

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](#).

FRIENDS OF THE WESTERN BUDDHIST ORDER

Seminar: The Precious Garland

Day 1.

Compiler's Note: As you will soon see the scan of this seminar is very poor. The original that it was scanned from was just a carbon copy (the only remaining 'original') of the seminar. Much of what follows will, I predict, be totally incomprehensible!)

Silabhadra July 2004

S. All right, let's start from the introduction. We can just read a paragraph at a time, just going round the circle from left to right. You start off...

? Nagarjuna was an Indian pandit from Vidarbha in south India who lived approximately four hundred years after Buddha's death. At that time the Mahayana teaching had diminished, and Nagarjuna assumed the task of reviving it by founding the Madhyamika school of tenets. Here, in his 'precious Garland', he clarifies the Buddha's exposition of emptiness based on the Perfection

of Wisdom Sutras (Prajnaparamita). He presents the ten Bodhisattva stages

leading to Buddhahood based on the Sutra on the Ten Stages (Dasabhumika). He

details a Bodhisattva's collections of merit and wisdom based on the Sutra Set forth by Aksayamati (Aksayamatinirdeśa). The Precious Garland was intended primarily for the Indian king 'Satavahana', therefore, Nagarjuna includes specific advice on ruling a kingdom. (The section on the undesirability of the body is written with reference to the female body simply because the king was a male. As Nagarjuna says, the advice should be taken as applying to both males and females.) Along his works, the 'Precious Garland' is renowned for extensively describing both the profound emptinesses and the extensive Bodhisattva deeds of compassion.

S. Mmm. Carry on round0

? The translation is based on an oral transmission and explanation of the text received from His Holiness Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, in Dharmasala, India in May of 1972. The text was translated in accordance with the commentary by Tsong-ka-pa's disciple Gyel-tsap whose guide has been included here to facilitate reading. The work was translated by Jeffrey Hopkins

2.

Hopkins, who orally retranslated the English into Tibetan for verification and correction by
ati Rimpoche and then worked with Ann ~(?) to improve the presentation in English.

S. Mmm. So this little introduction gives us really all the facts that we need before we
actually start studying the text. Is there anything that isn't

clear to anybody? Is it quite clear who Nagarjuna was, very generally speaking? the history
of what he did, what his importance is in Buddhist thought and Buddhist spiritual

tradition?

? that Nagarjuna assumed the task of reviving .

S. Mmm.

? I think that Nagarjuna was more or less responsible for bringing the teaching out rather
than rev.....

S. Er, yes, well this reflects the difference between what we may describe as the Western
scholarly point of view and the traditional Buddhist point of view. That's not to say that one
is right and the other is wrong, but there is a difference of standpoint here. The traditional
Buddhist and traditional Tibetan point of view as expressed here is that the Buddha himself
had taught the Mahayana, but the Mahayana Sutras were delivered by the Buddha exactly as
they've come down to us. But that by the time of Nagarjuna they'd sunk into decline and
Nagarjuna revived them, even rediscovered some of them. ~The Western scholarly point of
view would be that the Buddha had not taught the Mahayana Sutras, certainly not in the form

in which they've come down to us. Maybe certain things that the Buddha actually said, certain teachings that the Buddha actually gave, contains the seed that later on developed into the Mahayana, so that the Western scholar would regard Nagarjuna as developing those seeds, not as reviving something which had already blossomed. So there is a definite difference of

3.

viewpoint here.

? That could be a Hinayana point of view. For the Mahayana's the point of view is of the teaching, and Mahayana came later

~. Yes, this is very much the Hinayana point of view, or Theravada point of view, rather than....

? The correct point of view, as you say, would be the Mahayana of all... Indian and S. This is what, this is the Tibetan point of view. Probably, if we looked at it quite objectively, we can't really see either point of view explicitly

I think we can't accept that the Mahayana Sutras were taught by the Buddha

exactly as they have come down to us, but we can accept that they certainly reflect the spirit of the Buddha, the spirit of the Buddha's teaching, recast in - you know - another form at a later time. We can certainly see in the Pali

text even, not only the seeds but the quite definite statements of teachings later on that come out more fully in the Mahayana tradition. So probably we just have

to follow a sort of middle way here, and give a certain amount of weight to the traditional point of view and a certain amount of weight to modern scholarly opinion, but not regarding either as exclusively right, or either as exclusively wrong. And then we find this sort of difficulty, you know, when we're dealing

with Buddhist Sutras very often. And to what extent can they be regarded later as actually the words of the Buddha? to what extent are they sort of reshapings

of His original message? and it may well be that, you know, we can't always be absolutely certain that the Buddha said these particular things in that particular way. Probably texts

like the Udāna texts, like the Sutta- Nipāta, bring us back as near to what the Buddha said in the way that He said it, as anything else in the ~role of the Buddhist Canon. But that doesn't mean that works that originated ~ later as regards- their literary forms, don't very faithfully reflect the spirit of the Buddha's teaching, even though the form may be different, you

know, from the form that He gave the teaching. So it's a question of a very fine balance between the spirit and the letter. So here, whoever ~ responsible

for the introduction, is reflecting the traditional Tibetan point of view,

4.

Buddhist which again reflects the original Indian point of view that Nāgārjuna revived

the Mahāyāna teaching, that that teaching had been given in its fullness exactly ~qA~ as contained in the Mahāyāna Sūtras by the Buddha, eMiL that by the time of

Nāgārjuna~ this had ~unk into decline and been revived. And where as I said the Western scholar would be more inclined to regard Nāgārjuna as developing some- thing which wasn't fully existing before his time.

Would ~ the king have scribes that this would' be an oral...?

S. Mmiii?

transcribed? Would this have been transmitted orally and the king....?

S. NO~ as far as we can see Nāgārjuna wrote. By the time of Nāgārjuna writing was in quite common use and he clearly ~ wrote this as an actual letter, or maybe a little sort of work on BuddhistL in the form of a letter.

? This would be about the same time as the Prajñāpāramitā texts, the only ones that were written down?

is

S. Yes, yes... That about 400 years after the Buddha. You notice

it says the translation is based on an oral transmission and explanation. I mean this draws attention to the fact that, you know, even when works were written down the teacher who wrote them explained them to the disciples, and 9-

they explained to their disciples. Usually in Tibet you don't just read a text

by yourself, you go to a guru teacher who's heard the explanation

from his teacher and so on. In the case of quite elementary works this isn't

- 'so important, but if it's something quite abstruse and difficult, well obviously it does become more and more important to have the correct interpretation. And sometimes the correct interpretation may even be lost, you know; if that continuity is interrupted, and one may have to search it out again. So usually along with the text you get the oral explanation of the bringing out of the meaning of the text in full. And most people who have been on study

5.

retreats have found that they get far more out of the text in that way. If you very often just go through it by yourself, it doesn't mean very much, but if

you actually go through it in this sort of way, then you see far more meaning in it than you would have done otherwise. Much more is brought out.

? Nn¶. W~~~nIt~~~~ asked out when you.... before your ordination, er, what books you'd re~

S. That's right..

? And by that they meant what books you'd read with a teacher~

S. Yes~ yes, that's right. That was in the context of the Therav&d~. That was the same tradition there. ~at you've read by yourself in a sense

doesn't count..... t~e~ it's p~~~~&t~7 Tim?

Tim (?) It's food to keep a ~C'~~~ ~udy retreats ohculdb
st~.

S. You'~ ~e4&ee ~ all the anyway..... All right, let's go on to Chapter One
and read a verse at a time, going round the circle
and t4~l - ~)

Chapter One

I bow down to theA i~~a;-2+. fre~from all defects, adorned with all virtues, the sole
friend o~~beings.

S. There's quite a number of points to go into here. Tho is being
saluted here, who is the author bowing down to?

The Pu-ddha.

6.

The Tuddha, hm? ~y do you think he is doing that?

Acknowledging the lineage.

S. Acknowledging the lineage and you know, possibly, as it were, opening himself to the spiritual inspiration of the Buddha.

? It's like Milarepa with 7

S. Right, yes, yes. Fe says, 'I bow down to the all-knowing'. Now what does 'all-knowing' mean? Is he actually thinking that the Buddha 'knows all'? that the Buddha is omniscient? And is that the Buddhist teaching?

In terms of, maybe, in terms of the Nah~jana, the N~liayana teachings iv'. aybe.

S. All is all, you know, 'all-knowing'.

? Completely Enlightened.

s.(p~~~£) No, it doesn't really mean completely Enlightened because that is Samyak-sambodhi, but this seems to represent some such term as Sav which means all-knowing, so knowing everything, so in what sense is the Buddh.~ said to know everything?

? ? °.~ ? ?

S. Mmiii. That's getting a bit closer to it. But is it the Buddhist tradition that the Buddha literally knows everything? T)id the Buddha Himself claim that He literally knew everything?

c&s~

(j(~~~~ The thing that comes to mind is the - I think they call it the house builder.

7.

S. Ah, yes, hm,~the Buddha knows who has built the house, He has seen through him.

Yes.

S. Yes, so the emphasis is more like that why this question comes up is because in the Buddha's day there were certain teachers who did claim to know everything. At least their disciples claimed that they knew everything. In particular there was Mahavira, the founder of Jainism. He is called Napatika in the Pali text, & he claimed, or at least it was claimed by him, that he knew everything in the sense that he knew literally how many leaves there were on any given tree, he could tell you the exact number. So some people in the time of the Buddha seem to think of Enlightenment even, in this

sort of way, a complete factual knowledge about everything, almost like scientific repudiated knowledge, but factual knowledge. But the Buddha this, and the

Buddha said quite clearly that he did not claim to possess that kind of knowledge. He was not all-knowing in that sense. And He made it clear in what sense He was all-knowing. He was all-knowing in the sense that He knew Nivarna, He knew how to get there, He knew what helped you and He knew what hindered you. He claimed to be omniscient with regard to the goal and the path. He claimed to know all about the goal and all about the path to get there. But He did not

claim to be omniscient with regard to matters of worldly knowledge, about matters of Geography, History, Science and so on. So the omniscience which He claimed

was, we may say a spiritual omniscience, but not anything, as it were, scientific. So it is quite important to understand this.

So Nagarjuna salutes the Buddha as the all-knowing in that sort of sense.

Of course sometimes you do find that some Buddhist writers, sort of carried

away by their enthusiasm, or by their devotion, do seem to ascribe to the Buddha so much more than what He claimed for Himself. This is perhaps especially true of Mahayana writers, but strictly speaking one should not look upon the Buddha as omniscient in a worldly sense, as omniscient about worldly matters. He was sure about the path, He was sure about the goal, and that was sufficient,

8.

that was all that was needed. - Present in India nowadays you get the sort of strange attitude on the part of many people, that they expect a spiritual teacher to know everything. If for instance they go to a spiritual teacher and they've got a pain in their stomach, they expect him to know all about this and to know what's wrong with them, and to be able to tell them what to do etc. And, you know, some Indian teachers know that they do their best to live up to this, and, you know, to give answers to all these sort of questions in a very confident sort

of way, as though they did in fact know everything. So there is a sort of pre- on

ssure them from the religious minded public to adopt this sort of role.

It's very sort of comfortin~ to think there's somebody knows everything. But it isn't necessary from the purely spiritual point of view that anybody should know everything. So it's quite possible to have one and the same person spiritually Enlightened but ignorant about quite a lot of things. That this is some~you find quite difficult to imagine - that a Buddh~ for instance wouldn't know anything~ about motor-cars. He might not know anything about as to 2 1 Geogr~hy, He might be quite ignorant 'z~L where exactly ~urope was in relation to India. Of course He'd never heard of ~urope as such. He probably did think; if He thought about the matter at all, that there was a great central mountain calle~ Mount Sumeru. But mis-information about scientific matters is not

incompatible with spiritual knowledge and spiritual realisation. So this _____ I kind of sometimes gives us, ~know, quite odd~esults, when someone is trying to

expres;a hir- spi-:itual J understanding and spiritual insight and realisation through the medium of perhaps quite ~ wrong scientific knowledge. T~ you see

what I mean? For we have to be able to distinguish the two and get the mess~e and i~~ore ~n r~r th~n the media. j~4(J4 tal~~out the body in (?)

S. Yes, ri£ht.

But now isn't it quite often claimed the Bu&dha's knowledge of the Univer~e say was....was.

~. Yes, well this is claimed by scn'e modern Theravadins. ~They try to provr via the truth of N~ddhism ~ science, which I think is quite mistaken. J~nd th~ir

9.

rea~onin~ is like this: in the Pali text you can find all sorts of statements attributed to the Buddha, which show that he anticipated some of the best discoveries of modern Science, so this shows that the Buddha really was Enlightened and that

Buddht~sm anticipates Science and therefore you can trust Buddhism. It is trying to bolster ~u~dhism up with Science. But I think this is completely misleading, completely wrong, because you confuse these two kinds of knowledge. Even suppos~ the Buddha had anticipated ,say, the Theory of Relativity, that wouldn't prove that He was Pnlightened spiritually, it would only prove that He had anticipated t£,~ Theory of Relativity. Ax~d you can have a true spiritual knowledge about some- thing, and a false Scientific knowledge about it. ?~? For inst~~ce, you can realise that something is impermanent, but you may not know exactly how it works. You know, a Buddha would know about a moter car if you put one in front of Him, that it was a conditioned thing. He'd see through its conditionateness.

e'd have no attachment to it, because He saw its conditionateness, but He wouldn't be able to

tell you how it worked. So He would have a spiritual knowledge of the motor car ~') "-~~, but He would not have a mechanical knowledge of the motor car. So the two things

are quite distinct. He would be seeing the motor car in its reality, but in another sense ~{e wouldn't know anything about a motor car. In the same way He would see a flower in its reality, but He might not be able to tell you to which botanical species it belonged, and He might even make a mistake about its botanical species, but at the same time He might tell you that the flower was impermanent, the flower was not absolutely real and that would be the truth. So the fact that ~je 'd made a mistake about the species of the flower would not invalidate the truth of what He'd said about the ultimate nature of the flower.

? That seems to be the difference between Eastern poets and Western poets. The Eastern poets seem to experience ~L~p~~0er~ ~ a flower and express. ~#. ¼ ~ jCt ~tt~~4~~
\\ ~cA

S. There's Su-uki's famous comparison of a poem about a flower, written by a

Zen poet, a Japanese Zen poet, I forget which one, and, you know, a poem about a flower written by Tennyson. Tennyson's poem begins,

10.

"Flower in the granite wall,

I pluck you out of the ~", and Suzuki says, 'Look, we can't just look at the flower, he's got to ~~~~pluck~~t out of the

"And hold you all - root and all -

Th my hand. V1 He clutches the flower in his hot, sticky hand (laughter). He can't just leave it there growing (laughter). Then he says,

"Little flower, but if you ~could understand..." and Suzuki follows his thought as it were, 'Well, you know, what is he expecting the flower to understand?' (laughter). He points out the difference, this is the difference.

?

S. Well, Suzuki doesn't think very much of it (laughter)..... quite devastating. And in the end the poem ends up,

'Little flower, but if I could understand what you are root and all,

All in all, I should know what a flower is" and Suzuki says, let it grow there and just contemplate 'Well, what nonsense! (laughter). it, but here he is saying it out (laughter), clutching it tight and looking at it earnestly questioning it and not getting anywhere. And according to Suzuki-

uki this illustrates the difference of attitude on the part of the Zen Buddhist poet and the Christian poet towards nature, maybe life in general. Certainly a different attitude towards flowers anyway. So it's almost as though you know, so 1/4 people in Ceylon (~) some Buddhists in Ceylon (I know, con-

scious of the meaning of Buddhism in their own country, are just trying to

sort of bolster it up by appeal to Western science. It's as though science

is the real authority. So if you show that Buddhism agrees with science, well then you've done something for Buddhism. I think this is treading on very dangerous ground indeed, because a lot of science changes: the science of today is not the science of yesterday. The science of tomorrow is not the science of today. And it isn't as though you've got an absolutely established body of scientific truth that everybody accepts. That isn't the situation at all.

1~.

Indians say the same sort of thing about the Vedas: it's all in the Vedas, the Vedas anticipate all the latest discoveries of modern science. I mean Hindus in India will tell you that if you only care to look deep enough you can find out about the atom bomb in the Vedas, that the Indians, the Ancient Indians,

knew how to make atom bombs, but they didn't like, they just didn't bother. But how

to make an atom bomb you can discover from the ??? They really believe this.

But this is basically the appeal to authority, except that nowadays we don't have a spiritual authority, we've got a scientific authority. The scientist is the man who knows: science is knowledge. So if Buddhism agrees with science, Buddhism must be right. If Professor Soand so, you know, the great physicist, speaks up in favour of, you know, spiritual life and spiritual things,

well, there must be something in spiritual life and spiritual things, because a Mm? Yes? great scientist, a great Physicist, has spoken up in favour of that. This

seems to be entirely the wrong attitude.

sort of? Maybe even brings a certain security.

S. Yes. kind of? :L ~

? Maybe the East are looking towards the West to find the support because the West are

S. Right. Yes.

That goes of just grasp (?) the head, and not the spirit in that.

S. Very likely. Perhaps they hadn't even grasped with the head. I mean Buddhists in Ceylon who do this sort of thing are usually, you know, Western educated Buddhists who are trying to justify Buddhism in terms of Western thought and Western Science, and sometimes completely miss the whole spirit of Buddhism, which, of course, very often the Ceylonese do anyway.

It's just playing safe.

S. Yes~ playing safe. But why do you want to play safe? You want to play safe when you're unsure, you're anxious. And you've no experience of your own to fall back on. It's not Islam about to.... a similar misunderstanding that an educated man who studied philosophy at University is more likely to understand Buddhism than someone who hasn't. There is this sort of assumption

12.

in some quarters. If you've studied Comparative Religion and you've taken a course in Western Philosophy and you're reasonably well educated, well you stand a better chance of understanding Buddhism. But again, you know, that is completely beside the point. You understand... I don't know... Buddhism only by virtue of a certain spiritual insight, which is not necessarily associated with those other things. In fact, very often just the opposite.

That was the impression I got at first with Buddhism, that you have to ;~~ be at a certain intellectual standard before you l=~ what it's about ... know

what it's *rying to say.

S. Well, I've even, yo~ know, heard ~ome Ceylonese monks say, and also, you know, read some of their articles to this effect, that Western people aie in a better position to understand Buddhism because they a;- highly educated and intellectual. But my own eperience, you know, in the West, is perhaps if anything in the opn~osit~ direction. You know, the rrore highly educated and intellectual you are, the less likely you are to be able to appreciate and to

the real sort of spiritual essence of Buddhism. You know, if you're highly educated and intellect~al you may be able to master some of the, as it were, Philorophical teachings more easily, though that isn't necessarily the case even, but you may have no sensitivity to wbLt Iutdhism is really all about at all You may entirely miss the point of those teachings, even though in a sense, on a certai~ level, you do grasp them intellectually, you know, and can even write aout them and explain them. But you can still be missing the point of them entirely. And even in the same sort of Wc~~ you can be a --erfectly good Buddhist, but not know very much about the Eistory of Buddhism. Although that's another thing that we tend to assume, you know, in Western Buddhist circle~, tTh~t a ~udJiist is one who knows all about the Nist~ry of Buddhism and can ra~tle off the names of all the diffei~nt schools, and tell you roughly what they taught...

:rnu know, when they flourished, and so on. But you can have all this ~ort of knowledg~, all this sort of information, rather, and still be quite remtoe from Buddhism, you know, quite remote from the real trtith of the Pharma. I mean, you're a Buddhist if you really have an understanding of certain basic~principles

13.

and you really do try to p~ these into ope~ation, you really do try to practise them. But it's as though, almost, we're expected to sort of go through the whole istory of Bud~hism and study all the te:~ts and le~rn to pass examinations in Buddhist philosophy before, you know, ~e 're able to be Buddhists at all or to practice Buddhism. This is thjj impression you get from some people.

... be ~nligheten people on the earth who've never heard of the Mis- torical Buddha?

S. ~t's not impossible. I mean I've mentioned before that I have met Tibetan tuddhists who have never heard of the Buddha - I mean not the historical Gautama the Buddha, Sakyamuni. I mean their - the centre of their attention is Avalokitesvara, ?ara, Padmasambhava, Tsongkhapa. So~e of them have never heard about the Buddha, the historical Sakyamuni. They know the term 'BuCdha', but that is the 'Enlightened ~ein~': they (on't think back to the historical Bud~ha~ ~y.. many of them.. Padmasambhava is more

real to them than ~akyamuni.

But, for them as it were, Padmasambhava has become the archety~e of J~nli~fte ~
A~~ & (&~t bAAA ~ ment. He is the BuddI~. ~They don't know anything about his life,
very often, flU~~

but they're still Buddhists. ~Thy? Because they are orientated towards En- light~fiment.
They are practising certain spiritual teachings.

? Your lecture .~ er... Perfect Unn'er5tandi~~~ I think, clears up quite

a lot othis.... ~Ibat Perfect Vi~ion is and what understanding is. It's not OL

r'tr~h~tt~~ Buddhism.... ajk &~ ~'~ *~~& ~ C?' A

And when I came tack from India to England and when j used to go along to the
Buddhist SocieLy ~ummer School and when I used to go to the Society it~elf, and also take
classes at the Hampstead Vihara, this was very much the approa~h of many people, if not the
majority. And this is why the summer schools ~~ or~anised in that sort of way. You'd have
someone talking about Tibetan Buddhism, ~omeone talking about the ~aA#t~'~~~~, someone
talkin~: abomt the Theravada, someone talking about Zen, and if you added up all these
things and

14.

put them all together yo1~ got BudChism. That seemed ~ be the tssumption. And at that
time there was virtually no meditation, and there was no Puja at all, ~~'A~~' That was
absolutely out. I introduced that in '~~ ~ ~SUMmer School, and that was considered
quite extraordinary, not to say outrageous, to have Puja, or to have a shrine, they didn't have a
shrine. There was a big lecture on, but no shrine, and no meditation worth speaking of.
They'd have a five minute quiet sit, that was about all. And lots and lots of books on sale;
and lots and lots of discussion, and lots and lots of socialising - and lots and lots of non-
vegetarian food. It was reall~ extraordinary when one thinks back to it. But, you know, it~s
understandable , that was a certain historical, you know, stage.

I ~we're beyond that. to go, you know, To some people it might well be helpful, through schools and

the development of History

S. Yes, right ? p--

. I think that is also very important.. It seems to correspond roughly to the distinction between what Buddhism calls the *śramaṇa-māsari*, the doctrine follower, and the *śrāvaka-māsari*, the faith follower. The Coot: ~m ?ollc~er s helpeC by study, he likes to know c~ll about T:U¼ Chism, not just the ~harr.~. L~t the faith follower Coesn't bo~her with all tho:~e thin~s. For the faith follower the teac~er is more important, personal contact with the teacher, and just gettin~ the instruction that he himself needs for his personal development. The doct- rine follower, we're told, isn't so d:pendent on the teacher. ~e's much more fond of stucy, of comparative s~udy, aa-lC ~';her likes to work thing:s out for himself, and to know what ot~er people have thought at different times, and what other people have practised. But the faith follower jus- doesn't feel inclined to bother with all ~hat. he's just concerned with his own practise, and with understanding certain basic principles , ' p. putt~ into op- E:ration.

15.

Take a different dimension that different people to

take The intellectual kind of (?) rather superficial

the surf~ce.... S. Of course, especially the doctrine follower is also a follower. A

doctrine follower in the Buddhist classification is n't just an intellectual. I mean he is following the path, but in a quit~ different sort of way. I mean you can have, you can sc.t'y, the two ~xtremes. Instead of the doctrine follower y~u can have the mere intellectual, the mere scholar, and of course instead of the faith follower, you can have the merely sort of sentimental person. So you've got the two extremes. But the doctrine~is following, and the faith follower te also following, but in different ways. But the mere

intellectual, the mere scholar, is not following. And nor is the merely sort of sentimental ~devotee.

I'm ~'ust thinking of Sariputra and Naudga~ayana, wondering if they stand

Tor - :~present~~~~, or symbolic, maybe, of the two followers.

S. I think~~Ananda is re~axded as mor representative of the faith follower
j think.

Sariputra perhaps of the doctrine

S. M:mm. As I Kay, within the context of Tibetan Buddhism, Tsongkhapa is very much the doctrine follower; Nilerapa is very much the faibh follower.

Cn the two ways be combined?

S. It seems very difficult to ~et °~hese combined in the same person, eh? And they seem mutually exclusive: if you're the one you're not th~ other. Perhaps iou can, you know, concentrate a bit more on ~UUI~Q' (.) c bit ~re at one tIme of your life, and a bit more on the other at another time, but you can't

really combine them ft the same tiire You can have, you know, great faith and quite

devotion, and still co quite a lot of study. Yo~ c~ do~a lot of atudy and still

have faith and devotion. But the pure types seem quite incompatible. I think most people are either the one or the other.q You could say the doctrine foll- ower is sometimes too broad; the fai::h follower is sometimes too narrow. But the doctrine follower at his best is sort of broad and sympathetic, and the faith follower at his test is deep and intense. But the doctrine follower

16.

if he isn't careful tends to become shallow: he s~~reads himself too widely. And the flaith follower, if he isn't careful, tends to be a bit on the fanatical Any way all that arose out of the consideration of Nagarjuna's bowin~ down to the BudTha as the 'all-knowb~g'.

Then it goes on to say, '~ee from all defects, adorz led with all virtues'. In other words je's seeing the Buddha in two-fold mimer. ife sees the Buddha cS freed from all Cefects, ann adorned with all virtues. In cther words he sees Him as morally and spiritually lperfect. But when he says that the Buddha is freed from all defects, what sort of defects is he thinking about?

The hincranoes anJ

. Well, he's thinking of ~hat we may describe as defects 0 character, not defects of ki~wledge or information - that the Buddha is free from defects such as craving, attachment, hatred, fear, anxiety, Yes? and adorned with all virtues - virtues in tho- sense of all good, psoitive, spiritual - tven more than spiritual - tr~~scendental qualities. ~~by do you think IT,agarjuna says 'adorned' with all virt~es, rather than say 'Possessed' witl a~l virtues - I'm taking the Mnglish version quite literally - 'ado~ned' with all virtues.

Was it all this in ~~~~ the word

No, it wasn't connected with that. Pnat does 'adorned' suggest?

What's the difference, what's the feeling different if you say, 'well, he possesses all the virtues' or 'He's adorned with all the virtues'.

? He wears them sort of obviously.

Flowing over.

z). Flowing over - Yes, but the word itself doesn't suggest

? ~~~ ~S

~. N'o-o. When we speak of someone being adorned, you ~Io~, what . ~t=L~
+h~~~

Me says, er, he has the... he's ~ in the Mahayan~a

S. No (laughter). Oh, but this is obvious.... ~That does 'adorned'

Can?

? All the highlights. Made beautiful.

17.

S. I:~ade ~eautif~, yes, made beautiful. So if you say, 'inde beautiful with all virtues~,
what does that suggest? - about the virtues themselves? (Babble)

They are beautiful, they're

(Babble)

S. rThey are beautiful. So it's when ~juna speaks of virtues, he

speaks of the Buddha being adorned with virtues, he is suggesting that the virtues

are something beautiful and attractive. So that by ~ossessing these virtues,

being adorned with these virtues, decorated with these virtues, the Buddha becomes Himself
very attractive, very fascinating, as it were. Not that virtues are something rather grim and
forbidding, but they're something which adorn and decorate the particular person. So that
other people are very attracted by that.

Fascinated..

S. Fascinated by that, drawn by that. So this is very important... because in a way this is the beginning of faith, eh? 1) Do you see that?

Mmm

Pretty well

S. What is faith? That's, faith is not belief, faith is your emotional response to the spiritually attractive, eh? yes?

° Yes, I was going to ask you about that question, with the last point... what... faithful, and what

S. ?W Faith follower is one who, in a sense, has a more emotional, more devotional temperament, eh? and who perhaps is drawn more by persons than by abstract principles, eh? So the faith follower will tend to be attracted by the teacher, personally, and to follow whatever the teacher gives personally... I mean he's more responsive to certain things, certain qualities that he sees in the teacher. Whereas the doctrine follower seems more responsive to certain general, even abstract principles that he encounters in the course of his studies.

The hurdle there is for the faith follower to overcome the sort of the devotee bit, and become a disciple though, isn't it? because you can be torn (?) through it and leave it at that.

18.

S. Right, yes, yes.

? ~o if (?) you were obliged and try to attach yourself to him, and you don't sit down and go away and make an effort - you're willing to be like that.

S. Whereas with the doctrine follower the danger is he remains a student and never becomes a disciple. Yes?

~=. , yes.

S. So there's a difference between student and disciple, and a difference between devotee and disciple. Yes? But, er, in speaking in terms of the doctrine follower and the faith follower, these are both disciples, yes? The doctrine follower is not just a student; the faith follower is not just a devotee.

There's quite a difference between say, a devotee in this sense, and a disciple

who is very, very devoted, there's quite a difference between those two, just great as there's a difference between the student and the disciple who is studious.

And so there's finally you go on - the verse goes on - to say, 'The sole friend of all beings' .. 'Adorned with all virtues, the sole friend of all beings'. So what does this suggest? That

Nagarjuna, as it were, contemplating the virtues of the Buddha, or contemplating the virtues with which the Buddha is adorned, feels, as it were, spiritually very attracted by the Buddha, develops great devotion, develops great metta, and realises that the Buddha is the sole friend of

all beings. In other words, there is a sort of emotional, devotional rapport, established between Nagarjuna on the one hand and the Buddha on the other. It's as though the verse sort of gathers emotional intensity. But I bow down

to the all-knowing, 'the all-knowing' a purely, as it were, intellectual

yes~ at least as regards the terminology. Then 'free from all defects',

so you clear all the defects out of the way. 'Adorned with all virtues', then you see the Buddha, made beautiful with all these positive spiritual qualities, and then 'the sole friend of all beings'. I mean the only person to whom beings are really attracted, in the end, because He possesses all these wonderful spiritual qualities, and is able to help others. And seeing these wonderful spiritual qualities, and seeing the fact that He is able to help others, anyone who is at all sensitive or at all aware, will realise that the Buddha is the sole friend of all beings, that there's no other friend, other than the Buddha, the

19.

only one really able to help.

° Do you think you can say that you can only, in a sense of being a sole really friend, that you fear. Only trust someone who is at least a stream entrant?

S. Yes, I mean you can only really trust someone who has got, well, permanent spiritual qualities, because, well, you may be depending upon them having those spiritual qualities, but suppose they've only got them for the time being? yes? supposing they're just the result of some temporary dhyanic attainment, then what happens to your trust? You must be able to repose your trust on something in someone. really so? id, huh?.. So here it is said of the Buddha, 'The sole friend of all beings', as if to say He's only someone who's got this sort of rock-like quality, this rock-like nature, that you can really depend upon to be your friend. And you know that even with ordinary people, as it were, you know that there are certain people who, well you can depend upon at least in certain respects, under all circumstances, but others you know, well, if the going gets a bit rough, they'll probably let you down. And that is, you know, quite a sad experience, if, you know, you hadn't realised that before.

It's yourself anywhere a kind of constancy in someone

Let's say that you can put your trust in, ~~~~ you feel that you might want to, but

you can't . -. _____

S. Tyy~~m. Yes.

Certainly sorn--one to w~.it for (?) And if you're ith someone~ who is constant, there is that sort of reg~larity, there's the tr~ast, and then there's the sort of emotional response to that, of re~lly feeling loved, for instance

S. Yes. But that depends upon - feeling that that oth~r person can be

a re~l friend, eh? you know in the true- sense. But only that sort of percon can be (????? bus ~Jing by) because somebody olse would. be at the merc:J of ?.-is,~er,

well, his own weaknesses. So how could he be a tr~~e fr5end? There's tThe minu~o when you really ne~d l~im, or ycu need to depend upon him, -ell he's just not available. That means you just can't place that sort of trust.

~O.

This is why, I mean, Aristotle said, 'there can be no real friendship between wicked people'. There can be friendship rn~ly between the good. Yes? I mean there can be a certain camaraderie ar~ng the wicked, yo4 know, a certain~ fellowship among thieves as it were, but there can't be any real friendship. According to Aristotle friendship impl~Os virtue, you know, fri~ndship is a virtue, only the virtuous can be friends, because there must be that element of constancy. If you rob a bank with 5Om2bOdy~ well, he's not really a friend, because, you know, if he was promised a free pardon, you know, provided he split on you, he'd split on you. MinC you, there are some bank robbers who wouldn't, but they'd be true friends despite being bank robbers. But the majority, prcba~ly nine out of ten, would split, unless they were afraid of being bumped off, you know, when you ~~e out, or something like that. They'd just save their own skin. Sc there'd be c friendship there.

You know, I can't help reflecting on the orC~er, becuse, you know, of what we are in the order

S. Yes, yes.

? And it, well, to me it seems it doesn't exist outside.

S. Yes, right.

? the orC~r~r when you've got

~. At least you've got it as it were collec~ively. You may not be q;~iitc sure about each and every indIvidual, but you can be quite sure about ~he order as it were, collectively. I smy, as it We~~ collectively, because you can't really have a. collectivity of individuals. Yo~~~ve got s?Ple... well, you've got to... °-ou can trust the spiz~tual community. Yes? Sc if y~u ~et to~ether with them, f, you know, ycu ne~~d any sort of advice or a~~y sort of help, well you can be suje you will get that, you'll not be misled. You'll get wh~t you need, even though it may not be what you want. (Laughter). So you can be a friend only to t~~ extent that you, you know, you have as it were some srirituai life and some spiritual development,

eb? It's no easy to be a friend. (r~)- ? This ties up with commitment. It's rather like being able to commit oneself, either to an ideal or to a person

S. Mmm, yes
21.

I mean at that level of attainment or realization, you can commit yourself to an ideal or to a friend, quite possibly.

S. N~, yes. Probably, in a sense, the ideal comes first, because, I mean, how do you come to commit yourself to another person? It's not in a sense,

you know, committing yourself to their, to all their imperfections for the sake of their imperfections, but you commit, er, on account of a certain ideal, you know, which you have in common. That is the basis of the relationship, and what makes the mutual commitment possible.

the binding, keep the binding . ~

S. Mmm, yes, except that I don't quite like the word 'Binding', Because
it's also a free thing, it's a spontaneous thing. You don't sign anything on

the dotted line (I&~A ? terms (?) of course. S.]~a. Lk-&N'A~
? So, it's like you've got to accept - a communication is taking place

S. I?r~'jfl. All right, then, this is ~aJ.rjuna~s opening verse, 'I bow down to the all-knowing, free from all defects, adorned with all virtues, the

sole friend of all beings'. Of all beings? What exactly does that mean ?

In what sense is the Buddha the sole friend of all beings? There are lots of

them haven't heard about Him. Most of them haven't heard about him.

(J~flA# ? But ultimately they're all

S. Yes. They're all, you know...

S. ~that, you mean potentiall~ the friend of all bei1~gs, in principle e is already, He --s w~lling to be eh?. But there must be some response, some initiative from the other side, from the other being- as ~eli: the Bu~dha is available. All right, let's carry on with verse two.

? 'O King, I will explain practices solely virtuous to generate in you the doctrine. Practices will ~e established in the vessel of the excellent doctrine'.

22.

S. ~mn. O~O, ~O King, I will explain practices solely virtuous to generate in you the doctrine'. The practices will be well es.... will be established, in the veesel of the excellent doctrine.' So, 'O King', this makes it clear who he is addresseing. ?~? The first verse is the salutation to the Buddha. Now, he as it were, opens his letter, opens his epistle: 'O King* I will explain practices solely v~trtucus'. ~nm? I will explain practices which are concerned only with skillful mental states, skillful actions and so on. 'To generate in you the doctrii~'. I don't know whether doctrine here is really the best translation, but the original wo~ must be 'dharma' or the equivalent of dahrm~~~T~ which is . ~*, if you use the term 'doctrine' it suggests something as it w~re intellectual, doesn't it, something just to be un(ler~tood. But if you say 'dharma', then r~t gives the full meaning. 'To generate in you the dharma'.~ This is a quite interesting expression: to give birth to the dharma in you. It's something living like planting a seed, planting a germ. So Nagarjuna proposes to explain to the king, those practices which are concerned solely ~~ith skillful things, skillful thoughts, skillful words, skillful deeds, so that in the ki~g there may be planted some seeds of the aharma , so that the dharma may be brought to birth within the king. In other words he wants to apark the king off, you may say. He docmn't want ~ust to impart information~ But he wants the ... that his words, his explanations will actually quicken something in the king. 'For the practices will be established in a ve~sel of the excellent doctrine'. What does it mean to be a vessel of the excellent doctrine?

A carrier.

S. A carrier. That 5u~r,g~5t5 --o ~ receptive. There's a text which says that there are four kinds of disciples, like four different kinCs of pot. The first kind of disciple - not real disciple, of course - the first kind of disciple who comes along, you can say, is likL- a pot turned upside down. So what does this suggest? Completely unreceptive. Yes? Closed. And then there's the leaky pot - you know, it receives, but it all leaks away, bcoase there axe so many holes in the bottom. Now wThat does that suggest?

23.

? Drains (?) A drain round it (?) -

S. Yes, in a way. The person who receives but cannot retain. It go~s in one ear and out the other. He understands ft at the time, accepts at thc ti~~ but you know, immediately

afterwards forgets all about it. And then there's the pot which is full of poison. What does that represent?

? There's no room for... anything(?)

S. Yes, but full of poison, not just full of, you know, anything-

?. Bad mental states

S. Bad mental states

? ;~Laughter)

S. Yes.

receives this knowledge before he can enjoy (~t by himself

S. Yes, yes. We sometimes really see this, that other people come ~long with very intense, very miserable resentment, for instance. But they just aren't able to receive and assimilate the teaching. I mean they try to ruin the tea

changing itself into poison. They twist, they distort, they misunderstand. They seem to want to misunderstand. And then, of course, there's the pot which is just clean and open ended - you know, just ready to receive. So that's the vessel of the excellent doctrine.

(k, ~L ~ ~ ~ A ~ t M t ~)

What does Nagarjuna mean by saying 'for the practices will be established in

the vessel of the excellent doctrine'? I mean he's referred to practices twice, hasn't he? First explaining them and then establishing them. So first he explains the practices, the practices which are 'solely virtuous'. By so doing he demonstrates in the king some thing of the nature of dharma itself. You notice that he generates the dharma, he doesn't generate an understanding of the dharma, in the king, but he generates the dharma itself. What does this sort of suggestion? The king's own potential.

S. The king's own potential, yes. And on account of the dharma having been generated in the king, he becomes the vessel of the dharma, he becomes receptive to as it were a still higher level of the dharma. And by being receptive to that higher level of the dharma, the practices which Nagarjuna had

24.

was originally explained to him, and through generating the dharma in him, become still more firmly established.

? The vessel is also a vehicle.

S. Yes, yes. Right. Well, that is in English, the word 'vessel' has got that double

meaning. On one of the previous sessions, I forget what the original text was, but.... I remember the phrase that the Buddha 'spoke dharma'. And we found this quite interesting. He didn't speak about the dharma, the Buddha spoke dharma. Yes? So, in the same way, Nagarjuna doesn't propose to generate in the king an understanding of the doctrine, an understanding of the dharma, he proposes to generate dharma 'for himself'. Yes? The sort of living spiritual principle as it were.... And you notice Nagarjuna says, 'I will explain practices solely virtuous to generate in you the doctrine'. The English isn't all that sort of elegant, but still we can't get something of the meaning, at least. No doubt we can assume that the king didn't know very much about Buddhism, about the dharma. Maybe he didn't know anything. So what is Nagarjuna proposing to do? He's proposing to explain practices solely virtuous, instead of

virtuous we can probably say skillful.

He's going to talk about practices

which are simply skillful. He's going to talk only about skillful things,

only about skillful practices. So this perhaps suggests that it's very important when we talk to someone who doesn't know much or anything about the dharma, that we should as it were concentrate on this aspect of things, do you

see that? by

? If you mean that... only things that will benefit them, and that's...

S. Only things that will benefit them, yes.

Not too much or too little, but, as far as possible

S. I mean, for instance, if you meet someone for the first time interested in Buddhism, interested in the dharma, or just coming on, it might not be

the most skillful thing to do to give them a sort of complete history of the VI, friends. I mean that might be quite irrelevant, they might not find it very

interesting. Or to talk about Buddhist doctrine, or just about personal things, or the weather or how did you get here, etc. etc. The most skillful thing may

r

may well be ~ust to talk about such things as will help that particular person to get some feeling for some more positive state of mind or some more positive state of consciousness or something more skillful than normally he does experience. And if one can do this, then there's a greater likelihood of a little bit of the c'har~na being generated in- ' that person. I think sometimes we overlook this, that someone~say - comes along to the centre: why have they come along? They're looking for something, yes? We have to be very careful, you know, what they're initial - not just impression - is, but what they first get from us, or from

the centre. I mean immediately they~ arrive, you don't want to thrust an appeal you know for funds under their nose. Yes? I mean maybe that's quite a good thing~in

a general way, but not as their first impression. They've come - we hope, principally - for the dharma. So we have to be quite sure that we sort of place the emphasis there, and that the first thing they hear is something - you know, to use - er a word that hasn't always got a positive connotation but which can have one - let them hear something uplifting, as it were. Do you see what I mean? or something - inspiring. I mean this point was made say by some friends of mine who went along to Pundarika, and they just found people popping in, popping ~t, and getting together in a corner about this or that or the point~ing, but they didn't get anything very positive or inspiring from anybody - well, nobody had any time, uh? So we have to be very careful about

that, Yes? That, you know, the first time people make contact with you, at even least they get something uplifting, or something inspiring if possible. And that they're not just given a few facts with figures about the friends, or a few

facts and figures about Buddhism. Try to do better than that. So therefore Nagarjuna says, 'O King, I'll explain practices solely virtuous to generate in you the doctrine'. Not, you know~ 'O King, my monastery needs... (later).

or 'O King I need a new robe', yes? or 'O King~, you know, what do you think such that

and such teaching of the Abhidharma - say, you know, a point of doctrine explained

by another teacher of the Abhidharma. No! but 'O King, I will explain practices solely virtuous to generate in you the doctrine, yes? I mean this indicates the sort of principle behind the whole approach to the, say the relatively

26.

new person, the enquirer. Talk about skillful things in such a way as to generate the dharma in that person. Talk about meditation, talk about emotional positivity, talk about devotion, talk about the life of the Buddha. Or even talk about some aspects of the friends activities, provided you do it in an inspiring sort of way - not just an informative sort of way. I mean, if you can do it in such a way as to communicate a certain enthusiasm, well that's fine

? One has to communicate energy, hasn't one? S.

One has to communicate energy

S. Energy? Yes, yes, yes.

...rather than j%-st or whatever.

S. ~ast week I got a letter from~namata from the Thiropean retreat, and she made this point, she said, you know we've got some very good people here and the retreat is going very well, but the one thing I see as most necessary is inspiration. People must be inspired. And if one is leading a retreat or if one is, you know, having anything to do with running t1~ings, I me2-n there...

one should, you know, see to it that there is some inspiration aroiiin~, Huh?

Otherwir th~ whole thing falls so flat 'and cold and lifeless, huh? So, you if, kno~i, what's the point in having I mean a retreat of any k-n~ you ki~ow, you're

doing all the nght things - an hour of meditation in the morning, an hour of meditation in the evening, communication exercises in the afternoon, two or three taped lectures - if it doesn't spark everybody off and inspir~ them, and ent~se them, what is th~ point? what is the value? It's just been a sort of mini-Su~mer school, you know, instead of a real retreat or a real sort of dharma situation. So this is what Nagar~una is proposing to do, he is proposing to spark the king off and generate in him the dharma. Huh? To give birth to the Oharma in him. huh? A sort of process of spiritual i~emination, you could say. 'For the practices will be established in the vessel of the excellent

doctrine' We

~~~i notice that in line two flagarjuna says 'doctrine' or 'dharma' and in line

Sr--

27.

four 'excellent doctrine', or 'excellent dharma', which must be 'Saa~~arma'. Now, er, in the ancient Buddha's especially when they were writing in

verses eve:~~ sin~e word, every syllable is considered and ha~ a meaning, so w~y do you think he says 'dharma' and then 'Saddharma'? I mean 'Saddhaxma' is, although the two are almost strictly distinguished, 'S~ddharma' suggests son~ething ven higher than 'dharma'.

Pimm? Yes? dharma can be used in a very ordinary, almost moral sort of sense - to follow the dharma, to lead a good life, but the 'Saddharma' is the true or the real dharma, the ultimate (i)harma, the dharma that is direct~y' concerne- with eality. So Nagarjuna says, 'O King, I'll explain practices solely virtuous to generate in you the dharma, for the practices will be est~blis1~ed in a vessel of the excellent dharma'. You see? ~ow the~hing is raised to a higher level. I mean, first of all Nagarjuna explains virtuous practices; the purpose of that is to generate in the king dharma - the moral and spiritual life - but then he says 'For th~ ~rac%-ices will bc est- ablished in a vessel of the excellent dharma', h~h? As though the king has now risen to a so~ewhat higher l~vel, huh? and can become a vessel of the dharma in an even higher sense. .

All right, let's go on to verse three.

For one who first practices high status\* -°et goodness arise~ later.

For having attained high status then comes ~Tadually to definite goodnc~s.

S. Mmm. I must say I don't qui~~e like this e~pression 'high status'.

It means a high position within conditioned existence, a high position within

prominent the wheel of life, that is to say a very happy, pr~sperous~uman life, a life

among the gods.~~n? But 'definite goodness' suggests those qualities that make for liberation, those qualities that make for Nivarna. huh? So 'In one who first practices high s~atus', that is to say one who wishes to improve his position within the samsara, 'definite ~'~~0~e55 arises later'. The urge for liberation arises lm~er. W~~ mustn't assume though that it aris~ ~utomatically. It may not arise at all. It will arise only if you start really seriously think- ing about ~, and question even yo~~ high status and your worldly happiness. For having attained high status, one comes gradually to definite ~~dness'.

N

28.

Again not that one will automatically. On may, o~may not. Fo: instance, supposing you take the case of someone who's done very well in life, who has attained high status, who maybe is quite well off, who's, you know, quite hap:~ily mm~rred, with children who are grovn up and you know, all got good jobs, or, you

know~~ bOt happily married themselves and so on. And supposing that person has their  
th0uv!~ht5 everything. I mean is it inevitable that ~~ will turn in a spiritual

dire'~tion?

?? Mo, no,

S. Mo: in certain cases yes, in oth~r cases no. So o--e has to be careful not to  
misunderstaj~d ~his verse, huh? But in one who first practices high status or who first aims  
at high status within the sphere of conditioned existence, definite good ~ss arises later - may  
arise later, can arise later. 'For having attained~ high status one coir~~s gradually to defintie  
goodness'. Pe~ haps has in mind the fact that hc is addressing a king, yes? YotL'  
know the traditional Indian belief being that if you are born in a royal family and ir2ierit the  
t1~rone, this is on account of previous ~co~ karma. So he is, as it were saying to tho king,  
well look you've L~t so far, you've achieved high status, as a result of ?our vIrtuous deeds  
you've bec~~ne king. So perhaps it is time now you should think in terms of achiuving or  
developing definite goodness. £Ie might even be saying to the king after this, 'Well, it's  
inevitable now, what else can you do?? But remember he's just speaking to that particular  
individual, it's not to be take~ as a general ~~le that everybody who attains

high statue, in that sense, automatically starts thinking in terms of definite in teri---s  
goodness, h-li? Sometimes he usQ- starts thinking~about higher status still.

Make ten, and then you start wondering whether you couldn't make a hundred if you really  
tried.

... it was a hindrance... it ~T55 a hindrance having high status and.. S Ah.  
?~igh status in the sense of a happy human life, prosperous human life, or re-birth among the  
gods

It raa~thngs a bit too...

S. A bit too easy. Well, you can certainly look at it like that. Some-

29.

times people don't seem to make much progress unless, you flflow, they have a few  
unpleasant experiences, ~hat niake them think. If things are going along too smoothly, too  
comfortably, ~ll, you start taking ever~thing for gxanted. You becomt forgetful, you become  
unmindful.

You need ~, So, if we're not careful, NaTh,arjuna's verse certainly does give the  
impression that, you know, the positive goodness arises almost naturally as & consequence of  
a high status0 But it doesn't seem really like that at all. It may, but on the other hand it  
&~finItely may not. But as I-say, perhaps the verse is, you know, or perhaps we should, you  
know, in reading this yerse, bear in mind '~e is addrssing the king, who, you know, may be

assumed to have attained high status, and to be aet'~~~~y read~ for positive goodness, and Nagarjuna tries to encourage him, by presentin~ perhaps that next step as virtually an inevitable step for him.

You mean to encourage him?

S. To encourage him, yes. It's like when you start thinking, well, it's inevitable I do this, inevitable I do that, well, you usually do it. Like, for instance people sometimes think, ah, well, I suppose it's inevitable I become an order member sooner or later. It means they've made up their mind,

when they start thinking of it as inevitable.

They don't literally mean it'

something that's going to happen to them whether they like it or not. It's a way of saying, well, I've really made up my mind. It's inevitable, it's going to happen, you know, I've no control over the where or the when, but I

know it's going to happen. It's inevitable. So maybe it's in that sort of

way that we're to understand this, the as it were virtual inevitability of positive goodness arising, you know, as a consequence of, or out of, the high status. Certainly in the case of this particular individual, the king that Nagarjuna is addressing.

Encouraging him to keep... S.

Encouraging him to keep, then? yes

? (of ~ ~~~~~i'la 6MI M~ \_\_ Samaalli

S. Yes, yes. And you've been practising the precepts for so

30

long, well it's inevitable you start meditating. How can you help it, as it were? Yes? But not that a great accumulation of high status will inevitably produce momentum, you know lead on to definite goodness, no it must be a definite individual decision and awareness at that point for that transition to be possible. This whole question of positive... of high status and happiness, raises in my mind the question of the so-called healthy person, whether the so-called healthy person is a more suitable vessel for the dharma than one who is not so healthy, and what do we mean by healthy person?

... someone... Ana Marta wrote to me in this same letter, that she felt that the people who came on the retreat in Th~urope were more healthy than the people we usually get along to our centres in England. And I wonder about this. What does one mean by a healthy person? A healthy person necessarily spiritually more open? I really doubt that is very much.



In terms of physical health.

S. Mot ~ust physical, but in a way sort of mental too, but in a way. don't really see such a person as, you know, healthy in a more Buddhistic sort of sense. Yes? M~ I rather get the impression that healthy in this context, at least for ~ina marta, mean~4) first of all someone who's yes physically l~althy probably, a'~~ active, with a lot of energ'J coming out, and

rr~~aybe ~ufte capable, and maybe quite s4~ble in lot~~f respects, and ith, you you know know a certain amount of social know how, and a certain ease of relating, you

know and a ccr~ain directness. 3u~t that such people sh~uld, as it were, auto- matically be more receptive, you know, to the dharma in the purely spirituA sense, than others who were not so healthy, I'm rather donbtful. Do you see what I mean?

WkaM~ ? You're talking in terms of like the hell worlds. You're talking in terms of people who are...

S. U-ell not even as extreme as that.

~L~c24A~~~ '~~~? ~'~

S. mmm,yes,yes. (Babble).

QA~ ~::~ ~~~~ A ~

"S.. 31.

S. ~r½~i~l~I was ]~~g-. ~l Holland, and I met number o~ healthy pecp~ - they seemed healthy physically and mentally, but healthy in a beefy sort of way, if you know what I mean, %-he healthintss seemed,connected with a certain coarseness and insensitivity. They were c~rtainly healthy, but in an almost sort of animal way, not in any way that suggeste?-- they mijft, you know, be spiritually

receptive, or that that mt~ght be almost inevitably the next stage fo~~ard for (t~t them. Milereas sometimes you can see that people~are in a~unhealthy, even

phys5.cally unhealthy, emotionally disturbed, perhaps, in ome cases, may have a spiritual receptive receptivity or a spiritual sensitivity. So I think we have to beware of you know, assuming, that the healthy person, healthy in tha mjore sort of group therapy kind of s~nse, is necessarily ~~oin~ to be a better vessel of ~~he dharma . YAl see ~hat I mean?

calls to mind ~Jo on this..... John ~ John, yes, on the retreat

Becaas'~ he didn't re~lly look healthy, you L~w, he didn't sort of

start~look~ ~L~t& . - at first he was argting, he was you saw that a bit niggly.

But, you ki~w, after a day or two~he was open, he was &ctually then asking and waiting for answers, and~yOu know when he was rece4ving them,

somet-hing was definitely touching ~im

S. So we shouldn't be sort of too much concei~ed whether we're getting healthy people along ot not so healthy people along. Because even if we tend to think, 'O wouldn't it be nice to ge~ealthy people' we're sort of assuming that well, they're going to b~ more s~iritually receptive than the not so hc-althy people. I don't thin:: this is necessarily true at all. So I think we shou~dn't think so much in terms of getting along healthy people. If we do get health~

people, O.K., we'll do w~t we can ~'fth them, if we don't get healthy people, never mind a~rig~t, we~ll do what we can with them, but not sort of get worried because

we seem to be getting not so many'healthy',~ inverted commas, ~~ple coming along.

32.

r It's the opelnross and the sincrity... S. Yes.

? Those are the two particular things that came across. I mean you couldn't

you felt they were, they were. ~~~e of a v~~ccl for th~, thrn people who

were on the retreat who ~:~ened much happier, in a way, and were lau~~ing much,

nm~ch more.

S. Tel.

? But weren't that open in that same way, and may b~ot as sincere.

S. Mmm. Yes, yes.

I think the problem is that where ~~~~~ i~~~a lot of people, perhaps ten or twenty, and thtt's when people start to g'et worried (?).

S. Yes, yes.

It fives you a good sit~ation on a retreat... a srall sort of ~roup of people, who

could possibly practice with four very positive order mmm

b..s.....

S. ~ in another way you can, you can get a bit worried when you've got also too many healthy people who are just healthy. That can be, you know, a quite

frustrating situation, when they're just healthy, but not spiritually receptive.

Yes?

? --nd want to stay healthy.

S. Mid want to stay healthy ~ot

Philips (?) in the City, someone had a e4s inside, and the rest, everything else would seem to be going: against that, so in a way you would be quite unhealthy. So when you do come into contact with something that was going... drawing you along, you would be more receptive.

S. Mmm, right; yes. I think you'd better be quite careful about this criterion of healthy. I mean the sort of current, as it were, psychological, even psycho-analytic, psychotherapeutic healthy, doesn't it correspond with the traditional skillful. So--etimes we say 'healthy' instead of skillful, but when

we do we must bear in mind that we are, you know, using the word 'healthy' as

33.

equivalent to skillful, not as equivalent to the word healthy in the more current sort of sense. Yes?

It often means worldly.

S. It often means worldly, yes, yes, happily worldly, successfully worldly, healthy. So people like that, I mean, may not be vessels of the dharma, or vessels for the Dharma at all. But some battered specimen still get out of a mental hospital may be. You know, one must be open to that possibility. ~nm? Or someone just out of jail may be. I-trnm? May be

more of a vessel of the

dharma

? '.,-, ~ in the past, (4ttLin the past to

people like this, you know, at that time just couldn't ~top1c

spend their time and their energy on these peop~e. You know if...

S. ~-;- ~, t)ais, we were thinking really~Jou~know didn't have any sort of ~Aj~~ piritual sensitivity or spiritual rece-tivity, and who weren't healthy either,

who~eeded ~me sort of you know real psychother'~peutic attention. And obviously, you know\* we couldn't you k~rnow deploy too nt~~h of our recources just on that. Now, jus~~ to come back to this question of skillful, we mustn't forget that the Buddhist skillful suggests freedom frcm craving, freedom from anger or hatred, and also fr~~~~om from Moh~ -hich :s bewilderment, mental confusion, mmm? So the hem.lthy person in the moe current sense certainly isn't free from craving. Mc will certain?~y become angry on occassion aod has got a lot cf r~ntal confusion aM bewilderment, you know, from a spiritual point of view. So they are not strictly he~thy in our sense or ~n our terms. They may be functioning very well in society, they may be successful~hey may even be happy, in a way, b%t not h~althy you know i~~ strict Buddhist sense.

FRIENDS OF THE WESTERN BUDDHIST ORDER. TRANSCRIPTION

Seminar: The Precious Garland. Day 2.

S. But er just to come back to this question of skillful, we mustn't forget that the Buddhist 'Skillful' suggests freedom from carving, freedom from anger or hatred~, and also freedom from moha, which is bewilderment, mental confusion, mmm? So the healthy person in the more current sense certainly isn't free from craving, will certainly become angry on occassion, and has got a lot of mental confusion and bewilderment, you know, from a spiritual point of view. So they are not strictly healthy in our sense or on our terms. They may be functioning very well in society, they may be successful, they may even be happy, in a way, but not healthy, you know, in a strict Buddhist sense. And also don't forget the Buddha said that all those who are, you know, short of stream entry, are mad, huh? (Pause). So I think also we have to be very careful sort of not to be thinking in terms of all these imaginary very healthy

people who never come along to any of our centres. (Laughter). Where are

tend tp, you know they? Huh? mmm? I think some of our friends, you know~~think of it in this

sort of way, yes? I think that the healthiest people that you can probably who hope to meet, the healthiest people are around, are right within the Friends

not anywhere outside undiscovered by us. Some of them might have been, you know, old

crocks to begin with, huh?, but not any longer, not after a few years, - you know, of positive practice. All right, let's go on to verse four.

Ajita? High status is thought of as happiness,        Definite goodness as liberation,        The  
quintessence of their means    Are briefly faith and wisdom.

S.        Mmm. So high status is thought of as happiness, eh? or high status  
really amounts to happiness. I        don't know how literally we should take this,  
'is thought of as happiness'. But it's as though that's its outstanding character-

2.

istic, or maybe it's in terms of happiness that people think, eh? They think that they're doing well, you know, according to how happy they are, huh? This is the criterion, huh? They - you know, life in the world of the gods is a happy life, eh? and lots of people say 'I want to be happy', mmm? So, you know, if you're in quest of high status, it really means you're in quest of happiness. But if you're in quest of definite goodness, then you think in terms of liberation. So it suggests, it's as though, Nagarjuna is suggesting these two ways of thinking: you can think in terms of gaining happiness, or you can think in terms of gaining liberation. If you're thinking in terms of gaining happiness, you're still, as it were, concerned with the world, eh? It's only when you start thinking in terms of liberation, of freedom, huh? that you're on the spiritual path, huh? Or~you could say that the worldly minded person thinks in terms of happiness, the spiritually minded person thinks in terms of liberation, freedom. The worldly minded person asks, 'How can I be happy?', 'What will make me happy?' 'How can I get happiness?'. The spirit- ually minded person asks, 'How can I become free?' 'What will help me to become free?' 'What will make me free?' 'What is freedom?' huh? But do you see the difference, or do you feel the difference? between these two? So that suggests

the spiritually minded person, the person who's thinking in terms of positive t

goodness, eh? who is aiming at freedom doesn't think about happiness, doesn't in

a sense bother about happiness, mmm? Which also means, of course, that he's got a much better chance of obtaining it, eh? Happiness is a by-product, eh? Do you see what I mean by that? rnrnm? You see, if you do something because you think doing it will make you happy, eh? the chances are, it won't. if you're thinking in terms of, 'Oh, well I want to be

happy', and look around for some- thing the doing of which will make you happy, you probably won't find anything, you'll just go from one thing to another, getting more and more bored and more and more frustrated. (Pause).

So there are these two ways of thinking, in terms of happiness, in terms of liberation. 'The quintessence of their means

Are briefly faith and wisdom.' It's not quite clear whether

3.

faith and wisdom jointly are the quintessence of the means of happiness and the means of definite goodness. I rather think that faith is regarded as

the quintessence of the means of happiness and wisdom as the quintessence of liberation means of - - - but we shall see. (Pause). All right, let's go

on to verse five.

? Through faith one relies on the practices, Through wisdom one truly knows, Of these two wisdom is the chief, Faith is its prerequisite.'

S. I-irn. So the suggestion is that through faith one relies on the practices,

and through the practices one achieves high status, huh? But it's through attaining wisdom that one truly knows, and truly knows, in the sense of -'°, huh? ~fInit~ goodness definite goodness. So'f these two wisdom is the chief, Faith is its prerequisite.' ~?

Do you altogether agree with this, or do you think there's another way of looking at it, or another way of looking at it even mentioned in the Buddhist text?

? Uttera .....experience

~hu

Uttera. Yes, I sort of felt, you know, in terms of , you know, sort of, to have.... faith in the true sense maybe you'd have it in corporate, incorporated in wisdom.

S. jf~~ Yes, yes. ~ell this is the teaching of the five spiritual faculties ~~here faith and wisdom seem to be equal and co-ordinate, and to be balance&, eh S~ it~~ ijyL question there of faith being- the prerequisite of wisdom, eh? You could say that in ,another sense wisdom is the prerequisite of faith, huh? P.-'agarjana seems to be taking faith in a somewhat more ordinary sense in a way, yes? ~aith that, you know~~, on account of which one practices, and achieves high status, huh? ~d then through wisdom one realises positive goodness, but I mean, the wisdom through which one realises positive goodness, it has surely to be balanced with faith, in a higher sense. So that the faith, you know, through which one relies on the practices is more like confidence, yes?

4.

Whereas the faith which is linked with wisdom, with the wisdom through which one truly knows, that is more like one's total response~ to the higher spiritual ideal? to the virtues of the Buddha, or to the virtues with which the Buddha is adorned, huh? In modern ~ddhist writers there is a tendency to play down faith, huh? especially ~Theravada writers, do you notice that, huh? and usually one sign of it is to translate ~Saddha~ by confidence, eh? It's certainly one level of meaning, huh? But not the whole meaning ~f faith, of Saddha, by any means, huh? So faith is really much more like your, not just emotional, but your total, including emotional, response to something which you just recognise as higher, huh, mmm? Spiritually higher, spiritually more attractive etc. huh? It's in a way sort of aesthetic, mmm? It's to be distinguished from belief, eh? at the same time it is much more than confidence. It includes confidence, it includes trust, eh? but also there is this strong element of devotion, huh? (Pause). One could paraphrase this verse by saying that through confidence one relies upon the practices, through wisdom, joined with faith, one truly knows; of these two, wisdom joined with faith, is the chief, confidence is its prerequisite, huh? Do you see what I mean? You

shouldn't really, I think, make this sort of distinction between faith as a

'4, prerequisite and wisdom as the faculty through which one truly knows.  
And

you know, the term wisdom. itself is cognitive, huh? do you see this? I

mean ~st taking it as a term, it's, as it were, intellectual, mmm? it suggests an exclusion of the emotional, eh? but, you know, it is not really through something cognitive, as distinct from something emotional, or a cognitive faculty as distinct from an emotional faculty, that you know in this sense, eh?

Even to speak of knowing is open to misunderstanding huh? Do you see this, I mean there is just this higher spiritual faculty that you can't speak of in terms of knowing, or even a feeling, it's both as it were joined together on a much higher level, eh?

Uttera. It's an intuitive understanding.

5.

S. It's an intuitive understanding, but also with an intuitive feeling,

you could say, yes. ?Nanm? On that level there is not that distinction of faith

and wisdom, really, eh? or understanding and feeling, or understanding and devotion, eh? On that level they are experienced, I won't even say jointly,

they're not separate, eh?. It's a question of a total act of your being at a

much higher level than normal, huh?~mm? It's like for instance if you're talking to someone and you're really into what you are saying, thought is there, feeling is there also, eh? but can you distinguish the thought from the feeling? It's all one, because of the sheer intensity of the communication. So here also, eh? when you 'know' inverted commas, positive goodness of a higher spiritual ideal, or whatever, that so-called knowing is an act of your total being, in which there is thought, in which there is feeling, but in which thought cannot be distinguished from feeling, feeling cannot be distinguished from thought, the thought is the feeling, the feeling is the thought, you feel the thought, you think the feeling, yes? but not as two separate things. It's all one, which is just you, though functioning at that much higher level than normal, huh? tmm? And, as it were, intuiting, reality. So that even i'~~~arjuna can be a bit misleading here if we take him too literally. (Long. pause) Yes, Q~im (?)

7

'He who does not neglect the practices through desire, hatred, fear, or ignorance

Is known as one of faith, a superior Vessel for definite goodness.'

~m. 'He who does not neglect the practices through desire, hatred, fear, or ignorance Is known as one of faith, a superior Vessel for definite goodness.'



This suggests that faith counteracts desire, counteracts hatred, counteracts fear, counteracts ignorance, doesn't it? (pause) and it also suggests or in fact it states, that one can neglect the practices, - , on account of any of those mental happenings. How does one neglect the practices through desire, for instance?

6.

? One gets caught up in craving

firm. t~.

. ~and can you practice when your mind is over with hatred? and can you meditate when you have hatred? No. What about fear? when you're really worried and anxious?.. Ho, and ignorance - well, when you don't truly understand the need for practice, or the value of practice. So if you don't neglect the practices through desire, or hatred, or fear, or ignorance, then one is known as one of faith, huh? In other words it suggests that, you know, you need faith you need faith in order to be able to practice, eh? and to keep at bay the desire, the hatred, the fear or the ignorance which will prevent you from practicing. (pause).

Uttara. is the practice of all the communist states well,  
the same thing.

question S. ~es, well, or, if it's a form of meditation practice, one holds them at bay, and it's only insight that will finally destroy them, huh? (Pause).

'is known as one of faith, a superior Vessel for definite goodness'.

This also suggests the importance of the emotional positivity. I've been talking about this quite a bit lately - talked about it on the four Things retreat in connection with the problem of Viharas and the ~bhavana , mmm? and how important it was that people should be in an emotionally positive state,

eh? that there should be friendliness, there should be compassion, should be sort of joy,

should be equanimity. I also explained how equanimity was the ~culminati~n previous of the thre~, especially the imetta, not a state of, as it were, indifference.

And then I c~dCd that, you know, that faith and devotion were also very, very ir~ortant as positive emotional qualities. So if one has not only faith, huh? but these other positive emotions then indeed one becomes a superior vessel for definite goodness. I .~ally feel that unless people have got these sort

7.

these higher, L~re refined, positive emotions, the~~ can't make ve~ much spiritual progress. ~eally it means that negative emotions have to be out of the way, and the positive emotions really well developed - positive emotions meaning the four ~rabmaviharas plus faith and devotion, otherwise you're not likely to get very far, or, in Nagarjuna's terms you'lre not likely to become a superior vessel for definite goodness, mmm? I see this as in some ways the, you know, great prac- tical thing to be dozie as regards people in general, just to help them -i become emotionally more positive, huh? which is much more than healthy, rrunm? It goes beyond the ordinary conception of healthiness, eh? The people who are healthy in the ordinary, everyday sort of sense may be emotionally positive, but it's on a much sort of cruder and coarserlevel: what one is thinking of is something much more ref ined, much more pure, in a way, also much more intense, eh?

And stable.

And stable, yes, yes.

? . . . .

S. Mmm, yes. ~ So,~oparaphrase this verse, I mean, the person who is a superior vessel for definite goodness, who can go on to make real spiritual progress, eh? is the person who is free from negative emotions, huh? and who is full or positive emotions, full of friendliness,compassion, joy, equanimity, and also faith and devotion, and who has in fact so much faith and devotion, that quite naturally and spontaneously and happily, he gets on with his spiritual practices,eh? T mean that sort of person can be expected to develop. Mimm?

? rot to mention the effect that he will have on others.

S. Right,yes, yes. (pause)0 So there's no real practice without faith,

which again doean't mean belief, ~%ich means enjoyment, eh? I think I mertationed this actually at Four Winds, that faith meant enjoyment, that this was another way of locking at it, that faith meant the enjoyment of the Buddha, Yes? mmm? That when you sort of contemplate the iaeal of the Buddha, or the spiritual ideal, you enjoy that, hmm? you feel great happiness, just contemplating that, that is faith, hmm? it's rejoicing in the ideal, hmm? being fascinated by the ideal,

[41]

So if you rejoice in it in that way and are fascinated by it, you can't help practising, this will carry you along, you'll feel so happy, huh? It's just like when you contemplate a beautiful work of art: you can't help feeling some emotion, huh? You can't help feeling happy, you can't help feeling delight huh? and faith is that sort of joy, that sort of delight, you know when you contemplate these lofty spiritual qualities of the Buddha, or when you start thinking about higher level of Reality, a higher level of being, huh? It's that joyful response that you get, that is faiths not believing this and that doctrine about them, huh? and it's this faith that carries you along, this sort of joy, huh? So practising because you've got faith, really means practising because you enjoy practising, huh? So if there's no joy in your spiritual life, it means there's no faith, really. There may be belief, but there isn't faith. This reminded me, reminds me rather, of a very interesting expression I heard, or read about the other day. Let me just try and think. Yes. Someone was writing, I forget who it was - yes, it was John Middleton Murray writing about Cardinal Newman, yes? and Cardinal Newman's belief in God yes? He said Cardinal Newman believed in God, but he was afraid of Him, yes? You could also say, perhaps, that Cardinal Newman believed in God, but he didn't like Him, huh? mmm? yes? So you can believe in God and be afraid of Him, you can believe in God and not like Him, huh? You can believe in God and be terri

fied of Him, huh? But this is not the sort of belief that is implied in the as it were, Buddhist faith, huh? The Buddhist faith is seeing the Buddha and liking Him,

huh?, that is faith, huh? you know, seeing the Buddha's spiritual qualities, and rejoicing in those spiritual qualities, huh? taking delight in them, huh? and, you know, when you are rejoicing in them and taking delight in them, you naturally feel happy, and it's that which enables you to get on with your spiritual practices - your getting on with your spiritual practices is a natural expression of that joy and happiness, eh? You're not doing it out of belief in a sense of sort of investment, that if you do it now when it's very difficult and you don't enjoy it, you'll catch something on account of it later On: not

early stage, like that. maybe that is sort of necessary at a very but

9.

you should get on with that as quickly as possible, eh? and, you know, engage in the practices because you enjoy engaging in the practices.

He believed in God and had no faith in Him.

S. Yes, he believed in God and he had no faith in Him, yes, mmm?

Could this be? you know S. I mean this is the position of many Catholics, they believe but

they've got no faith, mm?

?. maybe.. I think.. you know, we come across it. We started

this thing that you was talking on, giving a lecture, in terms of, to do with the voidness, of things, you know, you know, talking in terms of Reality and this, an ~eople woulo just, you know, myself included, were afraid in some cases of the void, of nothin£ness, and this co~ld be just a sort of conditioning, or the wrong approach to

S. !anm, yes.

Uttara ..to the Buddha.

S. .Yes.

Uttara. ~hile you were saying it's

. ~ must be careful, I mean, how and in wint way and to whom you speak about the void, you see, er, you want to attract people, you don't irant to put them off

Uttara: Yes.

I mean most penple cannot but think of the void as nothingness, Thich it is not, hmm? So, you know, if you're going. to speak about the void, all ri~ht, r~e quite ~ure people are riot ~Oli1E- to take it as nothingnes~, yes? Otherwise, instead of gettin~. attracted, they'll ~et repelled. Yes, by the way I didn't quite correct the quote from ?~rray. \;b~at he actually said ~:as, that Cardinal Hewman believed in God, but didn't trust Him, which is even worse, isn't it? Qe.. not tha~.. He d~~n't trust Him (laughter), as if to say, well, if he wasn't very, very careful, you know, Cod might come up behind him and trip him over, you know, strair..ht down into Well.' and you had to be really careful ith God, you couldn't trust Him. It's like believin~ in some horrible

10.

monster,mm? So I thought that was really terrible, but lots of catholics,

I'm sure, are like this, eb? They believe in God, but they don't trust Him, but they know that their fate is in God's hands, so what an awful, you know, feeling, to feel that your fate is in the hands of someone in whom you believe, but whom you can't trust,eb? You don't know whether your wretched accumulation of virtues, eh? ir going to get you through,eh? you migift ha'~~ just missed that, you know, you might have committed that odd sin and forgotten to confess it, yes? And, you know, you might ~ve ccnfessed everything else, but just that one sin, it's not been confeesed(?) and God has remembered it, and you've forgotten it, and He'll get y6u: you can't trust Him, and He's not going to forgive you, no. Mmm?

? Would it be possible to believe in Cod and trust Him?

rr~ekt S. Oh, I think it would, I mean, I mean a ~a-f genuine sort of Christians

might say, well, you can't believe in God really without trusting Him, and that that isn't real belief in God, and some Christians would say that. But it, you know, no doubt that there are quite a few Christians who've got that sort of belief in God, belief without trust, mmm? It's like having an angry father: well, you believe in him, because he's around, but you don't trust him.

You don't like him.

S. You don't like him. .... clip you round the ear, huh? any moment, hmm? So, you know, that is belief without faith, hmm? so when we speak of faith in the Buddhist context, it's not belief, certainly not belief in that sort of sense(?) We certainly shouldn't think of the Buddha in those sort of terms. You remember in the er... in the , I think it's Sualama ~tra that Ananda is asked, I think by the Buddha, what attracted him first to the Buddha and to Buddhism, and he says the appearance of the baḍha, hmm? - when I saw the beautiful light shining from the Buddha's body, yes?

the beautiful light which was the radiance of all his virtuous deeds, eh?

I was - when I saw this light, you know, so overwhelmed, so overcome, I was so fas-

11.

fascinated by this light that this is why I became a disciple and why I follow the ~harma, huh?

But who would speak like that nowadays? But that was faith, you see, hmm? It's always aesthetic, as it were, hmm? I mean there's some- thing of this in the Bible when, you know, they use the expression, 'The beauty of Holiness', huh? mm? yes? But it's not an aspect that we, you know, very often stress nowadays. You know the spiritual, certainly the religious, is rather un-attractive, eh? But I think we have to completely reverse that.

It ties up too with the element of not expressing that. People who may be even Christian, feel that just a little bit...

S. Yes.

? And do feel that... some kind of faith like...

S. Yes

.. but not really having the freedom to express that to other people; keeping that quite in check

S. Yes, ah, yes, mmm. Well, this ties up with what I've often said before,

that it's our positive emotions that get repressed, more often than not, not our

negative ones. That if they were allowed to be, many people would be much more

positive in expression than they are now.

You can't help thinking that if you go, say, somewhere on retreat and you see how positive people can become.

b~. Yen, right

r And you think where was that previously?

S. Yes, yes, yes. I mean, it's not some sudden miracle, it was there lurking below the surface, and not so very far below the surface, huh? not that~you've had even to dig very deep. So I think it's very important, broadly speaking, to present this sort of attractive side of Buddhism, the attractive side of the spiritual life. It's not just a side, it is what it is, huh? And if this is presented, you know, people respond to it, eh? And that response

is faith, huh? (Long pause). An~~y, we've come to the end of our Session, huh?

We've only done five verses, but I think we've done - no six verses - we've done

12.

them rather well, huh? so perhaps that's a ~;ooc start, eh? e

? Do you think that the fact that, urn, people respond like to emptiness

and the void negative

S. I think yes, but the old is terrifying, but you could say that the void is terrifying in a positive way; again it depends how it is presented, eh?

Does the void threaten your ego, you could say, yes? But SF don't think, if one

is teaching, one should threaten people's egos too prematurely, you know, especially when they are very hard, eh? You should let the ego sort of loosen up and soften up and melt a bit, eh? before you, you know, you confront it with the void.

That seems helpful, what seems helpful to me, is to keep some of those terms deliberately in the Sanskrit.

S. Yes, yes. words? And the too - that came up from that last week of that talk on the

Dharma (?) was 'sva' and 'Sunyata'

S. ~li, oh...

Purna? and I keep it like that, until

~. Don't say ~god~, 'gods1, S. Yes, yes. Purna? Don't say other things that ~ake people talk about it, have them rsk. S. Yes, yes, that's quite good. Purna: and then you're not tied down then. S. I'trnnI~ yes, mmm.

Purna: It seems to be more... much better.... much less misleading, and you

were ~ore openbr, when they come back with the questions, if they corne importance? re~ularly fo~~rds what's the importance(?)

S. Yes, yes

It I~~~~ and it's e~en easier if you talk about someone's qualities, rather than...

S. lather than virtues.

abstract state

13. S. ~bmn, yes, ~ .. f u,~M~

? ...the fact that the Buddhists

S. brilnin, yes. I was talking on the last retreat, the previous one, about the Mah~vastu, you know, the three-volume text about the Buddha,

and I made the point that you get from this whole text a great impression of that atmosphere of rejoicing, everybody's rejoicing in the qualities of the Buddha, they're so happy to have the Buddha around, they're so happy that a Buddha has

Li{~ ~ aA arisen in the world. You know, it's just one , one great long celebration, huh? and they're just so happy to have the Buddha aipund, they're so

happy that the Buddha is here, huh? mmm? We get this feeling very strongly, some in of these very old Buddhist texts. So we need A much more of where the festivals come in that sort of feeling, huh? And this is -' 1 because

~re rejo~in~;~°, huh? On Wessak ~ay, w, you should be~happy, that the Buddha r6~ined Fnlightenment, you know, as I pointed out,"

you know, the first Wess~~ ineetin£ I addressed when I came back to Dngland, I went along to the Caxton Hall at the invitation of the Buddhist Society, and gave my little talk, but I couldn't help noticing hov sad everbody s~emed, eh? so I mentioned this in my talk, that in the ra~t everybody rejoices on i~~~~~ Day, they're hap~y that the rmiddha gained Sf.nlightenment and shiwe~ the path to :..Irvana. WWhereas here everybody, you kno~~1 seems sad, airost as though they were sorry that the B~ddha gainec Enlighteninent, rather

than feelin~ happy about

it, eh? So we need to capture some of that sort of atmosphere, that joy, as ~

it were, and not think of the spiritual life ~ (?) in terms of a very diff

icult thing, a hard grind all the time, YOU know, struggle with oneself, no.' it's not like that at all really, it's a very happy, carefree life, huh? and also been reminding people that in the East, and I noticed this myself, you usually find the monks are much happier than the lay people, yes? The monks are supposed to have given up everything, they've got no home, got no wife, (laughter), no job, 'hat? they're people, you know, to be lived with(?) laughter),

14.

(laughter) They're so perverse(?) , you know attractive. I know the monks usually feel quite sorry for the lay people (laughter)

so tired, so worried, and the younger~ even the elderly ones, are so sort of cheerful and happy and jolly, they're like schoolboys most of the time, eh? ~even - it's not necessarily the case that all the monks are highly spiritual and are practising meditation, no, it's just the way of life that they live huh? Or

and happy and carefree, hmm? I mean, you know, they don't look as old~

as the lay people - I mean a layman at fifty is really old, but a monk at fifty still looks quite boyish. That quite noticeable, you know you see this as you move along, huh? ~if a party of pilgrims arrives from Ceylon, with

some of the monks and some of the lay people, well, even if the monks weren't

wearing the robes you could~\$hem out - they're the ones that look much happier. Isn't it? So the spiritual life is a happy life, huh? You know, that's why we've

called our, you know, our new centre Suddhiavati, which means the Happy Land, eh? Or, If you can't be happy, you know, following the spiritual path, ~ following the dharma,

well, you know, how are you going to be happy~

~urmer (laughter)

.. ~ of the incidentals of, you know, the Suddhi? ~armt ~ all that, you know, enjoy~ but still, in the long run, and especially when one looks back upon, you know, after a lapse of ten, fifteen, twenty years, you know it's as

though those rosey clouds begin to sort of hover over everything as if we see U

things from a distance (laughter) ~ood old days, aren't they? You remember



about them, and , you know, ~ about them, huh? ~ even at the

oi~e Ca: feel, you know, a great cSeal of happiness, even though some of the things quite it's one has to do are, you know, in a sense, difficult, eh? But basically~a lot of enjoyment in the spiritual life, and we tend to think of the spiritual life as a real t~===== struggle, but, to some extent that is, you know,

part of our Christian heritage, our Ch:ristian conditioning. That is no% to say the spiritual life is easy, but it's enjoyable even when the living is tough, huh? He came across a very good instance of that in the Songs of LSilarepa

last week. rn~here's a poor young man, a, you know, that's come into contact

15.

with Hilarepa, one of the young~ noklemen, hihi? and ~ilarepa sort of and he develops this faith in ilarepa, but ilarepa sees his great potential, but gives him a very, very tough time, yes? in - so tough in fact, that in the end the young man is so unhappy, so miserable, he's going through such a~ny, he's £o5m£; to commit suicide on the spot. But he says, 'I've never been so happy as I am today,' eh? There's the two things there - he's been - -ila- repa has reduced him~ to such a state that he's thinking~ of OOmmitIr~ suicide, he 's threatening to commit suicide, but he's havin~ met J Silarepa and being with Lil

arepa, he's so happy that he says, 'I've never been so happy in my life'. Yes?

So sometimes it's like that, we're going~ through realH(~,~eal agony, but

still, you've never been so happy in your life, yes? (subd~e~ laughter).

All right~ then, let's conclude for the morning~ and...

S. PL~t, ~a~ eighteen, verse seven, then, let's go on reading round the table. ~, we'll~ back where we started, hih?

Paving thoroughly analysed All deeds of body, speech and mind, He who realises what benefits self And others and who always practises is wise.

S. Irrin. '~~aving thoroughly analysed All deeds of body, speech and mind,' eh?

So the question arises

how does one analyse deeds of body, speech and mind? what does one analyse those deeds into?

?

The eventually (? r~h~5 is sometimes called the Ihamma-

vñka'ya of mental states, meaning a mental state. ~'~ +f'4Lu~? Purna? You could call it mindfulness.

You could call it mindfulness, yes, and this is considered a very useful exercise, eh? that one examines oneself, you know one looks at oneself, looks at all one's deeds, at those of body, those of speech, those of mind,

and one just tries to analyse well, have they been prompted by loving skill,

have? no what was unskillful, eh? And what's the basic criterion of skillful

is.

an unskillful? According to the Theravāda tradition an unskillful? And what is connected with craving, hatred and delusion is unskillful & what is connected

with the opposite qualities is said to be skillful, yes? One could say, more generally, that the skillful is whatever pertains to the path and to the goal, either approximately or ultimately. Or, in more contemporary terms, whatever helps one to develop is skillful, that is skillful which helps one to develop, that is unskillful which doesn't help one to develop. 10 you think this implies an, as it were, overly self-conscious attitude? What about the claims of spontaneity, intuition? If you're always stopping and analysing, do you think that will have the effect of making you unspontaneous?

? Conceivably (?)

S. Well. It does, but er, you know, what is your spontaneity usually? Is it usually a true spontaneity? It's usually more instinctual or reactive, eh? But it is quite difficult to sort of not be so self-conscious, not so self-analytical, that you don't inhibit yourself - that you do inhibit yourself altogether, as it were, almost immobilise yourself. On the other hand, not to give such free rein to your instincts and energies that, you know, you lose sight of the mindfulness. I mean it's very important to keep in contact with the springs of creativity within oneself, you know, without actually say in the time (?) losing mindfulness. And to be active, to be spontaneous, but to be aware, not at the same time, but as sort of one indistinguishable act, as it were, that is very difficult. Sometimes you find it when you're working, I think; you know, all your energy going into the work, eh? you certainly are

experiencing energy, energy is flowing, but you're very aware and very mindful of what you are doing, mmm?

Purna: a kind of absorption.

S. A sort of absorption, yes, in the same way when you're painting, or writing, or doing anything really creative, you know; or when you're talking with someone and it becomes a real exchange, a real communion, a real flow, huh?

Uttara: Yes, sometimes in a situation of crisis, I found that out then too (?)

S. In what?

17. A situation of sort Uttara: of crisis when you've just got to

S. ?~nm. Yes, yes.

Uttara: quickly (?) do an action

S. Yes: all your energies are mobilised

Uttara: Yes.

S. People sometimes do find this, not only at times of crisis, at times of danger, when maybe their life is at stake, eh?

? I remember one instance, going to be upturned by a car, all of a sudden: you know, just that I was right there, and I, I dived over the car.

S. Oh~

Uttara: That was just it.

S. You didn't think.

Uttara: No, I didn't think.

S. No, right, yes. C p~)

Thxna: Some people find it difficult with mindfulness at first, I mean the sort of levels of mindfulness, the mindfulness of body, the mindfulness of breathing,

it comes across a bit too mechanical

S. Yes, yes,

Purna: You know, aware of the body...

S. Yes, yes. Yes, it's not a question of being mindful in the sense of standing outside and watching, but the mindfulness or the awareness I should infuse and inform the action or the feeling or whatever it is, I mean as it does when you are absorbed, Pbm? ~someone made the point some weeks ago that there is a feeling quality to mindfulness, and this is very true. It's not a cold, objective, intellectual sort of thing, mi.? I mean the integrated awareness does have this feeling quality.

? Positive; feeling. S. Positive feeling. A sort of sensitivity ?  
concentrated

energy

S. Right, yes, and that means that the reason (?) is there~

17~

then Joy is there.

You're in this completely unified

no conflict one half of your~

self against the other..

S. Yen, right, yes, right.. sort of Uttara: Would it sort it out in giving yourself  
the benefit of the doubt in

a certain situation, you know a bit dodgy, but whether\* er, they both have the right\*  
but you can't make a decision, you know, you really don't know\* completely.

S. ~ ~w do you give yourself the benefit of the doubt, on which side does the benefit lie?

Uttara: The benefit of doing the action and Just seeing what happens. S. ~). Well,  
you can do that. But you can also sort of give yourself the benefit of, of being mindful and  
not doing it.

Uttara: ~Ihh.

S. depends on your general nature. If by nature you're a cautious, inhibited,  
self-controlled\* self-contained person, ~giving yourself the benefit of the doubt would  
mean letting fly, letting rip, as it were, and seeing what

happens, eh? But if you are naturally rather wild and uncontrollable and, you know,  
spontaneous in a purely instinctual \* reactive way, then giving yourself the benefit of the  
doubt, would mean, er, you ~, checking that and being more mindful and more controlled.

? Yes.

S. I think(?) probably, you know, to risk a generalisation, more people you know are inhibited, as it were, rather than reckless and~uncontrolled. So usually,

I think, giving yourself the benefit of the doubt will mean taking a bit of a

risk and going ahead and doing it. So, 'Having thoroughly analysed All deeds of body, speech and mind,'

eh? I mean this is with a view to ascertaining, you know, what is your general direction, mmm? It's not an end in itself, but, you know, am I on the whole, er, acting with body, speech and mind, more positively or more negatively? Am I in fact developing or not? It's a sort of general stock-taking,eh? ~9hat

Is.

are my thoughts usually like? I mean are they thoughts of craving and hatred,

or, you know, are they thoughts of friendliness and joy and so on? This is a bit what it really means, being~aware of one's own mental state and the direction

in which it is heading, hmm? ~eing aware of the extent to which you are or are not actually developing. So that doesn't mean sort of, you know, every few minutes you sort of stand up against your spiritual wall and take your spiritual measurements, and see how much you've grown you know, since you measured yourself last. It doesn't really mean that sort of thing. It's more having a general sense and awareness of how relatively positive or relatively negative, relatively skillful or relatively unskillful you are, rmmm~ and, you know, what direction you're heading in. It's more like that. You're not tearing yourself up by the roots every few minutes just to see if you're growing,eh?

So, 'Having thoroughly analysed All deeds of body, speech and mind, He who realises what benefits self And others and who always practises is wise.' Eh? So what is it

that benefits self and others, eh? It's the development of the skillful, and the cultivation of the skillful, and you notice Nagarjuna says, '~bat benefits self and others' eh? because he is a follower of the Mahayana, and he accepts the Bodhisattva ideal, so his ultimate aim is Enlightenment for one's own sake and that of others, eh? You know, in the traditional phrase,eh? Not that one takes 'self and other'" very seriously~ in the ultimate sense. But that is how one has to think to begin with.

So, 'Having thoroughly analysed All deeds of body, speech and mind, He who realises what benefits self And others and who always practises is wise.' eh? I mean it's not

very difficult to thoroughly analyse all deeds of body, speech and mind, it's not very difficult to realise what benefits self and others, but that isn't enough, eh? Then one has got always to practise, huh? then you're wise. I mean very often we don't realise what a great difference there is between what we've understood and what ~e're able to practise, eh? It's usually in the ratio of a hundred to one - I don't think that's an exaggeration - a hundred to one, e~ (Long pause).

19,

It certainly looks as though he hasn't just re- You know, in the d

beginning he hasn't disregerde~ self

S. ~, yes, yes; what benefits self, yes. You have to think in those terms, long you know, for a long~ime: what is good for you, eh? There's nothing wrong

in thinking that sort of way: 'What benefits self and others', eh? n? Quite a few people, more recently, have raised this point, or made this point, that they were given to understand from an early age, eh? that it was wrong to want to be happy,eh? hn? they were told that this was selfish, you shouldn't want anything for yourself, heh? him?

Purna: Which would be slightly what we said this morning about the spiritual life not being connected with happiness.

No, spiritual, well certainly spiritual life isn't \* but worldly life is ,huh?, mm? er, I mean this is what J~gar~juna said, that high status means hap- piness,eh? happiness means high status, and this is what people are after. So there'. nothing wrong with this in a sense of there's nothing sinful in that, eh? ~? er, or well put it this way,that people are given to understand when they're young that er, well jot that they, it's not a question that they shouldn't go after hap~ines.,tha~ shouldn't be happy, yes? that even if the happiness

sort of comes wi-sought for, him? - it just happens, they find themselves happy, they say they shouldn't be, they don't deserve it, as it were, huh? this is what they

were made to feel, huh? -guilty about being happy, heh? not guilty about going in search of happiness, but being happy, you know, experiencing happiness, as though that was all wrong, heh? you shouldn ' t be happy heh? as though you shouldn't, as it were, want anything positive for yourself, you don't deserve

it, him? So I think there's quite a bit of this sort of feeling unconsciously, sort of you know, in people's minds, eh? and this is why they~an't really wish well

towards themselves, huh? because they always feel that they don't deserve it, to

don't have a right to, you know, be happy and~have good things occur to then.

So they sort of inhibit themselves from the beginning. So it ' 5 not directly a question of trying to make yourself happy, but just doing what is good for you, huh? yes? and it '5 as though some people find it difficult to think even

20.

in those terms, huh? of doing what is good for oneself - you don't deserve that,

hmm, you deserve only th~bad things should happen to you, hmm? and perhaps do

deep down you~elieve them, you're really wicked, heh? evil, heh?

Furna: In this country - I'm not - at school and things where it seems always a contradiction between doing what you think is good for yourself and for.. what the scho~l thin~~ is good for you.

S. ~eoause doing what is go'od for you, I mean what you think is good for you, is not necessarily doing what you like, huh? but sometimes it is quite

difficult to disentangle the two, huh? And sometimes, you know, one gets so ought used to doing what you i-tto do, or you know, doing what other people think

you should do, that sometimes, you know, you have to get back to doing just what you like, for the time being, re~ardless of whether it's right or wrong, almost, eh? just to re-establish contact with your own feelings, as it were. So there '5 nothing wrong in wanting to benefit oneself, there's nothing wrong in wanting to do good to oneself, heh? hmm? If you do good to yourself, ~t'll so happen that you feel happy, heh? but it's not a question 0£ going after the

happiness directly, but it's doing good for yourself, just as, you know, you c~~~~~ u)

would do good for anybody. 'And others' eh? that '5 the important ~rerogative.)

To benefit your own self, you know, be your own best friend,hmm? Well, then Nagarjuna goes on to give details of the... Read those two verses together, eight and nine, they link.

? 'Not killing, no longer stealing, Forsaking the wives of others, Refraining completely from false, ~iviA~ve, harsh and senseless speech,

Forsaking covetousness, harmful Intent and the views of NThilists - These are the ten white paths of Action, their opposites are black.'

S. )~nm. So these are of course the ten skillful actions, eh? or the ten I was

~pasika vows, huh? ~alking about the first two of these recently and saying

er, that their implications go far beyond what we usually, you know consider them to mean, eh? For instance, not killing: it isn't really just a matter of not killing. The actual precept in Pali says, 'Panatipata' and you're

21.

familiar with this, but do you know what 'Panatipata' means? - lit u-- rally? or

'Pranatipata' as it is in Sanskrit? and you recite it every day, but what does it mean?

? . ....

S. Er, yes and no, but not quite in this context,heh? 'Prina' here means a living being, a breathing being ie. a living being. so.. and 'Atipata' means, er more like attack upon, assault, injury, huh? hinin? or harming, eh? So the most accurate translation would be'harming living beings',yes? So I undertake the training precept, eh? or the step in training, which consists in not harming living beings, eh? So it's a question of not harming living beings. ~t how do you harm them? Well, you harm them,to begin with, by depriving them of life. So that's the simplest and most elementary way in which you harm living beings,eh? But why is it harmful to living beings to deprive th.i of life?

? ? .....

S. Pardon?

? Prevents them evolving.

S. It prevents them evolving, yes? So harm means to prevent from evolving, doesn't it? This is what hani means really means, huh? So if you want to go a bit more deeply into the precept, it means, eh? you could say getting in the way of, huh? the development or evolution of other living beings, eh? Especially of human beings. So it's not just depriving them of life, it's not just inflicting pain and suffering, but it's preventing, it's hindering their development, hmm?

? Why does that stop them evolving?

S. ?~mn?

? Why does, why would it stop people?



S. Well, look at it this way, er, it's.. in the cue of the ordinary, the average person, huh? can you hinder them from evolving or not?

? Yes.

S. You can, yes? so that meanN you shouldn't do it, yes? No doubt there are some people you can't hinder them, uh? You might get angry with them, you

22.

might beat them, wouldn't make any difference, you wouldn't be hindering their evolution, you might stop them meditating, you know, might shut them up in prison, you still won't hinder their evolution, but that doesn't apply to the majority of cues. You can definitely get in the way of another person's evolution, yOU know~ when their evolution is still very precarious and very, you know, finely balanced, eh? when they're not very strong, b-fl? so...hm?

U~tara: This...I was going to say, this takes in the Tantric precepts

S. rtf! yes, yes that's true. And also the precept is phrased negatively because, as if to suggest, it's very difficult to help another person evolve, huh? b-fl? The least you can do is not to get in their way, eh? And, you know, so often people get in one another's way, b-fl? or you get in somebody else's way, l-rn? So that's the least you can do - keep out of their way, don't hinder them, don't interfere with them, don't interrupt them, huh? If you can

help them evolve, so much the better, that's wonderful, yes?. ~t, at least even keep out of their way, don't hinder them, eh? Or, you could~put it in this

way, respect the individuality of others, huh? b-fl? Don't get in the way of

the free development of their individuality. This is what the first precept really gets... is really getting at, eh? So not to kill them is the very least that

you can do, yes? b-fl? I mean that's a pretty poor sort of observance of the precept, that you just refrain from killing, er, other living beings, eh? All right, that's a level, and certainly the elementary level has to be observed, but much more really is expected than that, eh?

Purna(?) It's the extreme... of the precept.

S. Yes, right, yes. does The question that I'd is the killing of animals, is that stop

its evolution? And does.. do animals evolve in their own lives?

S. I~in. I think this is very doubtful, b-fl? I think it probably couldn't be said in the cue of animals that you hinder their development, eh? but you certainly would hinder their continued enjoyment of whatever they're being, or whatever level of being they have already, eh?

yes? whether that there is an

23.

infinitesimal sort of degree of development or evolution, it's impossible to say, but I.. certainly~you hinder them in the enjoyment of the existence that they have got , hmm?

Purna? If one takes, er... gives any credance to the idea that animals benefit from contact with h~tan beings from the of evolving, then if you kill them it does, it must get in...

S. Rina, in that sense, yes, that presumably would apply, you know, more to

to some animals than~Others~ certainly to the more highly evolved animals.

Then what about the second precept - 'No longer stealing', er, I don't know

why it's translated 'No longer stealing', of conrac, it is the precept 'Adinna- dana' - not to take the not given, eh? Not only.. it's not just not stealing, eh? but 'Not to take the net given', hmm? So how does this sort of tie up ~ith what we've been saying about the previous precept?

Uttara:Stealing time.. e

S. Yes, you wast their time, you steal their time, hmm? you waste their

energy, you steal their energy sometimes, him? So to take from someone some- thing which he or she is not willing to give, this is a sort of violation of their individuality, yes? Of course if you look at it in purely economic terms or political terms, then you can raise the question of, well, supposing they're in possession of something that they've no right to be in possession of, you've got the right to take it away from them, even without their permission, him? So how does this square with the dharma? Do you have a moral right to take away from someone something that they acquired perhaps by in=ioral means, eh? ? No...

S. You think you have'n't got the right?

?? No.

S. You don't think you have got the right?

Uttaras No if you have, you know... yes, if you have that sort of mental state, then you.. then you're still.. it's

still bad action.

S. Yes, mmm. Put should you leave the situation exactly as it is, with

24.

say the rich in possession of their ill-gotten gains, or should you not try to do something about it?

Uttara: I think you should make them aware of their...

S. ?~ke them aware of it, yes, Zn-. Funna: the path. S. Yes, quite, yes

Purna: You can do something, but have a right..

S. I mentioned in this connection on a previous study retreat the

land gift scheme, where he appealed to landlords to part with some of their land for the sake of the landless, er landless labourers. He did msaage to get in this way, just by asking, huh? begging, virtually, several millions of acres, huh? So it shows it can be done, eh? if one goes the right way about it, huh?

? I take it this was in India?

S. This was in India, yes. Well, you can do something even in this country. ~ybe not on that sort of scale, him? but people very often do respond to positive appeal - maybe not every person every time, but some do at least, and, you know, certainly one shoUld try.

So, 'not killing, not stealing, forsaking the wives ~ others', huh? This obviously refers to the third precept which is literally, 'Kamesu Nichachara' which means misconduct or wro~doing in sexual matters, eh? So this is usually explained as meaning~, 'Not stealing away another man's wife', this is, you knpw, explained from the point of view of the man - not stealing away another man's wife, and not raping or not abducting any unmrried woman, huh? This agi~n is the sort of mini:in~ required, }=? because er two things are involved here, first of all the violation of another person's individuality, yes? and second, I mean, certainly under the conditions of Ancient Indian society, making off with somebody else's property, eh? I mean a man's wife was considered in a sense as his property, you know, as his wife, eh? and in the same way the 'inmarried

25.

girl was considered - not exactly the property of - but under the guardianship or care of, either her father or her brothers. So in a way you were committing an offence against them, by taking away without their permission, eh? their

daughter or their sister, eh? you know Hut how would one look at this precept, say, going into it more deeply?

What would be...

? Exploiting (?) S. Exploiting, yes exploiting. So how does one exploit?

? Trying to satisfy your selfish, neurotic cravings (?)

S. Right, right, you're thinking only of your own gratification, and not of the other person. But supposing the other person agrees? eh? supposing the other person also wants to be gratified? Are you still breaking the precept? ? N~, yes.

S. Yes, really, you are, actually, the fact (that .. well, you're both breaking it, eh? mmm? yes?

Almost making it worse... encouraging other people to do...

S. Yes, it's almost making it worse. (Long pause).

Well, what's skillful sexual conduct?

S. Ah, that is the great question, then, what do you think it is?

Celibacy (Laughter)

S. Ah, a very simple solution in one word. How you think it is as simple

as that? - Er, do you think you can be skillful in that sort of situation? n

Do you really think you can? or is it just, you know, intrinsically impossible?

or a contradiction in terms?

? I should think you could be, but I, I can't. Uttara: craving ?

?

S. Well it's clearly not a human need like eating and drinking, because if you don't eat and drink you die after a short while, but if you refrain from sexual intercourse, well, you can even live to a ripe old age, some people

26. would say you live longer. ? t ? a Tibetan told on a tape about S.  
What was that?

? You know, sexual intercourse said to save the...

S. ~un. That was in the case of a highly developed yogi Bodhisattva

? Yes, I know (N~ich laughter). You said it could it..

S. And he was a very old man (laughter) Purna: yes it could be  
under certain circumstances. S. Yes, right, yes, right,mmm. It's a... N~?

? It's an attitude of gi~ving on both counts. sort of S. Look, I think that one has to  
be~quite honest with oneself: is it one's

predominant feeling at such times to give? Is Lhat the actual feeling, you know? Well,  
maybe it is, but, you know, or at least maybe it can be, but is that usually what happens?eh? -  
you get this tremendous urge to give, eh? Is it in fact that?

-usually?

? Usually not, but S. Usually not. ? if it was, it would be..

S. 3at, I mean, you say 'if', but do you think it could be? or is it some- times?

? I think it could be?

S. could be. Th:rn.

Uttara: Sometimes... I see in terms of sometimes a lower form of expression of  
yourself.

S. ?~i, yes, well, it's an expression of your i~stinctual self, as it were,

which is a level of you, which is a level of yourself, eh? Yes. one ? I think that aspect  
of it is quite important, that it is an aspect of

self, and that does need to be expressed in its own way, at least for a certain period of one's  
life.

S. ?~nm. I'm a bit doubtful about this need in the absolute sense, yes? er,  
27.

I think there may well be some people at least who don't need, eh? yes? ~e ~ere talking about  
this again some weeks ago, and I made the point that we seem to be getting now into the  
movement quite a few, you know, imich younger people, heh? and I think we have to avoid  
the mistake of sort of suggesting that they have to go through all the sort of experiences and  
problems and difficulties that most people

who, you know, have come into the friends in the past have gone through, eh? I sort of think  
it '5 quite possible for some people who are temperamentally so inclined, A

just to be as it were, sort of pure and innocent right from the beginning, and

stay that way, eh? without any sort of loss, eh? or any sort of lack of human

experience, as it were, yes? so I think one must be open to that possibility, sort of and, you know, ~not assume, Oh if you haven't had this sort of experience, or you

haven't had that sort of experience, then you're not really a human being, you're perhaps not really a man etc. etc. you've got to go through it allm huh - No! Athat isn't

necessary for everybody, heh? mun? do you see what I mean? hn? So we've lost the ideal of innocence, as it were, him? and I can even say regarding to this question of sex, I mean, apparently, y~~ow, judging by articles in the news- papers, it's come to such a pass that in some schools, certainly in London, I don't know about elsewhere, if a girl is still a virgin at fourteen or fifteen, she's jeered at by her f\*iends. Well, this is terrible. So she has to sort of lose her virginity quickly, so that she's no longer jeered at, whether she wants to lose it or not: she may not feel that way inclined at all, or at least not for the time being, but she 's almost sort of pushed into it. So the same thing

seems to happen, you know, at other levels and you know, other ages, heh? that, (:0 you know, almost sometimes pushed against the grain of one's own Mt~~,

him? You're not allowed to be innocent and innocence is not regarded as an ideal, you know purity is not regarded as an ideal, him? I mean, we know that you can have a very negative sort of purity, but there is such a thing as a positive spiritual purity too, but that is no longer up-held as an ideal, heh? and then you have the Nary Whitehouses of the world going around, you know, talking in terms

of morality, which really is enough to put anybody off, eh? You don't get, you really know, a purity, er, presented as something~~attractive and inspiring, but something

28.

rather negative and dead, him? So I think we have to be very careful about talking about sort of sex as a sort of human need for everybody, yes? I think there are some people who I think may well not be in need at all, and that they're not deprived, and they're not repressed, eh? Mind, this old sort of assumption which I think now must be really sort of questioned - if you're not having sex, you must be repressed - you know, there must be something wrong with you. I mean it's not necessarily so at all, eh? You may be perfectly normal and healthy, eh?, but this is the standard sort of thinking in many circles nowadays, heh? hmmm?

? Started with Freud, I suppose.

S. Seems to have started with Freud. I mean, it may well be, that there are maybe quite a number of people, ~even the majority, who find that they need sex, in the

sense that if they don't have that if they don't have that particular kind of

experience they feel restless and dissatisfied and they can't get on with other say things, at least for a while, at least for ~some years, when they're young, eh?

But there may well be others who just don't feel that way at all. So we mustn't try to sort of

put everybody into the same mold, hmm? If someone has a sort of you know, as it were, gift of celibacy, well, you know, let them happily, you know enjoy that gift, not try to sort of push them in some other direction. (Pause). But that still doesn't deal with what er what you were saying' h=n? whether, you know, whether sex itself is compatible with mindfulness. All right, take it that a Yogi ~odhisattva, yes? can engage in this particular kind of activity without any untoward consequences, but what about the ordinary person who is really struggling and striving, eh? I mean is it possible for him to be mindful in this sort of context? or does it represent an occasional permissible lapse', as it were, from mindfulness, that, you know, you just have to permit that, because you aren't perfect as yet, h'm? Or do you think that even that can be incorporated, and that you can still be mindful, and that you can still sort of engage in that aspect of life, that kind of experience, without any diminution of your ov~rall spiritual progress? This is the real point. Whether you just have to accept that period- ically you just get a set-back, you know, due to these feelings that still per-

29.

sist. I mean that is the real question, hun?

I think very much, if it '5 done in the context of a regular spiritual practice, it can simply be incorporated.

S. Well, what do you mean by 'In the context of a regular spiritual practice'? Do you mean while still keeping up one's daily meditations and so on?

? fl-i.

S. ?~in. But supposing you find that, I mean, on the day that er you have sexual experience, e~, your meditation doesn't go qUite so well, are you just to accept that, that when~.. that is the situation? or, sort of, you know, try to adjust it?

Well, obviously, I would think if there '5 a

S. ?~, yes, yes. Thou~~, probably, for many people it means a sort of middle path, that, at least, even if one doesn't gt~e up sex entirely, one has to ensure that it doesn't interfere with at least the ~r -all progress of the meditation and other things, yes?

A question of deciding on the priorities. S. Yes, n-i. I think it requires a fairly high degree of self knowledge. S. ~. Right.

S. I mean some people apparsntly, as far as one can see, are temperamentally you know,

less able to do without sex than others. And I mean that also has to be taken into consideration. And also the question of age - you know, if you're sort of sixteen or seventeen it's usually, I mean other factors being equal, more difficult than if you are sixty-six or sixty-seven, or, you know, some such age as that.

Uttara: I mean, what came into my mind is, you know, that, say you aesthetically pleasing and you sort of see something, you know, something which is, a female is form which~ quite beautiful and aesthetically pleasing, and it came into my mind, this, what you were saying about a flower~ you know on the wall, it's no..

S. Ah:

50.

Uttara: You don't want nor this and nor that - just it.

S. Ah~.

Uttara:

S. Well, perhaps this quite a good sort of ploy, to try and adopt a more aesthetic attitude, eh? to sort of admire it growing there - you know, isn't it pretty, isn't it lovely, but why pluck it? Let it grow, huh? Of course sometimes the difficulty is that the flower steps out of the crannied wall and comes after you (?) (~ch laughter) And if ~~~i~~e~ only stayed in the crannied wall then there wouldn't be any bother (laughter) look at it.

But if that particular flower just jumped into your button-hole, (laughter) then what are you to do? But still you know what I mean, you know - you know, if you are able to remain at a distance well, just, you know, contemplate. This reminds me of a question that I was asked years ago in Bombay, by you know a famous Indian film actor or producer who was wanting to produce a film about Buddhism, and he'd gone to the Ajanta caves. He was thinking of setting the scene of the film there, you see. So he came back, and shortly after he came back, he met me, and he said, er, 'There's one question that I'd like to ask you, and it really puzzled me, Thant(?)'. I went to these Ajanta caves, they're so beautiful, huh? all these paintings of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, and leaves and flowers and fruit, animals, just like life, but, he said, 'one thing I couldn't understand, huh?' so I said, 'What's that?' and he said, 'These caves are supposed to be painted by monks.' I said, 'Yes'. And he said, 'There's all sorts of paintings of naked women. So how come, did the monks paint those pictures of naked women too, and why?' so, I'd never thought about this and I had to reply quite spontaneously, so I said, and I think this is actually the answer, that to those monks the forms of the women were just part and parcel of the natural world. They looked around, they saw flowers, they saw trees, they saw elephants, they saw also women. So in the same sort of way, in the same sort of spirit, they painted them, they saw no reason not to, huh? In other words their sort of contemplation of them was just ~~~ aesthetic. Well, this is what I told him and he was quite satisfied, huh?



31.

And as I've said, I think this is actually the answer, huh? So perhaps one can, you know, find some sort of solution, er, at least to some extent, you know, to this particular question, just by adopting this more aesthetic attitude, eh? By just sort of admiring from a distance, but, you know, not trying to pluck the flower from its crannied wall, heh, hmm? Rather than sort of rejecting it altogether, or trying to convince yourself \* you know, that it isn't really so

pretty after all. This may be difficult. (laughter) No wait, it is pretty, you know eh? but let it grow there, let it bloom, ~~~+ sort of. admire it, as it were,

yes?

Purna(?) What often helps, er in that particular situation, I think, is to

reflect that when you do try and pluck the flower, that you don't, that you can't

appreciate the beauty.

S. That's true.

Purna: The real beauty lies in the sort of distant

S. Yes, that's true,;-n~

Purna: You prevent yourself from enjoying the beauty by

S. Yes, yes, yes.~, mmm. Well, one could say that there is this sort of great difference between the aesthetic and the practical, eh? We talked about this a lot on the last retreat, eh? The sort of, the aesthetic appreciation as an analogy of the spiritual contemplation, yes? that, er, you, as it were, enjoy the, er, beauty of everything, you take delight in the beauty of everything, but, as it were, for its own sake: you don't try to use it, you don't try to do anything with it, eh? and this is akin to the contemplative attitude, huh? mmm? er, so in the case of the, you know, the beautiful natural object, or even the beautiful woman, huh? just sort of contemplate, you know, for the sake of the beauty itself. Don't think of using that in any way, don't think in terms of taking that for yourself in any way, just, as it were, you know, appreciate it, for what it is in itself aesthetically. And these two feelings are incompatible, huh? It's very difficult to appreciate something aesthetically, and at the same time to want to make use of it for yourself,

32. this selfishly, so if to the extent that you can concentrate on aesthetic contem

plation, and, you know, this is quite difficult, on the, you sort of suggestion, in the case of women, because the other desire will come in so quickly, but if you can just tw', you know, °°° the disinterested contemplation, and remain aware and mindful, then the, you know, the sort of selfish or grasping and clinging is much less likely to come in, eh? - especially if you say to yourself, well, you know, what a pity that would be, let me just leave that flower, just

blooming there, eh? And even if, you know\* the flower does seem to look in your direction, say well, I guess that's just imagination, that was just the wind blowing, huh? (Laughter). That would seem to be a middle way between the, sort of getting involved very subjectively and unskillfully, and, you know, the sort of attitude of total rejection, which might not also be very skillful, is it? It's not easy to maintain the sort of balance, as it were, the sort of middle way.

? I think often the

Puritan we're not good in England, attracted by that, we deny its beauty, and we deny our own responses to its beauty S. Yes, but again on the other hand, if you find that in practice you are

not able to appreciate the beauty of that object, but it becomes almost automatically an object of desire and craving, then it's better just to steer clear, hi.? So one must be quite honest with oneself about that, hi.? That's not only that, but if you can sort of cultivate appreciation of the beauty everywhere, well, it will have the effect of reducing the pressure of craving generally, huh? Is it? You see what I mean, eh? It's very important that there should be in our lives some element of enjoyment, eh? You can't get by without enjoyment, eh?

33

So, you know, through aesthetic contemplation and aesthetic appreciation, you do get a great measure of more refined enjoyment, eh? So that feeds and nourishes you somewhat, so you don't go looking, you know, for enjoyment and pleasure, in

unskillful ways\* huh? Is it? This is something I've been emphasising lately it's very important that that is, as it were the spiritual side of your life, there should be some enjoy-

ment, eh? Otherwise, if all the spiritual things become difficult and painful things, you're in a quite difficult position, yes? If all the, as it were, worldly and unskillful things are the enjoyable things, if all the spiritual and skillful things are the painful things, then your position isn't a very good one, eh? So you should make sure that some of the spiritual things are enjoyable things, is it? Do you see what I mean? And, er, one can do this very often with the help of Art and aesthetic appreciation and so on. Let some of the skillful things be enjoyable things, and some of the enjoyable things be skillful things, you know.

And getting into one's meditation.

S. And getting into one's meditation. This is also why it's important not to slog at the meditation too much, and not to try to lengthen it, eh? Unduly, eh? Even if you keep it short, it doesn't matter, provided you enjoy it, hi.? And the enjoyment of it is much more important than the sort of marathon sitting, that you can sort of pride yourself on. Even if you sit only for twenty minutes,

that's quite all right, quite enough, provided you enjoy it. But you must keep life that element

of enjoyment in the spirit~\* eh? otherwise it's very difficult  
for you to carry on. You certainly can't carry on indefinitely without some sort  
of nourishment of that kind, hi.?

Uttara: What happens if you dislike a practice?

S. That you...?

Uttara: Dislike a practice?

S. Do another one\* there are lots of practices: find one that you enjoy.

Uttara: You know, like, I dislike the mindfulness of breathing up until the last stage.

S. Ho, well maybe\*in this case you say up until the last stage, maybe you

34

just should go through the first three stages more quickly. I mean this is something A  
that I've said before, that if you find that you're not getting much out of the

lower stages, it may well mean that your momentum of practice is such, eh? that you know,  
you want to ~t onto the fourth stage, eh? you don't need to spend so much time on the first  
three. So if that is genuinely happening and you're not ~t impatient, well, by all means, ~ist  
pass through the first three~very rapidly, and get onto the fourth stage more quickly, and  
stay in it longer, and enjoy it more. That is quite permissible, huh?

Uttara: ~~-L.

S. - I mean, I thought this was something everybody knew.

Uttara: It's more kind of resolve, part and parcel of... just getting getting there, 'cause I  
just kept feeling, you know, screwing myself up trying trying to carry...

Well, sometimes, I mean, if one has a natural momentum, then the counting gets in  
the way, so one just drops it and comes onto, you know, the stages of no counting, and just  
allows oneself to get absorbed. (Pause). But I think, to go back to what I was saying, I think  
the great point is, the great modern miocchaditthi, or one of the great modern micchaditthis:  
'You can't be happy without sex', him? yes? If you're not having sex you must be unhappy  
and miserable. This is 'a great modern micchaditthi, heh?yes?

? People make you feel that way, don't they?

S. Oh, yes, they might even say, 'Oh, you haven't had it for a year and~ a half? well, hard luck!' (Laughter) 'No wonder you're looking so miserable'. Or you hear it about people. I sometimes am told, 'Oh, he hasn't had sex for three years, poor chap!' you kn-r, (Laughter) as though it 's a g~at misfortune that had struck him, but, fer from that, you know, it's praobably a great beissing, heh? And nowadays, you know, people are almost ashamed to admit that they haven' t had sex for so many years, as though it was some sort of failure, some sort of disaster, nobody wants them, they're unattractive, etc. etc. They always think I'm no good, you know, I'm a wall-flower. I'm not popular. I can't get it on, etc. etc. and you feel bad and inferior or are made to feel like that, even if you don't really

35.

feel that way yourself, eh? hm? And in the old days, if you went around, you know, having a too free sex life, you were made to feel that you were a bit of a skunk. Put nowadays it's just the opposite, you know, in some circles anyway. It's really so rediculous,eh?

???

[70]

Seminar: The Precious Garland. Day 3. (JENNY MASTIN)

S. And of ~ourse the subtlest of all, in the case of men is 'Well, you're not a man', hmm? They only(?) sort of get at you in this sort of way - there must be something wrong with you, heh?

? That's why I mentioned meditation, because, well, it's important for me, it's ... like, the experience, the experience of something even more pleasurable...

S. Yes, mmm, yes...

? Than what I was experiencing in sex.

S. Yes, yes.

? definitely more pleasurable even than any other enjoyment

that's there (?)

S. At least there was a possibility of some higher and iore intensely satisfying kind of experience, eh?

? people can say that.

S. Yes, yes, yes. Well, you know, sometimes they just think, 'Well, you know, ~ou

haven't had it properly', or something like that, yes? but, you know, sort of convince you just can't ~always everyone. But, you know, ultimately you

convince them by your general appearance and demeanor, huh? and if.. you know they can't deny sometimes that you really do look happy, eh?, so at the same time - not married, haven't even got a regular girl-friend, don't even think about sex any more, or at least not very often, and, you know, you've got no job, no money, but you're happy, so clearly your source of happiness is, you know, somewhere which is not quite in or of this world, heh? and, I mean, it's that that's going to ultimately convince them, huh? You know, they'll think, well, in a strange s~f paradoxical way, you haven't got all the things that make people happy, but you're happy. And that will make them think, eh?

? Is this... what you've been saying about... to do with sex, is that between men as well?

### PRECIOUS GARLAND DAY 3

71

S. Oh, I should assume so.

? Well, I get the feeling from Chintamani that he thinks it's sort of on another level, in a way.

S. Well, perhaps with him it is, you know, perhaps he has had some sort of higher experience in that way, you know, people just have to consult and be quite honest about that. their own experience,

? mit as an ideal almost (?)

S. Mmm. I'm not quite sure what he's getting at in that respect, you know whether he does actually think that that is a higher kind or higher level of experience, if so why. I don't think he's actually said that in his writing, but he does perhaps seem to suggest it sometimes.

? Mmm.

S. Perhaps he just means it's less troublesome.

? Needs a different kind of energy.

S. Mmm. But then this raises the question of what is energy, you know, is there a sort of separate sexual energy, or is there just one energy that takes different forms? eh? and this is a great question by itself, heh? And what does one....

? less... saying less vented sort of energy, um, you know, because it's less biological.

S. Mmm. Well, then you could say to that extent it's less sex, and maybe it's simply tha~hat he means, eh?

? It probably means that you don't start getting mixed up a purely S. Perhaps he simply means that the emotional quality, rather thanA

instinctual biological quality. Perhaps it's that that he's getting at.

But then to that extent it isn't sex, it's not sex ..~W~.~~ talking about then

? And I think quite a large factor is the projection element S. Mmm. yes.

? In a homosexual relationship there's less chance of projection taking place

S. Oh, I'm not so sure of that (general babble) No, no, I'm not

### PRECIOUS GARLAND DAY 3

so sure about that, I mean there are obviously different kinds of homosex- uality, ~ft supposing you're sort of very weak and effeminate, you project your unrealised strength and, as it were, masculinity, onto another man, yes? ? Yes, I was just trying to interpret what Chinta~ini had been saying.

S. yes, -1, well maybe he did mean that, but, you know, what you said wouldn't be correct as a generalisation, necessarily.

Colin: I also get the feeling sometimes with him that he '5 saying that

it's mainl~uppressive and not homosexual, do you know? what S. ~in. I don't think he's

saying that, but I think~he is saying is

that quite often there is an element of unacknowledged sexual feeling between men, uh? I think this is what he is saying, and I think this is quite correct, hmm, yes? Er, that doesn't mean to say that they're homosexual, but that there is this unacknowledged sexual feeling, very often, or even sometimes one can say, and also, sometimes an unacknowledged emotion, that they're

afraid of acknowledging, because they think it might mean sex, in fact whereas~very often it doesn't mean sex at all, it's just an emotion but

there is this sort of fear of the sexual element or fear of homosexuality,

so they end up not even acknowledging a positive emotion, huh? for fear it or

should be, you know, linked up with, somehow leading to homosexuality. I

think this is, you know, the great danger. I think this is one of the things that he was getting at. Pardon? Well, for instance, one man might feel quite warmly towards another, and then he starts thinking, 'Oh, good God, maybe I'm homosexual~ huh? and he represses the feeling, huh? and it may be a warm healthy feeling, just an emotion, yes? Nothing to do with sex at all. But then he suppresses that. And I think this is, you know, somewhere connected up with our general English Anglo-Saxon, you know, sort of sitting on our emotions. I mean in a way the English are quite abnormal, eh? I mean you go to India or you go to Italy, you even go to America, and you find people quite, you know - well, the men, that is - quite openly expressing emotions towards one another, without any question of sex coming into it.

~Ai 3

But the Englishman just doesn't do that, he just won't, he feels very inhibited about that, and that seems very unhealthy. But I used to really wonder about this, you know, when I was in India, because at least nine out of ten of all the European~ who used to come to see me, used to have some sort of fear or worry about homosexuality. I really wondered about this: what on earth is going on in Europe, huh? and especially what on earth is going on in ~~~ land and America? But I think it's mainly to do with this repressed emotion which is only an emotion, but there's the fear that it may somehow be linked up with sex, yes? I think this is - for most people - this is the situation, yes? and it seems so common in this country. But also there is the fact, as I said, that very often there is an unacknowledged sexual element too, you know~now which may be just an element in that particular person's total, you know, psycho-somatic or psycho-spiritual make-up. I think that's there, you know, more often than most people care to acknowledge, Huh? I think this is one of the things that, you know, Chintamani's been putting his finger on, and

maybe, you know, one of the reasons why he's been upsetting so many people. just -

These are the things that people don't, you know, like to have attention

drawn to, and that they feel, you know, quite uneasy about, eh? So anyone can say, well even if one does feel sort of quite emotionally drawn to another man, it doesn't mean that, er, you're homosexual, it doesn't mean that there's any sexual element there, necessarily. Er~ but even if there is something sexual in it, even then it doesn't mean that you're sexual, huh?

I mean these are sort of classifications which don't really correspond rather

to the way people are, hm? I mean, most people are quite complex, and have different sorts of feelings at different times, eh? So I think, I'd personally be inclined to say, you know, from the sort of standpoint that we've been discussing things, that there's not really all that much difference between homosexuality and heterosexuality, and that you have to be equally careful and equally mindful in both cases, eh? This is what I'd be inclined to say. And, in any case, you know, er try as much as possible to cultivate the purely emotional, rather than the biological side, eh? No?

Perhaps

I mean think in terms of friendship rather than love.

No, mmm.

S. But, you know what does the great damage, is inhibition of emotion, I think.

in the movement,

when you can, and even when you do decide (?) dealing with feelings, possibility of expressing them when you want to express them.

S. Yes, yes. Or at least you've got a sort of social situation, as it were, within which the expression of the emotion is acceptable, whether it's, you know, considered quite natural and taken for granted. I mean, as it is in India, you know, quite normally, quite usually. I also think, that the more freely one is able to express the emotion, the more easy it is to control the purely biological side. You know, if the emotions are satisfied, especially in a refined way, huh? through say the enjoyment of works of art, maybe by thinking of the spiritual ideal in more aesthetic terms, in terms of beauty and attractiveness, eh? and if there's sort of a good strong, warm emotional relationships in one's life, eh? with either... either not associated with sex at all or with sex playing a very minor role, then you'll have no difficulty with the biological side of your life, with the purely instinctual sexual side of it.

? And you recognise this as well.

S. And recognise it as well. But if you just try to starve it out, and make the whole of



your life very strict and very a~~~i& and very difficult and very hard, there 'mist be a powerful reaction sooner or later. (Pause).

Anyway, that's rather a long time over the third precept. which simply said, 'Forsaking the wives of others'. (Laughter). So is to leave the wives of others alone: that's the very lowest limit. If you can do nothing else,

at least do that. And, 'Refraining completely from fal., Divise, harsh and senseless speech.'

So we've gone into this , you know, on various other occasions false

speech, divisive speech, harsh - - and senseless speech. In the order of the ten precepts, or as we take them, false - comes first, then ha~~h

3

then er, no, it doesn't quite square1 does it? False speech, which is ~savada, harsh, which is: Pharasavacha, Samphappala pavacha which is use~

speech and divisive, yes is Pisunavacha, slanderous speech which divioe~

people. So that would be the order.

?

S. ?~nm?

?

S. Really, yes

?

S. Yes, yes.

?

S. Yes, "a. And then, of course, verse nine gets really down to the roots.

'Forsaking covetousness, forsaking harmful intent and the views of nihilists'~ bini?  
It's not only views of nihilists, it's also views of eternalists, these are the two extreme wrong views, huh? ... false views. What we can understand clearly enough 'forsaking covetousness', we can understand 'forsaking

harmful intent', that's pretty obvious, but to 'forsake false views', that is just is not so obvious to people nowadays, hmm? And this is one of the things that

I have become so aware of in recent years - the extent to which false views are in circulation, eh? to false ~~~~~ well, we've just mentioned one or two, eh? I mean in connection with sex, eh? - that if you're a virgin - especially if you're a man - a male virgin: 'Good Heavens, there's something wrong with you'. I mean this is a current false view, as it were, eh? A male virgin is, you know, an object of ridicule, huh? like a white crow, huh? ~~~~~ I asked some of the people on one of the previous summer retreats, to, you know, to state, or to bring up different examples of wrong views or whether favourite false views that they'd come across. I don't know anybody here's got any false views that they've come across or have encountered in other people... ~~~~~ view from the Dhamma standpoint, that is. (Pause)

? it's all one.

S. It's all one\* yes. er, pardon? ? on the beginning ~~~~~ retreat.

?~~~~~ Or ~~~~~ 3.

S. Did you? Oh ... oh. 't]hat, the recent one?

? M~~~~

S. °h, in what way did that come up?

? Well, we must all love each other because we're all one.

S. Ah. ~~~~~ In other words, you can't love one another unless first of all you're convinced that metaphysically you're all one? Well, that's not... In other words it's ~~~~~ if you're convinced you're not metaphysically all one, you can't love one another. In other words loving one another depends upon a view, eh? But does it depend upon a view? (short pause). No, I mean you can develop metta towards somebody else without being metaphysically convinced that he is one in essence with you. (laughter). So why make it dependent in that way?

?

S. Yes, yes. ?

a godhead, a knowledge S. ¶Thh, hmm

? Another one that came up is that you have to suffer.

S. Oh, yes, that you have to suffer, yes. And therefore that Buffering is good for you, hmm?

? Cannot hinder your progress.

S. Yes, ztk k:~~~ Well, the Buddha gave a classification of four kinds of disciple: those who in the course of their spiritual development go from suffering to suffering. Apparently there 'S one type according to this that has it hard and difficult all the way, eh? There's no explanation as to why this is, eh? ~ut they suffer all through their spiritual life, it's never easy, huh? Another type, at the beginning it 'S easy, pleasant, eh? but it gets difficult towards the end, and they suffer; another type, it is very hard at the beginning, they suffer a lot, but as they make further progress, it becomes more and more pleasant. Well then, another type, it starts off pleasantly, it remains pleasantly all the way, yes? So the Buddha acknowledge5

P~~~(O(£S ~rt~~~b ~~p~ 3

that possibility too,huh? But again one could say that in another sense or from another point of view, it might get more and more pleasurable, huh? as you go higher and higher, huh? to higher and higher levels. It may be that you have experiences that to other people look very difficult and painful, but you will still be experiencing, you know, pleasurable feelings and joyful feelings within yourself none the less. So in a sense you coul~ say the more spiritual progress you make, the more happy and joyful you will be. It doesn't have to be hard and painful all the way. And in the same way, if you're suffering, it isn't necessarily doing you good. Suffering isn't automatically good for you, eh? But this is, you know this really is a miccaditthi, you find it among the so-called Zen people, eh? - 'Oh, it's really hurting, so it must be doing you good'. I used to come up against this a lot in my Haa~ stead Thiddhist vihara days, mo~uonst Theraq%ins and people doing vipasana meditations - if it really hurt, w~ll it really meant you were getting some- where, so they just tried to make it hurt more and more. I thought that they were just all sort of well, flagellants, eh? They were just people that we~ punishing themselves, masochists almost, and they were calling it Buddhism. ~o that you have to suffer, and that it does you good to suffer, and that you automatically make progress when you suffer, this is another great micchaditth~

S. Yes, well yes

?

S. Please punish me. And, you know, it's quite interesting that the monk who'd been around just before me, and who'd gathered all these people, he was a sadist, he really was. Yes, you could see the way he sort of looked at

people and the way he sort of gloated over it all, he really enjoyed it, ~  
i1~~J~ used to a lot of suffering, he really~Put them the y  
through it, and used to take it, they used to enjoy it alniost, they used to

like it

? This difference between making an initial effort, then, and - you know a lot

~kp~ 3L a418

of the time ~hen p~-opl~ make an initial eff~~t in a certain situation they do suffer in some S  
Yes, yes, there's some discomfort, or in part(?,' it goes again~t the grain. But you mustn't  
think that if you make yourself suffer more, automatically you progress more. Mmm? No.  
not at all. I rememebir there was a woman who was also a ~1/2disciple of tb~particular monk  
ant she knew me too quite well, and she... one day she said to me, "Oh, you're not like him,  
~hant'e, you're quite different: he was a real sadist, he was." (Laughter) And the way she  
said it, she clearly rather liked the fact that he'd been a sadist, she'd enjoyed it, she was  
happy... I think she rather regretted that I wasn't. Any other miccaditthi? ? I've come  
across...

S. Oh

that ordinary, worldly ambitions are a perfect sort of happiness.

S. Does anyone really thir4hst these days?

? Yes.

S. Do they? Yes.?

Purley.. They really believe that~gettin& a better car, a better house, living in~ happiness.

S. How odd. \_\_\_\_\_ \Jt~et ~~~' <(~ \_\_\_\_\_ A ? ~°.i°~ ~,w don't have to do anything at all. S. Ah yes, Just t~t it happen, go with the flow. Yes, nwn. (laughter~ ? the Buddha. S. Yes. Just sit back and ~,~~n'.~A LL~':tL b~~:f A ?

? . ~ ~~~ak& ,~~ ~L~&'~~~~ S. Yes, yes, that's true. I mean this view was current even in the Thiddlia'S

day that evolution is inevitable. Yes, that is a real miccaditthi. In the

P~~~~s 6r~~~~flflb ~frp~ 3

Buddha's day this was taught by a particular teacher, I'm not quite sure who

it was, I think he was Mf~LC~4tl~ , but anyway it was taught in the form that, there are eighty-four different... eighty-four thousand different species of life, huh? or kinds of life, and that in the course of reincarnation any individual soul would go through them all, and when he 'd gone all through the... through all these eighty-four thousand forms of existence, he would automatically gain Nirvana, yes? evolution was inevitable, huh? You get this with the so- called New Age thinking, that evolution is inevitable, there's a great wave that is going to carry us all forward into the new age, whether we like it or not alrno\*, huh? yes? But this really is a miccaditthi because, you know, the general process of evolution carries you so far, as a non-individual, but when you wake up as an individual, then it all depends upon your own efforts~ your own individual conscious decision. You're not going to be carried forward by nature any iore, you're no longer a part of nature in that sense: from now onrards it's up to you. So this is really a miccaditthi\* you know the miccaditthi of inevitable evolution - well, higher evolution, huh? In ~ sense lower evolution is inevitable, in a manner of speaking, but the Higher Evolution isn't inevitable. (Pause). So you Just sit back and wait for the New Age to dawn, as it were, huh?

? I was just wondering, if it's got the views of a nihilist

in the sense that

S. Er, the Buddha used to say that....

?

S. Yes, er, the IhidOha used to say that it was better to be an eternalist than a nihilist, if you had to choose, because at least the eternalist believed that there was an after life, even if they had ungrounded sort of belief about it~ believed that there was an unchanging soul persisting after bodily death, whereas as the nihilists Just held that death was quite literally the end of everything#~, mmm? ~o he represents the extremists form of wrong view in a way.

