. Not even the Buddha, apparently could do that. But once you've experienced Insight, you do experience Insight under all conditions, not just when you're meditating. I mean, otherwise, you'd have to meditate all the time, in order to gain Enlightenment, to be Enlightened even,. Do you see what I mean?

Ratn~rabha: Yes.

S.: So that it suggests that, if you do attain Insight in the course of your meditation practice, you will not lose that Insight, if it's 'Insight' with a capital 'I'. When you get up from your meditation cushion, you will carry it with you, eh? So in the s&t~ way that you carry that Insi~ht with you after it's been attained, well, you can, in between parts of the meditation, keep up those reflections whic~

sps

are the sort of conceptual basis for the development of Insight, em? (Pause) They will no doubt, even as reflections, influence your conduct, eh? I mean, how much more so, when they are transformed into actual Insight. (Long Pause) Anyway, any further questions on that? Maybe we'd better not go into the next section today as it is a rather long one. Any further questions on anything that we've done this morning? (Pause)

Ratnaprabha: You said that, with regard to this section, that the material elements sort of syrtolize the way, the ~~~ principal ways with which we experience the world. But yet, this section talks specifically about the body, about seeing the elements in this body. It doesn't seem to mention regarding the whole world. ...

S.: Yes, it's as though we, we sort of reify what we experience, eh? I mean, earth is - represents the fact that we, we encounter resistance, hardness, solidity, and therefore we redefine that into a concept of earth element, eh, which we find or which we encounter in the case of our own bodies, because .I mean, we hit our own body, you know w~ith a part of our own body, we encounter hardness, resistance, eh? I mean the earth element is there in that body, eh, so to speak. (Pause) I mean there are other parts of the body, you know, which don't offer resistance, em? Well, for instance, the watery parts, eh?

Cittapala: Do you think in actually doing the practice then that, you can actually find this - this sirrple, em? When you said verification I thought you meant some- thing a bit more kind of elaborate, rather than just visualizing, maybe earth or water.

S.: Em. What does one, when one visualizes earth, what does one think of? I mean a lurip or. . a clod of soil or...

Gunapala: Rocks and wood and...

\_S.: Rocks...

Gunapala: ... Earth, hills, the world itself.. you know, things solid, buildings...

S.: ~diated jof course, by food, em?

Gunapala: But I think, I 've started to be~:e aware of the fact that it keeps on, as it were, going back to its origination, continually... It' 5 like I've got no control - the only control I 've got over it is to keep on ... pulling it in, the... that I have to keep on t~king food, and that automatically just keeps on leaving me sort of thing, and the sane with water. I keep on drinking it and it runs out the other end... (Words lost by interruption)

sps (Th~

S.: And the same with wammth.

Gunapala: And the same with air; you breathe it in and it autanatically goes out again, you know. Without one of them it seems like they all fall to pieces

S.; So you're at the centre of a process, -you're the nexus of various processes, which are going on. You're not a thing ; you're not an ~~t. That is really the point of the whole exercise. To feel good, to feel yourself, to express yourself more in terms of prooess than in terms of static being, a static object. And in no time at all after doing the practice for a while you get the feeling that you are renewing yourself, that you are renewing the physical body all the tine - you are taking food, water, heat, but its not the sane food, water heat.

Cittapala: The bedy' s a sort of a factory.

S: A sort of powerhouse. (Pause)

Devamitra: A machine for....

S: E~h?

Devamitra: A machine for producing very bad manure, isn't it? Didn't some-one say that? (Laughter).

S: No (unclear word) you've not got it quite right. This is George Bernard Shaw, in his usual cynical way (Laughter) he defined the human being as a machine for turning good food into bad manure. That is rather cynical isn't it; a bit reductive. (Laughter).

[171]

S: He didn't even say a body, as far as I remember, he said a human being. A machine for turning good food into bad manure. (Pause)

Cittapala: I find it quite interesting that the Indians obviously had such a detailed analysis of the body.

S: Em, even at that time.

Cittapala: .... at that time. By contrast to, well doctors or medical science in the West which was

S: I Don't know what the state of medical science was, er, say in Greece at that time. It was I think fairly advanced. Didn't Hippocrates live at around that time?

Cittapala: I don't know about Greece but didn't Leonardo have to sort of conduct experiments

S: Ah, but this was at a very much later date, because the Church placed a ban on the study of anatomy, eh? It placed a ban on dissection of the human corpse. ~o there was, er~~~I think the Greeks may have done something of that sort, or were familiar with the different parts of the human body. But the knowledge was lost to a great extent during the Middle Ages, for, as it were, theological reasons. I think the main sources for medical studies, er, medical knowledge during the Middle Ages, were latter translations of Arabic texts, which were themselves translations of Greek texts with commentaries. There was hardly any medical research during the Middle Ages. The study of anatomy, the practise of dissection were revived only with the Renaissance, with the increasing interest in man just as man, which came about at that time. The Christian view seems to be that dissection was a sort of sacrilege because the body was the temple of the Holy Ghost, eh? (Pause) And the Chinese objected to dissection, yes? Or they objected to surgery, because it was disrespectful to your parents to deface or interfere with the body that they had given you, eh?

Richard: What are your feelings on autopsy and the way that autopsies are carried out?

If there has been some uncertainty as to the cause of death then you have no legal prerequisites. Is that unethical do you think?

S: I don't personally feel happy about autopsies, but that is a purely instinctive not to say emotional reaction. (Pause) I mean, why does one want to know the cause of somebody's death? Apart from perhaps, for the satisfaction of the doctor who might have been giving the wrong kind of treatment.

Richard: I can see that it can be important in some cases, where somebody might be wrongly convicted or it might make that much difference which will be important

S: Yes, indeed, yes.

Richard: But, em

S: Well, if you were accused of poisoning your wife with poisoned coffee, well you'd probably be quite glad that there was an autopsy, and you could be cleared from suspicion. But, I mean, my instinct is against such things. They don't seem very pleasant. But, I mean, of course, it'd be a purely subjective reaction. (Pause)

Gunapala: I mean, surely when you're dead you're dead and your body is just the same as the earth element and the water element and so forth

S: It's the same as the earth element even when you're alive, eh?

Gunapala: Yeh, so surely there's no, should be no attachment to it - and that's especially when you've left it. Surely it doesn't matter what happens to it?

Richard: Well, I think if you don't know what happens after you've died

S: Yes, that is the whole point. You don't know how dead the dead body is. When the body is the definition of dead, even doctors, I think, are not quite agreed upon this. I don't think doctors collectively will probably be in agreement with, say, Tibetan Buddhist tradition, eh? Well, supposing you were still around and, as it were, hovering over your dead body, or, allegedly dead body, y' know, what would be the effect on that consciousness to see its own body being dissected or opened or whatever?

Richard: It'd be all right if you'd been doing the six element practise. (Laughter)

S: Or there's even the question of whether you might not even still feel something, after, even after, you were medically dead, eh, there is that to consider.

Devamitra: It is rather a horrid thought.

Gunapala: I mean if that's the case then (few words unclear)

Suvajra: the corpse a (nice stink)

!Th~ S: Well I don't know if it's sort of feeling in that sense, or sensation in that sense.

Gunapala: I mean surely the anaesthetic just kills, just takes the consciousness away from the body, and people

S: Which it is already anyway, by definition, - being dead, at least to some extent.

Gunapala: Yes, so it's just the same as being

S: Yes, and it could still be conscious of what was going on even as the anaesthetic was administered, because people under anaesthetic do see what is happening to their body. I'm not sure what their emotional reaction is. Perhaps it's one of mild interest, who knows?

Gunapala: Yeh, surely they're not in contact with the physical things or it undermines the idea of giving them the anaesthetic.

Harshaprabha: Well, if you die in hospital you're put into a fridge as soon as they can clean the body, along with maybe twenty or thirty other bodies.

Devamitra: If you don't die in hospital though, in the case of us, I mean, presumably we could delay notifying the authorities and what have you.



S: I don't know if there is a period in which the authorities have to be notified.

Gunapala: There must be....

Richard: You'd have to notify the doctor immediately by law in (word unclear) so the doctor is responsible to the law immediately.

S: Because he has to sign the death certificate, declaring the cause of death, and that's why if a doctor hasn't been in attendance on a sick or dying person, and if there is some doubt as to the cause of death, then the coroner will order an inquest. (Pause)

Suvajra: I should imagine that if you delay to perform ceremonies the doctor may just get suspicious, and then there might be an autopsy.

Richard: It seems an important area for us to create some kind of concession.

S: Yes.

Richard: Because we're Buddhists, that we, that we have that time period.

S: I think actually practice one does have, because even under ordinary circumstances burials or cremations aren't held much within a week of death. You have to book up the chapel or whatever, or the crematorium. They usually have a waiting list.

Devamitra: It's a question of the autopsy, isn't it, which happens I think fairly quickly doesn't it?

S: From the medical point of view, the quicker the better I think, because changes start taking place in the body.

Richard: Now ideally we want to not be put in a fridge or anything like that for a relatively long time.

S: It's something we need to go into. And Devaraja seems to have decided to start up a campaign for our own Buddhist crematoriums? So, we'll all be cremated in Brighton

presumably. (Laughter) It'd really put Brighton on the Buddhist rn~, wouldn't it eh? Possibly in the case of some of us, under the personal supervision of Devaraja (laughter) who will no doubt lay on a good fastive spread in irmirory of us. (Laughter) With meringues and cream. (laughter) Anyway, tomorrow we have the nine cemetary conterrplations, so that's quite cheerful. (Laughter)

... "Thus he lives contemplating the body in the body internally or lives contemplating the body in the body externally, or lives contemplating the body in the body internally and externally. He lives contemplating origination-factors in the body, or he lives contemplating dissolution factors in the body, or he lives contemplating origination factors and dissolution factors in the body, or his mindfulness is established with the thought, "the body exists to the estent necessary just for knowledge and mindfulness", and he lives independant and clings to naught in the world. Thus also monks, a monk lives contemplating the body in the body. (2)

And further monks, as if a monk sees a body thrown in the charnal ground, being eaten by crows, hawks, vultures, dogs, jackals or by different kinds of worms, he then applies this perception to his own body thus, "Verily also my own body is of the same nature, such it will become and will not escape it", thus he lives contemplating the body in the body,,,etc. (3)

And further monks, as if a monk sees a body thrown in the charnel ground and reduced to a skeleton with some flesh and blood attached to it, held together by tendons...

S: The dots indicate that... what followed here from the Previous paragraph is to be repeated,... but you need not do that, but just read the text.

(4) And further monks, as if a monk sees a body thrown in the

charnel ground and reduced to a skeleton, lightly smeared and without flesh, held together by tendons etc. ... (5) Andf~~ther monks, as if a monk see a body thrown in the charnal

~round, and reduced to a skeleton without flesh and blood, held together by the tendons etc.

... (6) And j~rt her monks, as if a monk sees a body thrown in the charnal ground, and reduced to disconnected bones, scattered in all directions, here a bone of the hand, here a bone of the foot, a shin bone, a thigh~ bone, the pelvis, spine and skull, etc.... (7) And

further monks, as if a monk sees a body thrown in the charnal ground, reduced to bleached bones of conch-like colour etc... (8) And further monks, as if a monk sees a body thrown in

the charnal ground, reduced to bones more than a year old, lying in a heap.. (9) And

fwrther monks, as if a monk sees a body thrown in the charnal ground, reduced to bones gone rotten and become dust.... He then applies this perception to his own body, thus, "Verily

also my own body is of the same nature, such it will become and will not escape it'. Th&s he lives contemplating the body in the body internally and he lives contemplating the body in the body externally or lives contemplating the body in the body internally and externally. He lives

contemplating origination facton in the body, or he lives contemplationg dissolution factor~ in the body, or lives contemplating origination and dissolution factors in the body, or his

mindfulness is established with the thought, " the body exists to the extent necess- ary just for knowledge and mindfulness', and he lives detached and clings to naught in the world. Thus also monks, a monk lives contemplating the body in the body.

S: Mm , so what is the purpose, of this practice , do you think, the nine cemetery contemplations ?

: Reflection on death.

S: Yes, it is a concrete form of the reflection on death.

\_\_\_\_\_ Impermanence.

S: what, impermanence of the body, hum...

Prassanasiddhi: And also to break down our attachment to the material world.. especially our body. ...

S: Yes, and of course it lessens the identification with the body, the feeling that the body really does belong to you.

Devamitra: have I got it wrong, or is it.. that sometimes there are ten stages...

S: there are indeed, yes there are ten stages sometimes. For instance in the Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa denotes ten

Devamitra: Which is the missing one ?

S: I don't remember which is the missing one, or whether there is a missing one. In a sense there must be... Ah if I remember rightly, there is in the ten, a bloated and swollen corpse, . . . swollen with gases and so on. That is very likely the one missed out. But clearly it does not make any essential difference. One could have twenty stages if one wanted or five.

Devamitra: It seems actually that the earliest stages are the most, in a way, disgusting. The further you get through them, it becomes less and less. ...

S: Hmm, you don't mind handling just a bone, that wouldn't bother you, but you wouldn't like to touch a corpse that had been dead only a few days, or perhaps a few weeks or months, but just a bone doesn't bother you, strange to say. It is a bit irrational.

Devamitra: But it would seem that if you were adopting a method of approach, I think I would find it easier to start at the end and work towards the beginning.

S: Hm, yes,. Yes, People wear ornaments of human bone without even... turning a hair, so to speak. Though I must say, some people don't like to do even that. if ~~~ move outside the Buddhist circle, if one was to put a human skull in someone's hands, they would probably shrink from it, in fact this was what I have found. People don't even like to see a human skull or a cup made from a human skull if they are not Buddhists.

Cittapala: Do Charnel grounds/still exist?

S: No, not really. In ancient India, there was a lot more waste land than there seems to be now. Now it is almost always a definite

7Fr

cremation, though sometimes the cremation is imperfectly carried out, the body is not completely destroyed just through want of wood. Sometimes people are not sufficiently well off to afford, you know, enough wood to burn the corpse properly, or someone is economising. You don't get any longer, areas where bodies are simply thrown away, but that is what the charnel ground was in those days.

~~~~~\$: What about the Tibetan practice of cutting up the body.

S: This is due mainly to the absence of firewood in Tibet, but also it is linked up with the bodhisattva ideal, of sacrificing your body for other living beings, so that after your death you are not wasted. This is quite a thought.

Prasanasiddhi: They feed the animals with it do they?

S: Yes. It's mostly the vultures but dogs and other such animals too.

\_\_\_\_\_: But why do they cut it up. Why not just leave it.

S: I suppose they want to make sure it gets thoroughly disposed of. They want to get at the bones also, because the bones are often ground down and mixed with clay and made into little images. This is quite common. Perhaps they chop it up to make it easier for the animals and the birds, all to get a fair share.

Prasanasiddhi: I thought, this does relate a little bit to Milarepa's life story, where he got his mother's bones and they ground them all up into a powder and made

S: The text refers to stza-stzas, that's what these little images are called. They are sometimes enshrined in a little Wayside Stupa. flundreds of them perhaps.

Devamitra: Can I come back to the method of approach with regards to taking up this kind of contemplation? Would it be traditional to, if you wanted to take up the practice fully, to go through each

of the nine stages, well, you know, from one to nine, or would you

start... could you sort of take up any particular. ...

S: Hum. But the procedure does seem to be that the monk goes to the cemetery, he goes to the charnel ground, and, according to this d~cription, and, I think, according to Buddhagosh~a's too, he contem- Plates first of all the newly deceased corpse and follows it right down to the end when there is just a handfull of dust, and the idea seemed to be to ~fl~~A~C~~~ to bring clearly before his mind the fact that his body is just going to end in a handfull of dust1 hum. This is the i~~~~~'~~c~of the body. Perhaps it's not so much revulsion from it. There is a sentiment to this effect in Shakespea~ I think it's in Hamlet. "The dust of Alexander turned to clay, will stop a hole to keep the Wi~~away11. It's the

same sort of sentiment, hum? Wait a minute. "Dust of Alexander" or "dust of Ceasar", I'm not sure which, but it makes no difference. "Imperial Ceasar dead and turned to clay", that's right, "will stop a hole to keep the wind away". Yes? (laughter)

Ratnaprabha: It says in the text. ... it uses the term, as if and further monks, as if.

S: Yes, I was wondering about that, yes.

Ratnaprabha: Does this mean that one is intended to do it in one's imagination, rather than....

S: No, I think not. I think this is just the awkwardness of the idiom of translation. And in this connection, it so happens that... I don't know if it's meant to be rear~ hypothetical. Huh?.. As if in the sense of seemingly~, just does not make any sense. It's more "as when". Huh? Maybe the translator didn't have a perfect command of the English idiom. It's "as when", I would say it should be translated though I don't remember what the idiom is.

It's as though the monk engages in these contemplations to convince himself that he really will die, huh. That his physical body really will undergo a process of progressive deterioration, hum? Ending up in no more than a handful of dust. He wants to bring that fact, you know, vividly before his mind's eye.

C\trAf4\~~: Do you think one needs, actually, the, er, physical

1%

S: Well on the occasion of Vangisa's death we were able to have the body in the shrine room, huh, at Sukhavati, you know, with the face uncovered. So that means, I'm sure some people, on that occasion, saw a dead body for the first time in their lives.

\_\_\_\_\_ I did.

S: You were there?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

S: Ah. That was over two years ago wasn't it.

\_\_\_\_\_ (something unclear)

S: Ah. Well I've seen quite a number when I was living in India. Some of them were in quite an unpleasant condition.

\_\_\_\_\_: Vangisa didn't look unpleasant.

S: No. Hum... well he had received a certain ammount of attention from an embalmer, ... a mortician as the Americans say.

~~~~~4: Apparently, in this country, when the body does start turning, they, er, they will, you know, the undertaker will come and put the lid on. You know, that the point when people just can't take any more, they don't want to see. It starts going black.

S: Hum. I suppose it's a bit different in the case of our friends and relatives. I may be quite attached to that person, so it must be quite unpleasant to4~him, sort of actually deteriorating before my eyes. It's different if you just see some body, which is a body in general, yes? And not one which you have learned to like. Huh?

Cittapala: Does, um, does realisation of death amount to an insight  
... into that sort of area?

S: Well , ..... put it this way... I mean, the contemplation  
of the body in this way can lead to the developement of insight, ~E\3~P~~~ o~ ~~&~~~~  
E~~~~Lr~~y ° °° ~, - °"1/4'

'so

example in front of one to actually to bring that home  
closely enough?

S: Well, it is said that it depends upon the strength of ones craving. Huh? I mean, something that I think I have mentioned before, but, in a sense the mildest of these practices is just the recollection of death, just thinking about death, and then, some- thing as it were, more radical, more extreme if you like, is the six element practice. And then more extreme still is this practice. If one finds oneself very strongly attached to the body then one might consider something like this ~&~vx just in modified form. Hum?

: But it's not as if we have had any expensnce of these, er, particular stages.

S: Hum. Well, in the case of many people its not that they have even perhaps seen a dead body, yes? We, er.. in our society that doesn't happen. I mean in India.... If you go to India, if you go to Bombay, well you... with a bit of luck, within minutes of 4

your arrival, you will see a corpse being bourn on a sort of

stretcher on peoples shoulders, the face uncovered.... it's a very common sight.... on its way to the burning ground. Huh? You don't get that sort of thing in England. The best you see is a discreet black Daimler with a sort of box inside, covered with flowers, and that's that. Even that you don't see very often these days. You don't see much in the way of funerals these days. I can remember as a boy, seeing hearses drawn by black horses and so on. You don't see that now.

So one has to, perhaps, search out other opportunities. I mean several of our Friends, two if not three, have, er, worked at some time or another in hospitals as porters, or have had to do with laying out corpses or removing them to the mortuary. I remember Siddhiratna worked in this way for some time. He said he used to find it quite interesting.

\_\_\_\_\_ : I was thinking you mentioned the other day about our own C~L~\~r0~place, for disposing of our own.... Buddhists. (laughter) And I thou~ht it would be really good livel hood in the sense of, er, creating something quite valuable, as well as getting an insight into the impermanOnce of our bodies  
[181]

cittapala: I mean, is it possible to really be convinced that you are going to die, becuse in a way, you know there is a part of you that isn't convinced that I'm going to die....

S: Well, because one is speaking of bodily death. Huh? If one says, "well, there is a part of me", well what does that mean ? Well, may. be one means some kind of conciousness fl~Lnciple, ewell that would would not be involved with the death of the body. One is concerned with ones own death only to the extent that one identifies oneself with the body. I mean if you identify with the body, well, when the body dies you die .I think one of the reasons why the bodily death is so terrible ~~r some people is, that they identify themselves with the body.

~UVN~~4L~ I think that was one of the strongest impacts on seeing Vangisa was the fact that he didn't .... his physical body was identical to how he had been in his life, except that there was no life left in him. You know he'd gone out of it, but left the carcasc as it w~re, there complete. So, there was no way that you could say that was Vangisa any more. It was just this carcasc~,... and that had a very strong impact, but a very positive one.

S: Well sometmes of course one can the presence of a person exactly as they were, ~t:~~4

their lifetime, or you know feel their presence as one felt it during their lifetime when the physical body isn't there. Yes, I spoke about this in a question and answer session didn't I ? I don't know whether on the occasion of Vangisa's funeral service, funeral ceremony, people had a sort of impression of Vangisa actually being present apart from the physical body.

Yes.

S: ~ometimes

Harshaprabha: I certainly felt it in the case of my mother, she seemed to have arrived before the body did.

S: Hm.

So, just in mundane terms, do you think it is possible to fully... to become sort of really emotionally convinced that you are going to . . that your body is going to die

S: Well, if one is fully convinced of this and acts upon it, well it

S(cont): must be insight. Because the identification with and attachment to the body is so strong that only insight is able to deal with that. Of course, you can have a sort of momentary emotional experience as a result of somebody's death.... again I spoke about this didn't I in one of the sessions!... but it doesn't last very long. Whether it was insight or not, depends upon the effects, the consequences. (long pause)

There are several stories, not only in Buddhism but in Christian tradition, also about the effects of the realisation of death on people. I'm trying to remember a story in connection with St. Bruno, the founder of the Carthusians... yes, the Carthusians are the strictest order of monks in Christianity... this is in modern times

, by modern I mean post patristic times, which means after the age of the fathers of the Church. He lived in the early Middle Ages. And, I'm afraid I'm not going to be able to tell the story properly as I don't remember all the details. But apparently in Paris there was. . it might have even been in the then Notre-Dame, I think it was in Paris. Anyway St. Bruno as a young man was present in the Church when an eminent dignitary of the Church had died. He was a Cardinal or something like that and he had a great reputation as a good man, a religious man, a pious man. So, the corpse was just laid out in the cathedral and the service was going on : In the midst of it all the dead man sat up And he said three things, I can only remember two of them unfortunately. One of them, the second was let me sort of invent slightly. The first one let's say, which I don't really remember, was, " I am summonsed" Then the second was, "I am judged", and the third one was, " I am condemned". Then he sank back. So this really struck St. Bruno. That even though this man had been a pillar of the Church, and represented the Party, in the end he'd been judged and condemned and sent to hell. He hadn't attained salvation.

Side two.

So he thereupon became a monk and eventually founded the order of Carthusians. So sometimes this experience of death can have a very dramatic effect upon people, the experience of other people's death or reflection upon other people's death. I remember when I was in Kalimpong three people that I knew died quite rapidly, four even, but three very close



together and this certainly gave me food for thought at the time. Well, more than that. There seemed to be a number of deaths at that time and some of them were quite inter-

S (cont): esting. One of them was the old mother of some friends of mine there and that was interesting, perhaps less interesting than some of the others there. And then there was the father of a friend of mine who was a doctor in the local hospital. He died after a week's illness leaving a bit of an impression on me. But then there was someone with whom I stayed for a while for six months after my arrival in Kal~mpong, who would have been the last king of Burma. Well, would have been the king of Burma, had Burma been a monarch and he died in the rather miserable circumstances.

And that was a bit more, as it was more impressive. That this man who was the sort of heir to the last king died at the age of 72 in poverty and obscurity. And there wasn't even money for the funeral. I had to get the local authorities to intervene and find money to pay for the cremation, which they did with some reluctance. And I performed the cremation funeral ceremony. And I saw the body four days after he had died and by that time he was - I was only informed and called then - in a pretty dreadful state. And his wife, who was the daughter of King (Theybor) and the daughter of the famous Cc~~~~A~/ - I don't know if you know your Burmese history - she was quite a character, a sort of latter day Cleopatra, anyway the princess was her daughter as well as the daughter of Theybor. Prince tatakina as his name was.. was her cousin and the heir to the throne. Anyway he just died miserably and I had to perform the funeral ceremony. So this no doubt led to all sorts of reflections later on. You know, "the glories of our blood and State are shadows not substantial things", as I quoted yesterday. And then there was another person I knew, though not a friend, but he had been the prime minister of Burma and his death was believed to be due to witchcraft and certainly when I went to the house, or the palace, and delivered a sermon at their request, chanted some sutras, everyone was in a very strange state - & though they

did not believe in it. So again a lot of reflections

So about that time I had a number of similar experiences. Oh yes and another: An English Buddhist woman, whom I knew, she'd been in an accident and died. And I had to see that she was cremated. I remember this especially because she was a woman of about 54 or 55. There was a dispute over the body just like something out of the Illiad because the local Christians claimed her for burial and I arrived in Kalimpong just in the nick of time from Calcutta and the dispute was going on and the police had become involved because the body had

S(cont): taken for a post mortem. I think she had died an accidental death knocking her head against something. Anyway the local Christians were claiming her for Christian burial. So my students were claiming her for a Buddhist cremation. And then I arrived in the midst of the dispute. The police were present and everybody was sort of asking "was she a Buddhist?", so I said "yes". So then the police inspector asked me, "but can you prove it?". So I said, "yes, I have the documents from her own hands signed telling that she was a Buddhist." So he said "well that settles it". So the body was handed over to us and we cremated it in the local Tibetan cremation ground. That's a whole story by itself.

But anyway, before it there we brought the body from the mortuary, to the place where I was staying, where I had this Young Men's Buddhist Association. And there was nowhere else to lay out the body except on the ping-pong table (laughter) So we laid it out on the ping-pong table (laughter). We'd invited a lot of people there for tea and so on before the cremation, so the body was laid on the ping pong table in the games room and one of my Tibetan Nepalese students asked - they were just going in there and looking at the body, walking round the ping-pong table, having a chat, they didn't turn a hair. But she'd known a

lot of christian missionaries so I thought it only right and proper to invite them. They sat in the sitting room drinking tea. They approached them and said, "would you like to come and have a last look at her"?. So they said, "On, no, thank you!"

So (unclear) look at these different attitudes, the christians, the missionaries, they don't want to see a dead body. But you know these youngsters, mostly teenagers, Tibetan and Nepalese students of mine, they weren't bothered about it in the least. They belonged to a quite different tradition and had been brought up in a quite different sort of way. So all these experiences gave me much food for thought. And then again when Miss Barcl&y, her name was, when Miss Barclay was being cremated, the Tibetans I'm afraid, well they're a bit sexist (laughter), they've got different, I don't know what to call them! Arrangements let's say for cremating men and for cremating women. Women, for some reason or another, I don't know why, are cremated in a sort of funnel shaped structure, almost like an oven. It's got a sort of grid half way down. The corpse is lowered down through the top of the funnel and the legs are pulled on either side~

of the grid and its sort of supported there. Then the fire is lit underneath. Whereas the man is laid horizontally. So, anyway, Miss Barclay was rather stout and they were having difficulty in getting her down the funnel (laughter) and the stout Lamas were tugging at the bottom while two others (~laughter) were pushing at the top. (laughter) For the sake of decency a sort of curtain had been erected in front so that the public, the crowd of people of about 50 or 60 in number, just couldn't see exactly what was happening until everything was in order. But anyway (laughter) I (unclear) by my students were sort of peeping round the edge of the curtain not wanting to miss anything, but again there were some missionaries who stationed themselves at a safe distance who were trying to stand on tip-toe and see over the curtain. I heard one missionary woman shriek to her husband, "OOh, look, look, what they're doing to that body, they don't realise it's the temple of the holy ghost and to~~ its got no clothes on" (laughter) Because the body is always stripped before cremation you see so that it burns properly. This created quite a furor among the local missionaries the way the body was treated and misused. It was all exaggerated and all sorts of reports (unclear) with what these Buddhists had done to the body of this unfortunate woman etc etc. But it wasn't, well it was a bit comical and on the other hand it was a bit, sort of pathetic, too, seeing the way in which this body was being treated, but anyway, in the end she was placed in this funnel and the fire was lit and the curtain was removed and there was a fine blaze. Being a stout woman she burned well because if you attend many cremations you know that if a person is fat then the body burns well because of the grease and all that. It's like pouring ghee or butter onto the flames. So she burned well and we all sat around drinking cups of tea until the flames had subsided. The missionaries were horrified. I think that didn't enhance my reputation among them in Kalimpong (laughter) There was another Buddhist friend of mine, a Western Buddhist, who was present who spoke to the missionaries and said, "Well I told you you shouldn't have come, I told you it would upset". (laughter) So I had many, at that time that was about '51 ~ '52, I had a number of experiences with the people that I had known dying. And it was, I mean, in most cases, I saw the corpse after it had died.

Harshaprabha Does that mean that the woman's body was cremated while she was almost standing vertically?

S. Yes, in a sense, yes in a standing position. I don't know how general that custom was but it was certainly the custom there. And it was a Tibetan ceremony, specifically Tibetan cremation ground used by Tibetan Buddhists.

Surata I wonder if this has got anything to do with the thing about releasing the consciousness from the top of the head?

S. Well, what about the men? The men were cremated lying horizontally, lying flat.

Surata Yes, but I mean, if you're a woman its better if you, as it were, reincarnate as a man, so, perhaps,~give them an extra chance. (laughter)

S. It could be, it could be, Yes that was rather strange. I have vivid recollections of poor Miss Barclay being tugged and pulled into this sort of funnel (laughter)

Anyway, we won't linger on that, I intend telling the whole story in my second volume of memoirs.

Cittapala Do you think i~s advisable to actually have some sort of document which says one is a Buddhist so that if one ended up in a car crash or something of this nature there couldn't be CL)A~ ~~~~~V'D\

S Well, no. One is best advised to make a will. OV'~ ~~~~~"r been briefed about wills. Oh, this is something that should

have been mentioned because I'll tell you what the law is. If you die intestate then you(relattons, that is to say, your next of kin, intestate means without leaving a will and disposing of your estate, if you die intestate then your next of kin have the last words regarding your ~~~~ arrangements. If they want that you should be given a Church of England funeral1 i~Hll, a Church of England funeral you are given regardless of whether you are a Buddhist. So if you want to make quite sure that you are disposed of in the proper Buddhist manner then you should make a will appointing Buddhists as your executors. If executors are appointed in your will

they have complete charge over the funeral arrangements. So, supposing you die in a car crash well the body will be removed to the mortuary there may be a post mortem, a co~one~stinqu~~~, ~~~ that well, the body is, so to speak handed over to the executors.

or if you have appointed executors they take over and make funeral arrangements.

Cittapala Who should the executors be? Can they just sort of be generally (unclear) somebody in the F.W.B.O., do they have to be specifically friends. The trouble is,~W~~~£ts~ they may not be around...

S. As Executors you can name anybody. I mean, supposing you have a car crash in a foreign country, well if your executors take swift action if they know that you've applied to them as executors well, they can get your body flown back.. If you were to die in India that might be rather difficult because in India they are not all that well organised. Well, you'd be cremated anyway in India. But the thing to do is appoint executors by drawing up a will. And if you've

got a large estate it's advisable of course to appoint as executor at least one person with some (degree?) of knowledge. But you can appoint two or three executors, it doesn't have to be just one. Usually people making a will appoint if not next of kin, the family solicitor I think.

Harshaprabha Could you say that the Order to be the Executors, well does it need to be more specific?

S. No. It has to be named individuals. And they have complete say and can disregard the wishes of relations. They not bound by the wishes of relations. They have complete (word?) You have appointed them and made them responsible. You can make them responsible. You can, if you want to, make it absolutely watertight by stating in your will that you wish to have a Buddhist Funeral. But it is actually quite safe left in the hands of the executors.

1£     ~~

CL

S: Is the neutral feeling a sort of mixture of/very subtle pleasur

able and painful feeling on that analogy or is it a different kind of feeling altogether, like a different colour, because the language of the text suggests that there are three distinct feelings, which are not reducible to one another, just as pleasure cannot be reduced pain any more than black cannot be reduced to white, or white to black. In the same way there is a third kind of feeling, analogous to another colour. But I'm personally unable to identify that.

Cittapala: Colour of my experience.

S: So, perhaps, it is that the feeling, that one has to think of it not the, despite the actual language-one has to have the text- one has to think of it not as a third feeling, but as a feeling experience which is so low, or so faint, as it were, that you really are unable to identify either as pleasureable or painful, and that there are only two feelings, not three as the text seems to say.

Gunapala: It even goes further than that. It says that there's these neutral spiritual feelings and worldly feelings.

S: Yes. I wish we had the Pali text here because I think it means purely mental feeling. That is to say those that are not directly connected with any physical object.

Gunapala: Usually they are talking about physical feelings and mental feelings.

S: I think so, yes.

A Voice: I've got the Pali words here. Worldly is *amisa*, and the spiritual is *anisa*.

S: Ah well it is that. *Amisa* means, sort of dependant on food, gross food, and *anamisa* means not dependant on food. So one could

say physical and mental. That would roughly, sort of, paraphrase

it. Though *amisa* is extended to mean something like worldly. Sometimes *amisa* is contrasted with *dharmā*. For instance, when the Buddha says to his disciples "Oh you are heirs of the Dharma not heirs of worldly things" The word for worldly things is *amisa*. (Pause) So *amisa*, feelings of *amisa* nature would seem to be feelings associated with bodily experiences, and *anamisa* not so associated. But even so they couldn't be very far above the level because you couldn't have a painful feeling on the Dhyanic level. On the Dhyanic level there are no painful feelings. Though

spiritual for *anamisa* is probably a bit too much for the present

context. Maybe worldly and non-worldly would be better. (Pause) Well lets leave it there because we're changing tape for one thing and the tea bell has just rung. I think we have got quite a lot to say about this question of feeling.

Surata: How do you spell *amisa* and *anamisa*?

Ratnaprabha: A M I S A and the other one is the same with a N I R in the front.

S: (Inaudable) . spiritual which I think is much too wide off the mark because it suggests spiritual as we use the term generally it covers the Dhyanas. You could hardly speak of painful feelings in the Dhyanas.

Devamitra: But you think that bodily and mental are better than worl~ly and unworldly?

S: Unworldly suggests something that goes beyond the mundane altogether, so that would be much to much here. (Long pause)

Ratnaprabha: Did you say generally opposed to the Dharma, was it?

S: No. Not to 'The' Dharma - to d~arma with a small 'd'. Dharma here means mental object,

object of mind.

- (Long pause, then tape stops.)

It does give a sort of broader background. Where one can see, in a sense, the rise of humanity if one goes far enough back. I mean in 'The short history' or, 'A short history of the world', Wells

first of all deals with the world in space, and the world in time. z

He gives a brief su~v~~~ you know, on the basis of what is known

today of the origin of humanity, so you get the impression of this

broad upwards sweep which is quite inspiring. You can see how far humanity has come. He brings you right up to modern times, through the ancient civilisations and so on. But I would say from a purely, say strictly spiritual context you don't need to know all this if you're, you know - I mean it is not necessary to Enlightenment. But if you are engaged in the teaching of the Dharma, or explaining things, putting things across to other people, a cultural background is very useful. A cultural medium or language is very useful.

Harshaprabha: What was that chap who wrote a book about the mediterranean area in 500 B.C.

S: (Herod~tus?) You can get this in Penguin, Penguin Classic series. It's quite a readable thick volume, actually. He's a very good writer; lots of anecdotes and stories and things like that. It's just like hearing an old man talking. His style is ( It's very pleasant reading. That's why he has lasted so long; he's called the 'father of history'. He travelled a lot. He travelled in nearly all the areas he described and collected material and learned, you know, traditions and legends on the spot. Anyway that's a bit 0j~ a digression isn't it. (lots of noise)

I think also from a more spiritual point of view, a study of history does help one to shed any parochialism one might have. Do you see what I mean?

Gunapala: That your own centre, your own world, your own

S: Yes, yes, it does give you a broader view of humanity. It will

Theip ou, perhaps, to realise that you are just a human being, not to be~i entified with this particular country or this particular

culture.

Gunapala: The human race as just being one human race.

S: So it's as if you have~t)belong to a group it's best to think of your group as humanity itself, rather than, you know, any smaller group.

Devamitra: I was thinking it is really quite difficult, I'd say, to know what's to be priority when there are so many things that in a way one needs to catch up on. You know lik~  
~culturally,

just culturally, quite apart from spiritually.

S: I've been quite surprised, you know, what big gaps there are in people's culture. I mean Subhuti said to me the other day, he said well I was talking to so and so, without mentioning names, and he'd never heard of the By~antine Empire. Subhuti was - genuinely surprised, almost shocked - that someone hadn't heard of the Byzantine Empire.

Gunapala: He's going to be shocked again.. (laughter)

S: Ask Subhuti if he will give you a talk on the By~antine Empire.

But you will certainly read about it in H.G. Wells' "Short History Of The World" (Long pause)

Guanapala: I mean I would have thought if we could develop metta bhavana it would be quite ( ? ) be good to

S: But that would include the By~antine Empire also. You need to do something about it. (laughter)

Guanapala: But I just don't see how it connects up at all sometimes.

S: Anyway back to feeling. And that does connect up, I'm sure. So what were we talking about - this distinction between, er, one speaks in terms of being not in touch with one's feelings. So one can take it either in the sense that a feeling which has, you know, you have experienced a feeling which has been repressed or suppressed and which is, so to speak, noW in your/conscious mind, let's say, though using a different mythological language, but which can be brought up into consciousness and experienced, as happens in the process of a~oreaction, that's one thing. But also, one can, perhaps, use the expression of not being in touch with one's fe~lings to mean that one has, in fact, not got any feelings. That one is in this grey, neutral, twilight sort of state where there is no very pleasurable experience, and no very painful experience. In fact, the state of feeling is so faint that you are at a loss to decide whether it is painfull or pleasant evCn. So I think that one has to be very careful how one uses the expression 'out of touch with one's feelings'. It's not so much, perhaps, in the second

case that one

is out of touch with one's feelings that you have actually had, but cut off which you are not conscious, as much as you are' touch with feeling,

!9Q

in the sense that you just don't have any feelings and need to develop them.

Devamitra: So it's a question of a lack of intensity?

S: A lack of intensity, yes. But then one might say, well how is it that people don't experience more intense feelings. When reading about the Middle Ages for instance, or the people of the Middle Ages, one gets the impression that they were much more full-blooded, that they experienced their feelings much more strongly. Their feelings were much more intense, one gets that impression about the ancient Greeks too. If they loved you, they really loved you. If they hated you they really hated you.. If they loved you they'd do anything for you. If they hated you they'd do anything, too. (laughter). There were no half measures. But feeling in modern times- I hope I'm not over generalising, but certainly among the people I've been in contact with in England, feelings seem rather tepid. Not very powerful. Not very full-blooded, as it were. Either for better or worse, whether positive or negative.

Cittapala: You said elsewhere that this is due to possibly increased mobility. Not being in one spot, or associated with any..

S.: I think I didn't speak so much in terms of intensity of feeling there, but depth of feeling. Though, no doubt the two are connected.

Devamitra: Could you actually elaborate the distinction between. .?

S.: Well what does it convey to you if I speak of, say, depth of feeling rather than intensity of feeling. Depth of feeling. Doesn't it suggest something deeply rooted. Something that's not going to be shaken, you know, very strong. But you can have a very intense feeling that doesn't last very long. So you can be intensely in love, it might not last more than a week. But you can have a very deep feeling of love which, you know, continues for years together and not shaken by circumstances. So there is a distinction between intensity and depth of feeling. So I was speaking then of depth of feeling. In other words not of intensity of feeling which is rather different.

Devamitra: I think maybe I confused one with the other, sometimes. Mistaking intensity of feeling with depth of feeling.

S.: Sometimes the two go together but not necessarily so. (Pause) Richard Clayton: What was this point on mobility?

S.: That, you know, one is very mobile in modern times. One can travel easily from place to place. I mean, modern Americans, we are

1%



told, never stay in one place more than five years on average. That means that you make a whole lot of new friends, perhaps every five years. So you don't have a chance to develop your friendships very much. It doesn't strike very deep roots. There's no depth to your feelings, you know, for those people. You get up and leave them quite easily. So, perhaps, mobility is associated with a sort of shallowness of feeling.

Cittapala: But that doesn't account for, necessarily, intensity.

S.: Mm.

Cittapala: That doesn't account for the apparent lack of intensity of feelings in modern people.

S.: No it doesn't. Perhaps the feelings are too dissipated. They are spread over too many objects. There are too many demands made upon them. Situations aren't any longer relatively simple and uncomplicated.

Surata: Can we come back to this thing about neutral feeling. I mean that is not necessarily a bad thing, is it? That one just...

S.: Well a neutral feeling is neutral.

Surata: Because, I mean, I think in my own case I've never really sort of appreciated the fact that I could just feel neutral. And that I wasn't feeling, sort of, quite, you know, quite sort of happy than there was something actually wrong with me. And I've noticed..

S.: Well, perhaps in a sense there is. You know, perhaps, it is more normal, so to speak, for a human being, you know, to be in a very positive, very happy, even blissful state. (Pause)

Ratnaprabha: With respect... \$as going to say with respect to those neutral feelings which are suppressed as opposed to those which are simply non-existent you spoke of abreaction, the psychoanalytic approach of abreaction. Do you think that is actually necessary if one has repressed feelings?

S.: I'm not sure whether the dramatic, sort of, on the couch, psychoanalytical abreaction is necessary but, surely, the energy in the feeling, the energy locked up in the feeling which has been repressed, let us say, needs to find some positive outlet. I think it can do that. I think that can happen without that abreaction taking place specifically with regard to the original feeling and the cause of that feeling. I mean the energy can, perhaps, find a way into your meditation without having to, you know, go through the particular process of abreaction, with regards to whatever it was caused originally, that feeling to be repressed. (Pause)

Richard Clayton: If one. you were saying that the natural human state is quite a happy one..

S.: I didn't say 'natural' I said 'normal'. I used 'normal' in the strict sense of in conformity with a norm. In conformity with an ideal. It maybe natural for the human being to be in a neutral state, but I think it's normal for a human being to be in a happy

state, a positive state. Yes? A

Cittapala: But does that imply that he should be having an intensity and perhaps even, a depth of feeling that is pleasant.

S.: Yes I would say so. Yes, I would regard that as normal, in the sense of which I defined the term. (Pause)

Surata: So normal be\$gs are probably in the minority. (Pause)

S.: Yes yes. I mean, say, looking back on your life, you know, before you came here, to '11 Convento' and say, considering your life here, would you say that it was, say, less neutral here than it was.

A voice: Defin~tely.

S.: That there was a sort of heightening. A sort of intensification at least by a few notches, by a few degrees.

Gunapala: I must say it~s more intense. It's deeper, there's more depth of being here. I mean i~s, when I was say in the outside world there was more ups and downs. There was much more of a as if you are on a rough ocean sometimes. You know, you were stirred round a lot but here ~ts very constant.

S.: But on what level is it constant? This is what I'm asking? Is it constant on a neutral level or, you know, a more neutral level or a less neutral level. Or constant on a more positive, pleasurable level.

Surata: There hasn't been so much neutrality for me, I've been really...

Cittapala: It hasn't been neutral.

S.: You said it had been best, well yours was neutral apparently before, well certainly you wouldn't say that your experience here has been a sort of predominantly neutral one.

Voices: No. (Pause)

Harshaprabha: In general its been more enjoyable despite, you know, the greater intensity of feelings. I certainly feel...

S.: Despite your hardships? (laughter)

Harsha rabha: They are very (Pause)

\_\_\_\_\_/9?

Ratnaprabha: You have spoken of the western idea of emotion,

having both a, sort of, vedana part and also a volitional part and here it's presumably simply vedana that is being talked about.

S.: It will seem so, yes.

Ratnaprabha: I'm just wondering whether intense feelings do imply strong volitional engagement and if one doesn't have that then the ordinary simple reaction to stimuli will gradually become less and less interesting.

S.: Yes, I think so. I think it is in practice very difficult to separate altogether emotion from volition. Even the very word emotion suggests that. It is connected with motion, with movement. Drive. (pause)

Gunapala: You say feeling here isn't connected with volition?

S.: No, just sensation. Vedana or feeling or sensation is one of the five skhandas and what we regard as volition is included under t:~~ sams~aras. But in practice it is quite difficult to sep~rate these two. A pleasurable sensation is one thing, an emotional quite another thing because of the addition, so to speak, or the emerg- ence within it of the volitional factor. The volitional aim. (pause)

Harshaprabha: I suppose hardships would be related to not being totally mindful in the fullest sense as is possible, as in my case..

S.: Well, hardships can also be connected with lack of distractions to which one is accustomed. Because there are no physical hardships that I know of. You are not sleeping on stone benches or anything like that? Oh dear (laughter) Sounds rather a mournful note. (laughter) Perhaps it depends on what you were accustomed to sleeping on in Manchester.