~~~~tloft~ OrAra~6~s)t ~~p~ ~

? And was this Nagarjana

S. It's very difficult to say - I'm not even sure, you know, whether the translation correctly represents what, you know, Nagarjana said.

? and that when they die Do ~n~ilists believe th~ that illusion,
everything..?

S. Well, in the Buddha's day, you know, ~&f~V~~~ as is the term, LLccJLCd~"~~ means the 'ism' of cutting off, the cutting off 'ism'* hence the nihilation 'ism'; that held that when you died you were cut off completely~ nothing survived, er, obviously the body doesn't survive - there was nothin~~ mental surviving bodily death, no psychic element, hth? independent of the body which survived, eh? whereas the Sassatavadins believed that there was an independent psychic element. Nt they believed that it went on unchanged, whereas the Buddhist view w.~s that consciousness was a stream, a flow, a flux, and that this flow continued from life to life, linking with one body~after another, but that there was not any unchanging entity as it were transmigrating or reincarnating. That was the B'~ddha's view.

S. Yes, yes, right. A charge of energy trans~itted. But not energy as a thing, energy as a process. Also, you k~~w, there is eternalism and annihil- ationism with regard to the ultimate goal Nivarna. If you think of fl"~arna as a purely negative state, a state of non-existence, so that when you gain enlightenment what happens is, you know, you're just annihilated, then that is

one extreme view, eh? But if you believe that in Nirvana, in the state of
enlightenment, you still exist, well that is eternalism, huh? ~hereas the

Buddhist view is that you cannot say either about Nirvana, neither that you are annihilated in Nirvana, nor that you go on existing in it, eh? it is a state which transcends that whole way of thinking, transcends that particular pair of opposites, you can't say that you die, you can't say that you live, eh? you can't say that your ego is annihilated, you can't say that your ego is preserved, eh? mm? it's another kind of state altogether, that is quite indescribable so no eternalism or annihilationism with regard to Nirvana either. Nirvana itself is not an existence as we understand existence, neither is it a state of non-existence, or both or neither, it just defies all our categories, all our attempts at classification. So I can't classify either positively or negatively - you know, no annihilationism, no eternalism.

? Nihilists come to change their views?

S. Pardon?

? Do? ...if you were a nihilist how would you ever come to believe anything else?

S. How would you come...?

? Yes.

S. That's quite a point. I suppose it would depend on what sort of person you were and how you'd become convinced of the truth of annihilationism - you know - in the first place, eh? The Buddha seems to have linked, according to the Pali text, seems to have linked eternalism with craving for existence, and annihilationism with craving for non-existence, hmm? For instance, if you believe that in the state of enlightenment, in the state of Nirvana, you still persisted, as it were, unchanged, eh? the only difference being that you were now experiencing a state of Nirvana or Enlightenment, eh? or had, as it were, come into possession of Nirvana or enlightenment, well, that sort of view would be the product of your craving for existence, your attachment to your own individual being, eh? so that you didn't even like to conceive of the possibility of that being not continuing, eh? hmm? But what about the craving for non-existence, when do you crave not to exist? It's when life becomes so intolerable, eh? or when you have such hatred towards yourself that you don't want to exist any more, hinni? So the Buddha seems to have felt that, seems to have thought that nihilism was a sort of rationalisation, almost, of a desire not to exist, or as a sort of self hatred, mmm? So one could, you know, get beyond that view of nihilism, only that were by tackling the cause, hmm? and trying to see why someone wanted not to exist. Why do you want not to exist? That is the question, eh?

p-Eu-S ~a~Ai~tb T~ 3

? You find this in quite a lot of old people who just want to die.

S. ?~nm.

? Who haven't had...

S. ~ni. Well, that means... that doesn't necessarily mean 'not want to exist'* because they might believe that they, you know, continue to exist after death. But if life becomes very painful, well, you just want the pain to cease, hmm?

So if the pain seems to be inseparably bound up with life, well, in effect, you want life to cease, huh? But it doesn't necessarily mean that you believe that there is no continuance on another plain, no continuance of consciousness. You could probably say that the 'natural' in inverted commas, state, is for a man to want to go on living, and that you start to want not to live at all, even after death, as a result of, you know, some painful experience. Maybe you're afraid of what might happen after death, you'd rather not exist and have to face it, huh? ~maybe it's because you don't trust the god that you'll find- after--your death, hmm?

Uttara. Judgement ~bay, Reckoning Day.

S. Mmm, yes.

Uttara. Having to stand, you know, having to stand... that is the sort of in~ression, I don't know if the majority feel that, but, when we

die what we go through...

S. Mmm, yes, yes.

Uttara. You know, the sort of states, the states that we experience when we... everything, everything comes up, so to speak, before us, it's shown, and the~'s something'~there which is, which is the like sorting it all out and where we~

going to appear next. you know S. ~I'm, huh. But sometimes maybe people~crave for non-existence out of sort of

weariness~ sort of world weariness, do you know what I mean?

??? ?Imm, mmm.

S. ~but maybe then they can't necessarily exactly crave for it, it's more like wishing for it. ~whereas I think you actually crave not to exist, I mean only when you've suffered very, very much, and suffering seems inseparable from

p~~~~s ~tci~~kSb TtP~ 3

existence, and there seems to be no way out that you can see. I think you can only cease to be an annihilist if you could be brought to see that one didn't have to suffer, that there was a way out of suffering, hmm? I think it's the experience of suffering, or the inability, the incapacity to see any way out of that, any alternative to that, which causes one to reject life, to reject existence as such, and you'd rather not exist at all than, you know, continue to exist on those terms, and as far as you can see, those are the only terms available. So you reject them.

? So I wonder what... when an annihilist dies, what conditions would...

would carry on.

S. Well, what, you mean the annihilist would carry OIL in a sense, eh? ? Yes.

S. Er, but the stream of consciousness, as a Buddhist would describe it, you know would no doubt be deeply impregnated, tainted even with this sort of despair,

and general distaste for life, and you know, presumably the re-birth wouldn't

be a very good one. (Pause).

? All living things seem to have a like that

S. Th= Nfl. It also may be, I mean there is also this other way of looking at things, that death is a great purgation, as it were, hmm? that, you know, you forget, hmm? I mean, you forget all the, you know, the pains and the sufferings of your previous existence, and you know you could say that your sort of natural desire for life and enjoyment of life, you know, comes up again limir? and you start all over again in the new existence; you just forget, and you know, if one does believe in re-birth, then one has gone through so many previous lives* and no doubt, so many painful experiences, that one can

U even you know and, you know in this life, ~~~en with regard to painful experiences that you remember, you get over them, so what to speak of, you

know, when you die, you forget all about this life and all about this body and all about these sufferings eh? well, you're re-born with no recollection of them and maybe they don't leave all that trace at all after all, you know, you just start all over again almost with a clean sheet. ~s, things which seem very important to us at the time, you know later on they ~on't seem important

~ou know

at all. I mean, supposing ~Ou have a terribly miserable life, you know, a really bad experience, maybe a very, very unhappy marriage, very unsatisfactory children, great poverty, maybe your country's been invaded by some foreign army; but you die: you're quite out of that situation, hmm? and the greatest suffering is not to be able to get out of the situation, yes? But death takes you out of the situation and gives you a completely new start, in a

completely new body, in a completely different environment, completely different ~
~~. ?J~VS~j ~~~~~t

everything, hmm? So, in a way, this is one of the great advantages of dying,

you get the chance to make a new start, yes? So one can look upon sort of dying in a quite positive way, and so many people get themselves in such a

mess, yes? that it's a jolly good thing that they do have to die. (Laughter) It cuts the loss, as it were, or the Gordian Knot, that they're quite unable to unravel. Thank heaven, well even sometimes you might think, when you get into difficulties, eh? if you're very difficult~, maybe painful, traumatic situation, you know - if only I could just wake up, and be somewhere different,

out of - this altogether, yes? If only I could just terminate it, just like just that and be completely out of it, eh? Well, death offers that kind of opportunity.

I mean this sometimes why people commit suicide, yes? just to get out of an intolerable situation, and there seems no other way to do that. But, you know, if you can wait long enough, and just be a bit patient, well, you know, natural death will do it for you anyway. You're in a completely different situation, you know, all your problems are solved, I mean to the extent that they were the product of external circumstances and external conditions. I mean, maybe there is something within you, with which you have to come to terms, which precipitated at least some of those difficulties and problems: all right, you get another chance now to work all it out, to sort it all out. Maybe this time you'll do it, maybe this time you'll succeed.

But supposing you went on living indefinitely, remembering everything that you'd done, and everything that had happened to you, well how awful that would be, and if you think it over carefully, you'd probably decide, well, it would be better to die every now and then, and to forget all about the past, and make

V4%,)' 8'

a fresh start, eh? hmm? It seems the most sensible sort of arrangement.

? It's the conclusion that Shaw came to isn't it?

S. Did it? ~~, in 'Back to Methuselah', yes, right. I mean seventy or eighty years are quite enough, surely, yes? You know, for one stretch (?) of life. (Laughter). To have to sort of remember things that happen over sixty or seventy, eighty years, huh? Well, by the time you've gone through all that you need a bit of a change, a bit of a break, you know it's time to

forget. And if you can start all over again, well, how wonderful, not to have to have to think about the past, not even remember, not even to know, not even

to know that you have a past, you know just to start over a fresh, new, pristine human being, another glorious life, huh? hopefully. Anywhere (Laughter). These are the ten white paths of action, they're opposite the black.

Uttara: Yes, not looking at it in terms of just ten paths, but just one. S'~ Yes, er* In Sanskrit it's Dasa~~~~~ er, just a minute, Dasa~~~~~W'~~~~ ten white paths you could say, but really it is one path, yes.

? Aren't they also called the ten ways of Ultimate Truth?

S. Yes, er, yes right. Dasa- ~~

? The white really means something that is wholesome and er

~. Skillful, yes.

? Skillful.

S. Alright, let's read verse ten.

? Not drinking intoxicants, a good livelihood, Non-harming, considerate givin~g, honouring The honourable, and love - Practice in brief is that. S. ?;imn, not drinking intoxicants, huh? How do people feel about that?

I mean there's a bit of an analogy here with sex, hmm? Can you drink mind- fully?

? Not for very long. S. Not for very long. ? In moderation.

S. In moderati~n, yes. Ab.~olutely? It doesn't make any difference at all?

~~-4~ ~Pr 3

r a difference that doesn't make a difference? You know that you're a little bit merry, you know, you ~~~M) t&A~~ g-t~make some difference, but you know it, you're aware of it, eh? yes? So does it sort of matter, do you think? Or are you to that extent deviating from the path of strict practice?

? Something else to be aware of. S. Something else to be aware of... Has it got any positive value~would you say, ever? ? Yes... (mmrmer) S. You kno~, what do you think is... ? Sometimes... it ~~-lows you to express something.. S. ?mnrn, yes.

? It encourages con-inication between people ...

S. Yes, do you think you really can commimicate, or are you just a sort of, you know, rather mindless conviviality?

? Not if you're blind drunk, of course. (Laughter).

a °~lass of wine... quite

a lot of people...

S. I used to find this when I was up at number fifty-five, huh? I used to invite people for, you know, a meal and a chat. Sometimes they were so tongue-tied that I'd say to Siddhiratna quietly, 'Just go and get a bottle of something'. And it always did the trick, it's amazing, just that one bottle of wine between four or five people, and, you know, the tongues

would start wagging, certainly nobody got drunk or anything near (Laughter) not on a bottle between four or five, but certainly people loosened up a bit, and this was much better communication. So one can use it sort of mindfully in this sort of medicinal way almost, huh? yes? It shouldn't be necessary, 2 1 but sometimes unfortunately it is, or something like that is necessary, and

sometimes I used to find that the whole situation was so painful and people would be so blocked that one & almost, you know, feel like using a crow-bar if

necessary, but, you know, just this one little bottle of cheap, red wine,

(Laughter) or even a couple of bottles of Guinness or something like that...

~M~~4i~~b T~~ a

Usually it was red wine, though. \:~o sometimes these little aids, you know* do help, but clearly one mustn't mis-use them, or, you know, carry them to extremes... you might... one bottle of wine might help you to communicate, but it doesn't mean that ten bottles enjoyed (Xach laughter) ...better, it doesn't follow like that, does it? So how do you, you know, does one feel that, you know the occasional drink in that sort of way is permissible?

you don't think it's any violation of the precepts? Is that the general

(~rmers) ~n, mmm.

S. Yes, I think that's probably common-sensical. b~, 'A good livelihood'.

What does one mean by 'good livelihood'? I don't think that's a very happy translation, is it - 'good livelihood'? It's a right livelihood, a perfect livelihood.

? One that's conducive to... and~ developing.

S. Yes, one that does not tend to infringe the precepts, and, you know, which does no harm to other people.

? ???????

S. ~uL~~ (?)oneself and others, or at least does no harm to any-

body. This is quite important, because think of the time that you do spend on your

livelihood, if you are working full time. It must have an effect on

the mind. Anybody had any sort of experience of this sort? You know working many at a
~articular job over a period of~years and findiz4t did have a sort of psy

chological effort?

? I worked in a bacon factory for a few years, I'm sure it had quite a... in

S. Ah, well what did you actually do this baking factory?

? Bacon.

S. Oh, baconJ

? Bacon factory.

S. Oh, ah,ah.

? Cutting up ~orking with dead pigs, carrying thein into smoke

houses and things like that. I'm sure it has... well, it did have

TAP~ ~

1~.

S. Or it did have.

? Yes.

S. Yes.

? I found it heavy I did a few jobs with every job I felt after a week... I'd start
hallucinating. One job I had to do with little p'astic things. I'd just constantly be
hallucinrting these little plastic things in my mind, I couldn't get them out.

S. Oh.

? And a number of just repetitive jobs become... you just can't get out of it. ?

S. ell, it alienates you from the proc~ss of working itself, doesn't it? ? You kno~ you're

not enjoying yourself.

S. Yes.

The majority of are not creative, therefore one
doesn't fully enjoy it.

S. ~irni. Yes, the wage compensates you for the work, yes? Which is
really

a terrible thing if you think of it. I mean the work is so bad you have
to be paid well to get you to do it, eh? You wouldn't do it otherwise. ? ???? 3 <A
~

People are so bored and so frustrate? they want something to S. Liven things up a bit.
I mean they're not very hopeful about changing the whole system, but at least the odd strike
liven things up a bit. ~bnin, ?es. (M~rmer of assent).

? I found this at the Post Office, even there where the money were... seemed to be very good.

S. ~.

? I would say there's a lot of resentment.

S. Nmm, er.

P~~~Io'4~ ~fr~tfr~ ~4~ *bqq.

Complaining ~ll the time.

S. Oh.

? Always fault-finding, talking about 'them', you know.

S. I~nm.

? Inspectors....

S. Oh.

? A ktnd of resent~ent that went through that. If you looked at the situa- tion ~the Post Office seemed to go out of its ~ay to provide you with what you wanted: a good wage, a room with a television, food cooked for you, a uniform to wear, shoes for...everything. And then they would have their way (?)

you ~ould see the resentment.

S. But surely tht'~ J~ isn't all that bad?

? No, the job was easy.

S. So, why...?

? It was very boring though

? Very boring.

S. 3oring.

? Yes.

? That's the trouble with so many jobs, they're just boring, they're not

S. But did you get the impression that the workers, most of them anyway, would really be able to be creative, and do a creative job, do you think they have that capacity?

? They were definitely stuck there - people had been doing that for thirty

or ftttrty years... I think they were stuck with it, yes, they were st'ck, being looked at in that particular way, by that particular job.

S. Kinmi, ah.

? I think that's what they resented, because perhaps (?) they wanted to be be creative.

S. They... dependents.

? They were on rates, people were on rates

pa~io~ 4*'L&~~ ~p'p~ ~

no q~.

S.?~irni, yes.

? mit,

and a chap was talking about my

sort of local getting cut off from
the source, from people.

S. Ahh ? that seems, sort of wasted and... and c~t off from S. Ni-.
if we can see the positive side of this

at Sukhavati.

S. jY'nun, right, yes.

? Right livelihood.

S. ~mn, mmm. It does ~eem to be a very basic and fundamental thing, this
question of right livelihood. I r~an, if for no other reason because so
much of one's time is spent working since under the present system
it has to be.

? I think in a so-called

? You must understand

S. Yes, mmm, mmm. ? ~u'&~ - meditation

? \qhen I was working at Paddington~ this was a couple of weeks ago 7on the

p~~Uo~~ ~~~~~b T~~ ~

side, it wasn't hard work, it was just cleaning up that arid sort of thing, but it really was so boring, eh? and your energy,

I couldn't find... come to feel that a loss of energy going down and down

and down from an almost mechanical, and at

the end, you hadn't done anything, but you were so bored, that you couldn't

get that energy back up again, you didn't start meditating.

S. Oh, well perhaps you used most of your energy, you know, keeping your energy down.

? Yes, yes. I can really understand why people who spend their lives doing repetitive, mechanical jobs aren't interested in the Higher Evolution, because their energy's got into such a mechanical stream that all they want to do is to come home, watch the television and have a meal - that's all.

S. In my

? That's their lives.

S. Mm

? I can really see them, I got a real clear insight into their lives somehow. (pause).

? I think also problems when the employers ask you to do a certain standard of work, you know, everybody must do a certain standard of work, whether you can do it or not, you know, they don't care, they want a certain standard, you know.

S. Well, mmm.

? They don't really express sort of an individual who might do ten things well, and another person finds you know... can't do it because the

Union says you can only do a certain amount, you know.