So I think that a point seems to have been established that quite often when people speak i~ terms of themselves of other people not being in touch with their feelings what they really mean is that, not that they are out of touch with strong repressed or supressed

~~~.~~ ~&. feelings but that they dwell in a sort of emotional twilight state.~ ~

~So when do emotions bcome intense? How do they become intense? Or

perhaps in what sort of situations does one feel intense emotion?

Cittapala: Are you talking of emotion as distinct from feeling?

S.: No, the pleasurable sensation with this volitional element present. In other words, emotion in the sense that we usually use the term. When do we feel intensely emotional?

Devamitra: When you're really absorbed.

S.: If you are really absorbed. Well what sort of things absorb you?

What sort of things give rise to intense emotion?

Richard: Watching something, looking at something.

Gunapala: It can either be ph~sical or it can be mental. T mean you can have an intense pleasurable mental... let me see, say when you are thinking about something or I suppose listening to music, there's a mental happiness and enjoyment of a beautiful piece of music, and then on the other hand you could be doing a s~ort or, you kno~, swimming, some quite Ph)~ical...

S.: But isn't that enjoyment rather than emotion? Can one not

distinguish n an emotion and an enjoyment?

Ratnaprabha: It seems that if one is very aware of sensations then, assuming there's not actual phsical pain, then these sensations would just be enjoyable. Just enjoy, just to feel what's going on. And in yoga just to feel you body is very enjoyable as long as one is not in pffsical pain which one sometimes is.

Devamitra: But that seems a bit more passive.

Ratnaprabha: Well that's what I'm saying. It's not emotional. That's not emotional, that's just simply enjoying the sensations but

the emotional element comes in, say, when there's some sort of object..

S.: Yes, when there's something expressive- (pause)

Devamitra: When there's something expressive?

S.: Expressive. That is to say you're not sitting back and enjoying something and letting it affect you. You are doing something. You are engaged in something. And in connection with that you experience emotion. I mean emotion suggests a sort of outward movement.

Devamitra: There also has to be an element of attraction towards that particular activity or work--ever it is that's...

S.: I don't know about attraction, certainly an element of satisfaction in it. (pause) Because we speak of enjoying music, but can one speak of emotion in this connection necessarily? You might, I mean, the composer might have experienced great emotion in composing the music, but do you experience emotion, as distinct from enjoyment in listening to the music? If so, what is the basis of the distinction between the two?

Cittapala: You can sometimes feel very moved by it, a passage in it.

E.: Yes.

Cittapala: I mean, you almost feel sort of like I don't know, being quite active in a sense.

Ki~

Gunapala: I mean physically too. I mean you can feel a smile coming across your face, and a warmth into your body physically so that you actually do sort of physically see ~ light seem to glow in you.

S.: Well, what then is the distinction between enjoyment and emotion? Is there a distinction~

Richard: If you listen to music for instance, you start making associations. And somehow put things together, and, perhaps, quite subtly you get a feeling of yourself listening. You are more aware of yourself, and an expandedness.

Ratnaprabha: Presumably there is a distinction between, I mean, in a strong positive emotion there will be enjoyment present, but there can be kinds of enjoyment that do not necessarily have any volitional things.

S: Yes, emotion seems to be a more complex state. It seems more object-related and to involve active contemplation more than enjoyment. Enjoyment is perhaps somewhat more passive, and emotion more active. One could, perhaps, say that. Well anyway, what I'm trying to do is trying to identify areas where we do experience emotion or feeling, let us say, more intensely. Because you know, if to experience emotion more intensely is better, well, we have to sort of first look at those areas where it usually happens and to find some clues, you know, from them for the development of emotion in a more intense sort of way. I mean how does one intensify one's emotions? Well, if one wants to move into that, well one can, first of all look at those areas in which normally usually one does experience more intense emotion.

Devamitra: Well, they are always associated with areas of interest.

S.: Mm. Mm. Well, I think that's obvious, in a way, isn't it?

Devamitra: Yes. (Laughs)

Richard: And in dreams you experience intense emotions.

S.: Yes, emotion, yes I suppose one can.

Ratnaprabha: I seem to associate experiencing intense emotions with a feeling of sort of being larger, of having expanded, and not experiencing emotions as feeling contracted. So, it's as if - somehow the object is at least to some extent sort of included in my field of awareness, or sort of almost in my consciousness in some sense. I'm thinking especially of another person; then there will be an intense emotional experience. But if I'm just really holding back and holding in, then, probably there won't be an intense emotional experience, unless you could call that feeling of frustration and blockage an emotional experience.

S.: It wouldn't be a pleasurable one.

Ratnaprabha: Certainly not, no. But even unpleasant emotional experiences seem to sometimes involve a sort of expansion. Like, you know, an experience of hatred. In a sense, it's sort of outward-going.

S.: Indeed, yes. But it would seem that powerful emotion involves an expenditure of energy, doesn't it? So this might suggest that there is a limit to the extent to which you can experience powerful or intense emotions, if they do involve expenditure of energy.

Harshaprabha: What would be the limiting factor?

S.: Well, the amount of energy available.

Harshaprabha: So, in a sense, it could be limitless.

S.: Well, doesn't it suggest that perhaps one shouldn't expect to be always in a state of emotional intensity. You haven't got the energy for it perhaps, under the existing circumstances, anyway. Your existing reserves of energy are not sufficient to support a continual state of intense emotion. It would wear you out. You'd die of bliss, you know, quite literally. (Laughter.) (Pause.) But I think this may be you know why people nowadays, in the West or in England at least, well in

7q9

South-East England, well in London, well in Bethnal Green anyway (Laughter) don't seem to experience more intense emotion. It may be that their energy is being frittered away in all directions by the demands of modern life. You can't accumulate as it were enough energy to be able to invest in something which you'd then proceed to experience strongly in an emotional way.

Gunapala: I think you are getting closer now, getting back to energy. This lack of energy, and no emotion. No enjoyment. It almost seems like we need energy to even get the satisfaction of enjoyment.

S.: If you consistently experience a sort of dull, neutral emotional state, it may suggest that you don't have enough energy. That you need to accumulate more energy. It may even suggest that you're tired or even worn out. Really, I mean, have people noticed a correlation? When ~~~ tired, I mean very tired. Don't you find it more difficult, say, to enjoy music or to enjoy poetry? Don't you find it more difficult to enjoy anything, especially of a more refined nature?

Ratnaprabha: Especially if it's mental tiredness. An ordinary physical tiredness at the end of a good day's work doesn't seem necessarily to have that effect.

Surata: But even then. I mean I have experienced times when I've felt I was physically quite tired and then something unexpected has happened and I've just broken through that...

S.: Yes, maybe you've got perhaps reserves of energy and perhaps something arises in which one is really interested and that reserve of energy then just comes into operation. That sometimes happens but it doesn't seem possible for it to go on happening indefinitely. You can be so tired sometimes, so lacking in energy that even something that you normally find very interesting and very stimulating, say an opera by Handel that you haven't heard before, can't move you. You're just not interested. You just haven't got the energy to experience it in the way that it should be experienced.

Surata: For instance, when one is ill. I've experienced

that a number of times, just lying in bed completely submissive and restless, not being able to really put myself into anything...

S.: Well, a poem by Yeats in this connection I can't remember the beginning of it. (Pause.) He says, I forget what he's talking about, he says, "What's this?" He says something like, "To be drained dry by an old witch and then to be brought to a chamber where lies one wrought with despair". You are so drained by experiences of everyday life that when you are brought into contact with something that you really enjoy, would like to enjoy, you've just got no energy left to enjoy it with. This is sometimes a very sad state of affairs. (Pause.)

Harshatrabha: So that's why talks of getting away for periods.

S: Oh yes, now I remember. Yes he says,

"Toil and grow rich

What's this but to lie with an old witch

And after being drained dry To be brought to a chamber where Lies one long wrought with despair."

In other words, all your energies have gone into toiling and growing rich. You've been drained. So that when you come into contact with something really worthwhile that you'd like to enjoy you just haven't got the energy to do so. You might feel like that after a day of building work and there's a concert on in the evening but you just don't have the energy to enjoy it. Haven't got the emotional energy to put into it. So, perhaps, this has some bearing on our - rather neutral emotional state. But doesn't one sometimes find this with the metta bhavana? If you're rather tired and a bit drained of energy you can't get up a very strong feeling of metta.

Devamitra: Actually, I'm afraid I find this my characteristic level of experience. It's one of total neutrality. And most times that I do the metta bhavana it's just the same.

S.: So are you, sort of actually drained dry, as it were? Or is it that the energy is all there just under the surface and you just can't mobilise it in the direction that you would like to?

[201]

Devamitra. Difficult to know,

Richard: I experience this sometimes peculiarly if I feel energyless and I'm sort of aware of that and I'm saying I want to develop metta but then perhaps if I get some other dis'

tracting thought and I relax and forget, then something comes through almost, as if through a side route, And you realise that you have got energy there. It's just not forthcoming.

S.: Because one doe~ find sometimes people just springing into life. They're apparently in an apathetic state. The minute something that they are really interested in arises or is mentioned even, they spring to life.

Ratnaprabha: Yes I do have the experience that somewhere there is an enormous amount of energy and in a way I may be using a lot of energy all the time, but a lot of it just being frittered away, and if only I could discover how to direct it~ to focus it more, to mobilise it more, then I'd be able to put it onto the particular things that I feel are positive.

S.: Well one could even say that modern living is of such a nature that it's almost designed it seems to dissipate energy. To fritter every away. (Pause.)

Gunapala: I mean I think it's been brought up before, this unhooking, and hooking on. Unhooking from all these dis- tractions, and negative outlets and hooking on to the positive and seems like for a long time most of us are unhooking our energy from being dissipated and wasted onto...

S.: Well, maybe the energy may be spread over a number of things which are quite good in themselves. But the fact that the energy is spread over a number of things, it can't be put into anything, you know, with any degree of intensity. So that you don't have any emotional experience of any degree of in- tensity, in connection with anything. Like a man with six girlfriends, if you see what I mean, (Pause.) And metaphoric- ally speaking in modern life you have hundreds of girlfriends all the time. Representing all the little outlets of energy. So you don't have any one single very intense strong experience. And energy is often frittered away just by way of ordinary

superficial, not very pleasant day-to-day contacts. Even, you know you walk down the street in a c~owded part of London for a few hundred yards, you feel a lot of energy just being frittered away by that experience. You spend some time in a crowded bus or in the tube:



energy is being frittered away. At least you sort of ward off maybe the unpleasant vibes for want of a better term, coining across from other people. (Pause.) Or just keeping all that noise and sound at bay.

Gunapala: My experience is, I do get the feeling sometimes that I really like to board my life up in someways, to stop it all from escaping.

S.: Lure yourself in a tomb. (Laughs.)

Devamitra: But if that experience also continues in practically ideal circumstances, like for instance a solitary retreat? You sit down and there's no feeling of the metta bhavana, and you find it's characteristic of say that particular period of time. You can't really blame it on the conditions that you live in.

S.: No, it means in that case, it would suggest that your level of interest is quite low. Because there are certain things which do arouse almost everybody's interest. And stimulate their energies. For instance food. Then there's sex. These are the two main things. So usually one's interest is stimulated at least by these things. But if it is stimulated only by these things, well you're on a very low level of development. Clearly. But if it's stimulated by things higher up on the scale of cultural values, well clearly, you are to that extent a more developed person. A more evolved person. So it could be, if for instance on your solitary retreat you aren't really stimulated about anything of a higher nature, well it does raise questions about your over-all level of development. Because, presumably, if a beautiful woman was to be introduced into your caravan, you would then become quite interested. Even quite stimulated. (laughter.)

Yes? Or a beautifully cooked meal suddenly placed in front of

you. You know, your gastric juices would probably start flowing. And you know, a gleam would come into your eye. You know, your

dull, lack-lustre eye would start really gleaming. (Pause.) So, it would seem that there is, yes, in a way, a reservoir of energy, you know, so to speak. And that can be stimulated by maybe different objects depending upon just where we are on the overall scale of development. I mean a lot of people obviously are only stimulated by food, sex, a fight at a foot- ball match. Others may be stimulated by music and poetry. Others by friendship and the spiritual life. Meditation.

Devamitra: But, I mean, it's possible to be stimulated by some of those things. For instance by poetry and what have you and actually have a feeling for that and yet when you meditate it's as if there's no feeling for meditation. Certainly that's my experience. That you can't mobilise sufficient emotional energy to do the metta bhavana practice.

S.: Well, I think you have to begin by, sort of, mobilising your energies, your emotional energies, let's say on a level sufficiently near to the new level on which you wish to mobilise

them. Do you see what I mean? For instance, let's put it in very rough general terms. You can't jump straight, say from food and sex to the level of the first dhyana. You've got to, as it were, coax your feelings up to another level first. Maybe the level of poetry and music. And then from there coax them up into meditation. So if one really finds it difficult to have a strong emotional experience in connection with meditation it means, well, that one has left too big a gap between that level of emotional experience and one's usual level of experience. And you're unable to bridge that gap all in one go, as it were. I mean one big leap or one big jump. So maybe one does just have to cultivate an intermediate level, much more, first. And~that intermediate level being represented by for example, say, music and poetry and so on.

END OF SIDE A

Devamitra: About the level of development. Um, would it therefore be a bit pointless in doing a solitary retreat? Is there still a point in doing a solitary retreat?

S.: Well a solitary retreat has other functions too. It encourages one's attitude of independence and not depending

upon other people. One's ability to occupy oneself, even amuse oneself. It has got all those values. It enables one to see to what extent one is dependent on the company of other people for one's positivity. It enables you to see quite a lot about yourself, and to decide which things are due to just you and which things are due to external circumstances. So the purpose of a solitary retreat is not simply that you may experience a continuous state of dhyana. It's got other aspects too, other values too.

Surata:            Depending on your level of development.

Richard: This relates to the arts and artist. How far can that take you, your energy, to sort of refining it as it were? Does it take you into the dhyanic experience or is it...?

S.: I think through the arts one can occasionally, you know, even get as far as the dhyanas. I mean, I don't think it lasts more than a few minutes, but at least you can get up into a very ecstatic and refined, concentrated sort of state. Feel really carried away. I think probably it happens most of all in connection with music and poetry. I mean, sometimes, listening to say a Beethoven symphony, or a Handel opera or oratorio, one can be in a very absorbed state. An intense emotional experience.

Cittapala: Presumably from the point of view of emotion being quite an outward-going thing that's actually being positive, actively creative...

S.: I think it's possible to be even more intensely involved if one is creative. If one is, say, enjoying actively rather than passively. There again, I wouldn't like to generalise too much because some people can have experiences of extra-ordinary intensity at listening to music, or just reading poetry. Depending on one's individual susceptibility.

Cittapala: If one's experiencing the sort of problems Devamitra was talking about, should one then try and coax oneself into that, say listening to a piece of Handel, or something like this, then try to do the metta bhavana immediately afterwards or is it just..

S: Some people do find that useful. How soon afterwards, that's difficult to say, it's difficult to generalise. But some people do find that, you know, reading poetry, for instance, does help them to keep in touch with their emotions. Or, at least, let's say to experience positive emotion. And, so that, when they take up the Metta Bhavana they are already in touch with their emotions. They are already experiencing positive emotions. There's a sort of reservoir of positive emotion which they can proceed to draw upon. I think it's quite difficult, probably, to get into a really intense Metta Bhavana from a state of absolute, sort of, neutrality, emotionally speaking.

Cittapala : Perhaps too, because of the coarseness of, sort of, of depth of knowledge of higher cultural activities, amongst quite a large number of people, maybe that accounts for all the, sort of, greyness of peoples' states.

S: Perhaps it does, yes. But I think that even within the FWBO, I think, quite a few people would have to confess that their most intense emotional experiences are probably connected with food and sex. Even 40-years. (laughter) Do you see what I mean? That they are not carried away to the same extent by poetry. Even by Shakespeare. Or by music. Even by Handel or Mozart as they are in these two cases. So if one is, sort of, thinking a modest aim, well, one can think in terms of, well, finding the same kind of intense emotional experience in poetry and music as you find in connection with food and sex. And, of course, in the case of music and poetry would be of a higher, more refined level and to that extent, more intense.

Cittapala: It's interesting, though. I've never really, sort of, considered that perhaps, the intensity of one's emotional experience, say reading a Shakespearean play, would be the equivalent of the intensity of something like sex or really good food or something of this nature.

S: Mm. In other words you're concerned with it as a minor pleasure.

Cittapala: Well, no, it's just .. Well, it's a different sort of qualitative difference, but I never, I mean, I always equate what, the other two as being much more intense.

S: In a way it is qualitatively different, yes. But just think in terms of intensity in the sense of the extent to which you are moved. Well you aren't often moved on the level, say, of

poetry and music to the same extent that you are moved, say, on the level of food and sex by those particular things. But one needs to be and if one's, you know sort of, level of consciousness is to be definitely and, as it were, permanently shifted and you as a being, an evolving being, are to go up, as it were, one or two notches up the scale.

Cittapala: Well, I suppose, it is only in that way, that you are actually then beginning to see food and sex as, well ...

S: As peripheral. But if they are your main sources of emotional satisfaction you cannot but regard them as central and you put them, in effect, at the centre of your mandala. At least, in the centre of your emotional mandala ev~, if not in the centre of your intellectual mandala. So, in a way, you are, sort of, professing to regard as things of minor importance, things which are, in fact, of major emotional importance. So here is a sort of discrepancy. A sort of hiatus that has to be simply, sort of, reached.

Cittapala: It's a sort of unintentional hypocrisy, in a way, isn't it?

S: Yes, it, S unintentional hypocrisy in the sense that one's emotional experience does not conform to one's intellectual understanding. Which is, of course, in a general way the case throughout our spiritual life. I mean, our intellectual understanding's always way ahead of our emotional involvement. So one should be aware of what is happening. Aware of what the position is. (pause)

Richard: I'm not quite sure about how we are talking about energy. Whether we are talking about it as something that we do have a huge amount of and it varies (there are areas of it left behind) or we hide and we have to provide the right conditions for it to well up. Or whether, in fact, there is only as much energy as we actually create, within ourselves.

S: I think time-scale is important because sometimes we feel tired, yes, it's as though you can't draw on your energy or

anything. Even if you're normally interested. But if you have a good rest, after a while, you are ready; the energy is there. One can't think, sort of, of energy, of having oneself as having energy or not having energy in terms which are too absolute. It depends on the circumstances. Sometimes you can mobilise energy, but you need a bit of time. And sometimes you may be really exhausted and may need, you know, a rest of some weeks duration. (pause)

Richard: So in a sense are we creating our own energy or is, there is, is it there?

S: Well, it's both. It's like a reservoir, like a lake. And, er, it's a vas~quantity of it there but some of it is leaking away. But also it is replenished from time to time, by the rain or

whatever. It's difficult, I don't think one can speak in terms of infinite reservoir actually being there. You've only got to tap it. I don't think you can think in terms either of just producing energy. But, certainly, I think one can say that almost always there is, at least in a manner of speaking, more energy already there and able to be drawn upon than we usually think. In other words there is such a thing as energy blockage. (pause)

Gunapala: I mean, I've found, I've found that how we said that we can't sort of, ... energy is so easily used on these lower levels, sort of, we get emotionally involved in, say, the lower course of events, like sex and food and so forth and when it comes to more refined, as it were, higher states of feeling we can't operate on that level. As if there's something, a third another factor somewhere like consciousness or something or us that cannot operate on a more refined level or a higher level. It is as if

S: I don't like to use a, sort of, mechanical model too much. But it is as though one can speak in terms of refinement of energy, that it is not just that one has got a lot of energy. It's also a question of the degree of refinement of the energy, which ultimately, I suppose is a question of the degree of refinement of the person himself. Yes? So it is if your energy is, so to speak, crude, you can only put it into crude things. you have to refine the energy before you can put it into.

S: (Cont. ) more refined objects. And it, therefore it would seem that one can speak in terms of refining your energy to such a point that it is sufficiently refined to be put, so to speak, into the Metta Bhavana. You can refine it with such things as the enjoyment of music and poetry.

Gunapala: But if you're a coarse, say, you are a coarse person, then you won't, you won't enjoy Classical Music.

S: Well, you can learn. You can, sort of, do too much at once. You can start off with a few light, popular classics, if that isn't a contradiction in terms, and then progress to more 'highbrow' sort of things. Also, perhaps, one has to get rid of one's cultural conditioning. You may have been brought up as if you couldn't enjoy those sort of things. You have to be very educated, intelligent or, say, intellectual to enjoy all that sort of thing. You may have had an inhibition of that kind. You may think that, well, they aren't enjoyable or only enjoyable after a great deal of trouble. But then you might find, well, you actually do enjoy the Mozart and Beethoven straight off. No trouble at all. It was just your, you know, your sort of negative cultural conditioning that had got in the way. (pause) You maybe have been brought up to think that they were incredibly difficult to appreciate. (Laughter)

A Voice: Mm, I know people like that.

S: Or maybe you don't like the idea of being 'highbrow'. Maybe you've been brought up to think that people who enjoy Beethoven are a bit 'highbrow', a bit pretentious even and you don't want to be like that. So, in a sense, you don't want to enjoy that sort of music because you don't want to be considered that sort of person.

Cittapala: Do you actually find that certain composers enshrine higher values than others. I suppose that is obviously the case but I was wondering which ones you ...

S: I would say so. (pause) Some composers certainly seem cruder and coarser than others, though very vigorous. I mean I'm thinking of someone like Rossini, he's very lively and vigorous and tuneful. BUT he doesn't seem to have a very refined and

S: (Cont ) musical sensibility. Say, to think of Monteverdi in comparison then, I think, one would want to know what they mean.

Cittapala: Because, I mean just as in the same way we have been talking about composing a hundred best books, you could also make a similar list of great composers because

S: From the light classical to the profoundly classical.

Cittapala: Yes. I mean because it~ equally boggling for the majority of People especially when you look at some of the corpses of some composers. They are so large.

S: you wonder how they found time to write them all. (Laughter) Listening to them all. If you think that they have now recorded all Haydn's symphonies and they are in the recording process of recording all his operas even. Well, it's an incredible thing. He must have been a really hard worker, to say the very least. I mean just copying all that would seem to be a lifetime~ work, not to speak of composing it. But he did. And it's all, it's all quite listenable too. It's all quite tuneful and interesting. I've yet to even, I think, hear a bar of Haydn which wasn't interesting. It's an incredible achievement!

Cittapala: I have heard it said that you think that some of Beethoven's symphonies are a little crude ... is this with reference ....

S: Yes, this is true. This is true. I think before putting this opinion into general circulation I must listen to Beethoven's symphonies again. But I do sometimes feel that I just get the impression, a mental picture of a little man, sort of sticking out his chest and strutting. It's a little pompous, sometimes. As though of grandeur, an impression that is a little strained and a little forced. This is the impression that I get. But not always. Not always. Certain instances. I can't give you the, I can't refer you to specific symphonies or bars. Perhaps I should try and identify them.

Devamitra: You did seem, I think you did once. You said to me specifically particularly the

fifth symphony (unclear) I remember trying to defend Beethoven at the time, as regards the seventh symphony. (Laughter)

S.: Yes, there is an element of forcing in Beethoven. I think this is a maybe, general cultural line, of historical significance.

When you consider how some authors in the past just tossed off book after book, day after day, but so many modern writers seem to have to squeeze it out bit by bit. There is probably some general cultural lesson to be learned from this, but I'm not sure what it is. (Pause)

Gunapala: How is it, that it's been said, and you said that your intellect is one step ahead, almost, of your emotions.

S.: Sometimes many steps ahead.

Voice: Yes. And yet with music, you can get somebody that will say, really know Monteverdi and Handel and so forth, yet never know the first thing about any music, or any intellectual understanding in that way.

S.: Well, you don't need to know anything about music in order to enjoy it.

Gunapala: You don't - no.

S.: No. I think a modest amount of knowledge is usually helpful in enhancing enjoyment. I think you can enjoy it almost to the limit without knowing about the technicalities of music at all. I'm not, I won't be absolutely confident about this and some people might well disagree with me, but I can certainly say, you know, I know very little about music, technically speaking, but I certainly enjoy it enough.

Gunapala: Does the intellect come...

S.: Well, I don't think it's a question of, you know, that you have a big intellectual understanding of music with which your emotional appreciation of music gradually catches up. I think one can speak in terms of the human being as whole, as having, you know, intellectually advanced and emotionally advanced; that doesn't apply, as it were, to individual things like music which can be enjoyed. It's not that you have a big intellectual understanding of music and then you gradually begin enjoying it. No. [211]

Gunapala: It seems the opposite.

S.: No, if anything it's the opposite.

Cittapala: Coming in on that point I was wondering whether you can clear up the point between citta and manas. Because I looked up citta in the Pali dictionary and it said, it was "equated with heart and intention". And I get the impression amongst the Friends there's quite often this sort of feeling that intellect is just the top of your head.

S.: Just frozen.

Cittapala: And all your emotions sort of below your neck, and the two never meet.

S.: Like the North Pole and the Equator! (Laughter). Yes, that's true. I think there's not much conception of, sort of, intellectual passion. (pause).

Cittapala: But both terms actually are content of the mind, aren't they? It's just the mind in it's different aspects?

S.: I mean, as regards to the terms manas and citta. They are, they can be used interchangeably but it does seem that if one does use them separately or regards them as having somewhat independant meanings, it does seem that citta is broader in its connotation and does include what is almost an emotional and volitional element. In which case citta can sometimes be translated as heart. For instance you speak of the bodhicitta. But it isn't just a thought, in the abstract intellectual sense of, or about Enlightenment. It's a feeling for. That's why sometimes it's translated as Enlightenment heart. I translate it as will to Enlightenment, which I think is better than "thought of Enlightenment". But even so not completely satisfactory. Guenther translated it as an enlightened attitude. But that seems much more, it seems much too neutral, general, vague. It's a heart- felt aspiration including understanding, you know, in the direction of Enlightenment. (Long pause). So where does this leave us as regards to the contemplation of feeling.

Herein monks. a monk when experiencing a pleasant feeling knows

"I experience a pleasant feeling etc., etc."

Well, you've got to be in touch with your feelings. I suppose it means that. (Laughter). In the sense of being in touch with and fully aware of the feelings that are actually there. I mean as someone remarked at the very beginning, sometimes you may be in a grumpy mood and not really appreciate the fact. Not in a sense, really know. Not really be conscious of the fact that you are in a grumpy mood. So perhaps it relates more to something of that sort.

Gunapala: I so sometimes experience myself as being spread out over a long distance, over a long span in time. The feelings which are, have been a bit upset, as it were, understood as quite happy. Well happy to be here. And then there's the bit, I suppose, that stretches



forward and so it goes on. We're quite complicated. And our feelings aren't very simple. It's not just one feeling. There's a whole bundle of them. Some much happier than others.

S.: Yes, yes. (Pause).

Gunapala: I suppose it's just being aware of that.

S.: "So at least concentrated feelings externally and internally." Well, one's own and other people's, presumably. Though one's own would have seemed to be more useful from a spiritual point of view.

"And he lives contemplating origination factors in feelings or he lives contemplating dissolution factors in feelings or he lives contemplating origination and dissolution factors in feelings." And there's a note there.

"The factors of origination are ignorance and craving, karma and sense impressions and the general characteristic of originating; and the factors of dissolution are the disappearance of the four, and the general characteristics of dissolution. "

In other words, the feelings that one experiences, the impressions whether pleasurable, painful, or neutral are the outcome of ignorance, craving, karma, sense impressions and cease (in) the disappearance of those factors. In other words, the main point is that feeling is a conditioned phenomena. Feeling arises in dependence on conditions and disappears when those conditions are removed. But this has an important practical corollary. Because it means that you can, as it were, create, or decreate your own feelings. By, as it were,

manipulating one's impressions. Well, one knows this, doesn't one? One might feel quite depressed and quite sad but you know from experience that a day in the country will put you in a much more positive mood. That, in dependence upon those impressions which are experienced when you are in the country, there will arise pleasurable sensations. So off you go to the country. So you are, you know, your feelings are to some extent under your control. (Pause). Those which arise as a result of karma are not altogether under your control. You can't do anything about them. If, for instance, in the past you performed an unskillful action and had thus created a karma, the vipaka of which is that you suffer in a particular way, there is nothing which you can do about that. Except perhaps, under certain circumstances, under certain conditions to produce a counter-active karma. Otherwise you just have to bear that particular vipaka vision (one word unclear), but those impressions, which are not connected with karma, you can, as it were, manipulate. You can change. You can arrange.

Surata: Is it possible to sort of hazard a guess, to the best way, to sort of, know how common the karma aspect is?

S.: Well it's generally said that one can conclude or assume that something is due to karma, as a result of karma, if all one's efforts to remove it fail and there seems to be no reason why they should fail, as far as you can see. The measures you have taken are adequate to remove that particular effect, that particular experience whatever it is. But they don't work. You can then only assume that there's a karmic factor at work.

Surata: And in that case, as you've said, your only course of action is to try and build up an opposite sort of karma.

Gunapala: In this case, you know, Monteverdi always lifts you up, heightens your awareness and then one day all of a sudden it doesn't. This occasion is some sort of karma affecting you.

S.: Well I don't know whether it will work like that.

Surata: I was thinking more in terms of, say, you seem to have an irrational~isposition for anger and there seems to be no reason for it and then you might, sort of, undertake the practice of meditator as a sort of equal or opposing karmic factor, as a way of trying to

(rest unclear) .... (Long pause).

Gunapala: I'd thought of karma more as something that comes back on you once you'd done an act....

S.: Well no, one must distinguish, I mean here again it's a question of language. Karma is action. People often speak of "It's my karma In the sense of, well that's what is my fate. But one must distinguish karma from karma vipaka. Action from the fruits of action.

Gunapala: So it's karma vipaka?

S.: So you can counteract the fruits of karma. If you perform an unskilful karma, you can counteract the painful consequences, the painful fruits of that unskilful karma by performing a skilful karma, the pleasurable fruits of which will outdo the painful fruits of the unskilful karma. (Pause). For instance, if one, for no apparent reason, people are always hitting you and beating you in this life, well you can conclude that you may have done that to other people in your previous life. So in this life, you'd go out of your way to be kind and considerate to people so as to generate the opposite kind of karma vipaka.

-H-Ratnarabha: Is this, always possible? I'm thinking about a sutta I was reading a couple of days ago in which an arahant, I'm afraid I can't remember his name, after he had become an arahant found that people kept throwing stones at him, and such like. And the Buddha told him, this was the result of actions in a previous life, that he was still having to experience. So it seemed, in his case, although he was an arahant he was unable to counteract the effects of this kind of karma vipaka.

S.: Well, he didn't need to because he'd gained arahantship. He didn't need to.

Ratnaprabha: Right, so he's (unclear) ....

S.: The Buddha himself had to suffer from the consequences of a previous unskilful action, which was when Devadatta drew blood from his foot by rolling a stone down upon him. A splinter struck the Buddha in his foot and that was said to be due to, you know, an unskilfu

action performed by the Buddha in some remote past life. So the fact that you've gained Enlightenment does not exempt you from continued experience of the unskilful results of you own, or the results of your own previous unskilful actions. But it doesn't matter anymore. You j~st bear it mindful and possessed, and you know that you are not going to have a physical body again in the future, not under the law of karma anyway.

Cittapala: Does that mean, then, that, Milrepa would have experienced the karma vipaka of his actions as...

S.: Oh yes. This is why he set out on the spiritual path because he knew that the actions, the unskilful actions, he had committed were so terrible that he would surely go to hell on his death.

Cittapala: Well obviously it didn't matter since he gained Enlight- enment, but does that then mean that he experienced.

S.: Well, because he gained Enlightenment there would be no after death experience. He wouldn't go to hell and he wouldn't be reborn. He'd go to (unclear word) rebirth.

Cittapala: But he didn't experience any result of that activity, later on in his life?

S.: He might have done. He did have some, yes, someone tried to poison him. He had that painful experience. But he did escape any post-mortem retribution, by gaining Enlightenment (laughter).

Suvajra: He had painful experiences up until Enlightenment through his life with Marpa.

S.: Yes, yes. I sometimes make the comparison of someone driving a car, yes? And the, sort of, car has got out of control, corresponding to the unskilful karma, so that if you continue to be in the car, i.e. if you continue to be re-incarnated, you know, the car will smash. In other words a painful experience. But, if you manage to eject yourself, you know, from the drivers seat, and perhaps you are snatched up by a helicopter overhead, before the car can smash. That corresponds to gaining Enlightenment before there is time for

you to experience the consequences of your unskilful actions. Well, you know, it's a bit risky waiting for the helicopter, as it were, relying too much on that.

S.: Do you see what I mean? Otherwise you'd be hurtling to destruction in the normal course of things. But you're snatched, you know, up just in time. This is what happened in the case of Milarepa.

Richard: (Is it possible for people with (unclear) and done bad things in previous lives and come to this existence and have such a weighty karma, as it were, and because of lack of opportunity, say, of meeting a situation like the Friends, where the life was going to be dark, not going to be able to in fact

S.: Well, the fact that they don't meet, don't have the sort of opportunity, is to some extent or in some cases, at least with vipaka of previous karma, they have not perhaps made the best use of their opportunities in the past. So again, it's an additional reason for, you know, spreading the word, so to speak, about the Friends, as widely as possible. I mean, reading the people's life stories it's extraordinary the accidental way apparently, that so many of them came into contact with the Friends. I remember somebody was talking, someone from Glasgow was saying.. yes, must have been Jinavamsa... he was living in the same street as the Centre for quite a long time. Didn't know there was a Buddhist community and Centre in that very street, a few doors down, until, one day, he saw a poster, so he went along. So supposing he hadn't seen that poster? Supposing the council had said, "Oh well, don't bother putting up posters this time. Nobody ever comes along after seeing posters." Well, he wouldn't have seen it. Perhaps he would never have made contact. So it's very, very important, you know, publicity in this sort of way. It's like sort of throwing out a life-line to a drowning man in some cases. But sometimes you've got to throw out the life-line even if you don't actually see any drowning men. They may be there in the darkness. You can't see them. But they'll see the life-line you know, will clutch hold of it desperately, and haul themselves up, with your help perhaps. So I think publicity is very important from this point of view. (Pause).

Harshaprabha: I had the idea when Suhuti's book comes out to send a copy to my town in N.E. Scotland, to our local library, just

so that there is a copy there that somebody might see.

S.: The public libraries are used very extensively by quite a lot of people.

Cittapala: Perhaps there's a technique which we don't use in the Friends now. Going to general libraries, asking them to buy copies of...

S.: Yes a few people have done this with the Survey and it worked. They have, well you don't even need to ask them to buy it, you just join the library and ask for the book (laughter) and very often if they -haven't got it, or if it isn't available, the book will be purchased.

Devamitra: Unfortunately, sometimes they also get it from the British Library. I ordered the Survey twice in Norwich and both times they got it from the British Library. They didn't buy a copy. (Pause).

Suvajra: Get lots of people to do it at the same time.

S.: Ten of you, ten people at different parts of the country, ten different copies at ten different cities, at the same time on order, there will be such a long waiting list that they will have to buy extra copies. (Laughter). You can see what happens and then just report what happened. You can just co-ordinate. Give the name of the publisher or give them the full details and all that. And ask for this book from your local library. See what happened at the British Library when they've got all these demands piling in from different parts of the country for one and the same book, they might smell a rat of course. (Laughter). Maybe other people have done it before. Maybe not on the same day. That would like a co-ordinated attempt.

Devamitra: Over a period of about a month.

S.: Yes.

Devamitra: I'll organise it at the next Order weekend.

S.: Yes (Laughter).

Ratnaprabha: Another thing is putting publicity inside Buddhist books. So if someone has an attraction for Buddhism, takes out a Christmas Humphries book, then perhaps there's a leaflet inside.

S.: On the F.W.B.O. Yes. (Pause). We first of all will have to take out the cover of the Buddhist Society (laughter). (inaudible talk).

Ratnaprabha: Is that ethical?

S.: I think it's very very ethical! (laughter).

Anyway, anything more about feeling? Maybe we should stay with feeling for the remainder of the morning - only a little while left.

Ratnaprabha: I do have another question about this reservoir of energy you were talking about. I wondered if, is it, in fact, a limited reservoir. I mean can one really speak of having a limited amount of energy or eventually, I'm thinking of people in terms of say, the Brahma Viharas, which you talked of as the Immeasurables. The amount of metta that one can generate is completely unlimited. So is one's energy really limited or...?

S.: I think for practical purposes it is. Because you can exhaust yourself. You can die of exhaustion. You can die of over-work. (Pause).

Ratnaprabha: That's physical energy isn't it? What about mental energy? Is that of the same nature?

S.: Well, there is such a thing as mental exhaustion, isn't there? So, if, I mean, the energy may be there in a sense but it's not there effectively. It's not there for practical purposes, unless you've some sort of medium of contacting it. Which apparently you don't always have. (Pause). Otherwise, you know, you ought to have, say, if an unlimited quantity of physical energy was at your disposal you ought to be able to lift, you know, an indefinitely heavy weight. An infinitely heavy weight. But then there is also the question of whether the muscles and all that, through which the energy passes, are able to physically stand the strain of that weight. Do you see what I mean? And there may be something analogous to that on the emotional level. I'm not quite sure but do you see what I mean?

Ratnaprabha: So what does it mean when metta is spoken of as being immeasurable?

S.: Well it's spoken of as being immeasurable in the sense that it doesn't exclude any object. Doesn't exclude any living being. (Pause).

Surata: How does this link up with the fact that like when you are in a sort of higher dhyanic state, you are supposed to be, you are said to be, your energy is said to be replenished. In what sense is it replenished? Presumably you...

S.: Well, you ~e the experience of the energy pouring in, I mean the second dhyana is described in those terms isn't it? A lake which has the subterranean spring replenishing it. Well one does find, I mean one does feel, one feels sort of refreshed after that sort of

meditation experience. As though there has been a sort of excess of energy.

Richard: Doesn't that suggest that there is a reservoir, a literal something as a reservoir, as it were, beyond...

S.: There is a whole series of reservoirs, perhaps. And one, sort of leading into another. If your small reservoir is connected say, to a medium sized reservoir, and that in a bigger one still...but it could be that you know, the medium sized one is empty then you have to wait for it to be filled again from the bigger one. But, on the other hand, I think one has to look with some suspicion, at least, some caution, at what I call these mechanical models for psychological and spiritual events. And can one really consistently think in terms of one's energy as, or one's reserves of energy as of, you know, a reservoir of water occupying a definite space and being of a definite quantity? To what extent is that analogy valid? I think we have to look at that too. (pause)

Cittapala: Are Enlightened being? Could one say that they had immeasurable energy in...?

S.: What would it mean? Does the phrase really mean anything? Perhaps we have to look at that too. What does it mean to have immeasurable energy? Well, what is energy? (Pause)

Richard: What actually exists; what gives you existence.

A Voice: Can be a physical level.

S.: Well, what is the proof that energy exists? The proof is that things get done. So in energy, infinite energy really is infinite capacity for work. So, presumably, the Bodhisattvas have infinite energy because they make vows to deliver all sentient being and so, presumably, in a sense, spiritual energy is unlimited, at least on that level. When you say your physical energy is limited, you mean, well, a time comes when you can't do any more work. This is the proof.

Surata: Physical body is actually limited.

S.: Can you imagine yourself going~working without stopping? You can't. So it means that physical energy is not unlimited in the sense that you can draw on it indefinitely without interruption. You can go on working everyday, you know, everyday of your life, but you need an intermission. You need to sleep in between and to eat in between. You cannot just go on working. Your energy, your physical energy is not infinite in that sense. And your spiritual energy, how would that show itself? Well, by creative energy. And does even the most creative person create all the time?

Well, one of the most creative persons I've read about recently was Dickens who wrote an enormous number of words. Millions of words. But even, well, he did all sorts of other things too, but he even had to eat and sleep. So, I mean, in what sense was his creative energy limited? In what sense was it unlimited? It wasn't unlimited that he could go on drawing on it without ever stopping. It's as though it was renewable. (Pause)

Cittapala: It was as if his mind was actually curtailed by the body; by the limitations of the body.

S.: But sometimes, again, he sat at his desk and there was a sort of, the well-known creative blockage. He couldn't get on with his writing sometimes. The time was there. There was no physical obstacle. He'd had his breakfast. Had a good sleep but he still couldn't write.

Cittapala: Presumably, that's rather different. It's a quite different feel to connect that with the spiritual energy of a Bodhisattva. His ability to work in all ten directions of space at once. [221]

S.: Well, a Bodhisattva doesn't have a physical body, necessarily in the sense that we usually have. The energy is, as it were, directly available. It doesn't have to go through a machine, so to speak. (Pause)

(End of Tape 10)

S.: But I'm interested in one way or another to question this whole image of the reservoir. I think we have to be very careful how we use these expressions and how we think of energy at all. We mustn't use the mechanical model too unthinkingly. We come to think, or have learned to speak of emotional energy and mental energy and creative - but I think we have to be very careful that we don't apply all the things that can be said about physical energy to these other energies. If we do it mindfully being aware of the limitations of the analogy.

Suvajra: So there's a concept of 'energy' as we have been using it in the traditional texts?

S.: In the Vajrayana to some extent but not really in the Pali Canon, I think, no.

Ratnaprabha: Is not virya sometimes translated as energy?

S.: Yes. But one doesn't think of virya in those sort of terms; in the sort of way that we think of energy. It's a very general concept. Perhaps we have to remember what a general concept it is and be careful how we use the term. I mean, for instance, someone doesn't do a job and you say, "Why didn't you do it?" He says, "Oh, I didn't have the energy!" But is that



really saying anything other than he didn't do the job? Or that he couldn't do it!

Gunapala: Well, you've always got the energy i~ you want to.

S.: Have you? What does one mean by 'want'?

Gunapala: Well, if you really want to do something, yeah, you've always got the capabilities of getting the energy.

Cittapala: No!! That's the sort of thing my mother used to say to me!

sps m\ft

Surata: We've already said that if you were ill, you might want to do something but you..

Gunapala: You've always got the capabilities of getting well again!

S.: But have you? Suppose you've got cancer?

Gunapala: The~you're going to have to die and get reborn again! (Laughter) (Few comments lost in the laughter)

Richard: Could you explain the (unclear) something you said (few words) that we must all live in our heights as well as our depths?

S.: When did I say this? I vaguely remember saying something like that.

Richard: Was it "Peace is a Fire"? I'm not sure. I've heard it...

S.: I think I m~st have been refer~ing to something like verti~al integration. One's got to bring together unconscious and not just the conscious, but the superconscious. I was probably referring to something of that sort.

Richard: Does it relate to sort of the idea of ... experiencing your refined energy as well as your grosser energy? Were you meaning it in that sort of context?

S.: I don't think I was meaning it in the sense that you experience them separately on separate occasions but that you have to bring the energy which formerly was in the grosser experience more and more into the more refined experience. I think I was getting at something like that as far as I remember.

Richard: I'm relating it to this thing that if one's intellect is ahead of one's emotions whether one has to go back and be in one's grosser emotions and (is this that) you go back and you actually experience those...

S.: Well, presumably you have experienced them. In other words you are asking, "How does one integrate one's emotional energies with

one's intellectual understanding? How does it come about?

sps

Everybody must have done it to some extent, so in a way, everybody must know, hmm? How does it come about?, Hmm? (Nervous laughter)

Cittapala: Well, it's almost like there's a continuing tension (unclear)

S.: You never catch up completely till you're enlightened I suppose.

Richard: Trying to create the skilful acts(??)

Ratnaprabha: I suppose it's perhaps connected with reality principle and pleasure principle. There always will be a certain tension between them till enlightenment, but in a way perhaps it's even positive tension.

S: Yes, yes. Well one does have experiences~where one understands clearly and also feels strongly and probably at the same time. Maybe when you're reading poetry, certainly poetry of a certain kind. There is the intense emotional experience and then there is the clear understanding of the meaning of the poetry. - what the poet is driving at. It's not just an emotional experience. I think maybe the way that we have been talking about poetry suggests it merely an emotional experience in a quite one-sided sort of way. But in the case of the best poetry,

it's not like that at all. There is much to understand, but the understanding and the emotional enjoyment are two separate things sort of brought together of things that can be separately cultivated. You experience both at the same time. You experience them even as one thing.

You understand, you enjoy Shakespeare at one and the same time. And the more you understand the more you enjoy, or the more you enjoy the more you understand. If you go through say, the 'Hamlet', "To be or not to be " speech, and you understand what Shakespeare is saying then you can also enjoy the poetry more. So perhaps we should take the poetry as an example not so much of positive emotion but of positive emotion joined with understanding.

Gunapala: It does seem more balanced than music or art.

S.: Yes, yes. In the case of music, it seems that the purely

sps

emotional component is present almost to the exclusion of the component of understanding.

Cittapala: Although you do get critics talking about composers' ideas and working out of themes and so on, not that I'm particularly familiar with that, but it does give the impression reading the criticisms that there's almost an intellectual counterpart to be enjoyed through the working out of different....

S.: Well, they especially go to town in connection with say, Beethoven's final quartets. I can't help feeling that sometimes that music critics are a bit pretentious and read perhaps a lot into the music that isn't actually there. Well, again, that is one of the characteristics of music - you can read almost anything into it that you want. One of the advantages. You can listen to a piece of music and someone might ask you "well does it put you in mind of? What do you think of?" - "Oh, I think of a little garden with roses and palm trees, beautiful women", and somebody else asked "Well, what does it put you in mind of?" - "Oh, a Church yard in the moonlight" or "a street in Paris on a sunny afternoon" - It means (unclear) different things to different people.

Ratnaprabha: But religious music does have a definite conceptual content often, doesn't it? I mean, I could say Bach's Mass in B Minor...

S.: But (Unclear) not as music. Because, for instance, you mentioned Bach. He's a notorious example. Some of the melodies which he uses in his Church cantatas turn up in very secular contexts elsewhere in his music. So is that melody essentially spiritual or essentially secular? It's the words that give you the key to the supposed meaning very often.

Cittapa~a: And more often than not, one gets the impression that Mozart was a very irreverent personality. It was just the context in which he had to produce his work which gave it its sometimes more (serious side).

Voice: What about opera?

° S.: Yes, yes. Well, I was going to say an opera is a case apart because an opera is not a pure musical form. It's a composite form.

sps

Someone could say that the Mass is not a pure musical form, not like a symphony or concerto. The programme music distinguished from the pure music or absolute music (inaudible) But Beethoven is sometimes Programme music, isn't it? His Pastoral Symphony is Programme music to some extent, hm? yes? (Laughter) - The storm and all that sort of thing and the (sounds?) of the birds, hm?

Anyway, we've been dealing with feeling, we've been dealing with emotion and one needs to live contemplating one's feelings and the contingency of one's feelings. Also perhaps have to take more responsibility for one's feelings and realize that one can do something to affect them, to alter them, to change them but putting oneself in a different kind of situation, a situation which naturally stimulates more positive emotions, more pleasureable feeling. The way we come to a place like 'Il Convento' is not because it's convenient for studying the dharma, - it's also a situation in which you can experience greater emotional positivity. Even more pleasureable sensations. As you look out upon the green hillsides

lunchtime or anything like that, unless you have that back at home. Alright tomorrow we go on to the contemplation of consciousness.

(End of Side A)

S.: Alright, the contemplation of consciousness, p. 18 - read the whole of that section:

Harshaprabha: III. THE CONTEMPLATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS

And how, monks, does a monk live contemplating consciousness in consciousness?

H~rein, °raonks, a monk knows the consciousness with lust, as with lust; the consciousness without lust, as without lust; the consciousness with hate, as with hate; the consciousness without hate, as without hate; the consciousness with ignorance, as with ignorance; the consciousness without ignorance, as without ignorance; the shrunken state of consciousness as the shrunken state; the distracted state of consciousness as the distracted state; the developed state of consciousness as the developed state; the undeveloped state of

consciousness as the undeveloped state; the state of consciousness with some other mental state superior to it, as the state with something mentally higher; the state of consciousness with no other mental state superior to it, as the state with nothing mentally higher;

sps

the concentrated state of consciousness as the concentrated state the unconcentrated state of consciousness as the unconcentrated state; the freed state of consciousness as the freed state; and the unfreed state of consciousness as the unfreed.

Thus he lives contemplating consciousness in consciousness internally, or he lives contemplating consciousness in consciousness externally, or he lives contemplating consciousness in consciousness internally and externally. He lives contemplating origination-factors in consciousness, or he lives contemplating dissolution-factors in consciousness, or he lives contemplating origination-and-dissolution-factors in consciousness. Or his mindfulness is established with the thought, 'Consciousness exists', to the extent necessary just for knowledge and mindfulness, and he lives detached, and clings to naught in the world. Thus, monks, a monk lives contemplating consciousness in consciousness.

S.: So here we come to something, in a way much more complex, - the contemplation of consciousness. In other words, the different mental states in accordance with different classifications. One isn't to think these are necessarily all mutually exclusive so that you've got a definitely limited number of mental states. They do overlap to quite an extent in some cases. (Long Pause).

I mean the classification in terms of the three roots whether skilful or unskilful, that is quite well-known isn't it? In a way V it's quite an obvious way of looking at consciousness. But what about

that other division, the shrunken state, the distracted state and the developed state and the undeveloped state? That's not quite so common. We don't come across that so often. We don't have the Pali for the 'shrunken state of consciousness' and there's a note but it doesn't help us very much. It says "This refers to a rigid and indolent state of mind". Rigid is, in fact, as far as I remember, the term used to translate whatever the original Pali is, rather than shrunken usually. It's something rigid, contracted, hard, unpliable, unadaptable. It's the opposite of the distracted state. Do you see what I mean? The distracted state is too easily changed, the rigid mental state changes with great difficulty.

Devamitra: There would seem to be some sort of correlation between the shrunken state and a sort of hardened reality (and also) a distracted state and the pleasure principle.

S.: One could say that, yes. The shrunken or rigid state is a state of

sps 1/4?

settled down in something, not easy to move. As far as I know, the term for developed is (Mahagatta), which literally means 'expanded' or 'become great'. I think I've referred to this before. It coincides with the (Chalmer's?). So one is quite justified in speaking of an EXPANDED or EXPANDING consciousness. (Long Pause).

Devamitra: I don't understand this phrase, "The state of consciousness with some other mental state superior to it as the state with something mentally higher"?

S.: I think here the translation is - well, he is just varying the translation (so as not to be) repetitious.

I'm sure in Pali, it's exactly the same. It does it again you notice in the next phrase:

: So one should be constantly aware of ones state of cons- ciousness.

S: Yes , this is what it really amounts to, yes. And all these different classifications are so to speak from a spiritual point of view, even the range of states of consciousness envisaged is far more extensive than we usually think in terms of, I mean outside of Buddhism say.

Cittapala: How does this differ from the previous two in as much as the consciousness is presumably aligned with body and feelings. Is this just a more general classification ?

S: The former classification was purely in terms of feeling, vedana, but consciousness is a much wider term than feeling, for instance you can have the consciousness of lust associated with pleasant feeling, cons- ciousness of lust associated with painful feeling, do you see what I mean ? So the two are quite distinct. I mean there are some mental states some states of consciousness where you don't have any painful feeling, where you can only have a pleasant feeling, as in the case of the dhyanas. So again these do overlap, but the principle of classification is diff- erent.

Devamitra: Feeling seems to be \$it more neutral, in the sense that

S: Yes, well it is not in itself karmically neutral, but when one is engaged in the contemplation of feeling one is, one contemplates feelings simply as feelings. ONe is not contemplating them as regards their ethica~ significanne. You see what I mean ?

Devamitra. Yes. You wouldn't necessarily try to eradicate an unpleasant

Devamitra(ctd):feeling, but you would....

S: When you are simply engaged in the contemplation of feelings, you merely contemplate the feeling. You contemplate the emotional state. That is a separate practice of course according to this system.

Cittapala: Is the fact that it is actually delineated as a seperate practice and also put prior to this contemplation of consciousness, does that indicate that it is a practice that one should try

and take up before developing this practice of consciousness ?

S: It would suggest that. It would seem to suggest that. Because I think it also in a way corresponds to the facts of psychology, that you are in a way aware whether you are say happy or unhappy before you are aware of the ethical bearings of your state of feeling, whether one of happiness or unhappiness. Do you see what I mean ? As though whether you are happy or unhappy etc is a much more simple matter, much more simple to ascertain. But then you have to go much more deeply into the matter and try to ascertain on what level of consciousness that experience of say pleasure or pain takes place, and what is its ethical significance, what is its karmic significance, how does it stand with regard to other mental states, how does it stand with regard to your progress on the path, and this is what this section of the contemplation of consciousness moves onto. I mean somebody might be aware if you asked them, or become aware if you were to ask them that their overall state of consciousness is one of pleasure rather than pain, of happiness or unhappiness. That would be quite easy for them to tell you, but they might have to investigate a little and see what sort of happiness it was. I mean has it arisen because of their morning meditation, or because of the good meal they have had, or has it arisen out of some other type of experience, and whether it is associated with skillful mental practice or unskillful mental practice, that would be a more complex matter.

Cittapala: It seems almost analogous to the distinction you were making between sati and sampasampanna?

S: mm, to some extent. Yes, sampasampanna being the more complex thing. Here you are considering things within a much broader context. In other words it is not enough to consider whether you are happy or unhappy; you also have to consider why you are happy or unhappy. In a sense, whether your happiness is justified or at least whether it is skillful. Also you have to contemplate consciousness so that you can find out how to proceed. If, for instance, you discover that your state of consciousness is distracted, well then you have to take measures to counteract that distraction.

-ion

fipt [t( ~ &

S(cont): I mean has it arisen because of their morning meditation or because of the good meal that they had ? or had it arisen out of some other kind of experience and whether it was associated with spiritual or mental factors. That would be a more complex matter.

Cittapala: : It seems almost analogous to the distinction you're making between the psyche and the sampasampanna.

you're S: Mm. to some extent, yes~ the sampasampanna being a more complex. It's here /

considering things within a much broader context. In other words it's not enough to consider whether you're happy or unhappy; you also have to consider why you're happy or unhappy. In a sense, whether your happiness is justified or at least whether it is skillful.

(Pause) Also you have to contemplate consciousness in this way so that you can find out how to proceed. If, for instance, you discover that your state of consciousness is distracted, well then you have to take measures

that distraction            which would be

different from the measures taken if you found a mental state of one of being shrunken.

Ratnaprabha    Is this equivalent to the bodhyanga of investigation of mental states ?

S: Well, the    (preventives) come later on,, C~on:t they? But-there could be sor~°°~ overlapping, yes ~ndieneda. way, you have here the nucleus of the whole

Abhidharma, if you see what I mean. Well, at least in the preceeding section and the succeeding one, but maybe here most of all. A sort of rudimentary classification of mental states or states of consciousness

Abhidharma which is concerned with the elaboration of all this to a greater and greater extent. But the seed of -it all is here, or the seed of much of it is here.

Suvajra:            This is quite an early classification.

S: Yes, well the discourse is attributed to the Buddha, it does appear in the Majjhima Nikaya. There 'may have been some later elaboration, it is very difficult to say. But surely the Buddha must have had something to say on the contemplation of consciousness. At least introduced a few rudimentary categories. I think all these categories are found elsewhere in the Nikayas.    an they don't seem to be later, purely scholastic classifications. (pause)

Ratnaprabha    : The later ones, well most of them seem to refer in some way or other to the dhyanas, according to the notes.

S:mm, yes.

Surata : Why is , why are several different ways of describing

A&c

\_\_\_\_\_ (cont): the dhyanas used ?

S:        For instance there i~ one o5 taking so~of different cross-sections

of a mental state. I mean mental states are quite complex t~ngs. (pause) Let us consider the second paragraph here. The Buddha says:

"Thus he lives contemplating consciousness in consciousness internally or externally or both", which presumably means consciousness of oneself or other people. Presumably though, you cannot contemplate the conscious- ness of other people directly, unless of course you are someone who has developed the supernormal power of reading other people's thoughts.

jnana. (pause)" So he lives contemplating

origination factors in consciousness or he lives contemplating dissolution factors in consciousness or both." In other words, he understands that consciousness itself is a conditioned thing. It arises in dependence upon causes and conditions and it ceases when



those causes and conditions cease (that is taken from a look at) mundane consciousness.  
(Pause) And, accord

ing to a note, the causes and conditions are craving and ignorance. Karma and the body-mind combination itself, the psycho-physical organism itself. So that the human consciousness cannot arise without a human organism in its place, maybe I shouldn't say human, there are other kinds of conscious being as human beings, without some kind of physical base in the case of beings in the kama-loka. I mean consciousness just cannot arise. Or else some kind of psycho-physical base such as the namo-rupa.

because the namo part of the namo-rupa includes of course consciousness itself.  
(pause) This is quite a, in a way, important thought ~ early Buddhism. That consciousness was a conditioned phenomenon. And that therefore you could modify consciousness in the same way that you could modify feelings, modify your emotional state. The state of consc

iousness which you presently experience is not something fixed or final even or absolutely. It is sort of something that had come about according to

certain causes and conditions and would change as those causes and conditions changed. This is in a way what makes possible meditation. (pause)

Ratnaprabha : Was this a sort of Buddhist or the Buddha's discovery or was it known by previous teachers ?

S: mm, well reading, say the pre-Buddhist Hindu, say Upandshads, one certainly doesn't get any such impression, that that kind of principle was known. If anything, they tend to think of consciousness as something which is unchanging and they think it is in fact absolute.

Devamitra: Do you think there are any hints ~ this kind of insight in any other tradition? ~ ~

S: That is very difficult to say. But certainly this sort of analytical approach to the Dharma seems to be quite distinct from Buddhism, especially early Buddhism. Though I think one mustn't jump to conclusions

too hastily. For instance, there is the ancient Egyptians, although

the ancient Egyptians thought that man was possessed of a number of different souls, as we would say. I think even up to six or seven. They seem to have had some notion of the complexity of human nature, not to say human mind. What bearing that has upon this, I don't think has ever been investigated, perhaps we don't even yet know what the ancient Egyptians did believe or teach in connection with

But certainly in the context of thought Buddhism is quite distinctive in as much as it ~ gone into the nature of mind in this sort of way to such an extent, in such a detailed manner, such an exhaustive manner. In some cases actually carried it too far. (pause)

But I think the seed of at least this sort of approach goes back to the Buddha himself. Though he may not have given it the kind of emphasis that it was given later in the

Cittapala : To what extent do you think the Buddha was emphasising that consciousness changes every moment

S: Mm, I don't think the Buddha.... I mean the Buddha certainly emphasised

that consciousness change~. But what were called

"The Doctrine of the momentariness of all Things", including consciousness that as a sort of reference as a sort of teaching deve~ped some centuries later.

Devamitra: Presumably the fact that consciousness can be changed is simply a development of the INsight of ~AA~ actually.

S: Yes, well, philosophically one could say that. THE two are certainly connected : If things are anatta because they are anicca, then they are anicca because they are anatta. One can start at either end.

Suvajra; But would you have to have Insight to see that consciousness could be changed ?

S: Well what does one mean by Insight ? With a small or a capital "I" ? one could see it in both ways. ONE can have as it were a purely intell- ectual understanding which was quite clear, but which didn't amount to Insight in the spiritual sense, the transforming Insight which

Devamitra: Presumably, to really actually see that would amount to over- coming personality view.

52

S: Yes. It did mean that.

(Pause) (of Vipassana)? ritt~p~l~ . Why wasn't the development of the increasing absence /

S: It is very difficult to say, because why was there an increas- ing development of anything in the field of philosophy ? It is as though certain individual minds are interested in a certain line of enquiry and they ex ercise a great infl~nce on people, that sort of approach became visible. . There seems to be no as it were logical reason why they should have developed in this sort of way.

Cittap~i~ : Because presumably it must have divorced itself from spiritual values.

S: Yes, this does seem to have happened eventually. In the case of the Abhidharma, or in the case of some of the (other type of schools) They seem to have gone into analysis for its own sake. I mentioned a few examples of this in the Survey (unclear) The classifications on man. But there is a certain kind of m will proceed in this way. it cainn%ewhich :. Derive satisfaction.. may be/putc~~~l~eneral terms: why is it that

some minds, you know they sort of "narrow down their own field.? Want to

go in more and more deep~ly into that field, or some part of that field itself. And eventually lose sight of the whole field itsel~, of which that part is only a part. So why does the mind tend to do this ? W~lu~~~SF%rC~~tins~ance, y0O~fmItt~ig~~ts~drtto04owihftis?the study of the hi story of England, and you narr~~~~~fto Norwich, and you narrow your - self down to NORwich in the eighteenth century, then you narr~~y~~~Afa bit more, and you end up 6evoting your whole life to some very, very small - Why do people do that?

Ratnaprabha : Perhaps it is something like this shrunken or rigid state of mind that is being talked about here.

S: It could well be; some people are...

Surata : There is a certain kind of absoluteness about it too. Because if you have a thorough knowledge of something , then you cannot be questioned by anybody else.

S: Yes, there is a certain certaintev. r~he larger the field the greater the uncertainty - the smaller the field, the greater the certainty. ~ut really it is amazing the ~umber of controversies that there can be within a very very limited field~ Because you can be quite sure if you bec~ae an expert, say on the history of~NOrwich City Council during the

;55

S(cont): eigbheenth century, there'd be sure to be somebody else who knew al most as much as you and would disagree with you on almost every point.

Devamitra: We w ere actually discussing just before you came in about the sort of controversy~as to whether Bacon wrote Shakespeare's plays or Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare's plays. And there is a whole society devoted to that, which ir~ a way is a sort of narrowing down

S: Well you can end up with counting the number of times the letter "H" occurs in the works of Shakespeare, and the number of times the letter "H" occurs in the works of Bacon. You can end up doing that sort of ting.

Devamitra: They have done that sort of thing.

S:HOh, yes. They've got computers to work it out. (pause) So you might say that there is a sort of mind that wants more and more cettainty, greater and greater certainty, and so reduces itself to a smaller and smaller field. On the other hand there is another kind of mind, corresponding perhaps with the distracted mind, which throws up generalisations hypotheses 1 speculations, right and left. And who cove~ a very broad field~ sometimes as broad as one can in (dukkha).

Devamitra: The first kind seems to be expressive of a sort of doubting state of mind.

S: Which one ?

Devamitra: The first kind

S: Yes. Maybe in the case of a certain state of consciousness, there

is a lack of faith - maybe in the case of the eclectic state ~ \_\_ ~ '~~ ~7 ~~~; there's a sort of - I won't say an over-abundancy state, but there's a

sort of false confidence, which leads you to over-generalise and throw out certain speculations on a larger field than can be grappled with.

Ratnaprabha: When you say lack of faith, do you mean lack of faith in one's own abilities...

S.: There's a certain backlog of fear, yes, and so there's a craving for certainty because one can cope with certainty more easily than (unclear) so you confine yourself into narrower and narrower (unclear two sentences). (Pause) Anything further about the concentration of consciousness?

Gunapala: There's a small point about the dissolving of consciousness -

in that part of the practice here, you're dissolving away the hatred and so on in the (unclear) Your dissolving of consciousness itself in the practice as well, as

S.: No. Here I only contemplate the fact that the different states of consciousness arise in dependence on certain factors and cease when those factors themselves cease. You see what I mean? When a mental state of whatsoever nature arises, you note~that it arises; when it ceases you note that it ceases. And the essential thing about a feeling is that it's a conditioned thing- it's contingent on or if mindfulness is established then consciousness exists or consciousness exists to the extent necessary just in order for mindfulness "and he~ it~es detached and he clings to nought in the world". He doesn't see anything permanent! anything unchanging, anything of the nature of Self, he sees only the stream of these constantly arising and constantly pass

9 away mental states~ and in that sense he sees consciousness exists. -p

Gunapala: By consciousness here, he means- the lower consciousness.

S.: Well~ no, no because it is - the freed state of consciousness is the freed state of consciousness, the unfreed state of consciousness is the unfreed. Hmm? You see what I mean? The whole weight of the state of consciousness- one concentrates all of one, whatever happens to become - whether higher or lower. In the case of most people it will be only the lower states of consciousness which are present but in the case of others, it'll be higher states of consciousness,, even enlightened states of consciousness.

Ratnaprabha: But it does say in the notes that a freed state is just the one "temporarily freed from defilements".

S-.: Yes, well that presumably comes from the sub/~(te~t) The text does say the 'freed state'~, simply. So 'freed' in paragraph 1 'freed' even in the permanent sense. There's nothing in the text against that.... as far as one can see.

Ratnaprabha: Is that really meaningful anyway, the idea of being 'temporarily freed from the defilements'. I heard of the hindrances being temporarily in abeyance but I-thought the 'klesas' were rather something more deep -- roo~ed -

S.: Mmm. Well there is reference at Suttas in the Pall - Nikayas which gives some idea of - which is (Samanna) meaning something like (Kayanka?) and it's usually regarded as or thought of as 'tempor- ary emancipation'. It's a rather curious point which has nevr~elel~ satisfactorily explained so the sub-commentary perhaps takes this perhaps as referring to that. I mean there can be, as with the hindrances, - a state of suspension of the hindrances. But one can't really have a temporary emancipation in a strict sense because if it's temporary, you're not really emancipated. No doubt it's to some extent a matter of terminology - if one speaks of emancipation as something permanent, then it's confusing to say that then these are called temporary emancipation.. One could say, of course, that the fact that one lives contemplating the, not only the arising but the dissolution of different states of consciousness, that wouldn't apply to the 'freed-state' because it wouldn't pass away, you could say that and that therefore it must be a mundane state, but on the other hand you could say, well, if you look at the life of - in the light of the spiral path - if you look at the spiral path, at the creative consciousness, - it is not that the 'freed state' is something static. It is constantly passing away but constantly as it were, renewing itself in the form of something even more 'freed', so to speak. There can be arising and passing away as it were, of a creative nature as well as of a reactive nature, if one can literally say that The arising of, for instance, Suddha, and the passing away of Suddha, but then the re-arising of even higher degree of suddha, and so on. So with 'knowle~g~e ehap'coladnsgeayl with 'emancipation' you though that maysonaiesr become - M?t~ and more emancipated (Laugh)

So the factor here that one lives contemplating origination and dissolution factors in consciousness does not necessarily imply that the 'freed' state is only a temporary free state -nor either is it only a mundane state, not necessarily (Pause)

So it seems that this idea of consciousness being a conditioned thing - is not so important as one might think theoretically but more for its practical implications, in the sense that consciousness can be changed 'If one knows how to go about it. You're not permanently saddled with your present state of consciousness indefinitely whether you like it or not. If you don't like it you can do something about it.

Gunapala: So it's more that the consciousness can be changed in a direction, not so much eradicated, or dissolved. Consciousness doesn't dissolve, it~ change~~4

sps A 5~

S.: When he speaks of - It's not a question of dissolving consciousness in general. This whole passage is concerned with specific states of consciousness, all of which are constantly arising and constantly passing away, but not fortuitously, not at random, depending on definite causes and conditions, all of which can be changed.

Ratnaprabha: I don't know if this is a good place to bring it up, but I was reading the Pali Canon and came across this class of Devas called the 'Unconscious Devas'. So it seems from this, the implication is that you can somehow be in the dhyanas but not be conscious. Do you think there's any meaning to it or is it some lost teaching?

S.: Well on the fact of it it does seem to be quite contradictory. This did come up in some other connection, I forget where - not in (Unclear) but it has come up quite recently...

Ratnaprabha: It came up in the Diamond Sutra...

S.: Did it? Hmm,

Cittapala: I believe it had something to do with being - the equivalent ~/\n0Out of being in the dhyanas but being out of the being aware or the

ka~ma-loka (Xnaudible -)C..kind of being in a higherrealm but not really one in which you traditionally or nr~omally know.

S.: One could look at it like that but that isn't so far as I know the traditional explanation. I doubt if there is a traditional explanation, but that's certainly a way of making sense of the term.

Ratnaprabha: I didn't quite understand, "not being aware of the Ka ma-loka", is that what it is? (Laughter) (S.: inaudible remark)

Cittapala: I think the information wasn't clear.. .the equivalent being someone meditating and just being constantly in a dhyana and not aware of their sense of the world..

You S.: / t~chnically belong to the ~lane on which you were born, but your

consciousness, is~:permanently involved in some other plane so that you're unconscious of the plane to which you technically belong. Yeah? That is the only way that I can think of to explain the term.

Suvajra: So you're unconscious of the plane to which you were born?

S.: Yes. I think one rr~ight actually (throw) the question and say well, in the case of the Deva, wouldn't that mean he was sort of actually be born, hierarchically, where his consciousness was? (unclear)

Ratnaprabha: I think th context in which it comes up, is to do with Devas moving through the diffe ent deva-lokas and when they did pass through this one they'd sort of forget as a result of being unconscious all their previous re-births., and when they're reborn again this memory... I think it occurs in the (Brahmajnana?) realm.

S.: Well in that case it could be simply that Deva 5 are unconscious of where they come from.. .not unconscious with regard to their present state or their r?~fre5ent experience.

Cittapala: (inaudible) S.: (Agrees)

long S.: They're Samyas without being Devas. (Laughter) (pause)

Alright, let's go on to section four. Maybe we'll take it bit by bit. Read through - the Hindrance of Sense-desire:

Cittapala: " IV THE CONTEMPLATION OF MENTAL OBJECTS

1. The Five Hindrances

And how monks, does a monk live contemplating mental objects in mental objects?

Herein, monks, a monk lives contemplating mental objects in the men- tal objects of the five hindrances.

How, monks, does a monk live contemplating mental objects in the mental ob~ects of the five hindrances?

Herein, monks, when sense-desire is present, a monk knows, 'There is sense-desire in me', or when sense-desire is not present, he knows, 'There is no sense-desire in me'. He knows how the arising of the non- arisen sense-desire comes to be; he knows how the abandoning of the aris- en sense-desire comes to be; and he knows how the non-arising in the future of the abandoned sense-desire comes to be."

S.: Maybe this needs going into in greater detail.

(End of Side A)

(we ~kb ~ ~ ~'~pW1~2

S.: So the key passage of course is: "Herein Monks, when SENSE-DESIRE is present, a monk knows, 'There is sense-desire in me' , or when sense- desire is not resent, he know, 'There is no sense-desire in me.'"

So what has been the term for sense-desire? It's 'Ka\_:na-chanda', huh? Ka~~na meaning the sensuous in general, especially perhaps the sexual - and 'chanda' being desire in general. Sometimes 'Ka ~a~Chanda' is con- trasted with 'Dharma-chanda' : desire for the dharma, which goes to show that Buddhism does not speak in terms of th otal eradication of all desire. So first of all, you want to know fw~~t~~ar~~chanda~ a5~~e~spi~rer~ for ience through the senses, huh? I think it is sort of to be understood, that the desire is for pleasureable- sense- experience. Enjoyment, hmm? You could even say, the desire for sensuous enjoyment,hmm? (Pause)

So, "Herein, Monks, when desire for sensuous enjoyment is present a monk knows, There is desire for sensuous enjoyment in me". and similarly when it is not present in me, he knows it is not present.

Do you know, or are you acquainted with the fact that in many, many passages the Buddha says that one cannot enter upon the dhyanas, unless the five mental hindrances have first sub-sided at least temporarily, huh? So this is of some practical importance.

Devamitra: I'm not quite clear how it is the events in the context of this particular section differs from the contemplation of consciousness? Because we were talking about consciousness in terms of a mental state and after all the 'ka ma-chandra' is a mental state.

S.: Hmm, hmm. Well in a sense it doesn't differ. Well, it's not concerned with clear-cut, mutually exclusive divisions. There is a lot of over-lapping; one will find that more and more because when we come onto the five skandas and then the six internal and the six external sense-bases, the seven factors of enlightenment, even the 'four noble truths,' and some scholars are of the opinion that some of these categories have been inserted, that the Buddha originally gave a much shorter and simpler teaching. But be that as it may, there is a lot of over-lapping and states which appear on one classification, reappear under another classification. It's not going to be mutually exclusive.

Devamitra : But presumably there must be some point in division between the two sections.

S.: Well, yes, because in the first place there is this 'feeling', huh? And in this approach we're trying to concentrate on there is

sps

first of all, the body - that's clear-cut, the distinction between body and mind. And then within the mind itself, there is a clear-cut distinction between what is emotionally toned, so to speak and what is not emotionally toned. huh? And then within consciousness itself one can distinguish particular objects, more and more clearly, hmm? For instance, under the contentation of consciousness, one has got the concentration of low motivation and fairly broadly they correspond to the hindrances. Very broadly! The hindrances can be regarded as contained in them, so there is an overlap. But in the case of the hindrances, one is considering the motivation more specifically, more concretely.

Ratnaprabha: In what sense can we speak of there being objects in 'citta', in mind, - it seems / 'mind' is subject in some sense, so I don't understand what a 'mental object' is?

S.: Well, a mental object is an object of 'mind'. Not an object which is itself, mental, huh? The original word here is of course, is Dharma. So it is just as the eye has for its object forms, just as the ear has for its object - sounds, in the same way the mind has for its object - Dharmas, or ideas, or mental objects. Not in the sense of objects which are mental but objects which are objects for the mind, not any of the five physical senses.



Ratnaprabha: But if Ka~a-chanda say, is tental object,, it also seems to be, so much is implied, that it is a state of mind. I can't manage to distinguish between the subject and the object in this case.

S.: A subject is an object and sometimes an object is a subject. (Laugh) Because you can think of your own mental states, - you know your mental state is subjective but you can make it an object when you think about it. You have an idea of it, and that idea is 'dharma', a mental object. (Pause) So your sense desire or your desire for sensuous enjoyment is a part of your subjectivity but then you can make it an object, otherwise to self-monitor would not be possible. That's why it's called ref~exive

consciousness' because you're aware of yourself just as a third party would be aware of you. So the subject becomes object.

Devamitra: Would that be another way of describing reflexive consciousness

- it's getting objectivity of one's own self.

sps

S.: Yes, yes. Well as I said it's turning you-the-subject into you- the-object... that you don't say, only experience sense desire, you know you experie~ce sense desire. In other words, your own sense desire which is subjective becomes an object of your own kn0wledge~50 you know: "I am subject to - or I am experiencing sense-desire". An animal cannot do that presumably because it's a part of reflexive consciousness. (Pause)

So first of all you recognize that there is in you, this desire for sensuous enjoyment. And for instance1 you are sitting and trying to meditate, and supposing this particular hindrance does arise, this desire for sensuous enjoyment, - it obvi~2wusl doesn't arise in an abstract form, it arises always in a specific form. Maybe just as you're sitting there, trying to meditate, you have a sudden strong desire for something to eat- maybe for a chocolate or something like that - so that would be an instance

there is the desire for sensuous enjoyment IN ME. So then, the text goes on: "He knows how the arising of the non-arisen sense-desire comes to be". So how does one apply that? Suppose you are sitting there, huh?, and this desire for food, this desire to eat, this desire say, for chocolate comes into your mind, well, how do you come to know how that has arisen? It must have arisen from some cause./ Why has it arisen? You have to look at that~ So how might it have arisen? (Pause) In all sorts of ways, one might think.~ How might it have arisen?

Ratnaprabha: Well, just the idea, just the image of a piece of chocolate must have just popped into your mind.

S.: It must have 'popped', so to speak, from somewhere,huh? Well, as the mind works with

incredible rapidity. You might for instance, have just heard a sound from the kitchen - just a sound, people cooking, then you start thinking of cooking, kitchen, food, "it might be nice to have something sweet for a change: chocolate", yeah? You see what I mean? This is how the mind works, hm? so you've got to sort of trace back the process, you've got to see how it has arisen. 'Ah! Just because I heard that sound from the kitchen" and this is how the desire for that particular enjoyment has arisen, and usually if you?~~at in the case of these minor desires, it's enough just to (constantly keep aware).

of tracing back Cittapala: So the actual process/is important, is it, in terms of...?

S.: It's certainly helpful. That's one way, you can just push the desire aside, that's another way. Or you can think "I haven't sat down here to think about enjoying chocolates! I'm here for another purpose", and you brush it aside. But it very often does help if you trace it back.

[241]

CO~TTIt'~Thll): ~ty has it arisen? You have to look at that o, ho might it have arisen (pause). Well, how might it have arisen.. 9 ~'ell, there are all sorts of ways How might it have arisen ? (pause).

Ratnaprabha: Well just the idea, the image of a piece of chocolate might just of popped into your mind (laughter

S: It must have popped, so to speak, from somewhere.(pause). Well, you see the mind works with incredible rapidity. You might for instance have just heard a sound in the kitchen, just a sound people cooking, then you start thinking cooking, kitchen, food, "it would be nice to have something sweet for a change, chocolate", yeh. . .um.. . do you see what mean....? This is how the mind works So you've got to sort of trace-back the process, you've got to see how it has arisen ah!.. ..that's because I heard that sound in the kitchen", and this is how the, you know, the desire for a particular enjoyment has arisen and usually as you see that, basically, these minor desires, mean it's enough just to cause them to go away

Cittapala: S that actual process of tracing-back is important is it in terms of eradicating

S: It's certainly helpful because that's one way you can just push the desire aside, that's another way eh or you can think, "well, I haven't sat down here to think about enjoying chocolates" (unclear) Some other purpose, just brush it aside. keep without letting your thoughts wander of course.

So he knows, "How the arising of the non-arisen sense- desire comes to be" yeh....eh.. ..not only in that general eh.... more specific, but he knows generally it comes about as a result of what is called 'unwise attention'. It's because he's given attention to things in the past, because in the past he's greedily enjoyed chocolates, so therefore, the thought of them has come into his mind on this particular occasion. Do you see what I mean....? "So he knows how the abandoning of the arisen sense-desire comes to be" He knows he can abandon it either by tracing-back its causality in this way or by some other means eh.. .he knows how to go about it "And knows how the non-arising in the future of the abandoned sense-desire comes to be". 'ell, in this particular case, well, how would that happen....? 'ell it might be general reflection on the loathsomeness of food or something of that sort. Or bearing in mind that he is eating only to maintain the body in health and strength ?

Suvajra: Sampajai~a comes in here again doesn't it if you actually er. . . keep your mind, keep your purpose, when you say "I don't do~rri, without it with~Thin~

S: Yes, yes. Because if you sit down to meditate in a very relaxed sort of way,~well, in an unduly relaxed sort of frame of mind, or without the definite intention that you are going to meditate eh these hindrances are much more likely to arise, obviously

Surata: Sc this unwise attention is almost like the opposite of Sampajanna

S: of wise attention Surata: Yeh of clear~comp~k1ensi0n

CONTINUD. S: Yeh yes.. ..(pause).

So you can see, as it were, The Buddha or Buddhism generally is saying quite clearly, well, the desire for sensuous enjoyment doesn't just happen to come into your mind, it comes for a definite reason .... on dependance on definite conditions and you can do something about it you don't have to put up with it. Your mental state is under your own control (essentially?) (pause).

Devamitra: It's expressed in the texts almost in terms of er well the same formula....(4 or 5 words unclear)

S: Um yes

Devamitra: Even if you were vigilant enough in the method of practice it would er.. .inevitably bring about the arising of insight...

S: Yes. Yes.

Surata: Just by paying attention, as it were, long enough.... (few words unclear).

S: (3 or 4 words unclear) sort of sufficiently convinced, you know, of the fact that mental states like conditioned things in general I mean were conditioned, did arise in dependance on causes, did cease when those .... causes ceased. In a way this ~ of the matter, you know, an insight into impermanence, if that goes deep enough well you. ..you come in contact with the unconditioned (pause). ell the same formula is repeated for the er other hindrances. Maybe we don't need to er. . . read those next paragraphs just consider the hindrances themselves eh...? It's anger, but its anger in me and anger is not present in those... its simple enough. But with regard to - not only anger but the preceding hindrance, in fact all the hindrances - there's also the question of er. . the sort of situation in which they're likely to arise um I mean this is obviously important for future prevention um.... Do you see what I mean.. ?

Voices: Um. . .um....

S: And you may know, because you know yourself sufficiently well, that there, are certain things, certain circumstances, certain situations where your~ likely to become angry eh.... so it would be advisable for you to avoid those situations... because you don't want to experience the arisen anger any more. And certainly you don't want to put yourself in that sort of situation just before a meditation session. (pause).

Devamitra: It does imply well, it just emphasises rather, the er. . importance of foresight in the... (1 word unclear). .. practice of ethics

S: ... Yes yes yes. Well, its connected with what you were talking about, I believe, some time ago - not in this group but generally - er. . . about the situation into which one goes back, you know, from this....this course. One has to survey the possibilities, try to make-up one's mind wheher they are situations in which unskillful mental states are mo~e~likely to arise.

Devamitra: The whole question of foresight actually, does seem

C ONTINUED. to be er quite well, quite an important one. (4 words unclear, something about the practice of the Dharma.) Because I was thinking also in terms of your explanation, or one of your explanations about practicing er... non-violence and you have said you need to be quite....almost....(1 word unclear).... to be really able to practice non-violence and it implies considerable foresight in the same principles that it comes in here

S: Yes. Yes .yeh. Well, we're coming on, after anger, to sloth and torpor. I mean one knows the sort of situation in which sloth and torpor is going to arise. One knows that if sloth and torpor arises, one is not going to be able to concentrate and meditate.... eh.. .and one knows that er if one goes to bed very late at night and has to get up early in the morning, you know for meditation session early, you're unlikely to be able to meditate, because you'll be overpowered by sloth and torpor. You know, that dependent upon the late night and the early rising, sloth and torpor will definately arise eh

Voices: (much laughter)

S: So again it's a question of foresight. Otherwise its absolutely stupid, you know, to to allow yourself to go to bed very late thinking that your going to be able to get up very early in the morning and not experiance sloth and torpor you can be certain that you will experiance it under those conditions. That you don't want to experience sloth~and torpor because you want to go to meditate, you must avoid the causes and conditions that give rise to sloth and torpor. Even a late night.' It seems so simple and logical. It just calls for exercise of a little foresight. But if you decide, "alright", you know, you've decided that the late night is worth it, you know that you're going to experiance sloth and torpor but you, as it were, don't mind that, you've decided, "well, alright", its worth sacrificing one meditation session, well fair enough in a way perhaps but one should certainly not sort of er... .not expect sloth and torpor to arise under those circumstances. Or, if you know that you're going to be meditating say within an hour or so of a meal, well, don't over-eat, because sloth and torpor are bound to arise... .its as simple as that! (pause) After all, you don't have a big meal, usually, immediatly before going for a run, do you because you know what the consequences will be, so can one not apply that to ones meditation eh .? (pause).

And then what about "agitation and scruples". That's rather an unusual translation its... .er Uddhacca-Kukkucca . I~s scruple or worry, its a sort of unnecessary worry~ ,~cruples are supposed in a sense, are unnecessary scruples, whether one is really doing the right thing, is one really doing it in the right way etc etc. Some people are over s~rupulous (pause). Its the opposite of °ovvse of sloth and torpor um (pause).

So, sloth and torpor are a bit akin to t'hat was previously described as, or rather translated, as the sYunken or rigid state of consciousness and as you say, those seruples~are a bit similar to the distracted or restlessi" state of consciousness. There's not exactly an over-laping, but you can see they....they do refer to roughly the sawe areas (of experiance?) (pause). Restlessness and Worry probably is the better translation. Or agitation and cogritation. Or some translators, flurry and worry, which is quite good eh eh (long pause). And doubt. Doubt of course, is Vittikicca, and we know that this not sort of just intellectual doubt in tne ordinary

CONTI1~JM). sense but iMs a sort of, almost an unwillingness to ,wake-up one'a mind. it's almost a refusal of certainty, because once yow~certain, you have to take action yeh.. . .eh. .. (pause). its a keeping of one's options open indefin~tely um (long pause).

Devamitra: It seems either way that er there should be such a strong desire to avoid....certainty. (7 or 8 words unclear) certainty....

S: In certain area's eh

Devamitra: ~j' did you say that once you're certain you have to take action ? I mean, what area's would that actually be the case?

S: Well, especially in the area of the Spiritual life eh um I mean suppose for instance... kb .... supposing you are convinced, you know, that you (10 come to be convinced that the Buddha was Enlightened, well, then you've got to take very seriously what the Buddha says. So you may be unwilling to take seriously what the Buddha says because if you took it seriously you would have to act upon it, because the fact that you took it seriously meant that you would be prepared to act upon it, but you may with a lot of resistance have been (1 word unclear) so you sort of profess perhaps to be doubtful or even allow yourself to remain doubtful about whether the Buddha was actually enlightened so that you don't then have to take it seriously. .. what he said. Very well, at best you can postpone taking it seriously, postpone acting upon it.... (pause)

Ratnaprapa: So it's closely connected with commitment is it... that the sort of doubt

S: I would say so. I mean I must add that this is my personal way of looking at it (take?), you know (4 or 5 words unclear).... in terms of commitment, but it would seem to be clearly implied.

Richard Clayton: So that would be objective commitments, as it seems very difficult to tackle doubt because you may sort of see doubt in yourself but somehow you still don't confront it

S: I think, I mean one has to, you know, regularly determined effort to clarify one's thinking eh and doubt is more to allow unwillingness to clarify one's thinking. I mean there are people who like to remain in a sort of cloud of uncertainty because you can't sort of make anything of them Do you see what I mean

Voices: Yeh!

S: They don't have to take up a deflated position so they can't be attacked eh they think they might be attacked, they can't be criticised eh. . .50 there very sort of vague and sort of like a cloud, like a mist. It's difficult to grapple with them then eh. um. . .1 mean suppose somebody you said to someone, "well, why don't you come along to the meditation class, you don't think meditation is useless do you ?", they might say, "well no, I don't think meditation is useless but eh it's not that I altogether think it's useful, but I'm not that even sure about that, and maybe it is and well I don't really know ", !ell, how can you sort of, you know, get to grips with them then um

Devamitra: Can I ask you a bit more about this... er statement

COi1TiTtYED~. that once you're certain you have to take action .r.... it seems. er

S: Then I say that is of a sort of, in a way, logical compulsion. I'm not saying you0.\*.you....er...necessarily obeyed that logical compulsion yeh, but at least you've got no, as it were, real, no rational excuse .h....

Voice: Ah!

S: You can only then have to simply say, "well, I'm just too lazy", or "I'm just quite afraid", you have to say that eh

Voice: ...You have to admit your own (short-comings?)

S: Yes. Yes

Cittapala: Is the er...traditional er...list of questions for... °..... tries to pronounce Pali or Sanskrit term and fails) er useful in

S: For ?

Cittapala: Doubt or Vitt vitt...

Suvajra: Vittikicca ( much laughter)

S: ... Or Vittikicca in Fali, Kitsa in Sanskrit, Kicca in Pall.

Cittapala: I was interested.... (unclear. something about certain contents in a dictionary) sort of 16 different questions er.... .1 was wondering if they had any (reverance?). 9

S: W~ich ones are you referi~ to ?

Cittapala: .... ffi;ell there basically.. .you know, about ..... "what have I been in the pasti 9~

~: Ah yes

Cittapala: "how have I been?", or, "what am I going to be in the future?", "what have I been

S: ~Tell, it certainly suggests why doesn't it. Because it suggests self-preoccupation ..... and not getting down to it in the present. But it~ much more than that I would say eh.... it goes beyond this list (pause) It's icr£....i~s not so much doubt - doubt maybe is a misleading translation - i~s sort of, I would say uncertainty yeh. . . .eh.. °.4..um...It's allowing oneself to remain in a state of uncertainty~ it~ almost to avoid having to make-up one's mind and pursue a definite course of action with regard to one's own development or with regard to the Spiritual life. (pause).

I mean you can always tell when someone doesn't want to do something but won't admit it, they just sort of confuse the issue um.....So you say, "well, would you like to go for a walk in the afternoon?" eh....they say, "well, it, you; know, it might

CO~YrINTh~D. be a good day it might not be a good day, perhaps I'll feel tired or perhaps I won't feel tired", they won't say that they want or that they don't want,perhaps, to go for a walk, you know, they just make all those sort of not exactly excuses, they just confuse the issue... .eh.. . .um. So it's so that they don't really have to make-up their minds eh....(pause)....and Vittikicca's more like that. There's not a genuine doubt not a genuine, honest intell- ectual doubt .... but a doubt is something you try to resolve presumably. IMs not a genuine intellectual difficulty that you have .... . ..... it's just this cloudyness and uncertainty, a tendency just to remain in that and to use that as a sort of cam~lage self-protection.

Ratnaprabha: ~o it sounds as if it~s connected, also, with responsib 9

ility this example you gave us

S: Um. . . yes yes... .one could certainly say that... yes

Ratna~rabha: Not wishing to t&ke responsibility for one's ovm actions. 9

S: Um. . . .yes. . (pause).. .Or, not wishing to have any actions for v~ich you would ..... have to take responsibility or to have any sort of thoughts or ideas which, you know, lead to those sort of actions.

Voice: So that the throwin~ into confusion is a way perhaps... .... .a way of simply avoiding responsibility

S: Um....yes....yes one could say that....maybe it's going a bit beyond Vittcakitsi in the narrow sense, but certainly there is a connection... (pause).

I met some very good examples of this in India. In India you can get classic cases of this sort of thing. . .um.

Devamitra: And that's presuming one (who?).. (unclear. something about a right-line of thinking) ?

S: Yes, for instance, if you tackle a Bralimin eh. . .about 'Untouchability' um he would say "Untouchability, who touches who? it is all one", you know er.... 'Truth is one, God is one. I don't see that person as an 'untouchable', who says that I'm treating him as an 'untouchable' I don't see things in those terms, I don't see him as an 'untouchable' at all, I see him as God" eh... um o in that way the issue is confused eb. . .um he avoids responsibility for his actions for his having to change. Indians, especially Brahmins, are very good at this sort of thing ..... confusing the issue, all those sort of wordy obstructions and general- isations... .um

Ratnaprabha: It's 11kw the 'ee'l-wrigglers'. ...isn't it.

S: Yes their like 'eel-v~igglers'....yes....I m~an if you say, "well, that was rather an unselfish thing to do", well, "everybody selfish, human nature is selfish, wj~w pick on me?" ..... um. . . (laughter)... in other words, avoid, you know, facing up that you are selfish, you have been selfish and you should c~o something about it. So Vittc~itsa seems to ..... to be more that kind of... (4 or 5 words unclear).

CONTI~ThD.

Cittapala: Does it spring up out of confusion. ... say conflicting ..... sort of desires... greed or something lfle t}iat ?

S: It can....I dare say it can. It can very often yes....yeh.

Cittapala: but it could come from anywhere, it could just be a basic delusion about (mind?) that you

S: Erm. well certainly you can speak of it, also in terms of rationalisation er. .  
.um (pause) Anyw~~y, was that the bell...?

Voice: Um S: Oh yes' (Tea-break)

So even with regard to the you know, the 5 hindrances, there is a sort of measure of hope eh that is, however subject one may be to th~ 5 hindrances .~.... .... there is the possibility of getting rid of that er and one sees that possibility in this connection eh

One gets the impression going through this text that.... .... far from being relatively unoccupied, the monks in the Buddha's day had a very busy time of it Do you see what I mean....? b~ll there's a good c~ays work, you know, in just these two or three sections, examining your mind in this particular way, and contemplating (it?). You know, once they returned from their alms round, had their food, rested, they'd take up their meditation. They'd

be fully occupied. 1... 1... Imagine until their 'no-supper' time~....(laughter) (pause). So it does suggest that work on the mind really is work eh It is virtually a full-time job....(long pause) And it... it does show - I mean in fact all these sections show - how little eh... the Buddha (2 or 3 words unclear) left to chance. There's no sort ... no (real) pious ex~vitation, you're told exactly what to do exactly how to go about it

Devamitra: I get the impression that this is one of the most well known of the Four Sutt~

S: Well according to the introduction it~ certainly one of the most highly regarded

Devamitra: Yes

S: Yes ~-(pause). In way you've got - well for the monk at least - eve~hing in a nutshell.

Ratnaprabha: Is it significant that this Sutta is addressed specifically to the monks erm. . . while other... (4 or 5 words unclear)

S: Well, as I've mentioned, it does seem to be a pretty much full-time job going into things in this sort of way. Not~that the house- holder is, you know, is exempt....eh....

Cittapala: Would this mainly (2 or 3 words unclear) in the context of meditation. 9  
er going into

S: Well, not exclusively. I mean that does seem to be suggested er.. all the way through, it isn't just a matter of what you do while your formally ~tA~ s~tt~of m ~di~ta ion you try to carry it over, the fruits of your experi~nce ~h~ that is ade ~ry clear early on.. ..(pause).. . Do you see wjj&t I mean?

COI~IIThTE~. into other times as when your walking, standing, sitting, eating eh....that is made very clear early on (pause).

I mean for the laymen the difficulty arises from the fact that many of the activities in which he's engaged as a laymen perhaps, necessarily are more or less essentially un-ethic 1 eh.. .. (pause)... Do you see wh~t I mean? For instance, su~~ose he was a farmer e destroyJ life which would be un- ethical (pause till end of tape~.

;\qcl

SATIPATTEANA SUTTA TAPE 13 SIDE 1 26-11-82

Oitta~ala: Do you think it was mainly just spoken? Presumably most of the afternoon, just cont~plating, either formally or informally, these sort of questi~ns?

S: Yes, it would seem that in the Buddha's day, much of the morn- ing passed in taking a bath, walking to the nearest village, walk- ing round that, collecting your alms, walking back to wherever you were staying, eating whatever you'd collected, and then resting for a while, and then, if you were living on your OWfl, you spent the rest of the day either seated in meditation or walking up and down reflecting, that was a popular practice, that's called (Chankamana?) just walking up and down, perambulating, one might call it, huh? Er, I mean,



Christian monks did this in the West, that's why you've got cloisters, for monks to walk and as it were con~plate.

Suvajra: What was it called, the practice?

S: Er, it's called (Chankamana?) waThing up and down, backwards and forwards; we would call it ambulation, I think it's called ambul- ation in Christian works.

Guna~ala: I often used to see you doing this in New Zealand, you would walk up and down....

S: I used to do it quite a lot in kalimpong, I had quite a long verandah, and one can think and contemplate as it were, very well in that sort of way.

Citta~ala: But presumably in the context of these particular pract- ices it wouldn't be so much thinking so much in terms of what I usually think of as discursive thinking....

S: Well, no, it would be thinking but it would be more directed, huh? Usually people's thinking is sort of roughly associative, or it wanders quite a lot, digresses, diverges, quite a lot. But this kind of reflection is more sort of systematic, more directed, because it is directed towards the understanding of certain things. You don't just allow your mind to wander vaguely, from one thing to another.

Devamitra: Er, would you say that thinking by means of association rather than in a directed way is actually a hindrance to clarity of mind? I mean obviously there is some kind of thinking which is purely associative which is not going to get you anywhere...

S: Well, no, I wouldn't say that associative thinking is necessarily to be entirely discouraged, huh? Maybe associative thinking is help- ful sometimes, in sort of uncovering mental states, uncovering emotions, do you see what I mean? One thing sort of leads to another, but why are you lead from one thing to another? Why does the line of thought take the direction that it does? You find out things about oneself just by allowing the mind to freely associate, but keeping a sort of watch on it at the same time. You might find that the mind, you know, that starts off from different starting points, arrives at much the same end on different occasions, and that might tell you something about yourself, huh? Just as your might tell you about yourself, dreams proceed more by way of ~ssoc~tion. You might find that your thoughts were always coming back to ~ndia, or your thoughts are always coming b~ck to your child- hood. That will sort of tell you something about yourself, which you

# ~&

~ (cont): needed to go into more deeply, so I don't think that associative thinking can be entirely discarded, it is a sort of instrument for a certain kind of purpose, huh? You might even in- corporate associative thinking in this sense, in the process of reflection. If, for instance, you might be asking yourself 'Why am I so prone to anger? Why do I get so angry so often?' and you may not be able to find out any logical answer to that, so in order to find an answer, to uncover the source of the anger, you might sort of allow your mind to roam a bit, to freely associate, but as it were keeping your eye on 't all the time. You might let it go back yo your childhood, jus hinking about this and that: maybe you'll find some clue there, so insight, do you see what I mean? But even in that case you are using the associative thinking, I mean your associative thinking does take place within a broader context of meaningfulness and ultimate purpose, huh?

Devamitra: So in a sense it is actually directed...

S: So in a sense it is actually directed but perhaps from a distance, or not very rigidly, not very strictly, but it is directed nonetheless you're not merely wool-gathering, when you engage in associative thinking in that sort of way. I think that >t can be quite useful in uncovering emotional factors of which one isn't perhaps fully conscious, or just establishing broader connections that aren't at first sight obvious.

Devamitra: Why I raised \Vis question was because I remember in an order meeting actually here in Tuscany during the first part of the retreat we were discussing the nature of different people's intelligence, the way that different people seem to approach things or apprehend things, the way that different people seem to think. I think the comment was made by one or two people that, in connection with certain other individuals, that they seemed to think by Way of association, and I was just wondering if that's enough, or is it just that, temperamentally, as it were~ that's the way their intelligence functions, or do they actually have to learn to think in this more directed way as well, is it that?

S: I think one also needs to think, to learn to think if necessary, to think in that more directed, more purely logical way, er, even if only for the purposes of communication, because you can't always convince a person through, you know, by citation~ association, because for him, associations may be different, huh, but reason and logic is common to all, everybody can appreciate a reason, whereas not everybody will appreciate a particular set of associations, because, for ~~, they may have a different meaning, they may communicate something different, from what they communicated to you, huh? Do you see what I mean? So I won't be quite sure whether you, to be a fully developed human being, have to develop logical thinking, I won't be completely certain about that, but certainly, if you want to communicate with others, you have to be able to present your thought and conclusions and ~s beliefs in a logical, rational sort of form, you can't fall back just on your own associations. (Agreement) Or, of course, if you do function in that sort of way with regard to other people, that is to say, via associative thinking, you have to be careful to invoke associations which are associations for them, huh?, not ~i-aply association~ which are associations for you, huh? )Pause)

Devamitra: So really one should try to encourage people to go beyond their merely associative thinking?

A ?~1

S: Yes, yes. Because I think that very often associative thinking is perhaps not truly associative always, it's sort of superficially associative, based on superficial resemblances, huh?

Devamitra: So could you make that distinction a bit clearer, I mean, er, what would be genuinely associative?...could you give me an example of a genuine process of associative thinking?

S: That's rather difficult...perhaps I can give an example of what is not a genuine kind, say, er, association based upon the, er, similar sounds of words, huh, do you see what I mean?

Devamitra: Yes, I think...yes.

S: Almost sort of.0.the unconscious does work in this way. For instance, by way of puns, huh? I think Freud has gone into this, or somebody has gone into it, that it's as though the unconscious makes jokes in the form of puns, huh? I'll try and think of an example here, or invent an example...

Ratna rabha: ~v~ got an example from a dream I had a couple of days ago. laughter). Well, it may be, anyway. It was, er, about my street when I was a child. At the end of the street was a huge sort of railway arch with a dark tunnel going into it, and this railway arch was composed

of large stone blocks; I remember the word 'blocks' was quite prominent in my memory of the dream next morning, and it could well be that the reason I thought of them as being large stone blocks was because they weren't just squared blocks, they were psychological blockages.

S: That is a sort of pun, yes. But I'M thinking of a play on names, for instance, you mentioned block, there was a Thissian poet called Alexander Block. (Laughter) Now, you could for instance have dreamed that you, you know, went into a bookshop and asked for the works of Alerander ~loOk, and the man said ~No~ I'm sorry, we don't have them, we've got rid of them'. So, you know, your unconscious could be speaking in terms of getting rid of mental blockages, you see what I mean? So this is essentially a private association, purely verbal association; you couldn't very well use that in communication with other people, do you see what I mean? Perhaps that's not a very ~~~f example, perhaps clear examples aren't particularly easy to come by in this particular field; do you see what I mean?

Devamitra: Yes, yes...why I was asking was because surely if some- one does think purely by means of association, how does one tell if it is genuine associative thinking or only superficially so?

S: Well, I suppose it depends upon the conclusion at which he arrives, hum? Whether he arrives at a correct or incorrect conclusion, that must surely be part of it.

Devamitra: Or if he arrives at a conclusion at all.

S: Yes, or if he arrives at a conclusion at all, huh?

Cittapala: Does this tie in at all with Edward deBono's 'Lateral Thinking'?

S: Possibly, but I can't say I'm very familiar with that idea, e(xpa%%te) in a general way.

Devamitra: It does strike me that, well, a lot of people do seem to think as it were more associatively than in the more directed sort of way, I don't know whether in a general way or in a superficial sort of way.

S:~3ut it does seem that if you want to convince others of the correct- ness of the conclusions which you've arrived at through your associat- ive thinkingl you have to reduce your associative thinking to some kind of logical process, otherwise it's not convincing to other people. Unless they know you very well and have learned to have faith in the conclusions you arrive at,however you arrive at them, hum?

Ratnaprabha: Presumably every time we use metaphor or symbol we use associative thinking0

S: Yes, yes, in a way, yes.

~la: To talk about anything that's spiritually higher, would it have to be associative thinking? You know, associations to something spiritually higher?

S: Well, it depends on what one means by 'talking about', whether it means creating a sense of, or proving some point in connection with. I mean, for the first, associative thinking might be more suit- able; for the latter, more directed, logical thinking, huh? i3ut I suspect, though, that what ~ passes as associative thinking is very often just vague or loose thinking, I mean, it's pseudo-logical rather than strictly associative, hum? Do you see the distinction?

Cittapala: :[]o you mean pseudo in the sense that itts not really, or is it just private...

S: It purports to be logical, and the person concerned may even think that he's thinking logically, but actually he isn't, huh? So that cannot be justified as associative thinking.

Richard Clayton: On the other end of the scale of associative thinking, where does that lead? I mean in the sense that if you're contemplating in an associative sort of way and you find that you're actually emotionally involved, you start going into areas that you're not even questioning perhaps in their rational way whether things are marrying up, whether they are affirming one another, if one just has very strong feelings, that these things have relations. How do you see that going?

S: Well, as far as you need; for instance, supposing you're walking up and down and you're trying to discover, as I mentioned, why you always become angry, yes? Well, you may, through your associative thinking, feel your way, as it were, to some cause or source, of that. Not by any strictly logical process of deduction in a Sherlock Holmes sort of way, hum? but more, in a manner of speaking, intuitively, you feel your way, you feel that you're getting closer, and eventually perhaps you do stumble upon something, hum?, that that there's some connection with the fact that you tend to get angry.

Richard Clayton: Would you say that if one was contemplating the twelve ideas this would be...that's more the way one wants to engage in contemplation?

;

S: Well, that is more a model for this more directed thinking, rather than associative thinking. (Pause) I think that for purposes of exposition, or putting things across to other people, you need to put your thinking into a much stricter form, and perhaps it would have been necessary to satisfy yourself of the truth of certain conclusions, or the correctness of certain conclusions.

Devamitra: Presumably if you don't do that it would mean that there would be an absence of clarity.

S: Yes, and you wouldn't convince other people. Or I do know that some of our friends fall back, upon their feelings, huh? For instance, they say, 'Well such and such is the case'. And you say "Well what makes you think that?" "Well, I just know." Well, that doesn't help you very much. You just can't share that knowledge, so YOU say, "Well, what do you mean by 'you know'?" And then they will usually say, "Well, I just feel it, I just feel it here", you know, but again that doesn't help, huh? Er, and in fact it's not really correct to translate a strong feeling into terms of knowledge, because you don't know, you merely have a strong feeling, and that's quite different, and you cannot possibly expect somebody else to accept, er, what purports to be an objective view simply on the basis of the fact that you feel it to be true. You ought not really to have just a feeling that something is true, something which is capable of demonstration, you ought to demonstrate it, huh?, do you see what I mean?

Devamitra: Yes, you ought to be able to demonstrate it...

S: But if you can't, you have no reason to be annoyed that other people refuse to accept what you say.

Devamitra: So it may be possible that your feeling is actually accurate, but in the case of someone who was unable to think in a directed way, he would not be able to demonstrate that logically.

S: Yes, you can't expect somebody else to share your purely subjective conviction. I mean, for instance, er~ I mean, something might be missing, and someone might say that he

knows a certain person has stolen it, he feels it so strongly that it amounts to logic; well, you can't possibly accept that, and send for the police on that basis, and ask them to arrest that person; you say, well what reason have you got to suspect him, huh? And if he can't give any reason at all, one can be justified in concluding that his feeling is purely subjective and doesn't have any objective value.

Devamitra: But actually that wasn't quite what I was asking, er, do you think it is conceivable that you can have a strong subjective feeling which you can't demonstrate, and yet which is at the same time objective, it's just that you don't have the...

S: It may be so, but if it was so, if it wasn't just blind prejudice, you would be sufficiently objective to recognise that you couldn't expect other people merely to accept that, because you felt it to be so, huh? And you might have a sort of intuitive faculty, but you'd be the first person to recognise that others didn't have that, so you couldn't expect them to see what you saw. If someone insists, and says, "Well I know it to be true~ because I feel it to be true", and they want you to accept it on that basis, well that isn't reasonable, huh?

Citta~ala: This is presumably why you can't really explain higher spiritual truths to people because if they have no experience of that, er...

S: You can explain them to the extent that they are susceptible to rational explanation, huh? It's not that nothing can be explained, you know, which another person has not actually experienced, but at least one can point in that direction, huh? For instance, in the case of meditation, someone might not have meditated, might have had no experience of the anas, but you can give some account of the Dyanas to them, by appealing to elements within their own experience which do actually exist, and with which they are familiar; I mean, Sukkha, happiness, is part of ~4y~anic experience, so you can say, 'well, have you ever felt happy?' "Well, yes". "Well just imagine that happiness as become uninterrupted, intensified, ten, twenty times, well, that's one aspect of ~ana"0 That is, as it were, a more rational inductive sort of approach. (Pause)

Richard: It seems as if, er, ~beleif~, say, in the value of leading the spiritual life, to have faith in it...perhaps associative thinking is, er, this is only a suggestion, associative thinking is the more important, because in a sense you can deduce things, and you can see things (~3 or 4 words) but it's not that which is eventually going to give you insight, it's a moment of emotional intensity which...

S: Well, the rational ~o~~~~t can provide a basis for the development of insight, but no more than that, it can also provide a medium for its communication, its expression. It can't give the other person the experience.

Cittapala: Is the process of directed thinking one of deduction, or...

S: No, not necessarily, because we have seen that it can include an element of associative thinking, you can make use of associative thinking in the interests of, the overall interests of, directed thinking.

Cftta~ala: I mean if you wanted to explain something to me you'd use the inductive process, would you?

S: You'd use the inductive or deductive process, but you'd be logical, huh? Deductive meaning going from the general to the particular, Inductive going from the particular to the general, hum? In other words, you appeal to reason~ so to speak, hum?, if you want to convince others.

Devamitra: So it would seem actually that in terms of communication and explanation the logical process is indispensable.

S: It would seem so, yes.

Devamitra: No matter how you arrive at your conclusions subjectively

S: Yes, yes. (Pause) I mean, for instance, you can sort of speak in symbolic terms, you can describe symbols; for instance, you can give a talk, and at the end of your talk you can describe the figure of Avalokitesvara, huh? But, you know, you can do that, and do it quite convincingly, convincing emotionally, you can paint as it were a pretty picture which will impress even a non-Buddhist, but you won't be able to convince them about the reality which that particular symbol represents, or embodies, without some recourse to rational

S: (cont.) thought, rational communication, do you see what I mean? Otherwise you're just conjuring up an attractive picture, hum? It's like a science fiction story, or an extraterrestrial fiction story, well, it's sort of internally consistent, huh?, but does it have any congruence with external reality you know, that is the point. Do you see what I mean?

Ratna-rabha: From reading the scriptures one gets the idea that people ~~~q~ ~~~fr~ ~1/4\*~t the Buddha or enlightened people were able to almost show people things, they didn't necessarily have to... and often the Buddha seemed able just to show somebody the truth of something.

S: Well, yes and no. One could say that the Buddha himself was an embodied logical argument, hum? 1/4~hter) Empirically speaking because I mean that, er, if someone~well, no, I don't think there is such a thing as Nirvana! The Buddha could say in effect, well, "here it is", huh? And it could be evident perhaps that he was kind- er ~~~ther people, more intelligent than other people, so they couldn't deny that he'd attained something and that therefore there was something for a human being to attain, huh? In that sense his life and personality were a logical argument, a living demonstration, huh? of the truth of certain propositions, (Laughter), Just as the fact that a co-op exists is a living demonstration that you can to some extent break out of the existing economic system. You don't have to logically prove it, you just need to say, "Well we've done it, there you are." Do you see what I mean? Or if, for instance, someone tried to argue, "Well, it's not possible to be happy unless you've got a regular job~a wife and children", you don't need to bring theoretical arguments, you just say, "Well, look, we're living without those things and we're perfectly happy, just come and see, come and share our life." That is a logical argument, your life is a logical argument, there's no associative thinking here. (laughter) It's a very direct, plain, logical proof.'

Cittapala: In terms of convincing somebody that Nirvana actually is a reality, I mean you can only...if you're not spiritually enlightened yourself, you can only use inductive reasoning.

S: Yes, or you can give them some idea of the nature of such a state, without necessarily being able to prove that that state does actually exist, huh? It could be just a matter of day-dreaming, huh? I mean you could imagine a horse with six legs, but it doesn't prove there is such a thing as a horse with six legs. (Laughter) In the same way you can imagine a state of Sukhavati, all those jewel trees, but it doesn't prove that they exist; you can certainly convey the picture of Sukhavati to someone, that isn't very difficult, but to convince anybody that there is such a state as Sukhavati, such a plane as Sukhavati, such a world, you would have to have recourse to logical thinking, to reason to some extent. Some people can't distinguish between communicating a picture of something and proving that something exists. They think that if they have communicated the picture, that's enough, they've proved that the thing exists, that the other person ought to accept it; that isn't the case, that isn't so. I mean, the Christian argument ~ this is: "Well, it's true, the bible says it, it's written here." Some people have said this to me, put the Bible right under my nose as though I was being especially stupid and obtuse, and couldn't see the print, huh? "Look, it's written~ere, in the Bible!" Well, what you have to prove to me is the Bible has that sort of authority, but that doesn't occur to them, they take that for granted.

Ratnaprabha: Isn't this argument used to prove the existence of God, that because we can have an idea of God, such a thing must exist.

S: Yes, the argument ~s~ this is ~~~4Uti~ argument, 4hat an imperfect being cannot form an idea of a per~ct being; we have got the idea of a perfect being, therefore we couldn't have thought of it ourselves, it must've come from somewhere else, it must've come from the perfect being, therefore the perfect being exists. There is a flaw in the argument, of course. (Laughter) What does one mean by 'an idea of a perfect being'-we won't go into that.

Suvajra: Hum, this strikes me~ you've been saying for at least two or three years that people's thinking is quite woolly, could you actually suggest ways we can improve our thinking?

S: Well, just by thinking.' You've just got to sort of practiSe, huh? As if to say, someone was to ask, how can we improve cur muscles? Well, you've got to give them some work to do, ~o~DXe got to take excercise. So how can you improve your thinking? ~By thinking.

Suvajra: But you can be more specific with the example of weight- training, you can say you pick up these weights in such and such a way...

S: Well, one way would be to go and talk with people who don't agree with what you say:

Someone: Writing talks.

S: Writing talks, and meeting criticism, huh? I think that within the r~~O we often give one another a very easy time, because there are certain things that everybody accepts, so when those things are mentioned in the course of a talk, even though very weak arguments are produced, if arguments are produced at all, they are just allowed to pass, because everybody agrees with the conclusions anyway, you get away with a very weak argument and a very weak line of thought.

Devamitra: Do you think there is a lot of weak argument in our talks? (Indistinct 3 or 4 words) \~ \ ~~'

S: Well, I havnU~It listened to~jtalks recently, I think probably the reasoning could be tightened up very often, hum? I mean, where there is an attempt at reasoning; if someone is merely painting a picture, so to speak, that is another matter, though you could of course ask that the painting be more vivid. But I do think that perhaps people do need a bit more opposition, more challenge, huh? I know that if you go and discuss certain things with christians, you may meet very unreasonable people, I mean you can see the unreasonable-ness of their arguments, but on the other hand, you may become more and more aware of the ineffectiveness of your own arguments, and the weaknesses of your own arguments, even though some arguments would 1 ~e~~~ convince those people, hum? But nonetheless, one may realise how weak one's arguments are, or how weak one's position is, in terms of one being able to give a logical account of it.

Devamitra: Presumably there's always going to be a residue of weakness to the extent that there's a weakness of genuine conviction?

~: Well, there's always going to be a residue, ~ that cannot actually be reduced to logic. Well, in the sense that you can give a convincing account, of, you know, why you adopt a certain position, but that won't be really and truly convincing to somebody else, unless he's in some sort of emotional sy:npathy with you at the same time.

S (cont.): I mean that, as Johnston says,, 'a man convinced against his will remains of the same opinion still.

Cittapala: Woii~ you say that this process of straightening one' directed thinking would be part of d~ing ~raddha?

S: I wcul~t think of it as part of (i~ing Sraddha;I'm not quite sure what it has to do with Sraddha, it seems to have to do with the Prajna side of things more.

Cittapala: Well, what I was thinking was, you know when you discussed in a question and answer session, who is your spiritual authority, er, and you brought out a~ er, list of reasons, it did seem very close to the line of reasoning for developing...the attributes of developing Sraddha...

S: I don't quite see it.

~ttaala: You don't quite see it, er...

Ratnaprabha: I think that what Cittapala has in mind is sometimesZ divided up into faith based on, I'm not sure I can remember all the categories, but it includes faith based on reasoning, faith based on experience, these are just two of the categories, so the category of reasoning would...

S: Yes, it's more like'confidence', yes, there would be a connection in that sense. (Pause) Anyway, how did we get onto this topic?

Ratnaprabha: Associative thinking.

S: Out of regard to associative thinking, and discovering how things arose, and if you couldn't do it by straight logical thinking, because very often you can't, associative thinking may well be a tool for exploring your own well-hidden motivations. But then we sort of doubled back and considered the weakness of people's rationalizing. (3 or 4 words) It's not to say that, you know, rational thinking~ a completely adequate tool or means of expression or communication on all accasions, but I think many people in the ~riends need to develop that side of things much more. I mean, I know one has to go beyond rational thinking in the end, but that end may be quite a long way off, you've got to have something to go beyond.

Suvaira: Does the study of Logic help people...?

S: I think it does to some extent, but I don't think it can be, well, it shouldn't be over-rated. l~~ybe to get hold of a little text- book on logic would provide one with some amusement. Certainlyl it helps in exposing fallacies, that's one department of formal logic, fallacies in reasoning, that can be quite useful. You can detect your- self sometimes with the help of that section, you know, falling into logical fallacies, arguments which are not really arguments at all.

Suvaira: Another question as well, going back, er, you were speaking about ambulation, why should ambulation be conducive to thinking?

S: Or why should it be conducive to concentrated thinking? ~~ell, to begin with, there is an element of repetition in it, you are not just walking on and on indefinitely, you're walking backwards and forwards backwards and forwards, and that is sort of soothing, as it were, it is almost like being swung to and fro in a cradle9 huh?

S: (cont.) ° There's a sort of regular movement;, repetition is quite sort of soothing and conduces to concentration, conduces to reflection, and so it's a sort of welcome alternative to sitting meditation, because it gives you the opportunity to relax and ex~ercise the limbs, huh?



And there may be certain times of day when it's more appropriate; I used to in Kalimpong, as far as I remember, walk up and down quite a bit after lunch, er, because if you were to sit or lie down you might start feeling drowsy or sleepy, so it counter-acts that; on the other hand, one ~ feels very much like walking up and down in the evening-time, you know, 'When the shades of night are falling fast' and all that sort of thing. It seems a suitable sort of thing to do. I mean, yes, you're not able to concentrate very deeply when you're walking up and down, for obvious reasons, but you're certainly able to reflect. I think it is a quite useful alternative to sitting meditation. If you're doing a lot of meditation it's quite good to intersperse, you know, periods of just walking up and down; maybe walking up and down repeating your mantra to yourself, or just reflecting in a more purposive sort of way. Yes, directed thinking can also be called 'purposive thinking'; you're actually investigating a particular point; it may be a quite practical matter, you know, to do with the running of a ~ centre, you know, you just put your mind on it, you bring all the energies you have to bear on that particular topic, in whatsoever way. Or it may be on a philosophic matter, or some spiritual problem that you're working on! huh?, but you give your whole attention to it. I think that sort of thinking people don't often engage in, sort of more directed or purposive thinking. ~oe people of course do their more directed thinking out aloud in collaboration with other people, because sometimes, I mean, if someone's power of concentration is weak, they may not be able to sustain sort of purposive thinking, or directed thinking, very long by themselves. If they enter into a conversation, if the other person is, you know ~ also quite intellectually quite active, they may find they are thrashing the matter out and arriving at a definite conclusion ~ which they may not perhaps have been able to do by themselves. That's one of the advantages of genuine discussion, especially with one or two other people. You can't usually engage in this sort of discussion when there's a large number of people present. Ideally it's on a just one-to-one basis; the other person may end up convincing you, or you may end up convincing them; you may end up convincing yourself, you might not have been sure at the beginning of the discussion, or you might end up de-convincing yourself. But the fact that there's another person involved and you're actually speaking, there's a certain interest which tends to concentrate the mind in a way you might find difficult walking up and down on your veranda, or sitting on your meditation cushion. In fact I think this is one of the reasons why discussions in say council meetings are sometimes not very fruitful, because there's no overall purpose to the discussion, huh? I mean, in theory whoever is in the chair has the function of directing the whole discussion, so that everybody's thinking about the same thing, and trying to come to a decision about the same thing ~ But if there's no one in the chair, or if the chair is ineffective, then the discussion wanders, we all know that; supposing, for instance, you decide to have a jumble sale, and so the council meeting is discussing when to have it, where to have it, who to ask to help, and all that sort of thing; well, supposing in the course of the discussion a certain hall is mentioned as a possibility for holding the jumble sale, and that sparks off something in somebody's memory, "Ah, I remember when we had the jumble sale there two years ago, and so-and-so was such-and-such", and he and another person will get into a long argument about what happened, do you see what I mean? In other words, the sense of direction is lost; the chair, or whoever is in the chair, should pull them up, they are not all concerned with that, huh? But very often that doesn't happen, and they go on discussing that and other

S (cont.): people discuss something else, and the whole sort of meeting falls apart, in extreme cases. You see what I mean? So you can have this sort of collective, directed discussion, in fact this is what council meetings should engage in, but that means a strong controlling chair, and a definite agenda so you know what you're talking about and what sort of conclusion you have to arrive at, or what conclusion you have to arrive at on what topic, huh? Otherwise you just have a good old chat and you go home and nothing's been decided or settled.

Ratnaprabha: If you've got a good enough chairman, could these meetings be of any size and still have an effective discussion?

S: Any size? Well, what does one mean? ~ryone in the Albert Hall, or...

Ratnaprabha: Well, no, I've just heard that, people suggesting that if it gets above, I don't know, a dozen or something like that, then it starts getting very difficult...

S: Well, there is the question of time; if everybody is to have their say. Often what happens in a council meeting of this sort generally, is that people who don't really know anything about the matter in hand feel obliged to have their say nonetheless. So I think one should cultivate a sense of discipline and speak only when one has something to say, to add to the discussion, not feel obliged to chip in just to let everybody know you are there.

~~ SIDE ONE

Satipatthana Sutta No. 13

## BEGINNING SIDE 2 TAPE

7 S (cont.): Human nature being what it is, all other factors being equal, it's easier to chair and direct the discussion when there's only 4 or 5 ~~~~~~ than when there are twenty. It depends also on the degree of discipline which everybody observes, degree of self-discipline. And ideally everybody present should know something ~out most of the topics discussed and have something to say, otherwise, why on earth are they there? Why on earth are they a member of that council? They should inform themselves about whatever is on the agenda, and be ready to contribute their opinion or advice. Sometimes everyone might listen to the one person who is acknowledged to be the expert; I mean, suppose the Padmaloka council has the question of what plants to buy for the Padmaloka garden, well, there's only one person that council is going to listen to, you know, there's no point in everybody having an opinion. There's no point in somebody discussing it in depth about whether we should buy, say, daffodil bulbs before it's time to plant them, if you see what I mean. But you get a lot of that sort of thing. People really anxious to discuss the mowing of the lawn when there's nothing left to mow.' (Laughter) It is extraordinary the sort of irrational, you know, factors that come into play here, the sort of things that people get onto talking about. Anyway, we mustn't provide an example for ourselves.' (Amusement) (Pause) Anyway; we've been talking about the 5 Hindrances, so is there anything further we need to go into? (Pause) Alright, let's go onto this ~ction 2, sub-section 2, rather.

Richard: (3 or 4 words') Shall I read it right through?

S: No, just the first short paragraph first, because there's a note on that.

Richard: " And further, monks, a monk lives contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the five aggregates of clinging."

S: Note 22:- "These five groups of aggregates constitute the so-called personality. By making them objects of clinging, existence is repeated, births and deaths is ~11 Perhaps it's worth observing that in the case of all these categories and sub-categories, it's not so much that one is contemplating this or contemplating that, one is in a way contemplating the whole of existence, huh, subjective and objective, internal and external, in terms of whatever it is, huh, do you see what I mean? And this is particularly the case here, perhaps. You contemplate existence in terms of the five aggregates. It's as though you are attacking existence from different ~oints of view, different angles, trying to penetrate into it, now from this side now from that. It's not that you're studying and exhausting a mutually exclusive category of things, classification of things, huh? Because some of these categories have appeared before in other contexts. Read the rest right through to the end.

Richard: "How, monks ~ does a monk live contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the five aggregates? Herein, monks, a monk thinks, 'Thus is material form; thus is the arising of material form; thus is the disappearance of material form. Thus is feeling; thus ~ the arising of feeling; and thus is the disappearance of feeling. Thus is perception;

thus is the arising-of-perception: and thus is the appearance of p~p~ thus is the arising of formations; and thus is the disappearance of formations~Thus is consciousness; thus is the arising of consciousness; and thus is the disappearance of consciousness.' Thus he lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects internally, or he lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects internally, or he lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects internally and externally. He lives contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the five aggregates of clinging.

[261]  