S. Well, there were a few instances in the paper some time ago of workers

getting into trouble because they worked too well. You get into trouble with the Union if you work too well or do too much.

~~~'b ~~~

Utt~ a: ~s, that ha~penec to me in er ~hen, you kno~, up in Scotland - me and a friend were working on a hydro-electric dani, and we were really, you know,

ti~, ..'.~p ~ u~~u4Ao. ~&t~t, ~ you know the people were quite amazed that we were doing so much work, and the next... on the Tiday or something we were told that we...znnnn...that was it

S. Mimn

Uttara: I mean we did... we hadn't done anything wrong we were just, we were working~~4 ~ W-°IA ~just didn't... didn't like it, because if everybody had worked that way then the job would be finished and it would put them...

S. A, hmmm.

? Unbelievable (?)

(Laughter)

? When you think of the state of the ~ritish economy.

S. Anyway, 'a good livelihood', right livelihood; 'Non harming', well, we've gone into that under the heading of the first precept. 'Considerate giving', well, this is a more positive side of the second precept, eh? mmm? - not only that you should not take the not given, but that you should give consider- ately - considerate giving, not just blind, foolish, impulsive giving, but considerate giving, wise giving, skillful giving. And 'honouring the honour- able', eh? or worshipping the worshipful - reverencing, you know, that which is deserving of reverence. This is of course very, very important Indeed, yes, and, you know, here we come up against so many modern miccha ditthis, eh? Namely to the effect that, I mean, everybody and everything is equal, so no reverence is called for, you know, from anyone to anyone, or anything, even, eh?

? Nagarj~ma gives us a good example with the first verse 'bowing down.

S. Yes, right, yes, yes. (Pause). And there is this sort of modern attitude or tendency to want to pull down, to want to d~nigrate, to deflate, and so on. Do you notice this? ?~inin? (nnirmers) (Pause) Why do you think this is?

de-mystify.

P~t'O~ &~A~ib ~p~ 3

S. To de-mystify. What do you mean by de-mystify?

? Take one's

~. ~nm, yes.

? Through what one understands.

S. N~mn, well says that you can only reverence that which you don't understand - if you understand it, you in a sense master it, you know reverence is out of place or not called for, huh?

? It's a kind of resentment, isn't it, that there is something, more than you.

S. Yes.

? You feel a resentment.

S. Why should one feel that resentment, why not feel happy that there's something more than you, there's something bigger than you, better than you.

? You then would have to ego. S. Rgo.

Uttara: have a fixed attitude of themselves...

S. Yes, right, yes, mmm. No one shall be taller than you, eh?

Uttara: Yes

- kA4~LA&' ~~~w~ ()).

S. Because one would think, you know, that people would be only too happy, just to, you know, to be able to look up to something or someone, eh, something higher. What apparently nowadays not so. Or they look up in the wrong sort of way to the wrong sort of things and the wrong sort of people.

? The fashion seems to determine what one looks up to.

S. ~4mm, ~inin, yes. It's through this sort of ~rain and debunking combatness (?)

S. Vell, no doubt co should be debunked, eh? but people seem to want to debunk you know things which are really worthy, eh?

I think it's a quite good generalizing what's been originated

frPci~4~b TA~ ~

through many of the church ...the authority of the church, and people are

beginning to see through which has

been a great authority in the past, and it see S to now, but it's not really

an authority an authority that's human (?).

S. Yes, it's also no longer looking up to Co, you know they were accustomed to a great extent that when they do look up, that is what they look up to, so if that goes, well, it's as though well there's nothing to look up to, which of course would not be the Thiddhist point of view, hmm?. These are the very sort of strong points in Blake's teaching, he said words to this effect, that the true worship is honouring God's gifts, as he says, in great men and honouring the greatest men the best, huh? But this is not the mode= attitude - you find...try to find the great man's weaknesses, so that you can feel, well, he's no really better than you are after all, huh? Even though he was quite gifted in certain respects, but in other respects if anything he was even worse than you, heh? and that seems to give you a sort of you know comfort in a sort of perverse way, eh? mmm?

? ~ ~

S. Yes, yes, right.

Uttara:

S. If that is what he is, I mean, if he really is a superman, well, the appropriate attitude is to reverence him as a superman, huh? I mean we were talking about this last week in connection with the humanity of the Thiddha. The Buddha was human, eh?. But the fact that he was human didn't make Him any less the Buddha, yee? whereas, you know, the moderate attitude might be, well, if He was human, well, He wasn't the Buddha, sort of thing.

? Yes.

S. Yes? mmm? So you have to try and do both, yes\* you see the human-ness of the Buddha, and at the same time you do see that He was an Enlight-

TA~~ a

ened human being, yes? So, in the same way, if the great man has weaknesses, well, see those too, don't ignore those or gloss them over like the Victorians sometimes did, eh? but don't let the fact that he has certain weaknesses hide the fact that he is far more developed than you, or far more gifted than you, eh? despite those weaknesses, eh? but not sort of conclude well because he has those weaknesses - which I don't have - he's no better than me if not worse than me. What about those other qualities which you can't possibly hope to have:, eh? They surely count too?

Uttara: I think something extreme happens if you...

a person, and how you experience

and they show you, for instance, a weakness\* and you plunge down into the dark, disregard them almost through that one thing, you know.

S. Yes, quite, yes.

It's almost regarded as a sort of sign of, you know, well, naivety or foolishness or stupidity to look up to anyone or anything, as though you're very gullible, very easily taken in, yes? Well, no doubt many people are, but that, you know, mustn't blind us to the fact there is a true and a genuine look

ing up, eh? as well as a rather pseudo one. ? \_\_\_\_

S. So 'honouring the honourable' or reverencing that which is worthy of & reverence, 'and love' huh? Not~very fortunate translation, I shouldn't

be surprised if it means it's 'maitri', and you know Yo~ get the distinction between r.~aitri and what we usually mean when we speak of love, eh? what do you think is the main point of difference?

? ~~~ther sentimental S. Rather sentimental ?

~. ~tJnm? ? And more often than not sexual.

TPiP~ ~

~. Yes, and bound up with attachment,too.

? Yes, yes.

S. Whereas friendliness, which is what maitri or metta really means, is essentially, you know, a heart-felt desire for the other person's happiness, eh? for their progress, their development~, huh? (Pause). So N~arjuna's practice in brief is that, huh? That is to say the not drinking intoxicants,

the good livelihood, non-harming, considerate giving, honouring the honourable, and love, eh? ? It sounds so easy. S. ~mn? ) ? Sounds so easy. '~

S. Sounds so easy, mmm. (Pause). Anyway, time's just about up, I think we'll stop there, because in the next verse N~arjuna starts off with some different line of thought, eh? Are there any queries or content on what we've done so

far today? or is there a general impression you get what ITagarjuna's approached?

S. Also it's bound up to some extent with the philosophy of pain, the philosophy of suffering - that pain is good for you, that suffering does you good, eh? that it automatically purges you,

automatically purifies you - suffering is the great purifier, hmm? just One becomes as much attached to the body by the extreme of mort

ification, as one does by the other extreme of sensuality - as the body is, you know, crying out in discomfort, and so on all the time, ????????? S.

Nmm,mmm \hereas a middle ..... r~, mmm, mmm, r ... one can perhaps

S. J:~mm, yes. So keep it quiet and contented, but under control, hmm? °{~ you think this is real danger for people nowadays? - self-mortification? do they go in for

this sort of thing~ (Several voices) Some... 'mmm... this is sort of compulsive non-eating.. S. ~hat's true, yes, yes, hmm . Tut it doesn't take as it were religious forms, does it? it isn't done for religious reasons.

PRECIOUS GARLANb Tape 4 Side 2

? ~taybe a few Zen sort of... .rjmm,yes

? ... sort of people who are intereseted (?) in

S. Yes. Yes, some people punish themselves, don't they? this seems to be, in a way, a form of self- mortification. They seem to be bound up with feelings of g'iilt and s~lf-hatred or self contempt.

? Well\* in a way, a lot of people live with ....??

S. Hmm, huh, yes. But we can also say that mush that people nowadays would regard as self-mortification, the Buddha would have regarded

as healthy self discipline, and following of the middle path, huh? you know I mean, quite a few people would~think it a matter of self -morti

fication not to eat meat, to live only on vegeatables, eh? hmm? or just, you know, not to be able to enjoy certain things - go without certain luxuries, eh? This would be considered self-mortification, hmm? For instance I was talking the other day about how in India most people don't slvep on a mattress, they just sleep on a mat on the bare ground, eh? This is quite normal, there's nothing par- ticularly ascetic or, you know, self-mortifying about it, it's just the way they normally live, huh? But, you know, people in this country would regard sleeping on~the ground, on just, you know, a bare mat, a reed mat, as quite an extreme form of self-mortification. So we have to bear this in mind, too, that we have become, as it were, very soft and flabby. There's a lot of rather neurotic self- mortification around, but very little healthy self-discipline, one could say. People punish themselves, but they don't discipline themselves. (~~urmer of assent) (pause) So it's a question of a middle way between self indulgence and self mortification, with regard to the body, simply keeping it fit, keeping it healthy, so that it gives you as little trouble as possible, and you can get on

PRECIOUS GARLAND Tape 4 Side 2

you J<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>~%n~rore with, ~~ow,o important things. We mustn't forget



that asceticism come from a Greek word 'askesis' or... which means

training simply. It was the word used for the training of the athlete, you went into training, yes? If he was over-weight he reduced his weight, so that he could run quicker. So asceticism is really training, eh? One should, you know, think in terms of that, not in terms of self-ratification. Think in terms of going into spiritual training, eh?

I've been reading a book, about, you know, yourself and... the Greeks and things like that... and just what these people go into, you know, they... some spend fifteen years, you know, in caves or whatever you know, real discipline; and you ... read it, and - what am I doing? you know, it just doesn't seem as if there's really any... you're putting really any effort into the spiritual life, you know, it seems this way (?)

S. Yes, yes, yes. Well, I mean, not (?) to speak about you know, yogis and people who are meditators, what about athletes who train for the Olympic Games? Look how seriously they train, even a professional footballer trains every day, yes, several hours. But what about the, as it were, professional spiritual life, eh? I mean, surely, you know, you can't do less training than a footballer does, eh? He's only, you know, training his body, his mind's just something stiff (?) yes, er, most certainly not his higher mental

faculties, not to speak of spiritual faculties. I mean he knows you know quite well that he's not going to stand much chance of playing a

good game of football and helping his team to win if he doesn't keep fit and in training, but you seem to think very often that you can get by with just very minimal sort of training and keep spiritually fit and, you know, help your team, (Laughter) to score spiritual goals, you know with the minimum of effort and

## PREVIOUS GAELAW() - mapei\ Side 2

trouble, just (?) half an hour a day, Eh? and not even every day at that, eh? in other words, on your level, you're taking your life much less seriously than the professional sportsman takes his on his level, eh? which seems all wrong, I mean, not to press the analogy too far, but there is some truth in this, yes? (Pause) So perhaps one should think, you know, especially with regard to the body, simply that... of keeping fit, and going into training and all that kind of thing'. All right, let's go on. Twelve.

'He who does not esteem the great path of excellent Doctrine which is bright with ethics, giving and patience, inflicts his body, takes Bad paths like jungle trails;'

~. Yes, carry on with the next verse.

? 'His body entangled with vicious Afflictions, he enters for a long time The dreadful jungle of cyclic existence Among the trees of endless beings.'

S. Ninin. There's one point we didn't make with regard to verse 11, by the way. The reason for huh? understanding that 'practice does not mean to mortify the body, for one has not ceased to injure others and is not helping them.' I mean the fact that you are injuring yourself doesn't mean that you have ceased to injure others, eh? and at the same time one is not helping others either, so especially from the Mahayana point of view, what is the good of that mortification of the body, eh? I mean what is important is not to injure others and to help others, eh? But by mortifying your body you're not necessarily not hurting others, nor are you necessarily helping them, eh? So what use is that kind of practice, eh? hmm? So this sort of idea is developed in verse twelve when Nagarjuna says,

'He who does not esteem the great path of excellent Practice, which is bright with ethics, giving and patience,

eh? - that is, sila, dana and ksanti -

'Afflicts his body, takes Bad paths like jungle trails;' huh? hmm?

He is saying that the reason why one afflicts one's body, eh? the reason why one mortifies one's body is that one does not really think very highly, eh? of the true and the real spiritual practice, eh? hmm? One does not really appreciate the great path, of the Excellent Dharma, hmm? which is bright with, which is adorned with such positive practices, hmm? as ethics and giving and patience, eh? hmm? in other words, if you really appreciate the true spiritual path and the true spiritual qualities, eh? you won't find it necessary to fall back upon mortifying the body, eh? hmm? It's your failure to appreciate the spiritual path in a positive sense, eh?

that causes you to adopt that purely negative method, eh? of mortifying the body, eh? And in this way takes to,

'Bad paths like jungle trails;' eh? I mean, taking to the path of mortifying the body is just like being lost in the

jungle, eh? And then Nagarjuna indicates the consequences: 'His body entangled with vicious Afflictions,' - presumably the afflictions

created by the self-mortification, -

'... he enters for a long time The dreadful jungle of cyclic existence Among the trees of endless beings.' eh? Far from self-

mortification leading to liberation huh? you only become more deeply involved in conditioned existence itself, eh? hmm? This - I mean even if one takes it out of this particular context of karma and rebirth - it contains a profound truth, eh? hmm? That by tormenting yourself, by mortifying the body, you only become more deeply involved, eh? hmm? in attachment and so on. That is not the path to liberation. (Pause). You do see this, you know, with people quite a bit. I've had, you know, a few examples of it recently. People really tormenting themselves, maybe not tormenting

their bodies, but tormenting their minds, eh? and worrying themselves and bothering themselves and causing trouble for themselves, and really punishing themselves in all sorts of ways. One sees quite a bit of this, eh? hrnm? And they may be sort of involved in something spiritual or something religious, but it doesn't really function as a sort of means of liberation for them. They just become more and more deeply entangled and they try to entangle you too, to

get you too involved with all this, eh? So that they (?) ask you to punish them as it were, yes? Or they invite punishment,

they invite suffering. So this is the sort of thing that Nagarjuna has in mind apparently, though more reference to mortifying the

body:

'His body entangled with vicious Afflictions, he enters for a long time The dreadful jungle of cyclic existence Among the trees of endless beings.' eh?

And this is due to his failure to appreciate the true spiritual path, eh? His failure to appreciate the beauty of the positive spiritual practices. You know, talk to people like this about metta- bhavana\* or talk to them about generosity - they don't want to hear, they say, 'Well, I couldn't do that, that isn't for me', yes? hmm? talk to them about anything positive, they're not interested. Sometimes they say, 'Oh, I couldn't practice that, that's impossible for me,' or 'I don't need that, my need is different', eh? Well, as some years ago a woman came to see me, rather of this type, heh? and she stayed with me a couple of hours - a woman of about forty - this was when I was living at Highgate, eh? - and

she had the usual sort of moan and, you know, all that kind of thing, sheh~ o~ and she was clearly one of these self-tormenting people, hmm? So

we had a not very satisfactory talk, and she was sort of looking at

my book cases and said I had, you know, so many books, eh? So

she asked if she might borrow one of them, so, I thought, well,~~~~~M~~~

never mind, They don't usually lend my books, I said, 'Yes, borrow one by all means,' eh? So she searched among all these hundreds of books, and she came up with a book, an obscure book, called 'The Theology of the Pain of God', (laughter), and this is the one that she took away. I thought this was really sort of, you know, significant that that is the book among all my hundreds of books that she selected, eh? - a book on the pain of God, eh? by a Japanese Christian, eh? (laughter).

'Theology of the Pain of God', we've still got it, and I thought that really revealing, hmm? But it isn't easy to deal with such people. So this seems to be the modern equivalent of, you know, the mortifying of the flesh. A lot of it is quite compulsive, too, you just go on doing it for no apparent reason, no reason of which you are conscious.

Anyway, that's an unpleasant subject, let's leave it, eh? Onto 14.

'A short life comes through killing, Much suffering through harming, { through stealing poor resources, Through adultery enemies.'

S. Jmm. I see & there's a whole series of these verses, so let me make

a few general comments first, eh? Nagarjuna is describing the

consequences of unskillful actions, ah? and he's following the Buddhist tradition in this respect, eh? and he has in mind, of course,

the consequences of unskillful actions under the law of karma as operating over a series of lives; in other words the truth of karma and rebirth is taken for granted, eh? We need not necessarily look at it in that light because sometimes one sees the consequences of

unskillful actions even in this life itself, eh? But the point really to observe here is the appropriateness of the result, eh? of the unskillful action, eh? that a short life comes through killing, eh? in other words, if you shorten the lives of others, your life too will be shortened, eh? h? This is the sort of general principle, this is called the appropriateness of the karmic effect, eh?

PROLOGUE: S. C; LA - Tape 4 Side 2 To Q 150 do you think this is true in the shorter term, as it were? or why should there be this sort of natural connection between your shortening the lives of others, and your life being shortened? I mean what happens when you shorten the lives of others? why do you usually do it?

Hate.

S. Fate, eh? So if you are so imbued with hate that you are likely or liable to shorten the lives of others, you know, what sort of atmosphere surrounds you? bmm?

? ... hate.

S. an atmosphere of hate. If you are surrounded by an atmosphere of hate, you know, what sort of people, what sort of experiences are you likely to attract?

? Violence.

S. Violence, yes; death. So therefore it would seem to be true in a sort of ... in a general way, that if you shorten the lives of others there is a greater likelihood, to say the least, of your own life being shortened, eh? hmm? This is not to say that if your life is shortened well you must have been shortening the lives of others. It doesn't follow like that, eh? I mean your life being shortened, may be due to something quite different, but if you shorten the lives of others then inevitably your life will tend to be shortened too, because that is the sort of atmosphere that you are creating, eh? That is the sort of wave length on which you are operating, and you'll be tuned in to others, as it were, who are on that same wave length, huh?

physical. If you're full of hate

then your body - you're likely to die...

S. If you mean, mmm, there is that too, yes, yes. So - 'A short life comes through killing, much suffering through harming,' - for the same reason. If you're the sort of person who is, you know, likely to cause suffering to others, eh? You know, if that is your mental state, well, you

PROF. CAELINE - Tape / Side 2 (O~ 151 are likely, as it were, to attract harm to yourself. 'Do you ever actually see this happening? that people seem to attract trouble, just because their own minds are in a sort of troubled state, as it were.

Oh yes.

S. You see this? you notice this? yes?

Oh. (Laughter) hmm. So one does see that this sort of law, this sort of principle operates even within the short term, even, you know, leaving aside the question of karma and rebirth and future lives, eh?

'Through stealing poor resources,' eh? - You take from others, uh? then things will be taken from you, uh? Does one find this actually happening? or not? Are there exceptions? VJnln:, nunln.

You never find in a group of thieves - that thieves

Cost what you lost (?) for.

S. ~mm, yes, mmm.

Plus if you continue to steal it indicates possibly dissatisfaction

with what you've already got, and you continue to need more.

S. Yes.

The more you plunge into that, the more you need, the less you've got,  
you know...

S. Yes, that's true, yes, because your need is neurotic, preta-like. ? Yes, yes.

You find it in competitive business, which is ~(?) a fine form of stealing. You cut the throat  
of others, and of course they come and cut yours in turn.

Yes, yes.

? ... it's going on all the time.

S. ~nm.

~; ¼IC&S CATHIA~ T~pe 4 Side 2 ~~~ 1~2 a few  
sim'p]e belo~c.ings.... L~XAt S. ~!Jfl1n, mmm, mmm for want (?) of

'Throu~h Jultery enemies' eh? 4.ell~ that seems pretty obvious, eh? °P~ committing  
a(ultery, you know, you make enemies of the husbands of the women 'ith whom you commit  
it. .11 right, let's carry on, fifteen.

? 'J rom lying arises slander, .~ parting of friends from divisiveness, From harshness  
hearing the unpleasant, rom senselessness one's speech is not respected.'

S. ~. Sn does one see a connection here? - 'From lying arises slander'. You tell  
lies about others,

others will tell lies about you. Do you think this is true? Ices this happen?

? Ye~

b. w-mm, mmm, yes. It may be of course that others slancer you without your having  
lied, I mean, this is possible, eh? lut if you lie, then sooner or later you will be slandered, eh?

Yes.

S. 1'rm. And, 'A parting of friends from divisiveness,' eh? ell, this is obvious, isn't it,  
eh?

? 16hat's divisiveness?

S. Creating divisions between people, presumably, yes? I assume it refers to  
back-biting, because this whole verse ii about speech, isn't ~j, the conse~uences of wrong

speech. So,

'From lying arises slander,' then

'A p~rtin~ of friends from divisiveness,' divisiveness seems, you kno~, back~bitin~~~ riuo ting disharmony and dissension, by tittle-tattle, by repeating to one person what ~as said by another, about that f~rst person and so on, eh? So, if you s~w dissension in this ... yes, it's sowing of dissension ... if you sow- dissension

Pr.t..LtIOLS GARLA~T) - Tape 4 Side 2 ~OWl ~3. in this ~ay, the result will be that you will loose your o~-n friends, sooner or later, hmm?

Gossiping and

S. Nmm? yes, yes...

? ... negative kind...

Do you actually see this? eh? yes. This is why I think It is very importan to say what -- one has to say about other people ctuite openly and to them, eh? not just to tell it to somebody else, and then be maybe surprised '-hen it ~-ets arou~d to include that person themsel°es, eh?

S. 59, 'From harshness he~ring. the ~rnpleasant,' eh? eli, this again is obvious: if you speak harshly to oth~rs, if you're in that sort of habit, sooner or l~:ter somebody is going to speak quite harshly to you, hmm? Your harshness ~ ill (espout?) their harshness in others, eh? £0 you noti~e this too? mmm? Or maybe it's a long time since

anyone's been really harsh, eh? lorgotten ~hat...

° . . if they're only telling you not to be harsh

- ~ven if they're only harshly telling you not to b~arsh.

~es, yes, right.

'From sensclessness onC's speech is not respected,' eh? -:his is idle and useless tlk; the result of that is that one's speech is not respectec, people don't t~ke very seriously '-hat

you say, hmm? You know, if you talk ~ lot of nonsense ~nd in the end no-one 'ill take. very seriously, -hat you say, they '-on't bother to listen to you. - tt's only old so and so talking, just babbling as usual, eh? (Laughter). - When it sometimes happens that you're talking solid sense, but they still think that you're babbling. That's another... you know, another matter.

PRECIOUS GARLAb'D. - Tape 4 Side 2 ~ 154.

? You have to be careful, because you become labelled, don't you?

S. Nirirn, yes...

... after you've indulged in that for a year or so...

J~~mm, yes...

a year or so of corrupt(?) speech

S. Yes.

in the same company because you so easily get labelled.

Vmm, yes. I~t I think this is one of the things we have to be, you know, very much aware of - the fact that people do chang~, and. one must be very careful not to see people as in fact they were last year,

but are not like this year, hsm? Otherwise one becomes , you know, you know, like one's o~n parents - you often criticise your parents for seeing

you. not as you are now, but as you were ten years ago. I~t you may

be doing that on a smaller time scale - seeing somebody as he was three months ago, not as he is now. ? mm S. ... and you've labelled him once, so, so far as you're concerned, he wears that label for good, he had a bad temper, O.K. - he is bad tempered - you know, he's ba. tempered for life, as it were, because that's the way you labelled him originally . You ignor~, or you don't notice even the fact that he's changed since then; 6r you label him as lazy, and that's ho~ you reg'ard him from , you know, from then on - un- reasonable, eh? etc. So, you know, he's stu~k (?) with that, as far as you are concerned. "A '~ he's - tries to make an effort to get out of that - a lot

of those kind of projections.

S. Yes, or ever sort of rationalise his efforts aw~y, you don't accept them - ~ell, he's not being really positive, you know - he might not have actually lost his temper, but you could see he was very irritated

£ T ~5 CARL.r - ape 4 Side c? ~~ 155.



underneath. (Laughter) You ~on't give up your point, you won't give up your label of him, your classification of him. ~his is what happens.

? ~ think it definitely makes it mor~ difficult for him to free him- self from that.

S. Ninin, yes.

And ~hen people are turning round, you know, if you like (?) relating to him as a lazy person...

S. Fight.

...he's got to overcome his own laziness and also...

S. jVjnm~ yes...

? ... and also this projection of...

S. Well, this is what someone was talking to me about, you know, only a few days ago, someone from the Archway area. He felt he'd been so definitely labelled by the people around that, that he had to get away from the area now, because he had changed, and knew he had changed, but other people didn't know that he'd changed, hadn't been able to see that ~ had changed, they were still treating him and regarding him as he was, uh? but not as he is now - he felt, at least. But he felt the only way he could. break through this was to leave the area altogether, hm?

Do you think this is often the only recourse that someone has, if

there's a very strong image that they have to... have to live with

or do you think that you can just go on being yourself and people will

see you eventually?

S. I think you can if you're very strong-minded, but it's quite difficult, eh? And you may have to sort of insist, or you may even have to get angry with them. But supposing they've got an image of you as an angry person, eh? - it'll only confirm their image, if you say, 'Well, no I'm not an angry person' (angrily) (Laughter) 'You mustn't

f~R?F'CIIOUS GAaIANi - Tape ~ Si(e 2 /10 156

see ~ ~ th~t ~.ny :nor~, hllTh? T'~ ~)eek.' (~~ujhter never

~ct an~.~y'. £~.ll, it's a cou~.le-binc-.. situation, isn't it? ut,

mean, there are certain ways in ~.:hich you can convince them - if 'l'O%L

for instance, they think that you're mean with money\* A never spend it

well, you can make a point of being generous, and taking people out for a meal, and buying them a cup of tea, and then it gradually dawns on them that you have changed, eh? that is possible. You know, if it's a simple straightforward sort of thing like that, eh? But if it's a very sort of subtle and quite complex evaluation, you know, of the mysteries of your, you know, inner being, then it's a different matter. But I do think we have to be careful about labelling people for good, hmm? have to sort of take a look at the labels every now and then, and change them if necessary - maybe quite frequently.

~/:tjb4' Could one say that in the spiritual life the ideal is to know people thoroughly but never label them? One ideal?

S. One could say that, I think. I don't think it's really, ultimately necessary to label people, though it may be, you know, helpful, or rather a provisional labelling may be helpful for the time being. Also there is the point that people can't be labelled, to the extent that they're individuals. :~O the extent that they are not individuals, they certainly can be labelled, eh? and one should have no hesitation in labelling them. But the individual as such cannot be labelled, eh?

VZTh~ OF ape ,\ . \4). ~~/W (;; 1/2

## PRECIOUS GARLAND SEMINAR

Morning Session VII - 24 111

S: ... 'cause when you label someone you really get him or her to a class, you classify them; the individual as such cannot be classified. Most people can be classified, because they are not individuals, but as soon as you start becoming an individual, to that extent you are no longer susceptible, really, to classification.

Hridhya: If you have classified someone you find that you ... that you are less open to them and you come to a situation where you.. .(unclear). . .you are to some extent closed to them...and you are closed to certain qualities in them and it might be quite an effort to (suddenly) see those changes.

S: So, in a sense, one should always meet people as though for the first time, not relate to them on the basis of how you related to them before-forget all about that.

Voice: It's that first impression that you always...(unclear)...

S: Yes, indeed - and you might happen to have caught a certain person at an unguarded moment or an uncharacteristic moment, then someone might come, you know, to meet you

for the first time, you might be the meekest and mildest of people, but at that particular moment you happen to be in quite a temper, and at once that impression would register that you were like that, but it might be completely uncharacteristic of you.

Uttara: TEXT-"Covetousness destroys one's wishes Harmful intent yields fright  
Wrong views lead to bad views And drink to confusion of the mind"

S: "Covetousness destroys one's wishes" - what does that mean? It seems rather strange doesn't it?

Ananda: It seems like what we were saying yesterday, about, er, seeing something desirable and trying to covet it, destroys the beauty of it.

S: But this says "...destroys one's wishes" - by covetousness you get what you don't want, that's what it literally means. By craving you get what you don't want.

Hriddya: You get something impermanent and this when you want something that will last to give you satisfaction.

S: Yes... (unclear)... Someone once said, I forget who it was, that the tragedy is not that we don't get what we want, the tragedy is that we get what we want and then we are stuck with it, and we realize it isn't what we wanted. Because we've invested that particular thing or that object or that experience or that quality with all sorts of values that it didn't really possess. So when we get it we realize or it dawns on us at last that we didn't really want it. But meanwhile we've got it or maybe we married it for instance... (laughter)...or bought it. So "covetousness destroys one's wishes and harmful intent yields fright". We translate that into modern psychological language. If you constantly hate others, then you start suffering from paranoia. What is the paranoia? It's your own projected hatred, as it were reflected back onto you, or at you. So, "harmful intent yields fright"... if you are constantly intending to harm others, sooner or later you'll find yourself living, as it were, in a very fearful world, in a terrifying world, a dangerous world.

Voice: You can get into that state without hating people, can you not?

S: Well, if the world actually is dangerous, quite objectively, well yes... (unclear)...but that's a different situation.

Voice: You can end up in a paranoiac state without... probably through selfhate, rather than hating...

PG liz 2 S: Yes, you probably can, but what...where does that self-hate come from?  
(pause) How does self-hatred arise?

Uttara: Dissatisfaction with one's...with one's self?

S: No, that would seem to be quite positive, dissatisfaction with one's self.

Voice: Well, through alienation from other people, but not necessarily from hating them.

Voice 2: Through (...)

S: But why do you, I mean how do you start off hating yourself? Where does that come from?

Uttara: (...) people are telling you.

S: People are telling you, yes. I think it stems from experiences in early childhood, especially, maybe, with one's parents or someone closely connected. You somehow feel that you are not approved of, you are not liked, in fact you are even hated or not wanted; there is something wrong about you, bad about you, evil about you and you start feeling that way about yourself. And, you know, maybe, later on in life you sort of regress to that early situation and you, as it were, 'hear' threatening voices or you, you know, you sort of 'see' people, as it were, looking at you in a threatening and hostile way. This isn't a case of projection, or, if it is, you're projecting something which is introjected (?) (...) but the actual experience of the thing. But I think in that case that would be a positive step, because that is where it came from originally. Instead of saying to yourself: 'I am bad', you hear somebody else saying to you: 'You're bad' - well, that is a step in the right direction, because that was the original situation that you're getting back to. But in the case of actual projection, you hate others...er, or rather in the case of paranoia, you hate others...er. .but you're not, as it were, admitting that you hate others. You turn it above, you turn it around, and you start imagining or feeling or experiencing that they are in fact hating you. It's your, sort of, fear, if you like, of what they would do to you if they knew what you were thinking about them. This would seem to be paranoia proper, whereas when you are sort of projecting what was originally introjected then that would seem not to be paranoia in that sense. That would seem to be a more positive development. Can you see the difference between these two?

Ananda: A bit complicated!

Voice: Yes it is.

S: Well, you find, if you hate somebody, eventually you start thinking that he hates you, because you know that...or you know first of all that you hate him and you know that it's natural for someone to hate the person who hates them. (...) you have a secret hatred for something. When you see him you look at him with hatred, and at first you may think: 'Well, he doesn't know about it, but I really hate him; and then one day he looks at you in a slightly cold way and you think: 'Ah, you see, he doesn't really like me (laughter) and he hates me'. And, you know, that person may not have felt anything of that sort at all, but then you think; 'Ah yes, he hates me. But then later on you hear that he's done something or said something and you think: 'Ah, you see, he's done it or said it 'cause he hates me, he's doing it against me'. And in this way you build up a whole sort of fantasy about this person; being your enemy and doing things against you. And maybe the next time you see him, you feel, you experience that he is looking at you with real hatred, or you might even think that he's got a revolver in his pocket or that he's thinking of shooting you or something like that. You can weave a whole sort of imaginary plot in your head. A plot by him against you. This is paranoia. And all that time that person may be quite innocent of any sort of feeling of hatred about you. He...at most he might have felt only; 'that person behaves a bit oddly' or 'that it seemed quite sort of strict with me'. They might have thought no more than that. But you are convinced that the person absolutely hates you and is plotting against you - and it's

PG 113 3 all the outcome of your own feeling towards him. So this is paranoia. But what happens in the other cases that when you're small, you were told that you're no good and you felt that you were hated. ~o, you believe other people so much, in fact, in a sense, you have to believe thQm, that you take their side against your- self. You start saying: 'Yes I'm bad, yes I'm wicked, yes I'm evil, yes I'm no good'. ~)O you forget in course of time that you were told this, you think that thi is what you think. But when the whole thing starts coming out then, as it were, you start hearing those original voices coming from outside, that; 'Johnny you're no good, Johnny you're wicked, Johnny you're a bad boy, Johnny nobody loves you1 etc And you stop hearing it coming from outside and then you start becoming (...) from it yourself, you realize that originally - maybe, if you get a bit of help you realize - that originally it came from outside, it isn't what you think about your- self, you disagree with it, you reject it. You tell the voices to shut up, I don't believe, or, I don't accept it. What you say isn't true and then (of course) they die away eventually. So that, that is quite a different sort of situation. Even though, at a certain point, the actual experience may be more or less the same. But the first is what I would call paranoia in the true sense, the other is something else.

Ananda: Very often, Bhante, it is very, very hard for a person to know, whether to differentiate between the true experience, the true. insight into someone else, and em, a sort of fantasy which appears to be very real. Often someone says; 'but I see them like that, I really see them like that'; 'I really saw you looking at me ii that way, I know you're feeling like that about me'. How come one...er...is it possible or should one try to point out that it is a fact, 'cause it appears so rea to them.

S: Well, here I think one has to remember that there are differences of temperamen ... .... if one thinks in terms of the Jungian classification, there is the extravert and there is the introvert, there is the thinking type and there is the feeling type And, according to Jung, the, for instance, introverted feeling type is very difficult to convince about external objective matters. If he feels, within himself, that you think in such and such a way about him, it's very difficult to shake that, because he goes so much by what he feels and is somewhat dissociated from objective external facts. So if you know a person is~ or at least seems to be, of that particular type of temperament, then you also know it's going to be very difficult to convince them or maybe you won't try or you won't bother so much. But the more extraverted sort of person, the person who thinks rather than feels, can be much more easily convinced. Whereas the introverted feeling sort of person, if they, you know, believe that you've got a certain feeling about them, is, well it's almost impossible to shake them, because their feeling tells them that, and they're orientated much more towards their own feelings than they are to objective facts in the world outside. So it may not be possible always to remove the misunderstanding, especially if it's with regard to some quite fleeting thing, maybe just a bare look that you gave them that lasted just a fraction of a second. They say: "I picked up something negative in that". You say: "I wasn't aware of it". "Well, maybe you weren't, but I was, I felt it". But maybe you said: "I was - I just didn't feel it at all". But you didn't notice it, it was unconscious. And how can you refer back to that experience that look that only lasted a fraction of a second, and you begin to doubt yourself, or maybe it was slightly negative, but you can't even remember. You have to admit: "Well I wasn't conscious of it, but maybe he's right, he seems so sure". But that's because he's an introverted feeling type, his impressions, right or wrong, mean so much to him and are so real to him, that he just accepts them as gospel virtually, he finds it psychologically impossible virtually to question them. If he picked it up, well, that was that, it was there. To him it is a self-evident truth. ~o it is quite

difficult sometimes, Jung point~ out, for these different character types to communicate. And he says a lot of misunderstandings arise in this sort of way, arise, that is to say, on account of differences of psychological types. I mean, we've been seeing a little bit of this, er, within the Friends, from time to time, with regards to the, what I sometimes call, the organized and the unorganized or nonorganized types. We're using this as a very rough and loose classification, corresponding, perhaps, to the extraverts and the introverts. They really do seem not to understand each other sometimes. The extravert says, well, he says: "bone- lazy." The introvert says: "Well, you're just bossy~" I mean in that way the mis-

PG II~ 4 understanding arises. The extravert says: "Well, he just doesn't respond when you appeal to him or ask him to do something". The introvert says: "He's always trying to tell me what to do". (Laughter) You see, its just a crossing of the lines of communication between the different character types.

Uttara: But you can, you can get that extraverted lazy type, you know, and through classification, you get people who are extraverted but they're still not organized.

S: Yes, this is true.

Ananda: Is there anything in general. . .any point in trying to sort of. . .how you could argue out this situation if one encounters it with someone, because (...)

S: I don't think argument ever really works; the main thing is to establish communication first, and then try to explore the matter and try to ascertain what really did happen...

Voice: Because quite often...

S: ..you may have to go about in a completely different tack for a while, rather than persist with that point, which only, sort of, drives the misunderstanding deeper and deeper, and confirms it.

Ananda: With someone who's not very confident what happens often is that they suspect their own feelings, then they (...) the person who (...) and...in the first place...

S: Yes, Anyway, "harmful intent yields fright, wrong views lead to bad views" - I don't know about the translation here, I suspect that the original (...) is: "Wrong views lead to wrong views" or "Bad views lead to bad views" - its micchaditti, micchaditti leads to micchaditti. That's how I take it, so, you know, what does one think that means? (Pause) It means there's nothing worse than wrong views. mean once you've reached wrong views that is the ultimate, as it were. There's nothing worse than wrong views, which could be a punishment for wrong views. Even if you're sent to hell, that's not worse than wrong views. Having wrong views is worse than being sent to hell. U-c the only punishment for wrong views is wrong views. (Laughter) If you hold wrong views the punishment, as it were the natural consequence, is that you get deeper and deeper into wrong views. And that is a really terrible thing.' (pause) And this is, I'm afraid, one of the things that one constantly comes up against, in the world at large or within the Friends. Wrong views, false views, lack of clarity of thinking - or just views.' We mustn't emphasize right views even too much, I mean, the Buddha in the long run was against view as such. He regarded views as being a sort of rationalization of a really

limited standpoint. And the taking of that standpoint as ultimate, and taking the consequent rationalization as representing absolute truth. So ultimately no views, except you know, just right views very tentatively, provisionally held for practical purposes. But certainly no clinging to views, not even clinging to right views, what to speak of wrong views. (pause) So, "wrong views lead to wrong views", and nothing could be worse than that. Mud leads to mud. The deeper you're in, the deeper you'll sink. Alright, let's carry on.

Ajita: TEXT-"Through not giving, comes poverty Through wrong livelihood, deception Through arrogance, a bad lineage Through jealousy, little beauty"

S: Hmm, "Through not giving comes poverty" - this is very much a Buddhist belief, that, if you give, you will get. ~o you think this always works in the world?

Voices: ...~...~..~.....

S: Why not?

Voice: 'Cause giving.. if you give all the time.. I mean people, people are not

PG

5 accustomed to giving...

S: Yes.

Voice: ...if you give its just sticking to (...)

S: There are Buddhist Jataka stories where it says that the Bodhisattva - that is, the Buddha in His previous lives - was born on certain occasions, having practised dana in previous lives, to a certain extent, that when He was born, as soon as He opened His hands, then there were jewels there. Wherever He put His foot, you know, gold and silver sprung up, as a result of all the giving he'd practised in previous lives - but you don't take that sort of shows itself even sometimes? That because you're giving a lot, something comes back to you?

Ananda: I think in the very long term yes. I think on a purely material, immediate level very rarely, people suspect giving (...) they're very suspicious.

S: Well, they can't think of, maybe based on a previous experience, they can't think of giving as giving. They think its a sprat to catch a mackerel, as they say. And they wonder, well, what particular mackerel is he after. (Pause) They think they're trying to get on the good side of them, trying to butter them up so you want something from them.

Voice: The classic story of the man who's giving out pound notes in the street, and nobody would take one. (Laughter)

S: Well, this has actually happened, hasn't it?

Voices: Yes...yes...

Ajita: I think sometimes we are actually getting a bit, but we realize it - expect to be so overwhelmed with physical wealth and things like this, although, y1know, living a simple life...

Voice: (...)

S: Because if you're really giving, you don't think of getting anything back in return, do you? If you're really giving. So if you're not thinking even of gettin~ back anything in return, you're also not thinking, what you might get in return... So if you've got a preconceived idea of what you ought to get back as a result of your giving, you haven't really been giving. So maybe as Ajita says, you know, we do get back, but its not what we were looking for, what we shouldn't have been look- ing for something in the first place anyway. I mean if we really wereq you know, giving, you could say you're getting back and that you're getting all the time...

Voice: (...)

S: .. For instance, I was reading the other day Schumacher's little book, 'Small iC Beautiful', and, er, I forget the sort of economic details, but one of the points h~ makes is that, er, we don't sort of include within our capital natural resources. There are certain things we're provided with, by nature, for free, but we never reckon those things and some of those things are finite resources, which we just go on using up. But we never put that sort of loss, that sort of expenditure on the debit side of the column. We leave that out altogether. We get water, we get sun- light, we get air, we get all these things provided for free. ?o they're all thing we are being given. But we never think as if we're being given sunshine, we're be- ing given nature, we're being given water, we're being given light - we never think in that way. We think: "No-one ever gives me anything." (Laughter) But actually in a way we're receiving all the time. Maybe not from a person, but from the, as i" were, impersonal process of nature. Even when people do things for us, we're not always aware that, well, things are being done for us. We still have that sort of feeling, well, no-one does anything for me, no-one loves me. But actually a lot of

PG

6 things are being done for us, you know, by other people in much of the time. It's said, I don't know, the married man sometimes falls into this way of thinking. While his wife is cooking for him everyday, making the bed everyday, going and doing the shopping everyday but he thinks, well, no-one ever does anything for me. (Laug- hter) (...) is taking it so much for granted. And in the same way people come - ° along to the Centre, or at least they used to, they take it for granted that there is an OM there to run the class and to explain things and there's somebody there to make the tea - and they don't always appreciate or realize that something is being done for them, something is being given to them. We used to come across this a lot in the early days, so you might even remember that - it was just beginning to die away when some of you started coming along. We take so much for granted and then say



we're not being given anything, we're not receiving anything. (Pause) And even when we do receive something, when someone gives us something, then we rarely expres' any thanks, again we take it for granted. Or we just sort of grunt (laughter) or something like that. It's like the story of the long-suffering wife who's been married about thirty years, doing cooking for her husband and her grown up sons, day after day, never a word of thanks. So one day, when they lifted up the lid of the vegetable dish, they found a pair of old boots (...). So they say: "What's this?" So she said: "Well you never said anything that would make me think you would know the difference." (Laughter) This is sometimes what happens.

Alaya: It does come, say to Sukhavati sometimes~ Someone asks me to do something and I do it, and they thank me, and I feel strange them thanking me, because...

S: Ah yes, well, you know, there are situations where the relationship is, as it were, so intimate that thanks are out of place. But I think even it's better to err on that side, err on the side of overstatement rather than on the side of understatement. It also depends on how they're said. If there's a: "Thank you very much Alaya for doing that for me" (laughter) then, maybe, they just give you a, sort of, slap on the back and say: "Thanks for doing that", well, that's quite different, isn't it? Or they even give you just a little look that tells you they appreciate you having done it. But some people just don't know how to say thank you. They're so unused to it, they will be a bit clumsy or maybe overdo it. It should be a sort of natural and easy thing, to do it. But a lot of you just can't say "thank you" gracefully. Lots of other people can't receive thanks gracefully.

Hridhya: Do you think with giving, say, it's a question of openness and flexibility? All the time, as you say, we are receiving things, at the, when things fall down is when certain things come in, and they are sort of held onto. There is not that kind of give and take that you have, say, perhaps with nature, much more than with men. In the last verse of the puja it says: "the earth and other elements that are serviceable in many ways". Do you think that man isn't so serviceable in that (...), 'cause people choose too much, hold onto things? It would be much more healthy if there was that sort of flow, and in that way you're giving, but at the same time you're receiving, because you're open to things, to that flow.

S: Maybe it's just a question of making oneself more available, as it were; a lot say: "I want to help in this way, I want to help in that way".

Voice: Yes, that's good: available.

S: A friend of mine used to say, admittedly in a rather different sort of context: "The greatest virtue is availability". If someone is just available, you may: "Would you mind making me a cup of tea?" They would make you a cup of tea. But they don't say: "I want to help in this way and no other". They are just available. They don't mind what they do.

Ananda: They don't wake you up at six o'clock in the morning, with a cup o~ tea, and insist on giving you a cup of tea.

Hridhya: They do what's necessary (...) they do what's right.

S: Yes, and they're not too concerned about doing their own thing, or too concerned

PG 117 7 about 'expressing themselves'. That job needs to be done, they're happy to do it. It's as simple as that. (Pause) This is what I've been calling sometimes recently 'the non-specialized human being'. That he's got no particular talent that he wants to exercise, but who can turn his hand to practically anything that needs to be done and is quite happy to do that, but has not got any personal psychological investment in it, as it were. Do you see what I mean?

Hridhya: You said a psychologically healthy person feels like giving.

S: Yes. A psychologically healthy person has got energy. Energy flows outwards. It flows outwards in different ways in the case of different people. Someone will feel like doing something for you practically. ~omebody else might feel like giving you some money. ~omebody else might wander off into the garden, maybe your garden, pick a flower, come back and give that to you. It's a different thing. Or they give you time, give you attention, they give you affection; all these are different forms of giving. Different people give in different ways, according to their own nature.

Hridhya: If you do feel, I find myself, when I do feel, what I think is healthy or content, then I do feel more open to people or wanting to give. And then there is the side which is not actually giving in that sense, it's just, it would be frustra- ting, not to. You just want to express that. Like, when you sit down and have a good metta bhavana, and you do feel an upsurge of positive feeling, you're not giv- ing, sort of; if you help someone, if you smile at someone, that is the natural expression of what you're feeling.

S: Yes, it's an extension of that.

Ajita: You said that the state of mind caused by giving is in a sense receiving.

S: Well, if you give, ywu open the channels of communication. And if the channels of communication%~re open, the flow can go in either direction. If you give you are able to reci~ve. If you're able to receive you're able to give so in a sense giving is receiving and~eceiving is giving. If it's a question of interaction with or communication with another person, I don't think you ever give in the course of communication without at the same time receiving. I think the more intense, the more true the communication, the less it's possible to speak in terms of either giving or receiving. The giving becomes the receiving, the receiving becomes the giving. They're experiences of the same thing. -So who is receiving from whom and who is giving to whom, it becomes impossible to say. - I mean there is such a thing as a one-way-communication, which can be quite genuine; but I think it's got very definite limmitations. (pause) In order for you to be able to give in the way of communication to another person, he must be open to you. And if he's open to you, he can also give to you. And if you can give to him you're also open to him. (pause) We missed a line, didn't we.' 16: "And drink to confusion of the mind" - I think that's pretty obvious, doesn't need dwelling upon does it? That drink leads to confusion of the mind. (laughter) - sooner or later. So'through wrong livelihood comes deception'. Now how does that tie in? Why should decepti~on come through wrong livelihood?

Voice: Well, you're deceiving yourself (unclear).

S: But are you necessarily deceiving yourself, by practising wrong livelihood, con-

sciously and deliberately?

Voice: (unclear)

S: Give an example of wrong livelihood, a quick clear and obvious example.

Voice: Slaughtering.

S: Slaughtering. So how does that relate to deception?

PG

8 Atula: You must justify it to yourself.

S: Ah.' You have to justify it to yourself - presumably the deception refers to here: is others deceiving you. ~o how does the fact that you are engaged in wrong livelihood, that you are say, a slaughterman or slaughterhouseman, lead into a sit- uation in which others deceive you?

Uttara: You lose contact (...) contact with your own ... instincts (...)

S: ...Yes ... That would assume that there is, as it were, a better side for you, which your involvement with wrong livelihood is as it were falsifying or obscuring. So in a way you are deceiving others, and if you are deceiving others they can not but deceive you; you relate through deceiving. If you can call it a relating.

Voice: Would someone working in a~5laughterh0u5e feel the need to justify that more than (...)

S: In a sense, the ordinary person wouldn't. They take it for granted that it was alright. I mentioned once that when I was in New Zealand, looking at the daily papers, in every issue you see ads for slaughterhousemen. This is very very common. I don't ... I would imagine that the majority of them, you know, unless they were challenged, probably wouldn't feel any need to justify that. I imagine that they'd say: 'Well, we've got to eatL Human beings have to eat, and the animals were meant for us to eat. They're slaughtered painlessly so what; someone's got to do it. You know, what does it matter? It's good money, I feed my wife and kids with it.' This is probably what they would s~y. But you'd think that nonetheless there would be some other aspects of themselves that in a way they were going against or ignoring, so they could be said to deceive themselves.

Ajita: (...) Perhaps they feel an affection for animals or something like that.

S: But do they? You deceive the animals before they're slaughtered, but then he's not been looking after them, you know, they're slaughterhousemen. I mean, I don't know but I think in modern slaughterhouses you just sort of press a button, and the animal is stunned, slaughtered, and skinned and all that sort of thing, I think, mechanically.

Uttara: (...) It's like seeing, like seeing that other on the level.. a potential too, for

development, so have you yourself, I mean, that sort of frame of mind.

S: It's just a job.

Uttara: Yes. So, you know, you're not thinking along these lines either.

Ananda: On quite a deeper level, it's sort of contravening one's own nature.

S: Ytb.

Ananda: .. perception and (...) against oneself.

S: Or at least against one's potential. I think there maybe Nagarjuna is thinking that wrong livelihood in the sense of those forms of wrong livelihood, which do involve actually deceiving others, like using false weights and measures, I think probably he's thinking of that sort of thing.

Voice: (...) methods.

S: Yes, but this is a very standard form of or standard example of wrong means of livelihood in Buddhism. So how would that work out? How would you be deceiving others? By producing weapons of war?

Voice: (...)

S: Yes...

PG It? 9 Voice: (...)

S: Yes, you're misleading others, giving them the opportunity of.. helping them to engage in those particular activities.

Ananda: Actually by producing weapons you are effectively saying that wars can achieve something...

S: Yes.

Ananda: .. that wars can bring about peace. Actually they are very fundamentally wrong views.

S: Yes.. So in a way you are in that sense deceiving others.

Alaya: Aren't most jobs deceptive, really (...)

S: Well, one perhaps should examine what one means by deceptive. Deception means that...

Alaya: I mean jobs in. ..jobs in advertising...(..)

S: Well, advertising is certainly almost a sort of classic example.

Alaya: Job-advertising. Happy people doing those really horrible mundane jobs.

5 For instance I saw a most dreadful advertisement about abortion, because it didn't mention about abortion~~.what was the wording? It says something like: 'Preg -nant?' And then it said: 'Thy not deal with it the sensible way?' - 'phone so and so and so and so. I thought it was really sort of dreadful.' - 'Why not deal with it the sensible way?' and then the telephone number of the organization. (Pause) So this you could say was deception. I mean, what you're really inciting the person to do is to take a human life, or potentially human life. In other words to commit murder (...) from the Buddhist point of view. But you're sort of calling it: the sensible way of doing things.

Voice: From birth really you're constantly deceived.

S: Yes.

Voice: Everything, every idea that's taught you is a deception.

S: But livelihood? In what way is livelihood usually a deception? One could say, that you are.. .I mean, what is deception? ~t is presenting things as other than they are - yes? And doing the happy satisfied worker is obviously a deception as it were. If you present the impression you really like going to work every day, it isn't great fun; you need the money, you don't know how else to get it, you wish you could get the money, very often, without having to do the work. Though you don't know what you'd do all day if you didn't have to work, in many cases.

Uttara: I was working in a place called 'The Happy Cash and Carry' (laughter) - one of the most boring places.'

Voice: Can one in fact carry the generalisation that far? To say that livelihood basically is deception. I doubt that

S: Well the question is: is it essentially deception or does it under modern conditions usually result in deception or usually involve deception? Can anybody say anything about their own particular job, those who have jobs (pause). Has anyone got a job apart from Francis? I know he has. (laughter) What are you doing?

Uttara: Gardening.

S: Well, I just thought of a way, you know, that doesn't involve deception, that the worker pretends that he's working.' You go through the motions of working, but

10      y~u're not; you're~not really doing anything. You're just watching the clock. So in that sense, very often, it is a great deception, a great sort of con - that you are working at all. You're not, very often or much of the time, you're not. You're wasting your employers time. You're not working.

Ajita: Quite often in (...)

S: There's a lot of that in the army.

Alaya: It's deception in another way, that you're made to believe that there's no other choice... no other way...

S: Ah, yest

Voice: But that's not the fundamental criticism of livelihood. I mean, we're not talking about livelihood e~sentially are we? We're talking about livelihood as it has become in this society.

S: But livelihood means working, in order to earn money to buy what you need, to live. So this assumes a certain kind of economic set up. It involves - I don't know anything really about economics - but it seems to involve the existence of something called money. And it seems to involve, various things being exchangeable for money, or money being exchangeable for various things. One might say that that itself is a deception to begin with; so that any livelihood pursued under that set up, system, in as much as that system was based on deception would inevitably itself involve deception.

Voice: Because you're giving for reward.

S: Because you're giving.. you're getting as a reward.

Aflaida: Is that in fact the essence of livelihood? Does it involve money essent- lally? I would think it involves work, but not necessarily money.

S: But then on what ba~is would you be given? You could only be given... if you want, if you didn't get against a sort of monetary standard, or unit or measurement, then you'd have to be given according to your needs. And then you wouldn't be work- ing for wages, not even wages in kind in the ordinary sense. ~o it wouldn't be live- lihood, you'd be doing what you could for society and getting what you needed. Yes? Which... so that wouldn't be livelihood really at all, as we understand livelihood.

Francis: It would be a more healthy system, wouldn't it? If I would produce what I could from my own inner resources.

S: Yes. So it does seem that livelihood in the sense of working for - not just working and getting, but working in order to get, whether cash, or goods, this cannot - this is itself a deception. So that any kind of livelihood of that kind, you know, cannot but be in a way a deception, or involve deception. (pause) Eecause, how can you equate work, with money or work even with goods? I mean, what is the neces ary connection between one hour of digging in the field and a pound of rice? Is there any necessary connection? Why shouldn't it be one hour of digging in the fields and two pounds of rice? Yes - so if you say one hour of digging

in the field equals one pound of rice, that's quite arbitrary, so to that extent it's deception. Why should it not equal a ton of rice? Who says it equals a pound of rice and not a ton of rice? Who decides?

Ananda:       The law of supply and demand.

'~: )0 the fact that there is arbitrary connection within a set amount of work and a set amount of, for want of a better word, reward is a sort of deception. 'Cause it's being sort of suggested to you that there is a necessary connection between what you do and what you get, and there isn't a necessary connection, it's quite arbitrary.

Voice: This (...) this job... gardening... well, one day he said: "I give you £3, [121] give you £3, and you do what you feel is necessary for that £3." T was quite surprised...

Voice 2:       (...)

S:       It would be more ideal if it was possible, if he said: "Look, I can only afford to give you £3, do what the garden needs." Yes? Not "Do the amount of work which you think is equal to this sum of money", but "Do what you think the garden needs". That would be more... that would be closer to the ideal. But as a human he could only afford £3, he says "Well, this is all I've got, all I can afford to pay a gardener. But you do the best for the garden that you can". (pause) No, but let's go on, I think we could spend the whole of the ten days on livelihood. (laughter) "Through arrogance a bad lineage". Bad lineage in the sense of... we say low class family. The traditional Buddhist view is if you're proud and arrogant that the natural result is under the law of karma and rebirth, that you'll be reborn in a low class family, not in an eminent, and, you know, higher class family. I sat this just to give you an idea of what is meant by bad lineage. so through arrogance bad lineage. If you are arrogant~ you'll be looked down upon. Which seems contradictory because by arrogance, by behaving in an arrogant way, you try~~to get people to look up to you, to respect you. But actually in the end the opposite happens - so Nagarjuna says. Do you think this is true?

Voices:       ... ..

S:       If you try to down others, they will try to down you. It's as simple as that. If you try to lord it over others by your arrogant behaviour, well, they will resent it and they will try to do the same thing to you. so this would be the natural consequence. You can only put yourself up in relation to others by putting them down. I am not speaking in terms of natural development of real talents or anything like that. But in terms of position; if you try to get into a higher position you can usually do that only by putting other people into a lower one in relation to you. And naturally they will resent that, so they will try to put you into a lower position. And sometimes they may succeed.

Hridaya:       You're trying to be something other than you are.

C:       Ye.

Hridaya: And that would have (...) consequences.

S: Right. I must say that nowadays people seem unusually touchy about this. Position is one thing and one's natural attainment is another. People maybe quite rightly resent others trying to occupy our higher position irrespective of their actual character and attainment, but they also seem to resent the very idea that someone should be more developed than another. But that is quite a different sort of thing, and from a Buddhist point of view quite negative attitude. One should be happy and glad that there are some people more developed than you are, better than you are. (pause) Right; "Through jealousy little beauty". How does jealousy result in your being less beautiful?

Voice: Your expression for a start.

~: Your expression for a start. What is a jealous person's expression like? Sour, bitter, resentful. But this raises also the question of beauty: What is beauty? When you say that someone is beautiful, leaving aside the purely sensuous attractiveness, what do you mean?

Hridaya: One thing is a sort of peace and contentment.

S: Peace and contentment, yes.

Hridaya: If you were peaceful and contentful, you wouldn't be jealous, you'd be satisfied with what you had.

~: Yes, right. It's also a beauty of expression and very often it's that that one

PG Iz~ 12 is more sensitive to and more conscious of. So if a person is discontented with themselves or within themselves, which means that they are jealous and angry as with regard to others, not contented, you know, then that would produce a discontented, unhappy sort of expression which is just the reverse of beautiful. So it's pretty obvious. The next verse - we're moving on a bit more rapidly now, because we need to do that.

Voice: TEXT "A bad colour comes through anger ~stupidity from not questioning the wise. The main fruit of all this is a bad migration for humans."

S: Migration in the sense of transmigration. So "A bad colour comes from anger". Very often it says in Buddhist texts that the result of anger and the law of karma and rebirth is ugliness. And credit for the same sort of reason that anger distorts the features (...) or hatred maybe more than anger.

Voice: You get that in some of the Renaissance paintings (...) those kind of qualities, people kind of poisoned within, grotesque and frightening.

S: "Stupidity comes from not questioning the wise". This is quite interesting. Through not using the mind, not using the intelligence ... if you don't use your mind, your mind as it



were atrophies. You have to use the mind, and when you're questioning, questioning the wise, it means that you're using the mind, you're developing your intelligence, you're learning. You're trying to understand. And you are not questioning just anybody, you're questioning the wise. The people who do, as it were, have the answers. Have you noticed this? That it is usually the more intelligent people who ask questions? I mean, not necessarily, some very stupid people ask questions, ask very stupid questions. (laughter) It isn't surprising. But normally it's the person with an active mind who ask the questions.

Voice: I feel this particular way it's put here could lead to some confusion.

S: In what way?

Voice: That it's a very fashionable thing to question wise, so called wise people. And that people could be encouraged to put just the question in a sort of niggling sort of way.

S: Well clearly Nagajuna doesn't mean that. He means questioning seriously and with receptivity. Not just asking questions for the sake of asking questions.

Francis: Serious discussion (...) 'cause you want to know.

S: Yes, right.

Hridaya: Sometimes you have to give people the benefit of the doubt, if you feel they're just doing that to get on my nerves.

S: I think you also have to realise that very often people are a bit sat upon, they don't get much of a chance to express themselves, to say what they think or what they feel. Sometimes you just have to let them do that, even if it all sounds a bit foolish, a bit irrelevant, but they do sometimes need to do that. (pause) ~o the main fruit of all this, in other words, all these unskillful actions, in a word, is "a bad migration for humans" - a bad rebirth. That's the main fruit of all these unskillful actions. But even if you don't see things in that way, even if you don't accept this overall framework of karma and rebirth, it's pretty clear that even within the span of one short or comparatively short lifetime, the consequences of unskillful actions can be pretty bad. Even that should be enough to warn us off. Alright, next verse.

Atula: TEXT V 16'

PG (Z3 13 5: Do you notice anything a bit strange or what might be considered a bit strange about this verse?

Atula: I think the way it's put...

S: Yes, that seems to be misprinted, the 'a' shouldn't be there.

Voice: Did you mean something else?

S: Yes, I meant something else.

Voice: Do you mean (...)

S: It's this famous Indian negative emphasis - you see that? You've had in detail, in great detail, the results of all the unskillful (...) actions, they've been in (...) detail. But when it comes to the virtues you're just told the consequences of them is the opposite of the consequences of the unskillful actions. Wouldn't it have been better, one would have thought, to put it more positively. And then say the consequences of the unskillful actions are the opposite of those. I don't think there is anything essentially Buddhist about it, this seems to me to be Indian.

Voice: Do you think (...) a healthy and more positive attitude than perhaps now?

S: Possibly, but certainly not very helpful now.

Atula: Doesn't it (...) have more impact?

S: Well there is one explanation given which is that people are involved in all -i sorts of negative things; they just have to give up those negative things to begin with, those unskillful things. But I don't think that works nowadays, even if it might have worked in the past. It seems you have nowadays to offer people something positive and inspiring. Show them what it would be good for them to do, not just what it would be bad for them to do.

Voice: It's helpful to have the five precepts in a negative, and following immediately by the five (...) or the five positive counterparts.

S: Otherwise you give the overall impression that the Dharma is just something negative, and the end is negative. The end is just a great big sort of staring void, or a great big yawning void. Literally void, just empty, nothing. You just disappear over the brink of nothingness, and that's Nirvana. This is the impression that one gives if one isn't careful. If one were, say, conducting a study group or study course for beginners, one should put all these things in a positive form, if one decides to include at all. Or certainly not put in the negative without the positive counterpart. (pause) Let's go on to 20.

Voice: TEXT "Desire, hatred, ignorance and the actions they generate are nonvirtuous~  
Nondesire, nonhatred, nonignorance and the actions they generate are virtuous"

S: This is of course the traditional criteria, the skillful and the unskillful, the virtuous and the nonvirtuous. And you notice again it's nondesire, nonhatred, non-ignorance, as though desire, hatred, ignorance are the starting points. The negative, as it were, is the starting point and the positive simply a negation of the negative.

Hridaya: Is that again a question of (...) language.

S: To some extent, because in Sanskrit and Pali you form the negative by, you know the negative (...) and the word that you create in this way can have a more positive sort of being. For instance I mentioned the (...) the 'immortal' or that corresponds with our 'immortal'. So when we say 'immortal' we don't think of 'not-mortal', we think of immortal in a sort of positive way. There is a positive ring. So many

PG 1~L\* 14 of the Indian words are like this. They may be grammatically negative, negative in grammatical form, but the impression they create is more positive. Alobha is a little bit more positive than non-desire. Though not all that much. Non-hatred which is adosa or advesa certainly doesn't have the same force as maitri. It may be a bit less negative than our English non-hatred, but not so positive as maitri. Alright, next verse.

Voice: TEXT "From nonvirtues come all sufferings And likewise all bad migrations From virtues all ha~y mi at ions And the pleasures of all .. .

S: Is it true that all sufferings come from non-virtues, all the sufferings that befall one, the direct consequences of one's own unskilful actions?.. No. Let's be quite careful about this point. May they not be the indirect results?

Voice: The fact that you are a human being...

S: Yes, that you are here at all. But certainly it isn't the Buddhist view that all your sufferings are the direct result of unskilful actions, individually committ- ed by you in the past. It is the Buddhist view that an unskilful action will be followed by suffering, for you, for the person performing the unskilful action. But it is not the Buddhist view that if something befalls you it must be due to your own previous unskilful actions; that would be regarded as fatalism. Sometimes you do suffer undeservedly, at least taking the shorter~view. But taking the longer view it is afterall you yourself, your own mental attitude, your own thoughts, words and deeds which have involved you in this particular kind of conditioned existence, which is susceptible to that kind of suffering. (pause) In S~ntideva's words, somebody else may have taken the stick to you, but you have taken the body to his stick. Right, verse 22.

Voice: TEXT "Desisting from all non-virtues And always engaging in virtues With body, speech and mind, These are known as the three forms of practice'!

S: There is a more valid presentation: "desisting from all non-virtues and always engaging in virtues, with body, speech and mind, these are known as the three forms of practice". You all practise with body, speech and mind. Desisting from all non- virtues, in each case, and always engaging in virtues. (long pause) Alright, on to 23.

Voice: TEXT "Through these practices one's freed from becoming a Hell denizen, hungry ghost or animal, Reborn as a human or god one realizes extensive Ha piness fortune .

S: The state of a hell denizen, a hungry ghost or animal, these are referred to the three (...) a5 usually translated, the three downward paths. ~~ through these practices, better to say, by desisting from all non-virtues and always engaging in virtues, one is freed from these three lower paths, freed from becoming a hell denizen, a hungry ghost or an animal. One is instead reborn either as a human being or- as a god and as such realizes extensive happiness, fortune and dominion. (pause) It is, as it were, axiomatic, not only for traditional Buddhism, but for Indian culture generally, that the practise of skilful actions, raises you in the scale of conditioned being, and increases your happiness and well-being generally. In other words that, that what one might even call a worldly success or what the text calls high status or the translation calls high status is the result of virtuous action. It is very much the Indian belief, as it was apparently the Jewish, that virtue pays. I don't know whether this is altogether a

healthy view, certainly not taken too literally or carried too far; that if you practise the precepts, if you perform skilful actions of body, speech and mind, that will mean not only that there is this raising of the level of your own consciousness, but that there will be a sort of mundane reward. That you'll be reborn in a richer family, in a better sort of

PG

15 country, and that you have a more pleasant and happy time. Whether it is really as straightforward as that I rather doubt, but certainly we shouldn't t~2nk to~ muc~ these sort of terms, otherwise it becomes a sort of livelihood, a sort of wage-earn- ing business, or as Swami Vivekananda once said, a shopkeepe~'s religion. And you try to sort of balanue your 'moral books': "I can allow myself a bit of backliding, "

I got quite a bit of moral credit to my name

Hridaya: Get stuck in morality...

S: Yes.

Hridaya: ... not using it to move on.

S: It's a very sort of powerful incentive,cto good actions in a way, that they pay. But to what extent can one really be dependent upon that incentive, or to what ext- ent is it healthy to be dependent upon that incentive? There's these sort of two points of view about good actions: good actions are good because they lead to Nirvana eventually, or provide a basis that leads to Nirvana; good actions are good because as a result of good actions you get on better in the world. Well, perhaps both are true but perhaps one should be more preoccupied with the first than with the second. But I think we must be very careful about this 'making virtue pay'.

Hriiaya: It's the business of getting on well in the world.

S: Even if 'world' includes the worlds of the gods, it's still just getting on well in the world, it's just a question of higher status. It's really no more spiritual to me to think in terms of being reborn as the king of the gods, no more spiritual than trying to be president of the United States.. Up there they'd have their own little Watergates even. (laughter)

Voice: It makes me think we've got a very good birth to be sitting here now.

S: Mmm, yes.. 0You don't even want all this and heaven tOO, but you want Nirvana on top of it - or should one not rather think that virtue is it's own reward? In most Buddhist countries the lay people practise the precepts very much because they believe that they will conduce to wealth and happiness and prosperity in this life, and a good rebirth after death. This may or may not be true, but is it really a spiritual attitude?

Voice: The question really revolves around whether one regards virtue as an extern- al practice or action or cultivating a generous, an open state of mind.

S: But if one is more concerned with cultivating a generous, open state of mind, why? I mean, the only answer can be because that leads to a still higher state or at least to the possibility of a still higher state and towards higher states still and that ultimately to Nirvana, or to Enlightenment. If incidentally your cultivation of skilful states of mind results in wealth and prosperity and, alright, no harm, but that is just a sort of by-product to the process as it were, not it's *raison d'être*. But can one even say that there is that connection very strictly, that if you do perform skilful actions, that even the sort of by-product of that will be, that you become more happy and more successful in a worldly sense?

Ajita: I don't think so.

S: If not in this life, at least in a future life.

Alaya: Well you don't have to know those things to do actions.

S: At best they are incentive for people who think in a very, as it were, materialistic terms. But I don't think they're convincing arguments any longer, certainly not for people in the West. People in the West who would find those arguments convincing will have stayed firmly stuck in the Catholic church or whatever. (pause) Alright, 24

PG

16 Voice: TEXT "Through the concentrations, immeasurables and formlessnesses One experiences the bliss of Brahma

For higher status and their fruits"

S: So this verse is concerning with the results, the consequences of meditation. The concentration, the immeasurables - immeasurables are presumably the four brahma viharas - and the formlessnesses, the arupa-dhyanas. So, as far as I can make out, this line refers to the concentrations or dhyanas very likely, the brahma viharas and the formless dhyanas. ~o here Nagarjuna is speaking in terms of a higher, sort of spiritual bliss, through the practice of meditation, especially through the practice of higher meditation, the experience of states of superconsciousness. One experiences the bliss of brahma and so forth because there are so many different levels, so many different grades, and of course it suggests, experiences not only during this life itself when you are actually practising the concentrations and so on, but after death when you are reborn in the corresponding worlds. It must of course be remembered that these worlds are still part of the conditioned, you are still on the Wheel of Life. So even meditation has a mundane result in the form of the experience of bliss and a happy heavenly rebirth in a world which is not this world. This would correspond to people meditating, not because meditation leads ultimately to Enlightenment but just for the sake of the peace and bliss that they experience in the course of meditation.

Voice: (...) or for pink-footed nymphs.

S: Yes, after pink-footed nymphs, but sometimes you get pink-footed nymphs rather in the meditation (...)

Ananda: I think it's a bad teaching or approach that one suggests that these thing~ are at least (...)

S: Oh, yes; there is a difference between saying that skilful actions lead to worldly prosperity and increase of wealth and power and so on, and saying that meditation leads to states of happiness and peace and bliss. Because the latter can be directly experienced immediately and will just (...) the practice of meditation. There as the worldly gains accruing from skilful actions and a virtuous life have to be taken rather on trust, as regards future lives, even this life very often. Honesty does not always pay: as the writer in the Bible says; 'The wicked man does flourish like the bay tree sometimes'. And you rather wonder why, he doesn't seem to be getting his deserts at all, you seem to be getting his deserts (laughter), living a very different kind of life. (pause) (...) some nice consoling thought that the rich are really miserable, they don't really enjoy their richness - but is it true? I mean, are the rich really more miserable than the poor? It's a nice idea that the he awake at night, you know, very anxious about their wealth and worried that money has been stolen from the bank in the night (...) Do they really live like that or do they rather have a better time than the poor actually?

Voice: I think if you (...) stay in America for six months and enjoy yourself. (laughter)

Voice 2: (...) by the rich to you (...)

S: But I think therefore one has to be very careful not to tie up the spiritual life too much with worldly gains as it were. It is alright in the case of meditation to point to, and quite truthfully point to the advantages to be gained psychologically, in terms of peace of mind, relaxation and tranquility. But when the time seems appropriate, then point out that meditation isn't simply about such things. But to tie up as much as traditional Indian Buddhism does the practice of the virtues with worldly Indian prosperity here and hereafter, I think is a bit... well, it's not even dangerous, it's pretty irrelevant for most people (...). Wouldn't you say?

Voice: I don't imagine there's many Order Members who're interested in being rich.

PG Iz~ 17 5: Mmm, right, yes. Or not even in a future life. (pause) It seems in a way rather ignoble, doesn't it, that sort of appeal? Even if it's true, it's stresses seem rather ignoble. (pause)

Hridaya: You can't help thinking of the Maharishi's which (...) quite strongly on the development of efficiency and effectiveness in the world, and attracts a lot of people.

S: Yes.

Voice: (...)

S: That's also true. You notice there's this very brief reference to meditation and it's consequences, a sort of taste of the subject given to the king, as it were. Also, of course, it draws attention however to the fact that meditation is an action yes? And meditation is a skilful action; that positive thought is an action. I mean sometimes people say: "He wasn't

doing anything, he was just meditating". But meditating, if you're really meditating, is a very powerful form of doing, in a sense, the most powerful form of doing. Generating a new level of being. (long pause)

Ananda: All this question of doing is something quite interesting. A lot of so-called actions aren't really actions at all...

S: Mmm, right.

Ananda: . . . they don't achieve anything. It perpetuates the status quo. And in what sense can that something which perpetuates exactly the same set of conditions be said to be an action?

S: Yes.

Ananda: One could re-define action, then, almost by saying that which produces significant change of being. ..or...

S: Well, this is the classic Buddhist definition of 'action'; action is that which produces results. (pause) If no results are produced, then nothing has been done. A result doesn't just mean a rearrangement of existing elements. It means an introduction of a entirely new pattern, you know, maybe not even another pattern.

Ananda: Or maybe to take it a stage further, creative action could be that which produces something which didn't exist before.

S: Yes, right.

Ananda: ?omething new (...)

S: Or something which is unique, because if it's unique it's new. You know, I think we'll stop there, because with the next verse we go and do something quite different. We go on to definite goodness and we get into rather deep water. So I think we'll leave that for the afternoon, and splash about in deep water (laughter) this afternoon, or else sink and drown. Let's see. (chuckles)

[page 128 does it exist?]

[129]

S. The Jinas, yes. In other words the Buddhas, eh? I mean there are many titles of the Buddha in the Pali and Sanskrit texts that we don't usually use in English. 'Buddha' is only one such title, there's also 'Jina', there's 'Tathagata', 'Lokajista' and so on - 'Sugata' - we usually say simply 'The Buddha'.

So 'The doctrines of definite goodness are Said by the Conquerors to be deep, Subtle and frightening to Children who are not learned'. which So the doctrines of definite goodness are those are concerned not with

high status, that is to say, not with a more exalted position within the

Samsara, but concerned with liberation from the samsara altogether. So these doctrines which are concerned with Nirvana and with the path leading directly to Nirvana, these are said by the Conquerors, the Buddhas, to be deep, eh? profound, eh? you may remember that after, immediately after the Enlightenment, huh? when the Buddha was reflecting, eh? whether He should make known the Dharma, the Truth, the Reality, eh? that He had discovered and realised, to mankind, eh? He reflected to Himself that 'this Dharma, this Truth, this Reality, which I have realised, eh? is deep, huh? profound, huh?' and He spoke in that context more in terms of conditioned co-production, but it applies too in the teaching of Liberation in general, that it's deep. What does one mean by saying that it's deep? what does that usually convey?

? T...

S. What? ? Difficult to understand with er

S. Mmm. It's difficult to understand just with the reason.

? Yes...

S. There's always something more, hmm? And you can either speak in terms of you know, very profound, or very sublime, very lofty, er, you know that there are the two schools of Mahayana philosophy, for want of a better term, the Madhyamika and the Yogacara, and you're familiar with these terms, huh? in the Tibetan tradition, probably following the Indian tradition, the Madhyamika is always described as 'the profound Ma~dhyamika', whereas the Yogacara is always described as 'the sublime Yogacara; eh? But profound and sublime really

### THE PRECIOUS GARLAND TAPE 3. 130

mean the same thing, eh? I've suggested once that the reason why the 98. Madhyamika teaching is described as profound, huh? is that the Perfect Wisdom Sutras on which the Madhyamika teaching is based, eh? were said to have been obtained by Nagarjuna from the Nagas, you know from the depths of the ocean, eh?

so this teaching huh? this tradition comes from the depths, eh? so it's the profound Madhyamika ~ ,~eh? but in the case of the Yogacara school, Asanga, the

founder of the school, on earth, is supposed to have received his inspiration from the Bodhisattva Maitraya, this is the traditional version, Western scholars have a different view, eh? - the Sangha is supposed to have ascended in meditation as it were, to the Tusita Devaloka, the Tusita heaven, the heaven of content, where Maitraya is waiting for the time to come for Him to be reborn on earth for the last time and become a Buddha, and received the Yoga teachings from Him there, hmm? so since our Sangha ascended into the Tusita Devaloka and brought down those teachings from on high, as it were, those teachings and the Yogacara school generally, are described as 'Sublime', 'the sublime Yogacara', it's come from 'up there', whereas the profound Madhyamika has come from 'down there', huh? But down and up really come to the same thing., eh? T mean both suggest from another level,



even another dimension, huh? So if you say that something is very profound, or if you say that something is very sub- lime, you're really saying the same thing, huh? In other words it's some- thing beyond, huh? something from another dimension, something belonging to another dimension, huh? So the doctrines of definite goodness are said by the conquerors to be deep, hmm? and in them there's always something more, always something beyond, something that you can't grasp, something that you can't fathom, hmm? something that you can't comprehend, hmm? Not only said to be deep, but subtle, huh? I mean this is also what the Buddha said about , you know, His original discovery of the Dharma, that that Dharma was subtle - Nikula in Pali- therefore difficult to make known to people. So what does it mean by subtle? when you say that something is subtle, or you say that the Dharma is subtle, what do you mean?

? Not very obvious.

S. Not very obvious, it requires very sort of skilled penetration, hmm?

131 PRECIOUS GARLAND TAPE 3 99

It's not subtle in the intellectual sense, eh? it's very illusive, huh? It can't be very sort of directly grasped, you have perhaps to grasp it indir- ectly. It's very easy to miss the whole point, huh? so~not only deep... not only subtle, but fri.~tening, huh?

? You say .... and therefore (?) f~rightening.

S.~lnmi? No, it simply says, 'deep, subtle and frightening' ah? It doesn't say frightening because it is de~p and because it is subtle, er, you know, perhaps it does suggest that, hmm? But it says, 'frightening to children who are not learned'. ~ow what do you think this means - children who are not learnej? you don't expect children to be learned to begin with anyway,eh? ? People with little say(?) experience...

S. Well, this seems to be a poor translation. You may remember that in the Dhammapada, there is a chapter of the fool, as it's called, Bala-lTka, and a chapter of the wise, or learned, Pandita-lika, and I translated these as the spiritually immature and the spiritually mature, hmm? and the two are always considered antithetical, you know the bala versus the pandika, but 'bala' means not just child, eh? it means someone who's spiritually i~miature, not really gro~rn up, rather foolish, so therefore is translated as a fool, huh? so it's more like the spiritually immature, person, hmm? who of course may

from a worldly point of view be very clever, hmm? very intellectual, heh? but as

spiritually speaking immature and therefore a fool, eh? and in as much the

pundit is the opposite of the bala, the wise man opposite the fool, huh? and in as much a~, you know, I render 'bala' as spiritually immature person, I render 'pandi~' not as le~rned, which misses the meaning completely, but as the spiritually mature person, yes? You can get more sense out of it in this way. So - 'deep, subtle and frightening to the spiritually

immature', hmm? how are not spiritually mature, ah? So it's quite understandable that such a doctrine should be, not only deep and subtle, but frightening to such people, huh? I mean what could... I mean the general nature of those doctrines we shall see in a minute. So probably we shall be in a better position then to understand why they are frightening, ah? why they are fearful,

p~tO(At ~~~~~b ~AP~ 3 ii~

why they are terrible, huh?

? I think it's as though rather the children live on the surface of things,  
rather than...

.~. Finirn, yes, right, yes.

? Aware of the depths.

5 ~}mm.

? For children that sounds a bit like the Saddliarma Pu~darika...

S. Yes...

??? (Voices together,)

S. All right let's go on.

'I am not, I will not be I have not, I will not have ~~~~ That frightens all children And kills fear in the wise.'

S. Mmm. So these are the doctrines of definite goodness, you know, which  
lead to liberation: 'I am not, I will not be. I have not, I will not have'.

No 'I', therefore no 'mine', hmm? And this is the essence of the matter, hmm? That the 'I', what we experience as the 'I', what we experience as 'myself', is not an ultimate reality, jinirn? And therefore there is no question of 'me' as I experience myself being really and truly here, you know in the present, eh? - or in the future, hmm? and since there's in reality no 'me' in an ultimate sense, well, there's no question of my having anything, either now or

later on, hmm? There's no self-hood in that sense, and therefore no possession in that sense, hmm? So it's as though the doctrines of definite goodness say to the ordinary person, or at least the ordinary person feels that they say, or thinks that they say, 'You just don't exist', hmm? The doctrines of definite ~oodne~s seem to negate, eh? the ordinary person as he is, ek~. and as he will be, or thinks he will be, hmm? So this surely is experienced as a very terrible thin~, hmm? - that frightens all children, that frightens all spiritually immature people, to be told 'You don't really

p~~tIO(A~ ~4~t41~(~ TAP~ ~ 101

exist; what you take as Reality, that is to say yourself, huh doesn't re~~11,-

~xist at all, it's an illusion, huW? ~~~ ti~t that it's completely non-existent,

but it is not the ultimate reality, hm? the be-all and the end-all of ex~stenc~

that you tkke it for, hi? ~here's another dimension, there is another Reality, as it were, which is more real, huh? So here, we real~'nasense,~come up against it, heh? you know, when one is cnacerned with the teaching and

the practice of high status, you know, this is comparatively easy, I mean this is mundane, huh? But here we come to the doctrines of definite Goodness,

here we come to Buddhis proper, as it were, here we really do come to the I~ia~, and the Dharma says, or the Buddhas say, that you are not, and we cannot but experience it in that way. Not that you are a complete unreality, or that you don't exist in any sense, but you certai~ don't exist in the way that you think you do, r~~ i.e. as something ultimately real, eh? something

absolute,,~h? That is your delusion, that you so exist, huh? and that being will so existent, you possess this and possess that, possess thi~, will possess

that, heh? ~he ego is not an ultimate reality, I mean this is the message, heh? and this is very difficult for anyone to stomach, eh? for anyone to

accept. I mean it's not really a negation, really it's very liberating - after all this is - ~;the Path of Liberation, but you don't experience it at first

as very liberating, you feel it as something that negates your whole ~,~ing. But it kills fear in the wise, huh? for fear springs from the ego: no ego - no fear, huh? So if the ego is annihilated, if the ego is shown to be unreal, there's no question of fear any more, you're free from fear, hm? If you've nothing to loose, why worry? because there's no-one even to loose it hah, then nothing to worry about, heh? So it's very difficult, you know, eve~t~ a real glimpse of this, eh? hm?

? One sometimes gets very occassional flashes of this

S. Yes, mmm, yes.

? and then they go again.

S. Sometimes you can get it even in connection with dreams, or by reflecting upon dreams, uh? when you wake up and you just sort of catch the tail-end of

a dream and you realise, you know, that for a long time, maybe for hours,

i3~ I~~ ~t~b 74P~

you've been living some other life, you know, some other world, some other dimension, and you just catch it as its going, eh?mm? So you get the feeling that, well, the life that I normally lead when I'm awake, that's not the only life I have, there's another life behind that, that I forget, but which is there, which goes on, hm? but you identify yourself with your normal waking life, hm? and the Indian tradition generally, more perhaps the Hindu tradition than the Buddhist tradition, considers it as, you know, as quite important to reflect upon dreams, huh? not so much on, you know, individual dreams or particular dreams,, but the fact that you have this other life, this dream life in this, as it were, dream world, hm? There is this other aspect too, this other dimension of your consciousness, your mind, if you like, yes? which is as real in its own way~ as your so-called normal experience during the waking state. And then again, you know, the Indian tradition, again especially the Hindu tradition, asks one to reflect upon what happens to you in the state of dream- less sleep, hm? And that is usually regarded as a state of almost negative P~lightenment, huh? The ego is not dead, but the ego is put to sleep, the ego doesn't exist in the dreamless sleep, at least it's not experienced, it doesn't experience anything, hm? But it's not like the state of Enlightenment because

there's no awareness in that state, hm? there's just an absence of the usual and waking consciousness, ~even the dream consciousness: then when you wake up, you

know, you don't remember anything of that state of deep dreamless sleep.

? You know that sounds sometimes someone maybe the

impression of the... just the void. You know, that type of ... dream. S. Yes, hmm. But these facts~ just show that there are so many different aspects of the mind, hm? That the mind is not limited to the, you

know, the ordinary waking consciousness. Perhaps there are other~aspects, other dimensions, hm? So this, as it were, gives the death knell to the e~o in the sense of the waking consciousness with which we identify ourselves exclusively, hm? In the same way,~you know, people who've had experiences with drugs, even if they've not got, you know, anything else out of that, er, in many cases they've come to understand there are other dimensions of consciousness,

the em~irical ego, huh? is not the only self, as it were, they have some sort of experiential, you know, realisation of that fact. So one begins to feel, well, there are these other dimensions, these other aspects, eh? ~1iat we usually think of as the self, you know, the I, the ego, the centre of everything, eh? the be-all and~end-all of everything, the limit of everything, well, that's just one little aspect, and it's constantly changing anyway, you know, mm? So perhaps we can approach it in this sort of way, hm?

So 'I am not', 'I am not me', doesn't mean that the ego doesn't exist at all

in any sense, heh? It means that it isn't everything, huh? So, I "I am not,

I will not be, I have not, I will not have, I That frightens all children And kills fear in the wise.

So people who are spiritually immature, they don't like to hear this sort of talk, they don't like to hear these doctrines of definite goodness, they feel threatened, eh? Such teachings appear terrible to them, eh? or terrible to the ego, eh? Because they spell the death of the ego, hm? Or at least they spell what the ego cannot help regarding as amounting to death, hm? But they kill fear in the wise, eh? because the wise can see that it's the ego which is the source of fear, so if you get rid of the ego or the ego sense or the ego consciousness, then there's no further cause for fear, heh? And all fear, in a way, is fear for the ego, heh? It arises out of one's desire to protect and preserve the ego. But if there's no ego to be preserved or protected anyway, then, you know, what room is there for fear?. It seems simple, doesn't it? it's like, you know, the body; we're very much concerned with the body, eh? to feed the body, clothe the body, look after the body, nurse the body when it's sick, pamper the body, please the body, huh? But

supposing you haven't got a body? well, you're just saved from all that 'I' bother, hm? So it's a much the same with the , if you haven't got an

though, to say 'if you haven't got an 'I' is a bit contradictory, at least paradoxical - but if you haven't got an 'I', or don't feel~you've got an 'I', well, what a world of trouble you save yourself. (Long pause).

right, let's go on to 27.

~4&~~~ ~4f ~

? 'By him who speaks only to help Beings, it was said that they all Have arisen from the conception of 'I' And are enveloped with the conception of 'mine'".

S. Mmm. So,

'By him who speaks only to help Beings...

and who is that?

The Buddha.

S. The Buddha, Hmm. So it's interesting that Nagarjuna said that the Buddha speaks 'only to help beings', hm? This is the sole reason for the Buddha speaking at all. Therefore whatever the Buddha speaks, whatever the Buddha says, is Dharma. So,

'By him who speaks only to help Beings, it was said that they all' that's to.

say all beings - 'Have arisen from the conception of 'I' And are enveloped with the conception of 'mine'

him? I mean there's no being without a conception of 'I', that is the seed, which as it were, you know? from the being arises, eh? and the being is enveloped

with the conception of 'mine', huh? him? I mean there's the seed as it were as it were within and the, there's the envelope~~without, him? So in what way is the

being enveloped with the conception of mine, huh? Enveloping, you know, suggests sort of limitation. So here's this sort of, this central seed of the ego in the middle, huh? him? and around it is a sort of tent, as it were, in which it's enveloped, eh? and this represents the extent of its possessions, eh? Here am I sitting in the midst of my possessions, I mean, this is my house, this is my car, this is my land, this is my property, this is the extent of what is mine, so I am enveloped in what is mine, hm? That is my little

cocoon, hm? that is my world, hm? So 'I' and 'mine' go together in this

sort of way, hm? So, 'By him who speaks only to help beings', it was said that they all have arisen from the conception of 'I' hm? 'And are enveloped with the conception of 'mine' hm? is

It's as though the 'I', the sense of 'I', the inner limit, and the sense of

mine is the outer limit, eh? Do you see what I mean?

~hante, 'his connection, to what extent one is leading a group, a study

to~ p~tOLA~ ~L~4~b ThP~ ~

group or a to what extent should A' one emphasise this aspect

of things?

S.... Well, it depends, I mean a study group of whom? and for what purpose? I mean if one was taking an absolute beginners, you know, group or retreat, obviously, you know, apart from emphasising this sort of teaching, you probably wouldn't mention it at all.

?~ But people very often begin to ask about Buddhism by this very thing.

S. Then you must simplify it, eh?hm? I mean, speak say in terms of metta, and expanding the metta, including everybody, I mean speak in terms of not being selfish, you know, feeling for all, huh? Don't speak about the non ego

or getting rid of the ego in this sort of deeper, you know, metaphysical sense. and Either people won't understand, or, you know, they will become argumentative

and waste time in that way, or they will be thoroughly frightened, eh? and put off the spiritual life perhaps. But I don't think it's wise to sort of say,

even though it is the truth, that the ego does not exist, eh? hm? It's best not to speak in terms of the... or better to speak in terms of the ego~ing

absolutely real, uh? or there being other aspects to consciousness, uh? well, if there is one - this one, the waking consciousness, you know, as we know it - the self, the 'I' as we experience it, that's all right - but there are other aspects, it's a bit bigger than one really thinks, heh? Put it more in that sort of way, eh? This I think people will more readily accept. ? Hn~, they have its limitations.

S. Yes, speak in terms of its limitations rather than in terms of its not

existing at all...

Er~,hmm,hnm.

~b~ich is something very difficult to imagine, hm?

? Speak in terms of relative truths and not...

S. Yes, yes. All right, let's go on to 2S.

? "The 'I' exists,the 'mine' exists' These are wrong as ultimates, For the two are not (established) By a true and correct consciousness.'

~Ai~t~i'I~ rAp~ 3

~6. ~Jmn~. Wrong as ultimates, I mean this is the key phrase, hm? It is not that there is no experience of the I, not that there is no experience of mine, ~nn? but these experiences,

hm? are provisional only, eh? They are a matter of the relative truth, eh? not of absolute truth. in a sense experience the 'I' eh? experience somethin~ as 'mine' eh? But don't regard that as the last word of one's experience, don't regard that sort of experience as ultimate, eh? as absolute, hm? as wholly real, hm? and why?

'For the two are not (established) By a true and correct consciousness.

This true and correct consciousness is, of course, the Enlightened consciousness of the Buddha, huh? and to say that the Enlightened consciousness of the Buddha, the true and correct consciousness, eh? does not as it were establish, eh? the 'I' and 'mine' as intimates, means that that consciousness does not perceive them in that way, hm? hm? I mean in the enlightened consciousness of the Tiddha, there is no 'I', there is no 'mine', hm? as ultimates, eh? They have a certain provisional relative existence, but not an absolute existence. (Please).

Do you think this idea of relative existence and absolute existence is easy to put across, or relatively understandable by people?

? (Faintly) No.

? If it's readily understandable...

S. Hmm, hmmm. So how would one try to put this across? I mean how would one explain it? eh? That your experience is your experience, I mean that is not denied, eh? hm? But it is not... not wholly valid, not ultimately real.

? Rmm.

S. There is some other experience, some other dimension, some other reality, which is, as it were, more real, eh? huh?

A lot of people seem to have the idea that external things are real and the mind is unreal.

S. I mean, hm, yes. Ah, yes.

pg~ciott~ 4~~~b ,4p~ ~

Io~

? ~:hereas I think Buddhism would...

? ...the other way round...



? ... not bother giving the other way round(?) it wouldn't di~tinguish in that way.

S.. It would even, you know, query that kind of distinction, I mean 'out there' and 'in.here1, I mean mind and matter, hum?

Deep in the

. ism.

And experiencing... ~,~~~ C?)

S. TTmm. Well, this is wb7, perhaps, India~ tradition points to the dream experien~e, eh? and to the experience of deep sl~eP, because, I mean, there it is something within everybody's experience which does suggest the relativity of the ordinary waking consciousness, eh? and the limitations of the ordinary waking consciousness. I mean there is in Buddhism a who~le dream yoga, you probably know, huh? one of the six Dharmas of Navaka, hah? You know, trying to prolong a~areness into the experience of the dream state, and to, as it were, dream consciously and to manipulate one's dream experience and to £~ide it in a positive dirsction, eh? So this also, you know, gives one 'the sense of another dimension, you know, another aspect of oneself, hm?

'ne's experienced beyond, or at least distinct from, the waking consciousness - that you are not just the waking consciousness - this is what it is getting at, hm? 9'here's much more to y('u than that. Your waking consciousness is ont~y the tip of the iceberg. ~hat about your whole dream life, yuar dream exper- ience, eh? you spend perhaps houws every night dreaming, where do you go, what do you do? Isn't that part of your life too? Doesn't that affect your total being, your overall consciousness, your over-all state? him? and what about that state of deep sleep? where you're not even ~reaming? That is also you, doesn't that affect you? isn't that another aspect of yourself? Nm?

tkt you know So why should ~ waking consciousness~appropriate your total being, as it

~~~t~ ~&p~ 3 /~o

were? ~~liy should the waking consciousness proclaim that 'I am you? No, there are other aspects to youa you're bigger than that, more rn~ny-sided, more many-faceted than that, eh? and what about other possible dimensions, even beyond the ordinary dream" ~tate? him? the states that we call dhyana states? eh? what about those? I mean, other levels, other disensions completely, which it is possible for us to enter upon and enter into, him? So Buddhism will point to, you know, a whole multitude of other dimensions which are accessible to us' a'ad which, you know, could become, at least, extensions of our own bein~,

extensions of our own consciousness. So what happens to the petty waking consciousness then? with which we usually identify ourselves? That so-called ego is it really as real as it thinks it is? No? is it as much as it thinks it is, or as important as it thinks it is? I mean, supposing you lose all your money, all your property, suppose you lose your freedom, suppose you're shut up in prison, does that affect your dream life? Your dream life could go on, you know, quite unchanged, almost as though(?) not bothering what to you you know is happening, you know? On this level, ~on this plan., so it's, you know, much the same perhaps if you were to have a very intense sort of meditative life, huh? 'What happens to you in the ordinary waking state, the ordinary waking consciousness in the body, what does it matter? You know your meditative life goes on, huh? All your visualisations and your experiences on those other higher planes, huh? But this is also one of the reasons why, in earlier lectures, ~we've talked of the 'expanding consciousness', eh? not so much in terms of negating the 'I', negating the 'ego', but expanding consciousness so that consciousness takes in, you know, more and more dimensions, becomes, you know, more and more many faceted. So maybe it's better to think and to speak, not so much in terms of 'You don't really exist', but that you are bigger than you think you are, hm?

Uttara. A bit like sort of going forth from how you are, er, small self or...

S. Yes, but not, you know, to any sort of metaphysical bigger self, I mean Buddhism is a bit careful about that, but, you know, to just expand, eh? to go into other realms, other dimensions, eh? and not limit oneself to what one normally experiences ~ and not identify oneself with that, that 'that is myself, that's me', hm? 'that am I, I am that'. Otherwise you're confining yourself to such a narrow band of the total spectrum, eh? It's like a red or orange claiming to be all the colours of the rainbow, eh? Well, there are many, many other colours, eh? So in the same way the working consciousness claims that it is you. But you ~ much wider than that, much broader than that, hm? There's a whole range beyond that, a whole spectrum beyond that. But we don't usually experience that, or not very consciously, or don't bring, you know, all the different bands of the spectrum, as it were, together, hm? So perhaps that's a better way of looking at the whole matter. So therefore Nagarjuna says,

'The 'I' exists, the 'mine' exists'. These are wrong as ultimates.'

They're not wrong as provisionals, as provisional statements -

'For the two are not (established) just a true and correct consciousness.'

The true and correct consciousness, as it were, expands, eh? beyond the sense of 'I', beyond the sense of 'mine'.

When talking in relative terms and in absolute terms, you do get the possibility of getting some idea of the growth and change that comes(?)

to a person...

S. Yes, yes. Yes, because if you...? If you have that in mind rather than the sort of

metaphysically or explaining that way, but it's just that -

S. NZ, yes. But if you speak in terms of expansion, more clearly expansion is a form of growth, a way of looking at growth, from the smaller to the greater.

? ?irm, yes. ? People get a feel of potential.

S. Growth is not just, you know, upward growth, there's also outward growth,

eh? Not only vertical but also horizontal, not just in two directions, but

;lo

6r~~~ T~P~ 3

but in three or even four, five~ve.

(Pause).

All right, let's go on to 29.

'The mental and physical aggregates arise From the conception of 'I' which is false in fact. How could what is grown From a false seed be true?'

S. Mmm. So what are these mental and physical aggregates? These are, of course, the five skandhas, eh? There's one physical skandha, which is rupa, or form, and four mental ones, which are of course, vedana or feeling, sanna or conception, samskara~h or volition - not a very satisfactory translation - and vijñana or consciousness, eh? So Nagarjuna is saying that the whole psycho-physical organism, the whole psycho-physical being springs from the conception of 'I', ego. This is the source, eh? And then he goes on to say:

'How could what is grown From a false seed be true?' expansion The so-called psycho-physical organism, eh? is just a sort of ~ of the k

ego, eh? It's the ego blown up, as it were, the ego, you know, made concrete.

That very little, Bhante

Not the actual vibrations are manifest in your body in an exact~analogue of your psychic state...

. i'firm, mmm,

? 4~4 physical appearance

S. So what is the difference between Nagarjuna's conception of the mental and physical aggregates, eh? as having grown from the false seed of the ego? and our conception, say, of the expanding consciousness? Perhaps we could say that the mental and physical aggregates represent something rather rigid~

, a sort of rigid structure, you know, closed in on itself, eh? So what you ~£AAu) have to do is to open that structure up, open it out, as it were, heh? An&

of course there is here in Nagarjuna's case this, as it were, quite exclusively negative approach to the ego - he's concerned with, you know, with getting rid of the ego completely, eh? hm? mean at once, at one stroke, as it were, or at a stroke, we might say, yes? T~~ rather than sort of gradually refining it out of existence by expanding it, eh? beyond itself in all direction~.

t'~~

jil

&pra~&i~i~ --kP~ 3

It's as' though he's not prepared to admit any truth in the ego at all, huh? (Pause) But perhaps we shouldn't think of the ego as a sort of thing, huh? it's more like a way of functioning, eh? or a way of being, even, eh? So you are functioning as an ego w~hen you are sort of closed in on yourself, shut up in your~t~f, and yob? functioning as a non-ego, or in a non-egoistic manner when you open up, eh? or open out and begin to expand. I'm sure everybody, ~ou know, knows from their own experience the feeling, or knows the two feelings - one, when you feel really sort of shut up in yourself, eh? and shut up, or shut off fro~ other people, closed off from other people; and when you're feel- ing very outward going and expansive, eh? These are two quite different experiences, eh? In the first place you feel sort of cold and hard, eh? As though there's a tight little b~ll of something or other within you, and you are sort of organised around that tight little ball, eh? But in the other case you feel very sort of free and open and flowing and expansive, as thou~i there's no little ball there at '11, and there's just a certain waimth which is radiating, uh? Nothing tight, nothing hard, nothing solid, huh? So it's not as though there's a thing called ego in the first case, and a thing called non-ego in the other, heh? It's you functioning in two different ways, eh? You could even say you functioning reactively, you know, you functioning crea

tively. Hi=? To be reactive is to be egoistic, eh? to be creative is to as it were be non-egoistic. And when you 're being egoistic, you are recoiling~back

on your5el~ him? but when you're being non-egoistic you are just sort of - oh, what's the opposite of er recoiling back on yourself?

? Radiating.

S. Radiating, yes, opening up, expanding. So it isn't a question of getting rid of a thing called ego, huh? which is, as it were, lost in your gullet a~id you've got to vomit it up, eh? You know, it's a question of, you know, behaving in a different way, having a different attitude towards things, being more open, being more free, being more expansive, being more inclusive' heh? ? Hmm, and dream is something similar to that (?)

S. Yes, hmm. and then

2. Well, one can very often experience it, you know, like that, eh? there~ a lump of something to be &ot rid of, something that's c~h~ing you, which is something negative, it's your own negative way of behaving. It's not a sort of thing called the ego that you've got to get rid of, but, you know, a partic- ular way of behaving that you've go~o resolve, eh? (~tirmer, laughter). I mean, the ego is not a thing, it '5 just a way of behaving. I m~ an we must not allow, you know, this , you know, this reification Of terms to mislead us, eh? We say, 'the ego - I guess it's my ego, I've got an ego, or my ego is very strong', well, what do you mean by that? Is there a thing called the ego? You know, sort of lodged like a billiard ball in your gullet? It's a way of behavIng, you know a way of behaving in which you circle back on yourself instead of expanding and spiralling outwards and upwards, heh? In whic)frou revolve upon yourself instead of revolving upon or round something bigger than yourself, eh? You know, I mean to be egoistic is sort of returning to yourself all the time, instead of going out ffrom yourself, hm? I think that we'll probably have to revi~ all this sort o~anguage about the ego, it can be very misleading~ you're to give... to get rid of the ego, give up the ego, even transcend the ego, and ~'vo ~sed all these expressions myself in the past, but I don't think now that they're always very helpful, irntn? Perhaps it would be better to think in terms of, you know, two different ways of be- having, two different attitudes that you can adopt, eh? two different sorts Of things that you can do. So instead of saying to someone, 'Oh, you've ~ot to give up your ego', you say, 'You've got to be more open', eh? It has a quite different sort of ring to it, a different sort of feeling. You've got to expand, or even let yourself go, even that, you know, r°~ally~ponveys the truth of the matter in a fliore effective way, doesn't it? lunin? hmm?

? ~itnm, yes. ? People are...

S. Or just don't go round and round in circles, don't revolve upon, you know, your o~n axis, as it were, orbit around something bigger than you are, huh? Live ffor something outside yourself. I mean, ~Tho or what is the egoistic

i13

~~~b    ~~P~~

p~~ or? '~\$1he onz~ who thi~ks of and for only hirnself. ~~ ine~n to the extent that you think of sort~ebody els~ or for somebocy else, you're non-egoistic. '~t if you've only yours~~~~If to think of and think for, you cannot but be egoistic, that is the egoistic lift£'. hereas even if you~re just thinking of your wife and children, at least to some ext'~nt you're non-£~°goistic, at least to some extent your attention is cirected outside yourself, and you're thinking' of a1)d ffor others, hmfl~.? So I think we have to be very careful about using this

language of ego and non-ego in such a way as to suggest almost that 'the ego is a sort of actual A thing that you've got to get rid of somehow, eh? Do you see what I

mean? It's not a thing, it's just a sort of snarl in the skein, as it were,

a little knot in the string, eh? that's got to be undone: it's not a thing huh?

Or a particular area of - what? - existence, or experience, that is...

S. It's like a particular kind of limitation placed upon experience or existence, huh? hum?

? A particular kind of aberration.

~. Hm?

? ~ particular kind of aberration or distortion.

S. Flin, yes, imm. So instead of saying the ego doesn't exist or the ego, you know, isn't real, eh? you could say, well, to be constantly turning in upon oneself isn't the best or the most satisfactory form of existence, eh? or the best and the most satisfactory form of living, eh? ~ here are other

better possibilities available to you. ? And this ties up with giving, doesn't it, and altruistic activities? S. Yes, that's right, yes. ~ expand in the ego, expanding oneself. Yes, hrm, yes. ° Cro-ing.

o. Perhaps one shouldn't speak in terms of expanding the ego, but of expanding oneself, hrm? because non-expansion is the ego, if there is in ego it's simply the fact of non-expansion. ~ Tut, you know, if you start thinking in terms

p~ttO(AS ~A~Nb - ~p~ 3 /~tf4b

of well, the self is the ego, eh? then you just tie yourself into knots, huh? him? I mean there's no such thing as the ego, egotism is a particular way in which you behave, huh? him ~ and non-ego is a particular way, but in which you behave or can behave. (reason?. All right, thirty.

Having thus seen the aggregates as untrue, the conception of 'I' is abandoned and due to this abandonment the aggregates arise no more.'

S. Hm. ~, well, to paraphrase it, 'Having seen the ego-centric way of behaving is not the best way in which one can behave, one abandons that sort of way of behaving, and - on that account, you know, on account of one's constant expansion and spiralling up and outwards - and one does not revert to that ego-centric way of behaving any more, him?

%~ you see what I mean? You know you become so positive, you become so, a~s ~t were, altruistic, eh? you become so expansive, ~b\$ that the possibility of any regression, the possibility of you know, ~TOing back into tL'at old contractive sort Of behaviour, that doesn't exist any more, you've gone permanently beyond that possibility. I mean the momentum of your expansion is such, the process cannot be reverse&.

? Stream entry.

S. Stream entry, yes, yes, exactly. (Pause). I mean the process Of expansionjM~u~ow, has gathered such momentum that, you know, it is now irre- versible, heh? Yes, as you say, that is stream entry. You haven't sort of jettisoneC a thing called the ego, huh? ~ut read the next three verses ~~~~~hich are concerned ~~~ith the same thing.

'J~ist as it is said That an image of one's face is seen le~ending on a mirror ~ut does not in fact exist (as a face",

So the conception of 'T' exists dependant on the aggregates, but like the image of one's face In reality the 'T' does not exist.

~. Etnin.

? Just as without depending on a mirror

The image of one's face is not seen, So too the 'T' does not exist Without depending on the aggregates.

S. Do you see the point of this comparison of the mirror? Well, there's your mirror; you look in the mirror, and you see the face, huh? So without the mirror as a basis, there would be no face seen in the mirror, huh? In the same way, there are the aggregates, huh? The psycho-physical organisms, but you see in them an 'T': if they didn't exist, you wouldn't be able to see in them an 'T', eh? But you do see in them an 'T', you know, because the aggregates are there as a basis, hmm? But that reflection that you see, that 'T' you perceive doesn't exist ultimately because it arises in dependence upon, you know, the aggregates, in other words, you know, in dependence upon the mirror.

? Don't the aggregates arise from the conception of "T"?

S. That too, yes, it's a sort of reciprocal process, hmm? But here it's you know the 'T' arising- in dependence upon the aggregates that is being stressed. So what do the aggregates represent here?

? A particular way of looking at things.

S. A particular way of looking at things, eh, eh? -he 'T' is rather like that particular way of looking at things carried to extremes, eh, hmm? It's a sort of concretisation of it, eh? So how would you translate this mirror analogy into the terms that I've just been using, of expansion eh?

The mirror is becoming almost like a sphere or a

S. Mmm, yes.

? ????????

? ???????? jewel (?) ? Something many-faceted S. Mmm, yes, yes, yes, .

? Indira's .... (pause)

S. Mmm, mmm, mmm? Yes, Indira's net, yes. ~ Well, the aggregates in a sense are you, huh? hmm? The mirror is you, huh? But the image in the

116

PRECIOUS GARLAND -TAPE 3 148

mirror, the image of the face, is you functioning in a wrong way, functioning t

in a reactive way, functioning in an egoistic way, hmm? It's because there's

a you to begin with that you can be egoistic, you know, but we could, you know, push that a bit further, maybe depart a bit from Nagarjuna's analogy, and say that because you can be egoistic you can also be non-egoistic, hmm? Those are both possibilities for you. The same mirror can either reflect a face, or not reflect a face, hmm? Either, you know, reflect a face, or be empty, hmm? So the empty mirror that is not reflecting a face, is just like the expanding consciousness. The mirror that is reflecting a face, is like the consciousness that does not expand, that revolves upon itself, hmm? So the mirror in a way is you, eh? The empty mirror is you expanding, you know

the mirror with the reflection of as it were your face, is you just revolving yourself upon or around yourself, eh?

? I had a dream, and it said to me in the dream, some one said, when you look in a mirror and you're not looking at yourself, but yourself looking at yourself.

S. Hmm, hmm, hmm.

Is that anything...?

S. Well, it's yourself looking at yourself looking at yourself looking at yourself looking at yourself ad infinitum, isn't it? eh?

? Mmm. You'd have trouble shaving. S. Mmm. (Laughter). ? ...  
revolution. Mmm, , ? , ? overthrown



S. Well, it's the turning about, as the Lankavatara Sutra calls it, the turning about in the deepest seat of consciousness, in Suzuki's translation. The revulsion the parariti, uh? the turning about, the turning upside down.

? Yes, almost turning the mirror down so that.... face up.

S. Yes, mmm, yes, right, yes.

PRECIOUS GARLAND - TAPE 3 149 117

? To reflect the heavens.

Yes, right. So if one does use this analogy of the mirror and try to translate it into the terms was using before, I mean the empty mirror which is not reflecting a face is the expanding consciousness, eh? inmm? the creative mind, whereas the mirror, which is reflecting the face, is the reactive mind, eh? The consciousness which is not expanding, which is either contracting or just going round and round upon itself, eh? circles instead of spirals, hmm? ? find that's caught and mind that is not caught.

S. ~ind that is caught, mind that is trapped, yes, and mind that is un-caught, is un-trapped, free, soaring upwards, eh? I think all these analogies

in terms of things are very misleading, because as I said, the ego is not a thing~ the ego is a way of doing things, a way of behaving, a way of looking at things, yes? and non-ego similarly, they're not things, eh? You don't get rid of ego and get non-ego. That is a manner of speaking, not to be taken literally at all, heh? but in the spiritual life generally, and in the circle of spiritual literature, there's a lot of confusion created by this rather vague and woot~

use of terms like 'ego' and 'getting rid of the ego', hmm? and the fact that the ego isn't real. Well, what do you mean by saying the ego isn't real? eh? You experience yourself, when you function in a certain way that is ego, when you function in another way that is ego(?) But is the ego a thing? If it's said... if there isn't really an ego how can the ego be a thing anyway? There's no such thing as the ego, hmm? if there was~L-the ego would~ be a reality but We're told it's not a reality. So how~ can there be such a thing as the ego? Even empirically speaking, even relatively speaking, there's no such thing as the ego, there's only a certain way in which you can function, and usually do function: that's what we call egoistic - when you circle round upon yourself, huh? and don't look beyond~ that, huh? When you stop doing that, when you function in a different way, you know, when you spiral up and out around something bigger than yourself, and, as it were, revolve in its orbit, then you are said to behave non-egoistically, huh? to function non-egoistically - creatively or expansively. So I think we ourselves have to be

very careful how we use this sort of language, and if people ask questions using this language immediately translate it into more satisfactory terms, eh? more truly comprehensible terms~ }tuh? you know, remembering the ego is not a thing, h~ih?

11 right, thirty-four.

---

/5/ PRECIOUS GARLA~Th ~I1NAR TaVe 4      Transcription 119

(34) (7~~qy ~~~~~~'q)

?      '~.hen the superior £~~:a ha T Attained (insight into) '-hat this means, He won the eye of ~ octrine and taught it Continually to the inonks'.

S.      Who is this supei-ior Ananda, hmm? what does 'superior' mean?

EnlighteneC?

S.      No.

?      ?

S.      No, it's the Thera, hmm? presumably the Thera, the senior monk, you know Thera Ananda.

'~?hen the superior Ananda had Attained (insight into) what this means, He won the eye of doctrine and taught it Continually to the monks'.

~Ehat is this eyt of doctrine? It's not really doctrine, it's the Pharmacakr~ the Tharma eye, the eye that sees tha truth of the ~harma, it's almost like the s~called third eye, or alleged third eye, though it's a different, a new,

an independent faculty, with which you see the truth, you see Reality, hmm? sort of This is a quite commOn~Pali and Sanskrit idiom in early 3uddhism - to attain

the eye o2 the Bbarma, to ctevelop this higher spiritual faculty, eh? This gnostic faculty, as it were, eh? for direct vision of the truth, eh? ~o:

'When~5uPeriOr Ananda had -.ttained (insight into) what this means,' - that is to say

what Na~~un has Just been saying c~out definite goodness, eh? -

'He won the eye of doctrine and taught it continually to the monks' h~~~~ he couldn't keep it to

himself, he had to share it with others, eh? taught it continually even. It's almost %s though that insight, you know, released a tremendous energy in Ananda, uh? his, of course, h~p~ene~ after the Fara~irvana of the Bu~dha, and after he had, att~.\*~full enlightenment a'd 'o~ the eye of the Dharm~, according to the available records, Ananda did have a very 'firm~ followiz~, eh? and had many disciples, became almost a sort of second Buddha, I~r? (Pause~. dl ~--'Th ?-t'.

PRECIOUS G~APi~AN~.~ Te~e / IPO.

All right 35

'There is misconception of ~~~~ as long as A. the a~~e~tes are miscon~e~ived, When this conception of an ~I~ exists, There is action which results in birth.'

S. ~b=. There is m'~nconception of an "I" as long as the aggregates are misconceived. And how does one misconceive the aggregates? Hupa, vedana, samjna, san~sk~rah, vijnana. One thinks of them as something static and unchanging, instead of thinking them as b~ing in a state of continual flux, hmm? and transformation. So it's as though the "I"

comes into existence when the flow is arrested, when you start seeing hnnn? what is a p~0~~5s~ as something static\*eh? then the ~I~ comes into existence, hmm? but it's as though this you, which does that, in a sense is not the i~IfI, bmm? but of course that raises the very mysterious question, well why does it talk? him? but it's that sort of question the Buddha didn't think it very

to enquire, for he said that well, you will see th~t, you know when you reverse the process, eh? when you stop trying to stem the flow, when you stop, you know, trying to, ~;hen you stop seeing the dynamic as static, then you will understand these things, you will see, him? So the aggregates are misconceived when they are conceived as things rather than as processes, huh?

'When this conception of an "I" exists' - huh? - There is action which results in birth'.

So what does birth mean here? birth means of course re-birth, you know a repetition of the pattern\* him? when you arrest the flow, when you try to make the dynamic static, huh? you set up a sort of static pattern, huh? and the repetition of that pattern is what we call rebirth. (j~ &'ot~~,~ - - you

go round in the same old circle again, hiurn? SO

~hen this conception of an ~[[I~1 exists There is action ~hich results in birLh' - that action

is not ically action because L~t is not free, ch?

It's not creative, it's

not new, that -ction is re-action, that action is repetition, and repetition

PRECIOUS GARm~Th - Tape 4 121

ineans rpetition of bhe old - the same old pattern ie. another life, ju~t 121. like thE old 0~E, more or less - in other words a re-birth, him? (Pause). All right 36.

? 'With these three pathways mutually causing each Other withota beginning, middle or an end, This wheel of cyclic existence Turns like the 'Wheel' of a firebrand.'

S. Ntnm. So what are the three pathways, eh? The three pathways

seem to be, eh? the aggregates, the misconception of an "I", and the

V", act ion of the "I" which resutl in birth, eh?

'With these three pathways mutually causing each Other without a beginning, middle or an end, This wheel of cyclic existence Turns like the 'wheel' of a firebrand.'yes? do you see that?

Why this 'wheel of a firebrand' eh? It's Just that if you take a fire brand , eh? and you turn it round and round like that, it creates the illusion of a wheel, eh?

? three pathways?

S. Pardon?

? The three pathways - the aggre~gates.. S. Yes.

? The misconception of an "I".

S. Yes, this is what I take them to mean, or take that to mean, it isn't completely clear, but I take the three pathways to be first of all the misenception... first of all the a~gregates, then the misconception of an "I" based upon the aggregates, and then the action of the "I" which results

in birth, eh? - 'With these three pathways mutually causing each Other, without a beginning, middle or an end' - him?

.. interrupt your question, you can't perceive a beginning of it, you can't perceive an end. ~hy? because you are in the midst of it, you are part of it, you are it, him? How can you see the end of it? eb? to the extent that you are limited by it, eh? him? So you are just a pattern repeating itself, eh? him?

? Could it not also possibly refer to the three poisons - greed,  
hate and

PRECIOUS 'AtLA~ - Tape 4 122.

}o, it says 'these three pathways' hub? yes? the rEference is clearly there to the  
previous verse.Irn

? Ah. . . . . tr~u~~Hr)

S. So if you take the aggregates to mean Just you, your self in the ordinary sense, eh?  
~en you misconceive yourself, him? when you un- necelsarily limit yours~ then the ')" comes  
into ~xistence, eh? then the 'T performs various actions, eh? which express, you know, its  
limita- tions, aM which Just repeat the ol~ pattern that has been set up, and that is what we  
call rebirth, him? in that way the process goes on. The fact

that you repeat the pattern means that you increase... yo~ strengthen the Long tendency to  
repeat the pattern, hin? (pause). ? 37.

? '~ecause this wheel is not obtained from self, other Or from both, in the past, the  
present or the future, The conception of an 'T ceases And thereby action and rebirth.'

S. ~im. This is very difficult, it's very difficult to explain this

- one either sees it or one doesn't see it. The wheel is not obtained fo~m self, huh? one  
could say, because the self is part of the wheel, eh? and similarly it is not obtained f?rm  
what is other than the self or both from the self and the not self, either in the past the present  
or the future, and because of this, the conception of an 'T ceases, uh? In other words when  
you just see that, eh? when you see the whole thing, as it were, as a self-contained process,  
heh? and when you '- ... when the 'T ceases, there's no action based upon the 'T and no  
rebirth.

? In what sense does it mean self... ? Boes it mean the purely illusory

S. No, it seems as though self is distin~ished from ego here, self would seem to mean  
just the ordinary (coughing) in the ordinary sense, heh?

? Would you try and explain it again, please.

S. I don't know, I mean (faint laughter)

Would you have to be bullied? (?) (very quiet)

~~~~~ the wheel (?) represents a sort of self-contained process, eh? and the self is part of that process, the 'I' is part of that process, eh?. ? Ninrn (faintly)

S. It's as though because it is a self-contained process it doesn't arise in dependence upon anything else, huh? and therefore it doesn't have to cease in dependence upon anything else, him?

? Inim.

S. The difficulty is that you're speaking, as it were, of the 'I' as somethi~ real, in using the term at all, uh? but it isn't a question of getting rid of something ~1r~Lki5 actually there, him? It's rather a question of seeing through something th~t isn't there at all, huh? Hmm?

? It sounds like

It's a bit like this, it has been explained, all right - if I close my fingers like thie, here is my fist. Yes? him? I open my hand like that, what has happened t~ my fist? Does it still exist or does it cease to exist? r~iiiiim? It's like that. So. as it were, here is the e~;o, eh? or what you think of... I mean... take the hand as the self, yes? i~1l right, when it's closed up like this tere is the ego,eh? when it opens there is the non-ego; what has happened to the c-go? can you say that the ego existed but now doesn't exist? can you say that it didn't exist and now doesn't exist? eh? what can you say9. You can only say that, ~ell, the hand was closed and now it's open , him? but there's no fist, ~~La'& existed, but ~hich no doesn't exist.

? Like the Buddhist simile of the charriot, isn't it?

~. In a way, except that this :is sort of dynamic and not static; and even the analogy of the charri~ (?oesn't help very much. So when you become

enlightened what happens to your ego?

Well, it's like when you open your

hand what happens to your fist?

It's inappropriate to say, you know, that

it, you know, continues to exist, and also that it doesn't continue to exist, or both or neither, him?

fist from the hand, nor do you obtain it from something else, nor from both, eh? or neither, for that matter, in the past, present & future, -

'The conception of an 'I' ceases' - heh?~when you open your hand, as

it were, and thereby action and rebirth.' So, I mean, the difficulty is to some extent linguistic, eh? that you're getting rid of something that isn't there, that is what you have to do, eh? get rid of something that isn't there. This is why the Zen master, you know, says to the disciple, eh? put it down there, - well, no, what is it? I forget what it is...

? That are you carrying in your hand.7

S. ~what are you carrying in your hand? eh? He says, 'I 'I not carrying anything' - 'Well, then, put it down'. So what is it? that's the ego, eh? yes? (Pause) In other words (?) you tie yourself into knots, that you put down the ego, eh? but that you is the ego, the ego puts down the ego; how can the ego put down the ego etc. etc.? but there's no thing to be put down, hmm? yes? it's, you know. a way of functioning, as I said, that has to be dis-continued, eh? There's no question of getting rid of the ego, eh? but of simply no longer behaving in a certain way, hmm?

? ~here's a change of vision.

S. Hitun. Well, 'This wheel is not obtained from self, other Or from both, in the past, present or the future'

- because it's not really a thing, it's a process, hmm? it's a self-contained process, and when you see it as a process and not as a thing, then, you know, there is no longer any 'I', eh? the 'I' vanishes, eh? not that it even existed before, huh? - 'And thereby action and rebirth'.

? ???????

S. Yes, right, yes. (Pause). And Nagarjuna in a way sums it up in

verse 38, so let's list, read that.

'Thus one who sees how cause and effect Are produced and destroyed ~es not regard the world ~s really existent or non-existent.,

S. ~mn, mmm. If it was existent, how could you get rid of it, eh? If it w~s non-existent, well how could it create so much trouble, eh? (Laughter). So see things i~rms of cause and effect, in terms of process, e4 not as

entities, eh? Don't think of cause and effect as things, you know, which I,ong are produced and des~oyed, eh? hmm? (Pause). All right 39.

? 'Thus one who has heard but does not examine The doctrine which destroys all suffering, And fears the fearless state Trembles d-ue to ignorance.'

S. 'Thus one who had heard but does not examine The doctrine which destroys all suffering' - eh? - that is the

doctrine of positive goodness, eh? He's heard it, b~t doesn't examine it, doesn't reflect upon it, doesn't meditate upon it, eh? -

'And fears the fearless state Trembles due to ugnorance' eh? So this is a very sort of para

doxical - - situation - you fear the fearless state, hmm? I mean it's the, well, annihilation of your ego, to go back to that way of speaking, which is going to result in your being completely fearless, because your fears are all on account of ~e ego, but y~, presumably you in the sense of the ego, are afraid of that fearless state. How paradoxical~ eh? You're afraid of getting rid of your fear, eh? You're miserable at the thought of getting rid of your suffering, huh? getting rid of your misery, huh?

? Is this possibly because we don't really have the faith that it is a fearless state?

S. Ntnin~ yes.

? I don't really see it with clarity (?), so that it results in what we fear (?)

S. ~tnm. And of course, there's nothing to be afraid of, you know, the~'s nothing to be afraid of in fearlessness, hum? mit people are afraid of fear- lessness, virtually, in effect, an~ they don't want to be fearless, they're afraid of that. They don't want to be* you know, free from suffering, the

/SS PRECIOUS GARLAND - ~ape 4. 126

Thought of being free from suffering makes them - quite miserable, huh? Anyway, perhaps we've been - paradoxical enough. Co onto verse 40.

? 'That all thes@ will not exist in nirvana does not frighten you (a Hfnayan~ist), Why does their non-existence Explained here cause you fright?' -

S. Ntnni. It's the ?~hayanist, ie. Nagarjuna, speaking to the Hi~nayanist, heh? The fact that 'all these', that is to say the aggregates, the skandhas will not exist in Nirvana, does not frighten you, that is to say does not frighten the Hfnayanist, eh? because the ?(rnyanist believes, eh? that on the attainment of Enlightenment, eh? on the attainment of Nirvana, huh?

then there is no subsequent rebirth, eh? no subsequent reformation of the skandhas, the five skandhas, after physical death has occurred, eh? so the Hinayanist believes that once you've attained Nirvana, and once you've died huh? then there are no more five skandhas for you. So the Hinayanist apparently is quite happy with that situation - that in the state of Nirvana there should be no existence of the five skandhas, eh? But from the standpoint of the Mahayanist, the Hinayanist is being self-contradictory, in being alarmed when the Mahayanist says that even now the five skandhas

do not really exist, eh? mmm? you see the point, hmm? So, 'That all these will not exist in Nirvana Does not frighten you (a Hinayanist), Why does their non-existence Explain here cause you fright?'

That also suggests that, you know, the Hinayanist isn't taking his own teaching seriously, hmm? Because, you know, he's quite happy saying, well, when I gain Nirvana, well there'll be no five skandhas in that Nirvana; well, when the Mahayanist points out that even now the five skandhas, as Absolute Reality, as, as it were, the ego, do not exist, that upsets him, huh? But why? If you're quite happy to think that the five skandhas don't exist in the state of Nirvana, you should be equally happy to think they don't really exist here and now, hmm? I mean lots of people can contemplate with great satisfaction the future dissolution of the ego, but point out to them the dissolution of the ego here and now, and that will be quite a different

,~~ '~7.

PRECIOUS GARLAND - Tape 4.

matter. I mean like St. Augustine's famous, 'O Lord, make me chaste, but not yet' huh? (Laughter) Yes? - 'O Lord, may I give up the ego, but not just now', hmm? So the Hinayanist, again according to the Mahayanist, is quite, you know, happy to contemplate the non-existence of the ego in Nirvana, huh? but is not so happy to be told about the non-existence of the ego right now, him? It is not that it will become non-existent, it is non-existent, eh? hmm?

? Maybe he never really believes in his heart that he's going to get Nirvana.

S. Perhaps that's true, yes.

? ???

S. Yes. It's a game like the old woman in the story I sometimes repeat, yes? Have you heard that story? (Much laughter). It's just like that, yes? - 'Take me now', yes?

?(Several) Oh, yes.

S. Yes? that. But when the Buddha, apparently, appears, you know, He's ready to take her now, she says, 'O, no, no, no, that was ... that was just a little joke. (Laughter) Won't the Buddha let me have my little joke. She doesn't really want to go - now - which means really (?) she doesn't want to go at all. I mean, you might think, you know, you are meditating,

medi- tating, you want Enlightenment, but the moment the Buddha appears and says, 'Right, here we are, Enlightenment, I'll give it to you right now,' - 'Oh, no. .no, thank you,' (laughter)
- couldn't have made a different... (?)

quite ready. ? ??? T~et me just have another good meal S. Let me have just a few more, you know, rebirths. ~ don't think I'm quite prepared for Enlightenment.

But I find a lot of peo?le misunderstand the doctrine of rebirth, and use it as an excuse for putting off... 'I've got more lives (?)

S. That is what it is, reflrth means putting Off~~9c ~~~

? ~~~~~ if they made the effort,~ now...

(Side 2). \ '~ ' 2- '1'

? It's going to be straightforward, I think.

S. ?~, it's very straightforward. It's very straightforw~rd traditional Buddhist teaching, you know, c~ite sort of succinctly expressed.

? it's working very much with morality.

S. ~::~rni, mmm, yes, mm, well, with ~ila.

? Yes. (Long pause)

Purna: He hasn't mentioned meditation.

S. Fe hasn't, has he? no. That will come in later, but for the time being he doesn't mention it.

? V ~-\$ 'The doctrines of definite goodness are S~id by the Conquerors to be deep, Subtle and frightening to Ch5~ldren who are not learned.'

S. I~mn. \-Tho are the conquerors?

? The -inas.

S

?

S. Minni, rebirth means, you kno~, repeating the pattern.

Yes, yes,

S. So, so long as you're, you kno', you go on repeating the pattern, you put off being truly creative, you know.

? .~mm. i~Jnm.

? But you've got to get yourself out of it to experience that or... that is my experience.

S. Vell, if you get yourself read~y, you know the inherant momentum of the readiness will carry you as it were through. After all you can't literally be 'given' ;~~lightenment when you're not ready for it. So this is just, you know, to make certain things clear, hmm?

? Hmm, hmm. A~ if you weren't ready to accept that it was as though you were treating it more as an embellishment, aren't you, in practice? - Nirvana etc.

S. If you really wanted it for yourself in the future you would really want it now, you couldn't possibly be scared by the thought of having it now or being given it now.

? ~tnin, yes, hinin, yes.

S. So you can't really be genuinely happy with the idea of gaining Enlighten- ment after ten million births, but not genuinely happy with the idea of gaining it right now, heh? if opportunity offers, if such a thing was possible. Or someone might say, 'O, I'm quite ready to die any time,' but, you know - 'Are you ready to die this minute?' eh? - well, that's a different story. Unless at any time they were thinking of well, fifteen, twenty, thirty or fifty years tinie.' You know, not any time in the sense(?) of now. (Laughter) Verse ~c.rty-one. ?
in the sense that you take in suffering (?)

Enlightenment.. S. Yes... ...this would, to the extent that you suffer... 5 You suffer on account of your ego and your ego is (?) action, eh?

[161]

Not that you suffer on account of your ego as a thing that is there, eh? liwin? but, y~ ~~ %hen you behave in a certain way, ie. when you are

- egoistic, then yofl suffer, huh?

? So taking your more into

S. Unless you experience, you know, certain things as suffering...

? The less vulnerable you are

S. The less vulnerable you are because the more vulnerable you are, in a way - and you're more open, you're more vulnerable in that sense. I mean, just as if you're very open and you really do send out metta,

you know, you're more open, you're more vulnerable, but if someone though speaks roughly to you, you won't feel it in the same way, even -- -- you

are so open and so vulnerable, eh? So the more open you are, the

less you suffer, and the less egoistic you are, the less you suffer,

the more egoistic, the more you suffer. (Pause). Right forty-

one, Na~garjuna is still addressing the unfortunate H~ffayanist, eh?

'In liberation there is no self and are no aggregates.' If liberation is asserted thus, °
Why is the removal here of the self And of the aggregates not liked by you?

~. Hmrr. ~bicb (?) is in fact whqt I've been saying. If you're ~illing to give them up then, why are you not willing to give them up now?

"mm? All right forty-two, we become a bit abstruse here.

? If nirvana is not a non-thing, Just how could it have thingness? The extinction of the misconception - Of things and non-things is called nirvana.

S. ?1mm, in other words one should think in terms of process, eh? not in terms of things that don't change, e~? (Pause) So fla~garjuna is still thinking, as it were, in rather sort of static terms, eh? still speaking in terms of the extinction of the mis- coneption of things and non-things, eh? that is called- Nirv~ana, eh?

PRECIOUS GARLAND - Tape 4 130.

He's not really thinking... speaking rather, in terms of process. or H

in terms of a process. (pause). if Nirvana is not a non thing,

presumably it means 'If Nirvana is a thing'. If Nirvana is a thing,

how could it have thingness? What do you think it means by that?

? That it, you know, exists without a self (?).

S. I-sm, yes. I mean, Nirvana is not a sort of thing, not a sort of ego, as it were, yes?

? Not a sort of limitation.

S. Not a sort of limitation, yes. This is brought out very much in the Mahayaana, yes? But not, in this sense, Nirvana is not something which is not Samsara, huh? Because this would be, as it were to limit one.

? Ems'.

? So where does... process of Nirvana...

S. Ems'. Well, one can think of this in terms of the creative mind, and the spiral process of conditionality, I've gone into this in the

you might remember, in connection with Dhamma's exposition of conditioned co-production, that you've got the white or the positive series of nidanas, eh? hmmm? That's to say in dependence upon suffering arises faith; in dependence upon faith arises delight; in dependence upon delight arises joy, and so on, up to in dependence upon freedom arises the knowledge -- destruction of the asavas, eh? but one does... is not to assume that one has reached a final fixed point, eh? One can conceive, or one can imagine of a process, as it were, continuing indefinitely, eh? hmmm? and re-acting - if that

is the right word here from even that positive Nidana of the knowledge and vision of... I mean, knowledge -- destruction of the

aspects, to a factor still more positive and going on and on and...

in that way indefinitely. So Nirvana is not the final terminus of

the process (Buzzing, can't hear) Nirvana is simply a term used to

indicate the non-endiness of the process, the fact that there is no

PRECIOUS GARLAND - nape 4 131.

final turn, hmmm? hmmm? Well, Nirvana is not the final turn of the positive series, you know, Nirvana is a term used to indicate the fact that there is no final turn, hmmm? I mean the spiral process doesn't come to an abrupt end, as it were, just there, and that is Enlightenment, eh? In a way it goes on and on, and that is Enlightenment, which is not a thing, but a process, or if you like, a life, though it doesn't go on, though this is very paradoxical, in time, eh? It goes on, as it were, out of time, huh? But by the time, as it were, you reach that point, eh? well, there's no distinction between time and non-time, eh? So the extinction of the mis-conception of things and non-things, is called Nirvana, or the extinction of the

mis-conception of limit and no-limit, eh? That is Nirvana, eh? So one mustn't think, you know, from this point of view, of Nirvana as a fixed point at which you come to a final halt and there you are,

you're Enlightened, eh? Enlightenment - to be Enlightened - is a Iv' way of living, huh? Not something - - which you obtain and~which yei

-settle down, that is to make it a sort of glorified ego state, eh? You've described it much more creative

S. Ah, ah, ah. Well, this means, this is ,in a way jiatural, because

that is the way it is. It isn't something static. It's a process ftt~~~1~

of - ility of which you can see no end, huh? You probably A wouldn't be wise to say that it has no end, but you would be wise to say you can see no end, huh? you just see the whole process stretching before you, eh? you know from vista to vista un-ending, you can't see a final turn to it, eh? You can't see a ... you can see a vanishing point, but you know that beyond that vanishing ~i~t) you kn0w~there are other dimension~h? The vanishing point is o~ly there because of the limitations of your vision, and that point is Nirvana as you at present see it, eh? hmm? Do you see what I mean? eh? I mean* if you think in terms of perspective, you can

PRECIOUS GAPIAND - Tape 4. 132 see lines of perspective converging at a point in the distance, Yes? hmm?

? Hmm, hmni (in assent)

S. But~they actually converge, heh? but that point of conver- gence from this point of view is ~hat you call ~ji~van~a, but when you get to Wjrvana you can't ... the lines ju~t - open - and the process is still going on, hmm? But, due to your limitations of vision, you know you're fixed way of thinking, you cannot but think of Nirvana as a fixed point out there to which you are making your way, and at which you will stop, and which will mean there you are you've arrived, huh? hmm? I mean, this is what the Buddha is get- ting at in the White Lotus Sutra when He speaks of the Magic City, heh? which is the fixed point - Nirvana's the fixed point - con- jured up you know, just to encourage you to make an effort and get there, you know, but when you get there you find it's only a half w~y house, huh? There are other Nirvanas further along the way, you know, hmm? I mean it's like tAI¶&ng peace of mind and happiness and success - if you practice meditation in front of someone who knows - you know, hoping that- in en he does get to peace of mind, happiness and success, he'll want to go a bit further on, hmm? So we mustn't think of Nirvana as, you know, an... a sort of achieve~nt, a fixed state in ~hich you settle down, though we can't help speaking like that, becaus~, you know there are limit- at ions of language anC' OtAr - way of thinking, really.