Richard (cont.): in mental objects or he lives contemplating dissolution-factors in mental objects, or he lives contemplating origination-and-dissolution-factors in mental objects. Or his mindfulness is established with the thought 'Mental objects exist', to the extent necessary just for knowledge and mindfulness, and he lives detached and clings to naught in the world. Thus, also, monks, a monk lives contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the five aggregates of clinging."

S: The Pali terms here, of course: material form is Rupa, feeling is ~~~~~~ perception is~~), the formations are the Sanskharas, and consciousness is~~. One should really know these terms, at least in English, and preferably in Pali and Sanskrit too. This is one of the most common categories in the whole of Buddhist literature, whether Hinayana or Mahayana. This list of course occurs in the Heart Sutra, you remember. So in the Pali texts, possibly not in the very oldest ones but in many of the Pali texts conditioned existence, especially from the subjective point of view is analysed into these five. Not that these are five things, as it were of which the so-called personality consists, because each of them is composite, Rupa is broken down I believe into 28 in the Theravada; it can be broken down initially into four, which is earth, water, fire and air, and then they can be broken down into objective and subjective, that gives you eight, do you see what I mean? So it's not that each one is a sort of entity, it's not that the so-called personality can be reduced to these five entities, huh?, it can be reduced to a number of different processes. Unfortunately the Theravada, maybe the Abhidharma tradition generally, whether Theravadin or Sarvastivadin, tend to reify the different dharmas, the so-called ultimate elements into which the person was reduced or into which the 5 skandas were subdivided. But that wasn't the original purpose, the original purpose of the division seems to have been to encourage one to see one's personal existence in dynamic terms. You see it as something complex, a complex of interrelated processes, rather than just as a thing, or a collection of things, huh? So one has material form, Rupa, one has feeling, huh? one has perception, (v~?), in the sense of identification or recognition of things, formations, which are volitions, bringing about...which are your karmas, productive of future effects. And over all, one has consciousness, one has awareness. So these are the five as it were principal aspects of one's personal existence, and as I said, all of them can be subdivided. One is conscious that one has a material body, one is conscious that one has feelings and emotions, one is conscious of a world of objects which one recognises, which one can identify. One is conscious of volition, of drives, of instincts, acts of will. And one is conscious also of being aware of the whole process, huh? In this way one sees one's experience, one sees oneself, as something complex, and dynamic, not as something static and unchanging. So I mean contemplation of mental objects by way of the five aggregates is simply to assist one to this sort of understanding, this sort of realization of the complex and dynamic nature of existence, especially as represented by oneself. It isn't a question just of an unchanging soul in a changing body, it's much more complex than that., according to Buddhism. (Pause) Harshaprabha: Is it possible to break these down to one point or, you know, will it always be a complex system?

S: Well, the more you look into a complex system, the more complex it becomes, in other words, it's as though every process can be reduced to constituent processes, subsidiary processes. I mean, the Abhidharma seemed to believe that you could reach a final point, where you've got a

S: (cont.) fixed, a limited number of dharmas which were the ultimate elements of existence, or if you like, the atoms of ~emocr~us, except that they were both physical and mental, and conditioned and unconditioned, huh? But according to the Mahayana, these

so-called ultimate elements of existence could be broken down into something still more,~1~' which they call Sunyata. I would say in this connection that Sunyata is not a more ultimate thin~ into which the dharmas can be broken downy

The term Sunyata, or the concept of Sunyata represents the fact that the so-called ultimate can be broken down into something still more ultimate, and that that process can continue indefinitely, huh? Do you see what I mean, hum? I mean, for instance, you might have a number of figures made out of clay, so you can reduce these all to one mass of clay, do you see what I mean? So in the same way you have, you might think, the dharmas, and you might break them down into something more fundamental, that is, sunyata, but sunyata is not analagous to that big lump of cl~y, into which you've broken down all the clay figures. It isn't a bigger thing, as it were, to which all those lesser things have been reduced. Sunyata represents more the possibility of in- finite reduction to something still more ultimate, it's more like that, hui? Do you see the difference? So you mustn't think of sunyata as a thing, or even as a more ultimate thing, or a more real thing, it's not a thing at all.

Devamitra: It seems really odd that the Theravada should actually have arrived at the point where they did posit these dharmas as fixed ~;t~~ities.

S: Well, one has to be quite fair here, the Theravadins didn't quite do that, not explicitly; the Sarvastivadins did it ~O~ explicitly, at least some of them. It's as though the Theravadins treated those dharmas as though they were ultimate, rather than actually stated that they were. But the Sarvastivadins seem to have actually stated that they were ultimate, and hence provoked, so to speak, the reaction of the Mahayana, or rather, so to say, caused the Mahayana to reaffirm in stronger terms the original teaching of the Buddha, or at least to reaffirm the spirit of the original teaching.

Suva;ira: Was this a characteristic of all the Hinayana schools that they tended to reify these dharmas?

S: Oh~ there were many, many Hinayana schools, it wouldn't be possible to generalize in that way, no. Traditionally there are 18 mentioned, and it certainly would have been true of quite a lot of them. I know it was true of those schools that developed an Abhidharma, mainly the Thera- vada and the Sarvastivada, but more the Sarvastivada. They were the dominant school in India during the Hinayana period, not the Theravada. The Sarvastivadins are the real culprits, in a sense, in this respect, rather than the Therava~~ Though the Theravadins do tend to treat these dharmas as ultimate, though they may not have a philosophical theory of their ultimacy. p, i.t~~ hatnaprabha: Doesn't this reification of dharmas~onstitute a micchaditti which is going to prevent people from progressing on the Path?

S: I would say yes, well, the Mahayanists treat it as a micchaditti, and if you have that micchaditti you cannot progress beyond a realiz- ation of (pugdala naratmir?), you cannot proceed to a realization of (dharma naratmir?). They don't deny you can make some progress, even some progress on the transcendental path, but it prevents you making further progress into what one might call the Mahayana direction. Some Mahayanists might say they didn't want to make any progress in

)Q65

S (cont.): that direction, but that's another matter.

Hatnaprabha: The reason I ask is because I heard it mentioned that all the, at least all the Hinayana schools, although they disagreed with each other, they all said that you can reach enlightenment in any of these schools, am I right in saying that?

S: This is so, yes.

Ratnaprabha: So it seems that although presumably some of them did not believe that you could reify Dharmas, nevertheless they didn't say if you believe that, you can't reach P~lightenment.

S: They didn't discuss the matter in terms of reifying or not reifying dharmas. Those who did, if they did reify dharmas would not have agreed that that was what they were doing' a~4ay. But I have mentioned this in the course of a question and answer session that there was a general agreement that what one might describe as philosophical differences did not effect one's chances of Enlightenment, it was only differences regarding the Path that were important, not differences regarding more as it were speculative matters, though I have sort of introduced a note of interrogation here, but we won't go into that now, huh?

Devamitra: It seems, I couldn't quite understand why, if the Mahayana acknowledged that,er, even though you did believe in the ultimate existence of dharmas, you could penetrate (pala naratmir?) even though you couldn't penetrate (dharma naratmir?). I can't quite match that up somehow, because it would seem to me that if you did actually penetrate (pala naratmir?), just the force of that insight would quite naturally carry over to, through the other realization.

S: Perhaps even insight doesn't have infinite force behind it; what you're really saying is there cannot be a limited insight, which maybe there can be, otherwise you could argue that why should not the insight that carries you to Stream Entry carry you onto the path of, you know, once-returnership?

Devamitra: But doesn't it in a sense do that?

S: Well it carries you in that direction, yes, eventually. But some Mahayana schools believe that eventually even the Arhants will come onto the Bodhisattva Path. But I don't know how useful this sort of classification of the five skandas is in modern times. If one is say teaching Buddhism, well, teaching the Dharma,as distinct from Buddhism, let us say, well does it help people to speak to them in terms of they're being made up of five Skandas? The Abidharma itself abandoned this classification, quite early on, that's why it's rather interesting that Trungpa has got a little book called 'Glimpses of the Abidharma', where he speaks only of the five skandas, and doesn't seem aware that the Abidharma doesn't discuss things in terms of the five Skandas. It discusses them in terms of another classification, for which it abandoned the classification of the five skandas, discusses them in terms of Rupa, Citta, that is to say, mental states, (~)~~~Q\K~~~ or concomitants of mental states, and Miscellaneous, huh?, which is a bit more systematic. Nyanaloka's Dictionary will give you all the information.

Cittapala: Why do you consider that to be more useful?

S: Well, it is more systematic, er, it's difficult to explain in detail,

°k9

S:(cont.) but if one sort of looks at what they've included under each of these headings, one will see that that is the fact of the case. It's more tidy.

Suvaira: But I remember in our study group, the one with Vessantara, we quite often got stuck on the skandas because they weren't a tidy system, sometimes what we were thinking was a feeling was partly emotional, and included in the formations, we just continually got stuck in that area.

S: Well, perhaps some of the early Abidharmikas got stuck in the same sort of way, and

so that's why they abandoned that classification. One has also, you know, just to remember the general purpose of that particular classification, that one is just trying to see what one thinks of as something unitary, of the nature of entity and relatively static, ~ C trying to see it as a very oomplex and constantly changing phenomenon, i.e., oneself. In a way that's more easy to understand in the case of the physical body, you can study anatomy and physiology, you can study all the different systems of the body, the circulatory, respiratory, reproductive eystems, and so on. You realize that the body is a very complex thing made up of a inumber of different parts. I mean, for instance, we did the other day the 32 parts of the body, do you see what I mean, huh? So you might imagine the Theravada or early Buddhists not easily imagining that there were these 32 qaite distinct parts which were sort of separable, and you put them all together and you had a physical body, but isn't it much more complex than that? I mean, cuite apart from the fact that certain organs are missing completely, isn't it really much more complex than that? Don't the different systems work in a muoh more complicated way than that simple olassification would suggest? Well, it's the same, or even more so~ with the 5 'skandas. They don't represent the extremely complex nature of the human being or sentient being, the way in which so many different processes are inter- related, they just give a hint of that sort. The Abidharma followed j up that hint, but in some ways not very imaginatively, even though some of its teachings, yes, are very useful, and throw a lot of light on the workings of the mind. But it did become a bit rigid and over- scholastic in the end. Nonetheless it did useful work in maay ways, it's still a very interesting and useful study, but one mustn't lose sight of the general principles involved.

Devamitra: I must say, I've never explained the 5 skandas to anybody outside the context of a study group in which they've actually been mentioned, because the important thing is to coinuawicate presumably that principle, which you can do in other ways. So I mean, to answer your original qt~estion, I personally, when I look back at whenever I've comnamicated with people, I've never used it.

S: So supposing one was drawing up or compiling a modern text-book of Buddhism, that is to say, not in the sense of reproducing the original categories, but of trying to put across the essentials of the Dharma here and now, presumably one would not have a section or chapter on the five skandas. I mean, using those terms or in that particular break- down, that five-fold breakdown. Presumably that would not be very help- ful.

levamitra: Well I personally wouldn't use it.

S: I mean, perhaps it wouldn't be a bad idea to go from anatomy and physiology to what one might think of as mental anatomy and mental physiology. Sort of build up a picture of an extremely complex psycho- physioal organism.

Cittanala: Do you think things like classifications of the Ego, the Id

A6~

Citta~ala (cont.): and Anima and such things...

Wi S: That might be one way of doing it, or at least, illustrating it; a dynamic syst em. That is one of the advantages of Freud's system, if I can call it that: it is essentially dynamic. And he saw it in those terms, he was quite consciaais of that fact. Psycho-analysis has a dynMic basis, whatever its~~#o44~may be. I think it has --.-- ~~~ been called 'Thrnarnic psychology'. In a way the old descriptive psy- chology gave one the impression, much as the Abidharma sometimes does, that the mind is a very complicated machine, made up of all sorts of, you know, cogs and levers and pulleys and springs and so on~ that you could take apart, like the works of a clock, and lay them all out before you, number them, enumerate them, put them into groups; but it isn't really like that at all. It might be like that with the body to some extent, but it's certainly not like that ~Uh the mind.

Patna~rabha: The skandas do seem to be more of an idea of what 'S' happening in a successive way than, say, the components of the mind and psycho-analysis. You can see the form and perceptions coming in, but what you do with those perceptions, how we work on them...so I find it quite helpful in that respect.

S: Ah, good. (Pause) So if you were to write a little text-book on modern Buddhism you'd include them, perhaps?

Ratna rabha: Well I don't think I'd try to write a text-book on ~" BuddhismZ (Laughter)

S: Well, that answers the question, doesn't it? You're even more radical in your approach! (Laughter)

Cftanala: So it's not really a question of being able to look down from on high and see five ~iles or' heaps, but more just sort of seeing the sort of process of the body as a...

S: Yes, 'heaps' is misleading, even if you imagine those heaps, as people say, heaps of grain of different kinds, it's still misleading because they're static, ~'5 an essentially static model, you don't see the five heaps, you see, you know, five sets, if you like, of processes. '~'. C' Cittapala: And you use your directed thinking~to elucidate those processes for yourself, and if you happen to want to use this particular formulation, alright...others may be equally misled.

~~

S: Yes, yes. It could be~some modern formulation was more helpful~ even in a sense more true, closer to the facts. Well, I think that the teaching of the five Bk~s is hard going for a lot of people. It's often presented in little books and manuals about Buddhism as though the five skandas were five things, five sort of building blocks, into which you broke down your psycho-physical organism: first of all it's broken down into two big blocks, one called Nama sand one called R~ipa. Then you left rupa to one side and broke up the nama block into four, and that gave you, you know, your five skandas. And then, of course, the Abidharma got to work and chipped away, and each block was reduced to smaller fragments. But still the model tended to be, if one wasn't careful, static rather than dynamic. What you need is a dynamic model, that would be true to the facts. (Pause) It's as though, in the case of these old Buddhist categories or even teachings, that, you know, one can see what they're getting at, but the principle involved needs to be drastically re-formulated, if it is to be put across satisfactorily to people nowadays.

Devamitra: The static view of things and state of being literal-minded seem closely connected. I wonder, if you could say there's an equally close relation between the dynamic view and...

S: I must say, I've been a bit disconcerted, even in the context of the 'Friends', the extent to which people are literal-minded, huh? I've been thinking about that quite a lot. Maybe it's unavoidable that when you're beginning to think or learning to think~ you do take things a bit literally. I'm not sure about that, but there does seem that sort of tendency. Perhaps sometimes one ~ gets questions which are beside the point because someone has taken something that you said quite literally. I can't think of any example off-hand.

Devamitra: Performing miracles?

S: Hum?

Devamitra: Well the Mahasyana uses miracle and phantasmagoria to inspire people through that kind of, (~) of their, imagination.

S: Yes, the Buddha's halo is described as green, and someone wants to know why it wasn't described as blue. (Pause) Anyway,~the five skandas is a very important classification, a very important teaching, so one can't ignore it in studying the text 5, but perhaps one ought not to bring it into one's own original expositions of the Dharma, and find some alternative way of putting across those~t"ruths which the teaching of the five skandas is trying to communicate. Ask yourself why the Buddha spoke about, said anything about the five skandas anyway, what he was really getting at. (Pause) Any further point? Alright, let's leave it there.

[267]

?: Yes...(mumbled,something about green and white). (Pause).

(Ratnaprabha?):It might be useful if we do our voice prints today,perhaps,to make it easier for transcribers. (more muffled voices, followed by laughter). Harshaprabha: Well...er,I'm Harshaprabha,er,this is the second last day of the study,er,so far so good. (laughter). Richard: I'm Richard Clayton,so far,so good,still got another day to go, fire's burning away (something indistinct). (Pause).

Gunapala: I'm Gunapala, ah, it's only...three days?...three days to go to the end of our retreat here in Tuscany. I'm really excited and looking forward to going back to (England? )now. (laughter).

Surata:I'm Surata,um,I'm really enjoying this study and I'm looking forward to another good day. Devamitra:This is Devamitra,and (several words unclear) ...because we have to buy some (flowers?)..for Bhante, but while we were (several words unclear)...come across this very (one word unclear) postcard of Il Convento, so if anybody wants a copy we'll be going in on Monday to do some shopping (unclear),so it's very,very (unclear). ?:I might take Devamitra up on that for a moment (laughter). (some indistinct mumbling, and more laughter).

S: (something indistinct)...We must remember for next time,so that they're available,uh,on people's arrival, so, before the retreat starts(indistinct,something about Kalyana Mitras). (laughter).

Suvajra:My name's Suvajra,and just further to this postcard, it's very,very cheap,yes,it's less than five pence. S:That's expensive.'(laughter)...It's three rupees.' Suvajra:If you're very good,we'll sell it for sixpence! Ratnaprabha:My name's Ratnaprabha and,uh,I wish I could stay here for another several months.

(Long pause).

S: Alright then,let's go on with page 22,subsection 3.

(Pause).

I think it would be a good idea to read the whole of that subsection,so we can discuss it,uh,as a whole. (Pause).

?: "THE SIX INTERNAL AND SIX EXTERNAL SENSE BASES" "And further monks,a monk lives contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the six internal and six external sense bases.How,monks,does a monk live contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the six internal and the six external sense bases? Herein,monks,a monk knows the eye and visual forms,and the fetter that arises dependant on both the eye and forms.He knows how the arising of the non-arisen fetter comes to be,he knows how the abandoning of the arisen fetter comes to be,and he knows how the non-arising,in the future,of the abandoned fetter comes to be.



He knows the ear and sounds, the nose and smell, the tongue and flavours, the body and tactile objects, the mind and mental objects and the fetter that arises dependant on both. He knows how the arising of the non-arisen fetter comes to be, he knows how the abandoning of the arisen fetter comes to be, and he knows how the non-arising, in the future, of the abandoned fetter comes to be.

Thus, monks, the monk lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects internally, or he lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects externally. When he lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects internally and externally, he lives contemplating origination factors in mental objects, or he lives contemplating disillusion factors in mental objects or he lives contemplating origination and disillusion factors in mental objects, or his mindfulness is established with the thought:

'Mental objects exist', to the extent necessary for K

just knowledge and mindfulness, and he lives detached,

and clings to naught in the world. Thus, monks, a monk lives contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the six internal and six external sense bases. (Long pause).

S: The word for these, uh, internal/external bases is Ayatana...

(something unclear) (Pause).

?: Can you spell it please, Bhante? S: A-Y-A-T-A-N-A. Ayatana. (pause). There (ARF?)... altogether twelve, but we usually speak of four.. (under these circumstances... something unclear). IF you, if you, uh, if you, uh speak of the six internal and six external Ayatanas it gives you a total of twelve, huh? Then there is the consciousness that arises, huh? As a result of the impingement, huh, of, uh, each internal, with its external sense base, yes? That gives you twelve, uh consciousnesses--uh, sorry, six consciousnesses, so the original twelve, plus the six gives you a total of eighteen (dha-rtus?), huh~ In Buddhist literature you get references to he.. (several words unclear.) (Pause).

?: What are the six consciousnesses?

S: Huh?

?: What are the six consciousnesses?

S: Well, one is the consciousness which arises when the eye comes into contact with its object, huh? Eye consciousness, huh? And it's 0 on for the other senses, including mind, huh?

(Pause).

But it is very simple, but at the same time requires a little thought. You have these six senses, huh! and then you have the corresponding, you know, sense object. The six senses are here called bases, huh, uh, internal or you could say subjective bases, and the corresponding objects are called also bases, but those are external or objective bases. (Pause). Do you see what I mean? Or, as we would say, the senses and their objects, huh, their respective objects. Including, also, the mind and its objects, huh? Its objects are called... (unclear, could be Kombas?), huh? That's to say, uh, ideas, huh? (Pause).

'1 And further, monks, one lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects, of the six internal and the six external sense bases.'

In other words,uh,the monk lives contemplating ideas one may say,in terms of the six internal and the six external sense bases.It's a rather long way of putting it,but we'll see how it works in a minute,huh? (Pause).

S:The crux of the matter is,of course,the fetters,huh? Now the note speaks of the Ten Fetters,huh,do you notice that?(Pause).Note 24,there's the usual(enumeration?) of the ten principal fetters (unclear )as given in the discourse(unclear)...is as follows:

" Self-delusion,(?),scepticism,attachment to rules and rituals,sensual lust,ill-will,craving for (fine?) corporeal existence,craving for uncorporeal existence,conceit,reck- lessness and ignorance."

That's the usual list,huh?Uh,the Buddha may or may not have had that particular list of fetters in mind when he delivered this discourse,but nonetheless,they do represent a pretty standard(unclear).So how do they come into the picture?Do you see this?This should actually be?learl but do actually~see it?(Pause).

'l Herein monks,a monk knows the eye an~usual forms, and the fetter that arises dependant on both the eye and forms.He knows how the arising of the non-arisen fetter comes to be,he know ow the\$bandonin~ of the arisen fetter comes to be.

So what is the situation that you've got,huh? (Pause).All right,take up eye and visual forms,huh?You see visual forms,you see external objects,huh,and then as a result of that experience,it is possible for one or another,or indeed all of the fetters to arise,huh? So one sees how that happens and one also sees how that ceases to happen.Could one give a concrete example?Well, yes,let's take a nice easy one,number 4l let us say sensual lust,huh?Yes?Alright,so,here is the eye,you know,coming into contact with it 5 appropriate object,the internal sense base coming into contact with the external sense base.Supposing the,uh,external sense base happens to be a picture,say,of a naked woman,huh,well,then,that particular fetter of sensual lust arises,huh?You see what I mean?So one understands how that particular fetter arisesl in respect of those particular bases, huh?Do you see what I mean?Also one sees how it dis- appears,huh?Perhaps when,you know,the picture is removed or when you start reflecting on the picture in a particular way.Maybe one(indistinct).Do you see what I mean,huh?

S:So this particular section, this particular form of practice of mindfulness,consists in seeing how,when the senses come into contact with their respective objects, uh,any of the Te~etters may arise.It's seeing how they arise and also how they cease,or can be made to cease, huh?Do you see what I mean,huh?So one does this with respect to all the bases,in respect to all the fetters, huh?So if one keeps a sort of eye open in this sort of way,so to speak,well the fetters don't really have much chance to arise,do they?Or even if they do,uh,they're very quickly broken,huh?So you see how,sort of systematic it is,huh?(Pause).

(Patnaprabha?):I had always thought of the fetters as opposed,perhaps too literalistically as being rather like fetters that,sort of ,shackle you to the wall in a prison.In other words,they're there,sort of,all the time,and gradually you manage to,sort of,saw through the~,one by one,and once you've sawn through,that's it, that fetter gone,and then the next one saw through,but this seems to imply that they can,they can not be present and then be present,and then not be present.... S:Well,yes and no,because when one,when one says that in dependence on the conjunction of two particular sense bases,huh,in this case that of the eye and visual form, a fetter arises,one does not mean that it sort of comes into existence from nowhere,huh?It is,as it were,existing in a latent sense already,huh?This is,then,in that particular situation it comes more clearly or more forcibly to your attention.And when you deal with it in the way that you do,it is not that on the spot you necessarily break it, huh?When you deal with it in the way that I have described, that's a little bit like filing away at it,eh?Do you see what I mean?So that he fetter is lifted up into your view,or you respon

with a filing away at it and it sort of sinks down again,huh?So your analogy is not,you know~altogether incorrect.

(Long pause).

S:And of course some of these fetters are in fact broken before others,they're regarded...they are...you can be filing away at them all the time,but some are more easy to file through than others~huh?And the first three are

\$ /~

S:....filed through first-they're particularly gross, or if you like,relatively weak. (Pause).In other words, you know,what this whole section is getting at in very general terms is that you should be constantly aware, constantly alert,huh?So that you know,um,whether your sense experience,your experience through the six senses including the mind,huh,is conducing to your further spiritual development or not,huh?Whether it is conducing to freedom or to bondage,huh?Whether the fetters are arising or whether they are ceasing,huh?When I say ceasing,I mean whether they're,you know,being filed away,huh? (Pause).Eventually,of course,if they are filed away sufficiently,they'll be filed through. (Pause)

(coughing,then a long pause).

(I think it would be best?)...give another not quite so easy example,alright?Try the sixth craving,for fine corporeal existence,craving for existence on the rupa loka,huh?Alright let's,ah,suppose that,uh,you're in a state of dhyana,huh?And,uh,-or you have experienced a state of dhyana0Let's suppose that the gross senses aren't functioning,or are at least not functioning fully,the only sense that is functioning is the,uh,is the,uh,the mind,huh?And it forms an idea,huh?It,you know,it forms an idea of the desirability of,uh,rupa loka experience,huh,and it starts reflecting,how desirable it would be if this could continue for ever and ever,huh?In this way a craving for fine corporeal existence arises,and that constitutes a fetter,in as much as you cease to look beyond that particular experience,huh?

(Long pause).

Or (then,one might say?),uh,conceit,huh?Number eight,huh? Um,(pause).One might,for instance,see something that belonged to one,or something one had made,supposing one was an artist and had made something beautiful,and suppose you looked at that,huh?Then the thought might occur to you that you're a really wonderful artist,you're better than anyone else-in that way the fetter of conceit may arise,or could arise,huh?Do you see what I mean,huh?(pause). So this particular exercise consists in observing,you know, the way in which these fetters arise as a result of the contact of one's internal sense bases with their respective external sense bases,huh,and also seeing how

AThL

S:...they pass away,or can be made to pass away,huh?Not pass away in the sense of permanently passing away,nec- essarily,but at least pass away in the sense of being weakened,huh? (Pause).

(Ratnaprabha?):So the mental objects,uh,that are being talked about here,uh,that arise through the internal and external bascs,I mean,could those be the fetters themselves,as being mental objects,or are they more just the ideas...~ S:No..no..no..no,mental objects is in the sense of an idea,huh,an idea which becomes an object of consideration for the mind,in such a way as to give rise to one or another of these fetters,or to several of the; at the same time. (Pause).I mean mental object is really better translated as "idea1,,I think,huh?The mind and ideas,huh? And these can be\$ither ideas relating to things which have been or which could be experienced through the,the, uh,five physical senses,or thing~ which are purely of a mental nature ,huh? (Pause). (Ratnaprabha?):The reason I ask is because it,uh,speaks of the original factors,so these ideas have got certain origination factors,but the most obvious origination factors for the ideas,surely,are the sense bases themselves, but these are not actually enumeratec~ in note 25,that deals with the;. S:Hm,yes,but it does say(unclear)....that they come into existence,presumably,as a result of karma,hm?(Pause). (Ratnaprabha? ) :Yes. (Long Pause).

S:I think one has to take account of the fact that the Pali idiom is rather clumsy,hm?Not very precise,hm?A bit repetitive.

(Long Pause).

(Ratnaprabha?):So,does that mean that because they want to repeat the same formula in respect of each section of the sutta,it sometimes may be more applicable than in other cases?

S:It could be that,hm?But also one should remember that, er,the fact that,em,a sense object,a sense organ comes into contact with it's appropriate sense object,is,acc- ording to Buddhism,karmically neutral,hm?Do you see what I mean,hm?The mere fact that you happen to see something

A#9

S:....or think of something,is not in itself,karmically significant, hm?

(Pause).

?:The action that is taken on....

S:Well,it isn't,no.Not even just the action,it is the sort of associated mental state,hm?,that arises after that has happened,hm?When you,for instance,you could look at a flower,hm?And you're just seeing a flower,hm? There's no craving for the flower ,there's no aversion to it.There's no wrong view associated with the flower, that arises,you're just looking at a flower,hm?So that the mere contact of,of a sense base,of the internal sense base with the external sense base has no karmical sign- ificance,hm?(pause).Fjut then supposing,hm,in dependence upon that sight or vision of the flower,you develop a craving to possess it,well then that would be karmically significant.That would constitute a fetter,hm?(Pause).

That's why the Buddha gave that teaching to the monk who bothered him,of-"In the seen,only the seen.In the heard,only the heard. 11Hm?There's nothing wrong with seeing and

hearing,hm?Nothing wrong with a sense organ coming into contact with a sense object,nothing wrong with that at all,hm?(P~use).In dependence upon(p~assa ) arises (VEDANA?)-Nothing wrong with that at all.It's only when in dependence upon(Vedana ) arises (Tanha ), that the trouble starts.So sense,you know,the general principle is the sense experience as such in Buddhism is quite innocent,hm?But one very,very rarely experiences that innocent sense experience huh?It~s\$ually mudd~ed with,uh,well greed,hatred and delusion,hm?(Pause). ~narabha?):When people talk about,sort of,lost innocence,is this what they're talking about,do you think? S:I shouldn't think so.

(Ratnaprabha?):Well say when Blake talks about it,do you think he was thinking of something like this? S:(unclear)..I must~on~t normally regard children or infants as innocent (laughter).I mean,look at the way that a baby sucks at the nipple and pounds it's mother's breast if it can't get enough of it,kicks and screams with rage when she takes her nipple away-is he innocent? Is there no greed,hatred,delusion there?It seems that they're

S:....there in full force from the very beginning.But I think that the innocent child is a myth(laughter),or at best a symbol of something quite unchildlike.(Pause). I wonder where it came from, this idea of childlike innocence? I mean sometimes children do look quite preiLty,in a seem- ingly innocent way but,they're not innocent.(Pause). ?::Is there,is there any activity,whichwe,uh,we indulge in,which,uh,i#ot,uh,based in one of these TenFetters? In effect,can we actually,um,see flowers or the equivalent and actually not be affected by greed,hatred and delusion? S:1,1 think,I mean even though presuming that all our actions (4 or 5 words unclear)...these ten fetters,I think there are occasions on which we do see things,huh, at least momentarily,quite free from any of those fetters, I'm thinking here of,uh,something that was said by a famous yogini,a female yogi,(4 or 5 words unclear)... when I was around there,which I heard about.She had a particular teaching,um,she was a Hindu yogini,um,accord- ing to her,um,the pleasure that one has,hm,the pleasure that one had when a desire was satisfied,hm,was not on account of the satisfaction of the desire,it was on acc- ount of the fact that,for an instant at least,the desire ceased,hm?And you experienced an instant of desirelessness -it was that which really gave you your satisfaction,hm? Do you see what I mean,hm?So,uh,looking at things in that sort of way.one sees,uh,there are moments when we desire less,just because our desires have im fact been satisfied, huh"?I mean sometimes desires are satisfied~huh?\$mean you might,for instance,have had a good meal,huh?You might have,you know, thoroughly enjoyed some fruit.So since you've been satisfied,since that (4 or 5 words unclear).. ...you've been and looked,for instance,at a bunch of grapes,without any desire to eat anything more.Without any desire to eat even a single one of those grapes.So for an instant,when desire is satisfied,you can see things free from desire,hm?(Pause).

?:Hm.. .but does...

S:That is to say,not that you are totally free from desire, but that desire is in abeyance.So to that extent you(feel?) free from desire.Bven then it can sometimes arise quite easily and quickly.You might,sort of,start thinking,well,

S:....I wish I was hungry,hm?A pity to waste that bunch of grapes.But,yes,I do think that there are moments when, you know,we are,sort of,I say moments,when we are,you know,free from at least some of the fetters,and can see things in comparative innocence. Devamitra:But,that's,that's quite a,sort of,conditioned example,isn't it?Because,that freedom's dependant on having just satisfied a craving. S: Yes.

Devamitra:But are there any instances,other than,perhaps, an actual experience of Sunyata,where that would other- wise happen?

S:Otherwise it could only arise in connection with Insight, huh?Which is,of course,even rarer,huh?I mean (4 or 5 words unclear).B-ut going back to the case of the,the supposedly

innocent child or infant, I mean perhaps this conception arises from the fact that, um, obviously the, the infant has no sexuality, at least has no specifically genital sexuality. So I think probably the idea of, you know, childhood innocence arose from that fact. I mean so much has been, if immorality is identified with sexuality, or impurity is identified with sexuality, well, if the child is free from sexuality, well, it's pretty innocent, it's pretty pure, huh? It's as though other things, other forms of (unclear)...almost don't count in comparison, hm? That I think that's probably the most (unclear). Now of course we know that the child, I mean, maybe a pretty, sort of (unclear). There is, you know, a sort of diffuse erotic feeling present even in infants.

(Devamitra?): Is this idea of children being innocent a purely, uh, well just associated with western culture, or with Judaic, Islamic, Christian culture?

S: It seems to be associated with modern culture (several words unclear). I don't think it was present in the Middle Ages.

(Ratnaprabha?): (unclear)...the Massacre of the Innocents? ?: Yes, that's what I was thinking.

S: Hm? Ah, yes, but what does one mean by, by innocence here, hm? It's a bit like, um, you get a picture entitled 'The (unclear) of the Cross'. Well, invention is in the original Latin sense of discovery, not in the, sort of, artificially putting

A?A

S: ....together. And, you know, I think that the innocence here means that the, is sort of harmless small children, innocent means harmless, huh? But during the Middle Ages there was (several words unclear)...Christianity generally today, it still holds the idea of, you know, original sin, hm? (Pause). You know-we are born bad. It's washed away-you know, the waters of baptism, but, it soon starts re-asserting itself. (Pause).

?: So you think it's a fairly recent (unclear) ? S: Yes. I think, perhaps, I mean, as I said associated with this, uh, (unclear)...what did I say? This, this emphasis on sexuality, on the over-attention paid to sexuality, about. So that, when you see (unclear)...there in the child, hm? There comes to be a corresponding emphasis on it not being there, i.e. that the child is free from that. I mean, sexuality is regarded as the, uh, the sin 'par excellence', well, the child being free from that is free from the sin 'par excellence', and therefore is very innocent, morally speaking. That seems to me the way it works. (pause).

Suvajra: When did this sort of pro-occupation start to

arise, then?

S: Pardon?

Suvajra: When did this sort of thing start to arise if it wasn't there (around about?)...the Middle Ages? S: It does seem to be associated with the whole Victorian period, eh? The playing down of overt sexuality, hm? And you certainly do get then certain pictures of pretty, innocent little children, almost (several words unclear). (Pause).

Devamitra: It seems odd that, ~erhaps, you know, it should arise during the course of the, um, Victorian era, and, say, not at the time of, uh, the Puritan revolution, which, uh, seems the proper (time?)....

I think that probably it is a lot to do with economic conditions, huh? And the fact that in those

days,the child was not really...the child would not be regarded,uh,during the ~iddle Ages,and even earlier,as a sort of distinct period of life,hm?I mean,we seem to be,we always in modern times,we regard adolescents as different from adults,and adolescents as different from children.This seems not to

S:....have been the case,huh,earlier on,huh?This has been gone into somewhere,by someone writing (on?)...the Middle Ages,I forget who at the moment-it might be (Luisenger?), um,but briefly~it's reflected in dress,hm?There was no separate children's dress,a child was a miniature adult as regards dress,and a miniature adult in every way,hm, including work.There's no conception that childhood is the time when you must play and enjoy yourself.Yo~orked as soon as you were able,hm?With your parents.So there was no,sort of,idea of ,of childhood as a sort of separate period,huh?Much less of adolescence,hm?

?:Yes,but what effect did this have on the children of those times?

S:They probably grew up more quickly. (Pause)....or matured more quickly. (Pause). (something unclear).

?:Would you say that was a beneficial thing for children to  
in?

S:Oh,yes,I would-for children,eh?You're assuming,as it we~D,the modern standpoint,huh?So what does,what you're really saying is,well,is it,you know,good for a human being to assume responsibilities very early in life,huh? It depends on the conditions,I suppose.It's probably (4 or 5 words unclear)...in some cases,yes,in some cases no,huh.'. (Pause).I mean,in modern times we tend to think,well, children c~n~t be expected to be responsible,or to think of other people,so what happens?They become selfish little monsters,hm?And what about adolescents?Well,they're regarded as (8 or 9 words unclear)....so what happens?They become (Unclear).I mean many adolescents nowadays have the income of adults,huh,or the income that adults would have had, without any of the responsibility.I don't think that they make good u~e of their opportunities in rnany c~~e~, (Long Pause).So innocence is,I think,a comparatively rare phenomenon. (Long Pause).I mean,can any of you look back to a period when you were innocent?(laughter). . .in the sense of being really free from,you know,from unskil- full mental states?

S: . . . Sometimes in childhood and in infancy those unskilful mental states are very strong indeed and very violent and very powerfully expressed, more so perhaps than later on.... and babies sometimes go red in the face with anger!

Gunapala: They can seem very cruel at times-- little monsters.

S: Yes. Yes.

Devamitra: Lawrence seems to expose this idea of children being innocent little creatures in one of his essays, in the one dealing with education. Do you remember?

S: No.

Devamitra: (Few words) describes them as 'little brutes'... they're just 'little animals'...(Few words).

Ratnaprabha: (Something about Lawrences 'Rainbow') the heroine in that is a school-teacher who tries at first to deal with the children as if they were innocent, as it were, but she changes because she can't manage it. (Laughter) She goes to the other extreme, the whip and cane.

S: Anyway that's a bit of a digression, isn't it? Arising out of the question of whether we can actually see things 'fetter-free', as it were. As I said, I think this does occasionally happen only in a sense when we are temporarily satiated and just don't have any desires for the time being. At least for a few moments. Does anybody ever find this happening? You can look out on nature, say, with a comparatively innocent eye, not demanding anything from it, not wanting to make any use of things. (Few words)... to see them, to look at them, to value them for their own sake, as it were, yes.

Suvajra: I think it can happen after a meditation.

S: Mm. Yes that's true. When you've opened your eyes. before the mind starts working, desires start coming into operation.

Cittapala: I would say that it's one of my predominant themes when I'm in the mountains. Because at that time there are very few thoughts.

S: Yes. (Pause). So then one should perhaps review the whole list of ten fetters and check whether any of them is actually present. Whether there is any attachment to rules and rituals; to self-illusion, whether there is some vestige of that perhaps. Scepticism; attachment to rules and rituals; sensual lust; ill will; craving for fine corporeal existence; craving for uncorporeal existence; conceit; restlessness- that's a very subtle one. You may be up in the mountains and quite happy and really enjoying it, but there's a feeling to go down, to go back even before you need to sometimes for no apparent reason. Presumably that is just restlessness. The sort

of restlessness that troubles you even when you're having a good meditation- there's a sort of restlessness and you bring it to an end before you need to, even though you are enjoying it and quite absorbed in it.

~taala: Could you explain why conceit is put as the eighth fetter? Is there any significance in that? Ww'ould have thought it would be rather bound up in 'self-illusion'. If you manage to get rid of self-illusion...

S: Well self-illusion is clearly a comparatively gross form of self-illusion because it comes at the beginning. Conceit is presumably much more subtle. It is sometimes described or defined as the tendency to think of oneself in terms of one being either superior to others,



or inferior or even equal. It represents the idea of comparison itself. That you compare at all is a form of subtle conceit.

~taala: Does self-illusion then represent the 'ego' in

modern terminology? S: One could say that in that if by 'ego'  $\frac{1}{4}$  one means a stable centre, an unchanging centre of all one's

experience, a centre that sort of enucleates the experience and doesn't change even though experiences which it enucleates may change.

But if you had eliminated that then how could you compare somebody else to yourself if you no longer had a conception of yourself as....

[281]

S: Well strictly speaking you couldn't. So presumably the self-illusion which is eliminated at this stage (i.e. first fetter) represents only the grosser forms of self-illusion, and conceit presumably represents the more subtle forms. Maybe not even the subtlest because there's ignorance, the tenth fetter- presumably that accounts for the most subtle form of self-illusion or conceit of all. Perhaps we can't regard the fetters as sort of absolutely mutually exclusive and distinct. In a way there is only one fetter and these are all different aspects of it. I suppose, well, the one fetter is ignorance one could say, or self-illusion. It seems to be that self-illusion comes first and ignorance last. You notice that the note says "The usual enumeration of the ten principal fetters" in a way suggests there are other fetters and also that they can be arranged differently but the first three as far as I know always come first in any list of ten.

End of Side one) ~ape 14. { ~6

AS~

Side 2, Tape 14

Richard: Would something like (a name and your belief) in who you are constitute a gross form of self-illusion or a subtle?

S: Well it would depend, I suppose, in how deeply it went. If you think of yourself as identical with the physical body well that's gross self-delusion. If you think of yourself as being the mind, that's comparatively subtle, but it could go on becoming more and more subtle - the soul, some sort of ethereal essence floating around.

But anyway the general principle involved here is quite clear, isn't it? When the internal sense organ comes into contact with the external sense object, one has to give very careful attention to what happens as a result of their contact and whether those mental states are conducive to one's ultimate liberation or not. Whether they are essentially reactive or essentially creative. This is what it really means.

Devamitra: In terms of the 13 Dhatus, when you have a particular consciousness coming into operation, which springs from the contact of the two sense bases, in that consciousness would that consciousness be seen as in itself defiled or will it include whatever...

S: Well, well you can regard it as both because you can have, say, a sense object and then your awareness of that sense object and the awareness can be a pure awareness in which case there would be no element of defilement. But usually in our case the awareness is mixed with all sorts of other mental factors - in practice it can hardly be separated from them. So the idea is not to destroy the awareness itself, but, so to speak, purify the awareness. To remove the unskillful mental states so that you have a pure, unadulterated awareness of the object. In other words, "In the seen only the seen". Not that the seeing is eliminated - it's more that the seeing is purified.

Blake says something like that, he says something about cleansing the doors of perception, doesn't he? Not that

when you cleanse the doors of perception you cease to perceive, you perceive more clearly than ever, more brightly than ever, so to speak.

So I mean, all through this sutta there runs an underlying idea that everything you experience, everything you think, sort of counts. You can't afford to disregard it, you can't afford to let it slip past. Do you see what I mean? It's as though spiritual life is a full-time occupation, you know, no moral holidays, no spiritual holidays - you have to keep it up all the time. If you go for a little walk, well, thousands of thousands of impressions will come crowding in on you. You have to be aware of all of them and know what is going on and what effect they are having on you, what the overall tendency or direction of your mind or your consciousness is. Whether skillful or unskillful, reactive or creative, and you have to do this from instant to instant, minute to minute, hour to hour, all day and every day, all the week, month, year. This is clearly the way in which the Buddha

is thinking. You can't afford to relax, you have to be ever t( n vigilant  
With mindfulness strive on. See those words

assuming some kind of concrete content, eh?

Cittapala: ~ for unskillfulness.do

we primarily experience that#n terms of the first three fetters or... yes, is our experience predominantly ( one word ) with that kind of colouring?

S: I suppose one could say that the first three fetters, inasmuch as they do come first and inasmuch as the breaking of them constitutes stream-entry, are sort of more prominent. Also, it has been pointed out, they are more, as it were~ intellectual. The others, as it were, are~emotional inasmuch as they represent more deep-seated, fundamental, basic attitudes that it's much more difficult to get at or do anything about. It's as though the first three fetters represent more conscious, explicit, formulated attitudes which are, therefore, more accessible to treatment on the intellectual level. Even Guenther speaks of the first three as intellectual

fetters and the remaining seven as emotional fetters. One could say conscious and unconscious even. So certainly the first three fetters represent the way in which we usually

look at things on the conscious level. There is a strong self-illusion. There is, what shall we say, attachment to rule and right. Rule and right isn't really very satisfactory. Er, how could one render that... attachment to rules and rituals. ...?

Ratnaprabha: You've called it superficiality, haven't you?

S: °..Superficiality, um.\*. maybe. I mean that is one way of looking at it. Maybe that's not all that satisfactory, not as a sort of comprehensive translation. I've also called it I going through the motions, haven't I? Thinking that I going through the motions? I will do. Lack of whole-heartedness, lack of total involvement, yes, because that would suggest not bringing in to play one's deeper emotions, just being content to operate on a comparatively superficial intellectual or mental level. And then, of course, ( Vitsakitsa? ) well indecisiveness, that's probably the best single translation, indecisiveness, wilfull indecisiveness. I mean these are clearly attitudes which one can do something about on the conscious level. One can see through them on the conscious level, one can see through them intellectually.

Cittapala: Presumably then, that emphasizes the points you were making yesterday about directed thought.

S: Yes, that's true. Directed thought, whether or not you make use within that context of associative thinking, is required to break through these first three fetters, yes?

Such thought can merge with Insight, can culminate with Insight with a capital 'I'. First of all, insight with a small 'i', and as you put more and more energy into the whole process, maybe backing it up with meditation, it can be transformed into Insight with a capital 'I'. You really see through these~etters so that you're no longer a victim of them, in other words, that they're broken. And a decisive change takes place in the whole sort of current of your being. A decisive change of direction.

Devamitra: Did you say that directed thought was indispensable to dispense with these three fetters?

S: I think I would say that, yes... yes.

Devamitra: Because yesterday, as far as I recall, you said you didn't think that directed thought was necessary to gain Enlightenment or that one could think associatively and that wouldn't necessarily be an inhibiting factor of one's gaining Enlightenment?

S: Ah, but I did speak in terms of directing your associative thinking not that your associative

thinking was merely random.

Devamitra: Right.

Cittapala: It would seem that you need quite a lot of... amount of time to indulge in directed thinking. The only reason I brought that up was ( because say ? ) on a course of this nature it seems that there's loads of things to be doing from one moment to the next and it's almost as if you can be indulging in what you think to be Spiritual activities or aspects of Spiritual Life and yet never having really much time to reflect or contemplate on what one is d~ing?

S: Yes, one needs time for reflection and a lot of people don't allow themselves that. But, on the other hand, it's not easy to reflect in that directed way. I mean, if one isn't able to do that, if one is liable to start wool-gathering, it's better to have some positive activity to engage your- self in. I think not many people are capable of sustained directed thinking for more than a few minutes at a time. You need to be able to sustain it for hours at a time. I mean to some extent your thinking, your sustained thinking is supported by the book you may be reading, or the discussion you're taking part in, but left to your own devices, usually one finds it very difficult to continue sustained thinking for any length of time, your mind just wanders, your attent- ion wanders, it flags. Otherwise, theoretically you could set yourself to think in the positive directed manner about say the three Lakshanas for a whole hour. But how long would you keep it up? You'd be lucky if you kept it up for a few minutes, probably! Well, one can try it out if one doesn't believe me!

Devamitra: But you can use certain aids to help that...

S: Yes, well walking up and down as I talked about yesterday is one of those certainly.

Devamitra: I would have thought writing also...

S: Yes, writing certainly helps in the cultivation of sus- tained thinking because you have to put it all down in black and white, so to speak. You have to be quite clear, you have to see how one thought leads on to another, you have to be much more careful of the logical connections of your ideas. So certainly writing does help quite a lot. That is if you're writing that sort of talk. If you're not writing a sort of talk which is like a fairy-tale or description of symbols.

Devamitra: Or even actually studying a text and taking quite detailed notes...

S: Or having to explain to other people.

Cittapala: Are there any meditation practices which you would consider to incorporate directed thinking?

S: Well, Vipassana itself in the early stages is nothing but directed thinking. Directed thinking which becomes more and more concentrated, more and more intense. That's what it really is.

Cittapala: (But?) even the visualisation practices would presumably...?

S: . . . Yes because some of the visualisation exercises do contain verses to be recited which have a definite, as it were, intellectual content, but even apart from them the visualised form itself can be made the object, that is to say the subject of directed thinking.

?: Presumably you would make a distinction between directed thinking and what, well, normally passes for intellectuality.

?: (Continued) I'm not being very clear...

S: I mean I would distinguish between genuine directed thinking and a sort of loose association of concepts. Not because of an actual connection between those concepts but because of submerged emotional considerations of which you're not aware. I think a lot of so-called intellectual thinking is of that kind. Do you see what I mean?

Cittapala: That's presumably what we're suffering from mostly in our study groups (recently?) .... (Laughter).

S: I have talked about this before, that years and years ago it was my fate one might say, to come into contact with a species of being called Tibetologist, that is to say, a specialist in Tibetan studies. Some of them were very good scholars and, being scholars, their approach to the subject was supposedly purely rational, purely intellectual. Do you see what I mean? They didn't recognise any sort of emotional element, much less any spiritual element. I very speedily ( ? ) that these scholars were motivated by the most violent emotions, in their work and their relations with one another, mostly quite negative emotions, but they were completely unrecognised. They believed that they were motivated by quite impartial considerations of advancement of knowledge and scientific objectivity and all the rest of it. But they weren't, & they were motivated by very violent and crude negative emotions, much of the time. So the sort of logical association they made in connection with their work, the line of thought that they developed, though they gave it some loose logical form, was actually dictated by emotional considerations in many cases, but not recognised. Not avowed. Do you see what I mean? So there's a sort of pseudo-logical connection which is not really logical at all, but the result of submerged emotional associations. So that isn't really sustained or directed thinking. So if you do encounter this sort of thing in study groups, when one idea leads to another not because there's a logical connection, but because there's a submerged

emotional association. I mean, there's nothing wrong with there being an emotional association, but it isn't recognised,

it isn't brought out into the open.

Devamitra: And that is used as a basis of ... or i~~s seen as a logical thing when it's actually pseudo-intellectual.

S: Yes. And any coherence in the thinking is not really the result of logicity but of an unrecognised emotional element. Sometimes one can see it even if the author wasn't able to see it.

~taala: Does that mean that one ( never? ) goes round in circles, is there something, one can get that sort of feeling sometimes when one isn't actually apparently pene- trating...

S: Yes. I suppose essentially in this sort of case you're going round and round in the circle of your own submerged emotions, which are not being recognised or ecknowledged. I mean I used to ask, "Well why do people take up Tibetology anyway? " I mean there's no logical reason for your taking up a logical study or an intellectual discipline - it's usually for deep-seated emotional reasons of which you're completely unaware. Well why does one take up Tibetology, another Marine Biology, another Nuclear Physics - it isn't for purely objective, as it were, scientific reasons. There is some unrecog- nised emotional motivation. So your approach is ( vitiated? ) from the beginning, you think you're being very intellectual, very rational and all that, but you're not. I mean not that you need be, but then you don't recognise that emotional factor in your own motivation. I mean this unrecognised factor used to come out very strongly as I said in the rel- ation of these scholars with one another. They re intensely competitive and they would think that it was all in interests of science and objectivity, but it's just professional jeal- ousy. It's very clear.

Devamitra: So directed thinking as we seem to be talking about suggests... well it's definitely based in logic and based on clear perception.

S: Also one might say that directed thinking is an express- ion of an integrated personality. Because why is one's thinking sometimes not directed, what does one mean by saying it's not directed? It means that you digress, you wander off from the path. So why do you do that? Because of some emotional factor which makes it's demands upon you. And expresses itself in the form of a digression, or not even a digression, just a sheer distraction. So you can't really develop directed thinking to any extent unless you're a psychologically integrated person. Do you see what I mean?

Devamitra: Which would make it very rare...

Cittapala: But that awareness of your emotions presumably differs from the later fetters which you then have to break, which deal with more emotionally-based attachments.

S: You mean in the sense that the early ones were, as it were, grosser...?

Cittapala: Yes, but in the sense that you said you needed to use directed knowledge or more of an intellectual capacity to break through the first ones, you then use an emotional ( approach ? ).

S: Well one is not separating reason and emotion completely, but because you can't break through those first fetters, though one has called them intellectual fetters, without some emotional involvement, but there's still a great deal of emotional energy which is not involved. And that is represented by the so-called emotional fetters. Not that these so-called intellect- ual fetters are purely intellectual, and not that you can in fact ever be purely intellectual. I don't think there is such a thing as pure intellectuality. I think there is such a thing as alienated intellectuality which is directed by, influenced by, unrecognised unskilful emotion. On the other hand, you can have an un-alienated intellectuality which is fused with emotions which are more positive, even if they're not completely positive, and which are recognised. But not that you would break through the first fetters by entirely logical ~e~~S~ I don't think that 7 possible. Oh there's no such thing as a pure

4!c70

S: ( continued )....thought! But there can be thought which is distorted by unskilful emotions \~o~which it has become alienated and which it does not recognise.

In a sense, I don't think there is such a thing as an intellect- ual. In the sense of being someone who operates purely on intellect and is not influenced by his emotions. He is influenced by his emotions, but they're very indirect, devious means.

Cittapala: Would you make a distinction at all between the emotional integration which one has to go through to break the first three fetters, and the kind of emotional integration which one goes through to break the last?

S: Oh yes. The first is less than the second. The first is partial. The second, one might say, is total. And yes, I mean if one had to be fully integrated before one could break the first three fetters, one would never break them. So where is the partial integration which leads to the total integration.

Devamitra: Could I come back ~gain to the question of directed thinking in association with the phenomena of 'original' thinking? Presumably, if you could think indirectly, you would not necessarily be generating original thought, so what is the factor which makes one's presumably directed thinking enter a new area that can be

S: Well what does one mean by original thought? What does one mean by a new area? I mean, new to whom?

Devamitra(?): Well presumably it's original in the sense that you've not encountered it via any indirect source - you've uncovered it for yourself as a result of directed thinking.

S: Well I think in a sense it's accidental because you may or may not have come across that idea before that be as a result of accident you uncover it if you haven't come to it before or you come to it even if you have come to it before as a result of the needs or the existences of your own spiritual development or unfoldment. I mean if you haven't come to that idea which you then need before then you call it an original idea and you

S:(continued)....discover it. If you happen to have encountered it before then it isn't that. But the idea itself remains the same. And maybe if you haven't come across it before then there is an element of excitement which would not have been there had you already been familiar with the idea.

Devamitra: So it would seem to be largely accidental?

S: It would seem to be, yes. In other words, a 'new' or 'original' is a relative term. It tells you nothing about the idea itself, but only about the state of mind of the person thinking it or coming across it. An idea is in itself neither old nor new. You shouldn't really speak of a new idea, but of an idea newly discovered by a certain person at a certain time. Within the total context of human history and culture, yes, it is possible for someone to be the first discoverer of an idea and we call that person, say, an 'original' thinker or whatever.

Devamitra(?): I suppose where the confusion was basically in my mind was whether there was some sort of 'talent' upon which the possibility of original thought might be dependant. But I suppose that would also base on

S: In a sense, yes. At least as regards perseverance, because it's more difficult to think something which no-one has thought before than to think a thought which people have thought before and which can be reached, so to speak, by some recognised track. So at least one needs more perseverance and greater intensity and involvement to think an idea which nobody has thought of before. I think at least that can be said. Whether there's a special faculty or talent apart from that I wouldn't like to say. I think that's a quite tricky, quite difficult field.



Devamitra: So it would be a question of the depth of one's interest ..

S(?): Yes, and one's determination to find ut, to discover things. Rather than a separate faculty fo the discovery of the new. This is what I think at the moment.

4o\jw

Devamitra: That's what I was wondering, I think, basically, if there was a separate faculty.

S: I doubt this.

Devamitra: Which would suggest that if there was sufficient interest in perseverance on the part of any of us, then we would be capable of that.

S: Yes, yes. It's a very big 'if', of course!

Devamitra: . . Yes...

Surata: Do you think that you've got to if you're going to sort of end up with some original thought, you've actually got to start exploring previously explored tracks, as it were?

S: I think so, yes, because very often your original thought is an extension of thoughts that have already been thought by other people. You just go further in, broadly speaking, the same direction. Original thought is very rarely a completely new departure. At least the point of departure has fixed by people before you. At least that. However novel your own discoveries maybe, I don't know the technicalities, but you could say that I mean Einstein took as his starting point, I mean Newtonian physics, even though he did in the end come to correct or to modify them, but they did constitute his starting point.

Surata: Because I mean - certainly for myself - we~end not to sort of, do very much of that, do we? Actually think through other peoples',as it were, thought trains?

S: I think that in modern times there is a premature, over- hasty desire for originality, to be

original. At all costs almost. Almost as though originality is a sign of genius- well in a sense it is - but just being different is not being original. So very often people don't want to go over the tracks that others have been over even before them and master them and then, perhaps, develop something new or push on further in the same direction. They just don't want to be

C! C,

S: (continued) ..0.indebted to anybody else - very often they just want to start being original before, well, they know really what anybody has done before them. I think if one is really interested in a subject, well one will want to know, what others have had to say about it, what they've thought. You'll familiarise yourself with the subject in that way and then you may see possibilities of going further. It's then that your originality and your new thought will begin. In my own case, I never thought of being original. I mean my idea when I started studying Buddhism was simply to understand the Dharma. I'd no perception of making an original contribution or anything like that, even to the interpretation of the Dharma. I had no such thought. I just tried to understand. It was only years later that it dawned on me that in the process of trying to understand I was, in a sense, throwing some fresh light on ancient teachings. That I was, in a sense, giving a new interpretation. But that only came many years later. I had no desire or wish to be original. But I think I've ended up by being a bit original. (Laughter). One really tries faithfully to interpret tradition.

Ratnaprabha: So if there's no separate faculty which engages in inspirational thinking, do you think that calls into question the whole idea, say, of intelligence and there being differences of intelligence between people? What do you think that means when people talk about intelligence?

S: Well I have quoted this before. It has been said that intelligence consists in the creative use of concepts. But what does one mean by the creative use of concepts? It almost means a non-conceptual use of concepts. The use of concepts in such a way as to take into consideration the fact that

concepts do exhaust the whole of Reality. Perhaps one could A

say that. But how is intelligence defined apart from the

definition I've given?

~rabha: Well it tends to be quite a lot of the time on the basis of (score?).

S: Ah but that's not a definition, is it?

S: (continued) Well I think that's as far as it often goes in the world of ( ? ) psychology. ( it's said to be ? ) a

certain score that people achieve when they perform a certain test. So that shows you have a certain quantity of some unknown factor.

Ratnaprabha: ...Yes.... ( laughter ).

S: That you're sort of plus 'X' or minus 'X', or 2X or 4X. It doesn't tell you itself what 'X' is.

Ratnaprabha: Well I think a lot of these psychologists regard it as being a relative thing, that they can tell differences in intelligence between people but they can't sort of absolutize it

Gunapala: They can tell different sorts of intelligence...

Ratnaprabha: ... They can say this person is more intelligent than this person.

Gunapala: So they must have an idea of what it is...

Ratnaprabha: ...Yes it's ability to perform these intelligence tests...

Devamitra: But that's only intelligence in one very restricted area.

Ratnaprabha: Well they do make efforts to try to make the area as wide as possible I think. (Y words unclear, something about Spirituality! ).

S: The question that occurred to me a few minutes ago, when you were saying there's no special faculty for the discovery of new ideas or original ideas, well what about genius? What is genius in that case? Is there such a thing as genius? That's no doubt a very big question.

Devamitra: It is, isn't it.

S: ...Or is there a faculty of genius - so is their genius just another type of human being, as it were, is it not that he has a special faculty but that nobody else has, but that he is as a whole person, as a whole man completely different from everybody else. One sometimes gets that impression.

Devamitra: How would you define genius?

S: Well genius seems to have a large component of creativity in it. Again it leaves open that question, 'what is creativity?' I mean for instance, I've been reading Dickens, reading about Dickens. He seems to have been a genius if ever there was one, and he does seem to have been characterised by superabundant creativity. You read any of his books you get the impression of tremendous energy and zest and more than that of creative capacity. Same with Shakespeare. It's as though the greater the genius, the greater the capacity for creativity in whatever field. The greatest (genius or geniuses) (end of tape)

. the greatest geniuses seem to have really been characterised by extraordinary creativity. Which involved productivity; not that you're necessarily creative if you're productive, they were not only creative but they were very highly productive. Think of Mozart, Haydn, Bach, Handel, Rubens, Titian, Rembrandt, Blake. They were all very, very productive people not really(?) creative, they were creative on a grand scale. And they were all undoubtedly geniuses - I don't think anyone would dispute that in their case.

Devamitra: But all those examples you've quoted come from the sphere of the arts. I mean do you think it is possible to (posit?) such a phenomenon as scientific genius?

S: If genius involves productivity, then the question arises well, what is a product of scientific genius? You see it's easy to sort of estimate creativity or productivity cum creativity in the case of an artist because there is an objective work produced - you can speak of so many plays, so many novels, so many symphonies, so many cantatas, so many operas, so what is it that the scientific genius produces analogous

S: ...to the work of art? I mean it isn't necessarily just a book. Though a scientist may write books, but a great scientist may not write a single book in his whole life, that is possible. So what is it? What is his work?

Gunapala: It's his contribution to humanity, I would think.

S: Yes. But what form does that take?

Gunapala: Whether it has a creative effect on humanity in some way...?

S: Well what does one mean by a 'creative effect on humanity'?

Devamitra: Presumably, you mean the positive contribution to the furtherment of humanity...

Gunapala: Well I suppose. That's what I think science is about maybe.

S: But is it?

Devamitra: I mean like Einstein seems to be generally considered as a scientific genius or as a genius and he was a scientist, so presumably a scientific genius.

S: Yes. Yes. Um, yes that's very logical! (Lots of loud laughter ). Cynicism, eh...!

Devamitra: . . . ~ut I mean it is arguably I suppose if the products of his work have helped to further Mankind's (interests?) ...of Mankind.

S: Yes indeed...

Devamitra: ...Whereas I don't suppose you could really argue against the case of someone like Mozart.

S: So what is it that the scientist produces and especially the scientific genius produces in which his genius consists?

Richard: He allows us to see the world~~~~~L- in a new way.

S: But can that be quantified very easily?

Patnaprabha: It seems to be rather a matter of, to some extent, subjective judgement. One looks at the effects of Einstein's work, there are a number of different theories, a lot of different theories all of which had a huge impact on the further development of scientific thought.