? This is- :tis...

- S. Fmm?

...any...

S. And why should you stop?

Hinw (Agreement, laughter)

PR~CIOUS GARLANi- - Tape 2. 153. 've ? We,~stopped at the moment
because we're limited by the extent of

our vision, isn't it?

S. Yell, you could say, that from the ~thayana point of view, the mistake of the Hinayana
Nftvana ii the Nir~~fla of the stop, the fixed bait hmm? it's thinking of ~~irv~na as
something at which you arrive and in which you settle d.own, and that juit isn't possible,
hmm? that'O not the nature of Nirvana, it's not a thing, hmm? if you want to use a word at all
it's a process, it's ~way of liv- ing, eh? not something that you gain, or something that you
possess or something onto which you hold, or something which you can have for yourself as
distinct from shar~ng it with others, not really. So, you know, Nirvana you can say is the life
of E~lightenment, eh?

? Hmm, hmm.

-S. Nirv~a is the way you live when you're Enlightened,eh? hmm? It's not a sort of, you
know, ~~i~itu~l~~~ of retirement, hmm? you know, at which you, you know, retire from the
world and, you know, enjoy

your pension, eh? in the form of, sort of, Enlightenment. How does the process become
non-conditioned... s'4c~~~.~~,

S. (With feeling) Hmm. Well, the Buddha wou~ say that this is a question the answer
to which you cannot see with your conditioned mind. But when your ~ind is no longer
conditioned the question will not be there, eh?

? Hmm.

S. This is rather frustrating in a way. But then you know, when the mind is
unconditioned, you don't worry about that, you wouldn1~~ feel frustrated, you're not
frustrated then by the fact you haven't had an answer to your question - otherwise it wo~ldn't
be an uncondit- ioned mind, eh? So there is no question then. So it's the cond- itioned mind
that asks questions. So, you know, in the state of

mind in which you ask the question, you can't get the answer: in the state of mind in which you could get the answer, you can't ask the question, hmm? (A stir of laughter). Anyway, that's becoming a bit metaphysical. (More laughter). All right forty-three.

'In brief the view of nihilism is That actions bear no fruits; without Merit and leading to a bad state, It is regarded as the wrong view'.

S. ~bnin, well, we've come right down to earth now, with a bump, huh?

'In brief the view of nihilism is That actions bear no fruits', eh? Nihilism is the doctrine, the teaching - you're cut off at the moment of death, nothing of you remains, physical body dies, mind also perishes with the body, eh? hmm? So there's no re-birth, eh? hmm? There's no possibility of your actions bearing their fruits, eh? in future lives, eh? So this view is said to be -

Merit and leading to a bad state, It is regarded as the wrong view'.

? Hmm. I think an element of nihilism in the conceiving of Nirvana or ~~~lightenment~~~ that fixed point.

S. Yes, yes, right, yes. It's like the tiger's cave, as it were, into which all the tracks disappear, and ~ut of which nothing comes, or from which nothing comes.

? Thun.

-S. This is why the Mahayanists have the expression the Unestablished Nirvana, the '~~irvana which is not established at any fixed point, it is not established outside the SaThsara, hmm? (Can' hear). This is the Mahayana teaching, the Unestablished Nirvana, the non-established Nirvana,

which is not located at an~here in particular, hmm? which is not to be identified with any~particular fixed point, which does not exist

here as distinct from there, eh? sometimes translated as the un-

localised Nirvana. So it is really the Nirvana of no fixed point.

That would be a very good translation of it. (P~use). All right, forty-faur.

? 'In brief the view of existence Is that there are fruits of actions; N-eritorious and conducive to happy Migrations, it is regarded as the right view.'

S That's plain and straightforward, that's the, you know, the basic assumption of the practice of high status, eh? All right, go on to forty-five, huh?

'Because'is' and 'is not' are destroyed by wisdom, rn-here is a passage beyond merit an' 'sin, -This,say the excellent, is liberation From both bad and happy migrations.'

?j. Hmm. So 'is' and 'is not' are destroyed by wisdom - 'is' and 'Is they're not' are sort of stati5 ~~A - fixed; these are destroyed by wisdom,

huh? \~isdom sees things in terms of process, in terms of flux, huh?

see~things dynamically, huh? So,

'Because 'is' and 'is not' are destroyed by wisdom, There is a passa~e beyond merit and sin,' - you know

beyond the ~elative ups and relative downs of the wheel of life,

heh? - 'This, say the excellent, is libe~ation From both bad and happy migrations'. eh? You have to go

beyond high status as well as low status, eh? Wrong views lead to

low status,; right views lead to high status, eh? nihilism leads

to low status, eh? eternalism leads to high status, hmm? So

eternalism is ,relatively right, heh? But you want to go beyond

high status, beyond low status, heh? or rather, not only beyond low

status, but beyond high status as well. You don't want any position

on or in the wheel of life, eh? You want liberation, and that is

liberation, you know, f:~m both good and bad rebirth, from both low status and high st~tus - yes, from the cyclical as such, yes. You're not interested in the cyclical as such.

? ~mn.

S. I mean, you're a prisoner, you want to get out of the prison, out of the prison-house, you don't want to be re-classified as a class A prisoner, hmm? (Pause).

PRr-GIOw~ Gj~T?T!~I -. ~-;-~E! 6 SiC~ ~ I)~6

? rnWO that is 0-cyond (?) the Bigher ~olution?

Yes, one coulC certainly look at it like that - in the... or at least the upper r-aches of the Higher Thvoluti-o~n, huh? Pll the points bey- ond thc point of no return.

? no views lead to Nirvana.

S. limm, ah - no riews lead to '~irvana~ ye-s. (pause, laughter) And Nirvana... Nagarjuna goes on a bit after~~~~ards, I think in a ~ay a~it unnecessarily. He's already made the point cuite clear, but any~:ay let's see what he has to say. V~rse 46.

? 'Seeing Production as caused One passes beyond non- existence, Seeing cessation ~s caused- One no longer asserts existence.'

S. ?Wm~, you're getting rid of the opposite by its opposite*as it were.

~hat do you think th~t means, 'Seeing production as caused'? - 'One passes beyond non-existence, Seeing cessation as caused One no longer asserts existence.

The production of what?

? Conditioned co-production in effect.

S. ?-bnm. It probably refers to suffering, eh? seeing suffering, or

seeing the suffering of conditioned existence, eh? as not inherently

existing but as produced by a cause, 'eh? one passes beyond non-ex- istence, eh? And seeing cessation as caused, eh? one no long-er asserts existence. In other words~no longer thinks in terms of thin~ inherently existing or inherently not existing, one thinks in terms of things havin~ been produced by causes and ceasing to exist ~-hen those causes are no long-er present, mm? in other words one gets over the idea of inherent existence, eh? ie, the inherent exist- ence of the ego, actually.

? ~---rr.

S. ind this is, in a way, the basic 1~ddhist teaching or tenet, accord- ing to ?~~~agarjuna, that thing-s have no inherent existence, or what

we call things have no inherent existence, eh? hmm? They exist only in dependence upon conditions, and cease to exist when those conditions are no longer there. But nothing exists inherently, eh?

? Is that saying ... meaning the same as there is no without a ?

S. Yes, yes, yes. (?) That the elements~themselves can make up from existence and from self existence and it breaks down all the way... along.

S. Yes, right, right, yes, yes. I~ll right forty seven.

? 'Previously produced and simultaneously produced (Causes) are non-causes; thus there are no causes in fact, Because (inherently existent) production is not Conventionally or~ultimately known at all'.

S. Mirnin, that's rather obscure, isn't it? So -

'Previously produced and simultaneously ~roduce~ -- Causes are non-causes;' -- - -

If causes are produced huh? er, hmm. It's as though NP-&fflarjuna~ts saying, 'If causes are produced previous to the effect they're non-causes, and if they're p~oduced simultaneously they're no~ causes ~ither ~hus in fact there are no causes ultimately; nothing is a- cause by its inherent nature, as it were, eh? -

'Because (inherently existent) production is not Convention~lly er ultimately known at all.'

In other words, ultimately speaking, there's no production even, uh? and no cessation, eh? these also are the results of static ways of thinking, hmm? r]There's not some 'thing' which is produced or some 'thing' which ceases to exist, eh? hmm? In other words, he's sort of repudiating-, rejectin~ tha~~hol~ w~~y of thinking, eh? ~ven

~~~~hen it t'irns against itself,eh? all ? I'm rather wondering ~hy he goes into this t such length... A

S. Yes.

I mean, if he's pr--supposing that the king was... would... has already been trained in .....

~. t-mm, yes. Oh, perhaps he's forgotten all about the king. (Laughter). ~he king might be sittin&-:- ~kt,c, you know, reading the letter, ~onder-

ing %~c'..t it's all about. FerhQ~s ~ra~arjuna has got rather carrie;- aw~y by~ you know, his own experience, eh?

? because he's and also beacuse he's...

C; I~infl, yes, rig-ht. ? .... the beginning and the end?

-3.

there's no be~;inning a'~ n~ end.. well S. :--;mm. Also there is the f3int that Nagarjuna m~y~be reput~

the views of contemporary thinkers, you know, both B-uddhist and non-

Buddhist, huh? that we are no longer acquainted with - and his

remarks, his coinments, may have reference to those views of their's.

This becoies o:~l lite clear later on, in fact, hmm?

? '~as this text in fact written roughl; round the time when S~ant~eva wes writin~?

S. No, very much earlier, very much earlier.

? Oh, becausc Santideva also .

~. Yes, yes, for he is in the same tradition, Santideva, as :-Thgarjuna, that he is a follower of~. Nadhyamika tradition. Put let's just read

through, let's see, how far ought we to go - yes, let's read down

to fifty-one, because from fifty-two he goes onto the simile of the

mirage, and ~.~ t-L tA-" stop there. Read down to fifty-

one\* verse... verse by verse, turn by turn uh? from

forty-seven to fifty-one.

V~~(~'w-hen this is, that arises, Like short wh-en there is tall. W-hen this is produced, so is that, Like light from a flame.

|                                             |                           |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| When there is tall, there must be short,    | They exist not through    |
| their own nature, - Just as without a flame | Light too does not arise. |

Having thus seei that effects arise Prom causes, one asserts isihat appears In the conventions of the world And does not accept nihilism.

S. Hmm, yes, all right - O.~, carry on.

'He who refutes (inherently existent cause And effect) does not develop (the view of) existence, (Asse~ting )as true what does not arise from conventions; Thereby one not relying on duality is liberated.'

S. Nirno. It's as though one gets rid of the idea of an entity, a static thing, with the help of the idea of process, with the help of the idea of conditionality, or even cause and effect, but ohe mustn't regard cause and effect as things, eh? hmm? If one does, well, one just repeat. the same mistake, you know, on another level, in another way, eh? All right. look at it this way, Nagarjuna says, as it were, for instance; cause and effect are s~rt of relative terms: you can't think of cause w~thout effect, or effect without cause, just as you can't think of long witho~short, or short without long, there's no long without a short, eh? Long is long in comparison

wiLh short; short is short in compar4on with long. In the same I~

way cause is cause in ~latio~ to effect; effect is effect in

relation to ~cause. So can you have a cause withou an effect? No, can you have an effect without a cause? No. huh, hmm? But if you can't have a cause without an effect, heh?, hmm? Because, you know, the idea of cause is dependent on the idea of effect, how can you have a cause existing before the effect comes into existence? But unless~~ the cause °zistc before the effect co~D into existence, the cause is not a cause, so that you get landed in

so that you get landed in all sort~of logical contradictions if you start thinking of cause and effect as actual existent entities, eh? hmm? This is what in effect he is saying, huh? So don't repeat the same mistake on another level; just as, for instance, in the case of the jirayanaist, in the case of the Abhi~harmika, they

said that the so-called Pudgala consisted of dharmas, eh? of were cal~led elements which dharmas, constituent (?) processes, btt

they proceeded to invest, you know, the dharmas themselves with the same sort of reality, hmm? they had denied, or they invoked the -dharmas themselves, to deny in the case of the Pudgala, yes? So that rea~liy was transferred from the Pudgala to the ~arm~ so what was the use of that? It merely repeated the same mistake on another level, hmm? So what is the use of exorcising the idea of thing, with the concept of process, with the concept of cause effect, when cause and effect, or the concept of ~ause and effect, again are thought of as things, eh? It seems to be something like this that Nagarjuna is saying, or trying to get at. So he says as it were, something like, having thus seen that effects~arise from causes, one asserts what appears in the conventions of the world, and does not accept Nihilism, eh? - You take your stand upon the relative truth, eh? in order to realise the Absolute Truth . So,

'He who refutes inherently existing cause' eh? hmm? does not develop the view of existence, hmm? - the one-sided view of existence. He who refutes - who does not accept the idea that a cause is a cause, eh? by virtue of its very nature, as it were, huh? - who does not understand that cause is cause only in relation to effect, eh? He'does not develop the view of existence - asserting as true what does not arise from conventions - thereby one not relying on duality is liberated.'

An~ay, think we'll stop there for the time being. ~Naga~rjuna

#### PRECIOUS GARLAND - Tape 4 Side 2. 141

seems to be giving the ego a real hammering, eh? But also he's

trying to make it clear that the ego ~hich he is hammering is not a

thing, hmm? I mean again the difficulty is created by language, by linguistic convention. As... when we say, 'Get rid of the ego', heh? Put by even saying, 'Get rid of the ego' you're assuming the existence of the ego, and in that wa~ you're strengthening the existence of the ego: you say (?) 'Well, get rid of your ego' uh? So, well ~.~hat does that do? that re-inforces the sense of ego, hmm? So you have to tell people to get rid of the ego in such a way as to suggest the ego doesn't really exist, hmm? It's the same with anger - 'Get rid of your anger, get rid of your hatred,' but are they things to

be got rid- of? No, they're just ways in which energy happens to

function or not function properly, hmm?

So release your energy,

release that blocked energy, that would be a better way of saying it. Not, 'Get rid of anger' - anger is not a thing to be got rid of, eh? Anger occurs when you use your energy wrongly, you know - love occurs, or metta occurs when you use your energy rightly, hmm? But there's not a thing called anger to be got rid of, eh? Anger is just a way of functioning - of the energy, of the mind. It's just like, you know, when you open the fingers (?) the fist doesn't cease to exist, hmm? We tend to think in these very static terms, in terms of things, huh? not in terms of processes, in terms of actions - you know, Buddhism encourages us all the time to think in terms of process and action, not in terms of things, which are considered...

- regarded as ultimately real and unchanging. So you are not a thing, you are a process, eh, hmm? You are not a living thing eh? you are just living, eh? (laughter)

-? 'Living and partly living.'

-S~ What did you say then? (P~t)

? Um, that it... I'm afraid I've lost the thread now... ~- 1/4~) ~

'73

PTT-~IOUS (A)~LAif- ~ape A, SiCe ~-'. 42.

10, what you said, I think was that Nagarjuna seems to be pulling down conceptions, or misconceptions that we don't actually have, eh? hmm? huh?

? Yes.

But do you think that really is so, because it seems the main misconception he's trying to pull down is seeing things

or conceiving of things or misconceiving of things - as things - you

know, rather than as processes, and certainly we do this, eh? hmm? I mean the structure of language itself almost compels us to do this.

You can sort of almost understand it, but you can't put it into words.

S. Mmm. Yes, yes. You can't even put it in words, perhaps. ? No, hmm.

S. Because, you know, eve~ if you put it into words, a word is a thing, it's got a d~finite meaning, it checks the flow, un?

? Yes. Mmm.

? It seems that language is completely Westernised - that (?) it's got constructed or evolved from ~ery definite set of axioms or

S. Well, language was-' evolved for practical purposes, eh? I mean, 'Kill that deer', huh? that was how language started: 'Come and eat'. Fmm, yes? 'iring me that stone', eh?  
(Laughter) That was how language started (Laughter) Yes, good (?) practical purposes, hmm? So practical purposes means sort of tying things down, as~it were, huh?

? And now maybe that the purpose is different

S. Yes, you have to learn to use language, I mean, against the purpose for which it was originally intended. I mean language wasn't int- ended originally to communicate spiritual truths - that's the last thing people would have thought of using it for probably, if...

think. I mean language was invented to say things like

PRECIOUS GARLAND Tape 4 Side 2. 143.

"!~ll, I'rn hungry - give me food' or 'Let's go and- hunt', hmm? or

'I shall kill you'. (Laughter).

? rn~5~ ~iot has a...

S Or, 'I would like to eat you' (Laughter)

? Has a very good line... Thiot has a very good line in Four ;uartets. He said that look, we only master a language with a (?) theme that we no longer wish to say.

S. I-imm, yes. (pause). I mean that... maybe we should let I~. Thliot have the last word today then.

[175]

S: Verse 52. I think in the remainder of this chapter we find Na~~arjuna reinforcing what he has already said with additional arguments, and apparently meeting various objections, and there are quite a number of references and implied references to contemporary schools of thought, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist. However we wont let ourselves be become too much involved in that, but try to bear in mind the main point that Nagarjuna has been making about the as it were non-reality of the ego huh. Verse 52 ...



(v.52) V: A form seen from a distance

Is seen clearly by\_those\_nearby. If a mirage were\_water, why Is water not seen by those\_nearby ?

S: The comparison or simile of the mirage is a very popular one in Indian thought especially in Mahayana Buddhist thought. So in this verse Nagarjuna just gives a general idea as-it-were about this particular kind of comparison, about the nature of the mirage. You all know what a mirage is of course, as when you see water in the desert. So usually what happens is, is you see something from a distance somebody nearer than you are to the particular thing will see it even more clearly than you, because it is actually there. But in the case of the mirage it is exactly the opposite, you see it clearly from a distance but when you approach you find that there isn't anything there. So this shows that it is a mirage. And this is the nature of a mirage, you see it from a distance, but you don't see it when you come close to it, therefore you know that it is in fact just nothing there, that there is no water there in the desert. So this paves the way for what he says now in these next few verses (pause) yes carry on please :

xx

V: The way this world is seen As real by those afar

176

Page 2.

Is not so seen\_by those\_nearby

(For whom it is) signless like a mirage.

S: So those who are afar, that is to say those who don't see very well, those who are ignorant, see the world or see the world, the world of egos if you like, the world of things, but

those who are nearby, those who come close up to this so called world, close up to this so called thing, they don't see them at all, they see that really there is nothing there, just like the person that is near to the mirage doesn't see the mirage (pause) So those afar correspond to those without insight, those who are nearby correspond to those with insight. if you come close up to the world as it were, if you really look into it you see it isn't real, or it isn't as real as it purports to be. It doesn't have the kind of reality that it claims to have, or that is claimed for it, it doesn't have Absolute Reality, just as when you approach the mirage, the water, the water vanishes, it is no longer seen, so if you look very deeply into the world into things the qualities that they are supposed to possess, or as they seem to possess when seen from a distance they are then seen not to possess. Then there is the line of English poetry: 'tis distance lends enchantment

to the view! We look at something from a distance it seems very attractive; we get close up to it we see it quite differently. (pause) So you look at the world, you look at things as it were from a distance they seem very attractive, they seem pretty lasting if not ever-lasting, pretty secure. But if you take a closer look then you will see that they are not like that at all, their true nature is rather different. ( long pause) All right, next verse:

(v.54) V: Just as a mirage is like water but is

Not water and does not in fact exist (as water),

So the aggregates are like a self but are

Not selves and do not in fact exist (as selves).

S: Perhaps instead of selves we could substitute egos. "So just as a mirage is like water but is not water and does not in fact exist as water so the aggregates are like a self but are not

Page 3.

selves and do not in fact exist as selves. or egos. (pause) So what are these aggregates? - these are of course : form, feeling, conception, volitions, and consciousness. So they

all look like a self, look like an ego, look like something permanent, unchanging, fixed, just like the mirage looks like water (pause) but in fact the mirage is not water and in fact the aggregates do not add up to or amount to an ego. The aggregates are in a sense there but they are wrongly seen. The mirage is there, you do see something, but what you see is not water, and in a sense the aggregates are there, you see something but what you see are just the aggregates not an ego as you think. The aggregates may look like an ego from a distance but when you come up closer to them, when you really investigate them, when you really analyse them you don't find any ego, you only find the five aggregates. ( pause) someone blows their nose (pause) sound of door closing (pause) All right let's go on to

ve-se 55:

(v.55) V: Having thought a mirage to be Mitli

Water and then having gone there, He would ~ just be stupid to surmise 'That water does not exist.'

S: (pause) Yes the mere fact that one thinks that the mirage is like ether means that there is something with which the mirage can be compared, something for which you have in fact mistaken the mirage. And there is such a thing as water, but there is no water in the mirage~ itself, the mirage is not water~ water exists elsewhere. This is not to be taken by the way in the sense that an ego exists elsewhere but there is a state that there is a condition of existence in which those qualities which are wrongly attributed to the ego like permanence and so on, changelessness etc do exist. So from the fact that you don't find water in the mirage you proposed to conclude that the mirage that the water did not exist, from the fact that you do not find the qualities of the unconditioned in the conditioned you would be foolish to conclude that the unconditioned has the qualities of the conditioned, did not exist, you really have been looking for them in the wrong place. (pause) It is like someone becoming involved in a certain situation in search of happiness. That situation does not give him happiness and then he concludes

Fag~ 4.

that there is no such thing as happiness, and that is a mistaken conclusion. He has only ~ixxi not been looking for happiness in the right direction. The right direction of course being not to look for happiness as such at all. (pause)

V: (mumbled words) try to ~ooi: from ~oi( hL~i ff~xu- . (mumbled words) happiness.

35: Ulim ... Yes ... yes, a thing called happiness. (pause) All right 56:

(v.s~) V: One who conceives of the mirage-like

World that it does or does not exist

Is consequently ignorant. When there is Ignorance, one is not liberated.

S: One cannot say of the mirage, like the world, that it exists in the sense that it is absolutely real, or that it does not exist in the sense that it is completely non-existent. It isn't correct to apply to it either of those terms. If you do that then you are ignorant. And where there is ignorance one is not liberated. In other words liberation does not consist in seeing the world either in terms of existence or non-existence.

One realizes as it were the relative reality of the world, the relative existence. The world is real in as much as it is there

it is experienced, but it is not real or it is not ultimately real because it arises in dependence upon causes and conditions. (pause) All right 57:

(v.s.) V: A follower of non-existence suffers bad migrations, But happy ones accrue to followers of existence; One who knows what is correct and true does not rely On dualism and so becomes liberated.

8: Why do you think a follower of non-existence suffers

bad migrations? That is to say one who believes -- L40A& I apparently that reality does not exist.

Page 5.

V: Is it because ( a number of words inaudible ~

8: Uhm. ( pause) It's not quite that. ( mumbling in the background ) more negative state of mind. You know this ties up with what we said before. It's as though the attitude of you -- non or believing the world not to exist springs from a negative attitude in the sense of almost a sort of hatred of the world, as though one's belief that the world does not exist at all, not belief that it does not exist absolutely, that it does not -- IM -- exist at all that it isn't really there at all, is a sort of rationalisation -- a conceptual presentation of one's dislike for the world, of one's hatred for the world. Much as when you dislike yourself or even your ego, you shouldn't hate the ego, you should just look at it and see that it isn't there. If you hate it then you are -- li -- reinforcing it. If you hate it you are asserting its existence. So if you hate

the world so much that you say that it does not exist at all you are asserting its existence very strongly, but in a very negative manner, which indicates a very negative mental attitude, a negative mental state, and that will lead to bad migration~~.

V: You can see this you know with the attitude of the drop-out into ( a word inaudible ) or whatever attitudes, or rejecting the world, you know or saying that it's all one or something like that, or it doesn't really exist anyway. They've just dropped out from it so there's a dislike for the world

S: Yes well if you say that it's all one then you're sort of negating the differences To say that it is all one is in a way you know saying there isn't anything there at all.

V: Also they won't believe that their unskilful actions will have any effect

S: yes there's that too. That is the sort of ethical aspect of the nihilism. ( pause ) The follower of non-

Page b

existence suffers bad migrations, but happy ones accrue to followers of existence.' So if hatred characterises the mental attitude of, of a follower of non-existence, what characterises the mental attitude of a follower of existence ?

V: Craving.

8: Craving, attachment, but in a way this is better. At least it is a bit positive, so you won't get liberated that way, or out if you say that the world doesn't exist, the world is there, the world is real, that is somewhat better. You will continue to migrate to be reborn, but at least it'll be a happy migration not a bad one. ( pause ) or what does this suggest to you? All this suggests that well it's better to be a sort of happy worldly minded even attached sort of person rather than negative critical, complaining, sour, disillusioned, sort of world-rejecting. This is what it really suggests. ( pause ) In other words from the spiritual point of view, a sort of healthy acceptance of the world is a more promising foundation for future spiritual development than a sort of unhealthy negative

rejection of the world.

V: ( at least in the world you could be ) ( tew ~ords unclear ) then choose ( noros anclesr ) ( and you U~' that could

be directed in tore sairitual direction ) . ( You could convince such a person ) ( fe~ w0rQ un~lesr ) go in a c~rtain direction ).

S: there is a ~reat dii'ficul½J ° ~ith the follower of non-existence is ~ the following of non-existence , to usu'-'

Nagariuna '5 expression, very often presents itself in pseudo-spiritual guise. At bottom there is & sort of dee-seated almost hatred against existence~a hatred against life, a hat red against the world, the rejection s~rings from th>~t. ~x ( pause ) 10ne who ~noWs ':~hat is correcf and true doe--' not rely on du~l~m and so becomes liberated. toes not rely on dualism, does not rely on the dualism of existenteand non-eyisten~e , does

[181]

not take it as ultimate, and so becomes liberated.

V: Shall I read on ?

S: Yes

Cv.si) V: If through kno~~inj~ rh~t is correct end true He does not sssert existence and non-existence;

And thereby (you thin~) he believes in non-exietence, Why should he not be & follo~er of exi tence ?

S: Uh~ Nagariuns here seems to be re:~lying to criticI~s of the, er poos tbl/y the Hinayana, t~at is to sey criticismrs com~nf' from Lhe ~ahayana . sgsrjuns after all is a L'ad~hyamika, he is 5 follo~er ci' the sunyu vada te~'~ching- or sunya vada trsd{tion. He asserts neither exiwtence nor non-exisLence, neither ete'rnalim~r nihilism. But how may that appear to someone yr'h0 isn't very sytspsthetic to the Mahaysna or the sunys vada, possibly to the ilinayenist in th~s 0 o-e ? It'll look Ike nihilism, L'hat you don't (sasert) existence, that you don't (assort) non-existence, that looks li~e nihilism, and this in fact to us is what the sunya vada doe~ look li~e ; it talks about the void, and ~te msoy vury easily take it in thst sort of ~ay. And it does seem that even in l'agarJuna' a time some other Buddhists, presumably

followers of the Hinsyana did take the ~ha'yana sunya vada teaching to be a negative

teaching, a nihilistic teaching, which in fact it was not. So Nagarjuna seems to be referring to this. If from 'no refutation' or 'if from 'no knowledge' that is I - \_\_\_\_\_ correct and true. No, that is to say the 'no-self' does -I

not assert existence and non-existence, and thereby you,

the Hinayanist, think, he believes in non-existence, why should he not be a follower of existence?' No explains that in the following verse, so let's hear that.

V: If from refuting (inherent) existence C non-existence then accrue to him, Why from refuting non-existence Would existence not accrue to him ~

S: i.e. Nagarjuna points out that the Hinayanist, the Mahayana refutes both existence and non-existence, yes. So if from refuting inherent existence, if from refuting the fact that things exist in their own inherent rightness it were, it would not depend on other causes, a

essence to be then accused of non-existence, or of being a follower of non-existence, then why, because he also refutes non-existence so should he not be accused of being a follower of existence. In other words Nagarjuna is trying to show that the objections of the Hinayanist are illogical and self-contradictory. ( pause ) In verse 60 he strongly asserts the same thing again so let's hear that too.

V: 2h05Qw~ who relies on enlightenment

. I am a nihilistic thesis,

behaviour or thought, how can they be seen as nihilists ?

S: Yes, why do you think i.e. Nagarjuna says that, Why does he bring in enlightenment ? it is as though he is saying to the Hinayanist, Yes but after all you are forgetting who and what we are, after all we are Buddhists as it were we are aiming at enlightenment, which is in a sense, in a manner of speaking a positive state, even, how can you possibly accuse us of being nihilists ? 30 he says 'Those who rely on enlightenment have no nihilistic thesis, behaviour or thought, how can they be seen as nihilists ?' ( word unclear Now don't forget that the followers of the sunyavada are Buddhists, they are aiming at samyak sambodhi, enlightenment, how can you say they think of them as nihilists ? That book of his which they say is just as you aim is not just a state of pure non-existence, so how ridiculous to consider us as nihilists at that state, it's so silly so we're not Buddhists at all. So he's strongly rejecting that charge of nihilism, being a follower, the sunyavada

being a sort of ~er of no-fl- existence. ""Tty do yo - think this sort ol' misunderstanding arises  
'? that the sunya vada is thoQg'. t of as teaching non-existence ?

'83

Page 9.

V: ( answer inaudi~~le )

S: Also it rejects all conc~p~ts. So if yo"~ haven' L any s-1/4iritu~

spiritual experience, and your ~hole natursl ~if.e is ( wo-'d ~nlear ) rith concepts, and  
concepts are bein~ rejected you think everything is being rejected, so yhat is left ? - nothing.  
jo this is a bit like -chotenhur says er er to~ards, I think ot the very end of his '~orld a~~ ~-ill  
and idea' he says 50;~Lh)ng! lik thi : 'in sp1/4~:ktng 01- nirvana he says: ' to one to ~hom th s  
world, '~orl& '-iuh all its suns and stars and so on is everythim~, nirvana is, ' er um '3 So if  
for you or ~f t to you conc~pts are everything, the lack of concepts is nothing. Tf concepts  
are repudia~ted ~~~ryth)~ is repudiated, nothing is left. Ans this is what the t\$adhjyamika  
does, th 5 is what the sunys vada ~oes, it repudiates all concepts. So for someone nho, you  
know is identifisd T(ith cone~ts ~ho thin a very much of concepts, for whom concepts are  
everythii~, then nothing is l~ft, which me na non-existence, the teaching' of nihilism. It'L-~'  
just like on the very orninary level if you spe~k to the ordinary man in terms of no job, no  
inarrriage, no family, no football, 'ihat's left "-- th~re is nothing lef~. ~hst's life, it's just the  
same. 3-0 if you say to the er more philosophicalJy minuted, well no existence, no  
non-existence, no th~::~ no that, well he' 11 say there's nothing left, you're teaching nihilism,  
you are advocatin~ complete non-exis ence. ( pau~e ) So th ~s is ho~ you' '&nnw the sunya  
vada aDpe----rs, as it

seems, to some other Buddhists even in Na:arjuna's tine.

V: This see~rns very much parallel to 0 ~r situation, °eople ( few words unclear )  
nihilistic t~aching.

~: Well in a sense it is. It is only seen as nihilistic if what it n-'gates is seen by you as  
everything. Yeah? If you see sex as everything, and Buddhis~ negates s~x, well then  
Buddhism is completely nihilistic. If you see having fun as everything, and Buodhism says  
you rjuatn't have fun, then you see Buddhism as completely nihilistic

Page 10.



nihilistic. If you see making money as the be all and end all of life and Buddhism says it isn't very important, then you see Buddhism as nihilistic. If you see the Arts as everything, and Buddhism says well compared with gaining enlightenment the Arts aren't very important at all then again you see Buddhism as nihilistic

V: The way through that for ordinary people could be presumably to try to give them some kind of feeling that there is something beyond their limitations, not to say that Buddhism says that all these things are meaningless we can try and show them that

S: That's very difficult though. Or you can think in terms of the things to which they are attached,

or the things that they think are everything. It's here raised to the nth degree, or very technical refined, yeah? I mean for instance, saying they think family life is everything. Well, don't say Buddhism completely negates family life, yes we accept family life but that's not the idea of family life. Well, believe in a bigger family, a wider family. We believe in what we call a spiritual family. We don't reject the family altogether, but we want to improve the family, we want to have a better kind of family. If you speak more in that way, well perhaps people will be a bit more receptive. But if you negate the family altogether then there will be a strong reaction. But you have to use your skilful means in this sort of way

7: This is very much what the Buddha did

5: Yeah in the same way that people always say well, U.S. - F-

~Huddhi5fl tOt- 'I reject the ~~~~lf,. Say, well no it isn't quite like that. Buddhism doesn't say you must give up the self, as though the self is completely bad or wrong. It means you must give up the lower self for a higher self. Speak in those sort of terms, at least to begin with

Page 11.

V: I must say in my experience most of the people who dropped out of our classes have done so (few words, no less) this misconception that Buddhism (few words, unclear) because the, 'thief'.. it is teaching that all the values that they hold dear, and all the things that they enjoy are really not on.

'ell that J a true. I nle~n you c~'.n' t conceal the fact from people indefinitely. Yes It's all right just tsकिन to a beginner and scyine;, well yes '~e do beli~ve in the f~mily but a bi£%er family, a better fa-inily, a more spiritual family. Yeah, but you know the~ won't have ba been coming along for many weeks b~~'ore they reslise th&t most 'oec'ple in the ~riends ano most Order members don t h~.v' a farnily in their sense at all. Yeati

You can't disg~iis~ thot fact i'ro-q them, you can't invcnt an imaginary, mythic 'amily that you ( suppose ) do~n that you talk sbo t, sooner or l~~.ter they'll realise You're not married, you don't even have :- regular girlfriend pe-rhaps, you've no children, you don't Live with your parents, you live vith otheY similar peep1 in something called a s~iritual ccmn~nity, yeah "" A~d they'll realie t's a very different kind of BCt up. '2hey c&-nnot but feel threatened, yu .l krc~, lx'k~xlix by that in many os~es, and hoy~ can you escape that, that difficul%y You can't. Then they really ~iTl be brought up sgsainst it. In other vvo-'ds they can't re remain in a -cosition ci' innocent beginner--. i£l definitely. Sooner or later they have to confront the ~'emnd: of the spiritual life ii' they are go~n£~ to make any progeress at all. You can't shield th~m from the fact~ oi' the sp.iritual life a~ it ~ere indefinitely.

V: You can sort ci' pret".nd that you've got a i~"£~i ~y in the S 3'-outh of i~rance ~o~;i~~h~re. ( ~aiighter ~ iou ,~~~~Cp them there for the l'inu~~ ~;eabher.

S T~ell they'd soon see thst you hadn't the money nor that awT~ay. ( laughter )

Page 12.

~"~ bc sooner o'r l,t~r, I me~-n, t"~e op' Ic h~~' v~ to roolioc th~'mt the spirituel lif~ coes in~olve the givin\$~ u' for v~~ant

of better term of cuite a nu~oei-- of thi½~s of hich the are cuite ab cheU. Sc to th&tb extent L~oC1hiW'£ is

as t ~e~e negstiv~, I mean you mwj tiy to soften the bloir, but a blow there is.

V: Nm' ~ould you ~Jt)cak to a prosp,ectiv~e Order member YhO is marrie-d, but who ~ants to become so (?rder member. Uhm I ~sn your not -0 'i'-' to tell him 'o~ has tD ive '15 h his ma'rri~'~e b c-use he is al-ready co--'t~~ited.

S: 'ell I probsbly ~'ou~dn' t soy anythin~~ very ~nuch &~t all. I'd ~y ~elf look ~o end t'l £0 the other nyxrri~d

Order members. Ask them ho'~? they get on, hO it cut in their case, th L" is %-hat I'd say.

V: iu~d it is~' t true thet one caLosOt becomu- n Groer R~iC~,~O~j~ if on e is' ma rried.

el~ no obvious%y bec£~uoe you've got -'.£a:frltc %-rcJer mCmL'iu-n

V: ~ords un~;lear

S \Uell in that cob-c thc"U is ' hab I would soy. I I~l'een go a and tal~ to thO~'¼- Or.L -r me~sber;£ ~hc are married, Just see you kno ~ them ho" i t ~~crk~ cut, hO"" th~~y manage to be ccu~~i tteo ~~~ t the same ime spirituallu co':~nttted while at the s~me time you know- fulfi tlin thei re~'~oo5ibiliti~s h ~s!4nsno's-' ~ives fathers £soth~rs and s-s on. This 13 ~he't I ~ould say. I wocirin' t ir ' sort of ~ive afl/ ~ort of theoretical rca -' £'~ it -are. ( r~ause ) I .~an just ss in the same ay so;seDn~ 'yOd NLO er I~aU- interested in beco~iing on eagariks or ~o~tethin£' of th~'~~t sort, and gi1~7inK~ ur you know all sorts of you oc ~or1dT}y connections, ana -r'~wantin-j' to- ~~o~'- if that we possible if thou~ o-ild be done, I'd say wel'\_\_ 0 ann see those Order members' '-~ho -'~re \_ ct~laT%T dci 0&J th~~ t, ann lfrint;' in th~~'~~ t sort of way. T'~l~ to them, \$0 kney ths t y~o ld be the beset thin~, rath~- uhan tryin to ju~t

-age 15.

~~~~~ a sort of theoretical es~~~~Isnstion. T me'---n you

realise that sc'm~th"lnU~ is possible if you' r~ not sure

aboit it by c--'ec-i'i' that oth~r ~ecTmle Laan~g to do it,

so in a '~ay that's the best re""ly. There arc other reomi

who are not all that different to you 'h a-ce sotually

doing er J~ u k ow what you are thin~in~' of doin£--- in the wsy that co are thinkin'" to c-c
~£~~~ a~nu that can be quite as it y~ere ref ssuring -and supportive, oth~rwise you 'oegin to
wonder. N0% 61.

V: Ask the worldly On--s, the Sam~hyas, O~l-fcllo'~ers and 'N: i rgraothas, %~he
proponents of ~ croon and ~'m~'£fregates,

If they propound rhst ;-555C5 'beyond 'is' ann 'is not'.

¼: Hear Nargajuns is cbslle~ing a~l the non-Buc'dhist schools a fen words urctesr) the
lo~yartias, the lo&vartias ar

the '~crldly ones are the lokyartikas, that is to well tods~ you'd call them scientists, the Sa
~~hyas, thos~ ho teac) the principles of (por-cha) and (fr~~oulty) the Owl-followers. don't
knot~ who they're ~s'n't to be (laughter) 'h Lhey'rs the follow~rs of the (word unclear) the
che (word u~~clear), the pluralists you could say, and Nirgranthas

that id co say the Jainas, i~he propon.nts of a person and aggregates,

if they ~ropound what passes beyond 'is' and 'is not'. i~"~ybe some of these people had
accused the sunya vadins of being nihilists, but he says well go to themas~ tWm wheth~r they
propound any such teaching as ours that go~s b yond existence, beyond non~existence, beyon
d all concepts, ask them if they can show a te~ching as profound as this. In this way he sort
of issues his challenge. (pause) All right on to 62.

V: There-by know that the ambrosia

[188]

Page 14.

V: Of the Buddha's teaching Is called profound,

An uncommon doctrine passing

Far beyond existence and non-existence.

S: Uhm, this is why the Buddha's teaching is called profound because it goes beyond existence and non-existence, beyond all concepts. It says the ambrosia of the Buddha's teaching, the amṛta of the dharma, an uncommon doctrine passing far beyond existence and non-existence. (pause). Right 63, let's read that.

V: Ultimately how could the world exist with a nature

Which has gone beyond the past, the present And the future, not going when destroyed, Not coming and not staying even for an instant ?

S: This is a bit obscure isn't it ? I rather suspect the translator's having difficulty. But it seems to mean something like this; Ultimately how could the world exist, that is to say exist in the ordinary sense, or in reality) exist in the ordinary sense in the way we usually perceive it when it has in fact in reality a nature which has gone beyond the past, the present and the future, not going when destroyed, not coming and not staying even for an instant ? (pause) it's as though or not only is it, or not only does the world not exist in the way that we think, it's impossible that it should exist in the way that we think because it has a nature which is quite other from that which we attribute to it. In other words he is saying as he makes clear in the next verse that or this world in a deeper sense is ultimately real uhm ? The world as we perceive it is not ultimately real, the world as we think it is is not ultimately real, that is our big mistake, but the world as it were in itself,

189

Page 15.

S: That is ultimately real. Well therefore he says in the next verse no difference between the world in reality and nirvana. I mean the distinction is due simply to our dualistic way of thinking

V: We project onto the world our categories of thought.

S: The world.

Yes Yes to get beyond our categories

S: Beyond our categories

V: Of time space

S: Right including the categories of world and beyond the world, samsara and nirvana.
Well let's read 64 then.

V: Because in reality there is

No coming, going or staying, What ultimate difference is there Then between the world and nirvana ?

S: Uhm so Nagarjuna is getting very deep into Madhyamika teaching.

He is not of course putting forward a proposition in a purely sort of conceptual way:

nirvana and samsara are the same or anything like that. He is simply trying to rid people of the dualistic way of thinking. After all as he reminded the Hinayanists earlier on, he is a Buddhist he is in search of enlightenment, he is concerned with enlightenment, relying on enlightenment, so why is he saying all this then ? Why is he refuting all these false views ? Because they obstruct the way to enlightenment, his intention is practical. So he is not

190

Page 16.

concerned to assert a philosophy, he is not teaching monism, he is just trying to get rid of people's dualistic way of thinking, and one of the dualistic ways of thinking is thinking in terms of samsara and nirvana as quite separate or eternally separate realities. You have to think