S: It would seem almost as though a scientific genius was a genius who formulated an extremely large number of fruitful hypotheses. It's as though the fruitful hypothesis is the characteristic work or product of the scientific genius. I mean this is sort of what shall I say thinking aloud. I haven't thought about the subject before today, so I won't say that that's my last word on the subject by any means, but it looks as though perhaps one can think in those terms. But in the same way that the painter produces paintings, and the musician produces, say, symphonies, the scientific genius produces fruitful hypotheses. Now, what does one mean by fruitful hypotheses? When is an hypothesis fruitful? How would one understand that? What is a hypothesis anyway? I mean it's a principle of explanation which is not actually being verified isn't it? Well some say that scientific hypotheses are (incapable?) of

absolute verification. But the 'fruitful' hypothesis is one which when applied to various fields maybe in a practical sort of way, does produce inter- esting or useful results. Does lead on to further inquiry, open up fresh fields of investigation, fresh questions with regard say to the Nature of phenomenal existence.

Gunapala: I think I can relate it quite closely to Buddhism in a lot of ways. Sort of almost a scientific approach in it' ~ formulas and so forth.

2~rata: But so far this would all be devoid of any sort of ethical evaluation...

S: Oh yes. Oh yes. It would seem that the ethical element

y

S:(continued)...is not any part of scientific genius or sci- entific knowledge it would seem.

Devamitra: Would you consider that you could speak in terms of a scientific genius that...

S: It seems so on the basis of the discussion so far...

Devamitra: ... 'cos as far as I can understand his book (Bynanger?) seems to say that there's no such thing as a scientific genius.

S: Well it depends how one defines genius. We've defined it in terms of creativity, we asked, well, what is it that the scientist creates, or the scientific genius creates anal- ogous to the work of Art created by the Artist, but you could, you know, define genius in such a way as to exclude the scientist. If one intr6duced into that an essentially ethical element for instance it would then exclude the scientist. Also we're using the word 'creative' in a rather different sense from which we usually use it in connection with Buddhism. If we were to use it in that sense, well clearly there would be no possibility of scientific creativity in the strict sense because the ethical element is excluded. It~s a question of a narrowe~ or a broader conception of genius and of creativity. ~~~D OF TAPE ~ 1/4;, \_\_\_\_\_

I.M.Conroy.

The Sattipathana Sutta.

S: I suppose you recognise, say, one of MOZ?rt's operas huh, was an example of genuine creativity, with a genuine ethical, sort of content therefore. Well, suppose there was a sort of charity performance of Mozart's opera to raise money for unethical purposes Would that invalidate the creative nature of that opera ? Hmm ? would it; presumably not. So the fact that an unethical use was made of a scientist's discoveries would that necessarily invalidate the fully creative nature of his discovery ? (Laughter).

Suvajra: If 5.5. guards ~~~ listen to Mozrt's t

S: . .pardon ?

Suvajra: If 5.5. people in the Jewish Council listen to Mozart.. ("Yes,yes it was Bach": S)..and Bach.

S: I must admit it really shocked me. Where did this come up ?

Devamitra: Last year in Tuscany.

Suvajra: And again this year. You mentioned it this year.

S: Where, how did it come up this year ?

\_\_\_\_\_ Biography of ... that fellow who wrote er. . Kapleau

S: Oh that~ right, I remember. This really shocked me ~uh, mm! Because it really does raise questions about the nature of art itself. The nature ofL aesthetic experience mm ! And the spiritual use to which one can put art. I am presuming that these S.S. guards really did enjoy the music ! Apparently they did huh.

Cittapala: I don't understand why at Mozart pieces are ethical you~t

actually in themselves.

S: Well I'm not saying that they are ethical in the sense that they could teach explicit ethical lessons. But what does ethics consist in ? I mean if it exists in an expansion of consciousness or if it consists of an

S(cont): progression say, from the Karmaloka to the A-Rualoka Well, a Mozart symphony or opera does it not have that expansive or expanding effect on the consciousness ? Does it not refine the consciousness mm ? huh, or lift it to a relatively higher level. So to that extent is it not ethical huh? in as much as it has proceeded from lets say, a higher state of consciousness than we usually experience.

Cittapala: Would it be too far fetched to say that Einstein's equations can not have a similar effect upon a certain temperament ?

S: Oh yes, I think that's quite clear. I mean sometimes scientists and logicians use aesthetic terms to describe their demonstration. I mean mathematicians speak of an elegant proof huh ? don't they ? It gives them aesthetic satisfaction to contemplate that proof, huh ?

Ratnaprabha: Some physi ~ists have talked in terms of beauty as being one of the necessary attributes of a good theory!

S: Hmmm. .mm.mm It becomes quite Platonic in a way doesn't it mm.. It can't be true if it isn't beautiful ! Once again beauty is truth and truth beauty, that is all you know and all that you need to know (laughter) Unfortunately we don't even know that sometimes.

Ratnaprabha: Well then I don't think anyone said it would be the only attribute of a good theory actually.

S: Hmm. .mm

Richard: Why were you so shocked by the er, discovery of this fact that 5.5. guards listened with apparent satisfaction ?

S: Well, one was assuming that 5.5. guards were unethical creatures. One was assuming that if someone listened to and actually appreciated music like that of Bach it constituted a sort of quasi-spiritual experience huh , hmm ? Er, but if 5.5. guards could listen You know to the music of Bach and enjoy it and er, you know, still continue to be 5.5. guards, it did suggest that even music like that of Bach was ot as it were essentially ethical and had no



ethical effect. Do you see what I mean ? In other words the Aesthetic was not really any

[301]

S: part of the spiritual path Hmm. .hmm ? - one had to consider that possibility hmm !

Cittapala: Have you given it any thought ?

S: I must say that I haven't given it any further thought huh. Partly you know lack of anything more concrete to go on hmm. Apart from er, you know that little anecdote of Kapleau's.

Cittapala: Well it seems that, well I suppose that I was thinking that there were German generals and so on and so forth that had garnered and pilfered art collections from all over Europe during the war. That's not actually to say that they actually ("Appreciated" :S) appreciated ("No, it was just loot" :S) . .it was just loot.

S: Just like you know, a vulgar woman wearing a diamond necklace. It was just, you know, nothing more than that perhaps (mm..mm). Goering was the biggest looter and plunderer of the lot. What appreciation of art did he have. It seems it was just loot - just the spoils of war. Well they knew these were famous pictures huh. World famous pictures, so they just wanted them to adorn their houses and offices and museums huh. They showed no appreciation of art I would say.

Cittapala: But it would not be possible for them to listen to something, one of Handel's pieces in much the same way as one enjoyed a tune from a tinker's barrel or something of this nature.

S: Well we do know that some people in, say, London during the opera season go to the opera more as a social event than to listen to the music. Although this happens~i think less and less. Specially now you don't get dressed up to go to the opera any more. But I didn't get the impression that these S.S. guards were listening to Bach's music in this sort of way. Kapleau does definitely state that they were enjoying themselves. So presumably you know even the most, sort of ordinary Bach, one has, presumably, some sort of emotional sensitivity if one is to listen to it and enjoy it.

So why it shocked was that I thought maybe we have to accept that under certain

S(cont): circumstances even the greatest works of art do not have a refining influence hmm ? on the human psyche. Do you see what I mean ? So, you know, otherwise is culture necessarily a stepping stone in the spiritual path and in the spiritual life, huh?

a

Cittapala: Well it would seem to have rather limited effect. I mean I would it had rather a limiting effect. I any event if you looked ...

Richard: If you were unintegrated, I'm sure you could listen to music and it perhaps could just appeal to that part and another part would be unaffected.

S: Yes, thats true. So it would suggest that man is an even more or even less integrated creature than I had previously supposed. (Laughter) Maybe that contributed to the shock hmm. . mm... that an S.S. guard could actually listen to Bach and enjoy it. Well I remember when I was in the army in Singapore and I arrived three weeks after the Japanese surrender with lots of Japanese prisoners of war. We had a lot of them in our camp as sort of servants and so on. including a number of Japanese officers. I remember they used to just er, if they heard the strains of Beethoven, Beethoven seemed to be quite popular, proceeding from someone's radio - they'd sort of stand near to the door and listen, clearly enjoying it. But one doesn't like to think what what some of them might have been up to earlier on. Because some really

dreadful things happened in Singapore. I mean thousands of people \*

were tortured to death. Well, well we'll have to leave it there for

the moment and have our morning refreshments.

TEA.

Sf Well we certainly raised a lot of questions in that session but I don't think we actually answered many of them. Perhaps one

shouldn't rush to any premature conclusions and be content to open up the questions, you know, to further thought. I mean, for instance, we haven't really answered the question : what is intelligence ? Perhaps we could answer this year.

Cittapala: Develop some first hmm? develop some first (laughter)

S: Perhaps if anyone in the course of the next few~months does manage to discover what intelligence is, they can announce it at the first Tuscany reunion (laughter). Any further points arising out of the six internal and six external sense bases ?

It concludes:"Or his mindfulness is established with the thought,"mental objects exist", to the extent necessary just for knowledge and mindful- ness and he lives detached and clings to naught in the world."

Th~s almost suggests indirectly that all ones thinking should be directed. All ones thinking should be under ones own control. And when thinking isn't objectively necessary one just shouldn't be thinking. Do you see what I mean ? That is quite a tall order, quite a big demant

isn't it ?

Ratnaprabha: This is what the Buddha meant when he exhorted his monks to keep the Ariyan silence when they were not actually speaking Dharma.

S: It amounts to that doesn't it ? Yes, it amounts to that. I mean, very often the mind is just ticking over isn't it ? There is all sorts of mental chatter going on. That is the normal state of people's minds. But actually you should be able to take up and put down your thinking, as you please.

(laughter) Sometimes people think if there is something to think about, then you should think about it, just as if in the same way there is something to eat you should eat it. If there's a bowl of fruit on the table, well it means you have just got to go and eat it. You just cannot let it be there. In the same way if there's something to think about, well you have got to think about it there is no question of postponing it or thinking about it at a suitable time etc etc. I'm sure Chairmen are well aware of this. In fact I think in the case of Chairman sometimes they are forced to bring their thinking under control, because you know there are just so many things to think about, on your plate, that you just cannot think about everything at once. So you have got to write in your diary, you know, 2pm Tuesday afternoon, think about such and such. Yes : I mean if at four o'clock you are going to have a meeting and you are going to have to come to a decision about something, you have got to allow yourself time to think about it, but you don't have that time now. so sometimes you do have to sort of bring your thinking under control and it is very useful to be able to do this. To think about things when you want to think about them. And not be stampeded into thinking about them before you're ready, before you have really got time.

Suvajra: Well equally hard on the other side is not to think about things when you don't actually have to think about them. Just letting your mind come into control - like stopping the Titanic.

~Oq

S.: Well, an iceberg can stop the Titanic in the same way, mindfulness can stop uncontrolled thinking.

Friedrich: Would you say if you contemplated on just building up the intention to want to not carry on thoughts when not necessary that would slow it down or stop it altogether.

S.: It could help, it could help. I think what might help most of all is the situation like that in which a chairman finds himself when a lot of things to think about. You just can't think about them all at once. So you have to apportion time for thinking about different matters, hm? Perhaps an afternoon every week for thinking about things. And keep your problems, you know, till then. it can be done, it can be done.

Cittapala: I suppose the tendency is to think about them when you're supposed to be meditating.

S.: Yes, indeed, yes. Or when you're supposed to be doing something entirely different. Even when you're supposed to be thinking about something else, Mmm.

Suvajra: And this is the way you work, isn't it?

S.: Yes. I must say I am able to think about things when I want to think about them and refuse to think about them before. For sometimes people WANT me to think about things when I'm not ready. I just refuse to do that. I say "No, I'll think about that the day after tomorrow, not before." It's not unnecessary; it can be done definitely. And those that live with me sometimes find this rather exasperating. (Laughter) But when you've got a lot of things to think about, and a lot of things to do, one can hardly help arranging one's mental life in that way. In other words, you would just get overwhelmed by all these things you have to think about. You can't think about a number of things at the same time, you can only think about one thing at a time.

So, "Thus monks, a monk lives contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the six internal and the six external sense-bases". (Pause) Alright, let's go on to the "The Seven Factors of Enlightenment" Maybe someone can read. I was going to say read them all. No, let's take them one by one. Read the first three paragraphs:

Richard: 4 "The Seven Factors of Enlightenment

And further, monks, a monk lives contemplating mental objects  
the mental objects of the seven factors of enlightenment.

How, monks, does a monk live contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the seven factors of enlightenment.

Herein, monks, when the enlightenment-factor of MINDFULNESS is present, the monk knows, 'The enlightenment-factor of mindfulness is in me', or when the enlightenment-factor of mindfulness is absent, he knows, 'The enlightenment-factor of mindfulness is not in me'; and he knows how the arising of the non-arisen enlightenment-factor of mindfulness comes to be; and how perfection in the development of the arisen enlightenment-factor of mindfulness comes to be."

S.: So that the Seven Factors of Enlightenment are a very important series of positive mental states, that occurs repeatedly in the Pali Canon and clearly goes back to the Buddha himself, huh? It corresponds roughly, this particular series, corresponds roughly to the series or the sequence of the positive *~idanas*, mmm. So, it is in a way a very good representation of the Path. It brings up the spirit in the path.. as something progressive, cumulative, very clearly. So it's quite useful in the particular connection.

So. "Herein monks when the Enlightenment factor of Mindfulness is present..." Ah, before we go into that we have a further point. I mentioned these Bodhyangas as a series or sequence as representing the Path. But they can also be regarded as existing simultaneously and as it were, making up between them in their fully-developed form the content of Enlightenment itself. This is why they are factors of enlightenment. So they can be regarded as factors CONTRIBUTING to Enlightenment not as factors CONSTITUENT of Enlightenment. And one might say they occupy a special place in this practice because you

notice at the end of the introduction there's a passage quoted from the Pali Canon though no reference is given: "It has been said by the Buddha: 'Mindfulness of breathing developed and repeatedly practised, is of great fruit, of great advantage, for it fulfils the four Foundations of Mindfulness; the Four Foundations of Mindfulness, developed and repeatedly practised, fulfil the seven Enlightenment Factors; the seven Enlightenment Factors, developed and repeatedly practised, fulfil clear-vision and deliverance.'"

So clearly the seven factors of Enlightenment are given a fairly special place - of very special importance... as though the whole of this practice could be summed up in Mindfulness of Breathing, the Four

Foundations of Mindfulness themselves and the Seven Bodhyangas. So that

one could if necessary, if one wanted a condensed form of the practice of its teaching just leave out all these other sections, including you know, the corpse meditation and the contemplation of the Five Aggregates and so on. Just concentrate on the Mindfulness of Breathing, the 4 Foundations of Mindfulness themselves and especially the 7 Bodhyangas. But then there's a rather curious question that arises. The mind knows, ie. "the enlightenment-factor of mindfulness is in me", huh? or he knows that it isn't there. So that he is aware that he is aware, or aware that he is not aware, huh?. So doesn't that as it were, require mindfulness? Doesn't it require mindfulness to be, I mean, to know that you are mindful?, huh. So isn't that in a way a bit of a circle, not vicious circle but positive circle? But how do you get into the circle? I mean, when you're not aware, you're not mindful, so how do you become mindful of the fact that you're not mindful? Whereas by definition you're not mindful to begin with, or is it an artificial sense of question?

Devamitra: isn't it the way in which mindfulness arises? There seem to be levels, aren't there? You're first of all the mind, you're aware that you HAVE been unaware.

S.: Yes, that's true.

Devamitra: You're aware then that you ARE unaware, and then you're aware that if you proceed in a certain manner you will behave in another way.

S.: Yes, or that you will continue to behave in an aware manner, Yes. But I think very often you become aware that you've been unaware due to

perhaps painful consequence of your unawareness. Perhaps if you're walking along the road and in an unaware manner in an unmindful manner you just bang your head against the lamp post - well THEN you become aware that you have, you know, been unaware. So you're more careful in future. Do you see what I mean? So quite often we're forced to become aware of our own former unawareness due to, you know the painful consequences of the unaware state, hm? This is very often how it all arises, huh?

Devamitra: Because presumably, actually if you say on - in the later stage you're actually, you actually become aware in the midst of unawareness then the unawareness must instantly disappear, is replaced by awareness.

S.: Yes, well it may be instantly or it may be a little longer, depending on the intensity of the awareness.

Gunapala: The way it seems to me to flow here, the fact that you are aware even when you're unmindful, does it say that? (Pause)

S.: Well, it's nearly in a way, sort of contradictory "He knows the Enlightenment factor of mindfulness is NOT IN ME!!". What does that mean exactly?

Richard: Not fully developed.

S.: Not fully developed presumably because if you know, there was no mindfulness at all, how could he even be aware that he was not mindful?

Voice: There's also the factor of your spiritual friends.

S.: Indeed, yes, yes indeed. Your spiritual friends who draw the attention to the fact that you're behaving in an unmindful manner, yes. (Pause) So if one takes these, these Enlightenment factors, Bodhi factors, as a sequence, and if one sees that mindfulness is the first, it's as though this is the basic question that one should ask oneself, as it were. Am I being mindful? Because that seems to be the start of the whole series, the whole sequence of positive mental states according to this formulation. So, am I being mindful? Am I being sufficiently mindful? Is my mindfulness of the right kind? is it alienated or integrated? Hmm? (Pause)

Cittapala: It says, "And he knows when the arising of the non-arisen enlightenment factor of mindfulness comes to be". He almost seems to implicate that you actually know how it is you lose your mindfulness. But my impression of it is, that you just suddenly realise that for a space of time you're completely blanked out.

S.: In a general way you do know under what conditions that is more likely to happen, hmm=. So that you can therefore, take steps to AVOID those conditions. I mean for instance you even know well that if you've had a drink or two you lose your mindfulness, huh? You may know that that is what generally happens, so you avoid having a drink or two, hmm?

Cittapala: So it's quite general in that respect it's not that you have to develop some sort of really specific.. well, I suppose you would do.

S.: It's, its.. you're aware of those factors which conduce to mindfulness and you know, you take steps to cultivate them. You're aware of those factors which do not conduce to mindfulness and you take steps to avoid them. I mean everyone knows that there are situations in which you can lose your mindfulness much more easily. As, if you are having a 'good time', say if you are at a party and everything becomes a bit hilarious, well, very easily you can lose your mindfulness then. Or if things are going well with you and you're very successful and riding on a crest of a wave you can become over-confident and you may do foolish things. This is what the Greeks call 'hubris' - that sort of pride and sort of rashness or even almost madness which comes when you're too confident, too successful and you may do foolish things which incur the wrath of the Gods and for which the Gods punish you; and Nemesis overtakes you and Karma overtakes you or the results of karma overtake you, rather, huh? ~~~~ can see this happening with people, well, can't one? I mean even in one's own case, huh? This is why I sometimes say, that when you are successful that is the time to be very careful, because when you are successful and especially if you're repeatedly successful, you can become overconfident, huh, mm. And that can betray you into unmindfulness and recklessness and the consequences of that can be disastrous.

Well, I mean would you say that you have noticed an increase in your mindfulness say, over the last two years? Two or three years? Could you look back and say, well, you really think you do behave generally, that is to say in the affairs of ordinary everyday life more mindful now than you did two or three years ago? Could any of you actually say that? Or do you feel that? Oh good! People do agree! (Laughter) What sort of way do you think it shows itself, huh? What sort of way does it show itself? or in connection with what sort of things are you more aware or mindful? Is it the sort of way you drink your tea? The way you speak to other people, or walk along the street?

Surata: The company I keep.

S.: The company.. you keep.

Surata.: And where I keep it. (Laughter)

S.: Ah.' (Laughter)

Cittapala.: That's a good one.

S.: That's a little vague but we won't go into that. (Laughter)

Surata.: Well, I suppose, for instance, if I'm going to talk to somebody, a restaurant or a pub isn't a good place to do it. (Yes, yes) I mean somewhere nice and quiet where there is just the two of us is much better. Don't try to talk to a whole group of people in a pub or in a public place. It just doesn't work. It's useless.

S.: Yes, that seems to be more related to clear comprehension. of purpose, you don't - only bear your purpose in mind but you are alert for those conditions which will either help you to realise or obstruct the realisation of it.

S.: Any further examples?

Richard Clayton.: Not going into environments of things. Not going into town shopping and doing things like that which...

S.: Mm.

Ratnaprabha.: These seem to be examples of not putting oneself in situations where our mindfulness can't be cultivated rather than examples of greater mindfulness itself.

S.: Yes, areas in which you cultivate greater areas of mindfulness. I remember years ago when I was paying special attention to mindfulness I found it especially necessary to pay attention to it when you got into a discussion. That the discussion didn't get into an argument, you know in the negative sense. Because there is a sort of almost a fine point at which it can take that turning point if you're not careful. So you need to be very mindful of your talking and of how the discussion is going. What sort of emotions are becoming involved in it. Do you see what I mean?

Richard Clayton.: In a more positive sense is there an awareness of beauty? You mentioned (unclear)

S.: Yes. Just seeing more clearly what is there and paying more attention to it, appreciating it more.

Cittapala.: Understanding other people and yourself is a good example.

S.: Yes Just being more aware of other people because I mean it's extraordinary perhaps the degree to which we're not aware of other people. Of how other people are feeling, or where other people are at. You can think that you are very close to someone but you may be quite unaware of what they're thinking and feeling. There's a famous prose poem by Baudelaire dealing with that subject. I haven't mentioned it or referred to it before. Do you know the one I mean? There's a prose poem by Baudelaire where a young man takes his beloved out to go to a restaurant. This must be a palace or somewhere and you know they've got a table for themselves by the window. He's full of emotional love for this woman. And he seems so close to her that they have only got one soul. He knows every thought of hers and she knows every thought of his. They're just one. And he happens to just look out of the window, there's a poor woman begging. And he's in such an emotional mood he feels really sorry for this woman,



overflowing with compassion. Just as he's feeling that way the voice of his beloved breaks in and says, "I really do wish these ugly people wouldn't come begging so close up to the window." Now in other words he is totally out of sympathy with her and she with him. And despite his feeling you know that you know they're all just one soul. He didn't really know what her mental state was at all. Nor did she apparently appreciate his. They were really at cross purposes all the time. So one can train oneself to become even more aware of other people. How they're feeling how they're reacting how they're responding. Anyway perhaps here under this heading you know as regards this (poem) we can take as read the whole content of the sutta which is after all about sati or about mindfulness which is the first Bodhyanga. Or one can you know think here in terms of the four dimensions of awareness as I've put it. Things, people, nature, reality. Well let's go on to the second one then.

Cittapala.: "When the enlightenment factor of the investigation of mental objects is present, the monk knows 'The enlightenment factor of the investigation of mental objects is in me'; when the enli-

tenment factor of the investigation of mental objects is absent he knows, "The enlightenment factor of the investigation of mental objects is not in me"; and he knows how the arising of the non-arisen enlightenment factor of the investigation of mental objects comes to be, and how perfection in the development of the arisen enlightenment factor of the investigation of mental objects comes

to be."

S.: So investigation of mental objects is Dhammavijaya. It's often translated as the investigation of the Dharma. With a capital D, that's to say Dharma in the sense of the teaching. But I myself understand it and I take this to be correct in the sense in which it is translated here, that is the investigation of objects. In other words, the sorting out of the contents of one's own consciousness, and being aware of what one is thinking about and whether one is thinking about things which are skilful or unskilful, things which conduce to skilful mental states and unskilful mental states, to progress or to regress. Things which are reactive or things which are creative. Of course this is not unrelated to, does not totally exclude investigation of the Dharma in the sense of the Teaching. Because this may help you in the investigation understanding and classification and evaluation of your own mental states.

So clearly there's a connection between the first Bodhyanga and the second because one must first of all to become aware, that is to say aware of the contents of one's own consciousness before one can start investigating them and sorting them out and deciding you know which are skilful and which unskilful and so on.

Cittapala.: This would then fall into the category of sorting out where you lose mindfulness and where you gain it. Like the pub..

S.: No not quite I think this is more of the ascertaining the actual state itself. Whether say positive or negative, skilful or unskilful. perhaps it could be, you know, regarding, regarded as including that of the non-arisen Enlightenment factor of the Investigation of mental states comes to be and how perfection in the development of the arisen Enlightenment factor of the investigation of mental objects comes to be. In other words you are not concerned here in this

stage or in connection with Bodhyanga with understanding what conduces or does not conduce to this particular factor of investigation of mental states. Do you see what I mean?

Suvajra.: I've sort of lost the distinction that you gave.

S.: Well in this particular Bodhyanga in the case of this particular Bodhyanga you become aware of the existence within you of different kinds of mental states and you sort them out. So Gunapala was saying that you not only sort out those particular states, whether skilful or unskilful, but you also see how they

5/A)"

arise and how they do not arise. But then I pointed out that in this particular context one is primarily concerned not with how those particular states themselves arise or didn't arise~ but how that investigation of those states itself arises or doesn't arise. I mean the first is not excluded but the primary consideration here is with that particular Bodhyanga and how it arises or does not arise or how it is perfected yes?

So how does it arise? What conduces to the development of that particular factor itself. This factor of the investigation of mental states, investigation of mental objects. What helps that or what hinders that?

Ratnaprabha; presumably clear comprehension of purpose is important.

S.: Yes. One could say that, yes. Well one sees the necessity for doing that sort of thing, in view of one's overall purpose.

(End of Side one)

Gunapala: It's perhaps quite a good word 'integration'

S.: That is a pretty literal translation (Dharma Vihaya) investigation of mental objects or one could say mental states. Or you know, being clear of what one is thinking about, hmm?, knowing what one is thinking about, differentiating the different objects of thought according to their value from the spiritual point of view.

Devamitra: But the other factors which could give rise to investigation... I mean just the clear comprehension.

S.: Well, again, the advice of one's spiritual friends,

~'ttapala: You are using clear comprehension as (Sampa~anna?)

S.: Yes, partly in that sense, yes.

~ala: But then again , even it's your clear comprehension of your spiritual fri~d has been used on you.

S.: Yes, yes. They are applying it to you.

Gunapala: Their clear comprehension, their investigation on, still on consciousness, still on...

S.: And of course you may just find it interesting to investigate your mental states, you might have an interest in psychology in that sort of sense, huh, - that could help you.

Cittapala: It doesn't give any account of actually about how you come to have that idea, that purpose of friends' framework in which you wish to work.

S.: In what way?

Cittapala: Well, presumably you can only begin to investigate your - th\$ental objects if you know in a particular sort of a way, in a particular type of analysis if you actually have the conception, that you wish to attain Nibbana?

S.: Well presumably you have that sort of awareness of the whole context of this particular enlightenment factor in the sense of an awareness of the whole sequence of those enlightenment factors but you don't just see it in isolation but as a part of that series and that you see the series itself as culminating in enlightenment or (continuing) to Enlightenment.

Cittapala: Yes, I'm sorry I was just trying to think of it in terms of developing the sort of evolutionary sort of trend of going from sort of ordinary consciousness to reflective consciousness.

S.: Perhaps you find in the long run that certain mental states are more satisfactory and more fulfilling. Perhaps you find that. So you tend to want to sort out, well, which DO give more happiness in the long run; which are more satisfying? So you start investigating - maybe there is such a thing as intellectual curiosity too.

You mean in the case of Sati you know, one is often mindful by the painful consequences of unmindfulness, yes? So are you asking, so to speak, or is there sort of any analogous situation which, as it were, compels you to engage in investigation of mental states?

Cittapala: Well, I suppose what happens is first of all you become aware that there are some things which make you happy, some things which don't and then you have a clear comprehension that you wish to

5DS

pursue things which make you happy- so then on the basis of that you then investigate.

S.: Right, yes, yes.

Cittapala: How those come into...

S.: What is more likely to develop those. (Pause) .-.Alright, I'd like to read the paragraph dealing with the next one:

Surata: "When the Enlightenment-Factor of ENERGY is present, he knows, 'The enlightenment-factor of energy is in me'; when the enlightenment-factor of energy is absent, he knows, 'The enlightenment-factor of energy is not in me'; and he knows how the arising of the non-arisen enlightenment-factor of energy comes to be, and how perfection in the development of the arisen enlightenment-factor of energy comes to be."

S.: So in the case of the former Bodhyanga one is distinguishing between let us say, skilful mental states and unskilful mental states. In this stage one devotes all one's energies to the development of those skilful mental states. That is the connection, huh? And energy is of course, Virya. I've explained this in the Stages of the Path because the sequence here now for a few stages coincides with that of the positive Nidanas, doesn't it?

One could also say that energy is withdrawn from the unskilful mental states and concentrated more and more in the skilful mental states which one then increasingly cultivates.

Suvajra: Ah. So this stage here like the previous bit, this is referring not to how you apply the energy /to the unskilful/skilful mental states but to the arising of that energy?

S.: Yes, yes. So what factors do actually conduce to the arising of energy?

Suvajra: Clear comprehension of what mental state you already have. If you really thought of - it was something unskilful and lead you in a wrong direction.

Cittapala: Well, like sticking your hand in a fire.

S.: Yes, yes.

Skilful you Cittapala: Soon as you realise it is actually unskilful  
rapidly

S: Yes. the energy to pull it back immediately arises.

Suvajra: Discipline, (laugh) setting yourself a discipline.

S: Setting yourself a discipline and not dissipating ones  
energy.

Does not one find that on certain days, on certain occasions you feel more full of energy than usual? And perhaps sometimes you can see why that is. Maybe you just had a good night's sleep or a good meditation or a good conversation or you just feel more full of energy than usual.

Devamitra: Do you think it's more a question actually, of one conserving energy rather than actually trying consciously to develop it?

S: Well I think in the case of a lot of people, er, conservation of energy is quite important, because a lot of energy is wasted and frittered away. I mean for instance, when we have a period of silence, most people will probably observe that they have a bit more energy than usual, suggesting that energy is often frittered away. Idle conversations. Do you notice this at all? That you have a bit more energy - at least a bit more - when there's silence?

Surata: Perhaps.'

S: Perhaps. Well maybe in some cases you've got so much energy that they don't notice that little extra bit that, you know, accrues then as a result of a few hours silence. Maybe if you're quite tired you notice it then, but the silence gives you a rest and you accumulate a bit of energy.

Gunapala: I notice it. One place I notice it quite a lot, when I'm taken away from distractions, from advertising, say in the city or shops where there's a lot of distractions. Energy is di~ipated quite quickly, and if I take myself, remove myself to a situation such as this, the energy isn't dissipated so much.

sps

Devamitra: I just put that question a few moments ago. Initially because I don't know whether this is true, but I have the impression that maybe a lot of people have the idea, more in terms of the need to develop energy and I think

much more in terms of conservation.

S: While it would seem to me to be foolish to try and develop energy when already you're wasting the energy that you've got. It would seem the first step towards, as it were developing energy would be to conserve energy. I mean, just like with expenditure, financially speaking, when if you really want to have more money at your disposal, well the first thing you should do perhaps is to stop unnecessary expenditure so that you've got more money left to spend on worthwhile things. So if you're short on energy, well the first thing it seems one could do, the easiest thing would be to stop expending your energy unnec~sarily. But then if you still don't have enough energy for what you want to do you think in terms of tapping fresh sources of energy.

Devamitra: I wonder if actually one needs to do that, if the actual damming up process would be sufficient in itself.

S: Well. One can only wait and see, it may differ from one individual to another depending on what you want to do and how much energy is required. I mean this is one of the reasons you know for say observing celibacy in some cases. Even athletes ~ery often observe celibacy, to conserve energy, don't they?

Devamitra: I've heard that boxers do.

S: Well, local gossip perhaps.

Ratnaprabha: So if one does feel that one needs to generate energy, it's not sufficient just to conserve it. So how does one go about that?

S: Well, how does one go about that? What is energy? Where does it come from?

V: So a way of generating it would be solitary retreat, a solitary retreat.

sps W~/7

S: Or any kind of retreat. I think it is generally recognised that people come back from almost any retreat charged with energy compared with the state in which they went away.

Citapala: Doesn't the sequence of this, these factors of enlightenment seem to suggest that it actually comes from a clear sighted understanding of what is skilful and what is unskilful.

S: Well it comes from, presumably, no longer wasting energy, putting it into unskilful activities. And that definitely results in sort of, bringing together of one's energies. If all one's energies are so to speak going into a skilful activity there's a greater degree of integration and therefore again more energy. Your energies are not working against one another. They're working all together so in an overall sense you have more energy.

Cittapala: Yes, so it's really more, if you want to obtain energy then it's really a question of seeing with greater clarity.

S: That is certainly an important factor because if you see certain things with sufficient clarity it releases energy. It releases the energy which is necessary to do these things that you see are necessary to be done in the light of that vision. But from as it were a more common sense point of view, an ordinary point of view, first of all if you want to have whatever energy is necessary to lead a spiritual life. First of all you need or say to lead a regular kind of life with regular rest, regular sleep, regular diet, you know, regular working hours, regular meditation and so on. And then you need to withdraw energies from unskilful activities to concentrate energy. To integrate your energy generally integrate yourself. And perhaps also tap deeper sources of energy through meditation or through

perhaps reading. Especially reading things which are inspiring

and stimulating. And also you know, er, by means of contact and communication with your spiritual friends. And perhaps from time to time by going away on retreats. That should give you all the energy that you need for your immediate spiritual purposes. So it sets you in a sort of healthy spiritual glow as it were. Hrnm. You should be sort of incandescent. You should be an embodiment of Tejas (?)

V:

SPS

V: Who ar what is Tejas?

S: As in Tejananda and Tejamitra and Tejamati, that is to say a fiery energy. A fiery energy generated by spiritual practice.

Cittapala: It's interesting that you put regularity in life- style as one parts of developing that energy.

S: Well, I think that regularity of lifestyle helps to bank up one' 5 energies and prevent them from being frittered in useless activities.

Devamitra: But very often that would not be looked at as a source of energy.

S: I think it is not exactly a source of energy but, er , it does prevent energy from being wasted and perhaps to the extent that energy is flowing constantly in the same channels, does tend to intensify that energy.

Ratnaprabha: You once gave the precept, as a list of,

, well tantric precepts on terms of energy. That doesn't seem to be spoken about very often nowadays. Do you think it's a useful way of looking at it?

S: I thought it was, I really don't know. It's a question of, do people find it useful? I mean it!~s for them to say whether they find it useful or not. Some people apparently do. There's been severa~ references to it in recent months in various study groups. Not here, down in London and elsewhere. So perhaps people do find it useful.

Suvajra: We used it quite a lot in our study group with Vessantara.



S: You mean here?

Suvajra: Yes.

V: You mentioned at the beginning of this that you can correlate the 7 factors with the 12 Nidanas

SPS 519

S: Ah. But with certain of the positive nidanas , yes some of them do actually overlap. I mean some individual nidanas are the same as some individual Bodhiyangas.

V: Could you make that correlation quite close, er in the sense that, I see that next is joy

S: Yes energy is there, joy is there, tranquility is there, concentration is there in the series of positive nidanas. Upekka is not there. Upekka seems to cover the purely transcendental nidanas. But the series from, I think, energy to tranquility is there, er to concentration.

Suvajra: Energy is not one of the positive nidanas.

S. No, no, I said from not including. Joy is there, tranquility is there, concentration is there. Clearly both series are concerned with er basically the same sequence of spiritual experiences. They both represent the creative mode of consciousness, so to speak, from slightly different points of view.

Devamitra: They would also cover everything from knowledge and vision upwards?

S: It would seem so because these factors are definitely called enlightenment factors, Bodhiyangas. And clearly the first six aren't as it were transcendental. That leaves only the seven to cover that.

Devamitra: Presumably concentration would be translated as samadhi?

S: Yes.

V: But Samadhi more in the sense

S: You'd have to upgrade the meaning of all those yogas to give them a sort of transcendental. Upekka is often used as quite a developed sort of sense, not just tranquility in a psychological sense. But what I'd call transcendental axiality where you are no longer moved by any of the pairs of opposites, including

SPS

those of being and non-being. So that there would clearly be a transcendental attainment. That would clearly be Enlightenment.

Ratnabrahma: The positive nidanas are described in terms of in dependent~of this factor the next one arises. If one saw these ones as being a sequence as apposed to just factors of enlightenment itself, could one also see them in terms of ~ dependence upon mindfulness, investigation arises and so on.

S: Well in a way we have already seen that haven't we. It's in dependence on mindfulness that investigation of the dhammas ~ou know does arise or can arise huh? And it's in dependence not directly on the investigation of the dhammas but in dependence upon the more intensive cultivation of those dhammas which have been discriminated as skillful, that energy arises. There's not a straight forward cause and effect sequence, but the sort of, in a way loose association by way of conditionality. Right - someone like to read the next paragraph.

Devamitra: "When the enlightenment factor of joy is present, he knows, 'The enlightenment-factor of joy is in me', when the enlightenment factor of joy is absent he knows 'The enlightenment factor of joy is not in me'; and he knows how the arising of the non-arisen enlightenment factor of joy~be, and how perfection in the development of the arisen enlightenment factor of joy comes to be."

S: Hmm. So what is this joy, what's the original term?

V: Piti

S: It is Piti. So what is this piti, huh? I've discussed this so you ought to be familiar with that, what is piti? Well it's usually translated as rapture, enthusiasm or joy delight. It suggests something overflowing. Even something in a sense a little out of control. Rapture is probably the best translation for piti. Piti is sort of a psycho-somatic experience. Because

one of its characteristics is that it expresses itself in physical terms. As when you say, weep for joy, or when the hairs on your head stand on end, yes, with positive emotion. So it's essentially a psychophysical experience.

[321]

Cittapala: To the extent that it actually represents a stage in development on the spiritual path. I mean presumably there should be people walking around manifesting this. ...

S: Ah. No, unless they've gone beyond it huh! Because there is this subsequent stage of But yes there ought to be some people at least at certain times walking around manifesting Priti, yes. But what I mean, if you look at it more sort of deeply, more analytically. What is Priti, what is happening? When you experience Priti what is it ~p~pening. When say you weep for joy, huh?

Devamitra: It's an energy release.

S: Yes it seems to be an energy release. it is as though, you know, you are drawing on a deeper source of energy, hitherto blocked. It's as though, once your energy gets going as it did in the case of the previous factor then it sort of sets up a general movement of expression of energy. Blocked energy is then sort of caught up in the current and released. And maybe you've got more energy than you require for your immediate purposes, then it sort of overflows in various physical manifestations. I mean, sometimes when you are listening to some beautiful music and the tears may come into your eyes or a lump into your throat. These are physical manifestations because the music touches a sort of chord or stirs a certain energy. You've no way of expressing that, you're just sitting there listening. So it overflows in these physical manifestations.

Cittapala: It's a bit like it sort of snowballs and the whole thing just suddenly sort of gathers momentum.

S: Yes, yes, right.

V: I think Shan~tiprabha described it as a sort of atomic explosion in a sense.

S: A nuclear reaction?

Cittapala: Not that I understand it very well, the actual, you know, example

SPS

S: Yes.

Richard: Would this sort of cor~espond with the activity say of Michel ~angelo, something like that?

S: Ih, I don't know. His creativity seems to be quite anguished very often. I don't know, I wouldn't like to associate Michel~~WJQ(~).

Richard: Or say Handel.

S: Handel maybe, or the young Mozart.

Devamitra: So priti would be more of the manifestation of the creativity fulfilment rather than frustration.

S: Oh yes, yes, yes. I mean we've used words like accumulation or accumulative or snowballing it's as thought with priti the nature of the creative process as such starts coming out especially clearly and unmistakably, huh? Though I mean the creative process of the traditional Buddhist type, there's essentially a reaction, a creation in the positive from something positive to something still more positive. And from that something still more positive again. Hence it starts one using words like accumulative and snowballing. This seems to come up particularly clearly, maybe for the first time in the series in the case of priti. There's something supra abundant and overflowing and, you know, setting up a sort of chain reaction, in all directions. So, yes that is surprising that one doesn't see more people about like this or more often. I wonder why one doesn't?

Suvajra: (unclear) priti, physco somatic

S: Well one has defined priti as psychosomatic yes. So if they experience priti as defined it's psychosomatic.

Suvajra: So then would everyone experience priti then?

S: I wouldn't say nobody experiences priti, but they're not conspicuous! perhaps some people do sometimes experience priti. Sometimes people shed tears during meditation that is you know a form of priti.

SPS

Cittapala: Do you know anyone who hasn't experienced priti?

V. Do you think that it's quite a temporary phase?

S: It does seem~to be a temporary phase but it's succeeded by tranquility in the sense of the substance of the external purely somatic manifestations of the rapture. But what is left according to the series of positive nidanas, which is omitted here, so to speak is sutitra. The same experience but even more intensified because the somatic manifestations have been as it were withdrawn. That is how one comes to experience bliss.

Cittapala: But I mean, you presumably, in terms of one's spiritual development on a more long term scale. There must come a point when you just become sort of super-abundantly sort of energetic and creative?

S: Yes I think there is,

Cittapala: And there must be, well theoretically at least there must be peep~going around constantly in this state of ~::st....

S: I certainly think that some people are more sort of enraptured or enthusiastic than others. I think there's no doubt about that. One can piss them out very easily, others are a bit slug~ish and uninspired and dull. It's not very difficult to identify them. Even though there may not be an extraordinary difference between the two, but certainly there's a noticeable difference. Some people are more enthusiastic and as it were more inspired than others.

Gunapala: Is it quite closely linked with energy?

S: Well clearly, yes, yes it must be.

Gunapala: So when you, I mean just that the feeling of energy as it were rushing though you is a priti experience.

S: Yes it is, it is the, as was said a little while ago, I mean priti is experienced when energy is released. When blocked energy is released specially perhaps! You will start declining even from that priti experience in the full sense. You start to, you know

SPS

r~egressing, start going back.

Citta~ala: This dominant feeling, I think in the sort of experience you were talking about just before, that was when it's finished, when it's quite devoid of energy, sort of paucity of it. Whereas I would, even if you went, fell back from this priti stage into the preceeding stage you'd just feel, well quite lifted up.

S: Yes, less effervescent but lifted up, still in a highly positive state, yes. Still charged with energy.

Devamitra: Well presumably actually you'd have gone on to the level of tranquility.

S: Well Ideally yes, the external manifestations of priti experience will have subsided, leaving you with the intensified feeling of bliss.

Cittapala: But my point Ia, really was, even if you did fall back..

S: You'd be falling back to an experience will only be less relatively positive, which was still very positive in itself, yes. You wouldn't be falling back into a state of exhaustion. As one can do from this sort of rather hysterical pseudo-priti like experience. Well I found sometimes with women asking for ordination, they work, worked themselves up into this sort of hysterical state, laughing and crying. They really want it. Well it just doesn't seem very genuine you see. As I said if you get into the swing of energy, you're using your energy, your energy is flowing freely, then that seems to attract to itself and incorporate in itself energy which was hitherto blocked. And then that results in a

sort of priti like experience. Well don't you actually experience LJkick that when ~n~rg~~~a5 blocked for any reason or another is released

you do experience that as priti don't you~ joy as rapture, huh?

Richard: If experiencing this ... (noise)

How does that relate to the fetters, broken fetters, would you say that....?

S: Well you would certainly be much more likely to break any of the fetters. You'd be in a much better state to do that.

K~~X~X~:

SPS

Richard: If you experienced it all the time, it wouldn't necessarily say that you'd broken the first three fetters?

S: No I wouldn't necessarily. No that comes a little later. But certainly you are moving strongly in that direction. You're mobilising your energies. You're in a very positive emotional state. You're much more likely to be able to break the, or at least start breaking the fetters.

Ratnabrabha: Presumably an experience of the release of energy isn't necessarily and experience of priti? I'm thinking of sort of catharsis where you may have an experience which is, well not exactly unpleasant but perhaps not really rapture.

S: Yes perhaps one should qualify this statement and say it's a release of positive energy. Energy associated with positive mental states in this case.

Gunapala: It's not a negative....

S: No it's not the kick you get out of losing your temper. (laughter) Though that can be you know slightly pleasurable, but nonetheless it is not priti.

Gunapala: It seems very closely linked with, like the same symptoms, like people's hair can stand on end and they can cry.

S: And wrestle~ yes. But anyway how does this ~articular enlightenment factor arise. What are the causes and conditions on which it is more likely to arise. Well of course subjectively speaking, energy. There has to be a sort of full flow of energy to begin with so that blocked energy also starts being released. But in a more general sense one might say that the expression of energy is itself always pleasurable isn't it? If you're very active and in that way you're expressing energy, that is always a pleasurable activity. The experience of your own energy being expressed is pleasurable hmmm? But priti goes a stage beyond that when a moment comes when energy which was hitherto blocked and you were not able to use, that is released as it were into the general energy stream. That is experienced as intensely pleasurable.

SPS

Harshaprabha: So it's always like a positive release, you can't fall back. You can't fall back after....

S: Well you can fall back yes. And you can fall back, I mean, from any of the positive nidanas until such time as you reach, you know, the purely transcendental, the first truly transcendental nidana of the knowledge and vision of things as they really are. Yes, you can fall back at any time before reaching that point. You can sink unfortunately from rapture and inspiration to depression gloominess and stagnation, huh? (Laughter) I mean many creative people do, don't they. They never reach that point of no return.

Richard: In a way if one was going to experience it you'd need to be more mindful and more careful in an effort to make sure you didn't become ~~~~~~'~confident.

S: Yes I think this state of priti is in a sense not exactly a dangerous one but you need perhaps quite careful you don't

lose your mindfulness. You can be quite sort of overwhelming

experience sometimes. You can become a little over-hilarious or even a bit hysterical. I know quite a few women who know from time to time, or maybe quite frequently, they draw a sort of priti like experience in which they get quite hysterical, shed lots of tears and throw their arms and legs all over the place. (Laughter) Really you know, get carried away and lose their mindfulness. Just in the course of their life, or something upsets them or stirs them in a particular way.

Cittapala: \_In my experience it seems more common for women to experience this - ah I don't know why but thinking about it...

S: It's not exactly priti in this sense. It is sort of analagous to it or akin to it even but it, you



know, can arise even in situations which you know aren't particularly skilful

Devamitra: This sort of behaviour that you're describing does imply the absence of mindfulness quite strongly and er

S: I mean, perhaps it's essential to priti in the true sense, in the full sense, that mindfulness is maintained eh? Because, I mean the whole series of the positive nidanas is meant to be

sps

cumulative - not when you pass on to a succeeding nidana, you leave the previous one behind. You continue to conserve, so to speak, even intensify, even heighten your mindfulness or your investigation of these dharmas and your energy. They sort of culminate in the priti experience. But the sort of experience we've been talking about mindfulness is notably absent. So if you did, even if you did - even if you did attain a genuine priti experience - if you allow unmindfulness to creep in - you know.

Devamitra: Why do you think they should be prone to this particularly?

S.: I really don't know. I mean one would have to get rather more into the nature of the female organism presumably.

Suvajra: Oh dear! (Laughter)

Devamitra: We don't have to - (Laughter)

S.: There must be a reason but I must admit.. I mean a psychological reason, but I must admit I can't put my finger on it at the moment.

Richard: So to move on a second from joy to tranquility - rather than to fall back to energy - would one necessarily have to experience joy, or actually to just experience and bliss would come?

S.: No, I mean, one must take tranquility in the sense which it bears here. That is to say ~m4rn~Ji~i is not really tranquility in the literal sense. It's like calming down, a subsidence. And what is calmed down, what subsides is the external somatic - that is to say, bodily manifestations of the priti, which leave you with the intensified and heightened mental

experience of priti and that mental experience is what we call(sukkha) when it is intensified in this way. In this contact that means bliss. So, one clearly has to experience - ah. I mean, priti, and then tranquility before one can experience the bliss.

Richard: So would that come about through sort of through seeing that you need to contain it more by skilful action rather than...

S.: I think it tends - it comes about naturally, because you know, if the external manifestations are due to blocked energy being unblocked and flowing, mingling with the course, the stream

sps

of one's energy, well, that by its very nature, I think that experience can only be temporary; and after a while the external manifestations subside. You can't keep them up because you are not getting unblocked all the time.. though you know, there may be a series of unblockings, huh. The energy which is being unblocked is usually quite a limited quantity, a finite quantity. So the external manifestations of the priti subside. And if nothing further happens to interfere with the process, then what is left is just an experience of blissfulness. So in that sense, you have to go from joy, to the blissfulness through tranquility in the sense of the subsidence of those external manifestations of the released blocked energy.

Gunapala: It's blocked only in the sense that it isn't breaking through to a higher level?

S.: What does one mean by blocked energy?

Gunapala: I mean, I would have thought energy can operate quite freely on one level. it's just blocked when it is - when it tries to break through to a higher level. Say to tranquility...

S.: No, I mean when I was speaking of blocked energy, I mean energy of which we are not as it were, conscious, huh? Energy which is sort of locked up and not available at all on the conscious level. Hmm?

Gunapala: So really, you know, with joy and priti is coincided with the energy, when you're experiencing the energy, at that point you experience priti?

End of Tape 15

st~q

Satipattana Sutta

S. energy itself. Do you see what I mean? When you experience the flow of energy that is very pleasurable~. But supposing there is a blocked energy which is in some way released, there is some surge of energy from some hitherto unknown source into the general flow of energy. Well that is experienced as even more pleasurable~~~ and can lead to external somatic manifestations and that is what we call priti. It's not that incorporation of energy of which you don't already consciously it's a sort of explosion of energy from an unconscious level. Sometimes quite suddenly and unexpectedly.

Deva mitra Do you think though that this sort of priti-like experience is to some extent dependent on temperament. I mean presumably. ...

S. Well to begin with it depends on there being some blocked energy to begin with. Someone who has been very blocked for a very long time will sometimes experience intense priti whereas someone who is much less blocked and has quite minor blockages because he is more blissful will experience less priti.

So you see what I mean?

ice They've gone through it already.

S. Yes.

Deva mitra But in a way that wasn't quite what I was getting at. I was

wondering if, you know, that blockages in some cases, in the case of some people may just sort of be released very very gradually

rather than dramatically.

S. Yes this is true, I think the more dramatically the blockages are released, or the more dramatically the blocked energy is released the more pronounced will the experience of priti be. Yes, you sometimes find that with people, sometimes, I mean, something sparks them off and they might weep for two or three hours and that is a priti experience, a lot of blocked energy being released at one and the same time. With others they may just every now and then experience a slight lump in the throat - it's no more than that. Others may want to dance and sing and laugh and cry and roll on the ground and there are other ways of expressing it.

Ratna prabha Presumably there is, as it were, some blocked energy right up until well at least very high levels of development.

S. Yes and no. When one speaks of blocked energy one is speaking within an ordinary psychological context. Energy which is locked up in the , as it were, the unconscious but one could speak in terms of energy on the alaya level which is not tapped, though not exactly blocked energy in the ordinary psychological sense. But no doubt one eventually taps or touches energy on that level too. I don't think that is the energy which is as it were released in the case of priti. Hm.

Ratnaprabha: Well, what I was thinking of is the fact that priti is one of the factors in the first dhyana and dhyana experience obviously is common to people at all levels of spiritual development.

Will in fact priti only occur while there is some blocked energy in dhyana or will it continue?

[331]

S. I would say only while there is still some blocked energy<sup>1</sup> that is to say energy of which you are unconscious and which is not yet drawn into the general stream. It suggests that there's, I mean, this also raises the question of the unconscious mind itself, it raises the question of dreams. For instance, a Buddha is said not to dream because he has no unconscious mind. Hmm. Do you see what I mean? So one could very likely say, though I don't think this is ever said or has been said. One could also say a Buddha never experiences priti. He experiences something more than priti which is Sukha. Hmm, do you see what I mean. So presumably when a Buddha passes through the dhyanas, and again this hasn't actually been said, presumably he doesn't experience priti, but only sukha. Alright.

Deva mitra I'm wondering if it's at all possible to, as it were, by-pass

the experience of priti, that is just the physical manifestations of it, this energy, in some cases. Does priti always

S. Well that is how priti is defined. It is essentially that.

Deva mitra Yes.

S. So you can not experience priti, so defined, without somatic experiencing those manifestations.

Deva

mitra But you can presumably experience, I mean is it not possible to go from a state of energy in an undramatic fashion through to

Deva mitra tranquility. I mean, I suppose really that's what I'm asking.

S. Well no, through to true tranquility is through to sukha, through to bliss. Tranquility is the process of subsidence of hm, the tranquilisation if you like of the external manifestations of priti. So these external manifestations have got to be there for them to be tranquilised. So what you're really asking is whether one can go straight from energy to sukha? We, we've seen that you can't go straight to sukha in the full sense, because that, that sukha is as it were, heightened by the energies that have been fed into it by the released blocked energies.

If you don't have any blocked energy, well fair enough, you can no doubt proceed directly but, I mean, how many people don't have any blocked energy? The very fact that you dream every night means that you do have. (laughter)

ice I think that would be saying that you don't have any unconscious.

S. It would be saying you don't have any unconscious. So as long as you have an unconscious mind you have energies in the unconscious, and it is those energies which can be spoken of presumably as block, that is to say, there is something that prevents them from emerging into the conscious mind. (pause) Weren't we discussing the matter in terms which is not discussed in the text. The text only speaks of the arising of priti, but it is pretty clear, I mean, what sort of phenomena it is hm....

(pause)

So you could say, going back to women, you could say that, I mean if women are more prone to a sort of priti like experience, perhaps

S. as suggested, that women have got more blocked energy. That could be partly due to cultural reasons, that women lead a less active life, very often are more bound and restricted by men, than men are. You would expect perhaps that a lot of their energy is blocked and therefore that they're more prone to things like hysteria, but that blocked energy tends to get released quite frequently in that sort of way. I don't know whether anyone's ever done a cross-cultural study, you know, whether women are equally hysterical in all cultures. It may be that they're not. This isn't, as it were, an essential feature of the female.

I won't speculate on that. (pause)

Voice Would you also like to speculate that it is because the Buddha couldn't dream that he had the ability to meditate throughout the night?

S. Well it's not so much that he didn't, mm, that he had the ability to meditate, but if he wasn't dreaming, what else could he have done?

He was resting, he was remaining aware. That was his equivalent of sleep. He couldn't do anything else. (laughter) If he had no unconscious he couldn't fall asleep because what does falling asleep mean? No that state of consciousness is replaced by a state of unconsciousness, relatively speaking. So if there was no unconscious to replace the conscious state, well they had to stay awake and at rest. (laughter)

This is what is said, at least by later writers, if not the Buddha.

Citta pmla Is this the experience of more spiritually developed people, that

S. not disturbed by unpleasant dreams.

Ratna prabha I wonder if, it's often said I think, that the Buddha, during one of the watches of the night teaches to Devas. Could this refer to what we call dreaming, but in the Buddha's case it was entering a different realm.

S. Yes, I have actually mentioned this point. That is a possible way of looking at the Buddha's, as it were, dream experience. That it was sort of transformed or transfigured and that he had what in our experience appears as dreams, I mean, forms ? dreaming in the Buddha was a sort of archetypal experience, or experience of a sort of archetypal realm and that, you know, his teaching the Devas might have represented a sort of equivalent of a dream like experience, in which he as it were, well. The teaching of the sort of, represent a sort of process of communion with himself, in his own sort of enlightened mind, during his sleep. One could look at it, perhaps, in that sort of way.

Voice To the opposite end of the scale, an insomniac, a person that doesn't sleep all the time, would you say that was due to disturbed or sort of

S. Well I don't know much about insomnia, but I, from what I've gathered, just here and there, it does seem that people who suffer from severe insomnia are usually people who are psychologically disturbed.

(pause)

It can, of course, be due to more simple reasons like lack of physical exercise. Is there much insomnia in the F.W.B.O.?

w'~ &}{(~

Deva mitra I'm afraid I'm one of the worst.

S. Oh dear! Lack of physical exercise?

Deva mitra I don't think so.

S. Overactive imagination? (laughter)

Deva mitra It does vary actually on the conditions.

S. Well some people need less sleep than others and you may be awake, just because you don't need the sleep, sometimes that happens.

Voice I know, I m pretty certain I need less sleep than a lot of people but even so, I sometimes find, almost, I mean, I ve spent whole successions of nights completely awake virtually. Sometimes three or four nights in succession.

S. That's quite unusual.

Suvajra It does seem that which ever centre you go to there's always somebody who is insomniac.

S. I certainly know that there are people who talk in their sleep because sometimes they occupy the rooms underneath mine, or next to mine, (laughter) or sometimes some you can hear from the other side of the building. (raucous laghter)

Some people, I'm used to - I keep some distance away from. I mean,



S. especially if you're a light sleeper as I am. Sometimes there are statements made in their sleep that are quite interesting. Though one doesn't necessarily want to listen to those things at two and three o'clock in the morning. (laughter) Whereas, the classic, the classic case was Lokamitra who shouted in his sleep once when he was occupying the room underneath mine. I think it was Sofla's room. He shouted out, 'What the F.W.B.O. really needs is a completely new constitution!' (laughter). He used to take yoga classes in his sleep. (laughter) Once, I remember when I was in the army, there were some of the N.C.O.s who used to be taking their squads in their sleep, for drill. (laughter).

Citta pMa Did that have any effect upon the sleepers?

S. Well, if it wasn't an N.C.O. there, you could throw a boot at whoever was talking. (laughter)

Su

vaira I did hear Brian Rogers saying, 'I've told you about this before

S. Padmaraja told me about this before, yes. Well you should have asked what's waking' or'sleeping'. (laughter). Well Pause

Su

va~ra Subhuti was a ? ?

S. Oh. I mean there was the scream or shout when he was introduced to one of his lecturers on a famous occasion, (laughter) beating his chest at the same time. (laughter) but that was an order

"").~ C-, ;~ '-~'~

S. convention.

Ratna prabha I think it was an order/mitra.

S. Order/Mitra. Yes it was actually.

S Yes, yes ? for the benefit of the mitras perhaps.

Citta pmla It's been videod for prosperity.

S. Oh, well that's interesting. We ? to see that.

(Pause with chuckles)

Anyway, we ve covered quite a bit of ground with regard to priti. Perhaps we'd better leave it there for this morning and keep the remaining trivia down as our remaining two factors for tomorrow - especially as we don't have very much left to do.

(long pause , shuffles etc.)

Deva mitra When you say you think that, um, when you thought that possibly

insomnia was symptomatic of some kind of ps){hological disturbance - in what sense did you mean that?

S. Well I was only speaking then of just vaguely remembering people like, knowing an insomniac or just reading things about an insomniac in magazines or newspapers. Disturbed?

Well what does one mean by people being psychologically disturbed in general anyway?  
Either very very worried or neurotic,

n ~ 1/4 ~~

S.       obsessive.

(Pause)

I don't know what the state of research upon insomnia is at present or what it's supposed to be due to.

Do you know anything about it?

Deva

mitra No, well, I've read one or two books about insomnia. One of them says that usually insomnias tend to exaggerate the amount of sleep they miss.

S.       Ah yes.

Deva mitra They don't, they don't act, they feel they've stayed up awake all night, but actually they haven't. It's just that you keep waking up.

I've tested myself against that - if I think probably I did have an exaggerated view of the amount of sleep I missed, but also, I'm pretty certain sometimes I've virtually missed a whole night in spite of that.

S.       So that's all that these books say about the causes of insomnia? This is not even a cause.

Deva

mitra No. It's more of a description. I can't remember, I just read one book actually on insomnia which Kularatna gave me. He's somebody else who's suffered from it. There's quite a lot

of order members have actually. &~~~'i~i~:r'&~' ~7I~~L~\~~~~'(~L'l~~~~&j ?rti~i~~i° (cn \X~ V?~f t?) ~r~~ ~C'&\$~ L~~~(46~~ I

S. ~~~ D they worry a lot?

~ K

w') 1)'C

P~f1~n%i4+(c~'I do!

\_\_\_\_\_ I mean, Naga, I mean I know Nagabodhi has had cause to stay awake all night. (laughter), so has Dhamm~dinna (laughtbter) - also Parami (laughter) in various ways hm..

As for Kularatna, I suppose because he stu~ies~was when he was living at Vajrakula. I don't know w~ther he still does suffer from it.

Voice I have read in a book on dreams that one cause is fear of dreaming. In other words if people tend to have very frightening dreams, then they may simply be unable to get to sleep because they're afraid of re-entering those dreams, especially recurring ones.

S. Yes.

Voice My dreams are very boring.

S. Boring? Well maybe you're afraid of being bored. (laughter)

Voice Maybe. (pause)

Ratna Or perhaps fear of unconsciousness I think is another thing that prabha it mentions.

S. Yes. I have a theory that sometimes one may be prone to insomnia if one is too much out of touch with one's emotions. It's as though the emotions are nearer to the unconscious than is the intellect. If you don't experience much in the way of the  
[341]  
Page 13

S. emotions it's as though you've got no means of access to the unconscious and therefore it's more difficult to fall asleep. One might try reading poetry or something like that or making sure one is in a definite emotional state before going off to sleep. An emotional state rather than an intellectual state.

If you have to read don't read philosophy. Go and read something of the nature of poetry which is emotionally stimulating or go to bed after a puja - straight, straight to bed after a puja, assuming that one has been emotionally stimulated by the puja.

Deva mitra I suffered quite badly when I first got here, but actually, since the first couple of weeks, it's not bothered me.

S. Oh that's interesting.

Deva mitra Well, I have noticed sometimes I find it quite difficult to settle into new places.

S. Oh, I personally don't. It doesn't seem to affect me at all. I can sleep well in the strangest beds, so to speak. Well I needed to in India - a new bed every night - for weeks on end, so to speak.

Pause

but that never has bothered me. Pause

Anyway, we'll leave it till tomorrow. Tomorrow will be our

last day.

Various sounds.

,)

"N,

S. All right page twentyfive

Long pause

Voice We'd got up to the end of joy, I think, last time.

S. Yes, yes.

Voice So we've actually got to start at, at tranquility.

S. Yes right, we were on tranquility.

Someone like to read that paragraph, just to get us back into it?

~~~~j~~~t~i~~!'When the enlightenment factor of tranquility is present, he knows, The enlightenment factor of tranquility is in me.

When the enlightenment factor of tranquility is absent, he knows, "The enlightenment factor of tranquility is not in me," and he knows how the arising of the non-arisen enlightenment factor of tranquility comes to be, and how perfection in the development of the arisen enlightenment factor of tranquility comes to be.'

S. So, as I think I mentioned yesterday 'tranquility' is to be regarded in a rather special sense, that is to say, the dying away or the dying down of the purely physical manifestations or priti, hm. So that what one has left is simply a state of, what one might describe as calm bliss. Bliss or sukha is not specially mentioned here, as it is in the sequence of the twelve positive nidanas, but it is definitely due to be understood, and it's because of that, er, calm or

S. stable bliss that concentration is able to be developed. Do you see the connection?

Voices Mmm.

S. In other words, in this context, concentration, or samadhi is seen that, as something that, naturally arises when you're perfectly happy. When you're not happy you, you go looking for something else. There'll be some kind of restlessness, some kind of disturbance, some kind of evading. But to the extent that you are happy, to that extent you are concentrated.

(long pause)

'C ti~~t~~ Lt~L<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Ie~'~~ t~C'j~ ~ " Ct~~':kc'tc)

Citta ,p,ala Can I just come in there? I wanted to return to, to energy,

just briefly. Em, pamojja comes before priti in the list of the twelve positive nidanas and you also said in 'The Three Jewels' that as you pass from pamojja to priti, it marks the, going from the kamaloka to the rupaloka

S. Ah, right, yes.

Citta pmla Which would indicate that is one 5 normal state, walking around in the world. One would actually be manifesting pamojja as sort of the highest em, manifestable, em

S. . . degree of joy.

Citta

Zmaa Degree of joy. (laughing) degree of your attainments of higher,

Citta

pula the higher

S. Yes, yes.

Citta ~ Is that actually the case? So that, I mean even people who are quite able to enter into these higher states of the nidanas, would actually only be OL/~ <ib pamo~~a.



S. It depends, because clearly, I mean to the extent that you're absorbed in Gliyanas, yoia~r~ very deeply absorbed, tl~at w~'olves the suspension of any physical activities. So there's a certain level of dhyana that can be obtained only when you actually are seated, and that if external activities start up~well to that extent the dhyana is disturbed and you revert to a lower mode of consciousness, eh. So that one could perhaps say that pamojja is the, the highest state that you can experience as regards mundane consciousness, because vipassana is a different matter. Before you have to, as it were, immobilize yourself by way of seated meditation, in order to go further you probably could say that. Then of course the question arises, well, priti, - priti comes later. People do manifest priti even without being in a state of dhyana But anyway, this is answered, I think, in my account of the stages of the path, where different levels of priti are distinguished. I think five different levels so, the lowest levels are certainly compatible with ordinary waking consciousness, and just moving around in the world. But we've seen that perhaps the, the

highest are not. But the, you know ( )

in the higher, is the case of those higher levels of priti, very t~ ?~~e(~Y deep ,¼T, as it were, blocked energy, eh are

r~ ~~

S. attacked and, well, according to Buddhaghosa's account, may result in actual levitation and this is supposed to be the reason why some people levitate in meditation - it's excess of priti.

This can happen apparently without them, in a sense, in a sense knowing what is happening. That

rise from the meditation seat, due to excess priti, but without awareness of the external surroundings. That would seem to be according to tradition, the most extreme form of priti possible. Even that subsides eventually.

Pause.

One mustn't perhaps think of all these factors as sort of hard and fast stages. That it's only when you come to the particular stage that you experience priti in any form, do you see what I mean? This would seem to be the level of perfection because it says here, C~ ~~{~~,, every factor, 'he knows how the arising of the non-arising enlightenment factor of tranquility comes to be, and how perfection in the development of the

arising enlightenment factor of tranquility comes to be'

Citta pmla      Is the Pali term for energy here, virya'?

S.      Well there is no Pali term for energy in our sense. I mean, when we speak in terms of energy, we're discussing spiritual life, in modern terms. There is no equivalent, I would say, to the general term energy because it's derived from science, and science in our sense of it, didn't exist at that time. It's ¼ the term That had been transferred from science to psychology, perhaps quite legitimately but that way of thinking was just not covered in the Buddha's day. So 'virya' is definitely not just

S.      energy in our, in the general sense in which we use the term energy but vigour.

Citta pffa      And the characteristic, the characteristic of fully developed virya is pamojja?

S.      I wouldn't say that because that would suggest again that virya doesn't develop any further. Or that you leave virya behind. But it's a, when virya reaches a certain point then it is possible for, for say to, to arise. Perhaps one should I mean, again one is misled by analogies or maybe by the wrong analogy or understanding the analogy the wrong way. It's not that you're on the , on the steps of a ladder, if you see what I mean, so that, you know, one quality is there, and it supports the next, but it, it just sort of remains where it was. Perhaps you should think in terms of er, this( ? ) in any case( ? ? ) you, perhaps you should think more in terms of shoots coming out of one another, on a plant. When a shoot reaches a certain degree of development from it there comes out another shoot, so the first shoot acts as a basis or support of the second shoot. But even though the second shoot has arisen, the first shoot goes on growing. Do you see what I mean.? And then out of the second shoot arises a third. But that second shoot and of course the first shoot, they continue growing in their own way too.

It's a bit more like that, that would be a more correct analogy.

Pause

6£~'r'~ 1t6) t~~'~~V~ You could even imagine the whole spray sort of --  
so that in the end you've got all say seven shoots fully

-- V?

S. developed, even though they did arise one by one. But they all now exist in a fully developed form, simultaneously, because as I pointed out at the beginning, the br~j~~~~~'~ are not only successive, eh, but they are also the constituents of, in their fully developed form, they are collectively constituent

of enlightenment.

Pause

Deva

mitra I wonder to what extent you can comply with that sort of way of looking at different formulations of the path. For instance you've got the twelve positive nidanas - to what extent are they constituents of enlightenment? I mean obviously, eh, dukkha is not - perhaps you could say that, it would, that the other stages were

S. Well, you might say, well, there faith is the enlightenment experience. In what sense is there faith? There can't be growth in the ordinary sense.

Deva mitra No, but presumably there is, there is a fullness of faith.

?&~&~m.~~ ~~- - must be there, in some way, because it's not just

I mean, it's a kind of confidence, in it

S. Well, it depends how you define faith, doesn't it. But i~ you regard faith as essentially a state of positive emotion, well, a state of positive emotion must be present in the Enlightenment, above all, eh. If not there, then where else, eh? But it doesn't quite take the form of faith, eh.

Citta Presumably in that, em, these constituents, elements of this, er ala

c~ "!"~

pala seven factors of enlightenment would differ, quite significantly from the way we would experience them as, em, part of constructions, or

S. Yes, you might even argue, for instance, em priti couldn't be there, em.... and therefore that tranquility couldn't be there, which is the subsistence of the physical manifestations eh. That would seem to be a by-product of actually following the path.

Citta pala So the, the enlightened person's experience of priti would be of a different order to the sort of priti which we would experience, going through dhyanas.

S. Yes. Yes. One could say - I mean, this is not said - but one could say that in the case of the enlightened person, the external manifestations of priti are his, you know, external activities in the world, out of the fullness of his compassion. One could say that, but even that is rather different from priti in the ordinary psychological sense. But no doubt there is something analogous to that sort of experience at that enlightened level.

Pause But I think what one must guard against is thinking of the path as something entirely separate from the goal. Or thinking of the succeeding stage as entirely separate from the preceding stage, in such a way that you leave behind the preceding stage. In other words, you take the analogy of a path or a ladder too literally em. Perhaps it's better to think more in terms

S. the unfolding of a glove, eh. Or, you know, as I said some time ago, with the successive unfolding of petals which eventually all stand complete around the central calyx.