like that at the beginning of your career, you can't help thinking like that. Paradoxically you have not to think like that at the same time. Q
 ~~~~~ of in the beginning, you cannot see if you think of dualistic wall ~~~~~ having Wy- ideas and a state of not having dualistic ideas, you are still thinking dualistically, you are thinking in terms of getting rid of ~~~~~ thinking dualistically and thinking not dualistically, but that itself is thinking dualistically, but you cannot do anything else. It's the paradox of the goose in the bottle. You must get it out without breaking the bottle or injuring the bird, even though the bird is too big to get out of the bottle. So it is like that, you've got to overcome dualism with the help of dualism as the techniques were to say later on get rid of dirt with the help of dirt. I mean they point out that the Indian dhantry member) the India washer --K man ( or dobi ) sometimes washes clothes with mud. Have you ever seen anybody doing that? if you get mud from the river it's like a sort of soap. You can get rid of dirt with the help of mud and then you just wash the mud out of the clothes in the river in the water and the clothes are clean, you get rid of dirt with the help of dirt, you get rid of concepts with the help of concepts, you get rid of dualism with the help of dualism

V: A mud-pie, a ( ) pie

S: pardon.

V: a mud-pie too

P~e~ ~~ i~i

V: There's also tha~ good image of us ~ng the wind against yo~ to

go against the wind. The ~ind is blowing in the op~osite direction in wh-ch you want to go but by baine able to tack you can go in the opposite directi~n, and usin~- the wind. That's all you can ~o... against it. (pause)

S: All right 55.

V: If there is no staying, there can be a

No production and no cessati~n.

Then how could productin, staying and

Cessation ultimat~ly exist ?

S: Th y are relative terms so how can they have any absolute existence,

how can there be any absolute production ? Arid so on, they never exist by themselves, they orL~y exist in relati~n to the'r opposites, they are relative t~rms. So none of them can exist ultimately

V: Does th% misunder~andng come through ~i~ and lthat'



S: Yes, um. We come on now in the next to verse 5 to something called momentariness. This seems to be a criticism or an implied criticism of the

F~ge 18.

S: Uhrrng yes. We come ~n now in the next verse 5 to som~thing called momentariness. This seems to be a criticism or an implied criticism of the ( ? ? ) school of thought, they believed in the momentariness of of everything. Th~y believed that nothing lasted you know for more

than a split second, and that what we thought of as things were just dharmas popping up for a split second and immediately afterwards di disappearing. There was a series of dharmas and they were very similar so it looked like you know a single thing was there, just as in the

case of a film when you get a succession of intabtaneous frames creating the illusion of continuity, but Nagarjuna's got a criticism of that. I think we won't pay too much attention to it becaus~ it is getting a bit remo\$ from man's senses. Maybe someone could read through from 67 straight through to 70 - those four verses, they all deal with momentariness, yes 66 - 70.

V: How are things non-momentary

if they are always changing ?

if they do not change, then how

in fact can they be al~red ?

Do they become momentary through

partial or complete disintegration ?

B~cause an inequality is not apprehended,

This momentariness cannot be admitted.

When a thing ceases to exist through momentariness,

how can anything be old ?

When a thing is non-momentary due to constancy

How can anything be old ?

Page 19.

Since a moment ends it must have A beginning and a middle, This triple nature of a moment means

That the world never abides for an instant.

Also the beginning, middle and end

Ar~ to be analysed like a moment ;

Therefore, beginning, middle and end

Ar not (produced) from self or other.

S: in other words Nagarjuna is saying the whole idea of momentariness of the moment is self-contradictory. in other words the

( Sarva 77 ) seem ~o say the momentariness of phenomena is something absolute, but Nagarjuna is not agreeing with that.

V: I don't really understand his objection to the idea of a moment.

S: Well you can approach it from this particular, from verse 69, 'Since a moment ends it must have A beginning and a middle' yes ?

So what is that to say, er, the moment is not irreducible, the moment is not ultimate, every moment consists of moment"", every~ne of those again consists of moments, an infinite regression, so how can you take the moment as real, as absolute~ At the s~me time if the moment is absolutely infinitesimal you know ~y number of moments will not add up to anything at all, this is wh~t he's saying.

'This triple nature of a mo~ent means that the world never abides for an instant.', that there is no world atix~ all that nothing would be seen if even the moment was infinitely dividible which logic would seem to require it to be, but if it has' an end, then it must have a beginning if it has a beginning well it has a m&ddle U well, so then you'~

Page 20.

got three moments. i'h&n you can repeat the process with each of

those three. So if you continue that to infinity you get nothing at all, so the world does not exist at all, but you do perceive the w world

V: it sounds like nihilism.

S: Yes. Then he goes on in 71 to do this with regard to part"". Er, Just read 71

V: Due to having many parts 'one' does not exist,

There is not anything which is without parts,

Further without ~~~~~ 'many' does not exist And without existence there is no non-existence.

S: Well this is perhaps a reference to the Abhidharma, the Abhidharma

analysed things into dharmas but it regards those dharmas as ultimate. Nagarjuna is against that. Again he would point out in the same way well those ultimates can be subdivided into further ultimates,

so they are not ultimate. 'Due to having many parts ~on~~ d% does not exist, there is not anything which is without parts, Further

without ~o~~~ 'many' does not exist.' so ~~~et and 'many', the 'part'

and the 'whole' these are our ~ow~co-rel~tive terms, you can't regard the parts as real and the whole as unreal, or the whole as real and the parts as real, so this is in a way what the Abhidharma does, classing the parts as real and the whole, the whole of which, the whole that is made up of parts as unreal, but Nagarjuna points out that whole and parts are ~re~ati~ terms, one and many are relative terms

n

/9; Page 21.

you can't have the one without the other. So every part is itself a whole which can be analysed into parts, so you don't get at reality

that way by trying to re£-gard the unity as unreal and the parts as  
 unreal or the whole as unreal, the parts as real, you just have to r  
 repeat the process further down the scale as it were. What he  
 has done itt in respt'-ct to time with regard to momentarin~~ss, h.  
 now does with regard to space in connection with parts and the  
 whc~le, and througiout one is taking concepts as iltimate realities you kjIOW taking concepts  
 away ffrom their opposites in relation  
 to which ( ? ? ? ) exist, trying to invest them with a sort of ulti mate  
 reality, again this concerns discussion of thes- ancient schools of  
 Buddhist thought. ( pause )

V: If through destruction or an antido~

An ~xistent ce ses to exi~t,

how could there be destruc Lion or

An ~ntidote without an existent ?

S: H" 5 applying the sam eort of way h~re ( pause ) How could ther~ be a path to the  
 cessati n of suffering unless there was suffering to begin with? ( pause )in other words you  
 can't really have the antidote without the suffering. If ~ou think of Nirvana as the antidote to  
 Samsara you can't ever get to Nirvana because Nirvana can't exist apart from the Samsara,  
 yeah ? So you mustn' t thin k of Nirvana in that one-sided way as the antidote to Samsara,  
 because the whole idea of antidote is that it's ait antidote for you know suffering, for a  
 poison, so the

antidote as antidote e.xists only in relation to the poison. So path

in relati~n to, So path from suffering exists only in relation to suffering. Nirvana as escape  
 from suffering exists only in relation to suffering, so you n~ver escape from suff~ring,  
 because in order fer Nirvana to be there

S: suffering has to be there. In other words no dualistic conception of the spiritual goal. it's all right to think that way provisionally but not ultimately; he is concerned with ultimate truth. So this is why he says in verse 73, let's read that

V: ultimately the world cannot

Through nirvana disappear.

Asked whether it had an end The Conqueror was silent.

S: How can the world disappear through Nirvana because Nirvana has its meaning only in relation to, to the world ? 'Ask2d whether it had an end the Conqueror was silent.' Well it's inappropriate to say that it has an end or doesn't have an end, or both or neither. ( pause ) New the

( word unclear ) is not to think of Nirvana as the cessation of Samsara because these are co-relative terms where there will be Samsara there

there will be Nirvana, where there is Nirvana there will be Samsara. So

if you think of Nirvana simply as the cessation of Samsara, well when you realise Nirvana Samsara will still be there, because Nirvana has meaning

only in relation to Samsara. if you like it's like getting out of

prison but the prison is still there, the only difference is that you are not in it, but the prison is still there. Real freedom is where there is no prison at all, and where in a sense there is no freedom at all in the sense of freedom from prison ; and where there's no prison there is no such thing as freedom from prison , you know where there's no world there's no such thing as freedom from the world and that is the real freedom.

Freedom from the world is not real freedom. Now Nagarjuna here is getting a bit abstract here I think, anyway have a more or less come to the

end of that particular bit so let's go on, on to 74

Page 23.

V: Because h- did not teach this profound doctrine

To worldly beings who were not receptacles, The all-knowing one is therefore known As omniscient by the wise.

S: This ( word unclear ) back to the beginning when h- held the Buddha to be omniscient. 'Because h- did not teach this profound doctrine to worldly beings who were not receptacles, the all-knowing one is therefore:- known as omniscient by the wise' - uh ? The Buddha did not teach this to everybody, this is why he is called the all-knowing. He knows who to teach what. He knows who not to teach what .

And this is why he is called 'all-knowing' by the wise All right 75:

V: Thus the doctrine of definite goodness

Was taught by the perfect Buddhas,

The seers of reality, as profound, Unapprehensible and baseless.

S: So we've been concerned with definite goodness, in other words you know been concerned with Wisdom, been concerned with liberation, been concerned with sunya~, uhm ? 'Thus the doctrine of definite goodness was taught by the perfect Buddhas, the seers of reality, as profound, unapprehensible - unapprehensible in dualistic terms - I and baseless'. Without any support, not depending on anything else;

or as the note says 'not providing a basis for the conception of things inherently existing' ( long pause ) All right 76:

V: Frightened by this baseless doctrine,

Delighting in a base, not passing

V: Beyond existence and non-existence,

Unintelligent beings ruin themselves.

S: Um, so 'Frightened by this baseless doctrine' - baseless should perhaps be in single inverted commas - or frightened by this doctrine, which does not teach a base or, or does not teach anything to settle down in, anything to take as ultimately real, or any worldly thing to take as ultimately real. 'Delighting in a base, not passing beyond existence

and non-existence, unintelligent beings ruin themselves.' ( pause ) in effect Er, this 'delighting in a base' is what I referred to yesterday as

fixing the flow, stemming the flow, do you see what I mean ? When

you try to turn something which is impermanent into something which is permanent, when you sort of fix say a free and flowing situation, and make it, you know a permanent situation, so that you can settle down in it, this is taking something as a base, or making something into a base. So that is what we do all the time, or at least much of the time.. Can you think of any sort of examples, any sort of ways, particular ways in which we do this .?

V: If one comes back and ( a few words unclear ) another situation, you know your home or something ( few words unclear ) security.

S: Yes, security, yes. This is what it is, this is what the base is you know



V: It's also what we were talking about yesterday as ( words unclear )

S: Yes, yes, yes. Then they become part of your base

V: Because one wants to have some control over them

S: Yes indeed, yes,

V:

Page 25.

V: everything seems to be going on at such a rate, at such an uncontrolled rate.

S: But do you think that that is ever a positive thing ? The making of a base Or delighting in a base ? It is 'delighting' in base which is referred to.

V: Could meditation be this ?

S: in a sense it could be, but what sort of base. Perhaps there are bases and bases, because there is the closed base and the open-ended base. Do you see what I mean ? - -

V: The baseless base

S: The baseless, well, not quite, the base that leads on to another base which is even more refined, and which eventually leads on to baselessness.

I mean can you do without a base completely ? - right from the beginning ? It's as though you have to pass from a negative base to a positive base, and to a more positive one in the sense of a still more refined one, and

then, you know, there are other degrees of refinement to complete

baselessness. But it is 'depending in a base' that you know is referred to by, or spoken of by Nagarjuna, very sort of really hanging on to this principle of a base, and not even trying to get a better sort of base as it were

V: ( words unclear ) coming in terms of ( 2 words unclear ) it's not the ( word' sounds like 'lighting' ) and that.

Page 26.

S: Yes, um. ( pause )

V: I suppose you would delight in a base which you found satisfactory

( a lot of words unclear )

net S: And you'd be quite aware that that was something in which you were

to be permanently settled down. I mean for instance you might find

quite nice spiritual community, and you know you might settle down there,

but if you think thought ; well I'm just here for the time being, I'm

just going to enjoy these facilities so that I can grow, so that

I can develop, and then I shall be ready to pass on if needed be, or I'm

even ready to pass on right now if needs be, well that's all right, you are just making a  
provisional use of the base, it's a provisional base. But if you sort of get attached and you  
don't like to move and you get really settled in your ways, and expect other members of the  
community

to confirm you in your ways and you start resenting you; know any intruders and people  
who even slightly disturb your way of doing things,

and then you start thinking of being there indefinitely, of maybe

passing your whole life there and dying there eventually, then of course

you're really taking it as a base and delighting in it as a base, which isn't good. So not  
delighting in the base doesn't mean that you shouldn't

set up provisional bases and provisional structures which will help you on your way, or which  
will even enable you to rest for a little while before continuing the journey, even that would  
be permissible, but you know that

it is a rest, you know that there is a journey awaiting you the next morning as it were.

V: ( a lot of garbled words, something about flights of stairs I think )

S: Well when you go up the flight of steps, you do for an instance~ rest on

each step, and in a way~ that is a condition of ascending the flight of stairs. But I think we shouldn't as it were apply this too literally, not delighting in a base, otherwise you may not even spend a single day in the same place, even an hour, what would be the time it, five minutes, you'd have to be continually leaving the place, leaving the situation.

V: There is a question of attitude, of openness, one could try to develop that ( few words unclear ) changing that

V: ( words unclear, something about a butterfly mind )

S: Yes, there's the butterfly mind, that's the other extreme, ( pause ) I think sometimes just as the nihilist is mistaken for the spiritual person, the butterfly mind is mistaken for the unattached mind.

The butterfly it is true does not settle down anywhere, but it does not make any progress either; the rolling stone gathers no moss, you've got to be

a rolling stone that does gather some moss. You know if you can't be a rolling stone that gathers moss, better to be a stone that doesn't roll for a while and gather a bit of moss in that way, then roll on. So'

what is the difference? What makes the difference? How is it that some people just you know come along and settle in a negative sort of way?

V: ( few words unclear ) needs and ideas

S: There's no integration. It is only an integrated person who can decide not to settle down in a base. Uhm, so if you're merely being

sort of thrown hither and thither by your own whims and fancies, then that is quite a different thing. In a way you settle down repeatedly. Such a person settles down repeatedly, or is settled down and then

Page 2\$.

S: is unsettled and settled down again, and that isn't a very positive state. Right 77:

V: Afraid of the fearless abode,

Ruin~~d, they ruin ~thers.

O King, act in such a way That the ruined do not r,~in you.

S: Um, so, in this verse Na~arjuna rem..mbers apparently that he is addressing

the king. ( laughter ) and he uses the same sort of expression that he used before, the paradoxical expression : ~afri~~ of the fearless

, afraid of the state of fearlessness, 'ruined, they ruin ~t~~~~~

o King, act in such a way that the ruined do not ruin you.' It is almost as though Nagarjuna is warning the king against false presentations, false interpretations of the teaching, which must have been current in his time. 'O king, act in such a way that the ruined do not ruin you'. All right 7\$:

V: O King, lest you be ruined

I will explain through the scriptures

The mode of the supramundane,

The reality that relies not on dualism.

S: Uhm, this is where he suddenly realises that the king might not have understood what has been before, so he says, 'lest you be ruined I will explain through the scriptures the mode of the supramundane, the reality that lies not on dualism. I Apparently we are going to get a simpler

explanation of what Nagarjuna has been talking about, whether it actually will turn out to be simpler let's see. Right 79 now:

V: This profundity which liberates

Page 29.

And is beyond both sin and virtue

Has not been tasted by those who fear the baseless, The ethers, the Ferderes, and even by ourselves.

S: So what does this mean? 'This profundity', this profound absolute reality 'which liberates and is beyond both sin and virtue has not been tasted by those who fear the baseless', has not been tasted by those who delight in the base, who are attached to the base, 'has not been tasted by the ethers', 'the ethers' presumably means those who are outside the Dharma altogether, 'the Forders' are the leaders of various non-

Buddhist philosophical schools, 'and even by ourselves'. 'Even by ourselves' could be taken in a number of ways, it could be taken to refer to the Hinayanists, those who don't accept the Madhyamika viewpoint, it could be taken in a C... profounder sense, could be taken in the sense that it hasn't been tasted because tasting implies as it were dualism. One shouldn't take the tasting too literally. So in a sense, in that sense it hasn't been tasted even by ourselves, even by those who believe in it it hasn't been tasted, it hasn't really been tasted, because that implies a dualistic mode of thought uhh? It could be taken in that way too no doubt. ( pause ) O.K. let's go. reading on, \$0:

Woll we tend to get a bit susk~lc1ous, '2 tho a-r&:L~.ojrt o~c -.~r-  
c~-70-r.

LO -tic that v~n 't~ ~r'£~.' tic. £v.-. b4'T- -- -- L:-tj S~O. ~.- -- .-  
o-O~~o-nor,s L --

Ct'W'.t wn:-n th &~i~---.nts bec~~£-jo- t '., " Oljver, too a'bst~se, J~'u b~~~In t ~-  
.~~tst tj~~. dny d~ o~ tnink t"~a.t is ?

}~ theory is taht if soinaune ar.gues vory cl~v~rl and intricately and deter:ninedly then he is  
trying to conv~fl~ himself.

S: Uhm, yes, yes, quite, quite, it is alniost as though, taking that point of view that  
Nagarjuna hasn't himself c mpletely yet real~ied the truth of what he is talking about, and io  
going on and on refining and refining, almost trying to' o-onvince hThiself. That may b so,  
that nay n-;.t be co, it is difficult to ~r~,~w~ 2~t certt.ic-ty }~e s~e .i~d 'cilc~ r:~~~r'  
tI-wet, ouc4 convincing ---&i~i~r nn wi~n n' wasn't in a way so &-r~n;o,.flt~.t~~~o -no coy  
5¼' It nay w~~~l b. t~at that n d oL '-~ssI ~ a£;:~oaj-s to tn~ Tn£~Ian

otind, or . Anc' al-so that thoro w-or~ all these sort of otisund~~' ~~~stan~ing5 about

Page 30.

S: At the same time he does not exist apart ffem all these. Right, carry on \$1:

V: Just as the person is not an ultimate

But a composite of six constituents, So t 0 each of them in turn is a Composite and not an  
ultimate.

S: So the constituents, the six constituents, are not to be regarded as ultimate in the  
Abhidharma typo fashion, becau e each constituent is itself cemposite. All ri~ht on to \$2:



V: 'The aggregate. are n~t the self, they are not in it,

It is not in them, without them it is not,

it is not mi~d with the aggregates like fire and fuel, Therefore how can the self exist ?

S: in ether werds Nagarjuna is trying to show thta~ aid::i~in the ordinary sense is really quite illogical and inc~nsistent yeah ? ( long pause )

Right let's cntinue with these arguments. We may no-t find these arguments very co~vincing.

V: The three elemeits are not earth, they are not in it, IT is aot in them, without them it is n~t;

Sinc-' this applies to each, fhey lik~ the self are false.

S: What is Nagarjuna rtally trying to do here ? What is he really trying to get us to see ? By these, what might seem to us now , rather far- fetched arguments ?

Page ~. ~~

S: ( f~w w.rds unclear ) b ing r~fl~~d. - ( pause ) ( few words unclear ) Shantideva there is all s~rts f ingeniJus, logical reasons why we Sh'~uldn't get angry, but the longer he goes sn the r~~re angry we become ~ ( laughter ) Now most peoclo- I think, certainly in thlc c~untry,

will be quite, you know, satisfied with being told well anger is a neg~ tive thin~, hatred is a negative thing. You oniy mak yourself unhappy and t~comfortable, you cause trouble to ether peo'.ie, and it

clearly hinders the devf.lopment of a pesitive mental atitude, they w~~d

be qui te happy to leave it there rather than to allew themselves t be

convinced by these v~ry ingenious and highly logical an-d sohisticated arguments as to why you shouldn't got angry, you know, and why it's so ridicul~us for you to get angry. It's as though the Indian has alr:ost a misplaced trust in legicti reosoning and argumentation, as though he doesn't realise that people are not motivated in that sort of way, or at least not ev~rybody; perhaps some are, perhaps Nagarjuna was.

All right let's carry on now. I think we'd better read, I think we'd

better read it right through to the ~nd of the chapter, verse by vers~, taking ~'ne verse -cach in turn, and then discuss as a whole perhaps. He is talking in m~re or less' the same s~rt of way throughout.

V: By themselves earth, water, fi re and wind Do not inherently exist; ~dhen any three are absent, there cannot be one, when one is absent, so too ar the three.

V: Otherwise if each itself exists, Why without fuel is there n fire ? Likewise why is there no water, wind ur earth Withou motility, hardness or cohesien ?

V: If (it is answerdd that) fire is well known (riot to exist '~ithout fuel but the other three elements exist Independently), how could your three exist in themselves Without the others ? it is impossible for the three Not to accord with dependent-arising.

V: How can these existing by themselves Be mutually dep£ndent ? How can these which exist not by themselves Be mutually dependent ?

QO~

Page ~I&.

V: If as individuals they do not exist, But ~~'ie~~ there is one the other three are there, Then if unmixed, they are not in oje place, And if mixed, they c~as t~ be individuals.

V: The elements do not themselves exist individually, so how could there own individual characters do so? What do not themselves individually exist cannot predominate; Their characters are regarded as conventionalities.

V: This mode of refutation is also to be applied to colours, odours, tastes and objects of touch, Eye, consciousness and form, Ignorance, action and birth,

V: Agent, object, acting and number, Possession, cause, effect and time, Short and long ~~~ so forth, Name and name-bearer as well.

V: Earth, water, fire and wind, Tall and short, subtle and coarse Virtue and so forth are said by the subduer To cease in the consciousness (of reality)

V: The spheres of earth, water, fire and wind do not appear to that Undevisable consciousness, Complete lord over the limitless.

V: Here tall and short, subtle and coarse, Virtue and non-virtue And here names and forms All cease to be.

V: What was not known is known in consciousness as ( the reality of ) all that appeared before. Thereby these phenomena later cease to be in consciousness.

V: All these phenomena related to beings are seen as fuel for the fire of consciousness, They are consumed through being burned By the light of true discrimination.

V: The reality is later ascertained Of what was formerly imputed by ignorance; When a thing is not found, How can there be a non-thing?

V: Because the phenomena of forms are Only names, space too is only a name; Without the elements how could forms exist? Therefore even 'name-only' does not exist.

V: Feelings, discriminations, factors of composition And consciousness are to be considered ~~~~~ the elements and the self, thereby The Self constituents are selfless.

Page ~

S: Yes, well this is what Nagarjuna is trying to demonstrate that the six

constituents are selfless, that is to say: earth, water, fire, air,

eyes, and consciousness, which are regarded as making up the so-called

individual. He is trying to show in a way that the individual

cannot be a combination of these or a non-combination of these. So the whole idea of the self, of an individual, of being in the ultimate sense is ridiculous and nonsensical and

self-contradictory, so you

begin to doubt your own existence, this is what he is trying to get you

you to do in this sort of way ( some incident blows the microphone ) ( pause ) ArLd  
96: 'What was not known is known to

consciousness as (the reality of) all that appeared before. I hereby these phenomena later  
cease to be in consciousness.' it's again like the mirage and the water, or the water which  
was seen in the mirage., When you

get near to the water it is not that you see nothing at all, you see what was really there instead  
of the water. In other words you see the reality of the water. You don't see the water you  
see what was behind the water, and the appearance of the water ceases. So in the same way  
when you realise

enlightenment you cease to see the world in the way that you used to see the world, but you  
see the non-existence of the world but you see the reality of the world

V: A more apt analogy would be impressionist painting ( words unclear ) When you go  
near to it or the pointillist technique

S: It's a reverse illustration in a way

V: Yes

S: From a distance you don't see what it is really like, you don't see a

Page ~

picture, close up you do. Anyway what general impression do you get this morning from  
Nagarjuna's arguments ? What sort of impression or idea do they leave you with ?

V: They just seem to be sort of clarify'~g the verious points he makes

S: Yes, yes

V: Different angles.

S: Uhm. ( pause ) What do you think the main ideas, the ~-t~nes you would want to retain are ? Try to understand ?

V; Transcending dualsim.

S: Transcending dualsism, espaecially traisuending thu dualism of subjetct nd onject, of self and not-seif, I and you. In ether words

£'~agarjuna is trying to modify our experience of euro selves, do you see that ? He is trying to get us, to take ii ourselves not so seriwualy as we used to take ourselves, not t~ ta-c ourselves as a base, not to settle down in our present experi nce °f ours':£lves as something fixed and final aid ultimate.

Precious Garland.

FROL~ PG3

continuation of session 5 ( v. 52 - 100 ~

side A.

S: cont.: Sometimes we can approach this by just sort of, you know,

thinking back and realising how we've changed. So you know that

further change is possible. I as I am Row ain not something fixed and final. I'm not the finished product. I'm only a transitional stage. I'm still on the assembly line. The bits and pieces are still being put together, or taken apart. So Nagarjuna is as

it were trying to shake one's confidence in the reality of oneself as one now experiences oneself. in Zen terms he is trying to give rise

to the great doubt. What Whitman call' the 'terrible' doubt of appearances', he is trying to get back to that. ( pause )

V: You notice how much you change even when your environment changes, you know (few words unclear).

S: Yes, right.

V: I think one is very aware of that living in a modern city. If you're out one day, and yesterday there was a tree there, and today it's been felled down. ( laughter )

S: Well you have that experience even in the country. You go for a walk and you see all the corn that was standing there yesterday has all been harvested. It's now you know all lying, the straw is just lying in in bails, not the big untidy bails that you used to get but nice tidy bails neatly tied up, by hand by machine. ( pause )

Page 2.

S: I think it's call.d a combine harvester. ( laughter )

V: It's called a bailer.

S: A bailer. A combi~' harvester is something else is it ?

V: It's a v(~y good analogy tnat because li~, almost literally in the

morning y-'u can have food growing, and then a harvester c~-mes along and a bailer, and then s-.me~ne comes behind and s~ts fire to it and

burns it all, and then the thing comes behind that and harrows all the ground ready for the next ( w~rds uncle a" ) complete picture of change isn't iL ? ( pause ) All in on day perhaps. It seems to

me that peo;IL reatly know this in their hearts. Peop~e I'w met they know it but they're affaid of it, of change, of ev~rything changing. Everyone, theytry to rationaliseit away. Uhm but the fear is because they~r.~~ ro~ted in belief you can't change them or affect them by argument. Do you see what I mean ?

S: Yes.

V: You can't get anywhere by arguing because they won't be (w~rd unclear)

S: As with Nagarjuna's arguments, I mean you will only be convinced by them if you've got a terrific faith in reason~ and most people these days just don't have that sort of faith. I mean in ancient India they would have these great public debates between rival teachers. If you were defeated, if you were a teacher and engaged in one of these debates and were defeated by the other teacher you had to become his disciple along with all your disciples. It was taken as

seriously as that. But nowadays people might say, well, you know

Page 3.

S: why make that big change ~just because you've lost an argument. Just

because you lost an argument, it doesn't mean that your position wasn't the true one. The other's probably just better at arguing than you are. It doesn't mean to say that truth is on his side. That would be the modern attitude, perhaps in a sense more correct. I mean in the Middle Ages scholastic philosophers and theologians, they had great faith in reason. We don't have that sort of faith. We've

become rather mistrustful of reason. We've gone to the other extreme.

V: ( words unclear ) they still do that in the Tibetan tradition, particularly the Gelungpa school.

S: Yes the Gelungpas have this great faith in reason. And they do

follow this Madhyamaka tradition very strongly. The (Nalanda) Monks and the

Gelungpas(?) they do so to a much lesser degree. Milarepa goes almost entirely by inspiration and personal experience, whereas Trungpa tends to go much more by the Scriptures and reasoning,

no doubt you know confirmed by and in the light of his own experience, but his own experience is not to the forefront. Now if you were to try and give the average ( word unclear ) ten cast-iron reasons for giving up the worldly life and leading a spiritual life, he wouldn't be very impressed. It would strike him as rather naive probably. I mean the arguments might be excellent ones but they wouldn't move people. Because people are not moved by logic. Usually, though ancient Indians seem to have been rather different. The Greeks seemed to have believed in reason, you know in their



classical period, atleast for a while.

V: ( words unclear )

S: Uhm?

Page 4.

V: ( words unclear )

S: Yes, you have the, you get the impressi-n of them delighting in the use of reason, being quite fascinated by it, taking it quite seriously.

But sometimes even the reasons, the arguments of Socrates, seem to us not very convincing. In fact they seem to us rather weak sometimes,

even slightly illogical, or a bit sophistical. Even Nagarjuna

strikes one a bit like that sometimes. So it is important to keep

very close to experience and not get too carried away by the force of your own reasoning, or the plausibility of your own reasoning.

( pause ) Again in Nagarjuna says: 'The reality is later ascertained

of what was formerly imputed by ignorance; when a thing is not found, how can there be a non-thing? This again is to be understood in the

light of the analogy of the mirage. 'The reality was later ascertained of what was formerly imputed by ignorance. You later ascertain that what you imputed by ignorance, that is to say water, is in fact just say desert, uhm ? 'So when a thing is not found', when say water

is not found, 'how can there be a non-thing?', I mean nothing has been destroyed, nothing has been lost, the water just wasn't ever there, uhm ? So in nirvana as it were nothing is lost, it is not although the Samsara doesn't any longer exist, or you've lost something, you've found the reality of the samsara, you've not found the non-thing, you've found reality,

uhm ? ( pause So i mean this is in a way people 's usual way of thinking, tk~ when you  
ge% to nirvana there won't be this and there won't be that, there won't be wives and children,  
you know there won't be foOd, you know there won't be all sorts of pleasures and  
~cnjoymnts, there won't b. the world, but you will have the reality of all these things. Far f  
om being a state of deprivation, it is as it were a state of fuffilment. You could say that you  
k~ow, in the case of the mirage that y0b~ what you project you Yznw on to what

~Iq

Page 5.

S: is rea ly there, say you project water, so yot~ go you don't fi nd

water, you found a fountain of wine instead. You wouldn't complain

would you ? ( laughter ) You would ( word uncla~r ) there's

no water, you know you'd be so busy drinking the wine you w£uldn't notioe the absence of  
water. It's rathe-r like that. I mean you l~ow the the wine is water to continue the analogy  
i-n't it, the wine is liquid, but what a liquid. eh ? So what you took for water and went  
toeb.'ds warm~~' ~~I %i'.~~~'£ it ~a- wat~r, n£. y..c~ find that it's ~rine. So you~ve- given  
W; the water, but yc': Jcn 't thIn- o2 ~~~ 'bi~~' jtffi'~Q~' &'~ non-water. I m£--an what  
have I got . I've

x not got any water. NOg tL you~ve got wine It's rather liko-- that perhaps, a~  
least ina a manner of speaking. Just li~ all the people living at sUkhavati, you know other  
peopi e some of them atleast outside say, what have they got, they've got nothing, you kno-  
they've got no jobe, no families, they~re scruffy

they haven't even got any decent clothes to wear many of them, don't

have ( word unclear ) in their food, hat sort of life, n thing at all. -ihey must be thoroughly  
miserable. Then they see them, they are quite happy. So w{~at have they got ? They must  
be enj oying something that isn't readily acceptable to those outs~de,

V: Not wine (laughter)

S: Not wine, not very often. Right let's leave Nagarjuna there. We've finished a little

essence of the banana t'e'e by stripping off the successive layers of skin, you si~tly come ~o nothin0 at a~. ~o, ~~'p~ ~u.'~--t i'~' ~L'¼' W1~~rI twi' so called p~rson, the ego, ~.~n~ ~cr~~ ---l~~ con~c: c~ n~cs'; c'~~th w~'.ter, firC, air, Sp&:C'-, n~ cc so~ousness. You takc~ those apart you don't find anything left. Just as in the si: elec:~f~rt pr'ctic~,

thj- ~ix cle~ent meditation, yoI) ~ r'~~~~'uber ?  
~ee

Thoug~i as one ~L~ill

later on -ven that point of v~w if tsk~~n too lit-c--rally has its

limitations. All right, go on to 1o2:

V: Therefore the Conquerors said,

'All phenomena are selfless.'

S: Yes, all phc-nomena, all dharmas, all mundane things, all conditi~.ned things are selfless in the sense of being without a separate unchanging self or ego apart from the six constituents.

02/6

Page 2.

V: Since this is so, you must accept

All ~ix constItuents as selfless.

S: So ~er~~5 not much point in regarding the self as selfless, because it consists of six constitu~nts, and then regarding the six constituents

themselves as selves, they too ar. s.~lfless. But then the Buddha, then Nagarjb~na go'-'£s on to say:

V: Thus neither self nor non-self

Are understood as real,

Therefore the Great Subduer rejected

The views of Self and non-self.

S: There's not much point in getting rid of the view of self by means of the view of non-self, and then as it were turning the view of non-self

into a still more subtle view of self. So in that sense the Buddha

rejects both the view of self and the view of not-self, uhm ?

It's

not to say that the view of self is untrue and the view of non-self

is true in the ultimate sense. (pause) All right go on to 104:

V: Sights, sound and so forth were said by the Subduer

Neither to be true nor false ;

If from one position its opposite arises, Both in fact do not exist.

S: Uhm, 'Sights and sounds and so forth', and so forth meaning that which

can be smelled, tasted, touched, thought, 'were said by the Subduer, the (Jina), the Conqueror, the Buddha, to be neither true nor false, either absolutely nonexistent nor existent as absolutely real. The Nagarjuna says: 'If from one position its opposite arises, both in fact do not exist'. Now what does that mean ?

Page 3.

S: If a position arises from its opposite it means that the two, the two positions of the two opposites are interdependent. You cannot have one without the other. So they do not either of them exist absolutely, because to exist absolutely means to exist independently. In other words that which arises in dependence upon causes and conditions

doesn't have an absolute existence. If you cannot think of something without at the same

time thinking of its opposite. If the existence of a certain thing involves necessarily the existence of its opposite then that thing cannot be said to be absolutely existent or absolutely real. (long pause) All right 105:

V: Thus ultimately this world

Is beyond truth and falsehood,

Therefore he does not assert

That it really is or is not.

S: Like a mirage, it's there in a sense, you can see it but it has no ultimate existence, it isn't ultimately real. All right 106:

V: (Knowing that) these in all ways do not exist,

How could the All-Knower say whether have limits or no limits, or have both or neither?

S: This is a reference to the so-called inexpressibles, mentioned by the Buddha. & among them the Buddha did not state that the world

was either, or the universe we might say, was either limited in space or not limited in space. Are you familiar with this? In the same way he didn't say that the jiva, the life-principle was identical

Para 4.

S: with the physical body or was not identical, or that the Tathagata

existed after death or not, or both or neither. So in the same way the Buddha does not state in the early texts either that the universe is finite or that the universe is infinite. & this has

been discussed in modern physics hasn't it ? Wh~thre the unlv~rse is finite or infinite. Does anyone kno anyth~ng abou~' this ? Have any informati n about it ? W~at is che pr~sent state of scientific thought

on those topic ?

V: Two basic, basic theories. One that the universe is finite (word unclear) in the sense that it doesn't. It looks like a sphere with a finite radius. The other is that matter, existence if you like is continually expanding ad infinitum. But nobody agrees as to which is the most true. So what would be the Buddhist point of view. The Buddhist point of view would be that as indicated here that if something cannot be said to be either you know absolutely exist~nt iix nor non-existent. If it has an existence which is only relative like that of a mirage, depending on causes and conditions you cannot really say of it, it is inappropriate to say of it that it is either finite or infinite, the question;-. - doesn't arise. This would be the Buddhist view, or both or neither. In other words you cannot even say of it that it is both finite and infinite or even that it is neither finite

nor infinite. Those terms simply don't apply to something which doesn't have any real outward existence of its own. So Buddhism would regard it as quite mistaken to try to ascertain as it were philosophically or metaphysically whether the world is finite or infinite, there is no question of it being either. You might say that for certain practical purposes it is useful to assume that the world, that the universe is finite, for certain other practical purposes it may be useful to assume that the world is infinite, but that does not mean that the universe

is

Page 5.

S: as such as an existent reality is either

V: Could you say in fact that these terms finite and infinite let us say have meaning within a certain context within a certain consciousness.

S: Yes, well the~rc' is t~s who e question of the nature of spave. I mean

I think it is genorally h Id byphiloso:fhers, by idealist philosoph~rs

that space is not a thing, is not a sort of er empty box in which things

are deposited. I meen space is one of the forms under whihh we see thingaS. Spac- i~ not something which we see but is part of the oIDperat~

n of perception itself. like time. So there is no question of space being finit~ or infinite, no ,uestion of thr' universe being finite or infinite. When'knowing that thes in a~l ways do not exist, how coul-d the All-Knower say they havo lim ts or no limits, o-- have both or neither ?'So in as much as the worl is neither truc'- nor false, neither absolutely real, nor compl~tuly non-existent, how could the Buddha say that such a world had - ither l~jits or no limits, was

either finite or infinit~, if you like or both or neither. Right go on to 107:

V: 'Innumc--rf-'ble 3uddhas hav come, '-ill come and are

Hero- at present; there are tens of millions of sentient Beings, but the Buddhas will abi3e

In thu past, the present and the future;

S: Carry oh -c-ause it's connected:

V: 'The extinguishing of the world in the thr~e Times does not cause it to increase,

Then why was the All-Inower silent

About the limits of the world ?'

Page 6.

S: Uhm. i'his seems to be a sort of imaginary questi n of objection. It

isn't all that clear. 'There is a note which says: 'an objector wonders : ~Innum.o'rabls



Buddhas are effectively the liberators of even mere sentient beings. There are no new sentient beings, thus in time

all would be liberated. Since of course the extinguishing or

liberating of sentient beings does not increase the number of

beings, the world must eventually have an end, thus why did the Buddha remain silent about an end to the world? "Do you see the point of that? It's not unconnected with the modern

question about where do all the extra people come from when there's a population explosion. If they've all got souls where do the souls

come from? And if there is such a thing as rebirth where were they

all before they were reborn on this planet? You know, were they on some other planet or did they really make themselves some other way? It's not unlike that, that sort of question. Infinite Buddhas have come, will come and are here at present; There are tens of millions

of sentient beings, but the Buddha will abide in the past, the present and the future; The extinguishing of the world in the three times does

not cause it to increase, Then why was the ALL-Knowing silent about the limits of the world? It's as though the world does in fact have a limit. And the world is made up of beings. Those beings one day are all of them about going to attain nirvana, due to the efforts of all these Buddhas, so no beings no worlds, or no beings no world. So it seems that the world would have an end, therefore has a limit as

it were. But it seems to be a limit in time rather than a limit in physical space. So what is the answer to that? Let's see what Nagarjuna says:

V: That which is secret for a common

Being is the profound doctrine,

The illusory nature of the world,

[221]

V: The ambrosia of the Buddha's teaching.

S: (pause) Yes, let's go on to the end of that particular line of thought:

V: Just as the production and the disintegration xx Of an illusory elephant are seen,  
But the production and disintegration Do not really exist,

S: Yes, straight on:

V: So the production and disintegration Of the illusory world are seen, But the  
production and disintegration Ultimately do not exist.

S: Yes, carry straight on, let's finish about the elephant:

V: Just as an illusory elephant,  
But a bewildering of consciousness,  
Comes not from anywhere, Goes not, nor really stays,

V: So this world of illusion,  
A bewildering of consciousness Comes not from anywhere, Goes not, nor really stays.

S: Uhm so you see Nagarjuna's line of thought, line. of argument. You might find it a bit sort of abstruse. This illusory elephant appears again and again in Buddhist philosophical literature. The idea is that

222

Page 8.

S: a magician conjures up an elephant. The elephant isn't really there, but you see the elephant, just like you see a mirage, er ? So supposing the magician conjures up the illusory elephant, and then he destroys it. Has an elephant really been killed ? No. Have even the illusory elephant, or can it be said that even the illusory elephant has

been killed ? No, it can't be killed because it didn't exist in the first place. So the world is like that, it can't really cease or come to an end, because it didn't exist in the first place, it didn't have a real beginning. What didn't have a real beginning can't have a real end. The world never really came into existence so it cannot really go out of existence. So it's just the same as with regard to the finiteness or infiniteness of the universe. If it doesn't exist in reality, how can you speak in terms of it being either finite or infinite ? Uhm ? If it doesn't exist in reality, if it never in reality came into existence, how can you speak of it as in reality going out of existence ? (pause) So the world in reality neither comes into existence, nor passes out of existence, doesn't come from anywhere, doesn't go to anywhere, doesn't even stay. So 114, then what :

V: Thus it has a nature beyond time;

Other than as a convention

What world is there in fact

Which would be 'is' or 'is not' ?

S: 'Thus it has a nature beyond time;' The true nature of the world is beyond time, the ultimate nature of the world is beyond time. 'Other than as a convention', just as a manner of speaking, just as a way of thinking, 'what world is there in fact which would be 'is' or 'is not'?'

Nagarjuna is as it were saying, well there is no such world about which you can really say that it exists or that it does not exist, or both

Page 9.

S: or neither. So then he goes on to say:

V;li5 ?

S: Yes.

V: This was why the Buddha

At all times kept silent

About the fourfold format: with or Without a limit, both or neither.

~: I mean this is why the Buddha kept quiet, what could he say ? 'About the fourfold format' this presumably the (c~atara koti) the four points, the four alternatives, that it has a limit, doesn't have ~ limit both has and has not, and neither has nor has not. So silence is

the only appropriate attitude as it were.

You can't say that the world

has a limit, you can't say that it doesn't have a limit, you can't say that it doesn't have a limit, or both or neither, what can you say?

Nothing. So you keep silent.

V: Do you really think it is appropriate in the context of the West ? When people are very

very keen to know all about these things. Do you think silence is the best way, the best course of action ?

S: Maybe. It depends on the sort of problem you are dealing with.

V: I was just thinking that a lot of people might misinterpret

S: Well if you think you can really explain it to them, well fine. But that isn't so easy is it ?

Page 10.

V: A lot of people wanted to know in the Buddha's time.

S: Uhm

V: ( words unclear ) a lot better ( words unclear ) than we've got.

S: Well, you keep silent of course after rejecting the four possibilities. you could say that. In fact all the Buddha taught the four illimitable the the fourteen inexpressibles. Or as I say in this case if you say well the world isn't existent, the world is not finite, you explain that. So the person say well according to Buddhism is the world infinite ? You say no, it isn't infinite either according to Buddhism, you make that clear. Well they say in that case it must be some combination of finite and infinite, so you say no it isn't that either, you make

that quite clear. Then they say well there's only one alternative, one more possibility, it is neither finite nor infinite, no it isn't even that. So then they say -well what is it then ? When you keep silent. ( laughter ) You exhaust

the possibilities first.

V: Such people wanting a base again ?

SA: Wanting a base, yes. It's very good in a way when people are brought up against the limitations of the thinking mind, you know the limitations of the ordinary consciousness. One can't do that oneself prematurely. There no doubt has to be a lot of thinking, a lot of discussion, a lot of argument first, in most cases. And you have to really be able to show that the world cannot be regarded as finite, cannot be regarded as infinite, or both, or neither. So what then can it be regarded as ? Well it cannot be regarded in that sort of way at

Page 11.

S: all. Maybe you have to make that clear by means of words as best you

can. That the world in its ultimate nature in its essence is

beyond thought, beyond categorisation, beyond duality. It cannot

be thought, it can as it were only be experienced directly. (~~~~~i~~~~~)

Right 116:

V: When the body, which is unclean,

Coarse, an object of the senses, Does not stay in the mind (as unclean), Although it is adjacent in time in view,

S: Yes, carry on. It's all one:

V:       then how could this doctrine

which is most subtle, profound, Baseless and not manifest, Appear with ease to the mind ?

S:       Uhm, what does that mean ? You don't even see the true nature of your own body, so how can you be so foolish to believe that the natural nature of the mind is so easy to

reach? It is not, is it? The body, which is so gross, is not perceived by the mind as unclean, you know, is not perceived by the mind as it really is even though you see it all the time, even though it is all the time in view, how do you expect that to achieve ease to the mind? I mean the mind cannot even understand a simple thing like the, the gross, the unclean, impure, or unbeautiful, or unlovely nature of the physical

Page 12. S:       body? how can it be expected to understand the true nature of the world ?

(pause) We'll come onto this question of the uncleanness of the body shortly, we'll deal with it then. Here it just appears as an illustration. Do you see what he's getting at? You don't even understand, you don't even see the true nature of your own body, which is before you all the time, so is it surprising that you fail to see the true nature of the world ? as taught by the Buddha ? Something which is so subtle, so profound ?

V:       Is it this, that you must start at home ?

S:       Pardon ?

V: Is that the idea that you must

3: In a way yes. All right on Lo 118:

V: Realising that this doctrine is too

profound and hard to understand,

The Buddha, the Subduer,

Turned away from teaching it.

S: This is a reference to the Buddha's original reluctance to make the Dharma known immediately after his enlightenment. I think you are all familiar with that episode? When Brahma Sahampatti appeared and requested him to teach. So 'realising that this doctrine is too profound and hard to understand, the Buddha, the Subduer, turned away from teaching it. You know when the Buddha was minded not to teach, not to make known the Dharma, not to make known the truth that he had discovered, he wasn't thinking of matters of morality and

Page 13

S: and discipline, or even meditation, he was thinking about things of this sort, 'how will people possibly be able to understand such things such teachings! Such teachings that are completely against the grain of their whole consciousness or being, their whole way of thinking. (pause) Right, then what does he say?

V: This doctrine wrongly understood

ruins the unwise, because

They sink into the filth of nihilistic views.



S: Uhm. 'This doctrine' tha~ is ~o sayNagarjuna's doctrine, Madjhyamika doctrine, aw~avada, the doctrine of nondualism, of getting beyond Ijsl and 'is not1,'wrongly understood' that is to say, understood as

nihilisa 'ruins the unwise, because they sink into the filth of nihilistic

views.' It is very easy to misunderstand the teaching, especially this teaching. (pause) i~hough in another work of Nagarjuna's maybe it's a sutra which Nagarjuna quotes, he says words to the ffect that er you take medicine in order to recow~r from an illness but if the medicine itself makes you ill then what will cure you ? So in the sam- way Nagarjuna says, or the sutra which a'~e ~uptes says the teaching of sunyavada is meant to cure your egotism, but if the teaching of sunyavada is wrongly understood well what remedy is there for that ? All right 120:

V: Wurther, the stupid who fancy

Themselves wise, having a nature

Ruined by r-jecting (emptiness) fall headfirst

To a fearful hell from their wrong undrestanding.

Page 14.

S: ~o thfr is as it were two xtremes, to dangers, th t you misunderstand the doctrine of emptiness, tha~ you regard it as a te~ching of nihilism and also you think you've understood what sunyata is a 1 abott but you reject it. (pause) Well re0-d th c-next two verses, they go together:

V: Just as one comes to ruin

°£hrough wrong eating and obtains b~ong life, freedom from disease, Strength and pleasure through right eating.

So one comes to ruin Through~~ wrong understanding ~ut gains bliss and compl~te enlightenm--nt Through right understanding.

S:     So there's a very simple comparison, with eating. Right eating leads to health, wrong eating leads to disease. But both right eating and wrong eating are eating. You are taking in nourishment, but in the first case your system is healthy, it converts the food into nourishment, in the second the system is unhealthy and converts the food into disease. So just the same with ~hc- teaching, You can take the teaching in a right way, a way that helps you, or that nourishes you spiritually, or you can take it in a wrong way, that doesn't help you and that is a cause of misunderstanding, even suffering. Do you see any instances of this ? In ~haL way do people do this, or in what way does one even do it oneself sometimes ? Taking the teaching in the wrong way ? Perhaps you would extend the analogy with food, supposing you gobble down a lot of food, far more than you need, what happens ?

V:     Indigestion.

Page 15.

S:     So suppose you gobble :~own a lot of teaching, you had all sorts of books before you~~are ready for them, what happens ?

V:     Mental indigestion.

S:     Yes, right

V: (words unclear)

S: Yes. Or suppose --i take different kinds of food which are incompatible but you eat them at the same time. So in the same way you take different presentations of the doctrine, which even though they are ultimately in agreement, are so different at least in presentation, you can't as it were assimilate them together, then what

has; pens ? Well there 's some kind of internal disturbance.

V: °( words unclear )

S: Yes, supposing you were going too much in for say Zen and Shin at the same time, and trying to do everything by your own effort, but at the same time depend on the Greater Amitatha. Well how would you end up ? Or, well sometimes of course one actually does misunderstand. I mean there's this instance of awareness and mindfulness

Precious Garland

From PG 3

continuation of session 6 (vv 101-12~)

side 2.

S: ( word unclear ) how misunderstood the Buddhist teaching about mindfulness or awareness, they think it means standing back from yourself, putting yourself off from your experience, observing it and watching it as it were coldly and scientifically from the outside. And this results in what I call alienated awareness. So the Buddha's teaching about mindfulness, about awareness, has been misunderstood, wrongly taken, and thereby becomes a source of --at least discomfort if not suffering, and one doesn't make any progress. All right 123:

V: ~before having forsaken all nihilistic

Views and rejections concerning emptiness, Strive your best to understand correctly For the sake of achieving all your aims.

S: Yes, 'strive your best to understand correctly for the sake of achieving all your aims'.  
literally, it's for our own benefit to understand correctly. It is only if you understand  
correctly that you will be able to achieve all your aims, all your spiritual aims. So 'strive your  
best to understand correctly'. Sometimes this is very much lacking in people. There is no  
real effort to understand correctly, to

understand clearly. People are often satisfied with a vague, loose slipshod understanding.  
They very often don't try really to understand

really to get an accurate knowledge of the teaching. They just get a very vague general  
impression. But that isn't really enough. (pause) All right 124:

Page 2.

~: If this doctrine is not truly understood,

The conception of an 'I' prevails, Hence come virtuous and non-virtuous actions Which give  
rise to good and bad rebirth.

S: This doctrine, this doctrine of sunyata, the doctrine of the voidness,

the doctrine of non-duality is not truly understood, then the alternative is 'the conception of an  
'I' prevails'. In other words the conception of an ego prevails. There is no alternative, there is  
no Middle Way

as it were. If sunyata is not truly understood then the result is an egoistic life, an assertion of  
the ego.

V: That really amounts as much as ~o say that without the doctrine of sunyata there must be a conception of ?II.

S: Yes, yes.

y

SS Don't take the word doctrine too literally, it doesn't mean simpl~,  
purely a conceptual understanding of, conceptual formulation, yeah?

V: It's saying really that the only thing that can get rid of the constant feeling, the sense of ego is that voidness.

S: Yes, yes, or the experience of that voidness, that kind of experience, or that kind of life. So 'If this doctrine is not truly understood the conception of an 'I' prevails, hence come virtuous and non-virtuous actions which give rise to good and bad rebirths.' Hence comes the constant repetition of the 5,000 year old pattern.

V: ~o at the beginning he is saying that the very short experience is spasmodic.

S: Yes. Insight experience.

V: I'd just like to clarify that point. You know it's rather strange to me that someone could live a very, practise very hard in altruism, maybe practising the Bodhisattva path, and know nothing at all about the teaching of sunyata, and would this not overcome his sense of ego?

S

S: But what do you mean by knowing? It isn't just a question of a conceptual knowing. What does one mean by knowing? It's like the old

question of, well can't you be a Buddhist without knowing anything,

without knowing everything about Buddhism, or can't you be a Buddhist even though you haven't heard about Buddhism? It depends what you

mean by being a Buddhist, what you mean by Buddhism. I mean you can hear all about the doctrine of sunyata without giving up ego, and you can certainly give up ego without being acquainted with all the niceties of Madhyamika philosophy, and Nagarjuna's presentation of that. I mean probably as a matter of actual fact you would be unlikely to get very deeply into this non-go state without some encouragement from others who had at least some experience of that state themselves, and that points in the direction of a tradition where this sort of teaching and this sort of experience is familiar and accepted, which it isn't in all traditions. So I mean you are more likely to be in contact with Buddhist teachings than not. (pause)

Right then 125:

V: So long then as the doctrine that destroys

the misconception of an self is not known,

Take care always to practise

Giving, ethics and patience.

Page 4.

S: Those are the first three of the paramitas, at least practise those. prepare the way, pave the way for your eventual reception, realization, of the doctrine of sunyata. And then

a word of exhortation of encouragement even to the king, 126:

V: A king who performs actions

With their prior, intermediary

And final practices

Is not harmed here or in the future,

S: It is not difficult to see what are the prior, intermediary and final practices. But presumably it means the actions in their completeness.

V: Meaning the three: giving, ethics and patience?

S: Yes, presumably. Right, on to 127.

V: 'Through the practices come fortune and happiness,

There is no fear now or at the point of death, In the next life flourishes happiness, Therefore always observe the practices.

S: Nagarjuna is pointing out to the king the advantages of practising dana sila and shanti, from the worldly point of view. 'Through these practices come fame and happiness, there is no fear now or at the point of death, In the next life flourish happiness,' one is very very

happy, 'there always observe the practices. You notice we are back on high status, back with high status because this is an interwoven explanation of definite goodness and high status. So we've started with definite goodness now we come to high status:

Page 5.

V: The practices are the best policy,

It is through them that the world is pleased;

Neither here nor in the future is one cheated by a world that has been pleased.

S: So Nagarjuna is telling the king that practices are the best policy. After all he is a king. So perhaps he is looking for a policy, wondering what is the best policy for him as a king. So Nagarjuna is saying that the practices: dana, sila, arid shanti, these are the best policy. 'It is through them that the world is pleased;' that is to say if you are generous, if you encourage the practice of morality, if you yourself are patient and encourage others to be patient, then the world will be pleased. Do you think this is true, or an oversimplification, or a bit naive, or only perhaps valid within the context of the Indian monarchy? (pause) Or is there a general principle underlying this? Trevor Ling goes into this a bit, er, in his book: the Buddha, and he says that in ancient India there was a great difference between the Buddhist and the Brahminical approaches to statecraft, to politics generally. The Brahminical approach was infinitely one of power politics, the end justifying the means. It was in a sense almost totalitarian. But the Buddhist approach was very much that the function of the king was to establish righteousness, to encourage people in the practice of righteousness, and to try to secure the existence of a happy, healthy and moral state, a truly human social life, a truly human community existence, so that people might come all the more easily to the practice of the Dharma in the higher sense. So the ancient Indian Buddhists held very strongly, the Buddha himself held very strongly to the principle that the policy of the king should be basically a moral policy, not one founded merely upon expediency, or upon power. I mean that is easy enough to say, but how to work it out in practice, especially under the

Page 6.

S: highly complex conditions at the time of the Buddha's life in the 5th century B.C. And

the Buddhist ideal was that the king should be a moral person, a person who is wholehearted in his devotion to the Dharma, and who is not interested in power or wealth.

or, or the ideal was to make possible the moral life of the

individual. In fact, I am so far from the truth in the Greek tradition

said, especially Aristotle. He is particularly good on the state as the help of the individual citizen to



lead an ethical life. So when you've

got a king ruling, and when that king is advised by someone like Nagarjuna, it looks quite easy, but perhaps even in that case it wasn't as easy as it might sound. ' Neither here nor in the future is one cheated by the world that has been pleased. That seems to me to be overoptimistic. It is very difficult to please the world, it is very difficult for the king to please all his people. The Buddhist king certainly didn't succeed in pleasing all his people. I mean some of his people he offended most deeply, who were they ?

V: ( words unclear )

S: Well the Brahmins, the Brahmins because they were not given pride of place, so their advice was not listened to. Because their sacrifices were discouraged. So the king was very unpopular with them, the king certainly did not please them, Asoka certainly didn't please the Brahmins. So they worked against the Buddhist dynasties, and against Buddhism itself. (pause) But nevertheless the general principle does hold good, that you know through the machinery of politics one should try to implement basic ethical principles, one should try to make possible an ethical life for the individual. The whole of social life of economic life should be so organised as to help the individual in the process of his individual development, not to stand in the way of that, not to block that, or hinder that. (pause) Right 129:

Page 7.

V: The world is displeased By the policies of non-practice;

Un-til the displeasure of the world

One is not pleased here or in the future.

S: Uhm, again this seems over-optimistic, that the world is displeased by policies of non-practice. If your policy is based not on the

practice of, or if your policy rather is not based on the practice

of dana sila and ahimsa then the world will not be pleased. As I said that seems to be rather overoptimistic again. And 'due to the

dis~courage of the world one is not please-1~ here or in the future.'

It is very difficult to please all the people all the time, difficult enough to please even some of the people some of the time. What government is ever really popular? Would even an ideal government be really popular? Would everybody be pleased with it? Could you have a government or an administration, or a policy that pleased everybody? Or even with a majority, what would be very difficult

V: In that it has to govern

S: Ukim?

V: In that it had to govern.

S: Even in that it had to govern, yes.

V: It seems that Nagarjuna is very much saying what (word unclear) of success) (word unclear) for the king (words unclear)

3: Some of the ancient Indian Buddhist kings did very well like Asoka.

Page ~.

S: BUT conditions were very different then.

V: Were tWfr kingdoms smaller ?

S: No, Asoka's kingdom was very vart, it was~ well it didn't include the ext~me Southern tip of the you know Indian peninsula, but it went w~y up into whaL is now Afghanistan, and included what is now Pakistan. But he seems to hav~ adminsitersed it most ca pably. (pause)

Some of the Chinse emperors were very good rulers, and did musch for the people. But the requirt-- ;nts of the people were also sim~'ler All they asked for was food and clothL~g and a crtain amount of leisure, not too much work. Well it's not so difficult to keep them happy.

(pause) All right onto 130:

V: How cou d those of bad undrestanding

)n a path to bad migrations, wretched,

Intent on deceiving ot~ers, having

Wrong aims, understand what is me~~nIngful ?

S: Right, go on to 131, that makes it a bit clearer:

V: How could one intent on deceiving

Othera be a man of policy ?

Through it he will be cheat:

In many thousands of births.

S: Uhm, b~th of these verses seem to refer to a man 0: policy, the re~ policy, the true policy. Again it seems to be advice giv~n to or encouragement of the king. Right on to 132:

Page 9.

V: On who seeks disfavour for an -nemy Shoui~~ neglect his faults ~nd observe his virtues,

That brings h;lp to oeself And disfavour to the foe.

S: Uhin this seems LO b rather worldly adtice in a way. 'One who seeks disfavour for an enemy', one who seeks to bring the enemy into disfevour 'should neglect his faults and obse~rve his virLues, that brings help to oneself and disfavour to the fo~~' Almost sor of cynical advice to the king.

V: How does that

S: Well it's as though you should appropriate the virtues of your -'enemy rob him of his

virtues, don't bother about his faults. 'Take on his virtues, take over his virtues. This will help you and eventually bring the person who's virtues you have stolen into disfavour. People will start thinking more highly of you than they do of him, not only because you have now got his 5 virtues but because you know you

have adopted the more noble and generous attitude ignoring his faults and cultivating his virtues. Of course they may not know the real

cunning reason for which you have done that. It's rather like what St. Paul says about forgiving your enemies because in that way you

will heap coals of fire on his head not as extreme as that maybe. This advice does seem to be to savour rather of worldliness.

V: (word- unclear)

~: Perhaps one should just say one should learn from one's enemies. If people, it's not necessary perhaps for people to think less of your enemy on

Page 10.

So that account. You know perhaps it's very much advice given within the context of you know the royal responsibilities. Presumably he has enemies and he has got to have some way of dealing with them. Right 133, more duties of the king:

V: You should cause the religious

And the worldly to assemble through giving, speaking pleasantly, Behaving with purpose and concordance.

S: These are the (Sangha harastus) I think. (pause) ~he sanghaharastus which are said to be practised by the Bodhisattva, that is giving or generosity, affectionate speech, behaving in a purposeful manner, and practising what one preaches. So 'you should cause', you as king 'should cause the religious' people, that is to say probably the Bhikkus and Bhikkunis, and the worldly people to assemble, that's four means. Should bring together the religious and the worldly perhaps it would be better to say. What is the purpose of the assembly? It is not quite clear. Cause them to gather, cause them to increase perhaps. Gather them around you in this way, get support, get people's support by treating them in these four ways. All right?

V: I was going to ask what is the term used for these four:

S: Giving is dana

V: You used a collective term

S: Sangrahavastus. I think I've mentioned them in the Survey. Sangrahavastus (pause)

Page 11.

V: Just as by themselves the true words

Of kings generate firm trust,

So their false words are the best means to create distrust.

S: Uhm-. I mean there is quite a bit of truth in this. 'Just as by themselves the true word~ of kings generate firm trust, So their false words are the best means to create distrust.' Suppose you know that the king or the government always speaks the truth, always tells

you what is happening, what is really happening, then what could be

your attitude to the king or the government? you will trust it. But what is the quickest way to create distrust, in the people?

It is not to be truthful with them, not to tell them what is really happening. I mean there is great truth in this. So nowadays what is people's attitude rightly or wrongly to, the government as it would be nowadays.

Vs: Distrust

~ Distrust. they don't really believe that the government is telling, is speaking the truth, or is telling them what is really happening. Sometimes of course they may believe that the government doesn't know what is happening, or the members of the government do not know what is happening, they may think they do, but people may suspect that

they do not really know what is happening, that they are not really in control of the situation, And this is becoming more and more the case as modern life becomes more and more complex, and things happen which are quite unexpected, which none anticipated. You don't know why. I don't know what is happening now, but a few weeks ago, against all expectations and nobody knew quite why it was happening the pound [241]

S: became less and less in value. By all accounts it shouldn't have done, but it did and no one really knew why. Perhaps they did find out. rather lost track of things, by then, before then. So this draws attention to this, to the importance of true words, the importance of truthful communication, not only in public life but in private life too. If you get a reputation of not being truthful, then people sooner or later will come to distrust you, to mistrust you. I think this is one of the reasons for the influence of someone like Enoch Powell, because people do believe that he says what he thinks, he is truthful according to his own lights. He does you know speak up about the situation as he sees it right or wrong. And very few seem to do that, hardly anyone seems to do that in public life nowadays. You think they are adopting an attitude or saying something for a certain purpose, to create a certain effect, not because they really think it. Like Gerald Ford, when he finds out that certain people don't think he is right: well enough he starts making a few right: wing noises, not that he necessarily thinks like that, but certain people

need reassurance, so he gives expression to a few good solid right wing sentiments,

to get their votes, to show that Gerald Ford is the right man. I give this just as an example not as a general assessment of Gerald Ford's political attitudes. This is the sort of thing that happens, you tell people what they want to hear so as to get them on your side. You dare not tell them the truth because it might cost you their support. It might cost you, you know the next election. You think the main thing is to keep ourselves in power, then we can do all the right things all the good things. It doesn't matter how we stay in power. Even if we do mislead people a bit, it is for their own good after all. This is the way people often think, or don't think. They would never sort of enunciate this only, or explicitly, but this is in

Page 13.

S: In fact very much the attitude of people in power very often.

V: I don't think this has been going on for long in this country, but in America people take it for granted that politicians will speak for his own personal ends.

S: Well it's not only his own personal ends very often, it is the ends of the party. You sacrifice your conscience to the party. The main thing is to keep the party in power.

V: Now if he does speak the truth people don't take any notice. There is very little a politician can do to get the confidence of the people.

S: Well there is one thing which he can do, which is to start speaking the truth.

V: But people won't believe it.



S: If you start and go on people will sooner or later recognise that you are speaking the truth. But you may have to spend a long time in the wilderness

not to say the doghouse first. When you've lost your reputation

you are not going to get it back the easy way. There is no easy

way to get it back. You will get it back the hard way by speaking the truth, and paying for it. I mean there have been approaches, I mean there have been slight attempts to speak the truth, but it has been necessary within the context of the current economic situation. That you can't, for instance, increase wages and keep down prices, you can't do that, but until quite recently people were led to think that you could, that wages would go up and up, and prices would stay just

Page 14.

S: where they were. And people were discouraged to think this. But now they slowly, very gradually, have been given to understand otherwise, and the message is beginning to sink in a little bit. So without truth there's no confidence, either in public life or in private life.

V: Is there any real possibility, given this economic and social situation, for a government to be based on truth, because the whole thing in a sense is toxic (such a line).

S: Well I think it could be based on truth, or if not based on truth, I think that the population in positions of public responsibility, people in positions of political power could be much more truthful than they are. We mustn't altogether blame them also. Very often

the public does not want to hear the truth. If they spoke the truth they'd be out, they'd be as it were penalised for speaking the truth. The truth is not wanted. It is as though they are forcing lies upon

a reluctant public, by any means. Much of the time they are telling the public, or a section of the public what it wants to hear. They are dangling the carrot in front of the donkey's nose, even though they know it is a rotten carrot. Also the public must want to hear the truth and know the truth. In times of emergency and times of crisis very often it does. But at other times probably not so much. The difficulty arises when you need to know the truth, to be

to tell the truth so as to prevent a crisis. The danger is we wait until the

crisis is upon us and then ask what really is the matter, then demand the truth, and then it may be too late. You should have asked before, you should have wanted to know before. And it is not all that easy sometimes in a complex situation to see what is the truth of the situation. You can give facts but even facts do not always give you the truth, sometimes the reverse.

Page 15.

V: Part of the truth sometimes, a lot of the time, is is not known. Very often one is met with a situation where one isn't sure one doesn't know, publicly or privately.

S: But the politician has to have all the answers. We expect him to have almost the answers. That is what you pay him for.

V: I'm just wondering how Buddhism, how the Friends specifically can contribute to trying to resolve a situation which is so far gone in terms of a wilderness of untruths. What point

S: Well one has to begin at home. And that is very important. If one can even just run the Friends properly on these sort of principles well that will rally achieve it. If one can't even do that how can one criticise the government for failing to run a whole vast country with a complicated economy and complicated social system in that way. If you can't even run your tiny organisation that way, with just a few hundred people in it. If you can't run your order in the right sort of way how can you criticise the government for not running the country in the right sort of way. Begin at home.

V: I was thinking, earlier in the context, you were saying maybe we should try to get more involved with the United Nations. I am not.

~ ~~~ell v~~s nd no. ~hen W-j have as it -; re naL. or e that our own house is erfcttly in order, or as near as akes no difference. I t'nink i~ is a very good ~hing Chat y;u k-ow to some e~tcnt, say In Suknavati, we 'v--- created a re ut~tion for r-liable dealing. We

do hve deaiings with members f the ublic, and I think this is very very

Page 16.

S: ~important and there has got to be this g~n~ral feeling around in the minds of peop-le who have got you knw sorL of contact with us, numbers of the general public. Well even thoughtthe FWBO is a Buddhist organisation and they do some outlandish things, they've got some outlan ish beliefs, at least they are honest and reliable and trust--orthy, and you can depend upon them. At least that, that would be a very great iiki achievement.

V: That do-os bount for en awfu~ lot.

V: the District Surv~~yOr comus aroun d e~ctibg to be deceived.

S: Right wel if the Dist~ict Surveyor you know comes to understand that the Buddhist are not going to try and deceive h im, they are going C be qu~te open and honesta and above board. Well he'd get the message sooner or lay~r, and that's a very good thing. Well this is something I advised some of our friends who were on the dole.

Be c~ite straightforward when you go along there. Say exactly what the p position is, and ~om~ of them did and they met with a qu;te positive response.

V: It makes it easier CO tell the truth.

S: Yes, you don't have to remember all the lies you've told. (laughter) to whom, when, where. So this is all that we can do, and it is quite a bit already, to try to run our movement on these sort of principles. Just to be truthful and honest and open with one another and with people outside, that we come in contact with.

V: You wouldn't advise-- going a stage further and going out and saying

Page 17.

V: for instance that the trade union movement is based on a very un-Buddhist principle. Going out and trying to say that it is not the correct way to run things.

~: Well I'd be quite happy with doing that sooner or later, if it can be done in the right way and effectively. I mean one certainly wants

these principles, these right principles to spread as widely as possible. You know influence different aspects of people's lives.

V: (words unclear) first of the improved communication.

S: Yes right, yes yes. Not that one ~~~t but it isn't perhaps a very tactful a approach 0 say that you re doing things all w~ong, the Buddhist way is right. They ar~ probably not going to listen. You must get some sort of foothold, some of the way.

V: ( words unclear) com-iunication.

S: CeC to know individuals. (pause) All right let's go on, 135:

V: Wha~ is not deceitfui is the truth

And not a fabrication of the mind,

What to others is solely helpful is the ~ruth,

The opposite is fal~ehood since it does not help.

S: In other words truth helps, falsehood doe not help. ~his is a very important principle. Do you agree with it ? Do you think

S mtimes a littl bit of unt~uth does help ? Or that truth doesn't

Page 18.

U always help?Is it always advisable to tell the truth ?

V: Soinetimes it~feels as~thoug~ the truth doesn't help.

S: It depends what you mean by help.

V: It doesn't seem to help sometimes in the immediate.

S: I think sooner or later you've got to get back to the truth. Otherwise you just get caught up in an ever more elaborate web of falsehood, in which you get completely entangled.

V: You don't have to say everything all at once, all in one go.

S: Right, yes. Well sometimes you can't.

V: skillful

S: Well in the long run it is the truth that is going to help, so if you are talking to someone, if you are communicating with someone, and they for instance want to know what you really think or feel about them, their problems for instance. Well you may prevaricate for a bit, or not speak your whole mind, but sooner or later if that person is really going to be helped, then you've got to speak the truth as you see it. Sometime you've got to come round to doing just that, even though it may be quite painful and quite unpleasant for that person, at least you will be

trying to present the truth as you see it as tactfully and as gently

even as possible. Gentleness is in fact called for. In the long run it is only going to be the truth that is going to help that person, the truth about himself, the truth about herself, not a pleasant piece

Page 19.

S: of fiction, a pleasant falsehood. In the long run only the truth helps,

certainly truth in human terms, or here. human beings are concerned. One can go on putting off that day indefinitely, that is that one actually speaks the truth, that one says what one thinks

V: I've often felt that in my personal relationships with people, that

they've avoided what they're really felt because they have felt that the truth would hurt me, (words unclear) unpleasant (words unclear) but in fact in the end truth hurts much more because in the end it was delayed, for prevarication.

S: The fact that you know that someone was thinking otherwise for so long and you hadn't realised that or they hadn't told you.

V: there is a difference isn't there between not telling the truth and not telling untruths?

2: yes, yes.

V: avoiding lies.

S: and also telling the truth must be telling the truth, which means communicating the truth. Truth isn't just a factual thing that you can just blurt out. I mean the time has to be right, the other person has got to be at least reasonably receptive, it's only then that you can communicate. You might think something, but you'll know just by saying that in certain words isn't necessarily a telling of the truth. If the time is so wrong and the person is so unreceptive that they cannot but

misunderstand you, take it the wrong way, and then they will not receive

what you are in fact saying. So that would not be telling the truth.

You have to choose the time. You are not always permitted to tell

Page 20.

S: the truth. But then it is a very fine line of distinction. I mean also you can in that sort of way go on postponing the telling of the truth indefinitely. Maybe you'll come to the conclusion that there is

not going to be a right time. You have just got to come out with it.

And hope for the best., I can't sort of withhold it any longer. I

will just have to hope that my speaking the truth won't do too much damage, but not to speak it will be more likely to do even more in the long run. That's sometimes the situation you find yourself in.

V: Confidence is always important in that situation as well. If you do it quite confidently, with some positive feeling for that person, you can

put them at ease and (word unclear) too, but if you're wavering around you finding it difficult to get the words and doubting yourself, it makes it much harder.



1: One could say that part of the spiritual truth is having that right emotional attitude to the person.

S:

S: One can't know the truth-- in a cold sort of objective way. (pause)

V: Do you think it's better to just say what you feel at any given moment rather than think too much about it. I mean in the sense of always thinking is it right or is it wrong, you know about that

what I'm saying or how I'm feeling? Do you think it's just better to practise

S: It depends on the person. I think if you are normally an inhibited person who keeps things back, it is probably better just to practise saying things as they come into your mind whether right or wrong. But if you are a rather talkative as it were communicative person anyway

~g0

Page 21.

S: Perhaps it's best just to let you know turn things over in your mind a bit, and only speaking out when you are quite sure.

Some people don't think sufficiently, before they speak. They talk first and think afterwards

V; (words unclear) saying before some kind of truth is a feeling.

S: 'What is not deceitful i~ the trut~ and not a fabrication of the mind,

what to others is so~~ely hel~ful is the truth, the opposite is falsehood since it does not help.'  
So truth is what helps, and only truth helps, fals~hood doesn't help. Right 136:

V: Just as one splendid charity

Conceals th~~ fau~ts f kings,

So avarice destroys

All their wealth.

S: He is exhortIn~ the king to prac~se dana, and not to be avaricious.

~: Thinking back, in the parabl of the burnin house, (words unclear) what is solely helpful is  
tW tru th, (words unclear) wasn't

the truth but was solely helpful.

V: I would say it was the tr uth.

S: Well it was the trtth ;;ecaus he did have thos diffemnt vehi~les  
-outside. No sorry n£- didn't hav all the different vehicles outside.

He had the great big vehicle.

[251]

Continuation of session 6 verses

Ananda ... but in detail [/~c~t ~ 170

Sangharakshita (s) But in detail it wasn't factually true, 'h in that,, I mean, the truth of the situation was that he wanted to get the out, you know, which he succeeded in doing.

Ananda; One could even maybe define spiritual truth as distinct from factual truth as that which does help.

(voices unclear)

S I think though you have to be a bit careful how you... to what extent you get away from factual truth even. By the way, just to take that literal (literally?) example. What would be a concrete case of that sort of, er. skilful means in a situation we're familiar with?

Ananda; Telling someone not to get married maybe (pause)

S; No, it's not quite like that. You know, a real sort of parallel, I mean that's just good advice. it's not skilful means.

Voice; When you're in~a beginners class... when something...drive someone away. make them go away.

S; Let's look at it the other way around. I mean what sort of thing would be skilfull means to get the to say take up the practice of meditation that might not be quite factually correct?

Voices; Good states of mind. .and the sort of wordly happiness and.. (unclear)

S; Yeah. but you would have wordly happiness if you practiced meditation but then paradoxically, wordly things wouldn't mean so much to you. But if you spoke to a beginner like that he'd think or she'd think that er you know, you'd not only wordly happiness more but

hang on to wordly things more. They couldn't help maybe but take it in that sort of way eh? Which wouldn't be quite your meaning eh?

Pause

I think though as I say we should be quite careful about getting away from factual truth even and being as open and direct and truthful in all respects with people as we can (pause) You know, it would be like when meeting someone remarking, for the ...and then they ask you what sort of Centre you have got and. er. you've got a really big beautiful centre, you know, to get them along. I mean you feel that never mind even though you've exaggerated but once you've got the along, they're

252

sure to stay, oh? (laughter) But is even that really necessary? One could say 'well the centre isn't much to look at, it's not in a very attractive area, but it's a really good centre, it's really positive, it's got a positive atmosphere, you will meet some good people.' You could be quite frank and open about it, eh? (pause) But does that mean that the Buddha as represented in the White Lotus Sutra was wrong? You could of course, you know, if you wanted to be a bit casuistical (?) say that look the other sort of vehicles which he promised the children were all contained in that big vehicle, it isn't as though it's a separate vehicle different from what he had actually promised them. ah? It was the same vehicle, but in a much more ideal form;. as it were. One shouldn't perhaps take the parable too literally in that sort of respect. Or argue for it in too literalistic a manner ah? He gave them what he promised. But when you get something in that sort of way, it's always more than you anticipate because how can you know beforehand, ah? It's like meditation. You might have quite an adequate idea up to a point but meditation always exceeds your expectations because experience always exceeds anticipation - theoretical anticipation of experience, ah So you cannot but get more (voices in agreement)

So the Buddha didn't deceive the, h. couldn't put it any other way, eh? The Reality. you know is always greater than the description of the Reality. So someone who promises you, say. Reality is not promising you Reality. You could say he is telling you a lie because what he's communicating is not really Reality. So what you get will be different from what he promised you.

Voice A: So in that sense spiritual teaching is a lie?

S: So in that sense spiritual teaching is a lie. It cannot but be a lie. I mean it's like, well in the extremest case Nirvana.. the Buddha tries to tell you what Nirvana is and you go after it but when you get it, as it were. you know, is it really what you thought it was? But has the Buddha deceived you or not? No, you just couldn't understand. Or it's like even, I mean, it's on a comparatively low level, when you're ordained, you think you know what commitment

means but when you actually start getting deeper and deeper into it you find more often than not it means something quite different from what you imagined originally but have you been deceived? No, there was just the limitations to your understandings.

Voice B So when, er, someone says something... it means that they're, er, or rather what they say, they create an image, which is true. . .but what they're saying. might not be the true but theW're actually communicating the truth.

S: You mean their communication is truthful even though what they're saying is not the truth.

Voice C :      You see to look at who's done the deceiving.

S: Yeah, right.                      253

Scottish voice: Even if their vision of the truth isn't the truth but because they can always see beyond it there's a little more to it. So in a sense you can never really see the truth.

f: Yeh, you can only speak the truth to someone who knows it already.

(pause)

Ananda: But Nagarjuna (laughter) Nag~una's sort of criterion for the truth is that which is helpful isn't it?

5: Yes, in other words. the truth is not something abstract and conceptual. The truth is that which produces certain results or that which leads you in a certain direction (pause)

Right, on to 137

Voice: reads 'In peace there is profundity From which the highest respect arises From respect comes power and co-and, Therefore observe peace.

S: (repeats verse) What do you think is meant bW peace here in fact?

Voice: Well Samatha?

5: -. I think it means something more like composure. you know, tranquility. gravity. almost. 'In peace there is profundity'. After all, Nagarjuna is addressing the king. So the king presumably should inspire respect. Otherwise he won't be obeyed. eh? So he's saying be peaceful. calm. Be dignified, be tranquil eh? Because in peace there is profundity. People will feel then there's a certain depth in you, a certain solidity. oh? And in that way they will give you the highest respect. If your people, if your ministers. if your subjects, respect you, then you have power, then you are able to control them oh? Therefore you should observe peace. It's not peace in the ordinary sense. A certain composure and dignity.

YQL£LL Strength even.

5: Strength even...no, not exactly~strength. I would say. Any idea of... (unclear) at the same time a certain strength (pause) Again this is something that modern politicians don't have. do they? Usually. They don't have peace. they; don't have profundity and they don't inspire the highest respect. (pause) No dignity even.

Voice:D What people are there now though that do? What people are there say, in public life who do?

5: Even bishops and archbishops don't.

Ananda: The Queen? (laughter)

5: Perhaps the Queen is a better example than most.

Ananda: She appears peaceful and tranquil even if she is nothing like that...even if she isn't anything like that.

5: I think it would be a bit of a strain constantly appearing like that when you weren't in fact not like that at all.

A-dLL But she does manage to look Prett9 peaceful. i think, when Itve seen her (laughter)

5: Yes.

Scottish voice Christmas time... when she's holding a book

AM~: Last tale I went to fluckingham Palace. she seemed very at ease. (pause)

5: Alright. 138

Ain: Reads verse 138 'From Widsom comes a mind unshakeable Relying not on others firm. And not deceived therefore C King, be intent on wisdom

5: Obviously. Nagariuna's not speaking of wisdom in the sense of Praina. eh? wisdom in a much more practical wordl~ sense (repeats verse 138) just giving general good advice to the king, eh? Alright 139

Scottish voice; reads verse 139 A lord of men having the four goodnesses Truth, giving peace and wisdom. is praised by gods and men As are the four good practices themselves. S: HI, so there seems to be this group fo 4 qualities known as the 4 goodnesses and Nagariuna has devoted these last few verses to t ese. By way of generaladvice and exhortation to the king (pause) liright verse 140

££Lz- reads 140 wisdom and practice always grow For one who keeps cc.pany with those whose speech is beneficial, who are pure wise, compassionate and not contaminated.

5: So, wisdom and practice. Vajracjarina(?) presumambly. Eh or theory and practice principle and practice, always grow for one who keeps c-°pany with those whose speech is beneficiial. who are pure , wise compassionate and not contaminated.' So what is Nagarjuna drawing the kings attention to here? The importance of what?

Voice: Sangha

QS~

5: Sangha, Spiritual Fellowship, Kalyana Mitra0 (pause) alright 141

Voice reads 141 Rare are helpful speakers Listeners are rarer, But rarer still are words which though unpleasant help at once'

5: repeats verse So someone who is a helpful speaker someone who gives you good advice. someone who tells you the truth about yourself and what you ought to do are rare but. oh... those who are willing to listen to the truth about themselves, they're rarer still. And even rarer are those whose words which though they may be unpleasant help at once. Pleasant words, you know, usually help quite quickly once you've got the persons concerned to listen but unpleasant words which help at once these are the rarest of all. (pause) So listen if they're rare, ah? there's always some resistance to the truth about oneself eh? even if one can hear it speaking... spoken (pause) So it is difficult to get someone who speaks helpfully still more difficult to get someone to listen to that, still more difficult of all to get someone to listen when it is expressed not pleasantly but unpleasantly.

Alright 142

Voice reads 142 Therefore having realised the unpleasant, as being helpful, act on it quickly Just as when ill one takes nauseous medicine from one of a loving nature.

5: -, the fact that someone says something unpleasant, the fact that the truth spoken is unpleasant doesn't mean that it's necessarily unkindly intended or unkindly meant. It may be spoken out of love for you, out of affection for you eh?

So therefore having realised the unpleasant as being helpful act on it quickly. 'Just as when ill one takes nauseous medicine from one of a loving nature.' You know that the person who is giving the nauseous medicine is fond of you, is very fond of you, is doing it for your good. Therefore you take the medicine even if it's very unpleasant. In the same way a very unpleasant truth may be told to you eh? but if you can only just remember that the person who is telling you that unpleasant truth is doing it out of love and for your own good and your benefit then you'll be able to act on it quickly. So therefore it becomes important for the person speaking the unpleasant truth to communicate love and concern at the same time. Not just the bare objective truth, you know, about that particular person. but also communicate one's concern for the person and the fact that one is speaking the unpleasant truth out of that concern. Not to hurt, not to injure oh? Not to upset.

Ananda; Trust in the other person.



5; Yeh, you know usually trust develops only over a petiod of years. (voices)

£n~N(~ AnA n~+ th~niinn ~~~rIes of difficult liaisons.

5: No, right.

~da: In normal ever;day circumstances unclear

5; Where affection has been amply demonstrated time and again so the other person knows that you have their good. you have their welfare very much at heart. So when you say something unpleasant, a truth that's unpleasant well, they believe you that it comes out of your concern for them. 'sihereas had you been a completely new and unknown person saying that very sale thing really the person might have found it very difficult to accept. Not being sure whether you know whether it was aid out of genuine concern for him. (pause) alright  
143

~reads versel43 Always considering that life, health and dominion are impermanent You will make an intense effort Just to carry out the practices

S; Nagariuna is asking the king to remember that life, health and dominion, that is to say the royal rule itself are all impermanent..If one just realises this one will make an intense effort just to simply carry out the pr ctices, One should always be mindful of the impermanence of life, the impermanence of one's position a fact which applies more than ever. you know, in the case of a king, (pause) It pp applies to humbler mortals as well, eh? (pause) Just reflect - you don't have that much time (agreement). and the faculties that you have now, you may not always have. Well your life. you certainly won't always have, Health may go eh? and the facilities that you have at your disposal as kings may go. So practice now while you have the opportunit~ eh? Don't wait until you~re old, don't wait until you have the time or anything of that sort. just do it now. Practice now alright 144

Voice reads verse 144                      Seeing that death is certain that                      When dead one suffers  
from one's sins                      You should not sin, alNiough                      There might be passtng pleasure'  
~: Well, that it isn't worth it eh? It's not worth co-itting an unakilful action just for the sake  
of a passing pleasure that isn't even certain an~ay. There might be a passing pLeasure eh? So  
'seeing that death is certain, that when one is dead one suff4rs from one's sins. you should not  
sin although theyre might be passing pleasure. Perhaps we wouldn't put it quite like that

nowadays eh? Perhaps one would speak nowadays more in terms of development oh? That if you do it unskillful action that will hinder your development. And

therefore hinder your true happiness eh? So why sacrifice your true happiness just for the possibility of a passing pleasure (pause)

Voice reads verse 145 'Sometimes horror is seen and sometimes it is not if there is comfort in one, ~ fear you not the other~

&: - We've a sort of paraphrase of this in a note. Sometimes a horrible effect of a bad deed is seen in this life and sometimes it is not seen until the next life. If comfort is taken because the effects are not seen why is fear of these actions not generated when the effects are seen? That's the paradoxical nature of the ~human attitude, as it were, You take comfort when you don't see the effects of your bad deeds but you don't take the warning when you

do see the effects eh?

~ reads verse 146 Intoxicants lead to worldly scorn Affairs are ruined wealth is  
wasted. the unsuitable is done from delusion Therefore never take intoxicants.

~; S. more worldly advice for the king. 'Intoxicants lead to worldly scorn' You know no-one respects a drunkard. 'Affairs are ruined' You neglect your important affairs eh? 'Wealth is wasted' drink costs an awful lot of money these days eh? Even in Nagarjuna's time that seems to have been true. 'The unsuitable is done from delusion' You know, when you are drunk you just do anything. You know you recover after a bit of drunkenness maybe and you find you've signed a cheque for something you've bought, you have no recollection of having done it~ but there. you've signed a cheque you know and the thing is due to be delivered next day and you don't know anything about it. Therefore never take intoxicants. There is quite a bit of advice against drinking in ancient Buddhist texts. The Indians seem to have been rather more given to it than they are nowadays. Perhaps you know the advice and influence of Buddhists had its effect on this particular aspect of social life ah? Nowadays the Indians, I mean except among the Western educated minority, drinking and intoxicants is regarded as very very disreputable. It's quite unthinkable for religious people to indulge in intoxicants of any kind.

Alright from intoxicants to gambling.

fl~£ reads verse 147 ~Go'bling causes avarice Lktpleasantness, hatred, deception, cheating  
Wildness, lying senseless and harsh speech Therefore never gamble. 1: So gambling causes  
avarice, you become greedy for money. Un-pleasantness eh?

There are disputes as to who won, who's lost. Disputes about cheating accusations oh? So

unpleasantness, hatred even. You hate the person who's won money from you. Deception so you actually cheat yourself. oh, cheating is reckoned separately from deception. Wildness, you lose control of yourself. Lying, telling lies, 'Senseless and harsh speech, therefore never gamble.'

Voice Do sports count?

~ I don't think so. Again when it's wagering isn't, laying a wager.

Voice But games do seem to generate most of these things winning or losing a game.

flida It might be where it's proven or not.

~ This reminds me of something I heard on the radio not so long ago. It was just a little bit of any questions. And someone asked a question about bingo yeh? Bingo is a form of gambling isn't it? So someone asked a question about bingo and I forget what the question was but there was some sort of comparison between bingo . . .and I think there was some place in Brighton. I think a theatre which was being turned into a bingo hall. So the question was about whether people did really want bingo more than the: wanted the theatre. So the person who spoke, he was an ex-newspaper editor - he spoke up criticising what someone else had said to the effect that people shouldn't pontificate about bingo being bad, yeah? that nobody had the right to pontificate about other people's interests. But actually the other people hadn't been pontificating at all, they had been. just saying what they had thought. So it occurred that this was a good example of those dishonestly playing to the gallery, you're sticking up for the rights of the common people. and what they want, and not to be bossed around and not to be pontificated at. This seemed to me to be a sort of typically dishonest kind of attitude when the others hadn't in fact been pontificating. But he was sort of accusing the of pontificating and purporting himself to stand up for the people who have been pontificated against. So you see. you know, the (unclear) always doing this sort of thing, they're always trying to present themselves in a favourable light. and make out that they are in the right. that they are for you and somebody else isn't even when that isn't actually the case eh? Always give things a sort of twist. And you notice on these sort of programmes very much. They're not concerned with truth: truth is the last thing that they're concerned about usually. (pause) Well what do- you-think-about-bingo? Don't you think it's an utter disgrace and waste of time?

Voices in agreement.

~; Sordid, boring, lots of people don't find it brring.

Scottish voice When it was with my mother it used just to destroy '~e whole houstold with it.

~: Yes. But why do people engage in it? Why do they go? What is the attraction? Scottish voice It is some form of excitement and what the: get out of it...

~: The possibility that is.

Enalishvoice; The passions are aroused.

S: Yeh, S~o gambling causes avarice, unpleasantness. Is there any Un- ~pleasantness? I suppose there's not much chance of that because you

know you're just told, aren't you?

Scottish Voice: Ithink there's unpleasantness you know in the after effects of it probably. If you don't win you just feel

Atula But its very much a social thing aswell. I mean my mother goes quite a bit and she never wins much, but its for the contact...

S: So you're not really going in that case for the gambling. You're going at least as much for the social contact. But then that becomes quite a sort of commentary on our social life in a way1 or our lack of ot. That the only way you can get social contact is by, you know, going and visiting the bingo hall.

Ananda: It's the same with drink as well isn't it? It1s very much for social reasons~

S: But aren't there other ways of socializing? Or couldn't there be? I mean, how is it that socialising is connected with drinking and gambling?

Ananda: Isn't that surprising

English voice: Did you notice that they're saying that in the pub you get quite a lot of conversation and in the bingo hall and if you go to the cinema or a concert ..... talking about people

S: Because they're not going for the sake of socialising you're going for the sake of the performance.

Ananda: People want contact of some sort and I think if obviously they haven't got the facilities for getting aware sort of contact on a fairly deep level they'll have it on any level at all

S: But then again lots of people watch TV. That isn't exactly conducive to contact with other people.

Voice: The opposite.

Ananda: In that case maybe its a sort of distraction from boredom.

S: Yeh.

Ananda: (unclear) .. looking in that direction.

S: Yeh, Right.

Ananda: I feel somehow, the nature of Buddhism .

S: Well, we've had open days at Pundarika, and at Aryatara too, haven't we?

Ananda: I think though there are so many bored and frustrated people around that ...

and there's nothing for them to do.

S: So again that was a point made in the radio programme I listened to. That, you know, people complained that they're lonely, yeh? But why don't they go out and meet people, you know? That is possible after all. (pause)

Scottish voice: (unclear) ... in the library or something, looking at books and just the things that people could do in public you know, maybe pretty boring stuff for some people, but I'm sure there's something of interest.

S: Well if it was mainly for social contact, well, in a sense it doesn't matter all that much what you were doing eh?

Ananda: (unclear) ... or computer dating simply making up their minds.

What do you think about computer dating? LAUGHTER

S: What do I think about dating? (Laughter)

The less said the better. You know I think we'll close now, partly because it is 6 o'clock and partly because with verse 148 we're 'going to embark at some length, it seems on a quite different subject (laughter). Well I think it's mating rather than ... (laughter) ... not to say mating.

S: P.59 148. I'm going to suggest that we read this series of verses straight through. It's all an elaboration of one theme, eh? So if we read the verses straight through, reading one each around the circle and then we'll get Nagarjuna's advice on this subject, as it were full blast. And then we can discuss the passage as a whole in general and then deal with any particular points. So from 148 right down to 170 reading verses round the circle.

148 "Lust for a woman mostly comes

From thinking that her body is clean, But there is nothing clean ~oman's bod.

149 The mouth is a vessel filled with foul Saliva and filth between the teeth, The nose with fluids, snot and mucus, The eyes with their own filth and tears.

150 The body is a vessel filled  
with excrement, urine, lungs and liver;  
He whose vision is obscured and does not see  
man thus lusts for her body

151 Just as some fools desire  
An ornamented pot of filth, So the ignorant and obscured And the worldly desire women.

152 "If the world is greatly attached  
To the nauseous body Which should cause loss of attachment, How can it be led to  
freedom from desire?

153 Just as pigs yearn greatly for A source of excrement urine and vomit, So some lustful  
ones desire  
A source of excrement, urine and vomit.

154 This filthy city of a body, With protruding holes for the elements Is called by stupid  
beings  
An object of pleasure.

155 Once you have seen for yourself the filth Of excrement, urine and so forth,  
how could you be attracted To a body so composed?

156 Why should you lust desirously for this While recognising it as a filthy form Produced  
by a seed whose essence is filth, A mixture of blood and semen?

157    He who lies on the filthy mass Covered by skin moistened with Those fluids, merely  
lies

On top of a woman's bladder.

158    If whether beautiful or Ugly, whether old or young, All the bodies of women are  
filthy

From what attributes does your lust arise?

159    Just as it is not fit to desire Filth although it have a good colour And shape in its very  
freshness So is it with a woman's body.

160    "How could the nature of this putrid corpse, A rotten mass covered outside by skin,  
Not be seen when it looks

So very horrible?

161    'The sun is not foul,

It is like a cloak.' Over a mass of filth How could it be clean?

162    A pot though beautiful outside Is reviled when filled with filth. Why is the body, when  
so filled And foul by nature, not reviled?

163    If against filth you revile, Why not against this body Which befouls clean scents,  
Garlands, food and drink?

164    Just as one's own or others' Filthiness is reviled, Why not revile against one's own  
And others' filthy bodies?

165    Since your own body is

As filthy as a woman's, Should not you abandon Desire for self and other?



166 If you yourself wash this body Dripping from the nine wounds And still do not think it filthy, what Use have you for profound instructions?

167 Whoever composes poetry with Metaphors which elevate this body - O how shameless.' O how stupid.' How embarrassing before the wiseJ

[264]

168 Since these sentient beings are obscured By the darkness of ignorance,  
They quarrel mostly over what they want Like dogs for the sake of some filth.

169 There is pleasure when a sore is scratched, But to be without sores is more pleasurable still; There are pleasures in worldly desires,

But to be without desires is more pleasurable still.

170 If you thus analyse, even though

You do not become free from desire, Because your desire has lessened You will no longer lust for women."

S: So this is what Nagarjuna has to say on the subject of what is usually

called a " Do you think there's any particular

reason why he goes into this at greater length? I mean he's only got one verse on gambling, one verse about intoxicants but he's got this whole string of verses on the subject of lust for women. Why do you think that is?

Voice: In India in those times that . . . (unclear)

S: He's also addressing a King, a maharaja, who customarily has all these things very much at his disposal. But do you think its only in India?

Laughter

Voices: No probably not.

S: I think there are several points to be looked into here because this whole way of thinking, this whole approach goes very much against the grain of certain modern attitudes. Some people might even think this sort of way of thinking, especially systematically cultivated, is

265

here quite morbid and unpleasant, negative, depressing, one-sided and so forth. I think the first thing to understand is what is meant by 'shubha' and 'ashubha'? What the Tibetan word is I don't know but it is the word that is translated as 'clean'. Lust for a woman mostly comes from thinking that her body's clean. Well, the Tibetan word which is the original of 'clean' would have translated the Sanskrit word "shubha".

Voice: How do you spell it?

S: S-H-U-B-A, with accent on the last 'a', Pali shubha, the Sanskrit has a dash over the 'a'. This is quite an important term. The 'shubha' which is 'clean' and also 'pure' and also 'lovely'. It means all these things and 'ashubha' which is 'unclean', 'impure', 'unlovely'. But I expect you've heard of the three characteristics of conditioned existence. That is to say that all conditioned existence is unsatisfactory, 'dukkha' impermanent 'anatta' and without ego, without an unchanging self, 'anatta'. But there is a fourth one - 'ashubha' - when you have this fourth one added to those three, then the list becomes not the three characteristics but the four 'viparyayas'. Have you come across this at all? The four viparyayas - they're quite important. They are mentioned in the 'Three Jewels' by the way.

Voice: Could you spell Viparyaya please?

S: V-I-P-A-R-Y-A-S-A. Usually translated as the 'upside down views', the four Viparyayas, the four upside down views eh? The four inverted views, or even wrong way round views. So in what way are these four views upside down views?

Scottish Voice: You're actually perceiving it as it is.

S: That you're not actually perceiving it as it is. If one though, looks at these four within the context of, say, in the framework of the conditioned and the unconditioned, what does one find? The conditioned

the unconditioned is said to be blissful, is said to be permanent -

266

in the sense of transcending time -, is said to be possessed of true reality and is said to be

END OF SIDE ONE

START OF SIDE TWO

beautiful. But one does not see the unconditioned in that way. In fact, one is quite blind to the unconditioned. But these qualities of the unconditioned one sees or thinks one sees in the conditioned yeah? So you start thinking that the conditioned is blissful, you don't see the conditioned as painful, you see it as blissful. You don't see the conditioned as impermanent, you see it as permanent. You don't see the conditioned as devoid of true being, you see it as possessing true being. You don't see the conditioned as unlovely, you see it as lovely eh? In other words, those qualities or those attributes of the unconditioned you transfer to the conditioned. In other words you see everything upside down. You see in fact the conditioned as the unconditioned. You see the conditioned not as possessing the attributes of the unconditioned. Do you see this? (Voices in agreement) So here we are concerned with a particular aspect of the conditioned. Do you see that? In the case of the 'ashubha bhavana' you are concerned with the way you see the purity and loveliness which really belongs to the unconditioned, to the spiritual world in something which is conditioned. So the particular object which is pointed out here is the body of the person of the opposite sex yen? I mean if you're thinking in terms of purity and impurity, loveliness and unloveliness, then what is that particular conditioned object on to which you most easily and regularly transfer as it were the loveliness of the unconditioned; the beauty of the unconditioned? It's the body of the person of the opposite sex. So

that's why the whole attack as it were is directed there. You don't have a thing about trees for instance, you don't fall in love with trees eh~ You see trees as the loveliest thing in the whole world and get very attached to them and want to spend all your time with them, you know. You don't transfer the loveliness of the unconditioned on to that particular object, The conditioned object you usually do it with is the physical body of the person of the opposite sex eh? So this is why there is this special practice in all forms of Buddhism apparently from the beginning of learning to see the physical body of the member of the opposite sex not as lovely, not as beautiful, as you usually see it, you know, wrongly transferring the qualities of the unconditioned to the conditioned, but as it is, in a sense, really exists. That is to say, try to see it as a conditioned thing, as unlovely, unbeautiful. So in order to help you, the tradition draws your attention to certain aspects of that object which you usually simply overlook eh? So as to open your eyes, you know, to its true nature as a conditioned thing and therefore as an intrinsically unlovely thing. So that you may look for what is lovely, what is beautiful where it truly may be found, ie in the unconditioned eh?

Ananda: It seems to be a very absolutely, diametrically opposed approach to western attitudes, in particular, to classical architecture, poetry sculpture and that sort of thing. The purpose of which is to create a beautiful form in order to remind one of the beauty of the spiritual, of the unconditioned. It seems to be a completely opposite approach to beauty.

S: I don't see that it is. I don't see that it is. I mean, you're not here concerned with a work of art, you're concerned with a physical body eh?

English voice: 'Cos ideally the work of art would be a finger pointing towards the ideal not towards the physical form. It's when you get stuck in the physical form and you just look at the work of art and

just see a physical form, that you get bogged down.

Ananda: But here he's pointing out all the (unclear) of the physical form.

S: But not just form in the sense of outline, but all the unpleasant connotations (?) as it were which usually you overlook because you're craving, your lust is so strong, that, well, you just don't see things. So it's in order to sort of inhibit the lust that those other less pleasant aspects are pointed out.

Ananda: How would you account then for the fact that a lot of Indian sculptures for instance which presumably were meant for spiritual purposes are very voluptuous, very sensuous and not at all austere?

S: Well, it's a bit like what I said the other day in connection with the art of Ajanta. There's a purely aesthetic appreciation. I mean the human body is treated just like any other object in nature, just like a tree or like a flower. But that is not how we usually look at it, if we could do that it would be fine. But that is not how we usually look at it, We, as it were, single out the human body. I mean we single out the physical body of the person of the opposite sex

and pay it a very special attention and filter off that in a very special way that we don't feel towards say a leaf or a flower or a beautiful stone, or a beautiful work of art. It's a quite different sort of feeling that casts a very unreal sort of glamour over that particular object and not over any other. (Pause) So that you'd rather spend the night say with even a moderately attractive woman than you know, going around an art gallery, looking at all the masterpieces of world painting eh? So obviously it's not just beauty that you're after, but, you as it were think that beauty is there; but it isn't, You're after something else - you're not really after what you're after.

Ananda: You project the beauty, a beauty on to the form, so that one can have a reason to oneself for satisfying the craving.

S: Yeh, I don't think that it's - of course well obviously it isn't - a conscious deliberate process as it were. It's something blind and instinctual. So another point that has to be made, that sometimes people make, is that it's a very one-sided view, to cultivate this way of looking at the body of the person of the opposite sex, but even if it is, there's still nothing wrong with it because it's to counteract the opposite extreme. Well, one could say, it's not quite right to say that the woman's body is nothing but filth, though that is, in a way, quite true, but, you know, that is to counteract the view that it is all clean~ and all pure. And anyway Nagarjuna even says at the end of this section "If you thus analyse, even though You do not become free from desire, because your desire has lessened, you will no longer lust for women." I mean, in the case of the King at least, he seems to be quite satisfied if he brings the King back just to a more reasonable attitude, just a more moderate attitude through this very extreme sort of treatment, this very extreme sort of advice.

English voice: The extremity of the advice indicates Nagarjuna's idea of the extremity of the craving. He's having to go that for one way having seen it's gone that far the other way ...

S: But it's also being made clear that the feeling of lust is so strong that it causes you to overlook and ignore and not even to see, not even to notice certain things which in other circumstances you'd be extremely repelled by, yeh? But the feeling of lust is so strong, you just overlook all those things, you don't even think about them. So how powerful that feeling must be if it overcomes a sort of natural antipathy to certain other things. It's also as though Nagarjuna is saying, well look when you do get involved in that particular way when you are, as

Z+o

it were, satisfying you lust, well, what are you actually doing? Just think about it. What's actually happening? It's as though he's saying that too. Because it's usually a very unaware sort of situation. A purely, as it were, instinctual situation. So he's saying to the King, 'Wake

up.' Take a look at what you're doing. Take a look at what is happening. Take a look at this object you're so violently craving for. What is it really like?' So this is a standard practice in early Buddhism, not only in early Buddhism, in Mahayana too, this "asuba bhavana". Another form of practice of course is the stages of the decomposition of the corpse. (Pause) Also, there is the point that this particular feeling or this particular instinct is so strong in any case that it does require a quite drastic treatment as it were. Somewhere in the Pali text the Buddha says that if there had been another craving in man as strong as his craving for woman, no one would ever be able to gain enlightenment. So that's a pretty strong sort of saying. So this is probably one of the reasons why so much importance is attributed to celibacy. Not that technical celibacy in itself is all that important. But importance is attached to it as an indication that this particular feeling is under control. This particular instinct is under control. I'm quite sure the thought crosses the minds of quite a number of men in these sorts of situations. You know, what am I really doing? How am I really spending my time? What does it really add up to? One can't help thinking that way sometimes. Even the most ordinary worldly man sometimes thinks in this way, at least for an instant.

English voice: You think you're being trapped in the same old net again.

S: Yeh. Sometimes one, as it were, thinks, well here we go again. You know exactly what's going to happen. The same old pattern is going to repeat. And after a few times round, you can't help wondering, well, why am I doing it? What is the urge? What am I even getting out of it? You might go through all the usual motions from beginning to end and then

you start thinking what am I getting out of it? I'm not even really enjoying it anymore. What does it mean? What does it add up to? Why am I spending my time like this? It seems a sort of compulsion to do something that in a sense you no longer even really want to do. It's lost its freshness, it's lost its novelty. In the end, it just begins to get dull and boring.

Ananda: Presumably, Nagarjuna didn't feel the need to give this advice equally to women.

S: Well he's speaking to the King isn't he?

Scottish Voice: It says at the beginning of it, he says that this (unclear) dealing with women.

Ananda: He doesn't specifically say that in the text does he?

S: Well, he does speak of one's own body also. But he's speaking specifically to the King.

Atula: Perhaps he feels that men are more sensuous

S: No, I don't think he would have said that. But if he had been writing for a Queen, well, I'm pretty sure he would have laid down the same sort of line as it were. And you find that

sort of approach in the Therigatha, they usually don't say, you know, they tend to, when women are, you know, engaging in the corresponding reflections and try to sort of wean themselves away from men, they don't think so much in terms of ... the unattractiveness of the male physical body because, you know~ women don't seem to see the male in quite the same way that the male sees the female, but they encourage themselves with such thoughts as 'how treacherous, how deceitful, etc etc., men are, that they're not to be trusted. They tend to look at things in this way because what normally a woman wants from a man, well its security, someone she can trust, someone she can hold on to, not so much someone who's physically attractive. So they don't need to think about the physical unattractive- ness of men, they need to think about their unreliability and how

treacherous and deceitful they are, how they will always deceive you if they get a chance, that you're not to trust their sweet words eh, they say one thing and mean another, they're not faithful, they're not loyal etc etc. I mean women who get into the spiritual life and want to sort of get rid of their attachment to men1 seem to think or to encourage themselves more in t is sort of way1 because that counteracts the particular form that the attachment takes in their case.

Voice: (Unclear 2 or 5 words)

S: Yes, right, but the male, the male human being seems to be drawn by attractiveness of the female physical, that seems the great weakness, the great danger point in his case. So therefore, he's asked to just reflect on the other side of the picture.

Uttara: But sya you .. say someone did take up this practice and the male were you know reliable and that, wouldn't that have some form of your clouding the vision, this person could be reliable, the male could be reliable and the females doing this

S: Well the exceptional male might be reliable (Yeah Uttara) but most males are not reliable in this particular respect just because they're guided by their own instincts, so they aren't in fact reliable.

Uttara: But, I was meaning ... within the movement, you know, more and more~ (several words unclear) you have ... people who are, you know, seem more and more becoming reliable in certain things.

S: H~, in certain things, but that in being, if you become more and more reliable in other aspects of life and spiritually more reliable, in a sense you become even less reliable on this particular aspect of life (mild laughter) even less depended on, so the woman might think, well you know, how can I rely upon him, he might become a monk any day, 'i~ght want to go on a solitary retreat, so how can I rely upon him, I shouldn't hm?

[273]

Uttara: I mean, I see us having a, not having a very sort of positive effect in a way. I mean, I don't know, I'm not a owman. (Laughs)

S: Well you can imagine you are for a minute - (Laughter) - But, the point seems to be that the attachment is so strong that you have as it were in the beginning to attach it in a rather negative sort of way, just to loosen its grip. I mean you could for instance in a sense take the line of, Well, think about the unconditioned, think how beautiful the un- conditioned is; but that is very difficult when you're attachment is strongly to something conditioned, when you very definitely see something conditioned as beautiful. In this sort of way, you're attachment has to be sort of prised away from that before it can begin to direct itself towards the unconditioned; otherwise the unconditioned and the beauty of the unconditioned is just a word to you. On the other hand, the positive approach can be very helpful, but it seems in this particular respect you need quite a strong, as it were, negative approach or well at least to begin with, especially where craving and lust is very strong.

Alaya: Do you think this could in a way lead to going to mortification, self mortification because of disgust with one s own body, hate ..

274

S: I think probably with people in the West, you'd have to be quite careful about that, presumably Nagarjuna was dealing with, you know, not only in the case of a king, but generally with people who were sort of lusty and full-blooded and had no feelings of guilt and no self-hatred and self contempt wnd who could in a quite positive fashion be encouraged to think and feel like this. After all they had been brought up mostly in a way in a sort of pagan culture, pagan civil isa- tion. Here was the King, who had no inhibitions probably about having several hundred wives and concubines. certainly, you know, had no feelings of guilt about it. It was probably right and proper that a King should have all that number of wives and concubines, you know, whether he liked it or not, as it were, it was part of the royal panoply, part of his regalia, to have all these things. I mean this was going in Nepal even when I paid my first visit there. The Ranas and Maharanas all had several hundred wives and concubines each. I mean for the A-class Rana, about three hundred was often, you know, quite common. Three hundred women in their house- hold of various grades. So their whole attitude would have been rather different from ours. They wouldn't have had any sort of feelings of guilt or self-contempt or self-hatred, and so therefore they could be given this very strongly, very though sort of treatment. And even when asked to look upon their own bodies as unclean and impure etc. But, as I said, one has to be quite careful when dealing with



people in the West. I think probably the asubha bhavana generally would be very good for a lot of people because, you know, we have gone so much to the other extreme. I mean, you even find a sort of normal healthy reaction against that extreme even in popular songs. What's that old musical song. 'She took off her golden hair, She laid her glass eye on the chair, - oh you know that one - "But when started unscrewing her wooden leg, I pulled on my trousers and jumped out of bed'.' (Laughter)

275

A form of the asubha bhavana. I used to hear this song in my young days, it was quite a popular song (mild laughter still); might've turned my thoughts in the direction of Buddhism for all I know.

Ajita:- When you were a kid, you'd that kind of awareness, a lot of it of the kind of, sort of repulsiveness of the body, you know, I think in school I can remember, you know, in school, friends ... (several words unclear) ... and things like this.

Ananda: I remember quite clearly people in school saying, you know, how beautiful a woman's leg is, things like that. couldn't work out what they were talking about (laughter). I remember the process very clearly of coming to see it in a very attractive way, in a way that was quite unnatural really.

S: I think one has to distinguish quite clearly between aesthetic beauty and biological attractiveness. I think the danger is that we confuse the two, you see what I mean? It means, in a way, we've got a higher and in a sense a more spiritual conception of beauty. When, for instance, what is the advertisers conception of a beautiful? Well its just to enhance and enlarge, not to say exaggerate and caricature all her secondary sexual characteristics. And this is supposed to be beautiful. But actually that's got nothing to do with beauty, you know, in the sense of subha. Its just biologi- cally attractive, its just stimulating to someone of the opposite sex. Whereas presumably if it was beautiful, it could be appreciated by any individual regardless of sex.

Ananda: I remember Keats' poem Lomia deals with that, a sort of a man who falls in love with a beautiful woman who turns out to be a vampire and the philosopher Apollonius

comes in and everything dissolves.

S: Well that of course can be taken on two levels. Its perhaps not or maybe Keats himself wasn't sure which level he took it on. I mean he or she at the beginning of the poem he seems to take it in the sense of a cold scientific sort of philosophical outlook destroying all the beauties of the imagination. But you can take it another sense in the sense of the false glamour seen through by the you know, piercing vision of the truly wise man. You can take it in both these ways. You know, perhaps Keats himself hadn't completely worked out the distinction between the sensually attractive and the spiritually beautiful. You can have, say, a very old woman who is physically quite unattractive, but who is still beautiful; and you can sometimes find a young woman who is quite rally, you know, biologically attractive, that has got all the right measurements and so on, but is not really at all beautiful, is, in fact, quite ugly. So beauty is something other. So the term that Buddhism uses is subha. Its quite an interesting word is a way, because it means pure as well as beautiful. Sometimes I'd say, it could be rendered as pure beauty, or spiritual beauty, in a more sort of neo-platonic sense.

Hridaya: It starts coming up in what we were talking about on the first day in the Buddha's "Fascination".

S: Yes right.

Hridaya: 2 or 3 words unclear . . . attraction in that sort of way, through purity and virtue.

S: So, sometimes an artist can take up a form from the natural world, including even the female form, and sort of treat it in such a way that it, you know, conveys an im- pression of pure beauty, not an impression of sensuous attractiveness. I mean, if you're not sensitive to what the artist has done and if, y'know, you're not sensitive to the pure beauty of his work, you may just through your sort of

limitations look at it as though it was a sensually attractive object. I mean like the two British soldiers who were supposed to go into the Uffizi Gallery during the war and saw Botticelli's "Birth of Venus" and one of them said: "Oh, come and look at this Bill, there's a" what did he say "girl with no clothes on and two blokes spitting at her" - (quiet laughter) - That was the way he saw Botticelli's Birth of Venus - (more laughs) -. In a way, even the greatest of artists can't guard against that sort of misunderstanding. (long pause) I mean, obviously there is a great controversy as to what is beauty, y'know, and no doubt there is no end to that; perhaps one can say that, in a way, beauty isn't something inherent in the object, it depends on a certain way of looking at things. If you look at things with lust, then they appear as sensu-

ously attractive, but if you look at things in another way, in a more contemplative way, then those things can be seen as purely beautiful.

Hridaya: (Almost?~ on the level of one's vision.

S: But if you look with craving then you see things in terms of sensuous attractiveness, but if you look with Metta you see things in terms of beauty. I don't know whether I mentioned this on this retreat, but in some of the Pali texts, the Buddha does say that one of the signs, one of the characteristics of metta is that you see everything as beautiful, subha. You do not see everything as sensually attractive, you see everything as subha, as purely beautiful. So it's because it's disinterested. I think Schopenhauer emphasized this point, that aesthetic appreciation has disinterest, it was a contemplation, it was a pure delight in the object for its own sake; you didn't want to make any personal use of the object. This is the difference between the lust which is stimulated by the sensuously attractive and the sense of beauty which is stimulated by the pure beauty. I mean, when it's a question of lust, you want to grab,

when it's a question of aesthetic appreciation, you just want to stand back and contemplate.

Ajita: There's a kind of patience involved - (S: Yes)

Uttara: unclear

S: So in a way, even the asubha bhavana is just to induce a sort of contemplation; its like you stand back from the object and take a look at it, not move towards it to try to grab it. So it's trying to get you to stand back by inhibiting the feeling of lust or instinct of lust, by pointing out the unattractive features in the object. So in other words, it's trying to get you from selfish appreciation to disinterested contemplation. Schopenhauer used to say that in the aesthetic experience the will to live is suspended. But in aesthetic contemplation or in aesthetic enjoyment, the will to live is suspended. In other words, in aesthetic enjoyment we're something for its own sake, appreciating it for its own sake, taking delight in it for its own sake without any sort of inclination to make use of it in any sort of practical way. So the will to live is suspended, because it's due to the will to live, as it were, that we try to take hold of things, appropriate things, make use of things and so on. But if there's a beautiful painting, or if there's a beautiful melody, you just want to enjoy it, you just want to absorb yourself in it, surrender yourself to it, you don't want to do anything with it, you don't want to make use of it. So in the same way, if you see a really beautiful woman and -you just appreciated her as a beautiful woman, you wouldn't want to do with her, you'd just be quite happy gazing and

gazing, appreciating as a beautiful object. But, needless to say, that's not our usual attitude. We don't usually see aesthetically, we see in terms of sensuous attractiveness. Hence the craving springs up or we see in terms of sensuous attractiveness because the craving is there, it's looking round, it's searching for an object. So to

the extent that you inhibit your lust and craving for the sensuously attractive, to that extent you will be able to see things more and more in terms of beauty. I mean, Kama or Pema and metta are incompatible. This is why one is asked in the second stage of the metta bhavana not to think of someone of the opposite sex. They two feelings cannot exist at the same time together. I mean, one knows that in one's own experience. I mean metta is incompatible with kama or with pema. Very often, the sexual feeling, the instinct of lust is very ruthless, very exploitative, doesn't care in the least about the other person and that is quite incompatible with metta. It just wants to make use of the other person, not, doesn't feel, what I can do for the other person; how can I help the other person; how can I make the other person happy. No, the other person is a means to an end, your own selfish end and you justify, you rationalise, but this is what it really amounts to.

Hridaya:        You say, All 's fair in Love and War.

S:        Yeh, right, Love and War! It's interesting that the two are couples. (Pause) Y'know, some women react rather strongly to this way of looking at them on the part of men. It's always putting women down and seeing only the negative side, but it's not intended as an objective assessment of women as such, but as a method or practice for men who are trying to come to terms with or trying to overcome their own limitations.

Ananda :        (2 words unclear) objective assessment of men (unclear)

S:        (Long pause) Any more general points with regard to this? - long pause - It's pretty strong language, not uncommon in Buddhist texts.

Atula: (It's interesting, I think, I don't know of with what you said earlier about celibacy; I took you as saying it was incompatible, like sexual inter- course and like, an enlightened man) - very mumbled.

S:        Mm, yes. When we were doing the Ariyaparesse. . . (?) Sutta, we came across an interesting passage where the Buddha classifies Sramanas and Brahmanas in various ways.

Well, three ways. And there was a comparison of deer and the hunter who was trapping them. I sort of transposed this into the mouse and the cheese, so I'll give it to you in that form. There are three kinds of Sramanas and Brahmanas, three kinds of religious persons as it were. There are those who unwisely go after the cheese in the trap and are caught in the trap, yeh? There are those who wisely go after the cheese in the trap and don't get caught in the trap and there are those who stay away completely from both cheese and trap and are, of course, not caught. But it's quite interesting that the Buddha recognised the second possibility, that it is possible to enjoy the cheese, to nibble at the cheese and not get caught in the trap. If you are very mind-ful, he did recognise that possibility, but it's quite dangerous, it's probably safer to keep away from both cheese and trap altogether, because those who are in the first category of nibbling the cheese and becoming so unmindful that they get caught in the trap, they are much more numerous, but the Buddha didn't refuse to recognise the second, y'know possibility. But the Pali texts, the Theravada Pali texts, do say quite clearly that in the case of a Buddha, in the case of an Arahant, there's no question but that he is completely celibate. The Mahayana and the Vajrayana probably would not agree with that. But even the Pali texts make it clear that the Stream Entrant and even the - uh, no not the Ana -, certainly the Stream Entrant and the once-returner are not necessarily completely celibate but obviously in their case, it dwindles to something quite different from what we usually experience. This is perhaps why Nagarjuna is quite satisfied as it were, if he can simply reduce the King's craving in this respect. He's not even expecting to be eliminated completely, but a modest sex-life seems to be according to the Pali texts, compatible with Stream Entry, or vice-versa, Stream Entry to be compatible with a modest sex-life. But the emphasis is of course on the modest one. If you are a mouse, that's going to get automatically caught when he nibbles the cheese, well don't nibble it. I think nowadays the situation is such that one is better advised to stay well clear of both cheese and trap. (Laughter) I mean, only very heroic soul could adopt the second alternative. I've also referred to the later Hindu Tantric classification of spiritual people into the three grades of the Pashu (?), the vira and the deva. The pashu is the beast, the purely animal man, corresponding to the mouse who nibbles the cheese and gets caught. The second, the vira, is the hero, one who stays on in the midst of the world, who nibbles the cheese and thoroughly enjoys the cheese, but he doesn't get caught. So, he remains so mindful that he can do that; and the third is the deva, the devine man, who never even thinks of cheese, not to speak of traps. The thought of cheese never just crosses his mind. (Laughter) So he doesn't even need to go near the trap, he keeps well away. So the beastly man, the heroic man and the devine man, these are the (?) classification. So if you feel you really are a hero, well fair enough - (Laughter) but if you're not quite sure whether you're a beast or a god (Laughter) well just better to keep away from both cheese and trap. But you see the point? I mean, the Buddha, Buddhism generally is a very sort of moderate teaching; it's not one-sided; it does recognise that spiritual progress is still possible without being completely celibate, but at the same time it points out that that is quite difficult; a path which is only suited for the really heroic and the really mindful. I mean this is why one finds records of many lay-people who are living at home with wives and families do become stream entrants,

such cases are mentioned in the Pali texts. The famous one of the ladies of the harem who become stream entrants after listening to the Buddha, even though they're living, y'know, as concubines of the King, and presumably not celibate at all, but they become stream entrants. I also think that in the West, sex has ceased to be a simple straightforward matter, the simple straightforward matter of lust and craving. It's become associated with all sorts of feelings of

guilt and so on. So it's a much more complicated business for us that it was for these simple-minded, lustful people in India and the East generally. So I think for that reason also, it's probably better for most people to be as little involved with it as possible.

Uttara: You said yesterday something that women if only they could get over their maternal needs, they're on third of the way to Enlightenment, y'know, there's that general statement; how does that relate to (?) men in terms of (?).

S: Well, I think a male's got much more to get over - (Yeah, Uttara?) I mean, he's got to get over his ambitious-ness and competitiveness and all that sort of thing before he's on third of the way to Enlightenment. But I think a woman's interests are so concentrated on, y'know, the whole family side of things~ on being a wife and being a mother that if she can get over that, just by virtue of that fact alone, she already has made tremendous progress. For a man to give up sex is a comparatively small matter, for a woman, I think, not just giving up sex but everything that that is associated with, is a much bigger matter. So she's made a (corresponding?) (tape stops for four seconds) ... you can see, sex is a more detachable part of a man's life. If you give up sex, you don't feel that, y'know, you're not being completely fulfilled as a person, etc etc., but a woman does tend to feel it's not just giving up sex but being a wife and being

a mother and having children. So having to give up that whole side of life is a much bigger thing for a woman. I mean, think of the question of children, I mean, quite a few men would like children but not to have children is not a particularly big thing for most men, but it does seem to be quite a big thing for most women. So if a woman comes to terms with that and decides she's not going to, y'know, go into all that, she's going to devote herself entirely to her individual development, well already, that's a very big step that she's taken. It's more that the corresponding, more than the corresponding step taken by a man.

END OF TAPE

[284]

S; (starts in mid sentence... ..more than the corresponding step taken by man t

Utara: (unclear).. .They have a way of relating towards the world (unclear) I'

S: yes, hm. . . 'What is my function? " to turn Hridaya: Don't you think it's easier for a man - his ambition

and his competitiveness towards the spiritual life...

S: , I think it is very much easier (Hridaya: ..than for a woman) It is, Therefore once the woman has taken that step, in a sense, she is way ahead of the man who simply done that... .If you take the instances of a woman and a man, both of whom have decided to be completely celibate, etc. but for the woman it represents a much bigger step forward than. it represents for the man.. .hm...I'm leaving aside the question of where he was and where she was to begin with, huh? But for her it represents, in a way, a bigger sacrifice and therefore a bigger step forward.. .a bigggg achievement. Hridaya: orrespondingly more difficult .

S: Correspondingly more difficult, yes. So one should be a bit sympathetic with women who are just trying to take this step or are thinking of taking this step....It's easier for a man ..(pa.use) So any query on any of the individual verses? (pause) So this verse 169: "There is pleasure when a sore is scratched, But to be without sores is more pleasureable still; There are pleasures in worldly desires. But to be without desires is more pleasureable still." Yea, lust in the sense of sexual craving is very much like that, and the pleasure that you get from it is very often like that; it's just the pleasure of scratching a sore, scratching the itch.. .but it's even more pleasant not to have a sore, not to have that itch at all. hm? Not in the sense of just being deprived of it but having as it were, something better, something more truly satisfying. (pause) So "If you thus analyze;

~ven though you do not become free from desire. because your desire has

\*

essened you will no longer lust for women .

V

page 2

286 violent S: In other words, there won't be this~neurotic craving, even though

you may not entirely give up your association with women (that can hardly be expected of a king, no doubt; especially an ancient Indian King) (pause) I mean there are all sorts of aspects of this matter that Nagarjuna doesn't go into, that Buddhist tradition doesn't go into, which we have to consider in the West. There's the whole question of 'projection' as it were. hm? The projection on~o the woman, the person of the opposite sex, of those qualities which you should be developing within yourself...not just qualities of the unconditioned, which you see on the conditioned object, but qualities of the subject which you put onto the object, hm. .there's that too. At least this is the sort of psychoanalytical way of looking at it which seems quite helpful - that you're looking outside yourself for something which you should be

developing within yourself. (pause) Anybody got anything to say about this? (pause) You feel sort of incomplete, as though there's sort of half of you missing, so you try to find another person who can be that missing half; .so

you're half a person, they're half a person, yea? and you try to add up to a just n't whole person, which of cO~Se~is~possible, because there are two wills, to say

the least. ..so you have to develop that other side of yourself from within but yourself.. .it is there but in an undeveloped form, not projected on to somebody , and else - some membvr of the opposite sex then try to take hold of that for your- self.. .This is why some people experience such panic, huh?, and terror when the so-called relationship breaks up... it's like a half of themselves being broken off; and you know if one feels like that it means that you really have been projecting.. .no you're not losing another person, you're losing the other

half of yourself, hm? ...of what you've made into the other half of yourself. of learning Hridaya: Is there the pss~bility from one's projections if one is able to be mindful of what you project on the man or the woman

you get some idea of, if you like, the things that you are putting outside of yourself that do need to be integrated..

S: I think that one can say that in the case of practically everybody

V

page 3

that there is almost a sta~e of projection, huh? which practically goes in your adolescence and it would seem as though, in a sense that is the way, you cannot do anything else0- 'ut the relatively healthy person sort of withdraws the projection quite easily and naturally and soft of uses it to

become acquainted with what is in fact within himself, and some just go on a"

repeating the process in more extreme form every time;but one can learn from A

one's projections in that soft of way if you can keep~aware and mindful....



because

Just ask yourself, "What do I see in this person?", x that is what I am projecting then that is what I need to develop within myself. (pause)

Ananda: They're qualities you're projecting...

S: Yes, qualities... usually in the case of men what are projected are the so-called feminine qualities, which very often, you know, got not very much to do with women as such at all.. they project the so-called feminine qualities like gentleness, sympathy, receptivity, etc, etc, because one hasn't got those qualities oneself, in the sense of not having integrated them into one's conscious being, hm? so you look for them outside. So at least if you haven't had any previous experience of them consciously at least you'd have some experience of them through your contact with the other person, even though they are your own projected quality and then you can start thinking "Ah! that's what I've got to experience within myself". hm? So the pro

jection, the positive projection has a soft usefulness, huh? (pause) as ~ ~a: They wouldn't all come in together would they (?) (S: HN?)

If you start recognizing the qualities you're projecting on certain people, maybe there are others that will come back to you more easily (S; Yes)... You'll find there are qualities still projected on others - maybe those that are still furthest away beyond your grasp. (S: Right, indeed) ~ple start to complement you - perhaps you're attracted towards a particular man because he complements something that you don't have - and you project

that out onto him ~ Yes, right) therefore S: Or you may lack in self-confidence and/you may project that self

confidence onto somebody who has that and therefore they receive, as it were,

page 4

your projection-quite easily. It's not always easy to tell when one is projecting a positive quality~ and when one is actually seeing that in another person and appreciating it, yea?

Hridaya: Don't you think a certain amount of reflection of that

would be worked out in these people?

S: I think so, yes. (pause) The main thing is how you feel in that person's absence, or at least this is a good indication. If you feel you're not really there any more; you're completely lost~ helpless, huh? in respect of that particular quality, then you no doubt are projecting. . but if so~ one is no longer around and you can think of them quite happily, "Well, that's what I've got to be like, I'll try, I see what I'm gonna do" that is not projection in that soft of sense - it's more like an appreciation, a healthy appreciation

of that person's qualities. for some people at a certain stage Ananda: It seems to be

quite a useful kind of practice/to experience the

loss of a person, - in a sense the loss of a projection~ and you can see it as an opportunity almost, to see something that you can't see in any other

way (S: yea) (unclear)..

Voice : The danger of course is to look for a substitute (unclear) and to

if you're not really aware (unclear) look around...(Unclear) (S: yes, immediately) to fill the gap. ..and not sort

of laire yourself with that hole and look down into yourself(?)

Ananda: Almost like a Bardo, isn't it? at the moment when you lose someone before you look around for it's replacement (S: Yes, indeed).. ..an opportunity to step back..

S: So even if you reflect for a little while, you'll start looking for a

replacement a bit more mindfully and sensibly than you did before... long pause) ~aybe there's enough on that subject',alright,onto 171:

t I ~reading: To hunt ~ame is an endless Cause of a short  
life Sufferiru~~ and hell, Therefore. always keet from killin~.h

S: Why does he now especially mention hunting? (Pause) Again presumably because it's a king that he's addressing~and one of the functions, I mean, one of the privileges of the King in ancient India was to hunt, to hunt game, to hunt deer and so on - to hunt lions and tigers..~o hunt ~ame is an endless cause for a short life~ sufferin and hell, therefore alwa 5 kee

plain pag~~ from killing" that's/straight-forward adfl(e to the King.

~.T~i3c: Why an endless cause of a short life? not the cause of a short life?

0 S: (Pause) Well, presumably because the King keeps on doing it."There f~re

always keep from killing".. ..the idiom doesn't seem very clear..

become V~i~~. It could - just/a habit - another part of a kingly.. habit.

S: You mustn't forget that this has come from the Sanskrit through the Tibetan into English (pause) Anyway, Nagarjuna's disapproval of hunting is pretty clear; alright 172:

Voice reading: "Bad like a snake with ~oisonous Fangs, its body stained with filth, Is he who fri~itens embodied Beings when he encounters them."

S:/Y~u remember that one of the things that the Bodhisattva gives is fearlessness. Hm? So correspondingly, just as the giving of freedom from fear is a form of Bodhisattva giving, to cause beings fear, to frighten beings, to inspire terror in them ~is considered a corresponding vice, ~orresponding defect. hm?

(pause) Quite often we find that people like to frighten other people. hm? riece Ever noticed this? ...If you've got a of bad news, you get a bit of a kick

out of telling it to people, hm? sort of fri~htening them, hm? Why do you think that is? Why do we like to frighten peopl~

Voice: Power.

S: Power, we're producing an effect. hm? We're having an effect on them.(~~)

Sometimes you meet people who are positive alarmists - they always look for

I tbnk bad news, and unpleasant information, hm? and try to frighten./ Some people

in public life are a bit like that. . some of those who try to frighten you about the atom bomb or the effects of atomic fall-out, and things like

that. No doubt, practically sPeak~ng~~IS probably correct~ but they . seem  
or"~ to get a sort of glewt of telling you though they are trying to, ~~not~ just trying to frighten you so that something is done, but just trying to frighten you because almost they enjoy doing that ...it gives them a feeling, a sen- sation of power.. .that they can make you aftaid, that they can frighten you.

Voice: You can frighten people and be helpful.

~ You can, yes. S~a'.

Health food fanatics. QS; Hm. yes.)

V

page 6

t

U~~~~ta: Vegans. (laughter)

~ Even the people who are against smoking - all the terrible things that will happen to you if

you go on smoking.. you get stomach cancer and lung cancer and all the rest of it, huh?... That may well be true but the point I'm making is that sometimes people, at the same time, even though what they say is practically true\* they get a kick, a very subjective personal kick out of frightening you in this way. They don't do it purely~ objectively for your good~ I think always, hm? Do you not feel that with people? They like to frighten you in that sort of way; they rather enjoy doing it. They're not completely concerned only with your good.

Ui!~a: Yeah, indeed. (laughter) ~~~'s~ 1.

Ananda;~ Very often that occurs with people who are interested~(unclear)

they have the feeling that basically that's how life is, or that's how people are (~entence unclear)...therefore all the events of the world justify that theory (~ Hm)

~: So even Nagarjuna gives a rather horrible picture: "Bad like a snake with poisonous fangs, its body stained with filth, Is he who frightens embodied beings when he encounters them". You can frighten in various ways; you can frighten with violence, frighten with the fear of death, huh?, frighten in all sorts of ways.. but a- from frightening people you should try to reassure them. Not lull them into-a sense of false security, I mean, there is a positive fear. . .~, which is a fear of conditioned existence itself. (Long pause)

Ananda: It's almost - to put the other point of view it's very popular for people to say, "you're just an alarmist". There was an article by Lord A

Chalfont in the Times the other week. He doesn't like nuclear war and the

k;fv' other threats(?) (unclear) and a lot of people are calling - an alarmist

but if being an alarmist means one who can be alarmed then that's a very good thing. (S: Yes, right) but it's very popular to put ~ people in that category as an alarmist. I think because people like to pretend that the

threat isn't real.

ust S: Hm. It's like all these people who say all this talk about death is morbid.

'f

As though, you know, if you don't talk about death, you won't die. Or all the people who say the (unclear) is morbid, they just don't want to see that particular aspect of things, that particular aspect of life, even though it is there. It may not be the whole truth of the matter, but it is an

aspect. (pause)

Voice. People like to frighten themselves as well. There's a fascination....

S: HM. Well, people go to horror films ~Whv~do ~eo~e ~v they go to horror films? L

U4~ To experience yea well the reason sometimes I go to see them

is because I'm not feeling anything in myself so I start to feel....to feel something... in me...

Ananda: It's a way of giving themselves an experience..

S: Well, there '5 the three great primitive feelings in a way. There's lust, hatred and fear. Hm? So therefore, you've~obscene fi~iis, violent films and horror films. You see.. those three great categories. (pause) ?lost people get something out of at least one of These categories. huh? (pause)

t 'ra: Yes, (unclear) several types of films you like maybe depends on what type of person you are.

S: You definitely like horror films?

Ut~~a: Oh yea (laughter)

for

S: Well, you probably think that is permissible. You know that~the good

Upasaka, pornography is not really on, huh? and also blood and violence

isn't ~piite in accordance with the Buddha's teaching, but maybe horror seems

not quite so unskillful, yea? (laughter) .. s'%~.. ~s'i~

and I were talking about this last night about people who.(laughter)

~ Well, you're in good company, because the Tibetans seem to prefer those films - especially the~ild Western (laughter) The Tibetans when they came to Kalimpong, and they started going to films and they started inquiring what were the good films on, you know, getting their own idea of what was a good film. They'd always inquire about a new film ~Is

there lots of shooting in it?" No shooting,it wasn't a good film. (laughter).

Ananda: It casts in my mind a tremendous question of the who~ concept of entertainment. What is entertainment? Has it any place in cultural life?

V

page 8

S: I sort of look at it in a naive, unsophisticated way. Entertainment should entertain you, hm? You should enjoy it. hm? But - it should be something positive, no a substitute - ought to be getting out .t.an~ for something you

of life anyway , hm? So I think in that sense the pornographic films are unhealthy~because you know, if there is a place for sex at all, it~ould be in your own life, not in that sort of way; Not second-hand.. (pause) So I tend to think of entertainment as something - uh - - something like a Walt Disney film which is quite pretty and beautiful and attractive and, what shall I say, amusing....and even a bit inspiring...That to me is entertainment.

But a horror film is not entertainment and certainly a film with lots of

C

blood and violence is not entertaining~at all.. rather depressing. (chuckles)

Ananda: You say entertainment is a mild form of....

S: Entertainment is play, yea? Entertainment is watching somebody else play. ...really I suppose. So it gives you light-heartedness and joyfulness - that's how I look at entertainment. Not just sort of something to give you a bit of relief from the same old boring realm, or something to sort of titillate your lower desires - just to stir you into some sort of sluggish life, hm; (laughter)

Ananda: I was thinking recently about the whole idea of the word "enjoy" It doesn't at all mean what it literally means, to produce joy. It means more, to produce a distraction. (S: Yes) You enjoy, enjoyable things.

S: Most entertainment is just distraction - I don't think that is really entertainment. (pause)

Anan~ How often when we think we're enjoying something, when we look at it,

are~really in a joyful state. (S: Hm. Yes)

S: Are you in a joyful state when you're watching a horror film? Or a bod and violence film? In way, perhaps you are.hm? At least you're in a gleeful state (- laughter) There goes another corpse (laughter) that's 10, no, that's 11. (laughter) He missed that one. (laughter)

Alaya: It makes me cringe, that sort of thing.

S Why does one enjoy them, or even feel gleeful about them, do you think? What do you get out of them? Do you think it's a simple straightforward matter of your being fun~mentally violent by nature or having a very

V

page 9

violent, sadistic streak and having no outlet for it in ordinary life so you go and gloat over these sorts of films? Do you think it is as simple as

that? Or not?

S~~~..

-- We were saying last night, that perhaps there was something that we

didn't - or that perhaps we wereN ~t assertive enough - that is something we tend to play down, ordinarily - so we experience it in that sort of film.

S: Yes, I noticed this with some of the more extreme - forms of Pop music. I don't know if it's really Pop music - Rock music maybe .. that some of our meeker and milder friends just love to have something really wild and violent on full blast.~ It seems clearly compensatory, hm? Because they're meek and mild and unassuming~ they don't seem to go in for that kind of pop music~ they go in for the really wild and violent and (~!~i~~. That' 5 true -Laughter)

heavy thuds..

r~IIIo~ ~

Voices: Unclear - ~ ~'~.. Just keeled up - you know it's just an act really.

S: I don't know whether you do always.

Well, you do and you don't. You're between pure emotions, but you know it's just an act.

though S: In a way, you know, but at the same time you experience it as it were real.

Voice: I tend to feel conned when I start feeling that sentimental - that really sweet, horrible, sugary movie.

S: Yes, with all the tears trickling down you (Voice: unclear - laughter)

Voice: You're actually into contact with....(Unclear) (S: No, you don't)

~ Right (Voice: Unclear)

S: You even see the little box in which they disappear. They're just n~the~ anymore. Maybe you should try asserting yourself a bit more, and then see whai happens to your interest in films of violence. hm? Perhaps, some people won't be too pleased that I said that. (laughter)

Voice: What would be the reverse of that? What sort of films? \voices joking: Bambi - Claughter)

S: That's the sort of film that I like. (loud laughter) All sort of sweet %~~.. and innocent (Laughter) ( I like Bambi, Bambi' 5 alright - loud laughter

V

page lO2~L#



S; I'll tell you what I really liked cvt~~a~~it does give the game away completely and that's the 'Sleeping Beauty' (loud laughter). I really enjoyed that one. (loud laughter)...especially the "wicked fairy 1,.. (Atula:....the Seven Dwarfs...) I can really identify with them.(Loud laughter and other amusing comments obscured by the laughter)... It is quite revealing the sort of films that people like. Hm.

Hridaya: Perhaps Padmapani could put on Sleeping Beauty the next time we come down...and Vimilamitra (loud laughter)

S: - Can put on the sleeping part but I don't know about the beauty~. (Laughter)  
(Unclear comment) Anyway veris 173:

Atula readin~: "Just as farmers are gladdened When a great rain-cloud gathers, So one -- -- who gladdens embodied beings When he encounters them is good."

S: So "just as farmers are gladden~, when a great rain-cloud gathers"... presumably, Nagarjuna is referring to the beginning of the monsoon. .. If the monsoon is even a few days late it means a very bad crop, a v~ry poor harvest. So the farmerexi usually very anxiously watch the sky for the first monsoon clouds. If they come at the right time, then they're very very happy, hm? "Just as famers are gl~sntd when a great rain-cloud gathers, So one who gladdens embodied beings when he encounters them is good." hm? This is a very strong emphasis of Buddhism, especially of the Mahayana, that you should gladden beings, that you should make them happy, huh? That you should generate positive emotion in them hm? This is one of the main

functions of The Bodhisattva - just to make people happy - to gladden people. sort of Not in a foolish, frivolous, hilarious way, but by arousing genuine joy....

and this means helping them overcome their fears and anxieties.. and worries. (pause) So if you enjoy creatin~ fear in others, then that suggests you want power, I mean puwer, over them. If you want simply to make people happy, to make them glad - what does that suggest? (pause)

Hridaya: Willingness to give to others.

S: Willingness to give- to be open~which is the opposite to power. You're giving yourself to them instead of trying to control them for your own turposes. (pause)

Hrida a: Like the rain-cloud, you give what they want.

--. v~ ~~~ ~~~. ~~~ , -- ~~, A~~~~ 4

page 11

be happy. hm? One's duty to be joyful (pause).. You obviously can't gladden others unless yofre glad yourself,hm? You can't put others into an emotionally postive mood unless you're

in an emotionally positive mood yourself to begin with. hm? (pause) But as I ~id) especially in Mahayana Buddhism very great~ importance is attached to this. .50 the Bodhisattva spreads confidence, and happiness and gladness wherever he goes, among people. If you're a wet blanket, you're not a Bodhisattva...~ou' re a ~small Jimmy, you're not a Bodhisattva. If you're a prophet of gloom and disaster, you're not a Bodhisattva.

Hridaya: In our own case, taking a meditation class or leading a retreat, ~

even if you know all the words of (unclear), you should be happy.

S: This is what ~ina~ta mentioned in one of her letters to me, a letter written while on retreat. She came to see that the most important quality for an Order Member either leading a retreat or even being on a retreat with others, was the capacity to inspire them, hm? This was the most important thing. (pause) I mean, if you're not quite sure what exactly are- the seven Bodhiyogas, well you can look it up in a text book afterwards, what does it really matter in a way? But if you're not inspired, nothing can make up for that. Not much good you're being inspired next week - after

the retreat is over and all the people have gone away.. you need to be tyt

inspired on the spot (long pause) I ~found that I keep coming back to this.

I spoke about it at Four Winds and it's also been talked about ~xúX on previous study retreats,~the importance of the positive emotion ... the importance of the positive atmosphere even...the importance of Metta, Mud~ta, Karuna, Upe~ and also Sradha. ~ud~ ~

Ut~ra: Why is it we don't do more of the - Bhavana in the Movement? S'

Do they feel they're getting too abstract? (S: Pardon?) Why don't we do more

of the NIIJS~havana within the movement1or do you not feel it would be bringing in too many practices?

S: Well, in a sense, what one mustn't think of the Mud~ta Bhavana as separate from the Metta Bhavana. yea; The basic practice is the Metta. yea? The Metta is basic to the Karuna, is basic to the Mud~ta, also to the Up~k~a One mustn't think of it as a separate practice - just as - Metta is separate

page 12

from Mindfulness, hm? You cannot practice the Karuna Bhavana or the Mu~j.ta Bhavana without the Metta Bhavana, yea? In a sense, if the Metta is there, the Karuna and the ~ua~ja will automatically be there. They are depend- ent upon circumstances, hm? Put it in this way, if you are in state of Metta, and this is the basic positive emotion as it were,if you're in

that state, ---and if in that state you come into contact with people who are unhappy, what will happen to your state of Metta?

Hridaya: It will transform into Karuna.

~ It will transform into Karuna, huh? So you don't need as it were to develop Karuna separately so much, if you've got the Metta, then the Karuna will arise according to circumstances - the circumstances being, if you come

in contact with people who are suffering. yea? If you try to develop Karuna ~~~~ without the solid basis of Metta, you may just develop a sort of pity which

will not be the real thing...which won't have real warmth in it. So in the same way\* if you have already developed metta, you're full of friendliness, drull of good will, and you come in contact with people who are happy, what will be your natural tendency? hm? yea? You'll share their happiness, you'll share their joy. Your metta will be transformed, as it were, into sympathetic joy, yea? So in a way, you don't need to develop Karuna, and Mu4~ta, separately. If you are practicing Metta, you are also practicing Mud~ita. hm? Because if the Metta is there, then when you come into contact with people who are jo~~nd happy, you will share in their happiness and joy. hm?

Hridaya: What you're doing is developing positive feeling common to all four of them.

S: Yes, right. The positive feeling towards other people.

Utra: Because I find when doing the Metta Bhavana, there is something more concrete to work-with.

~ In a way, there is something more, because if you come in contact with people who are happy and joyful, their positivity reinforces your positivity. If one does the Mudt.ta Bhavana as a practice, it should be only after doing the Metta, or at least being ~na very friendly and Netta-ful state of mind.... even if you haven't actually done the practice in a technical sense. But it is quite impossible, to be in a state of mind of no good will towards others

page 13

and a bit unfriendly and "Alright, I don't feel like the Metta today, let's do the Nud-j-ta"...that would be quite impossible, hm? (pause) and even more so to the .. "Well I don't feel very friendly today, I don't feel very joyful, alright but I'll get on with the Equanimity". No. ~hat is even less possible. hm? Why is that do you think?

Ananda: You're returning to indifference.

S: You're returning to indifference. So what is equanimity if it isn't indifference?

Hridaya: Stability?

S: Stability. Does equanimity exclude Metta? MudIta and Karuna?

Hridaya: Because their development will make that stability (unclear)

S: You say in their developed form but what is their de~oped form? How ti does it become developed?

Alita: Acceptance and potence(?)

S: Yes, more, but is that enough. . .Equanimity develops whet you have the same Metta towards all. hm? You develop equanimity by developing and stressing the element of sameness of the Metta, the same Metta towards all - not more towards this person, less towards that person, hm? This is what leads to the de~lopment of equanimity - in. other words you have an equal attitude and as you have equal emotional towards all beings. So equanimity arises when you develop that evenmindedness with r~rd to Metta, and so on. hm? So that is stability. You've got the same attitude of positive emotion, well you couldn't be more stable than that short of being enlightened. hm? So that is equanimity. So you develop equanimity be stressing the sameness of feeling towards all - ecualizin~ that feeling towards all. (Pause)- It's very import- ant when new people come along to a centre, they should feel a sort of happy, friendly, or even ~oyful atmosphere. hm? and a peaceful atmosphere too, a relaxed atimosphere (long pause)

Atula: Would you say, then1in that sense the Metta is the really most im~~rtant

practice of the two?

S: In some ways it is 1I think. Yeah. But I have heard it said a little while

ago by some people, they f~l~t there was a tendency for the Metta, if one wasn't careful, to be neglected. , because sometimes one doesn't feel in a very

page 14 ~~~

positive mood and a bit like "I'm not in a very positive mood, I can't get anywhere with the Metta today. Let's do the mindfulness of breathing instead."

Hm? But actually in a way it should be the other way around. If you're not

~,

feeling too good, and not feeling very positive~~th~t's just when you should

do the Metta. Or at least try to do it. . and very often you can. hm. You shouldn't let yourself be influenced too much, by what may well be a sort of surface feeling. I mean, when your disinclination to practice the Metta, may be~j~t~o to a trivial i=itation that you can get over quite easily actually- once you make an effort.

Hridaya: It's the unwillingness to try;

~ It's the unwillingness to try, yes, quite. In a way you want to indulge the feeling of irritation and resentment. You don't want to give it up.

Ananda: Over a long period I found the Metta practice, a great difficulty with the actual practice. ..the technique ~f it. .visualizing the people,~~evel- oping the feeling in that situation. I hav~/hgradeat difficulty with that for a long time, but at the same time I found that my overall general feeling state A

was actually more positive. Can you account for that? Should one worry that one can't Set on with the practice?

S: I think sometimes, there's a delayed effect from the practice. hm. (pause) . it may be that one is spending too much time in the early stages, one should get on quite qu~~ly, or relatively quickly to the fifth stage which normally one would enjoy more.

Ananda: I very riarely often used to get on - - - the fifth stage.

~ Well, there you are, then. ...So perhaps one whould try that. Just spend a minute or two on the early stages, or in each of the early stages, and allow onesLef to get on to the fif th stage quite quickly

Ananda: I remember your saying quite a long time ago, "one can't really do the Netta, unless in the first place you develop positive feelings towards yotlrself." And I took that in the sense of spending a long time in the first stage.

S: Well, it's also a question of regular steps and irregualr steps. That if you follow strictly the path of regular steps well then you will just stay with stage one until you've got it going really well. But one can also follow the

path of irregular steps. If you find that stage three is very easy for you well, get on to that more quickly, hm? but sooner or later you'll have to develop Metta really fully, you will have to sort out this question of your lack of good~ill towards your own self. But having experienced at least some measure of good~ill towards others you can then come back, and work on your feelings

towards yourself more easily. yeah? But sooner or later you will have to come back and sort of, as it were, retread the path of regular steps. But that doesn't mean that you can't have quite an extensive experience of Metta in the mean time. But to develop it really very strongly you'll have to include yourself too, sooner or later.

I find it a lot easier to develop Metta towards a friend,

~ Yes~ most people find that the easier stage. If you can get going there, it not only carries you forward but it also carries you back, too. You can sort of retroactively experience good will towards yourself.

END OF SIDE A

V

page 15

SIDE B Cv. ~1~~(q~~

S: It also carries you back too, you can sort of retroactively experience some good will towards yourself. For instance, if you get the goodwill towards a friend going, then you could sort of imagine yourself in a happy situation with that friend, heh?, a situation in which you're feeling a lot of good -

will towards the friend and the friend also feeling good will towards you. yea?;

and if you can feel somebody else feeling good~ill towards you, then you can start feeling good~will towards your own self, too. yea? This is usually

how it starts.. if we find it

-- difficult to love ourselves, you know,

C- ~sr9 the word "love" just for once). ,if we find it difficult to love

ourselves~ very often the only way in which we can get around to that is through realizing, through recognizing, that somebody else loves us, yeah? and so we start...the first thing "Well, I can't be all that unloveable. That person does have a very definite feeling for me"~ so reflecting in this way, you start feeling some love towards yourself. "I can't be all that bad." hm? "Somebody at least has got some warm~ feeling towards me. Somebody thinks I~o~ there's some good in me." So you start feeling a bit happier with yourself then. So very often one can do it in this sort of way And self-hatred is a/~~~em for quite a lot of people or at least self-dislike or

self-contempt. So the experience of being accepted by others and liked by 1,

others is really important...and here again is the function of the spiritual

community, hm? If you feel that you really are liked by others and others care for you well, then, you can begin to accept yourself more easily and more readily and feel more positively towards yourself~~.but if such a person is not accepted by others, it's all the more difficult for him to accept himself. and some lucky people can accept themselves and love themselves regardless of what anybody else thinks and feels about them. . but for most it's quite difficult. I think most people if they felt that every in

their environment was looking down on them and disliking them and blaming them feel quite bad towards them/aSnt~XesSo on, they~ take on as it were, or

take over as it were, the feelings of~her people about them.. and this is what happens in countries like China, it seems, where you're subjected to  
[301]

very strong pressure by your group~ or your collective or whatever, and you just sort of have to accept their evaluation of you and reform yourself accordingly, huh, just to get back into some sort of contact~th them - to ~~~%&~.. Sr'.

feel some - positivity (unclear)... It's~a terrible situation to

be regarded negatively by the whole of your group, the whole of the group ju~t to which you belong. You just can't stand it. You'd give up anything. "Yes,

I am bad". You'd agree with it just to get that measure of approval. "I did do wrong. I was a traitor". "I was a filthy Capitalist spy." You~agree to it all just to get their acceptance. "Yes, I will reform myself. Please take me back. Please don't feel so negatively towards me" is what they're really saying and the technique works. In every case except that of the strongest minded people, who can stick out against anything...and they're very rare. And some people, you can burn them at the stake, t~ won't change, but the majority aren't like that. (pause)

Hridaya: You See that with animals I as well, that are ostracised by the group. Not long ago I was visiting a relation's farm and for some reason that had happened to -- pig in the group. He'd been picked on by the other pigs and you could just see marks and scratches where the other pigs had gotten him physically. He had been pushed to one side. He was a healthy looking animal~ but he just died and the relations said "well (fault-in recording)...." ~~~i')

S: Hm. So one must be aware that the effect on the -I was going to say "individual" -but it's more like" group member" of the attitude of the rest of the group is quite strong, huh? a -- - therefore, even within the context of our

own movement, we may be quite careful of the way in which we bring, as it were, or

pressure to bear on any single person, because sometimes the person Ae might

be an individual is quite difficult to stand up against it and resist it, especially if it does seem as it occasionally has happened, that a particular person is labelled in a particular way<sup>1</sup> or treated in a particular way. It's very difficult for such a person to ~hstand this, especially as usually seems to happen<sup>1</sup> that that particular person is a bit weak to begin with anyway~and that's why he or she is picked on. So we really have to watch this. A United disapproval of the whole movement virtually or a sizeable section of it, could do

quite a bit of harm and damage. ~7. Voice: Isn't there a right amount of "Right disapproval" against (unclear)

.6

page 17

S: Oh yes, yes. I mean if it's just a measured, rational disapproval of something th't a person had done which he shouldn't have done that's a different matter. I'm thinking more of something ~ike making a scapegoat of someone) and that has happened once or twice, and that is quite a terrible thing. - tended to happen and it did get nipped in the bud but ~it was painful(?) (fault in recording) (pause) And similarly a positive attitude on the part of other people, can really bring the individual up, and it's very important to give that from time to time. This is where the expression of approv~al and appreciation and gratitude and thanks does come in, and very often we're very deficient in that sort of way. We don't thank people enough; we don't show our gratitude enough; we don't appreciate people enough; we don't speak warmly to them enough; we just don't show enough friendliness. I think things are better within the Friends than they are -f in the world at large, but certainly there's still room for improvement even, ~Ln the Friends. So positive emotion, we come back to that. .1 I think we'd better end there, there's just a few minutes before 12 and were going into quite a long topic after

just half another verse 174: "Thus always observe the practices And not those counter to



them."

After that we go on to the signs of a great being so we'll leave those for the afternoon. So any general points about what we've been doing this morn

ing? (long pause)

aesthetic

Voice: When he talked about contemplation, the will to live is

suspended.. would that be the same as the Ego is suspended?

S: In a way, yes. But suspended - in abeyance - not actually destroyed; not actually dissolved, yes, yea. The will to live being taken as "egoistic". So this is why, as it were, aesthetic contemplation is not only disinterested, but in a way, impersonal, hm? You sort of lose yourself in it, in a positive way. You lose yourself in the beautiful object, in the work of art. You forget everything, you forget all about your own sort of petty affairs, your own personal concerns, huh?

Hridaya: Would that be equivalent to the first Dhyana? ~: y~, yes) I think for most of us, we need both. The contemplation of the beautiful and the reflection on the unbeautiful (S: Oh, yes)

V

page 18

S: You need both the stick and the carrot. you know.. yes, very much so. (long pause) This ~I think, is one of the functions of the arts.. that they can lift one's emotions to a higher level, ~ a more refined level, hm?, especially

say, if one reads the poetry of Shelley or the poetry of Keats or something sort of like that, or Blake. Maybe a lot of modern literature wouldn't have that/effect.

You have to be careful what -you read. (Pause) I think in some circles, it's S

regarded as very old-fashioned, to read poetry for the sake of beauty, huh? hm..

of to think of poetry in terms of beauty, hm?, but ~s certainly at least one aspect of it. It seems to be an old-fashioned idea, or is considered to be an old-fashioned idea, that poetry is concerned with the creation of beauty or a certain kind of beauty ~and that you should get a sort of uplift, as it were, from it...not a pseudo-moral uplift but an experience of a higher level of being, even a more disinterested, less narrowly personal, level. Where you

can lose yourself, forget about yourself, while still being aware.

Ananda: I think ~nr?at~ ~~lel arts, contemporary arts, the ideal of beauty

is becoming very much abused. . .and very much secondary to something that is O~LC\*  
m0re~pOlit~cal or satirical.

S: Hm. This is what I enjoyed that film I mentioned; "The Sleeping Beauty" is very beautiful, yea? (pause)

Ananda: Surely it's a phenomenon of segregation, of beauty, of (unclear) expeflence, surrounding the arts apart from any spiritual connotati ~. (S: hm) (Pause) ~eaction against the Victo~an sentimentality as well - we're going through that quite a bit.

S: I'm not so sure about that. '-- was this Vict~rian sentimentality, for instance? (pause) Were the Victorians all that sentinisental? We should start questioning some of these assumptions. (Ananda: They were. There was another side to them as well.) What is sentimentality? Were the Victorians not sensitive to beauty? Perhaps they weren't (Pause) They certainly didn't

seem all that sensitive to a more ideal kind of beauty or, for a better term, to the a more spiritual beauty. We don't seem to get much of that in/Victorian

period. You don't even get that in Tennyson, or whether you get it in the greatest of poets...there's certain picturesqueness, hm? but you don't get any glimpse of a real spiritual beauty, as you do for instance in the Romanti~oets usu1a~lly. (pause)

V

page 19

Hridaya: They looked quite a~ot to Greece for their inspiration. You see it quitt strongly there. (S: Yea, yea.)

S: In some cases what they thought was Greece....aomwtimes they projected their ideals back on to Greece.,, not always. No doubt there was some objedt

ive element there that inspired them. Apparently Keats saw the ? vase ~~, Well there was a ? vase which was a genuine Greek vase, huh. (long pause)

Alright~1~et's leave it there

S: Second half of verse 174:

Voice readin~: "If you and the world wish to gain

the highest enlightenment,

Its roots are the altruistic aspiration To enlightenment firm like Meru, the King of mountains,  
The compassion which reaches to all quarters, The wisdom which relies not on duality."

S; Hm. So here, Nagarjuna is putting before the king, hm~~ ~fact is the Mahayana ideal... that is to say the Bodhisattva ideal. huh? "If you and the world wish to gain the highest enlightenment" - that is to say - not enlight- enment for oneself alone, but the enlightenment of a Samyksam Buddha, hm? which is for the good and the benefit of all,hm?, then there are three rofts, as it were three factors which would help bring about that. The first is the "altruistic spiration to enlightenment firm like Meru, the king of mountains". So what does this refer to, what is this altruistic aspirationT to enlightenmeni~ This is the Bodhicitta. It's altruistic because it's for the sake of othrs as well as for oneself. And it is firm like Neru\* king of mountains, hm? So what does that mean? (pause) It means it's unshakeable, yea? It persists under all circumstances, hm? It's never overcome, hm? And secondly, "The compassion which reaches to all quarters," the compassion which is absolutely without limits; which is universal, which is omnipresent, huh? which embraces

all living beings, hm? of past,present and future-- and all directions of space., -"~p and "The wisdom which relies not on duality". hm. The wisdom ~oes

beyond duality. ~pause) The wisdom - goes be~ond concepts. The wisdom goes beyond the opposition between being and non-being. existence and

non-existence.. is and is not. So it's as though Nagarjuna is sa~ng to the

king that if he wants to fulfill the highest Mahayana ideal,-the highest ideal of the Mahayana - if you wish to be a B~~hisattva, then there are just these

V

page 20

three things that you must do: You must cultivate the Bodhicitta, the will to Enlightenment - making firm and unshakeable; You must develop your compassion to the widest possible extent; and you must cultivate the wi~dom that does not rely upon duality. Hm. (pause) In a sense one could say that there are only t~ groups, only two requisites for the Bodhisattva. One is Wisdom and the other is Compassion. The two really come together or begin to come together in the Bodhicitta, huh? So once the Bodhicitta has arisen, it means that Wisdom and Compassion already have coalesced to some extent\* and what one has to do then is to feed that Bodhicitta more and more, huh? with the development of compassion and the cultivaton

of wisdom. But the point is it must be a compassion which is without limit, that reaches to all quarters and~ a wisdom that does not rely on duality, huh? (long pause) Alright 176:

Hridaya reading: "O great King, listen to how Your body will be adorned With the two and thirty Signs of a great being."

S: Hm. Are you familiar with these two and thirty signs? of a great being? Hm. Have you heard about these? Ah, the thirty two signs or marks of a great being, eh, a Mahapurusha, literally a great man, a great spirit~ if you like, these occur as a list in the Pali texts. huh? They're supposed to be of pre-Buddhist origin but- that is to say ~ they are referred to in the Pali texts - especially by the Brahmins - as being a well-known set, eh? As if to say~ knowledge about them was widely current at that time. Actually we don't find, as far as I know, any reference to them, in non-Buddhist literature, in Brahmanical literature, hm. But from the Pali texts we gather that it was widely believed that a great man, a great being-, yea? could be recognized by his possession of these 32 Marks. There are 32 major marks, 84 minor ones..

and they're a very miscellaneous list - some of them seem very sort of archaic 1'

Something quite archetypal - others seem to reflect Indian aesthetic ideals

about manly strength and beauty. Some frankly seem a bit bizarre.. though sometimes one can see some meaning in them, huh? So this list occurs several times in the Pali texts, and it's also stated that there are two kinds of

great men - 1) The great man who is a universal monarch, huh? the Chakravarti~~ i.e., - and 2) The great man who is a Buddha, a Enlightened Being, huh?

V

page 21

So if one sees upon anybody these 32 marks, then you know he must either be a Universal Monarch or the Buddha. hm? So Nagarjuna is now saying to the King, "O great King, listen to how your body will be adorned with the two and thirty signs of a great being.".. that is, if you fulfill certain norms of conduct, hm? In other words, he's presenting the King with an ideal... what he will be like, what he will develop into, if he behaves and acts in a certain way. Sometimes these are called the 32 marks of a Buddha, but that is not quite correct - they're the 32 marks of a great being.. huh?.. and the great being may be either a universal monarch or a Buddha.

Voice: What would a Universal Monarch be? (unclear) .. a great King. Yes. One who exercises over-lordship over all other, as it were, petty

Kings. This again is an ancient Indian idea which is referred to many times in the Pali texts. The Universal Monarch is also one who rules by righteousness, huh?, who establishes the 10

precepts in all the 10 quarters, huh? and who rules justly, huh? Ashoka is supposed to have been, to some extent the historical fulfillment of this kind of ideal... You may remember that in the Buddha's very early days when the Buddha was a little child, even after his birth, a Rishi a wise man, can't recognize on him, hm? the 32

signs...of a great man. ..and predicted that he will be either a Universal Monarch or a Buddha, huh?. a fully Enlightened being, huh? So this is the way

quite interesting, this association between a Universal Monarch and the Buddha. Hm? It's almost as though the Universal Monarch is the secular counterpart of the Buddha, ha?.. as though the Universal Monarch represents the farthest limit to which one can go in worldly life. hm? Whereas the Buddha represents the farthest limit to which one can go in spiritual life? hm? So there is a sort of analogy between them, a correspondence between them, So there is further the suggestion, if you are a great man, then you have the possibility of either extreme worldly success or extreme spiritual success. hm? You can go either way, huh? hm? ... and this is very important because it suggests that the man who is spiritually successful~in the sense of a man who becomes a Buddha~ also has it within his power~ or had it within his power to be a great worldly success as well.. hm? and why do you think this point is important or particularly relevant? (Pause)

V

page 22

Voice: Worldly success is a means of - - Spiritual power.

~ No, I wasn't thinking of that. But the fact that the Buddha, according to Buddhist tradition, could have become a Universal Monarch had he so~Wanted. So what does that suggest? ~"p~.. ----- Renunciation.

S: Yes. Renunciation. t

U~ra: He can just make it in anything he puts his mind to.

S: Yes. In other words he doesn't go into the spiritual life because he is unable to cope with worldly life. huh? He~ going into spiritual life isn't compensatory for lack of worldly success....or inability in worldly matters. If he wished he could be as successful in worldly matters as he is in spiritual matters. hm? This I think is The great point here. (pause) So that the person who makes a true success of his spiritual life, is also in all likelihood to be the person who, had he put his mind to it, had he been interested enough, could have made an equal success of worldly life. hm? In other words, you~n't go into spiritual life, just because you're unable to cope with worldly life.. or unable to make a success of it.. you have that capacity too. (long pause).. ..Alright, let's see how the King is to become a great being, a great man, huh? (1??-)

- reading: "Through the proper honouring of reliquaries, Honourable beings superior

and the elder! You will become a Universal Monarch, Your glorious hands and feet marked with ( a des~gn)of) wheels."

~ Hm. "Through the proper honouring of reliquaries"; what are these reliquaries?

Voice~ STupas.

S: Stupas. Although actually a note here gives a different interpretation which says reliquaries here are a~tual Buddhas. Well, obviously you'd have to have actual Buddhas around, heh? before you could honour them, huh? So if there are no actual Buddhas, you honour the reliquaries. . .in the sense of the Stupas. But why is so much importance attached in Buddhism traditionally, to the honouring of reliquaries, the honouring of Stupas? Why is there such a great cult of the Stupa~ do you think?

Bridaya: Just like you said, if the Buddha isn't about then.. (Unclear)

V

page 23

S: Because originally a Stupa contained relics of the Buddha, huh? So you feel some sort of personal contact. There are other kinds of S~Lpas - there are commemorative Stupas erected on spots associated with The life of the Buddha, and Stupas which contain n~relics~ but objects which are associated with the Buddha...like his bowl or his robe, for instance. But in all cases there is a personal association with the Buddha, huh? and by honouring the reliquary, you get p~rhaps a stronger feeling for the Buddha, even for the Buddha as a human historical personality who did once upon a time live upon ~arth.

Hridaya: Didn't the Buddha himself recommend that (sentence unclear) ~~~ck Q~~t...  
..~'A

S: Yea, according to the Digganikaya (?), that is the~paranl sutta, yes.

~o, "through the proper honouring of reliquaries, honourable beings, superiors

and the elderly, you will become a Universal Monarch, (with) glorious hands and feet marked with a design of wheels". In view of what was said earlier on about the consequences of the skillful and unskill~ful actions, it's interesting that one becomes a Universal Monarch, under the operation of the law of Karma ,by honouring others. Hm, yea? The Universal Monarch obviously is honoured - is honoured more than any other secular personality - but the first kind of action which is mentioned as leading under the law of Karma~ to that state of Universal Monarch is honouring reliquaries, honouring honour- able beings, honouring superiors and the elderly, huh? In other words, you achieve a high position yourself, by reverencing others, huh? Not the other way around, huh? (pause) So this is the first of the signs mentioned - the mark of wheels - the Dhatmachakras on the hands and feet. These are

all signs

which obviously the Buddha according to tradition was supposed to have possessed read  
Alright, let's go and/all through these 32 signs and then discuss them gener

ally, huh, that's right up to 196: Let's go round reading one at a time:

'::~ reading: (178) "O King, always maintain firmly What you have vowed about the  
~ractices~ You will then become a Bodhisattva With feet that are very level." t

Ui~~ra reading: (179) "Through gifts and pleasant speech. Purposeful and concordant  
behaviour You will have hands with glorious Fin ers °oined b webs of li t

V

page 24

"Through abundant giving Of the best food and drink Your glorious hands and feet will be  
soft: Your hands and feet and shoulder blades And the nape of your neck will broaden, So  
your body will be big and those seven areas broad."

reading: (181) "Through never doing harm and freeing the condemned Beautiful will be your  
body. strai~ and lar~, Very tall with long fingers And broad backs of the heels."

At ul a reading: ~ 182) "~motithevowedractices ~od colour will be lori ous Your  
ankles will not be prominent, Your body hairs will grow upwards."

Ananda raading: (183) "Through your zeal for knowledge and the arts And  
so forth, and through imparting them You will have the calves of an antelope,  
A sharp mind and great wisdom." ~9. reading: (184) "If others seek our  
wealth and ossess 5 Through the discipline of immediate giving You  
will have broad hands, a pleasant complexion And will become a leader of the  
world."

jwWW~~ridaareadin: (185) "Through reconciling well Friends who have been divided Your  
glorious secret organ Will retract inside."

~din (186) "Through giving good hou~es And nice comfortable carpets Your colour will be  
very soft Like pure stainless gold."

reading: (187) "Through giving the hi~est powers (or kinga~ins) And following a teacher  
properly You will be adorned by each and every hair And by a circle of hair between the  
eyebrows." t

Utara reading: (188) "Through speech that is pleasant and pleasant ac in u on e goo speec  
0 0 hers You will have curving shoulders And a lion-like upper body."

Ajita reading: (189) "If you nurse and cure the sick, Your chest will be broad,  
~-----yilllivenatural1 And all tastes will be the best." reading: (190) "Through initiating  
activities concordant With the practices, the swelling on your crown Will stand out well and  
~your body) will be Symmetrical like a banyan tree."

Atula reading: (191) "Through speaking true and soft words Over the years. 0 lord of men,  
Your tongue will be long and Yo~ voice that of Brahma."

V

page 25

Ananda reading: (192) "Through speaking true words Always at all times You will  
have cheeks like a lion, tBe glorious and hard to best."

Others and doing what should be done, Your teeth will shine Very white and even."

Hridaya reading: "Through using true and non-divisive Bpeech over a  
long time (194) You will have foftylorious teeth Set evenly and good.

'reading: (195) "Through viewing things with love And without desire, hatred or delusion  
Your eyes will be bright and blue With eyelashes like a bull." 'reading: (~96) "Thus in brief  
know well These two and thirty signs Of a great lion of a being Together with their causes."

S: Hm. So what sort of general impression or picture do you get? t

Ut~ra: Of beauty.

S: Of beauty. This is clearly the intention. Yeah? Even though some of the details may not  
be quite in accordance with our conception of beauty. Yes, But clearly the general  
impression is one of beauty. . or the genral intention

is one of beauty. ... . S0 as I've mentioned these 32 signs are the

signs of the great man, the Mahapurusha (?), - so the Mahapurusha can be not only a



Universal Monarch, hah, he can also be a Buddha, a fully enlightened Buddha. So what does this suggest? (pause) This suggests that in describing the 32 marks, you not only described being a great man, you've also described the outward appearance of a Buddha, hm? In other words, you've described, or you've depicted the Buddha ideal in terms of Beauty. Heh? You see that? There has been quite a bit of discussion as to whether the Buddha did actually possess these 32 signs on his physical body. yeah? The Pali texts are sometimes ambiguous~ we can perhaps read between the lines. We can gather from some of the Pali texts, I mention Pali texts because these are

among the oldest, we can gather from some of the Pali texts, that the Buddha was not always recognizable. hm? That he sometimes appeared just like an ordinary person. heh? So this suggests that the 32 signs were not physical

page 26      ~~~\

signs\* by which he could be easily recognized, hm? On the other hand, we know also from quite a number of passages in the Pali texts, that the Buddha was an outstanding personality, even physically, huh? There are quite a number of references to the fact that he was tall, well built, well proportioned, handsome, strong, held himself with dignity, and so on. There are many such references about having golden complexion, but the 32 marks, the list of 32 marks, clearly goes far beyond that - so the 32 marks seem to suggest a sort of ideal beauty, or the 32 marks try to convey a sort of ideal beauty. And in later Buddhist thought, when the doctrine of the three Kayas were developed, it was sometimes said that the 32 marks, were marks or signs not of the Buddha's physical body, that is to say the Nirmanakaya, but of the Sambodhi; the Sambodhi, representing the sort of glorious ideal of the form of the Buddha abstracted from space and time.. hm?.. existing outside space and outside time... a sort of archetypal Buddha, hm? So you get the idea? But whether we regard the historical Buddha as possessing the 32 marks, or whether we regard them as pertaining to the Sambodhi Buddha, the ideal Buddha, I mean the intention is clear, - to present the ideal of enlightenment, either in its historical embodiment or ideal form, in terms of beauty, ...in aesthetic terms as it were...and this is quite important, hm? And if you look at the Tibetan tradition in say, Tibetan paintings, it's the ideal Buddha that is being represented. . that is to say that the Buddha is depicted in accordance with this tradition of the 32 signs, or marks (pause) In other words, the impression which is sought to be conveyed is of an ideal being - completely beautiful being. But of course, there's still a difference between the Universal Monarch and the Buddha... an indefinable difference.. The fact that somebody possesses the 32 marks, you can't infer that they are a Buddha. hm? Maybe a Universal Monarch. So this is why the Diamond Sutra says that the Buddha is not to be known from marks. hm? Which has also a deeper significance.. but apart from that the list of 32 signs or marks represents an attempt to depict not just the historical Buddha but the Buddha ideal, huh? in aesthetic terms, in terms of beauty, yeah? And this is obviously very important. (pause)

Atula: There are passages where people come specifically to look on the Buddha's those marks?

page 2?

S: That is true. Yes, there are passages in the Pali texts where learned Brahmins come along and recognize the 32 signs in the Buddha, huh? For instance, there's another passage where someone is following the Buddha's footprints and sees the marks of the wheel in the footprints. Then there are again other texts where the Buddha seems to pass for an ordinary person, whereas really if he had this protuberance or swelling on the top of his

head, etc, etc, well, it would have been immediately evident that he~

was not an ordinary person, hm? (pause) The whole subject of these 32 where it signs or marks is quite mysterious. As I mentioned no one really knows

came from. The Pali texts represent it as well known to the Brahmins of the Buddha's day, but in Brahminical literature it's not possible to find any reference to this list at all~which seems quite strange. But as I said, the general purport of the list is clear - to present a picture of an ideal being, who could become either a Universal Monarch or an Enlightened ~uddha, hm? So the enlightened Buddha possesses these characteristics and the enlightened Buddha is presented therefore, in these terms.. or depicted in these terms

seen in these terms the embodiment of beauty, as it were. ib~ ~ Is Hridaya:  
(unclear) King~presented some thing quite desirable. (S: Yes, yes).. a very desirable picture.

S: Now it's significant, you won't overlook the fact that in this particular chapter~ which is an interwoven explanation of definite goodness and high status, we've had two lengthy descriptions - hm? We've had a lengthy description of the uncleanness of the body of the member of the opposite and we've had a description of the glorious body of a Buddha. I think it's no accident and no coincidence that you get both of these in the same chapter. So what do you think is the general significance of that? (pause)

Atu~la: The conditioned and the Unconditioned.

S: Yes. It's the conditioned and the unconditioned. Nagarjuna is trying to switch the King's attention from the sensuously attractive to the spiritually beautiful - from the unclean - from the As~k& to the su~ka- the pure beautiful.

END OF TAPE

312B

And this also suggests that it isn't enough to divert someone's attention from the conditioned. One hasn't also got to direct that attention to the unconditioned. It's not enough to point out that the body of the woman is unclean one has got to point out the beauty of the Buddha's form. In other words a purely negative attitude is not enough there must be a positive attitude there must be a presentation of the ideal in positive terms. This very very important.

\_\_\_\_\_: It's a good idea to replace something which is negative and put in something that is positive.

S: Yes right.

: I was just thinking that if the King was thabout forty, then this sort of category wouldn't appeal much to him because unless you took it on another level , the marks, being that age...

S: No you will become" in a future life. It is the future life that is being referes to that if you perform all these good actions as listed by Nagasena, then in a future life, as a result of those good actions you will be born

[text for rest of this page needs typing in. ]

[text for next 48 pages very poor may need retyping. ]

2 (pg.1cont)

ing the arts. 'I'm certain there's been quite an emphasis on that but, you know, whether there's been an equally strong emphasis on the ideal, the ultimate ideal, the i~deal of enlightenment that sort' of way-presenting it in terms of pure beauty ty-I'm not sure. (pause)

:There's a point you know-whaea per- son's looking really well and, er, when he is practising, he does look beautiful.

S :This is true, I mean at the end of a retreat, you know, those people have been on a, how else to put it, beauty course or ' something like that, very much so.

: (inditinct)

S : So this also shows that it is a mat- ter of expression more than of actual fea- tures.

\_\_\_ : Yes, um.

S : You may have sort of quite clean cut regular fe'at'ures but you know not be at all beautiful. On the other hand, you may have quite irregular features but your expres- sion is beautiful. If you've both togeth- er, well maybe that's even better, (pause) I think this is something that in a way needs to be, you know, put across, perhaps to the general public, much more clearly

'a"

3

and m'uch more effectively than it is at pres'ena't. 'It's on'ly if the ideal is pre- sented in this

very positive, attractive terms that people will feel inspired. (pause)

: (something about spiritual art) too faint-

S : And we're not helped of course now-adays by the fact that there seems to be you know, a general depreciation of beauty or a general depreciation of the beautiful in a you know, more traditional sense- people aren't usually familiar with that ideal in many cases.

: (something about religious art in the west, as opposed to our own) too faint again

S : Well, you see the difficulty is this, that in the west I mean what has been the central object by religious art?

S : The Crucifixion

S : The Crucifixion, So it's very difficult to have a beautiful crucifixion. (pause) And you know Christ is described in the gospels as "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief" and there's another passage, quoted from the Old Testament, saying he's of "uncomely countenance" there's a sort of ancient tradition that Christ was quite ugly in appearance. So in, later painters there was a sort of,

a,

'4

out of their own sort of artistic instinct, they tried to represent Christ as beautiful but that's been quite difficult, culturally if you like, to represent a crucifixion scene, or if you're depicting a dead Christ. It's interesting that in the very early days of Christianity, in the case of the art of the catacombs, the Crucifixion was not depicted it seems, or at least not nearly so much. Christ was depicted as the "good shepherd" and they took apparently the figure, the you know, pagan representation of Apollo as the model. So Christ is represented in the catacombs very often as a beardless young man with long flowing hair and white robes sitting among sheep-which is quite different from later representations.

: (sentence indistinct) Could...life... seeing the spiritual ideal and seeing Christ or a cross, I would say, is that where the spiritual ideal ends up?

S : Well you could say you know it has a significance, you know, could say it represents the crucifixion of the ego and you can certainly give it that significance and that the spiritual significance. That there isn't anything in a sense attractive. You're not attracted by the idea of, you know, the Crucifixion of the ego-not unless you're a masochist. But the crucifixion of the ego is as it were incidental ; you the real (point/thing)?, the realisation of

the ideal. Sometimes in Christian art you

3

you do get a sort of more ideal Christ in, you know, the representation of the Transfiguration: that is sometimes represented. That that doesn't occupy the central place in you know Christian art or, in Christian religious consciousness, certainly not in western Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant Christianity, the central subject, you know, is, you know, the Crucifixion.

(indistinct)

---S: For instance, the Spanish church's you know the Crucifixion is represented very very realistically or gruesomely realistic~y. It's like something out of Madame Tussaud's.

~H: What do you think most Christians realise the symbolical nature of that event, you know, or is it just as a sad event? (and and)

S Well according to orthodox Christian teachings it has a symbolic significance, but at the same time it did actually historically happen-as in fact it may well have done. That the fact that that is the which, more than any other, confronts the Christian religious consciousness cannot but have its affects, so that the message comes across is a message of pain, and suffering and death and blood and no doubt that does all have a spiritual significance, but the immediate import is not of that kind probably in most cases.

6

It's surprising about the figure of the Madonna.

~: An, yes. The figure of the Madonna of course is a much more attractive one than, you know, it is a female and you know I mean that again carries its own message, it's mother, as it were, or a spiritualised one's mother (pause)\* In the case of Buddhism the central figure is very much the figure of the Buddha, the Buddha in a state of enlightenment, and, no doubt, there are many clumsy and uninspiring Buddhas produced in the course of the centuries, but the best of them are very very inspiring indeed. (pause)

(3-4 words indistinct possibly (shop) Buddha's) just down the road, from Aryatara they have candles, or you know statues of Christ and it's really so plastic there's not one bit of spirituality in the shop.

S: Well, I'm afraid you can't get plastic Buddhas too, unfortunately.

- This is in India?

: IM, well some of them even reach this country (pause) I suppose, whether we think in, er, plastic terms-I mean plastic in the artistic sense-three dimensional terms or whether we're thinking you know, in terms of a visualisation in a meditation, or whether we're just thinking about, imagining the, you know, the nature ?~ the ideal of enlightenment

~~,:a

,:a~J:<,w~~~' "~~Th

7

it, is very important that we try to feel it and experience it in positive terms- as beautiful.

sure? sentences indistinct,,) pre-

: Well I don't know if there is an image of ugliness there, do you think? Well ugliness in effect.

° (indistinct)

--°-with° ...because they maybe have contact zen and-they sort of go off~...

'a indistinct) I was thinking, perhaps in the last couple of years.

(,more voices at once, indistinct) S :res, Tibetan Thiddhism especially (pause)

It's more a matter of light and colours.

S :hm, hm, right yes (1-2 words indistinct) Incense and light S :And the rainbows

;bells, gongs that's what ~we want?) ~y talk about the gongs

a 8

- 4 (indistinct)' -

~: But then-again we have to be care-ful ; some of the thankss represent slightly garot-e'sque Buddha-you know, the proportions are not good or" there is unnaturally long earlobes and,things like that, or you" know, rather unnaturally broad shoulders, unn~as~l~y, you know, narrow waist, a and Of~a course at, Sukhavita we will ba'- t~y- ing t'o have a Thiddha ima'ge-the one th'st Aloka and Chintamani are working on-'wh~ch wil'l be attractive,, it will be in accordance with you know traditional iconography it will be atetbarnoami~nt'ime aesthetic' ally pleasing' and inspiring (pause). ~ I th4nk also it's important how one presents the -oharacter and sppearance of the his- torio'al Buddha himself uh? They are -talk- ing about the life of the Buddha, er when I first read books about Buddhism you know years,ago and even until fairly recently in some cases you know onea ~ust g~~a~~he impression that the Buddhas was a rather stern, stric't, school-masterly figure who was always going 'round,layin~ down~ r~les and telling-pecp',le what to do uh? hm. In from some (lives)? of the Buddha you do very much get that impression hm don't, you? But when you go through texts like the Sutta-N~pata as we did you know some weeks ago", the great chapter you get a quite differenta~i[[pression of the ~ddha, hrn? a~rst as the Buddha as a young man as very, very self-cinfident, very strong, very de-termined, very direct ah and well-

a a,, , ', '~',', , , , 'a', '~',~,

9

(bo-rn)? and attractive and so on. Th,~se poi,nt's are brought up very st,rongl-y \$hm, in'the text, but that isn't the usual 'ort of,impres)sion that we're gi~a~a~~ about the Buddha, um?' Also, it seems from some of these tex~s that the Buddha Was y~a~g~~ er 'when he gai,fled enlightenment than is usually thought. Usually told that the Buddha was thtt~~five when he gained ~afl~ighte~me~~a~~u~~t it seems from the ~ali

-'som'e of the ~ali texts- that he was' much yo'unger, I dis'~overed err, a few weeks a'go, a Mahayana text wh,ere it says 'that the Buddha left home at the age of n"jn'e- teen and gained enlightenment at the' age 6f thirty,' ah? Which seems much more likely hm, in view of these descri,ptions of him that w,e'ahave after his enlighten- ment as still' very youthful hm? So per- hap's the youthfulness of the Buddha is a g'ood thing to emphasise to even if he did gain ~nlig'htenment at thtrt~ftv. th~s not all '~hat iat'e' uh? B"ut the like,Iy hood is that he' gained e"nlightenment'at thirty, and left home at nineteen uh,mn? So this gives one the impression o'f a very youthful -ah, err, I mean attractive Buddha as it were huh, not an el,de,rly man sort of going 'round North-eastern Indi,a, ticking people' off you knpw fo,; 4ot'b~,i,ng quite strict enough,. Which is th""e- impres- sion 'y9u ~et from some other sources, mm? Can anya,ona~e re'member what sort of imrres- sion th,ey got about the Buddha as a his- torical 'figu,re,' or htstorioaal person~ality when th~ey first came into contact with

'~~',"

10

Buddhism,- nin? (pause) Or didn't the Th~d- dha figua~,~ at a]~l?

I think the idea I h,"aad was that sc~eone (w,,a'5 'nae?) very (cheery?)

)'s) :Yeh, but\_\_\_\_

not quite stern y'know, self-discipline'd, much very fun about it

S :Ah, yes, yes, hm

: I got that impression of you know ttefore-befor'e his enlightenment that~he was really strong and v~ry much d~t,a~e~a~~~rm ined in wanting to get what he was aft.#-',,"but after it, you know, he was ~ust err'Cpause) he had somethi'ng you know there (sentence) unc~ear) I hadn't read many books.

~: Yeah, but what sort of impression did you get of the Buddha as a human be- ing as it were? If you had met the Bu'ddha then do you think you wo"a,~ld have liked the Buddha?

Yeh, I think so (laughter)

- : I mean I got that impression just reading the light Of Asia,

S Ah yes. That is very positive. There the compassion~aspect w'as stressed very rn' much, yeh. This follows the (laltavista) which is of course a Mahayana work and does stress that side of the Buddha's

11

character0 Also I think there is the... the fact that later writers you 'know a-try 'to sort of,, they see the Buddha in term's of their own narrowed ideals ah, hm, for instance nowadays in the Theravada countries the Buddhasis, seen as the ideal monk um, not the ideal (man?) (skip in?) but the ideal monk- (p'o'ssible lost words?) Really wi'th his robes ~ery neatly worn huh and immaculate and nicely y',know freshly shaved head, very spic and' span, eyes sott of cast downuh-I mean he i,s represent,ed in th'is sort of way0 He's no longer the perfect man ; he's just th'e perfect monk,. um?a (pau'se)

~. I think that the fa~t that the ide-al as reflected um, something that- a 'lot of people wanted



even among these people who are monks. The feel~Irnggthough the Buddha was compassionate (words unclear) meek and mildness.

S Yes, yeh

~~. (unclear)

S : But you don't get that really from the Pali texts, actually; "The Buddha was meek and mild", huh he often spoke out, very strongly uh as very determined eh, when he uttered his lion roar, his (sing- hanada). (pause)

The thing that impressed me so much was (unclear) the from that sutra  
deter~ination (unclear) (pause)

- ~.:',

12

But to get back to what I was saying before, it becomes really ~a~, ~important you know to present the ideal; 'Of enlightenment, to present the ideal') ~, of Buddha- hood, yeh, by hook' or by crook') uh, in one way or another in terms of beauty ah to render attractive and inspiring yeh? hm? (pause) Otherwise people won't be attracted and inspired ~hey'll just be left cold ah? (pause). And you point in conflict with any of these verses or -gn'-s individually? There, is one - j~t with "ree't that are very level", that a~~~~o~ally and this is odd according to our ideas, the Buddha has the ideal of "the great being" has flat feet. Now we don't regard that as very attractive but perhaps this has ~pt some symbolic significance, 'an't his feet are in contact with the earth as if it were something like that, f4, -, ', knows? I mean this 'i's something that ~a, a~a to me, I've not read that, but t', ba't is a possibility, ah?

Couldn't, it be something to do with ~Indian idea, of beautiful landscape as one that was flat?

S : That's true, yes, yes, hm. They've no idea, about beautiful landscape; that is sort of ugly and untidy isn't it? (laughter) ~um? where it says, one-seventy-nine, ~, ~ a', I have hands - thousands - 'a' b' we 5, ~, a', j' ~ "of light" s-a't 'C'e""O""r't of commentarial addition.

An 'commentary, is, have been much puzzled by this; some thought the Buddha had webbed fingers' uh? 'Just as the feet of the duck Caa1~C°-Nebbe(3 tih? 'V tr'i ski~~ bwt -

,,,a~, "a a' ""a,,

are webbed uh? with skin between-they wonde'r,ed just what on earth that could mean wn? But here it says "webs of Light", at leas\* that's-how the Tibets unders~ta8n~~d it. Buat even webs of light you know i~tt easy to understand.

I think th-e for tha,t is a~~eb is an aura.

~ :hmmm, maybe and then, " hr u h ab -

w', b'r9-a~-en, -5,9 your' bO':'Na will be b'~'& and the-se s,ev~ areas,broa&" till? WaC,~i~ ~e,;r"e you get a more manly ideal. (pau's'e) ",f4r-'ouah ~ev'er doiTVR ha'rm and freei,na t~eo~4~"'-°'inned be~utjful will be your b9dY. stri-~4,' and " are ver tall w,th lon fn'-era'and b~,aaa,d backs of 'the heels" a'nd then' "~p'od ,,£~~~""r" ,, ",a'~~s~~\$t,~r~mynent", "b-d, hairs will "~row u~ward5" huh? This' 5, according to our ideas,- grotesque. The hairs of the body never, you know, going, growing the natural way down, grow up-but do you think this could have any symbolic significance? -

-. (unclear) in terms of err, hairs standing on end

S :Yes, with rapture. Yeh, you could say that ; in a~state of rapture and of vast energy. It could represent that

~,,, ~~~~~"a ~?~a~'~~~' ' a

: Gravity being conditioned

S :hm yes, right, growing in the op-posite direction-like against the stream as it were. Could represent that(pau-se). In some cases a connection between that ac,tions which the king is exhorted to perform and the' signs that accru'e to him - er in a future ~irth~ er, by virtue of p,er- forming these acations, does seem quite ,ap- propriate, but in other cases, not err, for instance here~ "IThrou'gh your zeal fo~ 0c~~9w- ~g~~i~~ and the a41t,s and 5,9 forthj'afl'd't~rO~h i~~t~ng them, rY9U will a-have the o~ve'-n' of

an'a44t'e{lo~e~ uh;; hm, q~~t;e clea~~rly~raaae~lly very shapely er-"asharc mind' and great wis

~"(pause) "If ot~er5 seek your wea'it?i and ~9~~sNesions. ttro#a,h the-diSci~l~wH~q{p{~),t~ ~Taaa,ea~;dia~e~ giving- yo,u, wi ll haVe bro - p" a lea'sa,~t' com~le,~i,on an~d 'will beo~at-a-a lea e"Th? tthi wprld~a (p,au"5e) 'a'n'd" thie"?i~ one aeigh~y-fivae "ro'u~h re'9onciling w'e'll ~ri,ends w210 h,ave bec6m'e div'~ided, your gl~i~uaa~ 'eecret organ will" retreat inaide". This 'is ano""ther rather o'dd si'gn a~? - That the sexual org'an of the great man is contained inside a sheath, th,e commentators say like tha,t of an elephant~er sometimes this is connected with the pra,ctic'e' of,er, celibacy'you know, for obvious reasons, but here it, i-s the re- sult of "r'~p9"ncilin~ well fflend~ awbo have been div&de"d"~' Why should it ha~e that significan"ce?

:Maybe because the (unclear) is sexual and the king tries to (unclear)'

15 ';;"} }

S :But it could have another signifi- canoe in that fri end ship has taken the place of sex, yeh? urn? I mean fri'eadahip re'presenting the more human, the more; sort of emotional-even spir'itual-k~nd of rela- tionship- the' metta uh? - So i'f that is dev- aeloped the result will 'be in a sense you don,"t need the sexual o,rgran ; it will retract ub'? hm-like that of a c'hild. So perhaps there is that sort of a connection. „So not only are you giv"en to friendship, you are so concerned a' bout it that you reconcile friends who have been divided. In other words, you are greatly~~ concerned to propa- ga'te metta. You' are g,re'atly concerned to propagate fnen~liness and friendship. so what happen~ as" a, result of that? Se: be- comes inoperative hm. I,think this 'is in a,Way quite im'p"b'rtant because one does find theat if one cultivates uh friendship ah and has warm emotional relationshIp's then sex does b,ecome less and less import- ant ; so, in that way, fne,ndship can re'place sex as it were. But one cana,?t, it see,ms, be without some ub som'e human relationships. It's very difficult to get on without that. If,~you don't have that you te,nd to fall back yoau know on the s6mewhat ~gro°~er or courser uh sati,s,faction of sex, urn?

Sex is, a very individual action where- assr~co~4i;;1,,ing frineds is more...

~:Well sex is individual in the sense, er not in 'the' you know, 'not in the tn~u~e individual 'sense ; it's more individual in its more selfish sense ,

l~

\_\_\_\_\_ : Whereas reconciling friends is more Cunci ear)

S :Yes it's more altruistic-creating harmony among people, 'whereas you don't usually-do that by means of sex.

:!Piat does the secret organ refer to

-h~~~~ere~in the text?

The secret organ refers to the penis. :Is the penis secret because it er...

- ~a : No, it's simply the organ that is kept covered uh. I mean the lali text has got a very oblique way of refering to this. They refer to it as that which is "clothed-covered" and presumably the Ti- be' tan "secret" refers to that, as when the brahmin tries to see whether "that which was cloth-covered" -was "sheath-hid" uh? That is the indirect way in which you know, the 'a'a'l'i texts' refer to the matter, (pause,~'. One-eighty-six JI -

co "-u' will b -

cone'p'icuo~s s-a of the'gr"eat"~af'l' and, therefore, also the Buddha :a golden cone~ ~leiton h~? tro~ably~ not literally go~d~n but shining and pure and bright - just like fine~gold,uh? (pause) ,"Throu h ~"i'l~N'-' i'b'l~tla'~at'a~we'r~ <or a - ""I "" ," "" 4iae'her -, --eri, ua'will

- ~,)~ " 'at ';;~a,'

be

be ~4~~~d--by each~and every h~r"--eas,,,,,c , individual hair will be beautiful"-""-b" a, c, triple of hair between, the eyebrows?" , this, is a circle of white-brilliant 'white- hair, er between the eyebrows ; white ~ust like lightening it's sometimes (pause) said 'and, 'Thro~~ see9h that' i~ ul~~san,t

- lea in a, ab acating u~on 'tbe'g'o6d

a 'aln-d a li"n~wwike'u -'e - "a " m'e'~n?"{ This is often men one in an an uma~,~literature-heroes are described' as having this sort of a body uh

: (unclear)

~: Er, no. Actually it means very broad at the shoulder, very narrow at the waist, the lion is supposed to be like that, yeh, "4~L~on-like ur~er bodyP ah? This is considered "red to be very man-ly as it were or in the west, too, Ne think like that ; very broad shoulders, very narrow waist-or narrow hips uh?

: (unclear) the figure O~ ,Amitayas(un- clear) -

S :aRight, yeh. Sometimes it's exagger- ated to such an extent that in that it no longer looks beautiful. "-~f y~u' nurse and care the sick. your che,st,'will be broad. you will live naturally and all tastes will be th~ be~t~ uh,' "-l taStes will be'the' ~"-wh'at do y9u think that mean's? (,pause) rt,'~ as ~bough you will thoroughly relish your'fobd'uh~ everything will ta\$e good~

[321]

tao, you, will taste the best uh (paL~~5C'')at - ~e-ninetY,tThr h i ' ia 'i

's'e''' i a' a r c- wn"-t e sn'ee. a, , the bo'h,iperuberano e as some-trans'lators render

e'tr "' li a,, banyan --" e~ in~ 5 0 say, 'your bo ,y 5 supp'o's'e'~- '0 b'e square uh? Wou're supposed to be as er as if er if you err stretch-- out your arms ah" you',re supposed to be 'as broad as y'ou are tallmm. Woul,,d that look aestheti,~c,,sIlly pleasing? If 'someone when they stret\*"h- their a~in,B, ,out they w,ere as. .as broad as the'y were tall?

:I think they'd (unclear) (giggle-s)

: Yeh ah

: (babble of 'voices)

-.Well stand ~p and let's see Ananda

;l,~,~ht er)

It's ~eonardo ~ (voices)

S : If you're six fo-ot taWl and then you out stYetch'4,..y~h hm. So, though,,,~agai~ ,it, is also,,said-that-this is one of' the-in-in'-o'-r 5~gfl~'l~a\${alt~ ,,the arms of the great man hang right d6'''wn'''~b,e,low''' the-the hands hang ria~ht down below the-kne~s. But this may ~ust' you know a literal way of presenting the (epiphet)'~? long' arms-heroes in- Indien' lit-ertt~~r~e

19

erture ,are described as, long-armed ;, ,tha,,t means a you know a very extensive reac", "h because, after all, they've ~ot to- ft',g'4t and to, to draw their boaw and that-~", 'a of-thing0 So perhaps it isn't to be 'tak'e'n too lite'rall'y, that you are long-armed ah- y6u ~ust have a long reach, uh.

~, : You know, ;,ante er sometimes y9u kn:O'w when you know all the times when we're g'oin,g sho'pping fo'r the necces~'ti,es fo,r a the retreat I ~ay you know well its no't a lo'ng reach uh

: T,eh, well be ,reboni with long arms ,""aughter) " -e'n thro ,,-s esk'''j N~,~one

ua~r v- 'a -t a- - r~ a". Tneare s this lo'~g, 'broa ongue ah~~? -')  
 ~u kno'w, one of th'e' more grotesque sign's, again, in,, t,,hat passa,ge i,n the ',~tta-Nipat'a  
 '~"a~ha,t I refeared to~ the- ~rahmin'~o'ouldn't' se,e 'n' {o't onl,y,whether what was er  
 cloth-cov~' {,r-e" d was she'ath-cas'~~'a'd' b~t also he cot ldn~~',taa,,aa~eae whe- ther the  
 Buddha"s tongue was' l6ng'a~;;~ b'road so to gratifY h,jni', to lea,t him ~n~w' that i't was so  
 the 'Buddha, as it is said, put out his ton'gue ana covered'his'whole forehead with his tongue,  
 ah? So ho'w,~,is one to take that? It' it to' be taken'literalaly or-does it have urn some other  
 meanin'g? hrn

~"

t"~6

: It says-

S : (~iearly the tongue repre~ents a prin- ci'ple cf co'mmunication-the- Bu#dha Was -a good  
 communicator-but the te"xt does dqscribe it in a' co'mpletely literal fashion

(unel ear)

S Uni, yeh right

In terms of knowledge

S :?eh flight,, er, there in Mahayana 5utra ~ou know go even further than this, tahe'~y'  
 dea~,NO,~be the Buadha's' as enormously,l;o,ng and broad and covering thw,whole universe  
 as it were. We regard that as grotes~;e uh, but the In'dian apparently' doesn't 9,r at' least  
 didn't. There's much the' sam,e~a with"these many a,rms and many headed deities, the  
 m.aning is quite clear of what they re- present but to the Indian, er, to the west- ern mind they  
 arn't all that attractive uh? I personally find them quite attractive.

(murmurs of agreement)

S :but many westerners, I think, don't or wouldn't. But it's quite' clear what they mea,,,n in a  
 gene-ral sort of wa'y hh? You know, a thousand arms repr,sents un~l,imited helpfulness ah?  
 of compa'ssion extending to all directions. (pause) And el"even heads, well, looking in al~  
 directions ah? (pause)

I"~' ' a ' ,,'

:hmm something to do with (unclear)

S : ~eh, yeh well you might ~onct~,tbly have an episode in English history where so,meboady Was just, ra'ther tong'ue-tied 'and

hwi',d"ra'4s' c'f years later they represent' it in art, he's a'ctually sh-~wn with his tongue hanging out with a knot in it (laughter) hm? It might be, just something like, that. '~tLght, one-ninety-two : "Th~ough ,s~eaking t,rue words alwaYs at all times you: wi'll a've, eek like a lion be lori ,iia a d h - ae t~~ 'ah4 ~ght," then o'n'e'-n 'ne y- two"" i.' Thro'~h show'in~ gre, at respeat~ :servin~ oth'er and in' what uld be don -'1/4 our

glori""ous eeth ~e, even y and'go6 - human beings do'n"t have forty tee"th do they? I 'mean, how amny do they have? thirty-some- thing.

- : twenty-seven

~: twenty-seven

:or twenty-eight

S : So forty then, again perhaps that ~isn't to be take'n literal~y. Why forty? li'fficult to say. bNaybe just a good even number uh?

: (something about a transfo,rmatation)

S :Um, yeh. ~}ien one-nine-ty-five : "Through

viewtn~ thin~s ith love ~and witho~t, aesire, -hat r' ed o'r' delue' on you~ ~:-'.y'es- wi'~'ll

~~)~rig'ht ,and ~lue witha eyelashes llike a bull""bm. Ita's' intere'sting' that we don't reg'ard' this as very beautiful, say someone has eye- lashes like a bull, but, er the Gre'eks have an euphet which Homer regularly uses for goddesses espically and particularly for Hera "cow-eyed" ah? because of the,se y'know bi'g eyes' with'long lashe's huh. - Though if we were to' describe a woman as cow-e'yed (laughter) you know she wouldn't take"it as'a' compliment the cow-eyed Hera. I mean the translators' of Homer usually translate it as "ox-eyed" because, you kdow they think if you translated it as actually what the greek text says-you know it gives the wrong s'ort of impression ; they call it ox-eyed huh. But the text Says- Homer -says-o'ow- eyed : eyes like a cow.

Quite a lot of women have false eye- 7shes.

S :hmm?

Quite a lot of women have false eye- ~lashes. ,Something' that feels very much... beautiful.

S According to traditio,n-accor~ing to r~aii text-the Buddha did infact have dark blue eyes, not brown eyes mm, (rela?) ah dark blue. So in a way it's natural that by "viewing all thinas with love' an'd with- ~,ut de'sir'e'~. hatred or delusion, vo'~ y,,es

23

w~~l,~~,~~riht~~ deep blue' and very lust- one-ninety-six : -",~~~~~nbrief kn'ow wel lthe'se~~thirty 'si sof-a ~re~t lio~a"f aein~ t?o~9,the'r'wit'the'ir c'a'u"ses" uh. ion'-ts (~an~a5~~gh~)~~hea man-liOn," the lion" a'mong men. The ~ali text (unclear) are full of expressions of this sort, you know, which convey a very definate impr,e,s- sion about the Buddha and of course-, '(n"ar

a,si,ngha), the lion among men uh? and he's al~o called ("narapungbhava") which means bull among men ah? So he's compared with these sort of animals uh? He's also refered to as the great elephant an'd 'the er great ~erp'ent man hah.' He's not refered to', to the best of my recolleot'ion as the lamb huh or anything of that ~nd uh (pause) It,'s the lion.

- Eagle

S :I don't remember he's refered to as eagl,eq though-the y~ti is sometimes ah symbolised by the avulture, which flies higher than any other bird. (pause)

The elephant didn't appear in any ~desorption.

S : No

Ah, I think you may be thinking of ~the ~elephant lo6k, where the Buddha turns the



whole body, not just the head, as the elephant is supposed to do.

[~'~    "-;rn--~'                    '                    , ,a , ,',,,,                    ap:, a

24

I think Cliintamani was pointing out      I think the rājā ~a'ramita, (un'7,cl.ar-  
something 'about an elephant)

~:Ah (pause) Alright let's go on, one- ninety-seven hm : (pause)

"The eighty minor marks arise from a notion of 'cause' I v,a ,Fearin 't is text would'

,~~~:,lnnl, I'm not quite sure what "from a concordant cause of love" hm er means.  
P'ezt-ap's it means 'is' that all eighty of the minor marks arise from the mettā of the Buddha,  
of the great, being. Anyway, Naga ~~~'~~~ not going to explain them because it would make  
the text too long. hm

:What does this word concordant mean? ~it to do with concord?

S      In agreement with uh? Huh? Harmon- izing with. Maybe appropriate cause uh hm.  
Alright, one-ninety-eight

-.      "All Universal Errors

t e r u t t e i r -    ° - and - no begin to match those of a

S :hmm? This is, in a way quite an import-

,:,,,a;~j:,,~a    ,

a,';~A

,ant~~Oint,', the Universal monarch and the Buadh,'-a h~~e the same thirty-two signs but  
 ~"%'"t'-of a'Buddha are i,nfinitely more de v'~e'"l~ped uh, an'd'beautiful than th~ce of- i?~he  
 'un,;iv'ersal t1O;fl~O)Luia, Airight, one-

ninety-nine. ~agasena goes on to say ev'en more than 'that

\LM1'-: "The ~od maj9r ~p minor ~arks Of a un'iy'er,s'al ~~e~r'

~ :Hmm. He ha,s said err, previously that the thirty-two er major marks arise from all sorts of  
 good actions yeh? and now he is sort of red~cing all those good- actions to one single act,  
 ,and that is faith in the Bud~ha uh? hm. So even though the uni- versal monarch has the  
 sa~ne thirty' -two 'major and eighty minor ,~gns that a Buddha has ah they are not- nearly as  
 glorious as his uh and, in fact, they arise at- all only because of, or only out of, er that parti-  
 oular person's faith in the Bud?ha eh? ah. In oth-er words, he's resisting any attempt to reg'ard  
 the universal monarch and the b Buddha as being more-or-less on the same l~evael and their  
 signs-end of side one Pg 4, Side 3, session BOTI), (vers-es 19~ 200)

Pag'e 1 of 2~

session S-- verses 1~-, a?,,",W side 2