S.: On to concentration then. we did start doing that, didn't we? I mentioned that where there was happiness, there was concentration; the external manifestation of Priti subsides, then one is left with Sukha, with bliss, steady, as it were, - when one is left with this aspect, one is left with concentration (Q. - ~iu's & t~K~ftt~n~ distinction between concentration in the sense of a forcible fixation - attention, and concentration in the sense of what you naturally experience when you are, at least for the time being, perfectly happy. You've got no wants, no restlessness, no desire.

Cittapala: Is there any significance to the fact that the term ~ru, ~rabJh for this particular - as opposed to Sukha to describe this particular

experience? iti&ko~tt' t~ -S()~tJ'~iq

£'b Sis.: \$) s%;;N7} i{%%{s~t~7~e %s~~\$e pr~rn~~ is what is left in priti

## 1.1 Sukha

but to a lesser degree because, so to speak, a lot of the energy was wasted in the external manifestation. Those have now subsided, so you've got only the Sukha left and that is also all the more steady and stronger for the withdrawal of those external manifestations. So Sukha is definitely implied here even though it's not specifically mentioned. Hm? In one context, the Buddha mentions four /P0,5aintaveinn1 andoa~~e5r Jontext he should have mentioned seven, this is not always easy to see. There are other passages in the Pali Canon where three or four of these factors are mentioned in the particular context. But the fullest is that of the 12 Nidanas, and it was in the 12 positive nidanas that upe~ is not mentioned. Th&t

is excluded, it is certainly implied. (Pause) And equanimity is the last of these bodhyangas. If one is considering them as a series, well, here if anywhere, one finds the, as it were, transcendental element in the series. So that means that upekk~4s regarded in a very lofty light. It's understood in a very lofty sense. In other words, it is this equanimity which transcends all the pairs of opposites. The lack of

equanimity is based upon oscillation between pairs of opposites. - ~er ~ t~th- I mean equanimity would be)no longer any oscillation between any pair of

opposites however r~~n~~, however subtle, even those between existence and non-existence, being and non-being, Enlightenment and non-Enlightenment. (Long pause)

Ratnaprabha: I think earlier you used the term 'transcendental axiality'?

S.: Yes, I used that in the Three Jewels, actually.

SPS 16

S.: You know what an axis is? It's something which something else turns~ (t~t~ axis o~

tt% ecu~~therefore something absolutely stable, absolutely  
secure, absolutely firm.

\_\_\_\_\_: Would you use the figure of Ratnasambhava to~'Jrj)~';

~4~~fLn '-~~~~ S.: You could~ in as much as Ratnasambhava is associated with  
the  
of equality, yes, yes. You see, as it were, - as equal. (Pause)

-Th-Ratnarabha: So this is the same term ~ LI~&\*~ is used u~ the four&  
brahmavihara~? (S.: Yes it is.) Is it meant in the same sense?

S.: That's very difficult to say because in what sense is the term used in connection with  
the four Brahmavihara52~ ~ll the Brahmaviharas have been debased or devalued ~  
~rn~~tI''mQ~ern times. But I would say, that strict- ly speaking,, they can be regarded as  
more or less overlapping. In other words, I would so to speak, upgrade the fou~~rahmavihara  
because it is said quite specifically, even in existing tradition, that upeksha is developed by  
considering that one has an equal n~tta, an equal r~~runa, for all living beings. So if you  
really have that, you really are not making any distinct- ions, so that would be a very high  
level of experience indeed. IF 5)~'-~ 6~~~~~ genuinely not distinguishing between yourself  
and others ~ou are

the wisdom of Ratnasambhava.

Harshaprabha: So would this equanimity, filter back onto the previous six..?

S.: Well, one could say that it would filter back, in the sense that the Prajna  
filters back onto or into the previous six paramitas and makes them truly paramitas, one could  
say that if one regarded

as a series. (Pause) In other wo~ds~ equanimity as it filters back would have the  
effect of stabilizing all the other qualities, all the other yangas. (Long Pause)

Then in the last paragraph of that sub-section, the same formula is repeated h~ (t'~e~  
L~n~mpiOh'flcj n1~~ O~dtC~ ;n~'Th--ttf\$bJ~c\*S,,tcomes down to ~o~~niplai''t'9j  
~rignation and ok;issolution ~~~rs t~nmental objects and then there is a note 26 which  
says: "Just the conditions conducive to the origination and dissolution of the factors of  
Enlightenment tc)(np(~ M~~ ofl'cjtfIC4)~& wI'ct JA~s~U4~~% -- factors here."

In the parThraph b#re the Buddha said nothing about )issolution of Enlightenment  
factors. Do you see that? So it would seem that the formula in this particular paragraph  
could apply not to the Enlightenment factors themselves, but to the whole of the preceding

section 4 On the -ontem-

55% SPS 16

plation of ~ntal &bljects because this contemplation of dissolution factors or ~igation and o(issolution factors, it doesn't apply in the case of the 7 Bodhyangas. Do you see that?

Ratnaprabha: This is not the final section on the mental objects~ (~ L-tfi

~~~~ot \*t refer to the whole lot tt W~w~~ bQ ft~LJ n~l~ 4 ttLt- Qt~,

S.: That's true. And then we have the 4 Noble Truths, don't we? And also the form#K the 4 Noble Truths, is very brief, in a way, suspiciously brief, and again doesn't follow the pattern. Some scholars, as I've mentioned before, are of the opinion that the original discourse was, as it were, simpl~rand with fewer categories. Perhaps there was a temptation to include more and more categories under this heading, huh? It could be that it hadn't really ended there, but if it didn't end there then clearly, there's a repeti~on of that, as it were, refrain, without any change, although it is inappropriate in this particular case - in the case of the 7 Bodhyangas. Do you see that? Hmm?

Ratnaprabha: So there aren't any G&ssolution factors for the Bodhyangas, - is that what you're saying?

S.: Well~ no dissolution factors are mentioned. The text jt&-[& ~()£&~~ c~~ Thet~ as developing and being ~r~&~~ You see that's rather significant.

(Pause)

Gunapala So did you go against the note, note 26? About A~~ssolution factors of Enlightenment?

S.: The note doesn't in a sense, make sense. "Just the conditions conducive to the origination and the ~issolution of the factors of Enlightenment corttprise the Origination~and-cl(issolution-factors here." It doesn't really make sense, because there's a paragraph that is dealing with the Bodhyangas makes no mention of Dissolution factors at all.

Gunapala: So we can add that Equanimity then has all the other 6 limbs, as it were, Enlightenment factors, within it?

S.: One could look at it like that. It's as though all the Bodhyangas are considered essentially

in their highly developed form, in which they, as it were, merge with Equanimity, and are permanently stabilized.

SPS 16            s~s

Ratnaprabha: Presumably one could see, at least the earlier stanzas as dissolving . They're not just ~~~nm6M\~&.&Xt?) So presumably, even technically

- t~n~e-c~tD would be factors influencing dissolution?

S.: But even, that being the case, it is even more surprising that the Assolution factors aren't referred to in the same way, I mean, as is the case with the previous

Cittapala: Is that something to do with the paragraph in the introduction that said on the basis of the development of 4 foundations of mindfulness, the Bodhyangas

S.: Yes, that could be. In that case of course, one would be regarding them all as existing simultaneously or emphasizing their simultaneity, as constituents of Bodhi, not as a series of leading up to Bodhi. But clearly the serial element is present to some extent., otherwise it would make nonsense of Priti and prasrabdi because they clearly represent a process. (Long Pause) One might say that the 7 Bodhyangas constitute quite a useful check list - one can actually ask ~ne~self - to what extent is Mindfulness present, in one? To what extent there is To what extent there is virya? To what extent there is Priti and so on. A day in which you didn't find any of these present is a very bad day indeed.

Ratnaprabha: A day in which you found them all present would be an extra- ordinary good day. (Laughter)

S.: That would be your Enlightenment day! (Laughter) If you found them all fully present.

Ratnaprabha: it talks about, as it always has about concentrating these externally and internally.

S.: Yes, again one is not sure whether a sort of formula could not be mechanically carried forward by the editors. You see what I mean? Regardless of whether it's appropriate or not - that does sometimes seem to happen. But perhaps one could contemplate them existing in others. Supposing one was to almost take that very seriously, well, how would it work out in fact? What would you do about it? Would you just sort of note in the people that you met or people that you pass in the street, whether these Yangas were developed or not? What would you do if you were to take that statement quite literally and seriously? Would it apply for instance say, just within a spiritual community?



Cittapala: in effect you'd be rejoicing in their merits, in some form or other.

Gunapala: You'd have quite a high sensitivity.

S.: Hmm, Yes, it would certainly presuppose that. it would suggest here, if you take it quite literally that it is actually a practice, just as it is a practice to contemplate for instance whether mindfulness is present in you and to what extent. There is a practice to contemplate whether mindfulness is present in other people and to what extent. So how positively can one take that? How useful is it? Does one see any usefulness in it? Because it would seem to be no less required if one takes the actual wording of the text.

Devamitra: Presumably if you wish to (be aware) of other people, you are quite concerned for them.

S.: There is no mention of concern here. There's nothing even to suggest that. There's a bare statement: "contemplating mental objects internally and externally" the personalities, so to speak, of other people.

Devamitra: So do you think that it can't really be taken that seriously?

S.: Well, I'm wondering, on the face of it whether I won't say consciously - but it hasn't been traditionally. I mean meditation teachers never stress this, as far as I know. You're aware of the in and out breath - in and out of other people, I mean, is this ever really mentioned? It isn't as far as I know. But the text mentions it. So have we sort of lost something or neglected something? Has something been lost on the way? This is what I'm perhaps wondering, or is it simply a formula that has been carried forward by the editors without really knowing what they were doing or understanding the implications of that.

Cittapala: If you equate Upeksa with an upgraded form of *metta*, perfection, to develop the Brahmavihara to perfection, presumably you must have developed Metta, Karuna, and Mudita which would in Pali - . . . an outgoingness which would perhaps be characterized more by previous stages.

S.: Yes. Well, for instance, as has been pointed out before, that perhaps in Theravada Buddhism, certainly more in Theravada Buddhism, for instance the whole conception of Kalyana Mithata has been rather forgotten. Or at least not given the emphasis it seems to have been given by the Buddha. And

then there is the fact i think i mentioned in the talk "The Case of Dysentary" theBL1a~a~s that had Ananda with him or some other personal attendant as we're

told, which again suggests that the Buddha attached importance to Kalyana Mitrata. in other words, Buddhism was perhaps not as self-centred and individualistic and some people often think it was, and perhaps there is something of that sort here. Perhaps there was originally some meaning or significance in living contemplating objects externally. Perhaps that was meant to be taken quite seriously. Perhaps it is a whole tradition and practice that has been lost, is what i~ondering

But if so, then how actually did one go about it?, so to speak.

Harshaprabha: There's the Zen story about the Master and a hopeful pupil turning up and the pupil went to the Master and the Master asked very simple questions: Where did you leave your umbrella? At what side of the hall did you leave your shoes? And in a sense, on the basis of that he in fact rejected him.

S.: But that's a rather special case because the Master is not doing that exactly as part of his own personal spiritual practice. He wants to ascertain just where the pupil stands. But yes, certainly, in the case of the pupil coming to the Master for instruction, the Master would need to know exactly where he stood in regard to Mindfulness and emotional positivity, and so on.

The text doesn't seem to be envisaged in that sort of special case, if you see what i mean. it would seem to be regarding "contemplating mental objects externally" as no less necessary in the case of one's own individual practice than contemplating them internally.

Cittapala: But if you were trying to develop Metta for somebody, would there be anything wrong in contemplating, say, the element of Priti or the element of Virya, in them?

S.: Well, no, because that would help you to appreciate them and presumably feel positive emotion towards them. But this is never stressed nowadays,- it's never taught. So i'm wondering, well, at present there is just a bringing forward of a formula that one needn't take too seriously, or whether in fact, the formula does represent a whole aspect of spiritual practice which had been lost in the case of

Devamitra: it may not have been emphasized, in the Theravada,

SPS 16

in contemporary times, or even a long time, but it does remind me of a little bit of Santideva's

teaching of 'the self and others'. (S.: Yes) So...

S.: Yes. Even when it comes down to practice, - the Mahayana very often practices in a sort of Hinayana way, if you see what I mean? Because it has inherited certain practices from the Hinayana - it doesn't so much practice in its own way.

Voice: i'm not sure I understand....

S.: Well supposing you are in the Mahayana, you've got this practice - of the Four Satipattanas, the 7 Bodhyangas, but I rather suspect that Tibetan Buddhist or technically Mahayanist would practice in exactly the same way as the modern Theravacist - not taking seriously this contemplation of mental objects, externally. in other words, that what it means by saying that the usual Mahayanist would practice in a Hinayana way.

Devamitra: Yes, but presumably, Santideva, would have - taking what he was saying, seriously

S.: Yes, but that's his speaking in a different context, or even on a different level, isn't he?

Devamitra: Yes, he's speaking very Bodhisattva-like but isn't it in principle almost the same, almost amount to same Sort of p~inciple...

S.: In principle, yes, but even in the Mahayana, one doesn't find an actual practice of the Bodhyangas stressing contemplating mental objects externally. it's as though in the Mahayana, the ideal may be altruistic but the details of the practice tend to remain in some cases, especially in the case of those practices carried over from the Hinayana, more self-centred.

Ratnaprabha Can you think of any examples from the Pali Canon, which might hint that people did practice sort of these external contemplations?

S.: I can't offhand, but it would be thatcombing through the Pali Canon, that one might discover such hints. That's quite possible.

(End of Tape)

[357]

TAPE 17\*

S: But leaving that aside er how would one actually practice living contemplating

mental objects in mental objects externally. How would one actually do it...? I mean one might find it can't be done and one could only (2 words unclear) in such a general way that, well in fact it isn't done um.. .but it's very I mean for instance in the case of your . say awareness of one's own breath, well, you can definitely be aware of your own breath if you count your breaths eh.. .but you can't quite do that sort of thing with regard to another person's breath. Do you see what I mean? So how do you apply that in the case of the breathing of the other person eh.. .?.and so on for all these other practices externally.... ?

Gunapala: Even if you do them in your own imagination it would still be internal

S: Yes. Yes. Yes but then the text does mention contemplating externally.... so it must have some sense. ...at least in some context

Cittapala: It's obviously a lot more difficult in some respect to actually be aware of somebody else's .unless your standing sort of half an inch away from them, but I mean I would have thought the respect of the other erm... .the other aspect, if you really get to know somebody very well then.. then you do stand a chance of being able to.. .to come to.. .be able to contemplate... .er.. .in a .. . their feelings and mental objects...

S: It occurs to me that the only sort of context in which this would make sense would be something like say a communication exercise Do you see what I mean...? where you did get very close to the other person both literally and metaphorically and you were able to monitor his changes of mental state in much the same way that you are able to monitor your own eh...um

Surata: It does happen to some extent... to some degree that doesn't it. ...in.. .like our communities because I mean if your continually living and working with the same people, you do get to know to some extent what sort of mental state they're in

S: On the other hand on the other hand, the beginning of the text speaks of the monk of going to the forest or to the foot of a tree or to an empty place... (laughter).. ..So, does one invalidate the other...? I mean which are you to take more seriously, as it were (laughter)... It doesn't go taking along a friend presumably eh. . . .perhaps it does but the text doesn't actually say so

Ratnaprabha: But you have talked about carrying on the practice into ordinary life as is suggested by this certainly er econd to the bodily... (2 words unclear) as well, and walks up and down... .he's aware of natural functions and things

S: Yes. Yes that's true.. .Yes.

Gunapala: Maybe it's something to do when you come out of your sitting practice....out of the sitting state

S: Um. ..So as far as I know this topic has never been discussed by any Theravada author. I've never even heard it discussed or considered.

CONTINUED.

Devamitra: This is half the teaching in the sutta

S: This is half the teaching in the sutta (laughter).. Maybe I'll have to look up those sub-commentaries and see whether there's anything there, because in "The Way of Mindfulness", Bhikhu Soma has translated a sub-commentary with some notes it might be useful to consult that....but I wouldn't mind betting er....that he~nothing to say about this at all. Which means in fact, he hasn't read the text carefully even though he's translated it!!

Devamitra: Maybe he just doesn't feel up to it

S: Urn Urn

Suvajra: What about this way you had of looking at it earlier on in the seminar looking at it more like yourself from the outside. I mean there is a tradition in the Tibetan tradition er...of external visualisation and internal visualisation. Could there be a connection there ? \*

S: Um.. .it could be (pause)... .But I mean that... .alright with regard to the breath but does it. . is there any difference on the mental level, you know, between contemplating N~S isn't really ( Th ~?c(4~'~d. . .So externally here in this context at least, must mean another person. In other words, it means if you take the teaching at all seriously, you've got to take other people much more seriously than the Theravada usually does. I mean for instance erm in the case of the corpse meditations eh. . . you're... the external contemplation is, in a way, more important than the internal one eh.. um... I mean in fact, the internal contemplation is, in a sense, based on the external contemplation isn't it, because you contemplate the corpse at a certain stage of decomposition... you say well, "I will be like t1~t", you apply it to yourself .h.... so from learning that particular exercise at least, you know, er. ... .... the contemplation of. .. externally, is clearly existing, it clearly has a place, quite a big place.

Perhaps it's significant that i~ only when the other person is a corpse that the Theravada takes him seriously eh (laughter) Do you see what I mean? But that is so isn't it eh. . . .eh. if we go back .... .um.. . the night cemetery contemplation "And further monks, if a monk sees a body dead etc etc he then applies this perception to his o~vn body" .... . .... "Thus he lives contemplating the body in the body internally, or lives contemplating the body in the body externally". So there's the same old formula eh.. . .first internally then externally but in the practice i~s external followed by internal .~... Do you see that..?

Voices: Urn Um

~: So that example will itself suggest that .... there is an aspect of spiritual practice, you know, where one does bring in the other person.~ Here in this particular section that is taken quite seriously. In fact it's a central part of the practice in a sense yeh..'. But why not else where ? Gurapala: There doesn't seem to be any reason why not

S: In the ~tathayana there....even there is this, you know, practice of 'rejoicing in merits', I mean there does seem to be some connection in 'rejoicing in merits' and say being a~~re of positive qualities the Bodhi~an~~ as developed by another person. So it could be that...

CO~~I~~UEi) er...you know, the Theravada ought to be a bit more 'other' regarding in its spiritual practice than it has been for many centuries.

Ratnaprabha: Do you think we could even/Say regard it - as Surata hinted - you know, as say we're living in a community, in a successful spiritual community where we're all meditating together and we're sort of feeling the an~, as it were, one by one almost, arising in all of us. So it's feeling, first of all, more and more mindfulness in the community, more and more investigation in the community... more.. and energy in the whole community... and so on, right up as far as you want to go

S: Yes. Yes. Yes tkn

Harshaprabha: Could this. .. could it also tie tip ~~~ith the fact that Buddhism, until recently, has been very inward-looking .... its never really, you know, gone outward ?

S: It could do so except there's a little contradiction, because some of the most outward looking and outward going Buddhists in modern times have in fact been Theravadins...er...well...one could mention Anagarika Dharmapala in this connection but he wasn't an orthodox Theravadin at all. But you know, a lot of Theravada Buddhists have been very outward going... one has to recognize that. Some of our, you know, Mahayana Buddhist friends don't, though technically inspired by the Bodhisattva Ideal, haven't been outward going at all. Not in modern times anyway. (pause) Not until they were pushed out of Tibet by the Chinese eh... then they went straight to California most of them... (laughter).

Tarshaprabha: How about (the?) simple point of view of friendship. Is that how (3 words unclear)

S: Anyway, perhaps we better stick with what the text says because it says, "Contemplating mental objects in mental objects externally." So, perhaps we better give a bit more attention to what that might mean if one took that seriously. It does seem that it's difficult to take it seriously in the broadest context huh... but you could, perhaps, take it very seriously within the context of the spiritual community or most of all within the context of a one to one relationship with another person. A relationship of quite intense Kalyana Mitrata or mutual Kalyana Mitrata eh

Gunapala: A little story that springs to my mind, I think with Sariputta and Moggallana was it....?

S: ...Yes... Yes.

Gunapala: where they were always together and er...one of them would see some demon bonking the other on the head or something - but they always seem to be sort of, well one of them - has some sort of awareness of the other all the time. They did seem to sort of work together in that way giving each other advice, contemplating each other externally.

S: Yes. ... that's true...

~~~~pala: Could you then say then that these Bodhianga~s could be sort of aspects or ~pictures of.. of the Love Mode....?

S:~ well, I suppose one could, but to the extent that all, you

COUTIIJUKTh. know, spiritual practices and experiences are forms of the Love mode rather than the Power Mode

~evamitra: To what... coming back to this question on faith and contemplating externally .... I wondered really to what extent you could succeed to do this anyway with even within a spiritual community which is functioning quite ~~~~. You've been commenting yourself just how difficult it is to get to know other people

S: Well, of course, so many people find it difficult to practice even internally, with regard to their own-selves. So I think the fact of difficulty, you know, need not, in a sense, deter us because of this one difficulty....

Richard Clayton: Seems like it might be fraught with danger though, if one's one sort of gets into interpreting how another person's feeling (and their communication?) ?

S: But, I mean, it doesn't say anything about interpreting but just contemplating, really knowing, really seeing. It doesn't even say discuss him or point out to the other person it just says contemplating him...(pause). That's being aware of!'

Richard Clayton: It might.... it could arise quite easily, you could see that one did

interpret the (7 words unclear)....

S: But then one has to take that risk. I mean there are many circumstances under which we might feel the need to say something to somebody else, give them some advice. It could be a question of mis- understanding on your part, but you don't refrain giving the advice out of that abstract fear. But it's true that within a community one does become aware of other people's mental states both individually and collectively. I mean, I've noticed at Padmaloka, you know, one always knows when there's a retreat going on eh... because it makes such a difference with the atmosphere. Even when not everybody in the community is on that retreat. When there is a retreat going on on the premises there's a definite difference of atmosphere. Not just when people are meditating but all the time. You can certainly give that up. And if you know someone very well and you know what their mental state is, you know, without anything being said you can sometimes know even when not in the same room there's a change in their mental state and you know that

Gunapala: It's more intuitive

S: ...Um. ...?

Gunapala: A bit more intuitive. It would be quite a bit. Is this contemplation externally quite an intuitive thing then? It could be I suppose..."

S: Well it has to be either intuitive - intuitive means direct rather than indirect eh - rather than say inferred - .... because you're not sort of reasoning from what you observe back to your mental state, you're picking up, so to speak, on the mental state directly. So to that extent it is intuitive. You're not saying well, "He's got a disagreeable expression, I infer, therefore, that his mental state is one of anger". It's not like that. You don't reason from the expression to the mental state. You pick up directly on the mental state. You might not be looking at that person, but you feel the 'vibe' as it were... (laughter). You can feel the [361]

vibe coming through the door even before the person comes through the door sometimes eh some people are quite good at sending their vibes through the door before they're in

Voices: Oh right Yes (laughter)

S: But, perhaps, you know, we can take the fact that this fact - you know, contemplating externally occurs at all .... it's a reminder that there has been a bit of an imbalance creeping into a lot of traditional Buddhist spiritual practice in as much as it is too self-orientated. I think it's a bit of a reminder that there has been a bit of an imbalance creeping into a lot of traditional Buddhist spiritual practice in as much as it is too self-orientated. And if you are going to ... I mean if your aim is essentially to get rid of that Subject/Object duality, you are as justified in thinking in terms of the object as you are in thinking in terms of the subject eh....um. You can approach the non-dual via the object as justifiably - I almost said as easily but maybe that's not quite true - as you can via the subject. After all, it's a Subject/ Object duality that you're trying to get beyond.

Gunapala: Could you say that it would be unbalanced if you went continually from the Subject ?

S: You could say. . You could say. You could even say, you can't go just from the Subject... you can't just go from the Subject eh... to say ultimate Reality, you go from the Subject/Object duality itself to ultimate Reality. You have to transcend the Object as well as the Subject, but you. . you can only transcend together because they're mutually dependant - you can't transcend the one without transcending the other (pause).

Devamitra: From your knowledge of the Pali Canon, do you think that that lack of emphasis is within the Canon generally or is it more that specific suttas have been given particular emphasis.. erm. . or particular aspects of the teaching in the Pali Canon ?

S: I think it's both. I mean I think if one comes to the Pali Canon one can find .... you

know, passages. . . .er. . . which give, as it were, more positive interpretation of the Teaching. And like the...the two passages - and there are only two - which makes mention of the Th~elve Positive Nidana~ themselves eh...I mean as twelve. ... other passages just mention a selection of them. And it~ also true that a certain text had been given undue - or perhaps undue - emphasis and that those texts don't include any of these more positive passages.

Ratnaprabha: Although even in a text like this which has been given a lot of emphasis, it seems that a hint at least has be~n ignored

S: Yes. es. I imagine if you were to ask11eir6 say a well informed Theravada Bhi~ u what he made of this .... he probably would think, "Ah well, you just have to realize that, well, ot~jer people do breat~or oter people might be mindful or might not", but I don't think he's th~s~ktvery seriously about how it could be a spiritw~~l practice or

CO1~fTINTffid. why it had not been taken so seriously, why the external aspect had not been taken as seriously as the internal aspect .h.... And I think hc'd probably wonder what we were bothering about eh. . . (pause, It is as though even the editors of this sutta - one can't say The Buddha Himself - but even the editors,. . I mean they... they weren't, peri~aps, quite mindful of what they were doing because they do, I mean there's the footnote twenty-six draws attention to that because the text does speak of even contemplating the origination and dissolution practice eh.... though they've not been mentioned in connection with tne Bodhianga~ and therefore the note has to say, " Just the conditions conducive to the origination and dissolution of the Factors of Bnlightenment comprise the origination and dissolution of Pactors here", which is just.... well gobbledegook (laughter,) one may say. I mean it~ saying something but I don't know whether it's saying anything. Or if it has any meaning its a... a non-sensical meaning

Ratna~rabha: It doesn't quite appear to be non-sensical but it aT)pears to be tauto)cgical rather

S: Yes its tautqjogical... yes in that sense

Ratnaprabha: than non-sensical

Suvajra: ;hat is tautoJogical ? S: It just repeats itself Suvajra: ... Oh

S: ... But it's no its even non-sensical actually, as well as being (everybody joins in) tauto logical... (laug~ter), because it's ~ju~t the conditions conducivea t9 the origination and diss- olution of the ~ctors of Inl~ght~nm~nt, :i~ Y't) dissolution factors have been mentioned eh... have ben comprised the origination eh... ~o it's both non-sensical and tauto logical...(laughter). I'll look ~p a few...er a couple of works when I ge'~back to Padmaloka. One is Nyanaponika's "Heart of Buddhist Meditation"... lets see if he says anyt~ftn~ ab~ut t~~at,... that's bas~ on the Satipatthana Sutta and then there is the ~y of Mindfulness" by Bhi~iu Soma...eh...

Devamitra: .I think we've got the "Heart of Buddhist Meditation" here

Suvajra: ... Yes

Devamitra: I could get it in the tea-break if....~~....

S: No. I think I'LL look it up when I get back. I'll have to read the whole thing through carefully, not jump to any conclusions.

Indeed, it just goes to show that one has to examine everthing very closely. You ca~n't take anything for granted.



Suvajra: In that this is a sort of erm... refrain that comes at the end of each section .... quite often refrains are common to the Pali Canon. Does this occur anywhere else that you know of....?

~: Not that I remember, but that doesn't mean anything with the Pali Canon is so vast!! (pause). In the refrain, "He lives detached and clings to noW'h,t in the world", that occurs in many ?~S~~e~ That's a quite stock, (extendable?) phrase.

COi~INUEb.

Devamitra: When you mentioned origin a few moments ago, you ~::~~de reference to the editors of the text, presumably that would be the

b: The -, yes. Or the redactors let us say. I mean they often did a good job but something they.. I mean they don't always seem to have fully understood that they were handing back... we shouldn't expect too much of it because it was all edited, so to speak, orally .... and they were.... they were much more concerned with the preservation of the oral tradition as it had come down to them by some means or other.... it's clearly difficult to do a sort of 'critical job' when you're having to remember everything and repeat it eh when you just don't have it on a written....written on a printed page eh Do you see what I mean?

Ratnaprabha: Could that evenK&emeant that they neglected the practice of some of these suttas in favour of the remembering of them... if you see what I mean.

S: ~ll, this has been suggested that for... for several hundred years.....that the main energies of the Sangha went into actually preserving eh... er... which meant memorising and repeating the traditions. perhaps more than actually practicing them. That is quite a point isn't it, because a.. a quite vast literature was preserved with a reasonable degree of accuracy for several centuries entirely by oral means.

Cittapala: When you say with a reasonable degree of accuracy, ..... how do you know that....?

S: UM ?

Cittapala: How does one....how does..how is it ascertained whether the.. the accuracy is so....?

S:: Well, for instance, there are no anachronisms~ that we've been able to find, we've... in the older texts eh... I mean there are no later interpretations eh...because I mean manners and customs change and that can be checked up on... and I mean we don't find that there are any interpolations of that sort in the older, you know, Pali texts. You get just a general (4 words unclear?) scholars in that they are upon the whole quite reliable....especially for0...historical information.

Cittapala: So, the fact that early texts don't differ from the later ones which were written down 2 or 300 years later

S: Ah.. No... Its not quite like that.. eh... we can distinguish even within the old tradition-- what we have now is a written tradition about ~OO years after The Buddha - .... different. or by ~OO years afterwards there were different versions of His Teaching.. had been written down... we have one of those-versions complete~~\$)the Pali Canon of the Theravadins. - ~o within that Canon as we have it, we ~n distinguish works of different c~~te4 .. there are few that would appear to have been packed written at the very end. some quite minor works included in the K~~d~~v~~ eh....But even those which

were transmitted orally eh, and eventually ~written do~ni, we we can distinguish different levels, different strata erm. . and we can distinguish some of those as early and some of these as later. Partly on linguistic grounds, partly on doctrinal grounds and we can see sometimes how a formulation has been elaborated and we can see - how the language has changed. ~o, I mean, the scholars have got a pretty good idea

CO?TTT~JTTAD. what is roughly old and what is roughly more recent .... but, you.... older within a different context and later within a different context of about 3/400 years. L~~~~ tto~Js - some of the( i~nci~~u~) criticism has been applied to the Pali Canon but not much, you ~now, there's a lot more to be done... (pause).

Of course, one of the ~ys in which one can get to know the. ... other people and be sort of. . . ..... as contemplate. ... erm. . mental objects externally, is by listening to their 'life-stories' I suppose

Voices: UM Utn Im

S: ml. I mean this listening to life-stories is something that we've developed in the F.W.B.O. isn't it...Much more so i~the last two or three ij~r~.?erhaps we don't fully realize the significance of that.... erm

Gunapala: It~ something quite rare. ... something quite new

S: .~ll, it is I mean does it happen in other spiritual groupsZ Do people tell their life-stories. I ~iean leaving aside the Evangelical Christians Tho tell how they were saved. In other Buddhist groups does it happen ? I'd be quite surprised if it did

Cittapala: There are some therapy groups in which they sort of have 'confessions' of some sort I don't know very much about it

S: . . You've got to make-up somet~ing dreadful if you don't do anything dreadful.. otherwise they say you're still suppressing things or not being very honest, so they event all sorts of dreadful things to see how honest yo~.being. But th~~~5 rather different, but we have ~~ this practice let's say ~p people telling their life-stories... .eh...haven't we eh... .eh...

So, what is the.....I mean that isn't just entertainment surely well, why do we do it ?

Devamitra: To get to know the other person

S: I suppose you do get to know the other person to some extent in that way also incidently, you know, especially as, you know, they approach their period of their involvement with the F.W.B.O. you get the chance of contemplating at least 1 or 2 Bodhian~\_S .... .um (laught&r).

Sur~ta: Actually, I really noticed it to some extent that some of us had been getting together in the evening to read.... er.... "Our Thkital ~ien .~.." together and even ju~t listening to somebody read a chapter, you can actually get quite a feel for them as a person. ... just the way they say the words they say

S: It...It's interesting that you've chosen that novel with that particular title anyway despite its bad grammar.".' (laughter).

Devamitra: You listened to life-stories last year as well on Tuscany... ?

S: ....I did indeed....Yes.

Devamitra: Did you have any contrasting experiences? I mean did they

CONTINUED. seem very different... or were they... (3/4 words unclear?). S: - Well, yes and no. Perhaps I don't have a proper basis for comparison .... inasmuch as last year they were on the whole much shorter. One group for instance~t through all its life-stories in one session. Yes. But again, that indicates that, in a way, life-stories are being taken more seriously because people feel it necessary now to go into them at much greater detail and much greater length eh Some, last year, were no longer than ten minutes....real summeries..'' But this year, some stretched over three sessions... (laughter)... Not three complete sessions but three sessions in a way....one complete session~nd two bits.. (laughter). So I... I...can't say that I've any general observation.

Devamitra: I was just wondering... I suppose I was wondering specifically about the question of inevitability

S: I can't remember thinking that last year, but it maybe simply because er...not so much detail was given in most cases it could be just that. Or it could be that I've just forgotten...or that the impression has faded....It could be that. But I certainly have had that impression of inevitability, so to speak, quite strongly this time ~~~t?t~~nc1 k' ?~cpl e~~ ti~~s~i~i'~<. In listening to the lives, well, about 2~~ of the way through it~s pretty clear exactly what was going to happen tj~~'tt(laughter)...If they were IULj~ . ...and I mean also another thing that struck me was er...I mean er.. ..how many people made their original contact with the F.W.B.O. as a result of a sort of accident eh. It could so easily have not happened.. so easily eh. ..um. If they hadn't been walking do~vn a certain street and seen a certain poster yeh they could, well, still have been, well, (lord?) only knows where..." (Someone?) could have been married with 3 children by this time.. ..Most of (them) probably..(l~ughter)

Gunapala: It is amazing th&-t most of us have got in this time lucky without that happening. It was seeing a poster or some little accident before we were actually settled down

S: Yes. Yes. Of course, you can do that quite quickly, I mean settle down and have a couple of kids and all could happen very quickly Indeed....yeh. I was thinking, well, since I've been back from India, a whole new generation has sprung up which is amazing because I remember because just after r~ arrival my sister who's younger than myself had her youngest daughter and one of my nep~~ttY~;had two boys and the~:(~ practically grown-up...and it seems astonishing that a whole generation has grown up since my return from India. It doesn't seem as long as that but it is.'

Devamitra: Nearly twenty years isn't it....?

S: Nearly twenty years Devamitra: (few mumbled words?)

S: Well, it's eighteen years... yes it's getting on to be as long as I was in India. (pause). Sometimes I think it's time a third phase opened-up.

Anyway (laughter)... it is practically tea-time so perhaps we will hold over The Four Noble Truths until after eh

Voice: What about the telling of life-stories within the traditional Buddhist context.

CONTINUED.

S: Well, there is such a thing as telling of life-stories. I mean Milarepa told his life-stories or the edification of his pupils at their request....

Voice: .....Right. ...yeh

S: And there are many biographies on Buddhist saints and teachers and a lot of that information must come, you know, from them. I think Milarepa's is probably the clearest example of someone telling his own life-story it's certainly one of the best biographies and, of course, The Sutra of Hui-neng, the so-called Platform Scripture that opens, I think, with Hui-neng telling his life-story.

Cunapala: Its accepted. ... it's taken for granted to further the development of.. for other living beings is well that they tell y~ 's life-story

~: Yes. Yes to inspire other people....

~~ala: To inspire other people. ...

Ratnaprabha: Do you know of any examples of it being used as a spiritual practice by people who...? I think highly developed like Milarepa and Hui Weng ?

S: I can't say that I do except by way of confession eh. urn.

Cittapala: Thecept that auto-biographies presumably er

S: Yes.. but I was assuming that (4 words unclear?)... 3 Buddhist context.

Harshaprabha. Did you used't to do it with your friends in ~limpong?

S: No... not at all. No.

Voice: (pause) Really that's how people understand people

Suvajra: How did it start within the F.V?.B.O ?

~evamitra: As far as I know it started at an Order Weekend. I remember you suggesting

S: ... Yes... Uin

Devamitra: that Order Members could write ~ their auto- biographies for Shabda and the extension of that. ... I think you also suggested that one or two people could give their life-story at an Order Weekend so we took it up and I remember (2 words unclear?)... four people told their life-story...

S: ... How long ago was that....?

Devamitra: ... it would be about three years Cz(~ - Ratnaketu was one of the first four and it was a weekend that he came. it was his first Order Weekend of the month, so it would have been after you came back from your. ...

~: .... just a matter of days after his arrival. ...

CONTINUED.

Devamitra: So it was about three and a half years ago wasn't it.... it was June that year you came down

Voice: . . . TIn

S: Perhaps (laughter). Yes it was because I arrived from India - I was in India when it was very hot - Yes it was June

Devamitra: So it's definitely three years ago.

S: Then it is really a quite recent (a word unclear) but it seems to sort of have assumed a quite an importance. I noticed though, the women don't seem to tell their life-stories in the... to the same extent if I'm not mistaken....

Devamitra: (few words unclear?)...

S: No, it's just that the thought has just stuck me. I certainly haven't heard of any of their life-stories, however, I believe two or three have given them in the context of, you know, a mixed Order weekend....

Devamitra: There have been quite a lot of them, actually

S: But I don't remember them sort of doing it on their own together

Devamitra: Its often.... surely I've reported in the women's 'Reporting- In' from their Order Weekends and one of them always ..... Vimala did it last month....it was recorded in Shabda.

S: Oh....Ah...Oh...

Devamitra: Before that it was Padmasuri. They nearly always seem to comment on that person whose told their life-story. ...

S: Ah (3 words unclear?).

Suvajra: V... about within their own communities....?

S: Perhaps it's just that there aren't so many women Order Members eh

Suvajra: .... I was saying, what about .... within their own communities, cos it, you know, happens quite a lot within our communities. in Men's communities Do they

S: I don't know that they spend enough time together for that.

Devamitra: But certainly they have done them. ... did do them in the context of mixed Order weekends because I was there at quite a lot of them Dharmadina ..... Sanghadevi. ..Vidyasri.... Parami. I know they've all done it.'

S: Yes. I think I haven't heard any of them....

Devamitra: Padmasuri did it...!'

Suvajra: One of the things we did within our community with life- stories, was er....we recorded ours....a little tape recorder at the side.

COITTING:ED although I haven't listened to the one I gave, everybody who listened to it though said it was really... quite sort of remarkable, seeing the area 5 they'd stressed... what they'd missed out and how they put their life-story

S: 'I tell, there are people who've given their life-story two if not three times and they say that each time they give it they give it a different way. ...

Voices: ml tkn

Gunapala: You get a whole new angle on your life while people get a new angle on it as well

S: Er....erm... But I...I think the general significance of the fact that people are telling their life-stories and, you know, telling at length and detail, is that people are. . are not, as it were, unwilling to be known. They feel no need for concealment. They feel that they can 'expose' themselves to other people. I believe that, of course, one particular session when the chairmen got together and life-stories were told, I don't think they were tape recorded.. I think that was almost an almost understandable (laughter) (few words unclear?)  
Probably in a few cases anyway yeh..

Suvajra: The tape recorder would burn up (laughter).

[Suvajra: I~ triggered a thought in my mind that .... I think I actually noticed here after almost three weeks to a month, that especially the people - the non-Order Members - that there was a definite point where they started to become a bit more 'other-orientated'. Like you'd go for a walk with somebody and instead of just trying to draw things out. . they'd start asking you about you. . . And I actually sort of noticed that as a sort of definite point as if they were becoming sort of much more 'other-orientated' Its interesting

S: tkn ml

Surata: Obviously I noticed that with people from Brighton. ...

S: Well, you could say that. You notice quite often how people actually start passing the sugar to other people... (laughter).. without being asked.... (pause) Talking of passing sugar, the tea seems rather late this morning

Voices: . .ml....Um....

Devamitra: °..In fact I'll check....

S: Yes perhaps you'd better. I don't suppose they've forgotten.. (Devamitra leaves room) (Bell rings for tea)

Surata: There's one other question I wanted to ask you, Bhante. Er... it was in connection with... you were telling us once... not here before here.. about you read somewhere a medical report about (1 word). if human beings weren't actually able to what is it.. sort of

S: ... Self-disclosure

Surata: .... That's it yes}i yeh...

C&'c1

CONTI~TULt'D.

S: I read in an article somewhere. I think it was by a psychologist rather than by a doctor. The self-disclosure was necessary to psychological health er....it was definitely bad for you if

you could not disclose yourself to another human being eh...I should have made a note of that

Surata: Right.. interesting... thank-you "

S: Self-disclosure is necessary for mental health. .I think that was what was said.

Harshaprabha: It's funny that you should have mentioned the point. I've actually noticed that they (women) have a greater reluct.. .reluct~nce to be open and to disclose themselves than men...

Cittapala: Ah. . yes, but that possibly is something to do with the fact that you're a man

Harshaprabha: bat....?

S: It could be due to to the fact that men tend to be exhibitionists eh... (laughter) (talking through laughter).

Ratnanrabha: I must say they have a terrible tendency to keep going on about t-emselves

S: Ah....but they don't tell you anything...!(laughter).... or say anything really important. No. No. ~ell its true isn't it...? (laughter).

Voices: Yes.. Yes....

Surata: Do they actually tell you everything as well, apart from the bits they think you might like to know or ?

S: ~ll men hardlr ever tell all of everything.. almost never... .never. . So one can't blame them.... (laughter).

Ratnaprabha: I suppose that we always de hold back if we're sort of trying to get something out of the other person I mean there's all that...

S: Not only do they hold back, but to prevent a false- appearence or at least the most pleasing side of ourselves... .obvious4y....

Ratnaprabha: And that's usually what were doing with women so it's another way of surprising them neither is open... (unclear)

No. it's rather not at all a matter of surpr~es. . .i~s not much honesty between the sexes....

Cittapala: It's a~so part of England's er.. sort of er. . .'ocial conditioning. I mean its part of the embar~sing thing of meeting an A~erican... .sort of almost....

— ... Or an Indian even

~ta~ala: swamps you with all those personal det~ils and huh

CCNTIittrD.b.

S: Yes. (Tea is served). I mean there's also the c~uestion of cultural conditioning because I mean a man could tell his life-story in the..at least in the audience of other men - possibly even women - mention var~ous affairs that he's had but until quite recently a decent wo~

couldn't do anything like that. She would have died rather than confess...(laughter). So there's an inhibiting factor...'

Cittapala: Yell, it's almost the opposite now. If you'd Onif confess to one or two. ...(End of Side 1 (end of what Cittapala said is lost in the changin~cver of cassette....))

S: er....er. . one of two sisters.. ..daughters of ( ? ... has an affair with... an affair with an attracti~e visitor, a very brief affair that nobody knew anything about, but since he d4dn't marry her, she felt completely shamed .... even though nobody ever knew about the affair ran away, she wasn't even pregnant, but she ran away and wanted to commit suicide, because she felt completely shamed ind er lowered and, you know, all that sort of thing and the whole plot turned upon that. And she dissappeared for five years and ~wentually came back to be forgiven ye.....

Cittapala: For something which nobody knew about (lau~iter).

S: .. ..To be forgiven...yeh....(3/4 words ~~nclear?)...Tt was... ..that sort of thing wa~ taken very seriously appar~ntly in those days.... .um

Cittapala: I find that a little difficult to ..... to marry-up with what was supposed to be in sexual-freedom of.. well perhaps not Tennyson's area, but at least slightly earlier (2 words?)

S: An.. ..don't forget it~ a class thing eh. I mean there are different codes of morality for different social classes. It was very different for a lady eh... .... from what it was say for a. a ,ervent ° going on the farm or something like that, you know

Cittapala: But even then in some of ( ?) plays I mean in some there's quite a....

S: rell then ycd~ going quite a way back, your almost back to the restoration with

Devamitra: But take say the time of Byro~, ..... there was quite a lot of promiscuity well, one got the impression of quite a lot of promiscuity - amongst society at that time

S: Yes. That is true... .yeh

Devamitra: °.. And thats just immedia~y before the Victorian era

S: w~ll, the early years of Queen Victoria's reign were not very Victorian in many ways and she herself wa~n't a r~ry Victorian personality. . .not by (Geothe?). I... ..all the sons of George IV setting a very bad example um...And there was even the cuse of one....of them... one of the daughters.. one of the daughters I forget which one of George IV's might of been Princess.. ..not Amelia.. another one who had an illegitimate child .... and was seclud~d for the rest of her life .... in one of the palaces I think it was Kensington.

CONTINtFID

Cittapala: But where does this sort of .... ..... sort of propriety come from ?

S: This seems to have developed more and more .... among the rising middle classes, who eventually imposed their code on practically the whole of society. And they. ... the rising middle classes were strongly under the influence of dissent - that is to say 'flon-conformism' - or even in a distant sort of way Puritanism .... and one can see ..... you know, in the reign of WilliamIV, when things started changing in the early years of Victoria's reign those sort of.. ..the old aristocratic code eh - which didn't mind a bit of sexual immorality - sort of clashing the... you know, the code of the rising middle classes to whom sexual morality was all important. And even the aristocracy had eventually to conform eh. .... though a certain



amount of immorality went on. . very quietly of course but it would have to be very quite indeed eh.. because otherwise your career could depend on it. ... could be ruined eh....um.... if there was a breath of immorality, you know, the breath of scandal attached to you - as in the case of (Parnell?) - his career was finished when it was discovered that he was a party to adultery with Kitty O'Shea.. a well known chapter of Irish history huh. "

Harshaprabha: So was it the Church that had indoctrinated the er.

3: No, it wasn't the Church It wasn't the good old Church of England, it was the non-Conformist morality. it was chapel rather than Church... even though.. this.. the Church of England itself was eventually influenced.

Cittapala: .... Sort of the shopkeeper sort of erm

S: . . . Yes... Yes

Cittapala: Maggie Thatcher element...

S: Yes (laughter)... There are lots of more l~ggie Thatcher's about

Voice: . . . One is quite enough

S: I meant it in the sense of a l~ggie Thatcher of Morality eh. C only she doesn't go on about morality does she....

Cittapala: But still, it seems strange at that time because I mean in the sense that the aristocracy or the landed Gentry were independent to the rising middle classes even.... even in terms of .....

"

S: . . . They were dependent on their votes

Cittapala: Well, I was just going to say they would depend on 9

their votes, but surely.. ..they bought them didn't they

S: Not any longer... ..not after 1832...

Cittapala: An

~Th

CoI~ImJ~D.

S ... With the first of the Reforming. No. They then had to appeal to the voter and that (there?) was not complete as franchise because the people who were in franchise were the property classes .... The working man didn't get his vote until decades later....

Cittapala: Do you think that had an influence on the sort of later developments of Victoria....?

S: Oh Yes...definitely!!' I mean I don't think there's any doubt about that. It was the middle classes imposing their standards of morality throughout society, they were the dominant factor

Cittapala: and she sort of picked up on that and

S: Oh No. Not the Queen herself. I mean ..... the Queen herself was in a ..... individually... ..... you know. Most liberal-minded. .er. . she wasn't intolerable in that sense at all.. Well, how could she be with all those disreputable old uncles surviving ye..... and having to look after the illegitimate children, who s~e kn ~r personally eh. . and welcomed to court.. .I mean she'd been brought up in that sort of way... (laughter)... .I mean from an early age, apparently, she knew quite well that her uncles had mistresses and second wives and illegitimate children, she was quite familiar with all those things.. The children used to come to court.. .at about King William's children 11 brought to court.. about a dozen of them.. (laughter).. Queen Victoria practically grew up in that.. (1 word unclear?)... (laughter) (sentence unclear?) (laughter).

Tarshaprabha: She's often depicted as being quite a stern lady....

S: So she was in some ways, but she was also a lady with common sense eh...but her mother "was not an unblemished character.. and Queen Victoria knew it eh. urn. from a very early age .... her father died young and her mother was apparently having an affair with a gentleman of the bed-chamber or something like that. ... (laughter)

Devamitra: . . Wasn't she ( ) supposed to have an affair with an all (screw?) (Devamitra breaks into laughter)...

~: No. ... that was much later. that was John ..... his name was John Brown. It doesn't seem that there was anything there.. she was about seventy-odd at that time nyw~ eh. But it may have been that Prince Albert in the royal circle was responsible for the

A 8th ~~~~~ inquisition of a rather stricter code than prevailed before. It's ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ & L%t~.w~a~e ~~~~J#y~fl~~~ with the facts of life from a very early age... SORT CF %~L#~~~ut~~ '1/2~j}(Taalal: 'were did this sort of ..... chapel' orientated

movement stem from. ... 9

S: Well, that's quite a big sort of question of English Social history.. but the key book here, probably is Tawney, "Religion and The Rise of Capitalism"....I don't know if you've read that, but it is a modern classic. it's definitely the key book.. the key work on this topic.

Voice: ..... ?

S: Tawney.. T.A."U.E.Y "Religion and The Rise of Capitalism

CONTINUUM.

Voice: ... T.A

S: .. T.A.W.N.E.Y its ~ q%D~each~le book actually... (pause). I think if it's 1st ~~~~k~first~discuss~2" seriously the question of the Protestant work ethic em.. .I mean basically to..really to over-simplify I mean sexually, morality was immorality, mainly because it, you know, interfered with regularity of life and making money eh...The virtues that were prized by, you know, the middle classes bent on making money were thrift, hard work, reliability, punctuality.... all those sort of virtues. These were essentially virtues, you know, conducive to the making of a fortune. ... .I mean, of course, why is it middle class people inter-marry with the (~?oV~rt~TeC( aristocracy... ° .. this is going on even today eh. C still... (pause).

Devamitra: ... Do you think that the attitude towards homosexual... - well homosexual practices came from the middle classes....OC'\$~!Yj- CF n~n~L~~ G~~~~

I: No. I think that essentially did come from Christianity, because tha~t was there - in England at least - at the setting of the reign of James #ien someone was executed for that. I mean right down to modern times,... There was a bit of tolerance, as there was in (purgatory?), to the reign of Charles II A few noblemen get away with (themselves for things?) but I think that stems from...mainly from traditional Christian teaching which had become very firmly established by that time eh And they were not at all (1 word unclear?), as it were, I mean .....didn't....was not inlined to tolerate, you know, sexuality in any form except strictly inside marriage... But on the other hand I mean prostitution never flourished in England on such a scale as it did do in the reign of Queen Victoria. It was a really trying social evil, you kno~, with which Dickens was very concerned. ~nly, you know, due to people coming to... into the big cities.. especially London.. .er London.. plenty of young women not being able to find work or being thrown out of employ- ment or having had an illegitimate child and "lost their character", as the phrase was, no alternative but the streets, except to become a prostitute. I mean that has practic~lly vanished now... that particular social evil. There was a lot of regular traffic in teenage girls.. well, very young girls.. just twelve or thirteen years old.. which was eventually expose~ by (~~D. Stathem?).

Cittapala: ~iat do you think of legalising prostitution... as been suggested in the House....

S: I really don't know. I suppose, in a sense, it's legalised even now. Ii?s not licenced but it isn't illegal, it~ not illegal for a woman to practice prostititition.... its only ille~~l for her to publicly solicit.. (pause)... It raises the whole question of promiscuity, but I think that probably that.. as far as I've been able to see, in the case of I mean any women who's in that.. that sort of medically a.... nymphomanaic er....promiscuity is probably er.. not very good for Them. So one has to consider, you know, the effe~ct upon the character of the person, you know, living~in that sort of way. In other words, having those sort of relations .... in which there is usually no emotional element whatever... when its pretty commercial, when th~r~~5 a pure cash nexus with so many men... with so many other people... with so many human beings.. So it would seem to be a very alienating experience. So on those grounds alone, perhaps not to be encouraged or not to be c9nfirmed

Citta ala: It's quite a considerable problem in New York and various major ci ies of the States..0 S. Well, wherever you get a large transient population, that is to say of men with..0 with no regular home life and no zgular sexual outlet, it's there that you get prostitution0 (pause) It would seem quite undesirable (pause). I can't imagine, you know, a woman going to that sort of way of life however hygienii~lly, so to speak, however well paid... and not suffering psychologically. I mean0.. I see some cases even within the FW3O... some women are suffering, or at least not getting on very well on account of a certain amount of sexual promiscuity. It does not seem to suit them. It seems to disturb them. They seem to want ot to need a sort of settled relationship with one person... that seems to be be what s~its them best 000 psychologically.' I'm not speaking in spiritual terms, I'm speaking more in psychological terms. Citta~ala: In psychological terms000 in that there wouldn't really be any problem about them associating with a man who doesn't share their spiritual aspirations 0..? I'm talking about women in the FWBO... S. : I think - I won't be sure about this - I think women tend to want 7o share everything, as it were, I think in a way part of their need perhaps..0 it has to be total... they like a total relationship if possible. That's why often they don't like to feel their part of a man belongs somewhere else... whether it's to a religious movement or..01 remember in fact, a woman saying whose husband got very involved in the FWPO, she would sa , "I wouldn't have minded if it had been another woman"... (laughter 0000 because at least it's on the same level, as it were... Cittaala : She can't compete... he can't compete, you see. ~tta ala: mit it seems to me that women who... are really in a sort of clet-sick... really... you know they can't... S . Yes. In a sense they are... yes. Well, it's not a problem that ~e me0n00can solve for them... well, from a spiritual point of view anyway. As much as spiritually speaking nobody can solve any other person's

problems... at best you can give advice and not get in their way (laughter). I think the best thing most men can do for women is to keep away from them (laughter)...that...that (2/3 words unclear) their already somewhat muddled lives.00 (unclear) .... (pause). Anyway, that's a bit by the bit. Alright, the four noble truths. ~unaala: An further, monks, a monk living contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the four noble truths. How, monks, does a monk live contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the four noble truths? Herein, monks, a monk knows, 'This is suffering', according to reality; he knows, 'This is the origin of suffering', according to reality; he knows, 'This is the cessation of suffering', according to reality; he knows, 'This is the road leading to the cessation of suffering', according to reality. Thus he lives contemplating mental objects in mental objects internally, or he lives contemplating mental objects externally, or he lives contemplating mental objects internally and externally. He lives contemplating origination-factors in mental objects, or he lives contemplating dissolution-factors in mental objects, or he lives contemplating origination and dissolution-factors in mental objects. Or his mindfulness is established with the thought, 'Mental objects exist', to the extent necessary just for knowledge and mindfulness, and he lives detached, and clings to naught in the world. Thus, monks, a monk lives contemplating mental objects in the mental objects of the four noble truths.

COI~II }TUED.

S: Eh. . there's a note here of course, 27. "The origination and dissolution factors of The Truth should be understood as the arising and the passing of suffering, craving. In the Path . The Truth of Cessation is not to be included in this contemplation, since it has neither origination or dissolution". (pause). I~s a bit as though the Four Noble Truths come in here as a sort of after-thought, as it were eh...um Because this, one can contemplate when it~in....in the case of the previous formulas it was as though one was contemplating one's own experience in terms of eh. ..er ..er those different formulations, but here, one is simply contemplating the formulations of the Truth itself. I suppose one could examine to what extent, you know, one had realized The Truth of Suffering, to what extent one had realized and put into practice The Truth of the origin of Suffering and so on eh though it doesn't actually say so And how it works-out with regard to internally and externally is another matter all together..'. Again, it's as though the four have been carried forward a bit mechanically yeh without regard to its appropriateness for this particular formula...(pause). But, there's no doubt that the external contemplation of, in the sense of the thing about, reflection on, The Four Noble Truths is, you know, no doubt a useful exercise....(pause). It has even been suggested - I forget by whom - that the original practice consisted simply in the mindfulness of the body, including the breath and that the remaining stages, the contemplating of the feelings or... thoughts and mental objects were a later development or extension. It might even have been stated by, you know, The Buddha Himself

Suvajra: ~'iho suggested that....?

S: I can't remember I read it somewhere (pause).... there is a book on... that I refer to... something which is in the Padmaloka Library by Pandey called....er...., "On The of Buddhism"1. He goes into quite a bit of textual criticism of Buddhism. It would be useful to look into that as an example of .... you know, the sort of approach that... that I'm speaking of.

~N~ata: ~~~at was his .....?

S: I think it was, "Studies in The Origin of Buddhism", its approximately that....by Pandey P.A.N.D.E.Y., an Indian scholar. Its a quite useful book from that point of view....(pause). One probably won't want to read the whole of it, but one can read a few chapters and get some idea of the...the complexity of the subject or this type of approach applied to Pali literature.... (pause)

Voice: ~hat does the phrase, "according to Reality", mean....? I mean this is something

S: ~r~~av~i~~tC~ L~& CL~I~~~c~ T think this is meant to suggest it is not simply, so to speak, an intellectual understanding, but .... an actual insight I think this is what is implied

Gunapala: (tti&-L'ect(~ on The Four Noble Truths that some of the Buddhists in the Buddha's Day gained Stream Entry just on the n~ntion of this Truth or even for emancipation, so it does seem, you know, in many viays seems to reflect on it in this ..... it being .... described.

S: Yes... Yes. ..um... (pause)

Gunapala: Do you think that was in ttiose cases.. in this side.. or just knowledge to whu~Ct they h~d to do, knowledge of

S: Well, whether it was Insight or not depends on the results

COITTIImILD. you know.... thats The only way in which man can tell um But soon T)u'll get to the criterion. I mean, whether in fact they did break the fetters and did gain Enlightenment, if it didn't happen, well, it was just you know, er. . an intellectual understanding as we say (pause).... Sophocles has a saying, "Call no man happy until his Death??, .... you might say, "Call no man Enlightened until his Death??, because you don't know. It's very very difficult. I mean in the Diamond Sutra it says that er. . the.. the (2 words uncloar?) Raja.. . The Universal Monarch has the 32 signs so how would you distinguish him and The Buddha.. .who also has... .you can't distinguish on the basis of science. So you can't really distinguish on the basis on anyb~in external... even behavior, because it might be the product of a very di plined character... not someone who has actually real- ized eh. . SO they might fall away from that. You can only be sure, and then only reasonably sure when their safely dead, so to speak.... eh.. .um (laughter).

Ratnaprabha: Well how would one know even then....?

S: {Jin...even then how would you tha~~ why I said you would be reasonably sure, but not absolutely sure um....well, not until or unless you yourself have reafl~~~ the same level and could perceive intuitively .h... as it were, mind to mind... .eh. . .um....

Devamitra: I~ interesting that I think The Buddha only .... mentione -, says of. . one of the that had past away that Stream Entry involved. . , he doesn't say it of anyone who...

S: An..' I think there are a few cases. For instance, with regard to er. A~n&t~~ kr&wfl&~~ cn~ o~ ~ ~ ~tr~+' ~I~ ~~~ple~. ~ ~

tlQt he- ~'~~~~ - ~ I think that is comparatively rare. Wff~ ~&~~ Devamitra: Its generally the anatman comes after their passing away....

S: mi... Yes.. Yes.... (pause).

Ratnaprabha: Is there... i it in any way fruitful for us to think in these terms wonderin~~ whether a certain person has reached a certain level of attainment....? One t;ilnks of teachers

S: Well, sometimes, you know, people can't stop themselves wondering.. .eh..er. . .but one does have to ask whether it is fruitful because you wonder so much that one might

neglect one's own practice eh. I mean some people are very concerned about finding an Enlightened teacher...so that they'd...so that they could study under him and be sure of gaining Enlightenment but in a way that's reasonable but if you are by definition already, I mean... un-enlightened, well, how are you going to be sure that someone is Enlightened.. you just can't know at that stage anyway '!' You may be taken in by anybody eh...It's not enough for someone to say he's Enlightened eh..4.you'd be very gullible if you just believed that eh...um

~ta: Somebody came to the Brighton Centre once and told Devaraja that he was a realized being (laughter)..~..much to Devaraja's delight (laughter).

Voice: quickest way to stir the....(1 word unclear?) (laughter).

S: Well it's not impossible but one need not accept it (laughter)....question him...er....without examination.

CONTINUED.

Cittapala: Had you actually been over the criteria. .. somewhere of how one should in theory, try to pick a Guru...?

S: I don't think I have... but, you know, according to some teachers, I mean, the question would be wrongly put anyway. They make the point that.. well, the disciple can't possibly choose a guru eh. I mean how? He's just not in a position to....!' The guru chooses the disciple yeh the guru sort of sees somebody and marks him out or marks him down, as it were, as someone with potential or with promise .... and tries to draw him into his circle, so to speak erm....But one might say generally the disciple choosing the guru is quite un-traditional.... eh...um....

Devamitra: .... I mean, does that tradition actually stand back to the time of The Buddha or is it a more later tradition.. (1 word unclear?)... of the guru, as it were, choosing the disciple

S: I don't know whether it's made explicit... but...H... IY...s a a time The Buddha.O.f.%~e0 ~'~fsci~e can't choose the guru because I mean the guru is going to have to give consent .... if you see what I mean.. I mean, in a way, the disciple has to give his consent.. he has to at least agree to.... to be led.

Ratnaprabha: There is a Sutta in the Pali Canon. ... in the L~jjhima Thikaya.. The ( ?).....The ( ?)....?

Voice: Don't know.. I.'

Ratnaprabha: er which describes... it's a bit like the Karsa~utta in that it describes how one should regard spiritual authority, as it were, but it does give some details of what to look for in a spiritual teacher and basically it just talks about er seeing whether any external manifestations of greed, hatred and delusion... and that seems to be the line it takes

S: .... but you can see who is not a spiritual teacher but that doesn't mean you can see who is a spiritual teacher... you can see who is not Enlightened eh...er...well, as far as those sort of criteria go - but even that isn't infallible er even though you can't see who is Enlightened eh, you can see if someone's teaching is inconsistent with his own behaviour. If someone says eh.. er well, you know, greed, hatred and delusion are nothing to do with Enlightenment and he clearly manifests greed, hatred and delusion, well, you're justified in regarding him as not Enlightened according to his own criteria. But, of course, some teachers

may say that the only doing this to test the faith of the disciples. I've heard this myself. I'm afraid I regard it with profound suspicion.

Cittapala: But... surely it's very difficult to know whether somebody's actually acting out of greed, hatred and delusion unless you sort of have some really rather strict guidelines - like the Vinaya - by which you sort of measure

S: I don't think you can know it if you have just strict guidelines, I think you can only know it if you're... if you've got a certain intuitive perception .... of that person's mind.. directly. Otherwise, I think I mean he can be very externally self-controlled and disciplined. . his mind may be running wild.' I've mentioned a case of this sort in my memoirs. I think I have yes I have.'~ My very early days in Calcutta I happened to stay somewhere once where there was a very meek and well-behaved little monk

CO~PrI~TSD.

who was so correct, so strict in his deportment. You would have thought he was an ideal little monk, a model monk. But, when I got to know him better I found he was not, well, like that at all, but he kept up the appearances very strictly and some people were quite impressed by that. And one was.. encountered a lot of that sort of thing.

Uc in the end you have to fall back to some....to a great extent on your intuitive knowledge and perception of that sort of person. At the same time I'm really sort of .... inclined to be very sceptical about teachers who claim to be just testing the faith of their disciples by indulging in say anger or greed or whatever it may be. I'd take a lot of convincing in that sort of area.

Also, I just don't see the necessity of it. I'm not at all happy about this whole idea of testing other people deliberately. I think it's if ever, in fact.' I mean, some of the Tibetan teachers or the Tibetan lamas over it~ the test they talk in those sort of terms. Or the disciples do all.. the only... really draw attention to some weakness, it~ll, he's maybe a drunkard".. .eh. and say, "Well, he's just testing the faith of his disciple." I can't except that I'm afraid. (laughter). I think it's humbug. (laughter). I think it would be very very rarely that a teacher, you know, actually did that and under very exceptional circumstances.

Ratnaprabha: How about sort of on a less exalted level, even, the Kalyana Mitra.- Because if.. if.. we let the Friends choose Kalyana Mitra's they've got to decide who is going to be suitable or.. for.. ..as to be a Kalyana mitra.. ?

S: They don't, sort of, strictly speaking, choose. They really say they'd like to have that person as the~r Kalyana Mitra, if it was considered suitable. If the Kalyana Mitra himself agrees, if the local chapter agrees and if I agree and So it's not that you've got. .. really a sort of unfettered (one word unclear?) choice.... (laughter).

Ratnaprabha: But, presumably, even in or.. stating one's preference one is sort of saying this I certainly can recognise in this person qualities that I would like to develop in myself. ... presumably....?

S: Yes. Yes. Yes. TJ~ll, in principle, that is what it should be eh Not someone who, you know, is likely to give you an easy time, so to speak.

Ratnaprabha: So it seems, in that case, one is looking to somebody more spiritually developed, and, in a sense, evaluating their level of development..?

S: Yes. And you have to be able to recognise something more positive than you can see in yourself. But again, I don't think you can just sort of deduce that, I think you have to get to know. . that particular person and sort of feel it to be there rather than infer its presence from

certain external signs eh. . . It's very difficult to know other people. 'bat you might think of, say as, Metta may be just a natural sort of cheerfulness and er... gregariousness, even, even though you may not be in the position to distinguish genuine Metta from that sort of 'temporary' that sort of mental state.

You may think someone is spiritually developed when they've only got a bit of charisma. This is something rather different eh. . (pause). You may think that they've got a profound knowledge of the Dharma when they've only, you know, read a few books of Tibetan.... can quote, you know, a few things at you. (pause).

Ratnaprabha: We were talking earlier about er. . \*Zengo, the meditation

S ~~~

COitTI~L~D.

teacher who once claimed to be Maitreya at one stage.

S: .. Yes indeed. And Jesus Christ. (laughter). He did eventually yes.': (laughter).... (will or well?) to come~again~ yes....

Ratnaprabha: .... Presumably the word criteria could be used then to decide whether one was going to take him seriously or not....? Was it sort of criteria or was it just er. ... just knowledge of him....?

S: Well, I mean er...when I considered him - the 'Came-to-Be' Maitreya Buddha yeh Come-Again - Well, he....that is to say, he made a claim in terms of Buddhist tradition .... But according to Buddhist tradition MGL~(t~6~ is not due~ for at least 2500 years, so he couldn't have been Maitre~ Buddha... yeh (laughter).

Devamitra: ~here. . . do those actual criteria....then double...?

S: -Tell, in the... there 'S a sutta in the Digha-Nikaya...

Devamitra: Do you know which one it is...?

S: No. You'll just have to go.. to read the whole of the Digha Nikaya.. . (lots of laughter) But, you see, you know, the thinking.. quite logically in terms of Buddhist thought. .. another Buddha in the strict sense does not come until the previous Buddha's Sasana or dispensation has entirely disappeared. . . Gotama Buddha's Sasana has not entirely disappeared. Therefore, he cannot be Maitreya Buddha. It's as simple as that. That is the stand I took. (pause). If you see what I mean....? So he must have been mistaken. The claim was. . was contradictory.

Harshaprabha: ~at do you mean by Sasana?

S: The.. the... the.. It's translated, 'Dispensation'. Usually it's understood to mean the sort... the Buddha's movement, as it were, eh. . the whole of the tradition established by the Buddha. It literally means something like 'warden' or (camargue?), even But some people were rather impressed by him and by that claim. I mean he was a bit charismatic. They over-looked the fact that he was at the same time having an affair with the wife of one of his disciples which didn't seem very ethical... who afterwards went to live with him. And, you know, caused that particular disciple, you know, quite a lot of mental suffering. Of course, you could of said he was testing (lots of laughter).



Gunapala: (Freeing?) his attention to it...

S: ... Lo....? Gunapala: .. C (~eeing?) (Freeing?)... S: ... Indeed

Devamitra: There does seem to be quite a lot of gullAubility with regards to charisma

S: Yes. Yes. There is I'm afraid. .in the West generally. I think this is the result, so to speak, of the lack of an established genuinely spiritual tradition which provides.. these are rough and ready criteria.. or some idea of what spiritual life, you know, spiritual personality are really like .... .becaus~

CO~fTliU1tD.

you know, people seem to easily to be taken in by the spiritual con-man. They seem to be want to be taken in

Devamitra: But doesn't that happen also to some extent in a more traditional society. I get the impression that it certainly happens in India... with Indian~ too.

S: Utn. . .tha~s true. Yes... .though, of course, you could argue that Their tradition has in fact to some ext~nt broken down due to western influence in so many centuries of foreign rule and so on. Though it is even so, sort of quite strong, but Indians can be very gullible eh. But that is because, you know most Tndians, most sort of caste Hindu S are looking for something different. The looking for a holy man with psyct%0 powers, with supernormal powers who can bestow wor~dly blessings. This is what the looking for. The not looking what we would call spiritual development or Enlightenment. Very very few are looking for that.... in India.

Devamitra: So perhaps it would be less likely for someone with a genuine spiritual aspiration to .... . form or the praise of that kind of gullibility...

S: I think so, yes... yes. I think so, yeh. . I think on that level the distinction is recognised. (pause).

Also, something that I noticed... that people like to sort of think that they are involved with a very highly developed preferably Cod Incarnate Guru because that gave them status. You see what I mean? They were the disciples of someone who was, well, Cod Himself. I saw many examples of this eh. Because to be the close friend and confidante of .... Incarnate... well, is a staggering sort of position...(laughter).....so that the higher position you give your guru eh, the higher in fact, the position you give yourself, and this I think was a very big factor in some cases... which came ~ndcr my personal observation you can see we~~ closely associated with no other than, well, The Absolute in human form, and your salvation is ~ranteed... (how could?) you have to do anything...you are just so close to 'Them-', well, you must be highly developed, you must be some sort of spiritual being yourself or maybe you were some sort of incarnation too...who'd come down with 'Them'....(laughter). That would be the sort of line of thought that developed. Your~'sort of the permanant transcendental entourage eh...um

Cittapala: It does seem a hallmark of Buddhism - perhaps with the exception of incarnate lamaism - that these sort of extraordinary claims are .... minimum.

S: I must say that this is one of the great virtues of the Theravada. It is very sober in. in this sort of way. It does sort of exhibit a sort of healthy scepticism about claims and this seems to go back to the Buddha Himself.. .eh.. . unfortunately they'd somethimes take it to the extreme~ of denying that any Transcendental attainment is possible in this day and age. But that~ another matter. But I think the Theravada is, in a way, to be congratulated on having a sort of.... quite sober attitude in these sort of matters. (pause).

Cittapala: ~iy was there a tradition of incarnate lamas in. ...er ?

S: Ooh.. ~\$tt~s ~1;~% b(~. (one word unclear?). very different I'm (going?) to have to leave that. Yes. Yes though I have spoken earlier on I think one of the lectures on Tibetan )~~~£I-£i~t'Srn series.

[381]

But, I mean, I've met, you know, dozens and dozens of incarnate lamas. Some of whom who've confessed that they've... they don't feel that they are really incarnate lamas and it wasn't just humility, they just weren't up to the job. And they knew it. So they were sometimes in an awkward position.

Anyway, we've wandered quite a long way from the text. Maybe we should finish off read the .... read the conclusio~1- discuss that if necessary and then maybe look back over the whole text eh. . .the whole sutta. "Verily Monks"

Surata: "Verily, monks, whosoever practices these four Foundations of Mindfulness in this manner for seven ~ars. then one of these two fruits may bc expected by him. Hi~hest Knowledge (Arahantship). here and now. or if some remainder of clinging is yet present. the state of Non-returning.

O monks. let alone seven years. Should any person practise these fo four Foundations of Mindfulness in this manner for six years...for five years... for four jears...for three years...for two years...one year. then one of these two fruits ma be ex ected b him: Hi est Knowled e here and now or if some remainder of clinging is yet present, the state of Non-returning.

O monks. let alone a year. Should any per3on practise these four Foundation of Mindfulness in this manner for seven months...for six months. for five months... for four months.. for three months.. for two months.. a month. . half a month. then one of these two fruits may be expected by him: Highest Knowledge, here and now, or if some remainder of clinging is yet present, the state of Non-returning.

O monks. let alone half a month. Should any person practice these four Foundations of Mindfulness in this manner. for a week. then one of these two fruits may be expected by him: Highest Knowledge, here and now. or if some remainder of clinging is yet present, the state of Non-returning.

Because of this was it said: 'This is the only way. monks. for the purification of beings. for the overcoming of sorrow and lamentation, for the destruction of suffering and grief, for reaching the right path. for the attainment of Nibbana, namely the four Foundations of Mindfulness'.

Thus spoke the Bles~~ed One. Satisfied, the monks approved of his works.

End of Tape.

[382]

(Laughter - a lone voice) "apart from that".

S: Well, what do you think the Buddha means by that statement or how literally is that statement to be taken? At the very least it means that there is no limit, so to speak. How quickly

you arrive at the goal all depends on the intensity of practice. It's not that you necessarily have to spend seven years; if you can intensify your practice you can reduce the time required.

(10 seconds silence)

(It's interesting) because of this (force it sake?) this is the only way. It's as though the fact of "the way of mindfulness is the only way" has got something to do with the way it permits of a sort of speeding up of the whole spiritual process, if you just put enough effort into it.

(Pause)

Devamitra: But this passage is a fairly stock passage isn't it

- this business of seven years, etc, down to half a month.

S: Mm. I wouldn't say it's very common - once, twice, thrice perhaps - in certain contexts. And, you know, in some respects the four foundations of mindfulness do represent a fairly complete sort of practice, certainly in terms of Vipassana

It seems like they think seven years is a long time.

S: Yes, yes indeed, and seven days is not too short a time. But perhaps it's significant there were seven years, seven days, it's a sort of symbolical number in a way. Perhaps that suggests it isn't to be taken too literally. But n~on-the-less the Buddha makes it quite clear that fairly substantial spiritual progress can be made within a certain definite number of years - I think there's no mistaking that - and certainly within the present lifetime.

(Pause)

But it also does, well I suppose if you do take it a bit more literally, it does imply that you can make incredible

SPS

progress in such a very short period.

S: Indeed yes, yes. It just depends on the amount of energy you put into it; the extent to which you are free from distractions; the extent to which you are single minded. But, you know, very often people are not single minded. The conditions of modern life do not~it seems, conduce mindedness, certainly not to spiritual single mindedness, a single mindedness with regard to a spiritual objective. The minute you go back, you know, into the world, so to speak, you will be assailed by a multiplicity of distractions each one tugging at you.

— You did say in the Three Jewels in connection with quick attainment of spiritual progress or even enlightenment that this - in the cases this was so that if one looked at it more closely there had been significant preparation over a period of time.

S: There is that also to be considered, yes. Though one doesn't actually know, for instance the Buddha is addressing a miscellaneous you know, congregation of monks. One doesn't know how long they have been monks. Some might have been monks for a longer, some for a shorter time. But it is significant, he is addressing monks, those who have - you know - those who have gone forth, those who have detached themselves from worldly life.

) Although it does say "whosoever practices" and apparently the commentary says this means whichever monk, nun, uphasak~or uphasika.

S: That is quite important because the words are saying up~~asaka or uphasika, because it suggests that you don't even need to be a monk or nun in the formal sense.

— Which goes against the apparent trend of Theravada tradition.

S: To some extent it does. Though of course it doesn't presumably override the Theravada tradition that if a lay person becomes an arahat he immediately also~st magically becomes transformed into a b~kk~ and the yellow robes appear on him.

SPS

(laughter) which is literalism carried a bit far, and his head becomes automatically shaven, hmm and presumably a bowl appears in his hands.

This connection of attainment - have you any thoughts - er based on these two views of Tuscany. You know, as to how future trends can be set up within the movement, maybe facilities would be better (unclear - worlds and transport??)

S: It's difficult to say, there's no doubt that the Tuscany process, as some people call it, does speed things up. I think there's no doubt about that, yes. Only whether it can be continued on those lines is another matter. I mean last year some people were saying that they wish the process could continue for another three months and it's since then that some people have been talking in terms of a two year course. Perhaps it would have to be a different kind of course, a different, new kind. But there's no doubt that these sort of more prolonged periods of more intense study and practice seem to have come to stay. You know, I think we can hardly go back, you know, on them - to a previous state of affairs.

Presumably they don't have to be confined to just the pre-ordination process, it could....

S: No, one could hardly imagine them being sort of pre pre- ordination but they could certainly be post ordination. Well. There is even talk of represher courses. On the Tuscany re-union that we had a few months ago, the possibility, people were asked if they would like to have a refresher after three years or whatever, and it met with unanimous approval. In fact a cheer went up (laughter) at the very thought of it. Someone was telling, maybe I don't know whether I should mention this, but I'll mention it perhaps more as a warning more than anything else. Someone was telling me the other day that he was looking at some photographs that were taken of people just after their ordination here last year and then he saw some group photographs of some people who had been to Tuscany taken some seven or eight months later. And he said they looked five years older. (murmurs)

SPS

Yes, I, now, so, does/this suggests one has got to be careful when one gets back. That one doesn't lose, doesn't dissipate what one has gained. One co~erves it as much as possible.

(?) after my ordination I had lost quite a few years. I think I can say that for quite a few people. It did seem like I had lost at least five years since I'd been here.

S: Make sure you keep it that way.

1/2? ~\L1/4(c~' Yeah (chuckles)

S: Hmmm (pause) And no doubt mindfulness will help you conserve whatever you have gained. Maybe you've already done this but maybe each person, before going back should think very carefully, well what are the distractions which are most likely to arise in my particular case. Because no doubt it can vary quite a lot from one person to another. For one person the major distraction may be simply just overwork, not leaving enough time for meditation and study and other such things. For another it may be living in the city. For another it may be sloth and torpor. For another it may be the possibility of so many cultural facilities- I mean cinemas and theatres and concert halls, and so on. For another it may be friends and relations, left over from the old days.

(Pause)

I think most people let themselves be much too much victims of circumstances, people adopt a passive attitude rather than an active attitude - yeah. You see what I mean.

V: You mean by remaining in circumstances which would not be beneficial or...

S: Or maybe assuming that there's nothing they can do about it

- that's the way it is. That's the way it's got to be, it's unfortunate but it can't be helped. When very often something can be done, something can be done.

(Pause)

And also not disguise from oneself the fact that you are making

SPS

a choice, not just succumbing to circumstances which you can't help, you are in effect making an active choice, yes. Well I've dwelt on this a number of times before. For instance people saying, well I had to do this or I had to do that as a sort of excuse for not doing something else. When in fact they chose to do that other thing. So you shouldn't disguise as necessity what is in fact your personal choice. That means you have got to recognise that you are making a personal choice, that you are free, that you're not the victim of circumstances.  
(Pause)

Sometime ago I had a letter from someone who was a bit concerned because a certain woman that he didn't really want to get involved with again was turning up in his area. But he seemed to regard it as inevitable that he was going to get inv~ed with her and there was nothing he could do about it. Which seems rather odd.

~ ~ou see what I mean, the way that it's sort of bound to happen. There's nothing I can do about it, I'll just have to submit even though I'm not happy about it, Yes?

Accepting his weakness in a way, his passivity to it, he's giving in before it's even happened, no wonder it's an ?

S: Not even considering the possibility of a struggle, or putting up a struggle. So, in the same way, about say going back to the city, one need not assume that one has got to be more distracted that one is necessarily going to be more distracted and sort of accept it in advance, at least put up a fight hmmm. (Chuckles) Especially if you live in a community you've got a very good base from which to conduct the fight. You don't necessarily have to accept a lower lever of spiritual life just because you, you know, live in the city. Certainly not accept it in advance, as a foregone conclusion. No, you could if anything think in terms of, well make more progress than ever once you get back.

I think it would be good to sort of encourage that type of view as we head off back to England. That we 're really going to give it a good fight, we'll fight when we get back there with it.

S: &{~v~a good hammering. He's not going to have it all

SPS

his own way, huh.

I suppose it's rather like, sort of, training up a crack troop and a whole load of good shiny swords and then as soon as they're sent out on a sortie they all put their swords down. (laughter)

S: Well. Why does one train up, you know the SAS, special group or whatever it is, yes. I assume it's supposed to operate in that sort of way, very difficult circumstances, that's what they are trained for.

Well most of our training is to guard off, is to defend.

S: Yes, but I mean. Don't underestimate Mara, he's very cunning, very resourceful but don't assume he's inevitably going to outwit you, or get the better of you. Go back into the world with a positive sort of attitude. You're not going to let it get you down. You are going to carry on. It isn't inevitable that you should sink to a lower level the minute you get back, or at least, you know, a week later. If you're careful and sensible it need not happen.

In some areas though people think that it might be the first time that they've ever conquered it. Maybe this person would give in on going, you know, the girl friend is moving down say to the end of the town, it was inevitable that he would get involved. It might be the first time that some of us have ever broken through that area.

S: Yes yes.

You moved into a place where there is this girlfriend and yet we break through it - first time. (unclear - choice?)

S: Yes, hmmm. I mean, someone was telling me not so long ago about a friend who went off for a solitary retreat, you know, well intensive meditation retreat for a week. And then he came back in a really good positive state but within 24 hours they had j

SPS

just blown it. Just through sheer foolishness, within 24 hours that seems such a pity.

(Pause)

I seem to connect with that, mainly because my name connects with it, (laughing

S: Yes, well protect your goodness and protect your little weakness6 eh (laughter). Don't let them be ripped off by anybody. (Chortles). I do believe that there are a~tments of some young lady that are decorated, you know, with (wings) and they're torn of or donated by young heroes eh.

V: (could ) quite easily. (Laughter)

V: Is that a story (more laughter)

S: Indeed it was, it was a very remarkable and fascinating story. eal sort of bedtime story.

I think ne just ~&as to be sensible when one gets back, there's no, one shouldn't be too much on the defensive huh.

— : Scuttering like rabbits into

S: Yes, yes. It should be Mara who should be telling you to be on the defensive, he's the one who should be scared.

I mean, especia~ly - I imagine - if we walk around in couples, not in a

S: Yes, yes (Great laughter)

V: That's not what I mean (more laughter)



S: Walk around in couples like policemen who work in dangerous areas - yes.

I imagine it would be quite dynamic, quite good - yes.

S: Some cases there would be more than two walking around together, there'd be three and four, and Mara wouldn't get

SpS D~~c\

an opportunity , just close ranks.

(Pause)

Yes, you don't want to imagine yourselves as little rabbits you know, scuttling back into your burrows, keeping a wary eye open for the old fox.

V: Bolting the doors.

S: Or like, you know, the three little pigs and the wolf. (Laughter) The third little pig did get the better of the wolf in the end, yes. One does not have an over~defensive attitude. The best means of defense is attack, or the best method of defense is attack

(10 %~~<~~~

Anyway most people are only going back to England, and those who are going further afield, perhaps they need to keep an even more wary eye open.

That applies to me doesn't it. (Laughing)

S: Yes I suppose it does actually (general laughter)

me for the present, I shan't be going any further than Norfolk, any further than Norwich, even there I have to keep a wary eye open sometimes.

Well, I shall be met off the plane by a really good mate, friend.

S: Yes, and escorted to the automobile meeting you and hurried off to a men~ community.

— No actually to his apartment.

S: Oh now doubt yo~ll temporarily transform it into a men~ community.

Anyway any overall impressions of this particular sutra, any overall comments?

Can I just ask another question about one of

5e??c2 SPS

the things in this final section? It's about the state of non-returning. I must say I don't really understand the state. I mean I understand its definition, but I don't really understand the state of non~returning and I came across a reference in the Pali Canon to the Buddha saying that when you're speaking to a Brahma that he's experienced all the states of existence and he knew what they were all like. And he knew that Nirvana was the, as it were, the highest, the only one he hadn't experienced he said, was the state of non-returning, because of course had he been reborn there he wouldn't be able to return as it were to the world and become a Buddha.

S: That suggests of course some incompatibility between the path followed by the Samyak Sambuddha, the path of the Bodhisattva and the path followed by one who's called an arahatship.

V: Why,

S: Well because a Bodhisattva doesn't ai~only, he aims for gaining enlightenment on this earth, so that, not after death in a higher world - so that on this Earth he can teach to human beings and others.

Suvajra: So you don't get Buddhas arising in other higher realms.

S: No, well as regards this world system, not arising on other levels within this world system but only on the human level. Whereas, so that if you are reborn as a non-returner, as if before you gained enlightenment, then you don't gain enlightenment from on this earth as is necessary for you to become a Buddha in the strict sense.

Ratnaprabha: I think what puzzled me about it was just this idea, of there being a sort of dead end. Almost, well~not exactly a dead end but almost a dead end, at least from the altruistic point of view, state. You get there and you can't get out of it somehow except through enlightenment itself.

S: Well perhaps that does suggest, you know, all the need for greater care and circumspection, even with regard to spiritual ideals and spiritual forms. Of course the Mahayana does

SPS

maintain that one can change from the Hinayana path to the Mahayana path even after gaining Arahatsip. At least some texts do suggest that, like the white lotus sutra. But that would bring up all sorts of further questions.

(Pause)

This order of non-returning was quite prominent place in what appeared to be the earliest strata of the Pali texts. Stream entry and non-returnship seemed to be stressed quite a lot. It seems to be only later that this four fold scheme developed, of stream entry, once-returnership, non-returns/hip and Arahatsip in the technical sense. And these seem to be the true great sort of turning points, one that you didn't fall into any lower form of existence when you became a stream entrant, and two that you did not come back into the world when you became a non-returner.

You could, could you be reborn with a human body and have gained enlightenment in a previous life so that...

~~~ S: The Hinayana %ysy&t least recogni~ that possibility.

Once you've gained enlightenment you're a non- returner. The state of enlightenment

S: Once you've gained enlightenment you're not born anywhere in the world or in the Universe at all. Not at least as the result of karma. That in the case of the Mahayana, that proviso has to be entered

Lt£'J~tc&. Would these non-returners, is it traditional that they could be reborn in other Buddha fields or such as....

S: I don't think anything is said about that. They are said to progress from one plane to another, by, therefore, until they gain enlightenment. They are said to be born in a group of worlds called the *śuddhāvastu* the pure abodes which is subdivided

- Where I've got my strongest experience of non-returning is through Milarepa where towards the end he goes into quite a detailed story of his non-returning, his being reborn

SPS

in more pure lands. It seems he's escaped the wheel of rebirth and now that he's in Sukavati.

S: This is within a sort of more Mahayanistic context. Where ((0 there's also the concept of the *Sambhoga* which you don't

find in the Hinayana. He does speak of meeting his disciples in the Pure Land, doesn't he? How literally that is to be taken is hard to say but that statement is there. And you do get this idea of non-returning reappearing in the so-called "devotional" Buddhism of China and Japan. That one aspires to be reborn into *śuddhāvastu* the pure land of Amitabha, from which one will not be reborn in any lower realm; from which one will gain enlightenment directly. So this is very much like the Hinayanar~or Theravada conception of the non-returning

Ratnaprabha: So do you think that the pure abodes may have been a sort of Hinayana Pure land.

S: Yes it does really amount to that. I think I've mentioned that in a seminar. Yes, I certainly see a connection between the two ideas. Because in as much as the pure abodes are inhabited by beings on the Transcendental path, they're not part of the mundane overall system in the ordinary sense. Even though they're said to be situated, so to speak, at the site of the world of form, the *śuddhāvastu*, which is itself quite an interesting point, especially in view of the fact that possibly the *Śuddhāvastu* represents a later addition to that fourfold scheme.

(Pause)

It's as though they represent the cosmological counterpart of those stages, those of the positive *nidanas*, subsequent to the point of no return. They're not a world in the ordinary sense even though they're said to be. The Pure Worlds are said to be a sort of sub-division of the (upa~(oka, they don't really in a sense belong there. They aren't actually described as trans-cendental but on the other hand it's difficult to see how they could be mundane in the ordinary sense.

What do you mean mundane in the ordi~ry sense~

S: Just spheres within which people are born for which they

SPS

(unclear)

(A They go to the centre, the centre of the wheel ~  
in that sense they're not created.

S: In that sense they are not really part of the wheel.

Ratnaprabha: There are actually several Pure abodes  
enumerated, aren't there? Each with a different name.

S: Yes, I think there are four, if not more. Maybe six. I've given the names somewhere.  
They're certainly well known.

There's a list there in the I must  
say I couldn't really understand them.

S: Well it's who the actual world is in some doubt or some dispute. Like the ? attapa  
it's called. I've given the best explanation I could. Several of them have something to do with  
light, don't they? Perhaps it is interesting that even the meaning of the words, the names of  
those levels of, they have been lost or there's some doubt in the elder

tradition. I believe, I usually regard this as not great. Q?c~G~t9 °vJhy has that term a~~~~  
been given to a particular pure abode.<sup>2</sup>

The terms of f~jr~~~v&~ , pure abodes is interesting, especially in view of the Pure Land.

Ratnaprabha: Could this be another example of say a lost teaching?

S: It could be. It could be. Perhaps. I've sometimes thought of going through the Pali  
Canon and sort of extracting all the teachings about, you know, the non-returnership ~dthe  
Pure abodes. It might be interesting to collate them and consider what the Pali Canon does

say about these things.

Ratnaprabha: I think I found that when I was writing my talk, that the four sights were said to have been sent to the Buddha from the Pure abodes by a particular Deva living in the Pure abodes.

S: As it would be perhaps quite interesting to collate all

SPS

those sorts of references.

Harshaprabha: Some people get born in the Pure abodes after very strong positive

S: Well after having broken the first three fetters and, broken the first five fetters actually. Yes, broken the first five out of the ten. The once-returner only weakens fetters 4 and 5 without actually breaking them. The Arahant is said to break all ten.

Cittapala: I think I'm right in saying that in the Buddhist Dictionary indicates that if you have a substantial experience of the fourth Dhyana that you were likely to be reborn in the Pure abodes..

S: Ah, it couldn't be just a substantial experience of the fourth Dhyana. Because if you have a substantial basis of the fourth Dhyana then you've got that concentrated energy, so to speak, for the development of insight. Because you can only become a non-returner due to insight. You can only break the fetters if you gain insight, not just as a result of Dhyana

Cittapala: So there are only non-returners living in the Suddhavasas?

S: Even that is not clear. If there are other Devas living in the Suddhavasas who are not Anagamis (non-returners). Well that does raise quite interesting questions about the nature of that particular world or that particular plane. I'm not sure whether there are any references to Devas as living there who are definitely said to be not Anagamis. That again is something that would have to be looked into.

Gunapala: It did seem quite a complex picture that was painted in the Milarepa story. There was quite a lot about transforming the physical body into the different Kaya~ - I'm not quite sure what it was - and so transporting the whole physical body somehow in a different form. I don't know what use that would have been or why. But it did seem quite a complex system

SPS

they were actually teaching there, as well there were Buddhas giving discourses.

S: This is not said, as far as I know of the SudIdh~asa. It's as though what&ver spiritual progress one makes there is the result of a momentum generated during one's last lid~e on Earth. I don't know if it's said that there is actually any instructon there as there is in Sukhavati.

Ratnaprabha: I mean I looked through all the Pali Canon books e 've got here when I was writing my talk to see if I could find out more about the Suddhavasa realms and there's very little about them really.

S: In a way it's interesting that there should be so little, maybe there's something in the Abhidhammakosa which represents a parallel tradition.

Anyway, any further poin~? I think that one general point which emerges is that it's not enough to have general sort of awareness, or not enough to practice mindfulness just by way of a general awareness, but one needs to scrutinise on~s mental state almost from moment to moment. In terms of specific lists of items almost to give more content and more concreteness to your practice of mindfulness. Presumably it's like asking yourself, well is there greed, is there aversion, is there delusion, is there mindfulness itself. Is there ~HH investigation of mental states. Is there joy and so on. Is there energy. In other words one needs, as it were to monitor ones mental state much more closely and in much greater detail perhaps than people usually do.

§{ ffi~flq~~The whole thing has left an impress/ion on my mind, is the process of how it comes to be and how it passes away and the whole

process of setting up conditions. Almost this cause/effect process that has sort of....

S: Yes, it just doesn't come about by chance. It's not just fortuitous.

Harshaprabha: It's as though we've got to be gentle and at the same time vigorous with ourselves when taking on this scrutiny.

s/ps

S.: What do you mean by gentle with ourselves? Not expecting too much too soon, eh?

Harshaprabha: There is that side of it, but I was more or less thinking of being able to stop and realize rather than to just plough on regardless.

S.: You mean blindly.... (Harshaprabha; Hm.) To see what you're doing; know what you're doing. (Pause) There's actually a way of going about things; you're not just putting your head down like a bull and just charging. (Laughter) It's almost as though it would be a good idea for different people to take up different projects and investigate certain things: comb through texts and find references etc. and present their results that they'~~ Otcc\u((~J in some sort of paper or talk.

Devamitra: Have you ever actually thought of drawing up a list of the possible projects people might wish to do?

S.: I haven't thought ((of it)), but it seems to be becoming necessary because I think I can't do it all myself.. and it is very good to involve a larger and larger number of people. I mean, last year I was combi;~ through the Digha-Nikaya with- just certain points in mind. I haven't followed that up since last year. I will have to make quite elaborate notes for the next time from the Digha-Nikaya.

Cittapala: So apart from investigating the Sudhavaśa, are there any other points from the study of this Sutta that you feel could be tackled in that way?

S.: Well, something I have thought of in the past is all the different series of positive nidanas, because one's not only got the 12 Positive Nidanas plus the 7 Bodhyangas but there are various other enumerations also of positive sequences, positive series. It would be useful to bring all these together and to collate them, to study them collectively. Maybe all the references to Kalyana Mitrata.

Devamitra: To undertake a project of that kind would mean first of all, going through the whole canon, wouldn't it?, on its own (S.: Yes) which is quite an undertaking.

s/Ps - Dq.~

S.: Well, one can do it. I mean a quick way of doing it is just with the help of the index



but I mean that isn't really enough be- cause sometimes there are some things which are just not indexed. So yes, it means really steadily reading through. It is quite a manageable Canon. It would mean mainly reading through the Nikayas.

Gunapala: I think it almost needs a University where people are sort of co-operating together, studying together...

S.: But I mean actually, for any talk that people give there ought to be a bit of preliminary research and study especially if they're breaking fresh ground - if they're not just following the well-worn beaten track. A few people have made a sort of few discoveries from their own and no doubt that will happen more and more.

And another topic would be, say, the 'Five Eyes'. I mean sometimes they occur in different order and different places and there are sometimes three images; sometimes four, sometimes five and always the same five. That's another subject for investigation. Oh again, another thing. I've looked into this a little bit myself and no doubt someone could go into it in great detail: all the different circumstances under which people Go for Refuge in the Pali Canon.

Devamitra: Do you think it would be more useful to, I mean as a whole, if one was undertaking study of a particular Canon to do it from a specific angle like this, because I can imagine if you did do it, say, from one of these points of view a lot of ~Tt~ c.t~~ would in a sense, pass you by. ~cft~

S. : I think you need to concentrate, yes.

Devamitra: You need to concentrate on a specific approach?

S.: No. It's not a question of an approach - it's just one particular topic. So if you go through the whole Canon, you're primarily concerned just with references to that one particular topic. That doesn't mean that you would ignore everything else. I mean, you might learn a lot incidentally. I'd be surprised if you didn't. But you'd be only extracting and making notes about that particular point or passages on that particular point. Then when you've got all those references together, then you look at them and see whether or not they made any pattern; if they threw light on one

N

s/Ps 6q~

another or upon a teaching generally.

Harshaprabha: I'd certainly appreciate having a project like that, especially living in the city.

S.: Also it does give continuity to one's study. One's not just sort of haphazardly reading this; ok and then reading that. It gives a definite direction to one's studies and you can learn, I think quite a lot from directed study. Sometimes things that you can't learn from the lesser directed, let's say, more associative

study "H~up" pose form of within the context of chasing-up quite,

seems almost esoteric aspects, one needs to feel one isn't chasing after a hare, so to speak, in which case - ((n&?) c~t~ ~ ~ #ctQ

(~nd of Side A)

Devamitra: ... You would work in that sort of way rather than perhaps drawing up a list of areas you would like to see investigated.

S.: I can't say I've really given systematic thought to it. It could be done in either way. I think as the Movement becomes more mature and people get more deeply into study, it's inevitable that certain individuals take up specific lines of inquiry and investigation. It would be surprising if that didn't happen.

Devamitra: Recently I've been going through - the Majjhima-Nikaya but it's only in very general way if you were going to do it quite closely (it's certainly worth going through and taking notes) but (in a way on) anything and everything that is of interest to you.

S.: Well, that's also a thing that one can do.

Devamitra: But from the point of view of the Movement it would probably be of greater benefit if I did that too....

S.: It's hard to say because doing it the way you are doing it, you might stumble upon things that everybody else might have overlooked. There's also that possibility.

Surata: I think also you've stimulated quite a lot of other people to sort of dig into it. I mean, I know it's had that effect on me and certainly lots of other people who have gone into

s/Ps #9

specifically that work and I think that's partially a result of your probings of the last 6 months or so.

Harshaprabha: I'd certainly be interested in looking into

S.: Also you have to be alert to the possibility of different translations in contexts. I mean in one point, it might be, one text or one Canon, - it might be "good fellowshi~" and in another - "spiritual friendship" or another "association with the beautiful". You have to be on the look-out for that sort of thing, you know, just going through translations. But also you know, be on the look-out for passages in which Kalyana Mitrata was in effect being described even though that actual term was not used. I mean, someone's behaviour in relation to somebody else could be in fact an instance of K.M. even though it wasn't described in those terms.

Cittapala: In as much as we're hoping to draw up a cross-refer- ence system of your lectures and seminar material, presumably this sort of study could also be fitted in the context of that to make a really comprehensive cross-referencing system.

Ratnaprabha: Buddhist concordance.

S.: Yes and Buddhist cum FWBO concordance. Well, Saga~&nati years ago said he was going to draw up a Buddhist Dictionary -

a sort of FWBO dictionary. I don't know how far he got. I think actually not very far but we do need something like that. I mean the Buddhist Society brought out a Buddhist Dictionary which is useful to some extent but we need something a bit different. I mean covering especially things of interest within the FWBO. We need an entry, say, on communication and communication exercises.

They don't have anything like that. We need an entry on meditation which really explained what meditation was from our point of view. We probably wouldn't need quite such a long entry on Christmas Humphreys! Possibly, you know, slightly, a longer one on people like Subhuti and so on. (Laughter)

Ratnaprabha: It's more of an Encyclopedia or even a glossary rather than a dictionary.

sps - /7On

Devamitra: There s also alot of your own terms that like love mode and power mode.

S.: Yes, or integrated awareness and alienated awareness.

Suvaj ra: Imagination...

S.: Yes. Imagination.

Ratnaprabha: ... Individual

S.: Individual... Reactive and Creative. Someone ought to compile something like that.

Ratnaprabha: It would have been very useful as a glossary in the back of Subhuti's book, actually, wouldn't it?

S.: Ah, that's true, yes. Well, perhaps, if the second edition is called for. (Laughter)  
~)~soon&r the first one is sold out the more quickly a second will be needed. (S ~~Wcc~)  
enough subscriptions to go ahead.

Harshaprabha: ... Sadhu! (Laughter)

S.: So it's lucky to be out on the 16th of April. Is it the 16th of April? Some such date.  
Anyway, we have a few minutes but I think that is really about all so maybe have a little  
breather before lunch.

Ratnaprabha: Thank you. .

Everybody: Thank you, Bhante. Thank you for the teaching.

S.: grateful and bear fruit in many learned papers. (Laughter)...In the next few years...not to speak of intensified practice, of course. (Laughter)

(End of Seminar)