~~~a ~&'a~T\$, 'a~r~~~~~ ~arW~n4~~~e °'

jL~ :a'~%?j%O½mpha5ises this~even more in the laet ~e~~~e,,~~,'atwo~hundred

e ac, at w - a

a '~ a ' "'~a 4,, '~a

Un%"v'{e'rsal ~e,~ ~. ,

~6~1/4) 4m Th~ 4e,a4t,,y' of,a ;i~~,ivera-1,,
~ar~%~~~a~~O,b5?~~~ps1e~~aaira~h4ly5,,a{~~~,e~s~ue~~~ghbla~5 ;tti'at"o"f a ~dha. th9
Mo4a~a"'s ah Nag~'a'aNa~fl~'5 6"~vrn 'o#t apf e,l,aboratio4-. a In, the Pa,,4,,,~
)~~O#{ata~,~aa'~t~he~, -i,s, n,'oa sugge,stion of,-any,,asuch a d,t,,f~f~r9fl,a,,Oe,,,a~
aa~ 4'5 'I r'ecolleot, ;"--but~Ai~ s'~emas',~'4i,,~~:~,16"acaI t,h'at' there s4~{,;t~;,a4 'b~,~
tA',at ~~~t ~f 'd~?'fer'ence;-uh. -

: t~ ta~hi~a~~~in~the~ s,ensO that the 'un',-Wver'sal tn~flar~h~a4~p~rs~on born
~nto that-alm""o{'s~'na'at

a' a a~~e a"ctions o'f,a,', ~y'er a{'al' m"o~{~~~4'#t'ere'~s a"'i~i~a&~~a requires
(~un- d' 1, a, 'e;'ar')

~~a;,,,~" a

~",'"-" , ,~'~~' , ' "

P~""e 1~ of ?? 2

hm yeh, W~iich, no doubt, would enhance ~the b~'eauty of your marks.

t (u,nclear), a

~: huh, yes quite. But the unive,rsal rnqnarch seems to represent the er per,fect human being
um? That is the perfec,t n,aatur al hui-inbeing,u~e ~brfe~t 1Lbn-e~~tIrltd hi-n' being hm~.a
- It's almost you coul"d' say the Greek ideal, in a way, uh, of t,he per- fe,ct man, but not
enlightened uh hm'. 30th physically and mentally perfect but er er you k~~ow not anything
more than that ; not sPiritually enlightened.' This is why; one somet,'imes feels-you kn6w the
Indiana Buddha image is sometimes said ttL have be-en mod- elled originally upon the figure
o'f t'he g greek 4,ollo-that the early Buddhist a'rts ists took the ima'ge of Apollo ah ,as a sort

of model for their representatipn's, of the 3u,d6ha huh? So you could sort of d''e'velop that idea and say that if you took,,-t~e fig- ure of Apollo ah that would rep're,asen,t some- thing like the unive'rsal monarch'; the per- fect, human being, the perfect' human form, um. 3ut sup,posing you imagined that Apollo becomi,{ng,enlightened, then you would have a Bu~daha,, hah, hum. {pause} So -there's that added, dimension''whi'ch is truely spir- ited, true-ly traneo~den~al which then, as it were, alters and modifies even th~ phys- ical foru~~- It,would be ~u~t like supposing the statue of this sort of figur'e 'or image of Apollo was 'hol~ow and you just lit a ~amp in' side it, yes? That would be like

Page 3

Apoll,o gain,ing enlightenment hm and that light shining th,,rough er his form,' through his figure : 50 it's the same form, the same figure but, as it were, stil'l more beauti- ful, illumina~e'd fro~ within by his exper- ience of en,iigh~tenmen''t, uh hm? (pause) It, might almost' be wo,rth trying. I-really do hope that Aloka' 'and Chintamini b''tween them will be a'ble to produce a really bea- utiful and inspiring, or you know Buddha i~a'ge,, for the shrine at Sukhavati-but it's goi?lg to be very difficult. I think t~ey've began ,to, realise 'that now. It's not just you know, a good object-or even you know, a good, work of, ar,t-but you know someth-ing with a definat spiritual quality. (apause), Some ancie~t images are said to be,~,5p bea- ~tiful and so, -irispiling that, you ~,'ow, you got °nlt~ t-wa~-practically just by looking at them, hmm? You got such a, strong impression of what enlightenment was like uh? Put obviously you can't produce' that sort of image unless you're a bit enlight- ened yourself, at least. At least you've got some sort of feeling for that state, for that conditional mode of being'. Oth- erwise you're just copying and putting to- gether mentally.

- (something about giving of yourself)

S Also yourself fell inspired by the best models and the best existing Buddha images-and pictures. In a sense they've got the hardest task of all that's required of (unclear). hm? at Sukhavati (pause)

","'~~~" ' ,~, ' a a'a~W

P~e 4

~: (unclear)

: Well it has already evolved hah? yeh h~ tahere have been various trials, hh,, yeh, qu~ite a number of figures have been re~ccted hah, oh yes there is alot of experimenta- tion going on. - I mean I've not even' 'been able to keep track of it all myself, um? A lot of changes have taken place (pau'5e) I mean they're not even yet.working on the final one, by any means, uh?

: I think it's encouraging that two people working together are (typical?) artists. One is Chintamoni and he's (unclear) and Allok's light-

~:Light, yeh, yeh...yeh hm. Well they ought to be able to do a bit of evolving hm (laughter) hm.

Perhaps of they realised how difficult it was

S :hm, yeh, hm

:They just wouldn't go on-

Sa : I think at moments they're almost despairing, hh. It's really difficult (pause) You know, we've come to the end of the chapter. ~n't want to start a new chapter, so ~ust;" look back over what we've done this afternoon, even what we've done today hm? and see if there are points which require further discussion. - (pause) 'We have by the way ~T c~u~

Page 5

the way caught up. Hm, we were rather lagging behind but we've now caught up and we are abreast of" the text in terms of time over the time available to us.

- : This point "Thro ~ eakin true words

like a lion, be ~glorious and hard to 'b' (unclear)

:There's also maybe that the lion you know er also roars. This expression that I mentioned the 'singhanada', a lion roar. He speaks out directly, boldly, fearlessly and he's got nobody to fear. But you're like--that 'when you speak the truth, you speak ~~~~~ out boldly and clearly so your cheeks are like those of a lion, as it were ; you speak like' a lion (pause). Some people can

of course tell a lie very boldly, with great conviction. ~ot everybody has this gift- which I believe is quite a useful gift- (laughter)- but some people do have it, ah ha; they can look you straight in the eye and tell you an absolute lie without blinking an eye-lid (laughter). Have you ever come across such people? (pause)

hm

S Oh, yes, I have

: (unclear)

S I'd like to think so, but in some cases I've been unable to detect it (laughter). They are completely unabashed uh? And do it

'~~~ 'a', 'a' ~r"" a '

,~a,ge~ 6 -

with a big smile. Whereas in your case, tel~ing a little fib and you know, you give the 'game away immediately (laughter). Ev- en a child could tell you're fibbing ; the blushes, stammer and you look aside. (laugh- ter) (pause)

:Just wondering about-going back to the 7~~unclear) of the''' Buddha, for a lon'g time In the east the (unclear) 3ud~ha was kno'wn

-S In in,dia, yes, that is true.'

:In a way that's total~y (unclear) in the west (unclear) let it g'row and evolve (unclear) If you try to have, "Oh we must have a 3u'd~ha image" (unclear) Maybe we should be a bit patient and let it grow on its own. (pause) (unclear)

~:I don't think it will be, I don't think it can be. I think there will be room for improvement-but it will correspond no doubt,, to where we're at now, hm? I mean the ~arge shrine room is not going to be a western shrine room; at the same time it's'not go'ing t6 be completely or- iental, hm? I don't think we've come to a point where we can have things, as, it were, completel,y western huh? It,,s still Buddhist. I don't think that is~,possible. ~~~a~~tn,"~) Kevin did a,very good- de'sign- Kev# in 3ooks- for the' shrine er defintely departing from Bu~dhist tradition and really quite in accordance with the spirit of Bud- dhism but my fee,ling was that it just wasn't really appropriate ; we ha got there

#'~'

Page 7

yet~ huh hm? It', that might be''' okay in fite'en or twenty years time ')but not now, hm'm,? It would be a bit artjf'i'''-cial now, hm ; we -arefl't yet that emanci~~aa:a~te~d from Eastern'Bud'dhism, or Eas,ta,ern ,Bu-,ddhist forms uh, hm. It was a rather A~ol,WO-'like figure actually with golden hair,~- ah? but it w~s Buddhist in the true ssense-there was no doubt about that. A so"rt" of sun god almost um,very, very beau,ti';t,ul and he'd worked out the 'plan of the shr,i;ea and the background really well and, h,a4"it, been done it would have been extreme'l'y effective but, er, it doesn't correspond to' 'where I think, we're at, in other respec'ts, at this point. Hmm, I wrote and thanke,4'him for it said, well you're fifteen y'ea~fl ahead of everybody else and, in a s'en~e{ '4 that is true;not that he is ge1Lc~--ally'-ahead -but at least his design was, -hm.

~,,: Was it a sitting figure or a standing

: It was a seated figure but 'with one ahh one 'er leg hanging down, ,ah and with thin sort of tussled golden hair a bit like Colin's' hair-well very much like Col- in's hair but golden huh and beams coming out. (laughter,) A rather relaxed figure; not quite meditation pose hm more like a bodhi5attva pose. Very e'ffective,' very impressive and quite inspiring., I was-I felt- so rry, but it wasn't appro',pt~~t,e 'yet and you could~~~ consider using it.

:- What do you think about using a stupa

Page"" - 8

- in a shrine room? 10 you thInk it's a bit clini, caal?~

: hm, possibly.. .you c9uld overcome that by" painting it g'bld

(unclear)

~: hm. Ah of course the early Buddhists Oidnlt represent the Buddha', not because they, were afraid they wouldn't be able--to represent satisfactor~l~y'* but becaus,e they w-ere convinced they couldn't repre-s~,,,at him at all, uh? The Buddha, bY virtue' 6~'the fact that he was the Buddha~uh, was a -true- ly transcendental being; he was the uncondi tioned uh, yeh? So how' can' you depict the unconditional? Tb~~t was their via,eW. So they h-ad a sort of abstract symbo,"l;j if the theme, or(s,eene?)"?represented the-a 3u{ddha's effli,*htenl,~, ,th en, well the~re~~:~w~&~as:~~~t~a~h~e 3oadhi tree,' there wa,s the empty t~--"n,e, and in"the same way, if they wanted t~"dea,,pict the scene of the Buddha's first~'te~ching they sho'wed the five aescetic 'li?.'t"'e'an'ing and they showed the thr~ne-a pre~aaQh~ng throne-but on tha't preaching throne there was the wheel of the Dharmha whi,ch ,the Bud- dha turned on tha,t occasion ; that represe'nt- ed the Buddha ; or similarly there, were his foot prints uh ; or there was a stupa-that also represented the Buddha, esp'e'cially,the Buddha at the time of hiS parinirvana hm. So there were these sort of, err, e2r~ ab- stract symbols representing the presence

Page 9

of the Buddha hm? But gradually,' po-s"sib'ly under (;re~~eRoman influence, they be',~~~ ,~p~~~5e~~~t~aaj~g the Buddha in huinan form.- ~t the~~presentation was not intende&n'atur- ~~~sa%j~~lly~ It wasn't intende'd to give you an idea of awhat the Buddha actualaly looked like-why, nobody knew by that time. It was inte'nded to rep re' sent-or intended to be-a symbol 'of enlightenment uh? enlight- enme',nt in human form, in the perfect human form.

:hmm, were any of these other specific symbols (unclear) was the stupa us'ed as a symbol ot enlightenment, or was it just representative of the Buddha?

That seems' to have been associated quite definite,ly with the parinirvana uh,
a'~dN,fa,'c,,~~,e it was us'ed on shrin,e,,~~ you kafto)~~~w, 'realc~the're woul'dn'-'t be
~~,N,'relics a r~~ after 'the' parinirvana. Tahe f,ao'OtPflnts

and the' lotuses usually repre'snte""d' the b birth uh; the horse represented i~? you kn'ow,
going forth ; and so on. T,~.' "wheel re'presented the first di scourse,-' the stupa the
pa'rinirvana.

:Were they ever combined into---? S :Oh yes, This sometim,es was done.

Into one? -

S : I think not into one but include""d into the same composition. (pause) It also
means considering this question of, beauty, ,;t~hat if one intends ah thinking of uh or ptae~
"a

Page'- 10

senting or representing the 3uddha in terms 0-f beauty obviously then there must be within,
oneself some sensitivity to beauty, hm?, That, if you'r'e an-artist and you w wa'n't to paint a
picture of the -Bud'dha you know representing the Buddha as beautiful, ~el~ you've got to
have senbiti,vity to beauty. If you're going -to dse~be the 'Thiddha, or if -you-'re going to
describe the ideal of enlightenment, in terms' of beauty- -say,, when you talk to other people
about 3uddhism, ah?-er, then again you must be s'ensitive to beauty in that sort of way,' in
that sort of sense-o'therwise you Won't be able to put, it across, you won't be able to
communicat,e it uh? tim. Yo'u""--ve ~t to have a feeling that you can-not just say just as a
sort of bold statement of £~ fact that enlightenment you know is beau- tiful-you've g6t to be
able to make people feel that er and you can't make people feel t,hat unless you feel it yourself
-to" begin with. -

I think the feealing of (in,, di stinct) ~ually helps

S :4~m, Right Indeed, very much

-You know, the work Cintamani's done ~3 sent'ences i~ndistinct)

S :Well, all the thankas originally were somebodies vision. So, in that sense, all thanka
painting is visionary art even through' you know in the course of centuries it has become
rather stereotyp-°e,' but or-

P~ge 11

itginally that is wh~t it was, (indistinct). One- of the things i'd like to see is Buddhist work in
stainea glass. I'd like to' see great s,tained glass windo~s of fl~d- dhas and Eodhisattvas. I
,think that 'w'ould be' not only beautiful and really appr'oprj- ate hm? I've made this
suggestion"to sev- eral p;eople but so far I havn't actuall 'Y seen anything.

- Why do you think that would be (unclear)

S : Er, I think it would tie-up real,ly well with er visuallisations because, in the' case of stained glass, you get the r riobness of the colours and you get light coming through from behind, uh? W}iid"h, you know, creates a very rich and JeWel- like ~ffect ; you know, something ~~iite vis- ionary and archetypal.

.aYoutd need an (unclear) kind'of glass, w'7uldn't you?

~:hm, yeh, yes

° (1-2 sentences unclear-about visual- isation)

S : I don't thi,nk there's, any actual prac- tise but, the,n y' 'know' artists often do pro- duce thaings in that s'ort of,wa~ Er, you -know, they experience' in the course of creating-er, you know, they don't have the experi~ce and then express it exact'ly; I mean there i,s something there which is t'ry

~~' "~~~" ~" ,~a 'a' ,"

Page 12

ing to com,e out but- they experience it in the course of bringing it out.

: (unclear)

S : For instance, some of the beautiful 3o"se windows in,' you know, Chartres, I me,an these are sort of my mandala-like, uh q'uite defin,itely; so the same sort of prin- ciple seems to be at work.

: I had an incredible experience in col- our um, (unclear), d~fferent ways...

~ : ,Well, one finds that in medieval manu- 50?ipt,s as though colour is experienced for it's own sake, hm? And very clear, bright pure colours.

~d (bold?)

S : I was reading in a book th'e', o~h day a very interesting little acco':~tna' a~O~t the famous I~hglis(hminitanst) 7 Hil"ltar" uh, hm? Who lived in the days of queen-'- iza beth, hum? and apparently queen ~iz'-a~eth had' very' strong ideas about portrait paint- ing-I !~ever

, 'a~' ' - ' ' ' " ~, ' ' ' ' , - , "'

g~ra,ns and er, ,e,r, stood him in the sun and, s-aid er, t~at's how you know, er,,,, er, someone should be 'represented ; now look at me. So she s'tood herself -in the sun where no shadow could be cast upon th,e face ; that '-is hōw the human face shouLd be r~presented, hm, without shadow, ah,- So she had these very strong ideas at~i'd' he was b,e'ing influenced-or wanting to be in,~ flue,nced-by contemporary Italian painti'ng which she wouldn't let him be. And, er, I tho'ught it was quite signific,ant~ er. There's a different way of lookin'g at, art in a'way it's more mediva'l, uh, hm. In a Wa'y the queen was re'sisting Renaissance in- fluences and no doubt that was a very ,grea't - d'evlopment, but,perhaps g'etting awa~ ,at the saame,time from something which was q,,ui,,te valuable hh. It was getting away fro;' the, the-I don't know what would be the w"o rd for it-the ar'chet,ypal type of art to natuara'l- istic and representational, uh? (paus';e) Of course the qu"een insisted that sh-e s'hou~~ be represented-and others should be repree sent ed-as though placed in ,clear sunlight, directly in front of clear sunlight with- out any ehado,ws, you know, thrown across the face. In 'other words not natural-in~ a way-not naturalistically, uh,? But per- haps in a slightly visionary sort of way. Y6u know Blake doesn't, er you know, have shadows in his faces as far as I remember does he? (pause)

S I don't think he does. ,I mean, may- be 2n some' those, er

(uncl,e,a,r,,)

S :Thlt ~~~s not conerned with, sort 'of Rembrantesq'ue light.' Perhaps, 'be'--s s'tr9ng- ly criticised er in all thos~ So'r't of paintings. There used to be the antipathes -of vis'ionary art, ha, hm.

It might be (unclear) mentality

S :Hm, yeh a,(ch uckle's).' yeh. Well there i~ a very, er, ther'e' i's an investing expreas - sion in, I think it's in one of the Hindu spiritual traditions, they speak of a world without shadows, uh, a world where there is light-but where no shadows are St be- cause there are no solid bodies,, , ' hm. And it's as though visiona,ry afl,,, ~ - of re ;ti eb't 5
 ~Nt]~L,ltt~a,l*,Ot~~; ~a - of, ob- j'e,cts, er, a world where the 0- a ;,~t;s are trans'cendental, and where ther's i--' - ~t but no shadows a're cast, hm? An p'e"rhaps 'medival art, to some extent, was mo'r,e like that, like, th,ey say that sort of art- (unclear) Ange~i,co. It reflects thaat sort of...even Botticelli's" art. But, ydu know, later Renaissanbe painting is ~very much pre-occupied with light and shade'uh? hm. And to me, from a visionary point o~ view at least, that does seem to represent a sort of decline, hm, hmmm.

- hm, I don't quite understand 3hante where visions start and darkness(unclear)

Page 15

: But why should that be? Psychologi- cally, wh~' is happen~g when you go o,ff bright col'ours? I mean,'it's be'en ~rt of pointed out that people in the Middle,. Ages, certainly a'rtists in the Middle Ages- well, it seems the whole populous really- 'had' this naive', almost childish, delight in bright colours uh, hm. But it's almost as,~tbo"ugh that was losat, gradually, lata,e,r 0Th,-', ~ fl'~s~~tf';\$~tur,cd,'witi,l the time o"f t'he" jma~p~are5~flfl~~5~ a It's quite int,e'r- e'sting going around, an art' gallery where the'paintings are arranged in chronologi- cal order, hm?, First of all there's the mediv'al period ; l6ts of bri,ght colou'rs- the're ; and then graudually through the Ren- aissance down into the seventeenth, eight-, een{th, nineteenth centuries, evrything gets - more sombre, er, 'and as,someone once said, in-the eighteen,th cent~r',y, it is as though a thick, rich dark brown -gravy has been poured over all t,he paintings. Then sud- denly at the, y'know towards the en"d Oa~f t'he nineteenth c'entury, there's this ter- rific, ex';'plo,sion o'f colours 1111,, brilliant col6urs,, - 'wh,ich 'is the impreesioniSt iiiove~en me'nt. - And it re,ally is quite ex,t;raorain- a'ry; so "wahat's happened? hm? I mean, what does colour represent in the life of man? If you go off colour what are you in fact going off? What is happening?

losing innocence and purity

: But where they all that innocent and pure in the Middle Ages?

Page 16

,S~v~~a'l V?ic esa ; Clothes-guilt-anger

S :Is t'here aflyway...its joy, yes...,~in a way it's joy',' it's happiness ; it's delight'.

° That's aform of innocence, though :Yes, That i-s true.

-:If we conci°veo~f ('unclear), as'very hard to vi~~itse it so'rt of spiritually (;un,'cl ear)

S : Ah~ yes. It could be. Cpauue) ,I mean, er-

- :,(unclear) Cl,ughter)

:Well quite a few people find it difficult to visualise, hm. I mean - often we've discussed this point that in, er, until recently, men's clothing in this country maybe in the West generally was so dark; why? In the Elizabethan period - ,,,7""O,u know, even right down into the reign of, ,:~' a,h, Charles the second, and, even to 'so,, me extent, during the eighteenth century men dressed quite colourfully, hm? You read of even in the eighteenth century, of er, you know, gentlemen's suits of claret coloured satin and er, you know deep blue velvets, and things like that, ah? Which is the sort of thing that no men would have dared to wear until again quite recently, hm? So what happened, why was this?

It occurs to me that people were more direct-even more simple-colour and feeling-

Page 17

S :Yes, colour and feelings, yeh. - : (something about colour and feelings)

S :the?

: the,, eighteenth - century

S : was it?

(unclear)

:No, well you could say that the latter day people felt more directly that they were less inhibited about their feelings, and, and you could say that until-but on the other hand, right up into the eighteenth century; the eighteenth century being the age of enlightenment and reason and all that sort of thing; and then of course overtaken by the end of the eighteenth century by the industrial revolution. So even poets like Wordsworth then started wearing russet black and then the top hat appeared, yeh-, etc, hm.

- . And, the depth of, sort of, feeling

S Yes. I think you could say that; yes colour is associated with feeling; that if you're contentive to colour you're more in touch with your feelings. I mean, maybe this is what happened in the west, for certainly quite complex cultural, social political, religious reasons men got more and more out of touch with especially his more child-like, innocent positive feelings and emotions, huh? -

Page 18

:Po,,r fifty years it's been a bit boring (laughter), :It's the way dull colours are the order and bright colours are the result.

S :hm, yes, yes,

': (unclear),

:The established order yeh,. Like,though ~ea~~~5~y5, WprieS~s in black gowns are walk 'in'g tht,tr rounds""uh?, "and binding with bri- a ~ors my ~oys and desires-" hm, Maybe it is significant that in the East the b~u's robes 'always been bright, warm colo~rs.' Tt's always yellow and orange 'and red""s-ex- o"e'pt perhaps, again significantly, for the a Ja"panese who go in' for those -black robes, uh?, (unclear 3-4,words). Ex,cept--occasions a I r'emember someone' from Glasgow telling me

er talking about the 3ath Street Centre, er they~had great ditficulty geatting the per- mission of th-e landlord to redecorate and paint 'and that they had a talk with the land- loxd"s wife and- her idea was that',- er? the w"hole' place shou~d be'decorated in a nice battle-ship grey (laughter)."" hm,,And if you go in-I remeniber 4s a child, yqu know, go ing to visit elderly aunts and so on and, you know, the interior of the houses were so gloomy, hm. I even remember in our home we had sort of, er, dark brown wallpaper, hm? er, tn the£sort of sitting room and hallway anda ~tothing bright ~d attr,act,,ive: i't waa al~ sort of dark brown. I fleBal,

Page 19

it's only veryarecently that there's ,been this revival of cp',lour. Of course, in the arts it happened --arlier on, you know with the' ImpressioniSt--s hm? or the Pre-raphaelites- they were ~ery,~~~ary sensittve. 'And' I think also one of the things that's made pepple in the last couple of decades more sensi- tive to colour is", er, drug's be cause you do find that unde~ the experience-und,er the influence~say of ~SL you do become much - more 'sensitive er than you were to colo;urs; a you see colours mlich more vivt~y, they stand out much more. I mean, this seems to be typical of,v-isi&nary ezperience in, ge'navral huh? or even a certain kjnd of mys- tio-al experience ;a you became much more aware of, much more sen~~itive to, colours, yeh? They become much n~~re vivid~ymuch mo're jew- wl~li~. Aldoi~s ~uxley describes it as ,Wthro,bbi,ng with ~l tfe of their 0W4", uh? -And it, is, very m'u'c'h like that, hm. ,So, you know as you-well in Buddhist terins-as you become more and"m~re full of metta' yo'u see everything bright~r ,and more beaiitiful and more gloriou's, huji", hm? So it's not, sur- prising if you se~ the spiritual ideal in that sort of ~orm{too uh? That"s the er you know the bri~htest and mOst col'ourful, most #lorous of all concievable or all im- aginable objewts uh, hm?

: (unclear)

S Yeah if a Buddha can't be beautiful, what can be beautiful? ah, hm a dull Bud- dha is a contradi~tion in terms, huh ;"an

Page 20

an ugly Euddha is' a contradiction in terms, ah?, '(pause) Much of 3yzan'tine art had this archetypal' quality. They went in for these goa~~~ backgrounds,' ah hm.

° And figures in white

S And figures in white

: Is there a 3uddha of the rising sun? Th,e Thi,ddha Anitabha iS the setting one.

S :Wha, ah, I'm not sure, ah, er, A~iiit- abha is defintely the setting sun, ah, I, don't know if there is specifica'll,y a,Eu'd dh'a" of the risin'g; sun ; there is(Va,,i,19,oana?) who is the sun Buddha but that i~-{-more, you know the mi~~da~y sun, the tjme',when its the-

: The brightest-the brightest sun ,jO in

the morning

: Is 'Rutnasambhava the (unclear,)

~ :Oould,be...(several voices speaking' at once) '4,'~b,bya-he is ass~ciated defintely more" wi;t,~ the ~tght sky

: (unclear)

S There is, of course, Marichi the as - it were, you know? 3odisattva, goddess of the dawn (uncl,ear) (laughter) little black sheep

Page 21

(unclear)

~:Well, probab~y the male chauvanist sheep (laughter)-, There it 'is-(lacki?lg?) them on (laught'er)

(indistinct)

S, : Well everything has a -meaning(laughter). °°~~Th~t it would be good to have a Bu-ddba cf the dawn, uh? Th'is is a very goo'd id'ea' : p'erhaps we should" mention it to Chintamani- you know, to see if he can produce Something.

°--°-: I was just thinking the (brightest?) being the dawn on water'

,--,: Ah, no. In-a way I,,correct,,myself . '--ghtly. Amit,abha does of course repre- sent, the west s'ettin'g sun but ,ther,e', are re- presentations o-f Amitabha in J'apan.'",e Bud- dhist art which depict him as'himsealf ris- ing as it were,, er you know like the ris- ing sun from beh--ifld the hills, uh? and this is sup~osed to r~present Amitabha as he ap- pe'ars to the believer at the time of death, ahhm:. It's as tho'~gh the vision of Amit- abha dawns on him. So here Amitabha d~es

aseem to b,e, not exactly asSociated with the rising j3Una in the" literal sense-in the sense of the Ea"stern di'rection, but certainly as- sociate'd"" with thea dawi~ing of a spir4,tual light', ah? hm. ~Snd thene" repres'entations are very, very, beautiful, very impre'ssive. I think they are-among the most beautiful pr,oducts of Bu'ddhist art,. You often get

P,~. 2£'

them' on screens, and it is said that in Japan the screens were unfolded in front of the dying person, uh? So you had this beautiful gol,den b,ackground-this golden sky,' hm-and then ',in the foreground a range of hills and then behind, the figure of Amitabha-or half ,:the figure-rising a; you kn,o'w, ~ust like a rising sun flanked- by the two bodh,isattvas formed behind the range of hills, uh? So 'this is very much, con- ,veys the idea of "a sort of rising su~~, the Buddha of the rising sun; even thoug""h Anit- abha- is, you know,,is, s,strictly speak'in'g, ass~oiated with t,,h e west ; but here he"s dawning on the- the sort -of spir~tua'l vi- sion of the believ',er, the worshipper 'of Amitabha' at the t~iine of" death, uhT (p' ause) r perso,nally very much like this particular kin'd of representatio,n this is very, very, in-spiring, very beautiful ; and there are great rays, you know, coming up from the head of the figure, long single rays. Any- one remember seeing this (unclear) (mu~nmers)

~~:Particularly when you were talking a- bo~t it I had a-v,ision of that one in part- icular you know (unclear)

S : So -'this is very sort of vi S, ionary art. TWause') 'h~"'.' in a 'way it is just about six o'clock ,Cpau'se)

:Well, one qizestion about what the Zen monks wear, in fact, what is the ,signifi- cance of that?

~, ' pagea ~5

I don't kn,o,w whether, you know, they attri'bute a ~5ig&~a~f~e to that-1\$a," not sure about tha"t-',but, psychological'l~Y, it -do.~~ seem sign, if"~ cant : but that is their norinal wear.

: I think tahey have something about -Zen ~bolise black as the void or something.

~:,hm, could be

., (indistinct), negative?

'~1--&But psychollgically,° it must have a nflg',ative ~ffe'o,t hm. I mean bri,ght ,colours

are s,tim,ulat'in'g~(pause). In Italy,, for in- stan'oe, you find, women,' especially t~e' more 61d-fashioned N6men, always wear black, hm? 'ma'ybe you know the idea is theya,' shouldna't 55' it were you know make themselves' 'a'ttr'ac- ti-ve when they 0 out, ah. 9ne can, under- stand the r easo, for this, ah.'

It ' 5:- ~,,~-,Snc,4.~d~att(Ie~otowit~t~ourning. ?Tr'2 sentence's ~ndistinct)

S .~Of course, -the Chinese use white' for mourning. Er, not though it's no't so much ~ thin,k" on the qolour vtiite but its,er, unbl~'~'ched cloth-which is the poorest and most simple material ;~so they wore, or they wear, this you know much as we would speak of wearing sack cloth : just to indicate their complete eschewing of everything luxufloous, ah? So it's more on aocdunt- of the simpli- city of the material than on acco'unt of

- ' , , J""T~'~,,,,"'~"~,'~,"'a~a,' ~'~'~',aW'aT"~ } ~~~~' 7"~a,,,~~~ - , -

ita'oo,-,lo,ur-1 but it amoun~s~ to the fact that, ,,i;a~fl~:O'W',-~i~~"i5 t'he c,dLOUR'cf n'ourn'ing. 'v-,~'-se)' a ~d" ")~ 'Chinese in t~his country 'a'an,'~4',~rethe,pe)N'rt of suits' you know for mouft~flg~P11~P""a~~~' They are~;v,'ery sort of oO"a,a;r;'se cloth~, unba1eache~d.~a (p"aua .) Well, a'n~w,ay. let's leave it there and~thena' to- ino'rrow we go on t,,o Chap"te~ three whi-ch is 'Tm"".' collections 'for ~lightenment1 uh?

-end, of side two-pG4 SI~E 3, Ses-sion S LTD Cverses 196-29fl)-

[337]

The Precious Garland Seminar

Tape : From PG5 Session 9, Chapter 3, verses 201-218 Side 1 Pg 1

S : Right Chapter 3 page 47, "Recollections for Erilighen- ment".

: "Great King hear now from the great scriptures of the Markosota Buddha arises from merit inconcievable."

S : I was just thinking this morning before we actually go into the verses, it might be useful to, to consider what are the principle stages of the Spiritual Path in prac- tical terms, because in Buddhist texts not only sutras, but in all kinds of books on Buddhism which are being produced nwadays one finds different descriptions of the Path : some of them very good desriptions, very in- spiring descriptions, but they don't always agree. Some- times, in fact, they're very, very, different. At times of course they do overlap. Some of these descriptions are very detailed and we sometimes rather get lost in the detail, and you can't help wondering exactly where we are and what exactly we have to do to get to the next stage or substage or even sub-substage. So I thought it might be useful at this point being about half way through

the seminar just to, to outline what in fact are the main stages-so far as we're concerned-and also to indicate some, some connections with some sort of traditional formulations, some of the traditional descriptions of the Path.

It seems to me that we can regard the whole Spiritual Path as consisting of five great Stages. These very roughly correspond to the five Paths of the Indian Buddhist tradition but I won't go at this stage very much into that comparison. I don't want to be as it were, comparative description but just a quite straightforward one in terms of our own needs and own experience.

So I can say that the first stage is really the Stage of mindfulness and awareness. This is really the first thing that one has to do, to develop mindfulness and awareness. (pause) One can of course think of mindfulness and awareness in terms of the Four Foundations of Mindfulness or in terms of the Four Dimensions of Awareness but that is, as it were, a detail. So the first thing that one has to do, the first stage that one has to traverse is the the Stage of Mindfulness and Awareness ; Which means especially developing self-awareness, which in turn means self-integration. So in a way mindfulness is also the stage of integration ; we bring all our scattered bits together-we integrate ourselves, we overcome confusion within

338

Page 2

ourselves, disharmony within ourselves : we get ourselves functioning as a smoothly working whole, not a jumble of bits and pieces, and fragments of selves all struggling and jostling for supremacy. So you can begin to see that this is quite a big task in itself, practising mindfulness, practising awareness and becoming integrated in this sort of way. But this is the first stage. It really means giving birth to oneself as an integrated person, as a self-aware individual.

:You appear not differentiate between mindfulness and awareness. Is there a significant difference between them?

S : Not really. In this context I use them quite loosely as meaning the same thing. (pause) I think you understand what I mean by not being integrated; and mindfulness or awareness is the chief instrument of that integration. This is why it's so important and why we can call this not only the stage of mindfulness or stage of awareness but also the stage of integration. It's a bringing of ourselves together into a whole instead of having ourselves as simply a collection of disparate parts.

Then comes what I can describe as the stage of Positive Emotion. (pause) By Positive Emotion of course I mean friendliness, compassion, joy, equanimity and faith and devotion. So in as much as positive emotion is something that moves, not something static-this is also the Stage of Energy. So in this stage one tries to make oneself as emotionally positive as possible. One overcomes all negative emotions. One not only tries to develop one's emotions but to refine them. One develops not simply positive emotion but even spiritual emotions. And here the whole question, the whole subject of spiritual beauty becomes of importance. (pause) So in this stage one develops the positive, even spiritualised, emotions to

a very high pitch of intensity indeed. This is also the level of meditation-Samadhi because these positive emotions and the energies that you generate carry you through all the levels of dhyana. But it's not the stage of ~eSi*ation simply in the sense of the stage of sit- ting in meditation. It's the stage of being emotional positive, if possible in a highly spiritual sense, whatever you are doing, whether you are sitting and meditating, or working, or talking, or just being quietly by yourself. (pause)

In the third stage one could say it's the Stage of Vision. In this stage one sees the Truth-not, of course regarding Truth as a thing out there to be seen, you know, like an ordinary object. One could say that this is the stage

Page 3 339

of openness to truth. Guenther talks in terms of the dimension of openness to Being with a capital ~B~ he means Sanyata; but though his expression is a bit round- about it's quite expressive at the same time the dimension of openness of Being. So this is also the stage of openness : openness in the direct~on of ultimate reality not holding back on the progress of expansion ; not opening up so far-that is to say opening up as regards positive emotion-but then refusing to open up any further. No, it's indefinite openness to the ultimate or, in terms of sight, a vision of reality, vision of truth. This is also, incidentally, the stage of death ~ne might say. It's the stage of spiritual death because it signifies that the death of the old self, the death of the ego howsoever much refined and the birth of what I mean. It's the birth of-if you like-of the seed of buddhahood. Not that in the sense that that seed wasn't there already, but the seed has now become as it were visible and from that seed the new being as it were, the Buddha will eventually develop and will eventually spring. So the Stage of Vision is also the Stage of death because when you see the Truth as it were, you die; or, even, when you die then you-can see the Truth. (pause) Among actual practices of course, this is covered by the Six Elements practice and the meditation on Sun- yata except you don't meditate on Sunyata as though it were a thing out there on which you are meditating :that would just be an idea, a concept a vague image of Sun- yata not Sunyata itself. So that's the Stage of Vision, or if you like the Stage of Reality or Stage of Death- what ever you like to call it-the Stage of Spiritual Re- birth.

Then comes what we can call~ the Stage of Transformation. This is when the vision that you have seen, or if you like, you experience reality starts, as it were, descending and transforming every aspect of your being. It is not just in the head, not even in your spirit~al be~~ it pervades all parts of your being, all parts of, as it were, your spiritual body. (pause) This is also the stage of meditation in a sense but not the meditation in the sense of the meditation with the help of which you gain Enlightenment but the meditation that you practice after Enlightenment. When- when I say enlightenment I really mean Pre-Enlightenment I mean this initial visionary experience. The practice of meditation in the sense of dwelling on that visionary experience, that glimpse of reality so as to deepen it and broaden it and to bring it down, as it were, so that it pervades and transforms all the different aspects of one's being. (pause)

And fifth and lastly we've got what we may call the Stage

of Compassionate Activity. (pause) This means that having completely transformed oneself in accordance with one's original vision-vision of reality-one is then in a position really to help others. One could say that this is also the stage of spontaneity-true spontaneity where if you don't sort of take thought, don't think what you're going to do to help others-at least not in the ordinary way-you just spontaneously function, you do what needs to be done. There's a sort of overflow of your fully Enlightened-being. (pause).

: Presumably, Bhante, there is going to be something of an overflow into (reaching)? between these various stages.

S : Well, I'm coming to that. (pause) So these five stages, the sequential, that is to say one after the other in regular order. So if one traverses these five stages then one traverses the whole Spiritual Path. (pause) But, as you know there is a path of regular steps and there is also a path of irregular steps. You could conceivably start work on the first stage-that is to say the Stage of Mindfulness, Stage of Awareness or Stage of Integration-and then complete that and then go on to the next- that is the stage of Positive Emotion-and then complete that and then go on to the third stage. Conceivably you could do that but I think very few people would actually function in this way. Most people I think for sometime at least will follow or will have to follow the path of irregular steps. So that means they will be working now on one and now on another of these steps. So that means they will be working now on one and now on another of these stages. One could even go so far as to say that one can think in terms of working on all five stages simultaneously. The first would be perfected first-that's where the path of regular steps comes in-the second would be perfected second. That is to say the first, the second, cannot be perfected before the first has been perfected and so on but one can work on all simultaneously so that the first becomes perfected and then you are just working on four; second becomes perfected; you're just working on three; the third becomes perfected and then you're just working on two; the fourth becomes perfected, you're working on one; the fifth becomes perfected and you're perfected then.

So what does this mean? It means that all the time that is to say everyday one has got five things to practice as best you can that is to say one has to keep up the effort to be mindful and aware and to be as together as possible as integrated as possible; one remains in as positive a mental state as one possible can; one does not lose sight of one's ultimate goal at any time

[341]

one tries to apply this to practice at every level whatever you've realised or discovered or seen on the highest level of your being at any time, and you do your best for other people, you do what you want to help people. But all these five simultaneously. This is your spiritual life and this is your spiritual practice. These are the things with which you are basically concerned. You can, as it were forget about all the other formulations, all about the Four Noble Truths, the Eight-Fold Path. On the practical side, this is all that you really need or all that you really need to think in terms of. Whatever has been said by all the different you know Buddhist teachers in the course of several hundred years of development is all really contained in this in principle. Whatever they've had to say about the different stages of the Path-you can get, as I mentioned at the beginning some very elaborate descriptions indeed, which will quite confuse you, even mislead you-well this is essentially, this is basically what

it is all about.

You can also think of these if you lie in terms of the Five Spiritual Faculties which are both successful and ~~~~~ First stage corresponds to the faculty of mindfulness. The second corresponds to the faculty of faith. The third corresponds to the faculty of wisdom. Fourth to the faculty of meditation. The fifth to the faculty of viriya. (pause)

If you want to think of any particular Buddhist virtue and understand its sort of place in the total scheme well you can do that by just allocating it to one or another of these five stages. For instance dāna. Where does dāna come? Dāna clearly comes in stage two because, you know, when you're overflowing with love and joy in a highly positive emotional state your natural tendency is to give; you can't help it. I mean, you're giving yourself all the time. You're flowing out all the time. The dāna comes there dāna is an aspect of that particular stage. But perhaps we need not go into that too much but just think in terms of these five principle stages. These are the stages that one is trying to get through and these are the aspects of the spiritual life and the spiritual path that one will be cultivating all the time. So if you just try to do these five things all the time. So if you just try to do these five things all the time you can forget all about making progress or where exactly you are along the path. One just intensifies one's effort in those five directions as it were, all the time. One simply can't go wrong then, (pause). Now is that reasonably clear?

Page 6

Hm

S : Hm (pause). You notice that three and four correspond to the path of vision and the path of transformation as described in connection with the Eight-Fold Path but unless you've got a scholarly mind you need not worry too much about these sort of connections. (pause)

Now is that sort of introductory-not exactly introductory-to this particular chapter but just introductory to one's as it were general understanding of the path because sometimes it seems that the traditional formulations, traditional descriptions don't square very closely with our own actual experience or our own actual needs.

Alright, let's go back to the text then. So towards the end of the previous chapter Nagajuna was describing the marks of a universal monarch and traditionally of course the marks of a universal monarch are regarded as the same as the marks of a Buddha. Both the universal monarch and the Buddha are Great Men (Mahaporsas). But Nagajuna has been saying or, rather, Nagajuna said towards the end of that previous chapter that the very faint resemblance between the marks of universal monarch and the marks of the Buddha; yes, they are in a way the same but a Buddha's marks are infinitely greater and more splendid in qualities. So he continues that sort of theme at the beginning of this chapter and he says "Great King hear how from the great scriptures of the Mahāyāna the marks of a Buddha arise merit inconceivable". So the marks of the universal monarch arise from a variety of skillful actions which Nagarjuna here is using the term "merit" : "The marks of a Buddha arise from merit inconceivable". Alright let's carry on then.

: "The merit which creates all solitary realisers, learners and non-learners and all

the merit of the transient ones is measureless like the universal stays".

S But who are these solitary realisers, learners and non-learners? (pause) The solitary realisers are the pratyeka-Buddhas. Nararjuna appears rather early in the history of the Mahayana and the distinction of the three Yanas-that is to say the Sravakayana, the Pratyeka-Buddhayana and the Bodhisattvayana is still quite strong and often referred to. A pratyeka-Buddha is a rather odd figure in Buddhist history or in Buddhist thought. Usually he is said to represent someone who gains Enlightenment by his own efforts without a teacher and does not communicate it to anybody who does not teach who has no pupils. So this has given rise to a great deal of discussion, a great deal of speculation because one would have thought that if one had actually gained Enlightenment that one would have taught spontaneously.

Page 7

So scholars believe that the pratyeka-Buddha isn't, doesn't really represent a Buddhist ideal at all ; that he's a survival of the Old Hindu figure of the (resi) but as it were translated into Buddhist terms but really you can't have a Buddhist ideal of this kind and historically we find that no-one has ever actually aimed at being a pratyeka-Buddha in historical times. Others again say that y'know the function of a pratyeka-Buddha is quite different. It is not to teach through words but to teach as it were by being. But the tradition says that he doesn't teach at all in any way so it is rather difficult to understand. This ideal does appear, is often referred to, is considered a form of Hinayana ideal in as much as the pratyeka Buddha doesn't teach.

The non-learners are the Arachants. And the learners are the Stream-entrants, the once-returners and the non-returners. So the solitary realisers, learners and non-learners all represent different aspects or stages of what the Mahayana regards as the Hinayana ideal of Enlightenment for oneself alone. Nararjuna is saying that the merit which creates all the pratyeka-Buddhas, all the stream entrants, all that merit is absolutely measureless. One cannot measure the merit that is required to produce even those who have attained only the Hinayana ideal of emancipation for oneself alone.

Right, then he goes on to say, verse 203.

: "But if such merit ten-times extended one hair-pore of a Buddha is achieved. All the hair-pores of a Buddha arise in just the same way."

S : So he's trying to give an idea in an imaginative sort of manner of how great and how wonderful a Sayak-Sambuddha is. The merit which creates all the solitary realisers in Ceylon, that merit itself is measureless but it takes ten times that merit to produce, to create, just one hair-pore of the Buddha. All the hair-pores of a Buddha-and there must be oh ten thousands of them-arise in just the same way : SO how much merit is required to produce a Buddha? He is trying to overwhelm one as it were with the-not the actual statistics-but the ten-times immeasurable. The Indian mind is very fond of this sort of thing ten immeasurables of immeasurables and expressions of that sort.

: Can I just recap on the previous one when it says 7 learners and non-learners?

This is for instance the stream-entrants and-?

S : Indeed. The non-learners is a term for the arahant

~~Lt

Page 8

:Ah

S who is considered to have nothing further to learn. In Pali a (saka) :one who has nothing further to learn.

: It doesn't mean a sravakas?

S No, no. (Saka) is different from sravaka. Er, I mean the word is different that is to say. The stream-entrant the once-returner and the non-returner, in as much as they have not yet gained arahantship, they still have something to learn. So they are ~all~ learners in distinction from the arahant who is called the non- learner; the one who has nothing further to learn. These are quite common terms in Pali literature. (pause) Alright, 204

: "Through multiplyin~ by a hundred the merits which produces all the hair-pores of a Buddha one auspicious minor mark is ~vwa~".

S Not a major mark you notice, but one of those eighty minor marks. "Through multiplyin~ by a hundred the merit which produces all the hair-pores of a Buddha"-not just one. all of them .- "one auspicious minor mark is won". So what a terrific, what a staggering, you know, what a mind-boggling quantity of merit you require just to achieve even one of those minor marks of a Buddha. ~ then Nagarjuna says

"Oh King. as much merit as is required for one auspicious minor mark so much is required for each up to the eighteenth~

S : Eighteenth

"eighteenth"

S : So you've got to multiply that eighty to produce all the eighty minor marks.

Well let's carry on. 'Let's just allow our minds to be blown completely.

: "Through multiplying by a hundred the merit which achieves the eighty auspicious minor marks one major sign of a Great Being arises."

S : So if you multiply by a hundred the collection of merit which achieved all eighty auspicious minor marks then you get, then you produce, one major sign of a Great Being-that is, in the case of a Buddha.

"Through multiplying by a hundred the merit from the extensive

Page 9

which is the cause of achieving the thirty minor signs the hair treasure like a full moon arises".

S : I wonder why "thirty minor signs"? (pause) Doesn't seem to be any particular reason for that. The circle between the eyebrows is of course one of the, er the thirty major marks. So "through multiplying by a hundred and the merit which is the cause of achieving" hm, "the, the thirty"? there aren't... seems to be some mistake here, doesn't there? Because, er..

: The eighty

S Either should be "the eighty" or you can't say "the thirty" because there aren't any "the thirty". You could have said : "of achieving thirty minor signs". So there seems to be some mistake here but you get the general idea (pause). Maybe it is thirty out of the eighty minor signs but in that case the definite article shouldn't be there. Well, I think we get the general meaning of it don't we?

Right 208

: "In multiplying by a hundred the merit from a hair treasure of a Protector's crown rotation

S : And then follows a verse which isn't in the Tibetan but which is in the Sanskrit. So let's hear that.

: "Through increasing by ten million times a hundred Thousand the merit of the crown-protrusion There comes the excellence which gives the euphony Of a Buddha's speech and its sixty qualities."

S : Alright, let's carry on.

: "Though such merit is measureless for brevity it is said to have a measurement and also of it said to be ten times the merit of the world".

S The Buddha's merit is, as it were, ten times the merit of all other living beings put together throughout all directions of space and all periods of time. (laughter) That gives one a rough idea. (laughter). (pause).

: It would seem (words indistinct) whether we should be put off by the immensity of the job. (laughter)

S Right, 210

: "When the causes of even the form of the body of the Buddha are immeasurable as the world how then could the causes of the body of Truth be measured?"

S: Don't forget, Nagarjuna says, we're only concerned-or have been only concerned up to this point-with the Form Body, the Rupakaya of the Buddha, his outward appearance even his physical appearance. Don't forget, at this stage of development of the Mahayana, there were no three Kayas. Nagarjuna never refers to a trikaya, this is a later teaching. He refers to two kayas the Rupakaya and the Dharmakaya. So Dharmakaya is Body of Truth that's how it's translated here. "So when the causes of even the form of body of a Buddha are immeasurable as the world how then could the causes of the Body of Truth be measured?" The Dharmakaya which constitutes the Buddha's inner spiritual essence, as it were. Right, 211.

: "If the causes of all things are small, but they produce extensive effects the thought that the measureless causes of Buddhahood have measurable effects must be eliminated".

S: What does this mean, exactly? "If the causes of all things are small but they produce extensive effects, the thought that the measureless causes of Buddhahood have measurable effects must be eliminated". Ah, yes, if even small causes produce extensive effects then you mustn't think that immeasurable effects can be produced by measurable causes. Or, rather, if small causes produce extensive effects it's inconsistent to think that a measureless cause is going to produce anything other than immeasurable effects. In other words, the merit of the Buddha are measurable and the results of those merits are also measurable. (please) So this is apparently to arouse faith and devotion and give one, give some idea of the magnitude of a Buddha's achievement. Let's carry on.

: "The Form of the Buddha arises from collected merit. the Body of Truth in brief. The King arises from collected wisdom".

S: This is very standard Mahayana teaching, you are familiar with the idea to begin with that there is the Rupakaya and the dharmakaya. There is, as it were, the Buddha's phenomenal personality, his human personality and then there is, as it were the Enlightenment Essence of the Buddha. The first is called the Rupakaya and the second is called the Dharmakaya. You get even this sort of distinctions in the Pali texts. The Dharmakaya there usually means the whole body of the teaching.

How is he translating as "the dharmakaya"?

S: It's translated here as "Body of Truth". But it's the sort of spiritual essence of the Buddha what the Buddha really is in the depths of his being. Outwardly he seems like an ordinary human being. That is his phenomenal personality, that is his Rupakaya, his Body of Form. "Body" here doesn't mean body in the ordinary sense (few words indistinct) aspect. But within, the Buddha has realised the Truth, he has achieved Enlightenment, as though he was

an embodiment of the Truth. So that~aspect of the Buddha in which he has realised the Truth, in which he is the Truth by virtue of his per- sonal realisation, this is called his ~harmak~ya. So this is why the Buddha sometimes says to his disciples : pay no attention to the outward physical form, don't be devoted to the Buddha in the true sense : the Buddha is the ~harma, he's not the body of flesh and blood. So Rupakaya and Dharmakaya.

Later on in the Mahayana the Yogacara school developed the idea of the Sambhogakaya and then the Rupakaya was re-named the Nirmanakaya. So in this way you get the three bodies of the Buddha. If you think in terms of say body and mind, the Buddha's body is his Rupakaya, his mind is his Dharmakaya, his enlightened mind. But if you think in terms of body speech and mind then the Buddha's body is the Nirmanakaya his speech is the Sambhogakaya and his mind is the Dharmakaya. So speech re- presents the principle of communication and Sambhogakaya is transformed principle of speech. It's also the sort of ideal Buddha, if you like, the archetypal Buddha mid-way between the phenomenal Buddha, the human historical personality and the Buddha as he is in his absolute essence outside space and outside time. Do you see this?

Iconographically, it's generally the Nirmanakaya in the figure wearing the normal dusty.

S Yes

orange robes.

S : Though sometimes of course it's difficult to distinguish between the two. They're both Rupakaya, sometimes Sambhogakaya Buddha are both represented in the guise of the Nirmanakaya but broadly speaking one can say that the decorated and adorned Buddha is iconography~ we should say that the Nirmanakaya Buddha should

Page 12

be represented very realistically~naturalistically-as he sometimes is in Chinese, in Japanese Buddhist art just as he may well have appeared as he tramped the roads of India a bit worn and a bit dusty. Then the Sambhogakaya Buddha should be represented as a sort of ideal Buddha form. Absolutely perfect, as beautiful as possible and in rather gorgeous decorated robes, even wearing a crown, with rays of light coming out, and so on. That would be the Sambhogakaya Buddha, the ideal of Buddhahood exempt from all the limitations of space and time ; (because the?, unclear) human historical Buddha may have been this and hollow-cheeked (indistinct) austerities. But we wouldn't represent the Sambhogakaya Buddha like that. He~, you'd represent him with all possible, all conceivable perfections. He'd be the ideal embodiment of Enlightenment...

(end of side one)

The Precious Garland Seminar - Tape PG5, session, Chapter 3, verses 201-218

Page 1

...represent him with all possible, all conceivable perfections. He'd be the ideal embodiment of Enlightenment. You might even depict him covered with jewels and so on to heighten the effect.

And then the Dharmakaya Buddha, how would he be represented?

I think he'd be naked.

S: Right, yes. Without any clothes at all. Representing the naked truth as it were, the naked reality and you do find this Samantabhadra, who sometimes represents the Dharmakaya for the Nyin-ma Pa, sometimes represent a the (Ari-) Buddha, he is represented in this way as a nude Buddha, a naked Buddha. So these are, as it were, the three levels: you could say the historical Buddha, the ideal Buddha, the absolute Buddha; the Buddha of history, the Buddha of Art and the Buddha of well what would one call it-the Buddha of truth.

: of meditation

S: Meditation, well no the Sabhogakaya is the Buddha of meditation. When you visualise you visualise Sambhogakaya forms, glorious forms.

- : Dhyanis Buddhas?

S: Yes, what are often called dhyanis Buddhas. The term "Dhyanis Buddha" by the way is never used in Buddhist literature, they are always called the Five Tinas, the Five Conquerers. (pause) And sometimes in the Himalayan regions you have three-storey temples with an image of the historical Buddha on the ground floor, of Avalokitesvara on the first floor, the Sambhogakaya, the thousand-armed Avalokitesvara, and Amitabha on the second floor which is the top floor, representing the dharmakaya. Sometimes again you have Padmasambhava, Avalokitesvara and Amitabha; or you can have Sakyamuni, Amitabha, Samantabhadra, but really the idea, the principle, is the thing: the historical plane, the ideal plane, the absolute plane.

It's usually that family relationship, isn't it? Between the three which are shown together when they are shown together., (words indistinct)

Page 2

S: If one strictly follows the tradition, yes. Anyway these are the two and the three Kayas, but here in Nagarjuna we have only two Kayas, two as it were bodies. Guenther actually recently has taken to translating Kaya as "sub-stratum of Being" so don't be misled by him when you encounter this. So "The form Body of a Buddha arises from collected merit. The body of Truth in brief, O King, arises from collected wisdom". "collected" isn't very good: the accumulation of these, in Sanskrit (punyasamhara) and (nanyanasamhara): the "accumulation of merit" and the Accumulation of wisdom". By merits is meant all possible, all conceivable meritorious or skillful thoughts and words and deeds. So there's the Rupakaya here represents as it were the absolute perfection of the mundane and dharmakaya represents the absolute perfection of the spiritual. to you see what I mean?

If you perform all conceivable skillful deeds over an immense period of time the result of that in terms of your own person, your own body :you'll be a rupakaya. You get the idea? So, supposing a certain kind of a skillful action produces beauty, another kind of skillful action produces strength and, supposing that you over a period of millions of years have been performing all these different kinds of skillful actions, all these meritorious deeds, all these punyas to inconceivable degree, an inconceivable extent then what sort of being, what sort of personality will you eventually emerge as a result of all that? That's the Rupakaya. But it is still the highest possible perfection of the mundane. It's rather like the universal monarch as Nagarjuna presents him infinitely glorified but still mundane. But the Dharmakaya represents the purely spiritual, the transcendental dimension. It represents complete, a full, a perfect, realisation of Reality itself. So in the Buddha you've got the Rupakaya and the Dharmakaya coalescing, The Buddha represents as it were therefore the perfection of unenlightened humanity and the perfection of Enlightened humanity. (pause) In other words he has fulfilled all possible mundane virtues as well as all possible spiritual and transcendental virtues and he is you-know the single embodiment of these two aspects.

: That ties up with the different kinds of aura doesn't it? There are different kinds of aura associated with the Buddha.

S Yes. In Tibetan art the aura around the body represents the accumulation of merits. The aura around the head represents the accumulation of wisdom. So it's

Page 3 3~I

you know, represents the Buddhist ideal as an accumulation of all ordinary human perfections to the highest possible degree as well as the supra-human spiritual qualities which lead to Enlightenment. So the highest conceivable experience of the transcendental is not incompatible with the highest conceivable development of the mundane. You don't have to mutilate the mundane in order to arrive at the spiritual. (pause) or transcendental.

You mention the pictorial forms as though those were the only disamble auras emanating from different areas from the body. One if you like emanating just as that kind of virtue the head. Well that kind of you know same from the body.

S Yes, quite. (pause) Well one could say therefore that this conception of the Buddha as Rupakaya and Dharmakaya can be expressed by Zen. That it represents the most perfect beauty considered as the expression of the highest truth. Or if you like, it represents the highest possible, the highest imaginable degree of beauty functioning as the medium of expression of the highest conceivable realisation of the truth. It goes back a bit -to what I was saying yesterday about the figure of Apollo as it were retaining all the beauty of the apollonian form but as it were, filling it with the light of Enlightenment. So if you can imagine all conceivable meritorious actions producing the most beautiful possible bodily form and that bodily form expressing the highest possible realisation of the truth then you get some idea of what is meant by the Buddha and his Rupakaya and Dharmakaya. (pause) The Rupa by the way in Sanskrit not only means form, it also does mean beauty. It is the modern Hindi word for beauty, rupa. (Rupavati) means beauty, full beauty. It's you know, a common name for a woman, (Rupavati) , "The form body of a Buddha arises from collected merit the body of Truth in brief O King arises from collected wisdom." But don't forget that

this wisdom is (vijñāna) in the sense of the intuition of reality not wisdom in the more mundane sense (pause) ARight, 213

: "Thus these two collections cause Buddhahood to be attained, So in brief always rely upon merit and wisdom."

S- : "Thus these two collection" Simply these two, these two (saṃparas) of merits and wisdom puṇya and vijñāna U Buddhahood to attained so in brief always rely on merit and wisdom". In other words at every stage of your s-ir- itua- career try to perform good actions, skillful ac- tions of body speech and mind thus accumulating wisdom and try to see into the reality of thi-~gs thus accumula-

Page 4

ting wisdom. These are the two great aspects of the spiritual path. Perhaps I should also point out that Buddhism does attach-or Mahayana Buddhism does in fact attach as it seems to do here-equal importance to puṇya and (jñāna?). Thy is it so important that the Buddha should have Rūpakaya? Why not concentrate on having a Dharmakaya? Why seem to give e-~tial status to puṇya and (nāna)?

Would the Rūpakaya, the thing that we approach, fi-~st of all, in that we ~trst see that.

S : So therefore it's important that t-~at should be as it were attractive. It's due to the puṇya that the Buddha has his own power of communication. The brhma-like speech is one of the marks, one of the major marks.

for (obscured by an aerop~ane, something about a need

S Yes and especial~y when one thinks in terms of the later teaching of the Saṃbhogakaya. The Saṃbhogakaya is, as it were, the glorified principle of communica- tion. So that is necessary. So one has the Puṇya- saṃbh~z,a of the Rūpakaya so as to, as it were , to equip oneself for ftirictioning in the world after one's Ealight- enment. So I mean, conceivably you could have a Buddha who was deaf dumb and blind, but tbu l dB~h~~a Buddha be very much use? So ~ccording to Buddhist thought if you were born deaf dumb and blind that might well be due to unskillful actions committed in previous lives, but on account of cu~~eattspiritual effort, yes you might be- come a Btiddha but you wouldn't be able to speak : you wouldn't be able to hear what other people said ; you wouldn't be able to see other peop~e : you wouldn't be able to communicate so you'd be a pretty useless Buddha even though you were a Buddha. So it's theref~re im- portant to accumulate merits so as to provide yourself along with your spiritual attainments with an effective means of cummunication. It's that also that the Pratek-abuddha lacks. You could say that perhaps the Preteka- buddha is one who developed the (nīya) side at the e~-: pense of the puṇya side. Of course one shouldn't think in these terms too literally because without a certain amount of puṇya you've no basis even for the realisa- tion of wisdom but apparently it is possible to develop, then in a somewhat unblanced fashion-especially if in this life you make a sudden spurt and gain Enlightenment you gain the T)harmakaya but without very much in the way

of merits from previous lives to provide you with an effective Rupakaya : So then you lack the means of communication. This is regarded therefore as quite important in Buddhism. This is why, you know, we stress that the bodhisattva, you know, learns all sorts of arts and sciences and even rhetoric just so as to equip himself for a better communication with other people. (pause) You're not much use if you're an inarticulate Buddha. Maybe even an inarticulate Buddha can communicate something but, you know, an articulate Buddha can communicate even more. So if you're a bodhisattva you have to think not only in terms of actually realising the truth, obtaining the Dharmakaya but also of equipping yourself with means of communication with other sentient beings, i.e., through a Rupakaya or Nirmanakaya and Sambhokaya (pause)

If one were, had a lot of merit but one didn't have the power of communication.

S : If one had-

If one had quite a lot of merit and actions and the other one didn't really have the power of speech in any sense that would be a bit contradictory; that's not what one has to develop, that

S Well what does one mean by merits? I mean, one particular kind of merit is you know skillful actions, the natural result of which is the power of speech.

- : er, ah, yeah

S So if one didn't have that even though one had other virtues it wouldn't mean that though your practice of the virtues hadn't been complete, hadn't included that particular virtue, the appropriate result of which was the faculty of speech. You would have neglected that one so the stress is the point that the medium of communication is also important that, as it were, Truth needs to be embodied in Beauty to make it attractive and accessible and approachable. So the fact that the Rupakaya is mentioned suggests that the ideal of Enlightenment is not something as it were bleak, unattractive, it coalesces with a kind of esthetic ideal which is the Rupakaya.

T was wondering if there was any more specific practice-something like awareness, like which could help one to develop a certain thing, like a particular sort, the ability to communicate. Because it seems very valuable asset to have.

S : Well what does Nagarjuna say about that? What did we see, what?

He doesn't mention it specifically

S He does mention it ; "Speaking true and soft words."

: Sometimes you might get someone with quite a lot of understanding and quite a deep experience of the Dharma without, who'd find it very very difficult to communicate. Perhaps he may be very frustrated by that.

S But Buddhism would regard that as an imperfection in that you should have taken care to develop that faculty of communication at the same time, as it were, you were penetrating into the truth because you should have been mindful of the needs of other beings; you should have been developing the compassion side as well as the wisdom side.

: So maybe the practice to develop that, er

S : The practice is the truthful and soft speech. In other words, even in this life itself, even in, on this particular occasion when the inarticulate person wants to explain something which he's understood what should he think if he's just tries to speak truthfully : I mean he will develop the power of communication. He just sticks to the facts and speaks softly and then he will develop it to some degree but it would have been better if he'd started earlier.

In the ten precepts, you see quite a strong emphasis on speech there. More, more of an emphasis put on speech and communication.

S So that is important from the bodhisattva-point of view because as the result of the practice of Right Speech ~ Perfect Speech you acquire the gift of eloquence, as it were, the power to communicate, in words, to other people (pause) Right, 214

"Don't be lazy about this (amassing) Of merit to achieve enlightenment since reasoning and scripture can restore one's spirits."

S : "Do not be lazy about this (amassing of merit to achieve enlightenment since reasoning and scripture can restore one's spirits". You notice that the term is (sabbhava) accumulation, what is accumulated. So in order to accumulate you've got to work for it, it's like accumulating money-it doesn't accumulate through its own accord

Page 7

unless of course you invest it but even then it doesn't accumulate very rapidly, it's only the interest that accrues. If you want to accumulate something very quickly then you have to work hard. So Nagasena says : "Do not be lazy about this (amassing) -or accumulating- "of merit to achieve enlightenment since reasoning and scripture can restore one's spirits". Why does he say that? (pause) I mean there is no necessity for you to be lazy. If you're lazy, if you feel lazy of overcoming it : reasoning ~ reason, well "this is very shameful, is disgraceful. I mean here am I, I've heard about the Truth, I've been told about the Path, I am a human being, why should I not follow it? Why should I not practice it? ~, that is reasoning and scripture is you know, reading through the scriptures, reading through the sutra to gain inspiration and get you going, so "Do not be lazy about this"-there's no excuse to be lazy because you've only got to reason, you've only got to read the scriptures and your spirits are restored. There is something else he could have mentioned but he doesn't and what's that, to overcome laziness and restore one's spirits?

- Kalyana Mitrata

S Kalyana Mitrata, yes. Perhaps that's even more effective for most people. I think quite a few people would find it rather difficult to reason themselves into a restoration of spirits-or does one not find that?

I find the scriptures, for myself, much more sort of, I know there's certain areas in which I can go which I can't go with-

S : I mean, some scriptures are more than others and, as you say, one does know where to go on any given occasion whether it's to read the life of the Buddha or the Perfection of Wisdom. Santideva, or whether and of course Kalyana Mitrata in association with positive people who aren't lazy, who are working hard, well this can restore one's spirits like anything-if it doesn't make you resentful of course (laughter). They often have to be tactful and not appear to be putting any sort of pressure on you otherwise their positivity and, you know, energy can be felt as quite irritating. So one could say reasoning, reading the scriptures and also association with good friends. (pause) This sort of, this question of laziness and restoring one's spirits, I think it is quite important when you think, what is laziness and what makes one lazy? This is something I've been wondering about recently. I mean, when you become lazy what is actually happening?

Page 9

S It seems to me that you get laziness in this sort of way, you come to this sort of full stop when what you've been putting your energy into, or the way in which you've been putting your energy, represents only part of yourself. Supposing for instance you've been putting your energy very much into intellectual things, you might have quite enjoyed that for a while but then there is a whole other side of your being, let's say the emotional side, which hasn't been getting any exercise as it were and which starts therefore demanding and therefore resisting and maybe, working against all that intellectual activity and that putting of energy into that intellectual activity : well, you come to a full stop. You are unable to continue with that intellectual activity. You feel lazy. So maybe that means it's time to put the energy into something else, to as it were develop some other aspect of your being. Sometimes of course it is just the old gravitational pull, the unregenerate side of you which is resisting because you've gone against it for so long and now it's beginning to pull. I think laziness is a quite interesting phenomena : why are people lazy? Usually we say "Oh, he is lazy" and leave it at that, but why? why should anyone be lazy? or what is laziness? If you were resting that is not laziness. That is quite natural, that is quite necessary. But I think laziness is very often a reaction that comes as a result of one-sided activity. I don't say that is the total explanation or the explanation in all cases but I think this does very often happen. It's sort of natural process of your whole being is not being satisfied and that is interesting when you are totally involved. If you're totally involved I think you can keep it up indefinitely. But if you are only partially involved in the sense of only part of your being involved, you can't keep it up indefinitely.

: But a totally integrated person-

S A totally integrated person couldn't be lazy. They might not do anything but that would be because they made a conscious decision not to do it but they wouldn't be in the sort of

situation where they'd decide to do something and wanted to do it but found themselves unable to carry on due to the laziness-so they wouldn't be in that sort of situation. An intergrated person can't be a lazy person. I mean they wouldn't put themselves in the situation, I mean that sort of situation where the possibility of laziness would arise they'd be much too sensitive to, wel~ if they were intergrated they couldn't

Page 10

could not but be totally involved in anything they did for whatever period of time in which they did it there- fore there could not be a reaction from any part of themselves that was not involved.

Any further reflections on laziness?

mm

S There's also the point that you can't always be work- ing, that you need a rest-not only physically but also mentally and you Being needs a rest ; you need to stop. You need time to assimilate, to absorb, to refl~ct, to consider. You can't always be on the go.

- : That's why it~s good to go on retreats.

S : It's a different kind of activity. In a way you might be doing much m~re on a retreat but with faculties, with energies you don't usually get the chance to use.

This allowing a period of time to let all the parts which haven't been developed to catch up with the more developed side.

S Indeed, right, yes. So this restoring of your spirits is more like a restoring of the balance isn't it, of al]owing the total person to be involved or at least a resting from that one-sided involvement. Sometimes oira~umstances may require a one-sided involvement ot what might seem to be a one-sided involvement on your part, you can't avoid it, can't help it but you have to do that quite wisely and, you know, not carry it to ex- tremes. (pause)

It's a sort of the old saying a change is as good as rest

S Yes, and sometimes I think you need to be able to dream. 1)0 you know what I mean by dreaming? It's a sort of free-flowing associate, well not only thinking but feeling and being. I mean usually you think "first I'll do this then I'll do that and for some other reason I'll do something else". It's rather brisk and practi- cal and direct. But that's only one way of ~unttioning. Sometiies you need to be able to juat dream and just let thoughts ~ through the mind, do a but of this and then do a bit ~f that and have a wonder round the garden and drink a cup of tea as you feel like it. This is another way of functioning which is equa~ly important too. You see what I me~n? This is like the dream state, in sleep.

Page 11

There needs to be, it seems, something like this in the walking state too, at least sometimes. Creative thinkers are very much like that. They are alive to the dream state or the dream experience. The flowing associative. They meander. They don't go, you know, along a straight line in a logical fashion from point to point.

I think I spent nearly all of my early life like that (laughter)

S Well, yes, you have to make up for that then.

Also I'm feeling very guilty about it. Feeling perhaps that it is wrong and that one has to do some useful work to justify one's existence.

Sometimes you just don't want to do anything at all.

S I don't know about that. I think eventually you would feel like doing something.

- (indistinct)

S Well, a few weeks perhaps. But what's wrong with that

- (something about seeming to be dying)

S Well, I'm not thinking of anything quite like that. I'm thinking more of dreamy-associative state which you enjoy. like a sort of reverie and you can just follow every whim and impulse and feeling as it arises and just go along and see where it leads. You know this is quite a positive state. You usually find when you are, engaged in it, indulge in it, you know, time passes quite quickly and you spend quite a pleasant day. And you might spend several days like this, even a week or two then you get a definite strong feeling I'd like to do so-in-so and you do it, vigorously with interest and energy. You're then into another sort of stage, another sort of phase. I think there has to be time and space and scope for what I call this more dreamy associative phase, or way of living or way of being. You can't always be geared to a timetable, a programme, a schedule, a set pattern.

- (question indistinct) (laughter)

S : (mooning around?) (first words indistinct) Though a day seems rather stagnant and sterile. People seem neither able to work or dream. Well anyway there's not much to do there if you are not working. There's not even a library to potter around in or a garden to potter around in otherwise people might potter more.

Page 12

I potter around in my room actually. I get quite a feel from usually what I do on Sunday.

S Yes, you know, sort of spend the morning hanging up a picture or tidying your cupboard if you have one (laughter) Or shshing your mat or just looking at your cycling boots or

something like that wondering about them and speculating about a possible new pair. Some people slip more easily into this dreamy associative state than others. Some start to be rather guilty about wasting time and I suppose I ought to be getting on with something but you don't really feel like doing it.

What about working and being in that sort of state at the same time?

S : It depends on the sort of work you are doing. You can do creative work in that sort of spirit, in that sort of way, but if it's work that requires presence of mind and promptness and speed, you can't, can you? (laughter) Or else you'd get the foreman after you : "get a move on there, haven't got all day you know" (words indistinct) (laughter)

~ sometimes laziness I mean I'm going to put in a good word for laziness now (laughter)-sometimes laziness is quite a healthy time. It's a sort of you know protest of a system that is either being driven too hard or is having to function in a one-sided manner. What is the sort of laziness then that Nagarjuna is referring to?

Slothness

S Slothness, torpor. (pause) Well I am quite sure that if you are leading a balanced and healthy life with all your faculties involved and have got a sort of positive goal I don't think that you can be lazy. You may mindfully take time off and you know, spend certain periods very quietly but you can't be lazy.

Alright 215

"Just as in all directions space, earth, water, fire and wind are without limit, so suffering sentient Beings are limitless".

S There'll never be a shortage of sentient beings. (pause) Alright on to 216

£"The Bodhisattvas through their compassion lead these limitless sentient Beings out of sufferings and

Page 1~ ~40

and establish them definitely in Buddhahood".

S : So a bodhisattva can't afford to be lazy as it were. But that doesn't mean that a bodhisattva forces himself. It's not very easy to follow this middle path between slacking and forcing, you see what I mean? You certainly shouldn't slacken off in your efforts but at the same time you shouldn't force yourself in a one-sided sort of way.

You know this excuse sometimes that you or your self-

S : Well one has to see the objective situation and also the forcing may represent the breaking through of a relatively superficial level of resistance and, you know, the gravitational pull. Once you've forced your way through that well you do feel quite genuine fresh energies spring

ing up. (pause) It's like getting your second wind-rath- er than trying to carry on when there's no wind there at -all-occasionally that may happen, then one should be able to recognise the difference.

Would you go so far to say that if you force your- self to do a job like that which you feel disinterested in, but you feel if you carry on really forcing your- self to be involved in that , that you will get, the resources will come up to do it?

S : I don't think they will. It just depends because you know why does one force oneself to do something in the first place? I think it depends very much on the mot- ivation and if it's something you don't particularly want to do but you see quite objectively and sensibly that it needs doing and you're reasonably intergrated person then you can decide to do it and do it quite hap- pily. But I think the trouble arises when you think you ought to do it not so much because you see yourself objectively it needs to be done and you're quite ready to do it eventhough it's not what you would have chosen to do, the trouble arises when you are motivated by guilt and feel you ought to do it not in any objective sense but you ought to do it because that is what is expected of you by other people or they'll blame you if you don't this really means that with you whole being you don't want to do it but at the same time you don't want to forfeit the esteem etc, of other people whereas in the first case I mentioned you don't particularly want to do it but you whole being decides that "yes, it should be done because there is the neccessity for it to be done and I'm also quite capable of doing it al- right, let me do it eventhough I'm not all that been"- then it's a decision of the total being. But in the second instance, you don't want to do it at all : what you

[361]

want is the approval of the other people, or at least 0 u want not to lose their approval, you're atr~dcio~f heir disapproval. 'Jike, for instance, if someone asks you to do some washingup, you might hav~ wanted to go and have a quiet read but, if you're a healthy together person you'll say "okay I'll do it", and you'll do it quite cheerfully and happily and be quite completely in to it. But, if you are a different kind of person and, suppose you don't want to do the washing-up but you haven't gottthe guts to say so, you go and do it with total unwillingness and drag yourself through the job but you'll feel quite tired and resentful.

And break all the plates.

S :~aybe. But so you see the difference. I mean you can sometimes take on a job you don't particularly want to do but at the same time take it on for quite objective reasons and get quite reasonably well into it. But on the other hand you can really~force yourself to do some- thing for, you know, want of a better term, feeling of guilt and be re~uctant and resentful all the time and therefore fee3 ~ery little energy and get ~ery tired very quickly.

Tn one you just do the washing~p and you just need Uhe energy to do the washing-up. In the other case you need to do the washing-up and at the same time dragging a good part of~ you along, well there's that extra load as well in this case so you're doing it twice or even three times.

S You're overcoming your resistance to do it. You're reluctant to do it.

So it looks as though you've done the same hob but at the end of it you've done three or four times the wor~

S So an integrated person is able to mobilise all his energies for a certain task, at least in the short term even though it isn't something that he would have chosen to do-you see the difference? But a less integrated person isn't able to do that-they're not able to say "no" in the first place but they're not able to say no because they have these feelings of guilt, obligation in the wrong negative sort of way.

Alright, 217 (ENI) OF SIDE TWO)

[362]

The Precious Garland Seminar ?Chapter 5 Session 9 continued page 1. 217 - 218 -
Verses side A Present: Ven. Sangharakshita, Ananda, Hridaya, Uttara, Ajita, Punya,
Colin Warren (now Surata), Frances Gritton (now), Alaya.

Verse 217

S: Right, 217. Right 217 and 218 - read them straight off because they are connected.

:"Whether sleeping or not sleeping~After thoroughly assuming

Such compassion~He who remains steadfast. Even though he might become
unconscientious. Always accumulates merit as limitless as

all sentient beings. For their number has no limit. Know then. that since (the causes) are
limitless. Limitless Buddhahood is not hard to attain."

S: Mmm, Mmm, so "whether sleeping or not sleeping. after thoroughly assuming such
compassion, he who remains steadfast, even though he might become non-conscientious,
always accumulates merit as limitless as all sentient beings, for their number has no limit..."
uh? (means) as a Bodhisattva he's aspiring to help all sentient beings. For that he'll require
infinite merits, because beings are infinite uh? But then, one advantage is, that with limitless
merits it won't be very difficult for him to attain limitless Buddhahood uh? This is where,
maybe, Nagarjuna's, one of Nagarjuna's rather sophisticated ways of encouraging the king
uh? What do you think is meant by "remaining steadfast. even though he might become
non-conscientious," speaking of the Bodhisattva? (pause) It seems to suggest that your
overall ideal remains intact, even though you might lapse from it from time to time due to
unmindfulness, something like that. You see what I mean? Do you often... do you find this
happening? Mmm? You might just forget yourself for a few minutes or half a day. It doesn't
mean that you've actually given up the ideal, you've just let things,

you know, let things slide for a bit, or let things swing even for a bit. You get back -to it consciously and deliberately, you know, after a while. Sometimes this does happen right? Mmm?

Voice: Mmm

S: Mean like when you go off to the pub for the evening you think well, not ~that you needn't3 consciously think, but you just feel like a break, and you're not sort of too careful at examining whether that is the very best thing for you.to do, you know, in the light of the higher spiritual ~ideals3 you just go off, and when you come back you maybe go to the meditation and chanting and, you know, you get back onto the path again, aa it were,yes? I think it refers to something like this. You remain steadfast, you've not given up the ideal, uh? In principle you are still on the spiritual path, uh? But you have deviated just a little bit, just for a few minutes, huh? mmm? But, you know, you've no intention of staying off permanently, its just that weak old human nature asserting its- elf, huh? I think most people find this happening uh? And I think so long as one's, you know, overall ideal remains firmly intact and really steadfast one certainly shouldn't feel guilty about these little, very sort of short lived, you know, strayings from the path. Don't deceive yourself ~or~ don't fool yourself, If you think about them at all recognise them, yes, for deviations from the path, uh? But at the same time don't allow yourself to, to feel too, too bad about them, too guilty about them. But certainly keep the overall ideal very steadily in view.

_____: That's important isn't it, that kind of honestP~~~~~

S: Yes, yeah, right, mm.

_____: ...this is a deviation from the path, rather than: "Well I can do this if I want to or....."

36'~ page 3

S: ..,or, or saying well I'm also following the path in my own way? (chuckle) I mean it is a deviation but never mind, the overall ideal remains intact and you're not going to be untrue to that, you're going to get back to that, you're not going to forsake that. _____ There's something a bit courageous about being able to say that, to be able to be honest.

S: Yeah, right, yeah, but it means you've got great confidence in your overall commitment eh? This is what it means.

Sometimes it doesn't seem that easy to really know~wheTher~

it is a lapse. I mean in fwhat does the lapse lie,~ presumably L;:£)~"~ in a lapse from mindfulness (2 nur~~ inai~~lu~~).

S: Yes, well in a way it doesn't matter whether it was a lapse in fact or not, (we~ need not bother about it too much, provided the overall ideal does remain in view. That is the important thing. But usually what happen~, you know, when you are devaiting, is that at least for those moments or for that evening the ideal is not consciously present eh? Mmm? That is

usually the difference, yeah? Or you're not engaged in any activity directly related to the achievement of the ideal hmm? At best you're marking time uh? Or at best you're just sitting down by the roadside and having a little rest huh? Maybe you haven't even gone away from the road, huh? Or maybe you're sitting down on the milestone, and just having a little rest before carrying on, or maybe you do just go - wandering off into a nearby field and pluck a flower or two, and then come back (laughter).

Well I think what is really important is just to keep the overall, the ultimate ideal steadily in view, If you can do that you can't strictly speaking be said to deviate. And I think even if you do really deviate there shouldn't be too much breast beating

page 4

about it eh? Otherwise you'd be so busy beating your breast that you again lose sight of the overall ideal huh? hmm? ~Now~ you start feeling well what sort of person am I? I deviated, I str~yed, I did this, I didn't do that, I'm actually really bad, maybe I'm not fit to follow the path, maybe I've made a mistake, maybe I shouldn't be following it, maybe I should leave it to another life et cetara, et cetera, huh? Its much more healthy sort of to keep the ideal steadily in view what ever you are doing eh? hmm? And think well never mind in a sense what I'm doing, I have got the ideal in view, I am working my way towards that in the long run. That in a way is a healthier attitude, hmnr? But of course that doesn't mean just a theoretical er - er - you know, posulation of the ideal, and not bothering about what you're doing eh? It mustn't be taken that way huh? But keeping the goal pretty reasonably in sight all the time and not letting it go out of one's conscious - er - consideration for more than a very short period at a time hmm? I think you may find this quite a bit if you've got a regular job. I mean during working hours do you think of the ideal? uh? No you don't, not consciously, usually, I mean how can you? Your mind is, you know, busy with other things, you've got to think about other things, do other things eh? But if your livelihood is right livelihood, well, at least, even though you're not consciously thinking about the ideal, - ah - you know, you are in a sense, you know, still treading the path, mm? But - er - your livelihood may be wrong livelihood, but even if it is, well then you are off the path, but, you know, when working hours are over, you know, you get back onto it again, and again the ideal comes consciously before your mind. If you do, as it were, stumble and fall down, I mean the important thing is not to sort of, you know, worry about having stumbled and

page 5

fallen, but just to pick yourself up and go walking on again. But sometimes it happens (that) people (are) so busy bemoaning the fact that they stumbled and fell, they forget that they have to walk on again.

_____ Sometimes when that happens you return to the dharia ~with~ a lot more zest, you know, you get sorta distaste for ... (3 or 4 words indistinct).

S: Well it depends how badly you burned your fingers when plucking that flower.... (chuckles) ybn think the higher... the, the path is safer after all eh?

Voice: Yeah.

S: Or you light have tumbled down a disused mineshaft or some- thing of that sort eh?

_____ Do you think there is possibly a case for someone who is very doubtful about the reality of the path and the goal and that sort of thing, they're very tentative in following it, ~~Laybe (to) forget all about it for a little while and do something completely different, do something which is almost unspiritual, just to re- inforce his needs for the path....

S: Mmmm, I think that... I'd say that would be a bit dangerous.... (laughter) I'd say he ought to cultivate his spiritual friends as much as possible. Mmmm.

Tha;t15 assuming that his vision is sufficiently developed to see the need for that. Maybe he's so...

S: Well in that case he's got enough vision to follow the path. No, that seems a bit sort of - er - theoretical to me. I think if there was any such person in sort of, danger of, you know, straying off the path permanantly, well he'd better sort of hold fast to his spiritual

page 6

friends if he has any, and ask them to drag him back if he seems to be in danger of straying eh?

_____ Often at that stage you, you know, you're not sufficiently clear minded to know whether you're you know, you may think that you're following a path of your own making as it were.

S: Well one is assuming that such a person is within ear-shot of advice eh? If he isn't then what can one do hmm? I don't think one need take unnecessary risks in the early stages of one's spiritual career uh?

(Indistinct asides)

S: I think actually we'll leave it there, because verse 219 raises some quite important and profound questions that maybe we ought to go into a bit thoroughly huh? And we've only a few ~inutes left of this morning's session. I think we'd better leave that until the afternoon⁴ Right, any other question on what we've already done this morning? (Long pause).

_____ Mmmm~ you've often said, or I think I've heard you saying something to do with a Bodhisattva °... If there is one Bodhisattva around then that's enough. Something along these lines, if there is one Bodhisattva in the world then it's enough to have around in some way. To know, to know there's a Bodhisattva around. Mmm, I can't really get the, the crux of the question.

S: I know I have said something about one Bodhisattva, that's one of the things I'm going to talk about in the afternoon, but not quite, not in that sort of way (exactly). Maybe you're thinki~g of something else I said.

_____ Just that I think that is to know, you know, in the world there is somebody like that around....

page 7

S: Well it's enough in a way, I mean, forget about the term Bodhisattva. But even if there's only one person who is sort of spiritually enlightened, that's enough for you to know that spiritual enlightenment is possible. It doesn't require a hundred people to prove it. It only requires one. Hmm? Yes? _____ Yes.

S: Perhaps I've said something like that.

_____ Mmm, I think I've heard you say it in connection with
the (word indistinct).

S: Yes, well the fact that one person could attain, you know, proves that, er, that anyone can attain. If one human being can do it, any other human being can do it. You only need one to prove the point. eh? yeah? If you've got more, well all that that would prove would perhaps, er, would be that it was more easy huh? You know, if a hundred people were enlightened you'd think well it can't be too difficult. You know, if a million people were enlightened you'd think well it must be dead easy. (laughter) But the one, even just the one, proves that it is possible, however difficult or however easy, huh? So one is enough in that sense, in that way. (pause) Alright, any other point? (pause) O.K. Leave it there then.

S: Let's start reading. 219.

_____ bodhisattva stays for a limitless time in the world For limitless embodied beings he seeks/like limitless (qualities of) enlightenment/And performs virtuous actions without limit.

S: Hmm, so what sort of impression does one get from this verse about the Bodhisattva?

_____ The infiniteness of things, like, you know, his activities.

_____ : He gives himself without any stint at all.

S: But even more than that?

_____ : Total egoless.

S: Total egoless.

S: Limitless.

_____ The quality of being outside time altogether.

S: Yes, hmm, In other words what I'm really getting at is this: Does the Bodhisattva, judging from this description, seem like a person in any recognisable sense? Well? eh? Can one really as it were imagine, can one actually think of someone who is... who stays for a limitless time in the world, uh? And seeks the limitless qualities of enlightenment for limitless embodied beings, and performs virtuous actions without limit? I mean can you actually imagine anybody performing virtuous actions without limit, hmm? I mean it really baffles the mind doesn't it, uh? So therefore what sort of impression does one get about the Bodhisattva?

_____ Beyond man.

S: Beyond man. And not only beyond man but, you know, beyond, er,

even individuality as we, you know, usually recognise it, as we understand it. Its almost as though the...the - er - Bodhisattva is a sort of - er - disembodied, impersonal spiritual energy, eh? Mmmm? You see what I'm getting at? ('Coc) ~ the Mahayana sutras we come across so many descriptions of a Bodhisattva, hmm? And - er - the Bodhisattva is held up to us as the ideal of the Mahayana, mfunni? This is supposed to be our ideal, this is supposed to be the ideal that we're aiming at, the ideal that we're aspiring to fulfil. But - er - do you think it is very practica~e for us, can we really think in those terms? uh? hmm? Can we actually think in terms of staying for a limitless time, uh? And seeking the limitless qualities of enlightenment for limitless embodied beings, and performing virtuous actions without limit, eh? (I mean) can we actually think of ourselves as actually even trying to do this here and now, huh? "Virtuous actions without limit?~, uh? That's quite a tall order, uh? Hmmm! So when the Mahayana represents, when the Mahayana describes the Bodhisattva, it's as though it isn't describing an individual at all, huh? hmmm? And therefore it's not in a way expecting us - er - to behave like that, hmmm? - literally, eh? you see what I'm getting at? It's as though the Mahayana is sort of trying to depict - er - in the figure of the Bodhisattva, this.. .this...er...well this spiritual energy, this spiritual force, which is as it were at work in the universe, eh? hmm? and -of which we can get just a sort of glimpse, uh? every now and then, uh? So it's as though the most that we can do in... is not very realistic for us to be a Bodhisattva like this, we can't really think of it, but what we can do is at least be open to the ideal, huh? and hope that to s~me extent at least, huh? that the Bodhisattva, or that sort of spiritual energy will be able

to manifest through us. That seems more realistic as it were, and in a way more true, uh? Do you see what I'm getting at? But if you say, I mean if you take the words of the Mahayana scriptures very literally, then you have, as it were, to say that "I am going to become a Bodhisattva, I am going to perform infinite good deeds, I'm going to establish a Buddhaland, I'm going to liberate an infinite number of beings~..fl but does one feel that - er - you know, one really is in a position to even aspire to this, eh? Can one sort of, in a sense, imagine oneself as an individual actually doing all this, uh? Mmm? So it seems that it would be, as it were, more practical if we take the Bodhisattva as representing this sort of - er - this universal if you like, or even omnipresent, you know, spiritual energy, eh? which is at work in the universe, tending to the good, tending to the emancipation, tending to the enlightenment of all living beings, eh? And we can hope, as it were, we can aspire as it were, to be a channel of that within our own particular sphere, within our own particular context, our own particular life, uh? Otherwise we get ourselves into the position of making vows or adopting attitudes which are not very realistic, uh? It becomes a little bit theatrical, and this has sometimes

happened in the Buddhist East and Mahayana countries uh? Mmm? So ~that it is not~ that you as an individual are going to be a Bodhi~attva, uh? in this sort of cosmic sense, uh? but that there is a Bodhisattva, or the Bodhisattva, at work, uh? and one will, as it were, assist and co-operate in that work, eh? make oneself a channel for that sort of energy. You can't as it were appropriate to yo~rself as an individual, which °eans~really~as an ego, the attributes and qualities, and activities and vows, of the Bodhisattva, hmm? So the Bodhisattva is not an individual in the ordinary sense of the term, Mmm? So it's

page 11

as though just as the - er - the S~boghakaya Buddha represents the ideal of enlightenment - er- as it were outside any historical context, any particular historical situation, out side space and outside time, uh? In the same way the Bodhisattva, uh? represents not an~ particular individual Bodhisattva, any particular historical individual, er, but rather represents what we can call perhaps the spirit of enlightenment at work in the world, and as it were person- ified in that Bodhisattva form, uh? Hmm?

_____ ~Could~ one put it maybe in the sense that there are certain basic forces at work in the universe ~in the process of~ evolution, which manifest because this is the way ~they can~ communicate 4and sort of embodying them selves into, or form~ themselves into the human psyche, for the sake of activity, ~for the sake of~ communication?

S: Mmmm, -In. One could perhaps, but I think you have to be quite careful how you put these things, eh? One is dealing here with myth and poetry, rather than with, you know, scientific fact uh? _____ ~D'you see it in terms of a certain} attitude?

S: Mmmm. Mean for instance the Bodhisattva takes a vow to persue his career for three unthinkable aeons, and to practice each paramita for so many millions of years, uh? Well can one quite realistically and honestly, you know, make those sort of vows? Hmm? One can perhaps think in terms of the Bodhisattva spirit at work in the universe, uh? not limited by time, not limited by space1 and think of the Bodhisattva as personifying that. And then one's own task is just, ylknow, to reflect that, to manifest that Bodhisattva spirit within one's own life and within one's own sphere of influence. That would seem to be ruore realistic and more true, and even in a way more honest, eh? I think one has to stick very close to one's actual situation and not

page 12

get lost as sometimes the Mahsyana does get lost in the East, in what are, as it were, rather

unrealistic aspirations. (That is really) Unrealistic considered as aspirations of the ego, eh? You see the difference between these two? In a way the Theravada is much more sober, and much more close to the actual facts of the situation, but the Mahayana gives very well the spirit of the whole thing, the spirit of the whole process, within a wider, even a cosmic context, un? In a way you have to take the two together, take the Theravada as a guide, more, for here and now, day by day, practise, uh? and take the Mahayana as a guide to the ideal, huh? as it exists outside space and outside time, and independently of one's own rather pathetic efforts.

_____ ° Could you repeat the Mahayana fone~ again?

S: Hmmm?

_____ ° Could you repeat the Mahayana again? You know, you said the Theravada represents day by day...

S: Well the Mahayana represents the, er, the spiritual ideal presented independently of any particular historical context; outside space and outside time, mmm? This is why I sometimes say there's only one Bodhisattva, huh? hmm? Just as there's only one Buddha, and one Bodhicitta, hmm? ~But~ the Bodhisattva is in a way a personification of the Bodhicitta, ~so that~ when you write Bodhisattva with a capital 'B', huh? mm? You could even say that the Bodhisattva represents the spirit of the higher evolution, uh? (pause) _____ (indistinct)...In terms of whether you're following the path, what makes the decision to follow the higher evolution, is it your ego, is it ego in a sense or is it that (sorta' that maybe at one). Is it maybe the Bodhicitta....

S: Well it's you, ~ou decide. (long pause)

page 13

_____ But, well, (moaning that we're inside time but that sorta higher evolution, that sorta attitude.... yes, well for a moment we could have been outside our (indistinct), outside

time, or going beyond it ~"~

_____ : .I don 'tknow what y~~~e really trying to say.

S: I think the difficulty is mainly linguistic; and regarding the ego as a sort of thing, oh? but it isn't, it's you who decide. (pause) Who else?

_____ Presumably it's on the basis (of) having some sort of contact ~with tho~~ transcendental ~in the process?~ Otherwise one couldn't have any conception of - er - ...

S: Yes, but it's still you who decide, and you have that contact. So what I'm trying to do in effect is ~t to in a way bring the, not exactly bring the Mahayana down to earth, but make a distinction between - er - an ideal as it exists independent of any concrete situation, uh? and - or - the attempt to embody the ideal in the concrete situation, hmm? For instance, just to compare again with the Buddha, Hmm? the - or - let's say the Nirmanakaya and the Samboghakaya. Do you expect to see the Buddha walking around north-eastern India wearing his thirty-two major and eighty minor marks? Hmm? ~I mean~ had you been alive in the time of the Buddha

mean would you..) had you met the Buddha would he have appeared exactly say as he's depicted on a Tibetan tanka, uh? No, huh? So why is that? (I mean) the Buddha, as depicted a the Tibetan tanka, represents a different order of existence, yeah? But does that mean that - er - the Buddha represented - er - in the Tibetan tanka wasn't there at the time of the, of the human historical Buddha? (I mean) you couldn't have seen him,4anyway~ with the eye of flesh at least, but then where would he have been? would he have been non-existent then

page 14

or, or what?

_____ Perhaps ~they'd say they'd seen him~ with the eye of meditation. ... spiritual ~experience.. .~

S: Mmm, So it's much the same (you know) with the Bodhisattva. The S~ ~~~ Bodhisattva as described in the Mahayana scripture corresponds, in a

way, to the Samboghakya Buddha, huh? He's the ideal, as it exists outside space and outside time. Not the ideal as realised, which the Buddha represents, but the ideal in process of realisation, hmm? So just as the, the human historical Buddha, on the human historical level, doesn't fully - er - (I don't know whether to say embody, huh?) ah - but doesn't fully express, huh? what actually in his inner being he realises due to the limitations of ~he historical situation, huh? Ah - in the same way - er - the individual person who is trying to be a Bodhisattva, doesn't express the full nature of the Bodhisattva ideal, in fact cannot express it, huh? ~because it is having~ reference not just to the individual situation, in which he finds himself, but all space and all time.

_____: (To me) you're talking about the forth and fifth stages in

S: Er - in a way.... (indistinct comments)...

_____ So it doesn't exist outside of man.

S: Also it doesn't exist outside of man. We say at work-in the uni- verse, but working, you know, through man, through living beings let us say. You could say that therefore the Bodhisattva is the spirit of the higher evolution, yeah? But no one situation, no one individual, aspiring to that ideal, can fully express it. So the Bodhisattva .~ represents, I mean the Bodhisattva as described by the Mahayana, represents - er - that ideal as fully expressed, uh? For instance t~ke the - the - er - the figure of the - er - Avalokitevara with a

page 15

thousand arms, uh? and eleven heads, uh? well this expresses something of that, un? that the, you know, tho Bodhisattva is so many sided, so omnipresent, huh? doing so much, huh? but it wouldn't be possible for any one person, in any one given historical situation to do all th~~se things, uh? yeah? So the Bodhisattva, as an ideal, doesn't represent something to be copied by each individual, uh? That is quite impossible, that would be a contradiction in terms. But (an~ individual is to imbibe the spiritof that, and express it in his own way within his own life and his own immediate situation, hmm? so therefore you mustn't take too literally the~Bodhisattva's vows about delivering all beings, or, throughout the universe, uh? Because here it is the Bodhisattva spitit speaking. You will do your bit by delivering those beings who fall within your particular sphere of influence, uh? (I moan) you will aspire to be just one of the thousand arms of Avalakitesvara, hmm? jBeoause~ the arm belongs to Avalokites- vara, Avalokitesvara does not belong to the arm, hmm? D'you see what I'm getting at? If you think that you have to be the Bodhisattva, well it's like the arm thinking it's got to be Avalokitesvara, or that Avalokitesvara beongs to the arm, whereas in fact it's the other way round - you've got to be an arm of Avalokitosvara, hmm? Is this very clear or is it still obscure, eh? It's not surprising if it is obscure Because W~~v~rything~ has been explained by anybody else. _____ (It's a l~t ~~clear~I mean it's all been very, very obscure).

S: Otherwise you get into all sorts of contradictory situations if you take some of the things that the Mahayana sutras say literally. Alright, if we... let's take it that - or - that every individual Bodhisattva, let's say that there are lots of people, thousands of people, all aspiring to be Bodhisattvas and to deliver all beings, uh?

page 16

But each one of them is going to deliver all beings? Won't they get in one another's way? (laughter) So what does that mean? There can only be one Bodhisattva, h=n? yeah? So there's one Bodhisattva spirit working throughout space and throughout time, and individuals who, you know, accept that ideal do their bit within their own particular sphere, but the idea of each one, as an individual aspiring as it were to that cosmic function, that is ridiculous, huh?

_____ So the Bodhisattva in that sense, in that archetypal sense, is identical to the Bodhicitta?

S: Er, yes. That's why I say, is the personification in a way, of the Bodhicitta.

_____ ° There's almost no way of differentiating between them.

S: Well in a way you could say the, the Bodhicitta - er - is the sort of psychological-cum-spiritual principle, and the Bodhisattva is the embodiment of that in human form, or as it were in human form. ~ A ~~~ ° (several words unclear).. But speaking in the sense that you were just interpreting it in, in the sense of the principle, rather than an individual being, ~it~ becomes the Bodhicitta.

S: Miii, yeah. And this is why I have said in the past that the Bodhicitta is not anybody's individual property or possession, uh? How can it be, uh? Er - the sastra says, I think it's Vasubandhu's, or maybe Nagarjuna's, that the Bodhicitta is not included in the five skandhas. I've mentioned this quite a number of times before, uh? In other words it's not part and parcel of the empirical personality, Y'know, the Bodhicitta is not a thought of your own individual mind, ah? If y~u translate it as will, it's not an act of will, t-t of your individual being, uh? hmm? It's something we

page 18

you know, one Bodhisattva; Bo they form as it were one Bodhisattva; they are as it were one being, eh? Er - 'Mean they've gone to the opposite extreme as it were from a group, un? They're even more than a spiritual community, they've become - er - you know, as it were, in a manner of speaking, one being. Which is at the same time something supra-individual, uh? Hmm?

_____ But if the ~Bodhisattvas, they were people the Bodhicitta) had arisen in, would they exist anywhere else?

S: Well - er - it doesn't exist anywhere. Mmm? It doesn't exist even there, huh? in the sense of being limited there, but it has arisen there, in the sense of manifesting there. It can arise, it can manifest anywhere, uh? M~iini ?

_____ Potentially limitless.

S: Potentially limitless. It manifests wherever it gets an opportunity. It can at the same time be manifesting - er - in other spiritual communities, in other worlds, in other universes, uh, mmm? So one mustn't take all this talk of different Bodhisattvas, and so on and so forth, too literally, heh? or regard the Mahayana sutras as referring to - to distinct personalities, huh? mmm? So what - all that one can do or, I say all but it's a very big thing, what one has to do as an individual is, you know, just - er - make oneself open to that sort of higher spiritual force, which we call the Bodhicitta, huh? which is a sort of movement or tendency of the, 't'know the spirit of the higher evolution in the direction of, y'know, ultimate enlightenment, y'know, for the sake, for the benefit of all, huh? One makes oneself as an

individual open to the spirit of the higher evolution you could say, heh? mmm? Or, in more traditional Buddhist language, puts oneself in touch with the Bodhisattva, or Bodhisattvae if you like to think in the plural, no harm, hmm?

page 19

_____ Seems to resemble like - mirrors; you can have any number...say there's one sun... you can have any number of mirrors reflecting. .

S: Mmmm, yes... Well there is this simile of the pots of water reflecting the moon, uh? and the moon is one but the pots of water are many, huh?

_____ But with the mirrors they have to be reflecting, they have to be right~ if you like

S: Yes, they have to be correctly placed, and they have to be clean, eh?

_____ ...and they have to be clean.

S: And not cracked.

_____ ° And you might have one or you might have many.

S: Mmm, yeah, right, yeah.

_____ I like the image of the prism that you (end of tape)
[381]

The Precious Garland Seminar Chapter 5 Session 10

verses 219 - 234 side B

_____ yeah, I find (it's just (words indistinct))... What is the Bodhicitta made up of then?

S: What is it made up of?

_____ ° Yes.

S: Well what exactly do you mean by made up (words unclear)? _____°
Substance...

S: Well Buddhism doesn't believe in substance, uh? mmm? And one mustn't think of the Bodhicitta as a thing, yeah?hmm? iMean if you ask well what is it made of it assumes it's a thing, but that's the whole point - it isn't a thing. Nothing is a thing in Buddhism. (laughter) It only appears like that, or we think of it as a thing, and we even think of the Bodhicitta as a thing. But that's wrong, that's our mistake.

_____: Or force...?

S: Even to think of it as a force, y'know, isn't quite right, but it's better than as a thing, because a force is in movement, a force changes, a force is process, a force is dynamic. So that's as it were nearer to the truth, uh? but thing is rather static, eh? mm? _____: Is that (sorta' process which is inherent, within our mitras(?) like?? (unclear)

S: But what does one mean by an "inherent" process? eh?mrn? One is just trying to describe, or, you know, to convey an idea of - uh, mm? _____° (I'd like to press the question..) (unclear) (laughter).

S: The process goes on, huh? 'Mean does it really mean anything to ask whether it is inherent? It's a precess which we can iniate, or a process which we can allow to happen within us, uh? or not allow, uh? that's up to us. (pause)

page 21

_____° ...(unclear)... you talk in terms of (we?) aren't using soma...such and such a potential of our energy?

S: Yeah.

_____° Is this the case that, y'know, mest of the time you ...(unclear)... you would block all this off in some way, or (for) some reason or other we have blocked off in some way?

S: One can think in those terms, er, but one again must bfware of, y'know, using language too literally. You say well we are potentially Buddhas, uh? so, like what's happened to our Buddhahood, 'mean where is it? Now? huh? Mmm? ~M~an you start, y'know, using the expressions quite literally, that..that if it is there, and I've only got to wake up to it, uh? Er - and see that it is there, uh? Well where is it now? huh? Hani? Well to say that it is there, is only a way of saying well if you make the effort then you can experience it, but it's not "there" in any literal sense, so they have to look.. have to start looking where it is, eh? hmm? That's

only a manner of speaking, eh? It's a way of saying that you have the capacity to develop that, uh? hmm? So the question of where it is before you've developed it, y'know doesn't really arise, hmm? (pause) So all this springs out of this particular verse of '1A Bodhisattva stays for a limitless time. for limitless embodied beings he seeks the limitless qualities of enlightenment. and performs virtuous actions without limit." y'know, this is as it were the cosmic Bodhisattva, huh? Perhaps that would be a better term, just like cosmic Buddha, cosmic Bodhisattva, huh? and the Bodhisattva spirit at work in the universe, huh? y'know, to which we can open ourselves and of which we can be expressions, uh? but whose functions we cannot as individuals take over, mm? This is what I'm getting at, uh? mm? ~-&'~mg~
 ~ a' _____° (Question indistinct)

S: Mmm, Ahh. Wee.. as it is framed in the Mahayana sutras, eh? the suggestion seems to be that you as an individual, one (unclear) individ-

page 22

ual, is...is promising to take over all the functions of the cosmic Bodhisattva. But can you do that, can you even think of doing that? No, you can't. Hmm? But, y'know, the best that you can say is well let me be a vehicle as it were of that cosmic Bodhisattva; and let at least a fraction of one of those vows be fulfilled through me, huh? And that is the more realistic attitude. Otherwise you suffer from, if you're not careful, not only from a spiritual indigestion, but tremendous spiritual inflation, uh? 'Mean the individual just can't do any of those things, uh? But, you know, the individual can make of himself a vehicle for. .for some of things being done. _____ So the vow is more an expression of the ideal within yourself?

S: Well the vow is more an expression of what the cosmic Bodhisattva, to use that expression, is doing, huh? what is going on, and one can make oneself a channel of that.

_____ ~Well~ it's a process, again..

S: A process again* yeah, that is going on all the time, even independently of oneself. Or one can help, you know, effectuate it, eh? mm? _____ I find it hard not to think of it as a ...as a ... thinking process ...(words unclear).~. "he seeks" 4..(this?) process, which has got a (line?)...

S: Yeah, yeah, well~we.... Since the Bodhisattva is being described, well, it can't be put in any other way, but actually there's not a mind there in that sense, uh? Not that it's a blind, impersonal, sort of ~natural~3 force. It's - er - seeing and aware - uh? - spiritual force - uh? - but not a force which is personal in any sense that we understand it. It's supra-personal, uh? - though that is only a word really ~to us~ uh? 'Mean it's personality of a type, of a degree, that we can't ~eally imagine, except sort of analogically. (long

pause) Alright, let's go on to 220

_____ "Though enlightenment is ~imit~ess/Wow could he not attain it/~ith these four limitless collections/Without being delayed for long."

S: Hmmm. so 'lthough enlightenment is limitless. how could he not attain it with these four limitless collections without being delayed for long" in other words how could he not attain it quickly, huh? One way of looking at the - er - the ~odhicitta and the Bodhi- sattva is - er - y'know, in terms of a river, huh? mm? A river that flows into the ocean; the ocean is - er - Buddhahood, uh? Er - the river is the Bodhisattva, huh? and the Bodhisattva, or if you like the Bodhicitta, is constantly flowing into - huh? - the ocean. The Bodhisattva is as it were constantly - er - realising Buddhahood outside time, but inside time he's always in process of.. .of realising it, un? If you take these two together these are called the absolute Bodhicitta. (long pause) Anyway these are rather, as it were, rarified heights, uh? Maybe we'd better go on and see if can encounter something more practical. Two-twenty-one.

_____ "~~e limitless oollections1~f merit and wisdom~ ~adicate most quickly1/(he sufferings of mind and body."

S: Hmm, this is - er - in a way stiking a quite old and familiar note, uh? That is to say cessation of suffering, uh? y'know which the four noble truths are concerned with, uh? So it's through the limitless collections of merit and wisdom that sufferings of mind and body will be eradicated. In other words these are the essence of the path, uh? They're equivalent to the eight-fold path, un? They lead to the cessation of suffering, most quickly, uh? (pause)

_____ And this in a sense is the way of the Bodhisattva isn't it?

S: Yes, yeah. Except he's concerned to eradicate not simply his own sufferings of mind and body but those of others as well, yeah.

(long pause) Alright, Two-two-two~ 0 _____ "The ~hysical sufferings ~) iigrations/£uch

A

as hunger and thirst arise from sins' (me~.) Bodhisattva does not sin,

and through his meritj~oes not(suffer ~hysically)in other lives."

S: Mmm. This ref... seems to refer more to an individual Bodhisattva, that is an individual who's trying to follow the Mahayana path, uh? and practise the Bodhisattva ideal.

_____ In the same way as the Buddha, sort of, when he was enlight- entd (words indistinct)... like he showed the way to other people (words indistinct)....

S: Mmm, it does seem like that, yeah. I tend to think - I don't know whether there's any sort of support for this in Buddhist literature but I tend to think that the Bodhicitta is more likely to arise - er - through the interaction of a number of dedicated individuals, or committed individuals, uh? mm? Because as I said - er - the Bodhicitta is not included in the five skandhas, uh? It's not anybody's individual thought, uh? Er - so in a sense it's not possible even, for the Bodhi- citta to be as~ociated with just one individual, huh, mm? You could say that - er - y~mow, when individuals, er - spiritually committed individuals, are in intense communication, spiritual communication, then the Bodhicitta is that sort of, that higher third that arises uh? mm? It's a little bit like, 'mean I don't want to press the parallel too closely, but there is a passage in one of the gospels when Christ says, 'When two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them', mm? yeah? It's a bit like when you get a number of - er - spiritually committed - er - individuals, huh? and when the spiritual communication between them reaches a certain

page 25

pitch of intensity, there is the Bodhicitta in the midst of them, uh? It isn't anybody's individual possession, but it as it were hovers over the heads of all of them, uh? D'you see what I'm getting at? huh? mm? and creates a sort of higher kind of unity, eh? which is even greater than the - the unity of the spiritual community, eh? The spiritual community becomes a sort of spiritual body, you could say, yeah? Or the spiritual cornr~iunity itself becomes, 'collectively', inverted commas of course, a Bodhisattva, uh? mm? I mean this is why I sometimei say that the. . that the figure of the - er - the eleven headed and thousand armed Avalokitesvara is a sort of symbol of the Order, yeah? mm? ideally, huh? I mean each Order Member should feel himself as a...a little hand, extended, huh? mm? It is more like that. (long pause)

_____ Do you think that it's premature to even think of some- thing like that - of a, 'say, much diluted perhaps nature - er - possibly exists already?

S: Hmmm, probably it isn't premature to think that. But what I was going to say was one shouldn't think in terms of 'I shall become a Bodhisattva' but 'we shall become a Bodhisattva', yeah? mm? _____ 'Cos in my own terms it's easier to explain what I feel is in the Order ~than~ in any other way.

S: Yeah, yea, yeah, mmm. (Murmurs of agreement from others) I think it's the sort of thing

that develops, uh? when a number of people have worked together spiritually for some time, uh? That is the next, sort of, level of development when a sort of higher power, if you like, heh? sort of arises within them and to which they all are sensitive, and which, as it were, guides them, yeah? hmm? You could say it's their common sense, mmm? (chuckles) or their common spirit, eh? mmm? It's as though it exists... it's not separate from

page 26

them. It's not the sum total of them, but at the same time it's not apart from them, in the sense of imposing itself on them from outside, eh? It doesn't belong to anybody, er - it belongs to everybody, mmm? Or you could say it doesn't... 'lean it belongs to everybody - er without belonging to anybody, mmm? It doesn't belong to each one individually, separately; it doesn't belong to all of them together collectively, mm? It's another category, another mode altogether, mm? (pause) °So you've got the member of the group, uh? That's the lowest level, uh? Then you've got the individual on his own, uh? who has left the group, grown out of the group. You've got the individual in association with other individuals, that's the spiritual community, and then you've got that intense interaction between - er - members of the spiritual community, ideally between all members of the spiritual community, er, leading towards the production of the Bodhicitta, which is a sorta' higher spiritual power guiding them all even more sort of definitely in the right direction. (long pause) Right, 223.

_____ "The mental sufferings of desire/fear, avarice, and so forth arise from obscuration~ ~ knows them to be baseless/£nd so can uproot quickly (all mental sufferin~~'

S: hmm, That do you think it means - er - saying that "the mental sufferings of desire, fear, avarice and so forth arise from obscuration"? 'Mean obscuration of what? Obscuration by what? There is a technical term 'avarana', I don't know whether this is meant to represent that, which means an obscuration, or veil of hindrance, yeah? _____ (indistinct comment)

S: Mmmm? Yes, it's the obscuration of reality, mmm? Notice that it said that suffering... that desire is suffering. It's pretty obvious that fear is suffering, uh? but 'desire is suffering', uh? mmm? Not that -er - the consequence of desire is suffering, but that desire itself is

page 27

suffering, yeah. Y'know, would you agree with this, eh? mm? (Murmurs of agreement)
Mmm, desire is usually an uncomfortable state. This reminds me of the teaching of a yogini in south India, that I've referred to before. I don't know if any of you have heard this, but she had - er - a teaching to this effect, uh? She used to say that - er - people speak in terms of the happiness that they experience as the result of the satisfaction of a desire, hmm? yeah? Er -

anyway you desire something, you want something, and you get it, and at least just for a few moments you're happy, huh? But - er - according to her this was an incorrect analysis of the situation, huh? According to her what happened was this: that when your desire was fulfilled, when your desire was satisfied, just for an instant the desire ceased to exist, and it was the cessation of the desire which was experienced as happiness, not the satisfaction, huh? eh? Do you see the point?

_____ (unclear)y'know, there is no satisfaction.

S: Hmmm?

_____ Y'know, that desire can't be satisfied by....

S: The desire itself cannot be satisfied, uh? er - but just for an instant, un, you think or ~eelthat, y'know, you've got what you want; the desire is satisfied. So the desire ceases, uh? Because you think, y'know, since you've got what you wanted, y'know, there's no point in desiring it any longer, huh? So just for an instant, uh, until you wake up to the fact that in fact you haven't got it, eh? desire ceases, uh?~n~at gives you an experience of happiness~ uh? And you think that the happiness is due to your having got the object, possessed the object. Actually it's d~e to the cessation of the desire.for it. ... (gasps) 'Cos when you've got something that you've wanted for a long time, or desired very strongly, when you've got it, or think that you've got it

page 28

y'know, you just stop desiring: 'Well I... I've got it', uh? So there's no desire just for instant, uh? And when there's no desire there's happiness, uh? So it's the cessation of desire that has given you the happiness, not the possession of the object. _____ Well what is it exactly that starts off a process of desire again, once having got the object?

S: Ooh! beginninglees ignorance, uh?habit energy, uh? ... Why does one repeat any pattern? ...Why does one ever do anything that one knows quite well one shouldn't be doing? What is it... it's a quite interesting, y~know, experience (I've had?) just to as it were allow yourself to do something you've done dozens of times, and you know it isn't particularly skillful, but here you are doing it again, and just wh... allow yourself to do it again, well just try and look and see well, why am I doing it? what is making me do it? I don't particularly want to do it, I know it isn't very skilful, but here I am doing it again, eh? Why? So just to look at the time that you are doing it and see what is impelling you to do it. And sometimes you won't be able to see, y'know, (unclear) there's some force, some motivation, well.. what eiaactly it is? It's very difficult to see. Something very blind, very deep, very obscure, uh? mm? And which seems very powerful also, mm?

_____ ° 'Think there's a very deep unconscious urge to repeat something which has given us, or at least apparently given us, satisfactiob in the past. Regardless of all our knowledge,

and thinking about it.

S: Yes, yeah, yeah. It seems very much like that.

_____ ° (Indistinct comment)

S: Mmm, mmm, mmm. (Like?) as you may know perfectly well that chocolate biscuits aren't any good for you, huh? That, you know, that they'll only make~your ulcer?~worse, eh? (laughter) Or give

page 29

you indigestion but, y'know, your hand goes out automatically. You know you shouldn't but you do, uh? You know quite well.... well what makes you do it? It isn't even just greed, maybe you don't even particularly want it, uh? Maybe you know it's going to make you feel a bit sick. You not even really looking forward to it but, you eat it, you do it all over again, when you know you shouldn't. (Laughter) So what is it that impels you, eh? That's a quite interesting study. _____ It's unsatisfactoriness.

S: Hmmmmm. But you know that that isn't going to give you satisfact- ion, but you still grasp after it, eh? Even when you've seen through it all. It's almost as though you think, 'I well what else is there to do?'

(unclear)... desperation.

S: Hinmi, maybe it's a sort of quiet desperation.

_____ ° (Almost?) it seems part of our security is tied up with all these little devils that we know, you know? Sort of quite happily continuing with them.

S: Mmmm, mmm, mmm, so how difficult it is to change, huh? How diffi- cult it is to stop doing all these little senseless repititious things that make up the greater part of our lives, uh?

_____ ° It's like saying ~Well at least I know I'm going to get this pleasure out of this thing, even though it's temporary and not completely satisfactory.

S: Yeah, yeah. Well even if you got some pleasure out of, y'know, that particular thing that would be something, but ruore often than not yo0I don't get any pleasure. You don't look for any pleasure, you don't expect any pleasure out of it (unclear) ... do it over again. You might ex....

_____ ° I think we build up an image of ourselves: tI?m a person who likes chocolate biscuits (rest of sentence unclear)...

[391]

S: Hmm, right, yeah. Well other people, you know, build up images of you in this sort of way. 'Mean I remember having the experience once that, er - I forget what it was exactly, but it was something... I went to have tea with - er somebody and - er - a certain kind of cake I was given, uh? and so naturally I was asked by my hostess, 'well did you like the cake?' I said 'Oh yes, thank you, liked it', so y'know therefore the word went (round) 'Oh Bhante likes such and such kind of cake', so wherever I went for a tea, y'know, this kind of cake was produced, huh? (Laughter) So, then I ended up, y'know. . .well alright, a couple of years later I went back to you know, where again had tea with that, you know, that woman, that hostess of mine and of course she produced this kind of cake again so (chuckle).. so I was offered a great big piece of it and as it so happened I didn't particularly want it so I just said 'No thank you.' So she looked very hurt and crestfallen and said 'I thought you liked that kind of cake!' (Laughter) as if I wasn't permitted not to like it any more, yeah? 'Mean my image was established, I was someone who liked that kind of cake, eh? mm? You know, so if you want to change well people really don't like it because it upsets all their ideas about you, yeah? mm? Or the ..'well you used to have sugar in your tea', you know, as though it's a sort of injury you've done thea in stopping having sugar in your tea. They have to adjust to this new you, you know, that doesn't have sugar in your tea any more, when you had it for years and years, uh? mmm? But this is what happens; or even if you cut your hair in a partic- ular way, or shave off your moustache, y'know? It upsets them a bit. Y'know, it's something ~else one has?~ to get used to; or if you (train?)...

:4As if you do it to~ spite them, to be awkward.

S: Yes, right. To upset them and make them uncomfortable, so they have to adjust to it, eh? mm? But you know, sometimes, y'know, one has the

page 31 392

same attitude towards one's own self, mm? So it's really quite

difficult to change, even in small matters, uh? Not just big ones, uh?

used to People get used to you being in a certain way; we get4ourselves being

in a certain way, we find it quite difficult to get away from that.

There's something in us that makes us carry on in that same old way,

being that same old person, even though we've got pretty fed up with

him by this time, uh?

_____: (unclear).... we need something to really jar us out of it....

S: Right. And then, 'know like we react in certain situations in the same old stereotype way. We can see it coming, we don't particularly

want to react like that, but we can't help it, we do. 'Mean someone says something to us in a certain way, and (~.~we're sparked off immediately, we just react. Even though we know it's quite unskilful, perhaps t~'know, we aren't particularly~ aware of reacting, but we do it. 'Mean it's just like someone presses the button and they get the response, y'know it's...it's automatic, it's mechanical, hmm?

It's Pavlov's dogs all over again, mm?

_____ (several words unclear).... hit the nail quite perfectly on the head, that it's to do with our self image. We have the idea that we are a certain person - well we behave in accordance with that image that we've formed, and when other people treat us in that way, it reinforces our identity ~'cos we know we are?) Youknow, it's a security ~Thing1~.

S: yeah, yeah. Well no image, no identity. And the repetition is, y'know, keeping up the...the image, uh?

_____. So the converse is the more image, the more identity.

S: Yeah, mmmm.

_____. (Comment unclear) In a way it's staving off the void.

S: Mmmm? yeah, staving o~ change...

page 32 393

_____. Movement... ~lexibility?~

S: ...~io~&~ar).. we very quickly establish a pattern. I was noticing on each of the retreats, in the course of a couple of days everybody had established a claim to a particular chair. (laughter) Yeah? Both for study and also for meals, uh? 'Mean there's no reason why one shouldn't, because, you know, it's maybe convenient, but it's interesting that this happens,

so that: 'Well that's my chair, that's my seat, that's my place, and I always occupy it', uh? mm? _____. But it's funny that we even carry this ~past~a ludicrous limit - er - in things that hurt us, 4 negative image about ourself?)

S: Mmm, yes, yeah.

_____. ... things like being incapable of doing a certain job properly. One even... for the sake of me having the image... (words unclear).. that role.

S: Well it's as though one says to oneself, you know, 'Even a bad image is better than no image at all', uh? yeah? The thing is to have an image of some kind, mm? And not to have no image, uh? To have a pattern of some kind, uh, and not to be without a pattern. _____. This is incredibly common, especially in the world of business, and politics (words unclear)...you get people who are all image (unclear).. consistently build up, y'know, Harold Wilson has a pipe...that sort of thing.

S: Mmmm. (pause) Alright, carry on then. Two-two-four.

_____: (unintelligible) Since ~

~'0 4 L~ Ou~n :~

S: (Mean this is a good example of the sort of thing I was saying: is it really a realistic aspiration for an individual, just an

page 33

ordinary human individual. who's trying to follow the spiritual path, even the Mahayana path, to think in terms of leading the worldly beings in all worlds, uh? uh? 'Mean could you really very positively, skil- fully or healThily think of yourself as leading - er - the beings in all the worlds? uh? mm? 'Mean you can certainly think in terms of the Bodhicitta leading them, the Bodhisattva leading them, uh? And you aspiring to reflect that, mm? But not think in terms of you leading - mean - the worldly beings in all worlds, uh? ~~- that would be alaost a sort of ambition wouldtL't it, mm?

_____ Could lead to really ~weird~~ kind of ambition.

S: Mmm, Yeah, yeah. I - I sometimes get the impression that - that some of the - the eastern Mahay~na Buddhists did get a bit inflated. (And?) forgetting what the sutras describe ts the sort of, the arche- typal Bodhisattva, or cosmic Bodhisattva, um... when one's own - er - function is simply to make oneself, you know, a channel for that within one's own sphere _____: ~When~ you say, you know, a channel - er - a vessel for the Bodhisattva,

'seems so much more akin to - er - opening oneself if you like to spiritual influences... whatever..

S: Right, yeah, yeah. But not that you, as a ~seU~~, as an ago, appropriate - er - all those functions, uh? Or think of yourself as

performing all those functions which amounts to the same thing. ~~

(pause) Hmm, I mentioned the other day (~~

~maybe some other seminar I've forgotten - so many seminars now, er, that -n~ there is one formulation of the Bodhisattva vow that I... I

if necessary, I will suffer in hell, uh? for untold millions of years, even - er - so as to save a single living being from even a few minutes of hell. So can one really think in those terms? Can you really undertake to suffer in hell for millions of years, uh?

page 34

It's absolutely unthinkable, uh? mm?

_____ ° (unclear)... the Bodhisattva....

S: mmm - You can think of a

_____ ° (interrupting)..~in a way, exists within that sphere.

S: Yeah. You can think of a sort of cosmic Bodhi - er - citta, a cosmic Bodhisattva which is steadily working against all odds, sort of from eternity to eternity, but - that is not any sort of human individual. No single human individual could do that or take on that sort of function, eh? That would really be inflationary. 'Mean it's difficult enough to bear a little pain for even a few minutes, uh? mm? (pause)... So then two-two-five, that says a bit more about suffering. _____: 11 It is hard to bear suffering even for a little~/ What need

who never suffers for an instant? '

S: Mmm. What does that mean ? "What can ever harm a happy man who never suffers for an instant? ". 'Mean suppose you cut his head off, won't he suffer? even though he's a happy man?

_____ ° Not really.

S: Mmmm. It is a fact that if the mind is occupied and absorbed, and happy, huh, physical pain even is felt less, uh? Er - And sometimes, you know, this happens to an incredible degree. 'Mean there are, you know, well ~tested cases of people who've been tortured and burned at the stake and who've at the same time been :fn 11 of joy, eh? So there's no question of stoicism, they just are in such a highly positive state that the physical suffering just doesn't mean anything, it just doesn't register. It's at the periphery of consciousness. So if you aspire to be a Bodhisattva you know, you should try and be in this ~ort of highly positive state, uh? 'Mean yknow if - if you're working, you're realty absorbed in what.. and you cut yourself you hardly notice. Or

page 35

like you when you're playing football you might bruise yourself quite badly, neh? You only feel it afterwards, because you're so much into the game.

_____ ° .. In fact there hseve been cases, I mean evidence, that - er - yogis have had their body injured but they've been in such a concentrated and positive state that they've healed - their body's healed again immediately. ... (unclear)

S: Yeah, right, mmmm.

_____ ° (Almost?) like the case of a Bodhi.... (unclear).. the

metta being so strong that it overflows into the physical (unclear).

_____ ° Is it Sariputra in the story or is it...in meditation he's

attacked by two men passing by, and they smash him

S: No not two men, it's two yakshas flying overhead, uh? So whether it's... 'Mean it's... they're - they're supposed to have cast down a stone, eh. But whether it is literally a stone or whether it's some sort of psychic disturbance, it's difficult to -to know. But anyway Sariputra doesn't notice. He just notices afterwards that he's got a slight headache. But Moggallana of course saw everything that happened, uh? And it was a stone big enough to have felled an elephant; but he only feels a slight headache. (pause) Alright, Tow-two-six.

_____ : "If his body does not suffer/How can he suffer in his mind? 1Throw~h his great com~assion he feels ~aini~r the world. and so stays in

(Long pause)

S: Alright, carry on. There doesn't seem to be any particular point about that.

_____ Does this not contradict ~~~Th~~~.. the last passage?

S: In what way?

page 36

_____ He says, first of all, a happy man cannot be harmed (for an instant?) or does not suffer (unclear)... Through his great compass- io~ he feels pain.

S : Mmmm. This seems to be a different kind of pain. It's not, sort of the pain of his own suffering. It's pain on account of others, uh? Tennyson calls this sort of thing "a painless sympathy with pain", uh? It's more like that, uh? (pause) Alright, Two-two-seven.

_____ "Do not then be lazy~ thinkingftuddhahood-Htisfarawa° Always strive hard for these collections/~o wipe out faults and attain virtue."

S: Hmmm. So here laziness is thought of in terms of "thinking

Buddhahood is far away", uh?

_____ It's no good making efforts.

S: Minmm?

_____ It's no good making efforts.

S: Hmm, yes, it's so far away it's ... there's no good m... it's no good making effort. Maybe one has to sort of follow a middle path here, huh? If you think it's too near you'll be disappointed when you don't realise it quickly; but if you think it's too far off then you'll be... you know... doubtful whether you'll ever realise it at all. So keep

it just sort of, you know, in between, eh? (Long pause) _____ If one has a positive ideal, this is probably where it is naturally, isn't it? Not too far aw...

S: Yes, right.

_____ Not too far away but not too close.

S: Yes, yeah. Mmm, If it's too close it isn't really an ideal. If it's too far away it's not an ideal either - it's not an ideal for you, uh? An ideal means something realisable in terms of life, uh? Soiething one can actually experience eventually, yeah?

page 37

_____ ...(unclear) has some relationship to... however....

S: Yeah. 'Mean if it's too near, then it, as it were, resembles your own life; you as you are - er - now, too closely to be an ideal, uh? But if it's too far away, too remote, you can see no connection between your life and that ideal at all, huh? so again it isn't an ideal for you, or it isn't an ideal, uh? So the ideal should be, you know, er - remote enough from you to be an ideal, but not so remote that it's im..., you know, impossibly discouraging, eh? (T~~c~?) Far and near, these are relative terms, uh? 'Mean there's... there is a story about the two disciples, huh? Have I mentioned this before, huh? Er - one of... one of them was told by his teacher that he'd gain Enlightenment after ten births, uh? And he said, 'What! Such a long time as that?? and was very upset and dejected. Another disciple was told - er - that he'd gain Enlightenment after a hundred births, he said 'What! So soon?' (Laughter) Hmmrn~? Depends to some extent on your temperament, uh? Mmm? Its, it's like finishing Sukhavati, yeah? You're told 'Oh, it's going to take another year'. 'Only another year!?' (Laughter) Or you'll say, 'Gosh, what twelve more whole months?' (Laughter)

_____ Seems sometimes very difficult to reconcile the - er - two approaches.. (But?) Yes~ one can get Enlightenment right here and now in this very life, almost in the next moment, if you just make sufficient effort ~and~ realise .. . (the truth that you can be clear with ??)... and the other way that, you know, we'll take infinite kalpas...(unclear)

S: Mmm, yes, right.

_____ Emmm, I don't know which is the most useful ~wre4~~ S: Well, ofcourse it also is said that - er - the realisation of Enlightenment has got nothing to do with time, huh? Hmm? _____ The tradition, as a whole, seems to work with both; doesn't it?

page 38

S: Mmmiii, yeah. Le

_____ ° Probably quite a~~~4~ way.

S: Yeah. (chuckles)

_____ ° When I first came to Buddhism I was very much into the Zen areas, and one or two of the teachers I studied with said, you

see know, all you have to do is to stop everything and just the truth

right here, and I really believed I could get Enlightenment..... S: (interrupting) Well, you know, why not, that... it's true. Huh? It's true. 'Mean the Theravada says it too. yeah?

_____ ...and I couldn't believe why it never happened. (Laughter)

S: Hmm, well you didn't make enough effort, that's all! (Laughter) That's what they always tell you. 'Mean you can get it right here and now, right at this very instant, if you make enough effort. Of course you don't get it... well obviously you haven't made enough effort.' (More laughter)... Try again! Huh? Hits you over the head with a stick, again. But at the same time it is true, uh? But you're not able to make that effort, you know, in that sort of way, actually. 'Mean if you could make it, yes, you'd gain Enlightenment on the spot. A few very gifted, very prepared people can do it that way undoubtedly. We read about them in, you know, many of the early Pali texts, uh? When all their energies are already well mobilised. So the other way is to do it bit by bit, you know, to... to chip away at the obscurations, mm? little by little. _____ This doesn't in fact contravene the requirement of merits; of acquiring a tremendous amount of merit (unclear).. the instant of Enlightenment. Because one can always say well one acquired it in a previous life.

S: Minim, mmm, yeah, mmm. Well if one did acquire it in previous lives, fair enough, huh? But if you... if you haven't and gain enlightenment in a sense prematurely, then you may find yourself a sort of deaf, dumb and blind Buddha, eh? (pause) Alright, let's go on to two-two-eight.

page 39

_____ "Realising that ignorance, desire/~d hatred are that non-desire, non-hatred, and non- 6' com~pletely/~ealise

i~orance(are virtues, and so ~ractice them with vigour"

S: Mmmm, these are the three unskilful and the three skilful roots, uh?

(end of tape)

The Precious Garland Seminar ch-rt~)5 ~ page 1

NB incorrect verse nos.

Session 10 continued v~sto2~~ written on cassette.

side 1. transcribed by Jonathan Brazier

_____: non-hatred and non-ignorance are virtues⁴ and so ~ractice them with vigour¹

S: Mmmm, these are the three unskilful and the three skilful roots, uh?

(long pause) Alright, Two-two-nine, uh?

_____ "~desire one is reborn a hun ghost. through hatred

in hell. through ignorance mostly as an animal; through stopping these

one becomes a god or a human being."

S: Hmmm. Sometimes of course it's said that - er - one is reborn as an asura on account of jealousy. Instead of these three poisons you get a list of five. So through desire one is reborn a hungry ghost, uh? I expect one has seen hungry ghosts in, you know, paintings of the wheel of life, uh? And through hatred in a hell, uh? Through ignorance mostly as an animal, and mostly means that - er - it could be an animal, it could be s~ms~ther sphere of existence. "Through stopping these one becomes a god or a human being". Clearly not through stopping completely, if you stop completely you gain Enlightenment, uh? But 'suppose if you modify them, if, you know, they... if you at least stop - er - the more - er - stop at least the cruder and, 'know less refined forms, then one is re- born as a god or a human being. (Long pause) Alright, carry on with - er two-thirty.

_____ To eliminate all defects and maintain the vir... To eliminate all defects and maintain the virtues are the practises of high statfls. To wi~e out all misconceptions~consciousness of reality is the practice of ("-clear) goodness"

S: Mmm, Again - er- marits (and?) wisdom. (pause) 'right let's read the next - er - few verses together~because they - er - cover the same kind of subject, eh~ Two-thirty-one down to... down to and including

page 2

two-thirty-four. Those four verses, uh? Read round turn by turn. _____ "With respect and without stint you should construct ima~es of Buddha. reliquaries and temples. and provide abundant richest food. necessities and so forth."

_____: "Please construct from all precious substances images of Buddha of fine proportion, well designed, and sitting on (lotuses?). adorned with all precious substances."

_____ "You should sustain with all endeavour the excellent doctrine... (words unclear) of monks⁴ and decorate reliquaries of gold and jewelled (friezes?)."

_____: '#Revere the reliquaries with gold and silver flowers, diamonds⁰ corals, pearls, emeralds, cats-eye gems and sapphires.' S: Mimni, So Nargarjuna is addressing the king, eh? And - er - tradition- ally in India it was the king who, you know, was responsible for all this kind of thing, uh? Er - he was the...the chief person in that respect, uh? So Nargarjuna is (appearing him?) and appearing to him, huh? To construct images of the Buddha, stupas, temples, to provide abundant riches, food, necessities and so forth presumably for the people living there and looking after them. Also appeals to him to construct er - images of Buddha with fine proportions from all precious substances, uh? And - er - and so on, huh? He's even asking to - to, er - to offer to the stupas gold and silver flowers, diamonds, corals, pearls, emeralds, cats-eye gems, and sapphires, uh? So what does one think of this? This raises quite important questions, uh? Er - 'Mean one can see the motive, one can see the intention, huh? That the - the - temples, uh, and the stupas, the images of the Buddha should be as beautiful as possible, uh? But there is a sort of drawback here, as, you know, Buddhism discovers later on, in that the monasteries and the temples became, you know, full of gold and precious stones and beautiful golden images and jewel-

page 3

studded reliquaries and all the rest, but what happens, uh? When - when you come to that sort of - er - state?

_____ You attract the attention of invaders and...

S: You attract the attention of invaders and robbers. You. °. you have to guard and look after these things, uh? You might even become a bit greedy and you might feel that what it is for the Buddha, but it's sort of for you in a sense, uh? So...

Means you feel insecure as well, or a bit....

S: So where is one to draw the line, mean this has happened a great deal in Europe, you know in the great cathedrals one used to find masses of gold and silver and precious stones decorating everything, mm? So, you know, and the - the priests used to say, in a way quite correctly, only the best is good enough for God, uh?

(Two unintelligible contributions)

S: And also the things that you used for decoration or... don't have to be intrinsically

valuable. There is that point too, huh? Even stones can be arranged quite prettily, uh? And natural flowers don't have to be of gold and silver, uh? Ordinary flowers look much better anyway _____ It does need to be something that encourages you to want to practise, or to want to be in those areas.

S: Yeah, it doesn't necessarily have to be costly, hm~ Or of costly materials, hmm? On the other hand, you know, it could be said Well if you are really devoted you will want to give of your best, hmm? You'll want to decorate the Buddha image with gold and silver and jewels, uh? But do you think that is correct?

_____ I sorta personally feel that, y'know, y'feel sorta, you fall short in some way. 'Know if you, if ye, say you give a certain thing, or present the shrine in a certain way, you - you buy flowers or

page 4

candlesticks - you always seem to fall if you haven't got enough money or whatever you fall short; you feel... I've fallen short within myself. Whereas that little bit extra could, you know, could do that little bit extra.

S: Mmm, mmm.

_____: It's no good if you're not giving of your best (in a valid?) way.

S: Yes, yes. That too. Otherwise the giving of the gold and silver becomes a substitute (if?) other necessary forms of giving. Or you think that just because people are giving gold and silver, oh they really are giving and they are good Buddhists, huh? But 'mean I... one has seen that - er - that is not necessarily the case. People sometimes give even for self-advertisement.

_____ (Well?) I don't think we'll have this problem will we? S: Mmm-? T)iaionds and gems and... ha! S: I don't think we'll have it for a little while anyway, eh? Mmm?

'Mean you might have it in your old age, y'know with people coming forward and they're wanting to plaster the shrine with gold and silver. They might even want to plaster you with gold and silver, eh? Also 'course Nagarjuna says, You should sustain with all endeavour the excellent doctrine and the assembly of monks. In other words patronise them, support them. This again has a weaker side because it did happen historically in India, that - er, that - er - Buddhism tended to rely too much on royal support, y'know, and when that was withdrawn, or when the kings changed their religion, then Buddhism got into difficulties. This happened during y'know, the middle ages especially. I mean the Indian middle ages. And sometimes it seems an easy way, you know that if you can get the king on your side, well then things will go very smoothly, and you'll be quite successful.

page 5 you know, vestiges of this way of thinking And I.. I see - er - or I have seen, in the East, huh? in India,

h~? er - where always the tendency was on the part of Buddhist organisations to try to get the support of the rich and the power- ful and the well-known, especially people in, you know, positions of political power, even though they might not have been at all - er - you know, religious minded, or at all interested, uh? But, you know, they'd try to get their support, and sometimes these people lend themselves to that because it's not a bad thing in India to be known as the religious minded man who supports and patronises religious institutions, yeah? That gives you a certain amount of prestige and even, sort of, political pull too, heh? hmmm? But I think this is a very undesirable thing. I've seen lots of it, uh? I remember going to (Saranar?) once, uh? and - er - I think this was in the (Buddha- janti year?) - and there was a programme organised for the whole week, huh? - er - for the, er, for the temple, this whole series of cele- brations, but anyway - they hadn't been able to sort out the details. So they printed the programme for the first few days, and then there was a little note to the effect that the puja will be inaugurated - er - on each of the succeeding days either by a govern- ment minister or a millionaire, huh? (break in tape) So as I said this was the attraction that was offered to you, and this is very much the tendency of many Buddhist organisations in the East even now. To...to.. as they say, to try and go to the top and get the support of the top people. (Though) the top people may not be at all interested, uh? And you.. you seem... You - you sort of try to get their support, you know, for puposes of sort of political leverage, uh? I saw so much of this in India, (and I mean?) this is one of the reasons why I decided when we started the Friends we'd just have nothing to do with that sort of attitude at all. Otherwise we'd be, you know, trying to get along Harold Wilson to declare our Wesak

page 6

celebrations or something like that - that's what they would do in the East! That's what they were always doing in India. The Maha Bodhi Society used to do always this sort of thing. Then of course you mustn't do anything to offend these people. You know, that places limitations ...(word unclear).

So to rely, ylknow, too much on the support of the rich and the power

ful, ~? is~quite dangerous for any sort of spiritual movement.

Airight, Two-three- five.

_____ "To revere the teachers of the doctrine is to do what pleases them, offering goods and services and relying firmly on the doctrine"

S: Mmmm. "To revere the teachers of the doctrine is to do what pleases them"... huh? This is quite a strong statement in a way, hmmm? ?..is to do what pleases them". What does this suggest or what does this presuppose?

_____ Faith in the teacher (and the?) guru.

S: Faith in the teachers, yeah.

_____: (Also we practise what he teaches)? (unclear)

S: Mmmhmmm, but what does it suggest or presuppose about the teachers themselves, uh? That you are to do what pleases them, huh? _____: They know what's best for you.

S: Er - yes. But it also suggests they'll be pleased by good things, uh? yeah? mm? 'Mean you couldn't say this in regard to any ordin- ary person, well you should do what pleases them, because what pleases them might be something quite unekilful, uh? So if you say that with regard to the teachers of the doctrine, that to revere them is to do what pleases them, it suggests that their desires are very skilful desires, uh? their desires will be for good things, positive things, creative things, uh? hmrti? So that, y'know, if you just try to please them, you will as it were automatically be doing

page 7

the right thing. That they will be pleased by what is skilful, not by what is unskilful. "Offering goods and services and relying firmly on the doctrine,"hmm? (pause) Right, Two-three- six?

_____° "Listen to a teacher with homage and respect. serve and pray to him. Always respectfully revere the other Bodhisattvas.'1

S: Hmm. The text apparently says "the Bodhisattvas", uh? But "other" is interpolated, presumably from the commentary - or - and what does it suggest if you say "the other Bodhisattvas" or if you undersatnd it to mean "the other Bodhisattvas"?

_____° That the teacher himself is a Bodhisattva.

S: Ah! That the teacher himself is a Bodhisattva. ~ut that "other" is not in the text apparently. (pause) Right, Two-three-seven, hmm? _____° "You should not respect, revere or do homage to others, the Forders, because through that the ignorant would become enamoured of the faulty.'1

S: M'nmmm. So this is something which - er - you might find quite difficult to understand. Who are these Forders?

_____: Wrong views.

S: Hmm?

_____° People with wrong views.

S: People with wrong views, un. It's ("tertheaka"?) huh? The maker of a ford, a ford maker. A ford is what - you know - er - leads you to the opposite shore, eh? But - er - therere a ford maker is someone who teaches a doctrine which purports to lead to the opposite shore, but, according to the Buddha is doesn't actially do that, eh? So a (tertheaka), a forder, represents a sort of false teacher, huh? Some- one teaching a false teaching or a false doctrine. So

therefore Nagarjuna says "You should not respect, revere or do homage to others, the Forders, because through that the ignorant would become an~moured of the faulty." eh? hnU~? So one sho~ld not - er - respect or revere

or do homage to those teachers who may be famous, may be well known,

page 8

may even be popular, is they are teaching something which is false, huh? Because you will then be giving your sort of er credance, you'll be giving your support, and that will mislead other people, thiy'll think that because you respect those teachers they are in fact - er - you know, deserving to be listened to, huh? mm? Perhaps we could say instead of (terthekas) or forders, you know, these days the popular pundits, mmm? Y'know the wiseacres of the air, huh? (long pause) Alright, Two-thirty-eight.

_____ "You should make donations of the word of the Kin :of Subduers and of the treatises he gave. as well as pages and books along with their prerequisites⁴ the pens and ink."

S: Hmm~ We've got to a stage as it were, (of) literary Buddhism now. He's suggesting that the king should donate, you know, copies of the Buddhist scirptures, uh? as well as - er - paper and books and pens and ink, and things of that sort, for copying, huh? Alright, Two-thirty-nine, eh?

_____ "As a way to increase wisdom wherever there is a school provide for the livelihood of teachers and bestow estates for their provision."

S: Mmm, the reference is presumably to secular teachers, uh? And secular education, secular schools. Here it seems Nagarjuna is speaking specifically to the king as king, uh? He's pointing out the sort of things that the government, we would say nowadays, should do for the people, huh? So you get, er, some idea of the attitude of Buddhism towards these things. That the goverrnment should encourage education and so on.

_____ In as far as the donations of the word of the King

of the Subduers is concerned, it seems'tbat Nagarjuna's thinking it and important enough then that you know, that books,Athe dharma, should

be circulated and copied?

page

S: Yes, indeed.

_____ ° This is quite early isn't it? This is - er - four hundred years after the Buddh~s

death.

S: Hmmm, maybe a bit more than that.

_____° Presumably when he's talking about - er - as a way to increase wisdom in this sense means (of~the?) wordly knowledge.

S: Yes, yes. Well "prajna" is use~ in serveral different senses. (Er?) wordly knowledge, also spiritual knowledge and insight. Right carry on for the next few verses, there're quite a few verses along these sort of lines, uh? Just carry straight on and... until... oh, there's quite a few, well just cerry straight on until I stop. _____° "In order to root out the suffering of sentient beings, the old, young and infirm, you should establish through your influ- ence barbers and doctors in your kingdom."

S: In India of course barbers are often - er - surgeons, un? They perform minor surgical operations, and also give massage and so on, huh? (Laughter) Just as the old, you know, fashioned barber in England - eighteenth century - used to bleed you, uh? Didn't need a doctor for that, the barber did it. Alright, carry on. _____: "Please act with good wisdom and provide hostels, amusement centres, dikes, (laughter) ponds, rest-houses, water-vessels, beds, food, grass and wood"

S: Mmmm. Right, on we go.

: "Please establish rest-houses in all temples,~ town~ and cities and ptovide water vessels on all arid roadways." _____ "Always care com assionatel for the sick the un- protected, those stricken with suffering, the lowly and the poor and take special care to nourish them. F"

_____ "Until you have given to monks and beggars seasonally appropriate food and drink, produce, grain and fruit, you ~hould not

page 10

partake of them."

S: Him. Now this is a tradition among many Indian lay people even today, not to eat until they've fed a beggar or a holy man, uh? And if one doesn't come along they may even go out into the street looking for one, so that they can feed him first, and the~at them- selves. This is - you know quite a common, or almost a popular sort of religious practise or tradition, especially in south India even there. Two-four-five _____° "At the sites of the water-vessels place shoes, umberallas, water-filters, tweezers for removing thorns, needles, thread and fans." _____° "Within the vessels place the three medicinal fruits, the three fever medicines, butter, honey, salve for the eyes and anti- dotes to poison, written spells and prescriptions." _____ "At the sites of the vessels place salves for the body, feet and head, wool, small chairs, gruel, jars, pots, axes and so forth."

_____° "Please have small containers in the shade filled with sesame, rice, grains, foods, molasses and suitable water." _____° "At the openings of ant-hills please

have trustworthy men always put food and water, sugar and piles of grain."

S: Even the ants are to be fed. (laughter)

° "Before and after taking food offer appropriate fare to
° hungry ghosts, dogs, ants, birds and so forth."

° "Provide extensive care for the persecuted, the victims of disasters, the stricken and diseased, and for the worldly beings in conquered areas."

_____ "Provide stricken farmers with seeds and sustenance, eliminate high taxes by reducing their rate."

_____ "Protect the poor from the pain of wanting your wealth set up no new tolls and reduce those that are heavy, free them from

page 11

the suffering that follows when the tax collector is waiting at the door.t1 (Laughter)

_____ ° "Eliminate thieves and robbers in your own and other's

countries. Please set prices fairly and keep profits level when things are scarce."

_____ ° "You should know full well the counsel that your ministers have offered, and should always follow it if it benefit the world." _____ ° "Just as you love to think what could be done to help yourself, so should you love to think what could be done to help others."

_____ ° "If only for a moment make yourself available for the use of others just as earth, water, fire, wind, medicine and forests are available to all."

_____ ° "Even during the time needed to take seven steps merit measureless as the sky is produced in Bodhisattvas who are well disposed to giving wealth away."

_____ ° "If you give to the needy girls of beauty well adorned, you will thereby master the spells to retain the excellent doctrine."

° "Formerly the subduer provided along with every need and so forth eighty thousand girls with all adornments." (Laughter)

S: Provided them presumably in previous lives as a Bodhisattva, huh? _____ ° "Lovingly give to beggars various and glittering clothes, ornaments, perfumes, garlands and enjoyments."

_____ ° "If you provide facilities for those most deprived who lack the means to study the doctrine, there is no greater gift than that."

_____ ° "Even give poison to those whom it will help, (laughter) but do not give the best food to those whom it will not help."

S: Hmm, that's the criterion, uh? If it helps, give, or give what helps~, huh?

_____ ° "Just as some say that it will help a cut finger to hold a snake, so it is said the the Subduer brings discomfort to

page 12

help others."

S: "am. Sometimes the medicine may taste naety, but it may do you good.

_____ ° "You should respect most highly the excellent doctrine and its teachers, you should listen reverently to it and the give it to others."

_____ ° "Take no pleasure in worldly talk, but take delight in what asses be ound the world cause good qualities to generate in others in the same way that you wish them for yourself." _____ ° "Please be not satisfied with the doctrines you have heard, but retain the meanings and discriminate, Please always make great effort to offer teachers presents."

_____ ° "Recite not from the worldly Nihilists, stop debating in the interests of pride, praise not your own good qualities, but stress those even of your foes."

_____ ° "Do not say what hurts, with evil intent talk not of -

others, analyse your own mistakes yourself."

_____ ° "You should free yourself completely from the faults the wise decry in others, and through your power cause others to do the same °~°~

_____ ° 'Consider the harm done to you by others as created by your former deeds, be not angry, act in such a way that you do not - cause more suffering and your own faults will disappear." _____ ° "Provide help to others without hope of reward, bear suffering alone and share your pleasiures with beggars." _____ ° "Do not be inflated evn when you have aquired the prosperity of gods. Do not even be depressed by the disadvant~.geous poverty of hungry ghosts."

_____ ° "For your own sake alw&ys speak the truth. Even should it cause your death or ruin your kingdom, do not speak in any other way."

page 13

_____ "Always observe the discipline of actions as it has been explained, then, O glorious one, you will become the best of models upon earth."

_____° "You should always well analyse everything before you act. through seeing things just as they are you ~ill not rely on others." _____° "Through these practices your k&ngdom will be h~ppy, a broad canopy of fame will rise in all directions, and your ministers will revere you completely."

_____° "The causes of death are many, those of staying alive are

few, these too can become the causes of death, therefore always~~

perform the practices."

_____° "If you carry out the practices, the mental happiness

which arises in the world and yourself is most beneficial411

_____° "Through the practices you will sleep and awaken in happiness; faultless in your inner nature happy will even be ~our dreams."

° "Intent on serving your parents, respectful to the principles of your lineage, using your resources well, patient4 generous, with kindly speech, without divisiveness and t~uthful," _____° "...through performing such discipline for one life- time you will become a king of gods; as such you will do still more, therefore observe such practices."

S: Mmm, so the Buddha is... or rather Nagarjuna's suggesting to the king that - er - you know A obtained of course the (acumen?) of worldly power - prosperity,happiness - so the next step is to become as it were king of the gods, through his virtuous deeds, huh? Airight let's stop there for the moment. What do you notice about this - er - this advice that Nagarjuna gives to the king? Well m&inly it's very simple and straightforward, doesn't require any explanation, the meaning is quite obvious.

pag~4

_____ : He must have experienced quite... these things him- self.

S: Hu.

_____ : Do we know the king?

S: Pardon?

_____ : 1)0 we know the history o~ the king?

S: We don? t. All that we know is that he was a king of the (Sasavana) dynasty in South India. We don't know anything about him at all other than that. 'Mean what sort of impression do you get about - er - Nagarjuna's - er - ideal of good government?

-- Making things easier for people.

S: Making things easier for people, yeah. Not oppressing them, uh?

Even positively helping them.

_____ ° Ideal welfare state.

S: Sort of, yes. In a very sort of simple most naive sort of way, but the general principle is quite clear, huh? But also supporting the dharma and encouraging the dharma and encouraging people to take an interest in it and also you know cre~ting faci 11 ties for the practice of the dharma. The.. you know.. the temples and - er - shrines, huh? and stupas, huh? Er - distribution of literature, and so on, hmm?

_____ ° I was just wondering how he was going to do all these

things if he's cut down the taxes and the

S: Mmmm, well right. Well Nagarjuna doesn't go into practical things like that. He leaves all that to the king, he just - you know - upholds the ideal.

_____ Some of the verses of how to practise could have come

straight from the Bodhicaryavatara.

S: Yes, indeed. Right. 'Course Shantideva is very much influenced by Nagarjuna, he does belong to that spiritual lineage in fact.

page1\5

: Here he says "The causes of death are many'l

S: Mmmm.

_____:(sentence unclear)...

S: There are all sorts of things, ylknow, that can cause your death, and the factors which are keeping you alive are comparitively few. And even they, huh, can become causes of death. So life is very precarious, huh? 'Cos what is one of the things that keeps you alive?.. Food, But you can get indigestion and then some stomach trouble and that can , y'know, be the death of you. (pause) You can choke on a fish bone, huh? (Laughter)

_____ ° Seems to concentrate quite a lot on food doesn't he

&ndThe - providing nourishment.... (words uflclear)..

S: Hmm, yeah. It is quite a basic thing isn't it? _____ ° There's some... I was thinking like... it's like an equivalent to spiritual doctrine...(4 words unclear)...

S: Hmmmrn. mmmm. According to Buddhist tradition the four basic requisites in the case of the monk are food, shelter, clothing and medicine, these are the four things that he's entitled to expect from the lay supporters, the lay community. (The) food comes first, huh? then clothing, then shelter, lastly medicine, hmm? And food you need every day, huh? Clothing you can be given maybe once or twice a year. Shelter, well that can be provided at intervals, huh? A shelter, you know a rough shelter lasts quite a few years, huh? Medicine you'll need occasionally, just when you happen to be sick. In a country like India you can get by with just these four things. (long pause) Right, any query on what we've done so far this afternoon? You notice - er - Nagariuna says "sleep and awaken in happiness" er - through the practices - "Faultless in your inner nature happy will even be your dreams." Uh? This is quite often referred to in Indian literature, that you're so happy that, you know, even your dreams are happy, hmm?

pag46

When you're leading such a good life even your dreams are happy, free from disturbance, free from trouble, free from anything unpleasant. So if even your dreams are pleasant you probably are leading a quite positive sort of life. Anyone notice this? y'know when you're in.. going through a quite positive phase, huh, your dreams change, your dreams become very positive too, you have good dreams, huh? (sniggers) .. or at least interesting dreams.
_____ (unintelligible comments, with laughter)....

S: Alright. It is just gone six so let's leave it there, and tomorrow we'll come onto a slightly different topic.

page~7

The Precious Garland Seminar PG6 sideA

side 1 session ii verse 283 only

(sounds of shuffling, the Padmasambhava mantra, coughing, and yawning)

S: Alright, page 59, verse two-eighty-three.

_____ "Even three times a day to offer three hundred cooking pots of food does not match a portion of the merit acquired in one instant of love."

S: Ahhh. Reminds one a little bit of the Dhaimpada doesn't it?

_____ (words unclear)

S: Though one offer a thousand times... uh? mm? a thousand sacrifices or something like

that, is not worth one sixteenth part of .. et cetera, huh? And also in the - er - (?) there's a verse something like this specifically with reference to metta, uh? I'm taking it that the love that this refers to here is metta, huh? 'Mean why do you think Nagarjuna is attaching so great an importance to metta? He's, you know, making metta out to be even more important than dana.

_____ It's the foundation of the arising of the Bodhicitta.

S: Mmm, yes, it's the foundation for- the arising of the Bodhicitta. Also if there is love there'll be dana in any case; if there's metta, well dana will automatically follow, huh? but you could conceivably offer three hundred cooking pots of food without very much metta.

Also the verse, er, emphasises the importance of the mental state, eh? in comparison with the external action. It is the internal mental, or spiritual, state that does really count, and that ultimately determines the birth of the external action even, uh? So "even three times a day to offer three hundred cooking pots of food does not match a portion of the merit acquired in one instant of love" huh? In other words very (?) value is attached to positive emotion, huh? As we saw yesterday, the positive emotion, or the development of positive emotion, is one whole stage of the spiritual path, one

page 11B

stage out of five. And also as we saw today, er - love - metta - huh? is the foundation for the development of the Bodhicitta. This also suggests, in the light of what I was saying yesterday, about the arising of - er - of the Bodhicitta within the spiritual community, that there must be love, there must be metta, among the - the members of the spiritual community. Otherwise there's no possibility of the Bodhicitta arising in the midst of them, huh? and for most people - in fact for all people - to begin with - metta arises in relation to persons, huh? not as it were impersonally. 'Mean ultimately you will be able to have metta without an object of metta, but to begin with you have to develop it, you know, in relation to persons. If there are no persons around you tend not to be able to develop metta. So this is why we start off by developing it, in the metta-bhavana practise, towards the four - er - kinds, the four classes, of persons, beginning with oneself. It's very difficult to have an impersonal metta, huh? You can have, but after quite a lot of practise directing metta towards persons, towards individuals. So the Bodhicitta, the arising of the Bodhicitta, presupposes the existence of - er - quite powerful bonds of metta within the spiritual community.

(end of side 1)

The Precious Garland Seminar PG6 Side a Session 11 contd. page~19

Side 2 Verses 284 -287 NB wrong verse numbers written on cassette.

S: Right, two-eighty-four and two-eighty-five, read them both straight through.

_____ ° "Though through love you are not liberated you will attain ~iht virtues of love, gods and human will be friendly, even non- humans will protect you."

_____ ° "You will have pleasures of the mind and many of the body, poisons and weapons will not harm you, effortlessly will you attain your aims and be reborn in the world of Brahma."

S: Hmmmm. So "though through love you are not liberated", heh. What does this suggest? Hmm?

_____ ° It's just the beginning, the foundation.

_____ ° ...(comment unclear)....

S: Eeerrr - yes.... "Though through love you are not liberated", well it does suggest you can be liberated through love, hmm? Even though you fall short of liberation, still, huh? you will attain eight virtues of love, huh? Mmm? So what is this liberation through love, huh? Er - this is referred to in - er - the Pali texts, it's not emphasised much in - er - present day Theravada Buddhism. The liberation of the heart through love, this is how it's usually translated, huh? The Pali texts speak, usually, of two kinds of liberation, uh? These are called ceto- vimutti and panna-vimutti. Liberation of the mind or liberation of the heart, huh? And liberation of wisdom, or ~ wisdom, huh? have you come across these expressions? Hmm? If you? ve read - er - many trans- lations of Pali suttas and (word unclear) texts you must have come across them, you might not have noticed, heh? Liberation of the mind or the heart, liberation of wisdom, huh? Mind's liberation, wisdom liberation. And - er - these two are always mentioned together, or nearly always mentioned together. For instance describing someone's spiritual career,

pag~ 20

mentioning how eventually he gains Enlightenment. In the Pali texts of course in the sense of

arahantship, huh? (it's?) said that then he was liberated - er - in mind, liberated in wisdom, and gained the final realisation, huh? So the question arises well what is this - this liberation of mind or heart, huh? \That is this liberation of wisdom? So ceto-vimutti refers to the development of the mind, the development of the consciousness, if you like the development of the positive mental and spiritual states, development of positive emotion to the highest possible pitch. This is what is called ceto-vimutti. Liberation of the mind or liberation of the heart, huh? And obviously this can take place, er, through or with the help of the metta-bhavana practice. So in a way this, er, also covers what we call samatha, or pacification, eh? (lo'ng pause) Are you familiar with the term "samatha"?

(mumbles of agreement) So samatha literally means calming down, huh? pacification, huh? And - er - it refers of course to the calming down, the pacification of all unskilful mental states. So it there- for refers to the dhyanas, uh? The states of superconsciousness, or states of higher consciousness in as much as in those states all unskilful menta~ states are calmed down, pacified, and only skilful mental states are present, yeah? So ceto-vimutti, heh? liberation of the mind or liberation of the heart, refers to one's experience of that highly positive - er - side of things, huh? those highly positive mental and spiritual states which include the dhyanas and positive emotion in its - er - most intense form, huTh? hmm? _____° Could you just spell that phrase for me please?

S: Ceto-vimu... C - E - T - O, V - I - M - U - T - T - I.

So you could say that this represents the complete purgation of one's emotional nature. You're in a state of intense emotional positivity, to such an extent that you're carried through the dhyana states, hmm?

[421]

and this experience you can achieve with the help of the metta bhavana practise. But you're not illumed, un? You've no insight, huh? You see the difference? So ~ranya vimutti, liberation by wisdom, refers to that insight, which we also call vipassana, especially in its~initial flashes, uh? So to be liberated by wisdom, means to be completely free from all wrong views, to be completely free from ignorance, to have complete insight into the truth, to have full and perfect vision, huh? So you have these two together, hmm? We've got as it were the acme of emotional positivity joined with the complete clarity of vision, com~lete clarity of insight into the nature of reality. So in a way you can see they correspond to punya and (unclear) . You see that? There is a sort of comparison, a sort of parallel, uh? So it's in the Pali text the expressions ceto-vimutti and panna-vimutti are used, and in the Mahayana literature and tantric literature the terms punya samphara and (ignara?) -samphara are used. But in my opinion these amount to much the same thing. As far as I know this connection this connection has never been pointed out before, but to me it seems that within their respective contexts these terms are pointing to, indicating, the same set, one and the same set of spiritual facts as it were. hmm? That you need to have the completely purged, purified, clarified, intensified emotion, hmm? on the one hand, and the clear vision of reality on the other, and these two joined together. You know there~s a little book put out by the Dharma publishing company in the States called "Calm and Clear", well this is the same things calm refers to samatha, clear refers to vipassana, mm? or to ceto-vim:~tti and panna-vimutti, or to punya-samphara and (nara?)-samphara.

_____ Seems like calm in a more active sense.

S: Yes, it's not just calm - er - as I say it's a calming down of un- skilful mental states, but - er - it isn't just that. Only skilful mental states are present, and they're present in a very - er - present

pag~22

to a very high degree. Very powerfully present, so that means that one's state of mind then is much more powerful than it usually is, uh? So it isn't calm in the sense of being weak, or even quiet, it's a very powerful and active and positive state. And a~in of course in the case of the Bodhisattva you've got karuna and pra4na. Karuna represents the whole, as it were, emotional side, and, you know, prajna represents the whole, as it were, intellectual side, eh? I say "as it were" be- cause these terms don't really fit, uh? (long pause) So "though through love you are not liberated" eh? In other words though you are not able, you know, to develop love to the - er - absolute limit, where it becomes as i~ were co-ordinate with - er - with wisdom, still you will attain the eight virtues of love, uh? "Gods and humans will be friendly, even non-humans will protect you". Hmm? This is obviously one of the great benefits of practising metta. If you're friendly towards others, others will be friendly towards you. At least there's a greater likelihood of that, huTh? Do you think it invariably happens? Do you think you can, you could literally get rid of enemies in this way?

- ° No.

S: You don't?

_____ Well maybe over a very very long period, but, you know, the short term....

S: 'Mean for instance we find in the case of the Buddha, hmri? a sad elephant was released against him, and the Buddha was able to turn back the mad elephant by virtue of his metta, yaeH? But who released the mad elephant?

_____ (Devadutta?)

S: (Devadutta?). So was (he?) able to change (Devadutta's?) heart through his metta? No. So there's quite a bit of food for reflection here. Even a mad elephant could be affected, yaeH? by the Buddha's metta.

pag~3

But not a human being, even one of his own disciples (indeed?) who had made up his mind, as it were, to go on the wrong path and obstin- ately fo~low that. Iimm? Yeah? So one must beware of thinking of metta as a sort of power that one can use, (that?) is irresistable, (as?) though you can knock someone over the head with your metta, so they have no choice but to like you. This is not possible. I mean if we're not careful we tend to think of metta in that sort of Way, as a sort of irresistable force or power, but no: people do have what we can only call their own freedom of will. If they ~ish they can resist (our?) metta. If they~wish they can repudiate our metta, as (Devadutta) repudiated the Buddha's metta.

_____ Could strengthen their hatred (in a way)

S: Could strengthen their hatred even, yeah. So I think we have to be very careful not to think of mettā is, you know, something that we can use, as a sort of force or power in a more worldly sense, otherwise it becomes an assertion of our ego, y'know, over somebody else's ego, mm? So if we feel mettā towards, y'know, people who are, you know, trying to do us (words unclear), that is good, uh? But if we deliberately direct the mettā just so that they will stop, you know, bothering ~5 and making themselves a nuisance it probably won't work, it probably won't be the real thin~. And then, you know, if even we start getting annoyed and irritated because they're not being influenced by our mettā. You know, if we're not careful we shall get into m~ch the same state that they are. So we must be careful we don't try to coerce people with our mettā, hm~? yeah? (Well) I was so nice to him but, you know, there was just no response and he wasn't nice to me, hm~? yeah? So mettā has no coercive power. It can be resisted. But, 'hian - er - other factors being equal, if a particular person has not, as it were, made up his mind to close himself to you, huh? to shut out your mettā, (then) he or she will (inssnsibly)' be influenced, there's no doubt about that.

pag~4

In the case of the mad elephant, uh? well what happened? he had no will of his own as it were, he had nothing against the Buddha, knew nothing about the Buddha, 'know he was just mad, he'd been - er - given some liquor, he'd been made a bit drunk and just released and there was someone coming along in front of him and he was just prepared to charge at him and trample him. He had nothing against the Buddha - er - particularly - er - but Devadutta had that settled resolution, hm~? to do harm to the Buddha because he bore the Buddha a personal grudge. Huh? The Buddha had spoken harsh words to him, at least strong words; the Buddha had refused to lead over the leadership of the Sangha, er - the - the - er - Buddha had - er - aroused his enmity in this w~~, huh? his jealousy. So Devadutta's, you know, feeling towards the Buddha was quite different from that of the elephant. The elephant in a sense had no feeling toward the Buddha, he was just in, you know, that state of madness and drunkenness, so he was quite easy to deal with, hm~? the Buddha had no trouble in subduing him. Y'know just send out some mettā, ~, ~ou know, it was done, the elephant was just kneeling at the Buddha's feet and offering him a flower with his trunk, we - are told, huh? But not in the case of Devadutta, huh? (Mean)? Devadutta couldn't be disarmed by mettā, huh? because he'd made up his mind to (word unclear) the Buddha, huh? He - he closed himself to the Buddha's influence, he shut the Buddha's influence out, so in the end he died a miserable death, hm~?

Ajita: Seems like the elephant's a symb~~l of sort of reactive aggression or ... (Here S and Ajita speak at the same time.. - words unclear)....

.kinC of aggression sometimes comes up with out you really,.. it just catches you unaware, you simply.... (excessive brogue for rest of sentence)

S: Yes, yes, mmmm. But occasionally you do meet people who~seem to be deliberately wicked, heh? hmnm? Do you know what I mean, I hope you haven't met too many of them, they're ~uite uncomfortable people to,

[425]

you know, have any dealings with, huh? hmm? But you can meet people like that who are so inveterately, well wicked is the only word, huh? who have made up their minds to try to do harm, who are fully conscious of that, who in a sense know what they're doing, and who are not going to be... eh?

_____. Cold blooded.

S: Cold blooded and who are not going to be affected by your warmth or positivity or love or friendliness or anything, uh? If anything it intensifies their resolve to do harm, to do injury, huh? To do away with you as it were.

_____. You used to get this in the old (giant?!) days when certain (real??) people were after you. They were very much out to do harm....

S: And if you('d) turn(ed) round and been all loving, even genuinely so, would it have had any effect?

_____(unintelligible comment)...

S: But anyway as I said, other factors being equal "gods and humans will be friendly, even non-humans will protect you. " By non-humans possibly means animals, huh? 'You'll have pleasures of the mind and many of the body, poison and weapons will not harm you." Do you think this is to be taken literally? "Poison and weapons will not harm you"? _____: Well, weapons... not literally) weapons or poisons but.. other people's ... poisons.

S: Mmm, yeah. Also other people'll be less likely, other factors being equal, to use poison, or to use weapons against you, hmm? Though 'cours4 it is a traditional Buddhist belief that you can quite literally, you know, turn away the effects of poison or of weapons just by shear,force of your own emotional positivity, Maybe even that does sometimes happen.

_____. Verbal weapons, sort of insults...

S: Mmrnm. "Effortlessly will you attain your aims..." What does that

page~6

mean? "Effortlessly will you attain your aims". Why effortlessly just because you're practicing metta?

_____. There won't be anything resisting.

S: Yeah that's true. And what about your own attitude towards what you're trying to do? If you're full of metta well things are going to go more smoothly, more easily, more freely, more spontaneously, there's not that sort... that strain, uh? You're not making a sort of willed effort. Mean metta is as it were a very natural state, it's not something that you can force, hmm? So if you are power~l (in) generating metta you are already in a sort of effortless state, a very positive and spontaneous state, the sort of state in which everything gets done very easily, it is no trouble to you, whatever you do. huh? "And be reborn in the world of Brahma." Uh? You 'll be reborn in a very high heavenly world, you know, corresponding to the mental state that you gained or experienced through the experience of metta. So even if you're not liberated through metta, or even though that metta does not directly conduce to your liberation from the world, huh? there are many advantages to be gained from it including a rebirth - er - very - er - far up the scale of conditioned existence, a long way up the scale of conditioned existence, i.e. in the world of Brahma. (pause) _____. (3 words unclear) .. the eight virtues?

S: What? Well these are the eight, huh? One: Er - gods will be friendly. Humans will be friendly. Non-humans protect you, three. Pleasures of mind, four. Pleasures of body, five. Er - poison won't harm you, six. Weapons won't harm you, seven. I dunno, maybe ..(3 words unclear).. them together. Effortlessly you'll attain your aims, nine, - er - sorry seven. And reborn in the world of Brahma, eight, or maybe the last two lines are one, huh? It's a question of either treating poison and weapons as one, and effortlessly and reborn in the world as Brahma as two, or vice-versa. But those are your eight. There's a similar list you('ll

pag~27

remember in the Dhammapada, yeah? There it mentions that fire won't burn your house for instance. Have you ever noticed that people who are full of hatred seem as it were more accident prone than people

who are not? Have you ever noticed this? A lot of things seem to go

always wrong for them, you know? They ~ft seem to be getting into trouble

for no apparent reason. Y'know, not as a direct result of their - their - their - hatred and anger. Have you ever seen this? _____. (... completely unintelligible, sorry!...)

S: Yeah, they do! Out of the blue as it were. Whereas (when) people are positive and happy and cheerful then very rarely things seem to go wrong (2 words ??). 'they don't seem accident prone. Have you noticed that? I knew a woman once in India who was so accident prone (that?) she was, y'know, very very bad tempered and violent and so full of hatred towards everybody (that), you know, except animals, except dogs and cats, especially the ca~s. She was always getting into trouble. Things were always going wrong for her... in a strange way, huh?... as though she had secret enemies.

_____ It also app~lies to people who unconsciously dislike them

selves.. (2 words??).. to punish themselves.. (app~rently... ??) tt(~ S: Well I think Athis woman didn't really like herself. I think it's

difficult really to hate others if you really like yourself, hmm? 'Mean liking yourself and liking others seem to go together.'Mean genuine liking of oneself and genuine liking of others. And (actual?) hatred M oneself and hatred for others seem to go together, in the same sort of way.

_____ If you're positive within yourself it's aa thou~h you like what you see around you.

S: Right, yeah.

_____ If you're in a depressed mood or upset, or negative, you look around you and all that you see seems to reflect that.

page~8

S: Mmmm, yeah.

_____...As you walk around you're just seeing your own negativity~ S: Mmmm. (pause) Right, two-eighty-six.

: "If you cause sentient beings to generate the aspiration to

Enlightenment and make it firm, your own aspiration will always be to

"

Enlightenment firm like Meru king of mountains.

S: Mmm. It's as though ;Lt should be~your own aspiration will always be... your own aspiration to Enlightenment will always be firm like Meru, kin~ of mountains, eh? 'mean the more you encourage others to be positive the mote positive you will be yourself, mm? The more you encourage others to generate the thought of Enlightenment, Y'know, the firmer and stronger will your own thought of Enlightenment become. I expect one finds this, yes? Mrnr~W (So?) why do you think this happens? Or what does happen?

_____ It sort of means you lre inspiring yourself as welil.

S: Yes, you're inspiring-yourself. 'Mean if for instance you... you're genuinely encouraging someone else to be positive, to be emotionally positive, well, the only way you can do that is to be emotionally positive yourself to begin with, otherwise it's only a matter of words, and you can't make somebody else, or encourage some- body else, to be emotionally positive.just with words, the words must be backed up with actual feeling, they must express actual feeling, your feeling, huh? But once you have - er - encouraged that person to - er - be emotionally positive, once he or she is emotionally positive, then there's also a feedback for you. You are now in the company of an emotionally positive person, so you become more emotionally positive still. Or if it's a case of the Bodhicitta, the Bodhicitta is strengthened, you know, for you, huh? And if your Bodhicitta is strengthened, well, that other person's, I mean, in a manner of speaking, Bodhicitta is strengthened. The Bodhicitta is

strengthened between you, huh? hmn? The emotional positivity, huh? is enhanced between you. This reminds me of a little story I read - er - some time ago, some - what - two or three months ago, which struck me quite - er - forcibly. I've - er - recounted it once or twice before, but I'll take it that nobody here has yet heard it. It's from Sufi sources, huh? Er - apparently there was - er - a sufi, a sufi master who had a disciple, huh? and this aisciple came from a long way away, huh? and after being with thO master for several years he had to return to his own part of the country, huh? This seems to have been either in Persia or Turkey, perhaps in Persia. And the part of the country from which he came and to which he had to teturn was very wild, very uncivilised, y'know very barbaric and savage sort of tribal people, but that was where he came from. So he had to return, huh? And he went to say goodbye to his old master, and - er - when saying goodbye he expressed his~ you know, sadness at having to go, huh? Not just because he was, you know, sad at leaving the master, but think- ing of the awful sort of place he had to go back to, eh? And he said to the master, well, we've always been able to have, you know, such wonder- ful spiritual discussions, but where I'm going there's nobody with whom I can have them, there's not a soul with whom I can talk, huh? What on earth shall I do? I don't know how I'm going to be able to stand it. I don't know how I'm going to be able to survive, so what should I do? ~o the master replied, just in three or four words. He said "(Beget?) the man you need." Huh? Yeah? Huh? So he wasn't referring to any physical process of begetting, but to the production of a disciple, yeah? In other words to the production of somebody with whom he could discuss. Hinni? So it's much the same, you know, 'ath this question of encouraging others tobe positive. Somettmes you may ~eel, you know, very much on your own, 'know, I'm the only positive person around, huh?

I don't get any encouragment from others, huh, yeah.. et cetera, et cetera, eh? So what should you do? I mean there?s no point in complaining about it, you must produce the man you need, you must beget the man you need. Just make somebody else positive. Nork on somebody, huh? until he becomes as positive as you are, or very nearly so, and then you can communicate with each other, you know, then you can encourage each other. So "beget the man you need". So this I thought was a very significant and very important little anecdote I was saying, huh? "Beget the man you need", uh?

_____ In a way this is what - er - (illiteratism and this is aimed at isn't it? consequences of having...)????

S: Mmm. Maybe it's even more, you know, the sort of thing that happens when (1 word unclear) solitary Order Member unavoidably finds himself in some, you know, distant vity, without a single other Or~er Member or mitra or even friend with a capital F. So, you know, what does he have to do? In his sort of shear deapARATION he ju8t has to start up some- thing to attract a few like-minded people, so that even fo~ his own sake, huh? there are a few mitras, and eventually a few more Order Members, huh? for him to relate to, yeah, hmm? 'Mean, you know, leaves aside any altruistic sort of - er - motivation just for his own sake, as it were, he has to do that, huh? He has to beget the man he needs, or the men he needs, huh?

(If that means going into the clubs then you go in)??

S: Mmm, yeah. Well, you've got to take your, you know, raw material as it were, wherever it lies to hand. Mmm.

_____ Perhaps it's a kind of way in which the Bodhicitta is operating.

S: Mmm. hmm.

_____ To encourage that to be worked (outside'?)

S: Yeah, right, yeah. M'it looks in a way selfish, but again at the

page~31

same time it's highly altruistic. Your selfishness compels you to be altruistic, so what a positive selfishness that is, that's really enlightened selfishness, enlightened self-interest, huh? That you go out and beget the man you need or the men you need. Well in begetting them you bring them also into existence, huh? So that they exist not only for you but also for themselves. In fact they cannot exist for you unless they exist for themselves. So, you know, you're being very selfish and altruistic, so in a way the whole distinction between selfishness and altruism breaks down. You can't really say it's either one or the other. It's good for you - it's good for the other person. It's good for him - it's good for you. Where does selfishness end, where does altruism begin? You can't really say. You do good for yourself - you do good for others. Do good for yourself - you can't help doing good for others. Or do good for others - you can't help doing good for yourself, eh? If you're positive it will have a good effect on others, eh? If you're having a good-effect on others, it'll have a good effect on you. So I think we mustn't make too much of an antithesis between, you know, helping others and helping oneself. If you help yourself you help others and vice versa. (pause)

Airight, two-eighty-seven.

_____ tVThrough faith you will not be without leisure, through good

ethics you will have good migrations. through becoming familiar with emptiness you will be unattached to all phenomena."

S: "mm. Here Nagarjuna is speaking of the consequences, the results that are to be looked for, as the result of the king practicing certain things, uh? Results or consequences not necessarily accruing in this life itself, but in the course of future lives. So "through faith you will not be without leisure", huh? If you have faith now, if you have faith - er - in this life, then when you are reborn, you will not be without leisure, huh? Presumably for hearing the dharma, leisure for

pag~32

practicing the dharma. So, you know, do you see the connection? Or is there a connection? "Through faith you will not be without leisure"* Why through faith particularly? Thy does faith have that leisure creating effect? you know, under the law of karma? _____ 'cos you might be - er - going in another direction. ~: Mnirn, mm.

_____ You'll be open to that possibility.

S: Mmm. Yes. Also, if you have faith you're making good use of your opportunities here and now. If you make good use of your opportunities here and now, the likelihood is that you will have those opportunities in the future, and that means leisure. (pause) "Through good ethics you will have good migrations". Wha~ do you think is meant by good ethics? Not a very sort of happy expression in English. Through the practice of sila presumably.

_____ (... mumble... mumble..)

52 ... Through the practice of the precepts, huh? you will generate - er - skilful mental states, the natural result of which is a good migration, a good rebirth, you know, in a human, er - body, huh? fairly comfortably (sic) circumstances and so on. "Through becoming familiar with emptiness, you'll be unattached to all phenomena." What does it mean by "becoming familiar with emptiness"? _____ ° Experiencing.

S: Mmm?

_____ ° ?~x~periencing.

S: Mmm, having experience of emptiness, having the experience of non- ego, huh? Not as a thing, huh? but as it were acting, behaving, non- egoistically. The result of that will be you will be unattached to all phenomena.

_____ ° 'you think it's easier to work, sort of, in that direction from the other side, almost, to try to be unattached to things? As a

pag~33 way of just sort of - er - becoming familiar with emptiness? In a sort of indirect way? S: Think this raises the whole question of discipline, yeah? For instance suppose you're very attached to, let's say chocolate bars,

yeah? well you can either... you can go on eating chocolate bars until you actually realise the futility of it, and then stop. Or you can discipline yourself by, you know, compelling yourself to give up the eating of the chocolate bars, you know, so as gradually to eradicate your hankering after them. 'Mean both methods do work, huh? but sooner or later you have to come to the actual insight, huh? but it may be that - er - you know, by abstaining - er - er - aa a matter of discipline, you can, you know, cut down the craving - er - to such an extent that you can begin to actually see the futility of ... whatever it was you were actually doing, so discipline has its place, certainly, as leading up to the development of insight or, as it were, you know, making insight more possible, huh? through at least an attenuation of craving, but discipline, even successfully practiced discipline, is not a substitute for the actual insight, huh? into the futility, you know, of what you are already doing. Mean this is where the vow comes in useful, huh? The vow is a form of discipline... in a sense it's more than a

discipline, 'cos (you know, when it's?) a discipline you sort of ~, but you know, you may (very well??) succe5d, but in the case of the vow you cannot but succeed. As soon as you've made the vow, well that's that. Hmm? There's no question of success or failure, huh? A vow is a vow. Do ~eople have any sort of definite, er, views on this subject of discipline in that sense? Or any experience of their own, huh? Anyone who has to be careful of discipline, huh? Who has perhaps ...(someone else speaks at the same time)....

_____ ° ..e.. discipline myself without insight I react against

the discipline.

S: Hmmm. Why do you think you do this? Mean you can surely see that

page~4

'mean if you adopt a certain discipline you give ~p something as a matter of discipline - er - that does red~ce the craving, you know, if it is a matter of craving, to some extent, and leave you as it were, more free to develop the insight into the futility of that particular craving, doesn't one find this?

_____ ..(ten mumbled words)...

S: Mmm. yeah, well certainly when the insight comes, one stops. But suppose it, I mean doesn't it help the insight to come if one stops as a matter of discipline? Does one find that or does one not find that?

_____ ° You can see it even if you react against it... still experience that reaction against it.

_____ ° (i feeling about that comes up about °....the insight.... I don't like that, ... like the idea of)????

S: Well, 'mean the insight doesn't just come. You have to do some- thing. 'mean even... you may not be adopting a particular discipline huh? in the sense of giving something up, uh? But you have to be doing something, yeah? so that the insight may... I mean you may not give up - er - chocolate bars, uh? You may go on eating them, but ~ou at least have to meditate (word lost), uh? So what do you think is the place of discipline in this sense in the spiritual life? Of say giving things up, in a sense a bit forcibly, before you've actually developed an insight into the futility of them?

_____ ° Gives you more energy in order to...

S: Gives you more energy, yes.

_____ ° ...preparation.

S: Preparation, yeah.

_____ Can (simplify?) a lot.

S: Hmm. yeah.

_____ Help, you know, the development of one's own faith, 'cos

pag~5

that's where the discipline itself is coming out of faith.

S: Mmm, yes, yeah.

_____ : Also (...seintence unclear...)

S: M~mm, yes. So it would seem discipline in this sense would seem to be useful or even necessary one could say, huh? Anybody else who doesn't feel happy about discipline? Even self-discipline? ~ta: Think there's a process which sorta cordons off~the disrupting part (I mean in a really get a good view o~ it y'kna?)??? Keep it in hand, y'know.

S: Mmm~ yes., Well it enables you to see er - mean how you would get on if you didn't indulge in that particular desire. Enables you to see the workings of your mind. ~upposing say you adopt the discipline of giving up food for three days, y'know it's a quite useful opportunity of studying how your mind works when you're deprived of food or when you deprive yourself of food, and that's how you feel about food, what food means to you, you can then begin to see it more clearly, which perhaps you wouldn't have seen if you hadn't adopted that discipline.

_____ . (2 words lost).. see how other aspects of you r

mind deal without that kinda expression, or

S: Well it's like a laboratory experiment. You take away, you know, a certain factor so you can see what happens when that factor is not present. You don't have to guess. You can then actually see.

_____ (6 words unclear)... about cigarette smoking. I couldn't give up by disciplining myself, I just, just stopped smoking.

S: Mmmm. When you gave up did you have an insight into the futility of it, eh?

_____ : Well in a way I had an insight for a long time, but it was always a struggle ..(still. There was always another part at me inside...)?~?????

pag436

_____ I've always found it very difficult to get friend-ship, between... the practice that is between the consciously self-imposed discipline, because you see that the consequences are going to be bad, and a sort of guilt sort of thing, (about 15 fifteen words unintelligible) ... and I think because of that the disciplines I've undertaken have not resulted in insight ...(only... the discipline . relaxed.... and you get a back beating and ??~.) you have some sort of insight. Maybe that indirectly is a consequence of

_____ the atmosphere has got to be conducive hasn't it to

discipline, You know, it's really hard to be disciplined if you're among others who aren't disciplined in the same direction as you are.

tends to sort of

S: Yes, yeah. Tends to undermine it, eh? ~ean if everybody else is smoking and you're trying to give it up, well that's a common instance. Unless of course they've taken a vow, then it shouldn't just bother them at all.

_____ ° Yeah, that's like a positive thing, where you all sort

of reinforce each other.

S: Yes, right.

_____ ° Would you say, Bhante, it'd be... there's a wrong time to take a vow, like if one doesn't really feel wholeheartedly that one can really...

S: Well it isn't a vow. Then.

_____ ° Would you say a bit about what is a vow then, 'cos I'm a bit....

S: Well, it's a sort of public, usually public, statement to the effect you're just going to do or not do something - er - sometimes for or within a specific period of time. It's as simple as that. You don't state that you will try to give it up. You state you are

pag5~7

giving it up. Or you're going to do it. And you say it usually publically, or at least even if you don't say it in front of your friends, and enemies even, huh? you say it in front of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas as it were, and you sort of call them to witness. Having done that

well how could you possibly not fulfil your barg...

(Here endeth the tape)

[438]

THE PRECIOUS GARLAND SEMINAR

VERSES :287-300, ch4 :v299

ALAYA (laughter) ..who could react

S : Aah..possibly. Tn terms of hatred.. go against the vow. You might struggle and at the same time you would know the struggle was completely useless.

ALAYA : Couldn't you go against the vow of...the extremes of self punishment almost.

S : Yes I think you would have to be very extraordinary sort of person in that case and you probably wouldn't make the vow to begin with anyway. If you have self hatred of that extraordinary degree you wouldn't be on any spiritual path at all. You wouldn't think of your-self good enough even to break a vow. (laughter) much less making of it.

ANANDA This must presuppose a considerable amount of intergration to make a vow.

S : Tf you haven't got it when you make the vow you be- come intergrated. That's also one of the functions of the vow. That's why you bring yourself to the point of making it, As you make it you become more intergrated because without being intergrated you wouldn't be albe to observe the vow, but there's no question of your not observing the vow so you just have to become intergrated. (laughter) There's no other way.

ANANDA : I can't really,...(laughter) I can't really see how.. you speak of it as if it's inevitable, I can't see just by saying you're not going to do something that you'll automatically (interterupted)

S :It's much more than a question of just saying it. For it's a vow , it's not a mere promise...um..or expression of willingness to try, The thing is when you make the vow is already accomplished, er, there's no question of your breaking the vow, you don't even have to do that no to make the vow is to keep the vow, er um.

ANANDA : So it's an attitude of heart really, farther than just making a statement.

S : Well, yes, just making a statement that doesn't mean anything at all. At the begining of the mitras retreat one of them stood up in the course of the puja and made a vow to give up the use of tabacco for 3 months and that is quite effective. I'm absolutely certain that he won't break it and I doubt very much whether he'll go back to it after 3 months, he probably won't. (pause)

S : Alright 288

UTTARA : "Through not wavering you will attain awareness, And intelligence through thinking, through respect. You will realise what the doctrines mean through their retention you will become wise. "

S :Um, "through not wavering you will attain awareness" er, this wavering is more like mental distraction, er you know though overcoming mental distraction, er you will attain awareness and mental distraction or awareness and wav-erThng are opposites. One suggests a lack of integration and the other suggest..er..intergration. (pause) You know when you're distracted it's different parts of yourself pulling in different directions, er, but if there are no different, different parts in that sort of sense, before the parts are harmoniously (coorlang?) together how can they pull in different directions? So how can there be any distraction-um-you'll be integrated and you will be aware, (long pause) So you will attain awareness through not wavering, or, and intelligence through thinking. Then does one gain intelligence through thinking and what sort of thinking?

HRIDAYA : Isn't it like the investigation of mental states

S : It's more like that. You could say that it is creative thinking, um, it's not a sort of worried thinking, er, most people's thinking is sort of worried anxious and he wants to gain security through that thinking, (pause).

: Also could it be that one is exercising that purpose-fully and making more sure?

S : Indeed yes, right but it still raises the question of or leaves the question of what is exercising. So, exercising that faculty of intelligence does not mean worry, does not mean being anxious, but thinking creatively. (LONG PAUSE) "Through respect you will realise what the doctrines mean." This is probably more like reverence than respect, er.. (pause)...so why is this, why is it that through respect or through reverence you will realise what the doctrines mean? er, Even a sharp intelligence isn't enough you must have that sort of receptivity that sort of sensitiveness which the word reverence suggest..uh..(pause).. In fact, er I'd go so far as to say that without a measure of receptivity and even sympathy you won't understand anything that is said really. uh, I mean anything of over and above a communication of mere factual information. You must be receptive, you must be sensitive, you must be open otherwise you will not understand even intellectually, er. (pause)

Liqo Page 3

AJITA And it comes back to the fact that it's not always the obvious, You've got to begin to be receptive to subtle communication,

S And that means there mustn't be any sort of resistance any sort of hostility any sort of reaction, otherwise you cannot understand even in the quite ordinary everyday sense not to speak of any spiritual understanding.

HRIDAYA Isn't like making space in one's self to be able to receive?

S : uh

HRIDAYA : finding room Whatever situation you are in for things to be able to come in like the image you gave of the (urn?) the man who couldn't receive because he was like the full cup and if the cup~s full, nothing nLoritean go in it, but if you empty it then there isn't any room for reception.

HRIDAYA : you can't be receptive.

S Right. I felt this quite a lot with regards to some of the recent discussion in (shabda?). I felt that in certain cases people weren't being nearly receptive enough to one another. Were not even trying to under- stand what the other person was saying or trying to get at. There wasn't that sort of will ~o understand. I felt in some cases-

HRIDAYA : A lack of ~ympathy.

S : A lack of sympathy so that sympathy for what the person is saying er, you make continue to disagree with that, It means a sympathy.for the person saying it, er, you are open to him, huh, you can, being open to some- one certainly doesn't mean to, that you agree with ever~ tlt1img~hey say, but you can be open, you can be sympa- thetic and sti~l disagree or even reject their views, reject their (bpinions, but you'll disagree and you'll reject in a certain kind of way, It certainly won't be a reactive way (long pause) and especially when ones studied the ~harma, I mean it's very, very neccessary to have this sort of receptive and sensitive attitude to be really open, otherwise you really learn nothing, no- thing that's worth learning. (pause)

HRIDAYA WoAd you think if one had an ideal (if you was generally the case, and that was from the heart?) that would include receptiv~ity?

[441]

S Certainly yes, the Buddhist ideal must include re- ceptivity. A receptivity towards the Dharma, recepti- vity towards other peop]e.

HRIDAYA : And if there wasn't this openness, this recep- tivity , it would indicate a lack in one of an ideal.

S Yes, or at least that the ideal was not vt.iy oper- ative, or not envisaged very completely or in all its aspects, or that there was a serious flaw in one's ideal or the ideal as one saw it (long pause) And this is what ~w~ssa~g, did say with regard to the convention discuss~on. At the convention or even at Order Day, there are more than a certain number of people present I think, receptivity is very diffi~ult under such con- ditions for most people (pause) Itls very difficult to be receptive when you're bursting to say what you want to say oT when there's thirty or forty other people all wanting to or having something to say. It's very dif- ficu~t to be receptive, while they're all having their say and maybe lon~ before it comes round to your turn, time is up, eh and you never had a chance to say anything (pause) So though respect through reverence recepti- vity you'll rea~lse what the doctrines mean you really have to take

them in the same way through reverence and through receptivity that you realise what other people mean. Without receptivity you cannot understand another person, eh, and i~'~~v~ry~imp6rt~nt to remember this, that without receptivity you will never understand another person, however sharp you may be mentally however intellectual, however penetrating, however shrewd, if we're not receptive you will not really understand, you will think it or (pernert)? it or (you misrepresent?) it you wil~ not understand it (pause) And one can even say sympathy is a part of understanding, not neccessar- ily a part of agreein~, but there can be disagreement, but sympathy is a pretty understanding (pause) "Through ~ntionouwillbecomewise" though the retention ~fi~tty~?~octrines, eh, the meaning of which you realise through respect through reverence, eh. In other words you don't become wise quickly, you become wise by re- taining what you've understood which means keeping it in your mind not forgetting it, thinking it over intt~e mind, reflecting upon it pondering upon it, assimilating it, eh, that's the way in which you become wise and it very often happens that we understand something we even get a f~ash of insight, but then we lose it, and why do we lose it? Because we reject it we forget about it, we don't dwell~ on it we try and do something else we talk about something else. We shouldn't do that, we should give ourselves time to assimilate eh, and this is wher~ in connection with the study seminars one's own notes

Page 5

are very useful, eh, because, eh, they'll help one to do just that, eh, maybe weeks afterwards, months afterwards, years afterwards, you'll go through your notebooks and just come across some point that you understand at the time, and which impressed you at the time, therefore you had made a note but which you might completely for- gotten in (materia~?) but the note at least allows you to go back to it and to dwell upon it again to turn it over in your mind, eh, so many understandings and in- sights we actually do have, eh either in connection with our meditation, or in connection with our own personal reading, or in connection with gr~up study, eh, or even in connection with the (chatting?) we just get a sort of insight, or a sort of understanding but because we don't dwell~ on it we loose it, eh so we have to give our- selves time to dwell on things and to associate things eh and in the meantime a written note is very useful, it makes sure we don't loose it. I mean those who do any sort of writing especially creative writing they know that onl~y too often if you don't write it down you loose it, eh, and sometim~s you can be thinking and a really good thought comes and just the right words and you're just going to write it down and the phone rings or some- one comes round to ask if you'd like a cup of tea. You are onl~y taken aside for five seconds, you go to carry out and you'l~ve l~st it, you may not get it back, that precise form of words has gone and you can't recapture it eh urn, so this is what T always s~'y to ~eople. Write it down eh, if it impresses you, if it strikes you write it down, you're sure to forget (short pause) if you don't do that, eh.

ALAYA Do you recommend a meditation note bo~k?

S Yes indeed thats true it's a good thing just a note of what happens or what happened, that is very useful if you can keep it up and then you can sort of trace the ups and downs of your progress, you know, from week to week and month to month and son 'Oh look I didn't do the metta for a whole month." You can look back and see that if you keep a record. You can say Thatts odd I seem to have all my good meditati~ns round the full moon day, huh ect, huh, or you can say that's odd I seem to have a good week, then a bad week, a good week, then a bad week, (long pause) You notice things like that.

ATULA :Lo you think one can utalise knowledge like that in a constructive way?

S Well yes, for instance you may have had a very good meditation, huh, and then you can completely forget about it, uhu, but supposing one~months's later, you've struck

Page 6

a bad patch and yo~ start thinking "I can't get on with the meditation, maybe I'm not cut out for meditation, I never have any good experiences, never get anywhere with it~, but then you turn through your notebook ~Oh.' So many months ago I had a really go~d meditation and the~~note- book brings it back to you. It was possible I did have it". But you might have completely forgotten it, espec- ially in the sort of mood that you are in at the moment, huh, so your ~otebook reminds you of that, it brings it back to you. You know, it creates fresh hope, you did have a good meditation and maybe you cou~d have one again therefore, uh, (p~use) But certainly, you know, leaving aside the keeping of a meditation notebook especially in connection with the study, or listening to lectur~s or even in the case of discission write down something triat strikes you as important and that you would not like to forget, as if, if you don't write it down the chances are that you will] forget however important it seems at the time and have led strongly you feelDyou couldn't pos- sibly forget in 99 cases out of 100, you will forget. So the moral is just write it down. ;[mean very few people have got that really (retetive?) memory which can re- tain without that ~ort of external aids and I certainly notice, speaking personal]y I wish that I had written down much more in my ealier days I mean, I've got quite a good memory and I rememb~r quite a lot but a lot of things also I have quite forgotten, huh and I wish I had made a note of it (pause).

HRIDAY Very often just a few words a, ah

S : A few words are quite- enough, It doesn't have to be long elaborate note, just a few words, even a sentence is often quite enough. That's all you need (long pause) AAlright 289.

ALAYA "Though not causing the hearing and the giving of the doctrine to be obscured, You will company Bud- dhas, And will quickly attain your wish".

S : "Though not causing the heaflng and the giving of the doctrine to be obscured, You will company with Bud- dhas,"huh,"And will quickly attain your wish". What do you think is the (theisi?) of the distinction between, hearing the doctrine and giving the doctrine, or dharma? huh. Hearing the Dharma, giving the Dharma, what's the difference?

__ Well one's recieving

S : In the case of hearing it seems to be not causing the

Page 7

hearing of the Dharma on the part of other p~ople take obscured, yeah, huh.

: A form of giving

S : Through not causing the hearing and the giving of the doctrine take obscured, What is the difference between saying allowing others to hear the Dharma and allowing them to be given the Dharma? Maybe this isn't a very happy translation, simply. Anyway the general import is clear. Not obstructing other people's access to the Dharma, yeah and it's not even a question of you yourself giving the Dharma or you yourself, causing them to hear Dharma even if you don't obstruct their access to the Dharma you will keep company with Bhiddha-- and will--

quickly attain your wish, huh. So one could even say, well how much more quickly if you actually cause others to hear it, cause the Dharma to be given to others. In other words, the more you give the more you will receive, huh. This is quite an important principle and this is why I sometimes say that you never really start to learn until you start to teach, huh. Anyone already found the truth of that? Yes. You don't really start receiving the Dharma until you start giving the Dharma and once you've started teaching, then you realise that your previous knowledge was very sketchy, very inadequate, very poor, however, well versed you might have considered yourself to have been before but when you start teaching then you really do start learning. It's a quite different experience, quite a different dimension of understanding for yourself.

You cannot prepare before, you find things in yourself which come together, and you learn a lot.

S : So teaching is really a part of learning, huh so it is really quite contradicting for someone to say I don't think I ought to teach just yet, I ought to go on learning. Now a point comes when you can, you really meaningfully to any degree---by teaching huh, because teaching brings you up against the limitations of your knowledge, huh, you maybe asked a question about a subject that you just haven't ever considered but you ought to have considered, but you have sort of kept clear of that because either you weren't interested or shied away from it because of some subjective reason or you thought it rather difficult but now you're brought face to face with that when someone asks you and you've got to make an effort to answer it, that means you've got to find out, that means you've got to think you have to look through the texts, huh, find the relevant quotations, huh, make up

Page 8

mind about it, face that particular question and maybe you've never faced it before, so when we study by ourselves with all sorts of gaps in our knowledge which we leave, huh, but if we have to teach those gaps usually get filled in sooner or later and not only that but our whole understanding of our whole knowledge deepens, and also you know first by talking with others answering others questions, things are worked off in oneself and you realise that you know things you didn't in fact know. You had known before or realised before, huh. Things are brought out of which in a sense you weren't conscious and in this way your whole experience is enlightened. (pause) But of course you have to have some small stock of knowledge before one starts teaching (laughter) huh. It's like a man who goes into business. You need at least a small amount of capital but if you say I'm only going to go into business when I've accumulated a really big capital sum, well you'd never get into it huh, some people you know can go into business with quite a small sum it depends on their skills, business (bent?) In the same way some people can start teaching with quite a small stock of

knowledge. But through teaching they increase it quite rapidly, huh (pause).

HRIDAYA : It ties up with what we were talking earlier about inspiring others, begetting the person you need~

S Right, the only thing is if you have a small stock of knowledge at least know that is a bit small and don't try to bluff anybody and if you don't know the answers say well, I'm sorry I don't know the answer, I'll think it over I'll look it up in the texts and I'll try let you know next week let's be quite frank about it. No one will actually really mind, eh. People don't really expect you to know everything, well occasionally it seems that they do (laughter) but the sensible questioner doesn't and if a sort of actual question that just needs looking at well, no one can know all the facts, that's impossible even all the facts about Buddhism. If you don't quite remember what you know, what the so and so where, or the such and such was is well say, I'm sorry I've have read about it but I just don't remember then of hand I'll let you know next week, I mean that's the thing to do not brush it aside, "well that isn't very important (laughter) " Just say "I don't remember". It saves a lot of blubbing. Well even if there's a question asked about something you haven't thought about, you say I haven't thought about that, you-know, that's interesting, "What do you think?" you can even ask the questioner (laughter) You can have a quick think

4q~

page 9

and say what you think about it. You know you'll go through it sooner or later, if you haven't gone through it already to some extent.

UTTARA One of the examples was Nan on the retreat who was teaching Tai Chi. She had been learning it one week and the following week she'd have a class, the night before her own and then she'd go and teach it, and ah you know (?) flyoU~~I have to wait till next week". (laughter).

I remember someone I knew at Sukura who was reported to be writing a book on eastern religions and she started asking me questions and I'd only been coming along for a few weeks (laughter) asking me about it and writing it down.

S I came only to Sukura the evening, found the same person sitting there with a pile of library books in front of her and looking rather desperate and as soon as I walked in she said 'Do you know anything about Judaism? (laughter) well I said a bit so she said tell me quickly I've got to give a talk about it in half an hour's time. (laughter) but that is going rather too far I'm afraid. (laughter) I think one must start off with a little more knowledge than that, let's be, you know, a small amount of knowledge but well mulled(?) (after?) something that you really do know even if doesn't cover much ground, but it still covers it quite intensively as it were, and that one also has one's own experience to fall back upon at least in certain areas, but, I mean, just (swallow?) up something a few hours before the class and then just vomiting it out, that isn't at all good. That isn't good enough. It might do for the City tit, but probably doesn't even really do for the City Literary well it could be better.

ANANDA I must say I've found when I've had to give a talk, that starts a long time ahead with actually to the background knowledge and to almost forget it all and ideally a month before you've had to give it, and don't do any more reading on it just assimilate it. That's a very essential part of the process of being able to give the Dharma and...

S : Well, of course again in principle you should be thinking about it all the time, eh obviously you can't think of all aspects of the Dharma all the time, you should be turning things over in your mind all the time so that when you are asked for a lecture you have already some understanding and you have something to say, maybe cer-

~4Th

Page 10

tain things you might have been turning in your mind for years and years before actually have been an opportunity to speak about, eh (short pause) so in a way your preparation goes in all the time.

UTTARA : You said that we shouldn't be too hasty to speak on the Dharma as such. In the class this has been the trouble too many people in the west are too ready.

S : Being too ready on the basis of just a mental acquaintance with the Dharma, eh, just reading books about it. But I think for someone with the friends or at in the order, eh, they could in most cases start sharing their knowledge with others, even though they might not have read all that much provided they reasonably assimilated what ever knowledge they have acquired and they have some actual practice, some experience to fall back on, in the light of which they can talk about the Dharma, eh, and it is after all that, that people want not just information out of books they can just as well be for themselves and read at home (pause) I mean it's contact with you they want as well contact with the Dharma or contact with the Dharma to the extent you've succeeded in embodying the Dharma, eh (long pause) and the Dharma isn't something abstract to be entered apart from people, eh, they may not be able to encounter a Buddha. You can't have a Buddha taking every class, but at least you can have someone, you know, who has assimilated at least something of the Dharma to extent and that is what people really need, hum, (pause)

So "Through not causing the hearing and the giving of the doctrine to be obscured you will company the Thiddhas according to your wish". eh, your wish for enlightenment, personally. Alright 290

ATULA : "Through non-attachment you will learn what (the dharma), Through not being miserly your resources will increase, Through not being proud you will become chief (of those respected), through enduring, the doctrine you will attain retention."

S : Um this seems to have been said before in a slightly different way "Through non-attachment you will learn what (the doctrines) mean", That does that mean? How is non-attachment connected with learning what the doctrines mean, learning what the

Dh~'-rma means? hum? (long pause) Through non-attachment to oneself, perhaps, if you're attached to yourself, if you're full of yourself how can you learn what the doctrines mean you, you've won't be receptive, you won't be able to be receptive (pause)

Page 11

UTTARA : (?) if you're full of yourself(?)

S Yes

ATULA : To the extent that you have an ego;~ you're not receptive to other people.

S : Yes, yes. (pause) Because you just don't encounter the Dharma y~u encounter the Dharma as spoken by other people (pause). It also presupposes listening, I mean sometimes people are quite impatient of listening,~ they don't want to listen, eh but that is the first prerequisite that you listen to what is being said. This is why the disciple is called the Sh~avaka, the one who heals, I the one who listens, huh, (long pause) "Through not being miserly your resources will increase", huh. You give and you will get~ Do you think that this always happens in the short-term?

S No, the more you give the more you get? no not necessarily, In the long run we hope under the laws of karma. "Through not being proud you will become chief (of those respect&d) Well, er, again very likely, but not necessarily so. (pause) we've covered this point before, er, that if you're proud, if you are arrogant well this brings about a reaction in other people who try to bring you down, huh so if you are not proud not arrogant there's a greater likelihood of them developing a genuine respect for you, huh. (very long pause)

?PUNJA : It says. Through not being miserly your resources will increase won't the motive be wrong? As though you're giving only to get?

S : It doesn't actually say that, huh, er, (pause) but maybe that is in your mind, er, it's very much in the mind of the average lay Buddhist, that, if he gives he will get huh. If he makes offerings to the monks, makes offerings to the temples and monasteries well, he will definitely get, in this and in future lives, eh,

PUNJA : Is that being selfless then?

S No it's being selfless but er, in traditionally Buddhism recognises that even expects that. That even though your motive isn't selfless still there is ~ result of your good action even though you give selfishly at least you have given, er so there is a result there is a reward as it were er, Because you could say the more selflessly you give you know, the greater the reward. But if you try to give selflessly for the sake of that greater reward you have defeated the purpose. To

Page 1P~

get that gr~&ter reward you have to f~rgct all ab~ut rewards and just give, huh. That's the paradox of the situation. Its li~e tryin~ to be happy, the more happy you try to be the] ess ~ikely you are to be happy. You know, forget all about being happy and you'll probably be happy and you'll] probably be happy. It's like trying to force someone to love, you kn~W~ hit them over the head with your metta, the more yoxx hit them the less likely they are to love you, huh.

When you're miserly you've already given and got hardly on to it.

S Yeah (short pause)

- Do you this that "enduring" is a rather odd word to use?

S It is indeed. "Through enduring the doctrine you will attain retention huh.

Therefore do you think it's about perseverance?

S: I think there's a word "larmadhara", one who bears, one who carries the dharma. flut this is in the sense of being a guardian of the dharma, a practicer of the dharma, not bearing it as a burden or enduring it as a burden. I think it lay be connected with that. Again, remeiber it came from Sanskrit, through Tibetan, into English, so there's bound to be little sort of inaccuracies of this sort, huh? So by practicing the dharia you will retain it, probably something more like that. But not enduring the dharia in a sense of putting up with it (laighter) and attaining retention seems to be a clumsy expression. Practising the dharma you won't lose it. It seems to mean something like that. (pause) Alright, 291.

_____ "Throu~ givin~ the five essentials As well as non-fright to the frightened No evil will there be to harm you. Of the mighty you will be the best."

S: A note says that the "five essentials" are sugar, ghee, honey, sesame oil, salt. That's not usually the list actually, usually it's sugar cane, ghee, honey, sesame oil, and molasses. So what are these things? Why are they esseatial? Is there an esoteric significance possibly? (laughter) No, these are the medicinal foods that can be offered to the bikkhu after twelve o'clock. Perhaps they are essential after twelve o'clock! (laughter) eh? Not salt though, I'm afraid. Usually pious lay people mixed them up all together into balls and offer those balls to the monks. This is considered permissible. Obviously you wouldn't mix salt up with these other things would you? So, "throw~i giving the five essentials as well as non- fri~ht to the frightened no evil will there be to harm you. of the mighty you will be the best." Yet this giving of non-fright to the frightened: we've already ientioned about that haven't we? Talked about it?

Voices: Yes.

S: Right, 292.

_____I "Th~ou~ offering many lai~s At reliquaries and elsewhere

[450]

And oil for lamps in dark places Your divine eye will open."

S: Well, you can see the logic of the connection, but it does seem a little bit like a carrot sort of dangled in front of the king's nose. If you offer lots and lots of lamps at stupas and in other places and oil for lamps in dark places then your divine eye, your third eye, will open, eh? You will be able to see, you'll have that sort of superhuman (?) vision, eh? Well, maybe. But I think we have to be quite careful how we present these sort of things. It's rather like say in some texts if you offer, you know, new robes to the monks then you'll be reborn in the happy, heavenly world, you know, wearing very beautiful silk robes, et cetera, et cetera, eh? And it's true in principle but you just have to be really careful how much or to what extent you aspire(?) to this strong, bargaining or shopkeeping instinct of people. It's not really very religious eh?

Ananda: Do you think Nargarjuna might have been using that symbolically, like offering lights in dark places, sort of giving light to the Dharma?

S: No, he's already mentioned the dharma. No I think he means it quite literally. There's a whole book called Viriana Bhak in Pali, a very late Pali book. Viriana is a sort of heavenly palace(?) in the air in which you sit and, er, there's - oh, lots of stories about different people being reborn in these Virianas and gaining these viranas after death as a result of offering all sorts of beautiful, comfortable seats to the monks in their lifetimes (laughter). I think one must beware of putting it like that. Although the principle is a true principle one must beware of presenting it in terms which are rather crude, apparently self-seeking. Right, 293.

Hridaya: "Through offering bells and instruments For the worship of reliquaries And elsewhere drums and trumpets, Your divine ear will open. "

S: Um, the same sort of principle, huh? The divine ear is the supernormal faculty of clairaudience. You could say just as the divine eye is the supernormal faculty of clairvoyance. Alright, 294.

_____. "Through not relating others' mistakes And not talking of their defective limbs. But rectify their minds you will gain Knowledge of the minds of others."

S: Um, that's quite interesting. Why do you think there's that sort of connection? (pause) If you don't relate others' mistakes and you don't talk about their defective limbs et cetera. It suggests a great sensitivity to others, and if you have, sort of, sensitivity the likelihood is that you will develop the supernormal faculty of telepathy, eh? In Pali it's called paracittajñana, knowledge of the minds of others, eh? In fact this sort of knowledge, this telepathic knowledge, is simply a development of extreme physical sensitivity, eh? Extreme sensitivity to others. That is why it very often happens between people who know each other or know one another very well, because they are very sensitive to one another, very tuned in to one another, very much in harmony with 'one another, on the same wavelength as we say. Therefore telepathic experiences aren't all that uncommon between them. (long pause) 295?

_____. "Through giving conveyances and shoes Through serving the feeble and through Providing teachers with youths you will acquire The skill to create magical emanations."

S: Hum, What are these magical emanations, huh? Uttara: Visualisations of the Buddha.

451 14.

S: No, not quite. It is belief that, er, it is possible that through the power of one's meditation, especially by taking the fourth dhyana as one's basis to project as it were replicas of oneself which would be perceived and experienced by other people just as though you yourself were actually present, eth? This is one of the supernormal powers.. So Nargarjuna is saying that one develops this through giving conveyances and shoes, through serving the people and through providing teachers with youths. Through these various means you acquire the skill to create magical emanations. So what is the connection do you think? (pause) It's providing facilities. i.e. what do these magical emanations do, eth? Let's look at them quite literally for a moment. I mean they do things that you can't do, huh? I mean there are many stories of teachers who were needed in another place but they are needed here. So what do they do, they create a sort of dupli- cate form of themselves which teaches the dharma in the other bit. I've known one or two people about whom stories of this sort were told. As far as I could make out they were quite well authenticated stories, that they were seen in some other place teaching or preaching even though they could not have been there because they were somewhere else, eth? So this is like a sort of extra facility, that you have. so, you know, you acquire that facility, that skill to create magical emanations by providing others with facilities as it were. You give them conveyances, that is to say vehicles which can take them from place to place, and shoes for walking, eth?

Sometimes you need shoes if the ground is so hot that you can't walk on it in your bare feet. Through serving the feeble you become the arms of the feeble, the hands of the feeble. And provide teachers with youths, that is to say, youths who will serve them, wait upon them, do things for them which they can't very conveniently do for themselves, or can't do for themselves without wasting time which could be better spent in other ways. So if you do all these things, if you provide other people with these sorts of facilities, you'll acquire facilities yourself of a supernormal kind, huh? (pause)

Uttara: It's a selfless activity...

S: It's not only a sort of sort of selfless activity, it's selfless activity of a certain kind. It's enabling others to function more easily and freely, yes? I mean if you give someone a conveyance he can move about more easily. If you give someone shoes he can walk about more easily and comfortably. If you serve the feeble, well they can manage better et cetera, and through providing teachers with youths, well you provide the teachers with youths who can do cooking and cleaning and run errands and get the shrine ready and so on. Well the teachers don't have to do all those things themselves therefore they can do more teaching, eth?

Alaya: We're doing that through providing Sukhavati.

S: Huh?

Alaya: Sukhavati has this function?

S: Yes, in a way anybody who helps to create a Centre is providing facilities for other human beings eventually. Yes, very much so. Alright, 296

Uttara: "Through acting to promote the doctrine. Remembering its books and their meaning, And through stainless giving of the doctrine You will remember your continuum of lives"

S: Hmm, this is another supernormal power, that is to say the recollecting of one's previous existences. So how does one acquire that? Through acting to promote the doctrine, eth? And remembering its books and their meaning, and through stainless giving of the doctrine you will remember your continuum

15.

of lives, huh? So what is the appropriateness of the connection here? One can see it perhaps more clearly in the case of remembering its books because it is the faculty of memory which is being developed. But why through acting to promote the doctrine and through stainless giving of the doctrine? Why should these two things result in the acquisition of memory of one's continuum of lives?

_____ Because again you're not hanging onto one .. (unclear)

S: Yes, (long pause) Alright, 297 then.

_____ 'I Through knowing thoroughly. correctly and truly That no phenomena inherently exist. You will attain the sixth clairvoyance That extinguishes all contamination well.'1

S: Clairvoyance isn't a very happy word, er, the correct word here. What are being described are the six abinyas. Abinya really is literally super-knowledge. They're not six clairvoyances, they're six super-knowledges of which clairvoyance is only one, eth? The five mundane super-knowledges which are physical powers as we've seen, and a sixth which is purely spiritual, even transcendental, which consists in the knowledge of reality, the knowledge that the asravas have all been destroyed, eth? (pause)
So "thknowinthoro~rrectlandtrul that no phenomena inherently exist." If phenomena don't inherently exist, how do they exist?

Hridaya: In relativity to one another.

S: In relativity to one another, but in what sort of way? What sort of relativity is it? It's the relativity of conditionality, eth? That is to say that things don't possess as it were the cause

of their existence within themselves, eth? They depend for their existence on other things outside themselves. In other words they are conditioned things. They arise in dependence on conditions, they cease when those conditions are no longer there, eth? So they don't have an inherent existence, they aren't the causes of their own existence, they depend on others for their existence. Others are the causes for their existence~ So no phenomena has inherent existence, all phenomena are devoid of inherent existence, so through knowing this thoroughly, correctly and truly, you'll attain the six clairvoyance, or the six super-knowledge that extinguishes all contamination. The contamination is the asravas, sometimes translated as the poisonous fluxes, eth? or contaminations. I take it you're familiar with the asravas, huh? Kanaerava(?), bhavasrava and avijasrava are usually enumerated as the three. The asrava of defilement of sense desire or desire for sensual experience, or experience through the senses, huh? Bhavasrava, desire for conditioned existence as such; and avijasrava which is the asrava of ignorance. A fourth is sometimes added which is ahiṭṭi(?), the asrava of taint or contamination of views in the sense of false views. So these are all extinguished. With the extinguishing of these three or these four you gain Enlightenment, eth?

A voice: Is the third one ignorance?

S: Ignorance yes, avidya. (long pause) Alright, 298

_____ "Through cultivating the wisdom of reality which is The same for all phenomena and is moistened with compassion For the sake of liberating all sentient beings. You will become a Conqueror with all the excellences."

S: "Through cultivating the wisdom of reality", that means prajna, the wisdom that knows reality, that experiences reality. The wisdom that is "the same for all phenomena and is moistened with compassion", huh? This is quite important, huh? That that wisdom of reality is moistened with compassion.

It's suggesting it's dry without it, huh? You remember we were talking about samatha and vipassana, huh? Some Theravadin Buddhists believe that there is

16.

such a thing as what they call dry insight, sukkha vipassana, that is to say vipassana existing without samatha. Samatha is the moistening factor as it were. So without samatha, vipassana is dry. So that there is the same sort of suggestion here, the same sort of thinking here that without compassion, wisdom - even the wisdom of reality - is, as it were, dry. The wisdom of reality has to be moistened with compassion, huh? There has to be the unity of these two elements, wisdom and compassion, even wisdom by itself is not enough. Of course in a sense you can't really speak of wisdom and compassion at this level as two separate things. We can think of there being as it were within ourselves two great streams, a stream of emotion(?) and a stream of understanding, or a stream of emotion and a stream of intellect, huh? and the more we progress, the more we develop, the more these two come together and coalesce. So by the time we reach the further or the higher stages of the path you can't distinguish any longer between them, huh? Jñāna is intellect, intellect is emotion, they're just one. So it's like that in the case of the Bodhisattva, huh? There's wisdom, wisdom of reality, there's

compassion. You can't really speak of taking wisdom as though it were a separate thing and then moistening it with compassion as though it were a separate thing. The two are completely unified, completely integrated, they're just one, huh? The Bodhi- sattva is wisdom and compassion and we speak of those two things because we experience intellect and emotion as two different things, but in the Bodhi- sattva they're completely unified, there's no distinction between them.

Uttara: I get confused with Tara as such, she's the quintessence of compassion. Does she embody wisdom? Is this what you're saying?

S: One shouldn't, or one can't really think of Bodhisattvas as really separate personalities. If you think well there's a Bodhisattva of wisdom which means he's all wisdom but he isn't compassion well that's really nonsense. Or if you think there's another Bodhisattva who is all compassion but she's not wisdom, again that isn't correct. Perhaps you can consider for purposes of your practice one aspect rather than another, but you can't really think of compassion apart from wisdom, wisdom apart from compassion. In the case of Tara, Tara is said, or the Tara practice is said to give the speedy realisation of wisdom. All Taras, all female Buddhas and Bodhisattvas forms are also embodiments of wisdom or(?) prajna, which is itself grammatically feminine. So yes, you can say Tara does represent compassion.

There is that story about her being formed from the tears of Avalokitesvara, so she embodies wisdom, but in the case of Tara it's the compassion aspect that you particularly attend to, eh? Or if you think there's one Bodhisattva in reality, well that Bodhisattva has different aspects. You can take these different aspects and personify them, as it were, in different individual Bodhi- sattva forms, but you mustn't really think that there can be a Bodhisattva without wisdom and only compassion, or a Bodhisattva who's always wisdom but no compassion, or a Bodhisattva who's all energy but no wisdom and no compassion. That is a much too literalistic way of thinking, eh? I mean every Bodhisattva is everything. It's rather like having a three sided figure, each side is a different colour, so you see the figure as being a rather different colour depending on which of the three sides is facing you. It is a bit like that. That's a rather crude analogy, but perhaps it does sort of convey what the position actually is. Alright, 299.

Ananda: "Through various pure aspirations Your Buddha land will be purified. Through offering gems to the King Of Subduers you will give out infinite light~fl

S: This purification of the Buddha Land, I think I am going to talk about this this afternoon at some length, so we'll leave it now because time is in fact more than up. So let's just read that last verse three~hundred and that will finish the chapter.

Francis Gritton: "Therefore knowing how actions And their effects agree

For your own sake help beings

Always and so help yourself."

S: So actions and their effects agree, that's the principle eh? So if you want to help beings always and so help yourself, let your actions accord with the effects you would want to produce, eh? So, 'I know how actions and their ~effects for your own sake help beings always and so help yourself.' (very long pause) So this is the chapter of the collections for Enlightenment, eh? The collection of punya~ collection of jnana, merits and wisdom. if you like samatha and vipassana. Vimuti, punya vimuti the emotional, the intellectual; wisdom and compassion.

wUlaa: How do you spell... S: J-n-a-n-a. With a little curly mark over the first A, and a long A. Jnana.

Ananda: How do you spell Avhijna?

S: A-v-th-i-j-n-a. That's the Sanskrit form of avthijna, with the curly mark over the N and the long A. Avthijna.

_____ Could you repeat that?

S: In Pali it's avhinn, with two curly lines above the N's. Avhijna, that's the Sanskrit form with the curly line above the N and a stroke over the final A. Avijna. Avhi is exceeding, great, superior as in avhidharma or avhirati et cetera, huh? (pause) Well, any general point with regard to what we've done today? (long pause) Alright, let's leave it until the afternoon.

* * * * *

S: Anyway we come onto Chapter Four. But as I said I'm going to say a few words about verse 299 first, eh? Nargarjuna says "Through various pure aspirations your Buddha Land will be purified. Through offering gems to the King of Subduers you will give out infinite light." So this idea of a Buddha land eh? In Sanskrit it's Buddhaksetra(?) So this is based on the idea that, in a sense, thoughts give rise to things. For instance if you practise generosity, if you have a generous mind then under the law of karma in some future life you'll be well provided - er - with the things of this world, eh? So there is the idea here that thought, that will, that aspiration is a sort of creative force. I.e. we live in a certain kind of world, a world of a certain nature, a world of certain general characteristics, a world which gives us a certain kind of experience. So we live in this world, we all live in the same world, because this world has been created as it were, by our actions. Our collective karma as it were~produces the world in which we collectively live, eh? This is the sort of general idea, and by changing one's karma, by changing one's mental state, by changing one's will, changing one's aspirations, one can modify one's future environment. Do you see the idea? So this also gives rise to the idea if your thought, if your will, if your aspiration is sufficiently powerful, you can create a whole world of your own, eh? A world which is much better and much purer, eh? than worlds usually are, huh? So one gets this idea in the Mahayana literature quite strongly that there are pure Buddha worlds or pure Buddhaksetra(?) which have been

produced by different Buddhas as a result of their intense aspiration as Bodhisattvas to create such a world, and such a world represents of course an ideal environment for living, perhaps an ideal environment for them to practise the dharma in. Because a Buddha does not live in his own world in solitary splendour. He creates that world by the power of his good actions, will, aspirations, so that others may be reborn there, eth? And may be able to follow the path under his guidance more easily than they would be able to in an ordinary world. So Buddhaksetras(?) of this kind are called pure Buddhaksetras. They're pure in the sense that they're inhabited only by men and gods, eth? There are no animals, no asravas, no pretas, no beings in hell, eth? Also there's no distinction of sex. Sometimes it is said that there are no women born there,

18.

but in a sense there's no men born there, eth? There's no distinction of gender, and also one does not have to work, food and clothing appear spontaneously, and one can listen to the dharma if one is so disposed day and night, eth? The most, the best known of all these purelands, these pure Buddhaksetras(?) is of course that of Amitabha, which is known as Sukhavati, the abode of bliss, eth? or abounding in bliss. So you get the idea, eth? This is all in a way a bit mythological, especially when you get individually named Buddhas creating their individual Buddha fields, or pure Buddha fields, eth? But what is the truth that you think this presents? Supposing we don't take it literally, or feel unable to take it literally, eth? What is the sort of general principle involved?

_: I think positive emotion.

S' Positive emotion, er, yes. In a well known phrase the power of positive thinking. That if you think positively, if you're full of positive emotion, especially positive spiritual emotion, then you have an effect on your surroundings, you tend to create both now and in the future a certain kind of set up around you. It's as though you're surrounded by aura, or as though by a sort of magnetic field which influences everything which is within that field. Do you get the idea? So in the case of a Buddha, if he is a Buddha, if he is in that highly positive emotional spiritual state, if he has wisdom and if he has compassion and these are as it were vibrating at a tremendously high frequency so to speak, then one would expect that such a person would be surrounded by an immensely powerful, as it were, magnetic field, gravitational field, call it what you will, and this would affect everybody who came within it. And this would be his world as it were. It's as though in a way every sort of powerful personality creates around himself a world. He affects other people. Not only affects other people but acts upon them. But he tends to set up things in a certain way by virtue of whatever the happens to be. As some people set up a really disordered and inharmonious world around themselves perhaps they just extend their own chaos. It isn't really a world. Somebody else might create something much more harmonious, much more concordant, eth? A politician tends to create around himself a world of politics, an artist tends to create around himself a world of art, eth? A Buddha will tend to create around himself a Pureland within the orbit of this influence as it were. It is more easy to follow, more easy to practise the dharma. So you see the sort of general idea. This is the sort of general idea, and in

Mathayana sutras it receives this tremendous extension, this tremendous amplification, that a Buddha can in fact, by sheer power of thought, create a whole universe within which other living beings can be reborn and within which they can follow the teachings, huh? So one may or may not be able to accept that literally, but the general principle is clear enough and acceptable enough. (pause) I mean Qotama the Buddha when he was on earth, well yes, set up this own Buddhafeld around himself, eth? But of course there is a difference between the Mahayana conception of a pure Buddha- field and an ordinary Buddhafeld just that this world can be because a pure Buddhafeld is an absolute environment actually existing on some other plane as it were. But the general principle holds good.

Uttara: Shakymuni, you said that created his own personal Buddhafeld. Then...

S: Well, of this time~that was the range(?) that was the extent of his influence. It wasn't a pure Buddhafeld because he couldn't eliminate all the unpleasant features, but in the Mahayana you have this idea of a pure Buddhafeld, a Buddha- field which is created only by the karma, for want of a better term, or rather or more strictly from, by the vow of an individual Bodhisattva after this Enlightenment he lives in that pureland, eth? Presides over and guides the beings in it.

Uttara: And yes his vow still going around today. He is still in a sense trying to establish that pureland.

S: Well, it is established, but the vow provides for beings to be reborn in it and to hear the teaching.

19.

Uttara: Yes, it's already established.

S: So this figures very prominently of course in Far Eastern Buddhism. So it becomes quite important to set up minor purelands, eth? I mean even a retreat situation is a temporary small pureland, I mean for the time being. At least the conditions are if not ideal they're very much better than one usually experiences them from the spiritual point of view, much more conducive to one's individual spiritual development. (pause)

Hridaya: In a sense the Tharma is an utterance from the Pureland. Could you say that.

S: Yes, one could say that, but not necessarily from a pureland, from a Buddha- land, yes. Buddhalands can be pure or impure. They're impure when the Buddha is, as it were, shares them with other beings who have brought that world into existence by virtue of their karma mixed, both pure and impure. But a Pureland is a Buddhaland which he has brought into existence by his own unaided efforts by means of thoughts and aspiration. and vows which are entirely pure, eth? Without any other admixture. It's rather like the difference between, supposing, er, that we wanted to retreat, so we had our retreat in the midst of somebody else's house where there were a whole big family and their life was going on and we were trying to hold a retreat in the midst of that, yeah? You get the idea, huh? That is like the impure Buddhaland. But the pure Buddhaland is where we have a place of our~own which is entirely designed for that purpose, eth? So how much more easy it is. I mean this world

wasn't designed for spiritual purposes, it was designed for quite other purposes. But a pureland is designed only with the needs of the Dharma in mind, with only the needs of people's individual development in mind. (pause)

Hridaya: Does the pure and the impure tie up with the Marmyakaya and the Sambhogakaya?

S: Yes, because he is in this Sambhogakaya form that the Buddha as it were presides over this pureland. The Namayakaya form is appropriate to the impure Buddha-world, huh? And the Sambhogakaya appropriate to the pure Buddha-world.

Hridgya: So you're in the world of the Buddha in the sense you can see, but under whose influence you become. And if you do just see the walking figure of the Buddha, if you like uttering the Noble Eightfold Path you would be the world you would find yourself in on account of that influence would be different than in the world you would find yourself in (???)

S: According to the Mahayana teaching you have to make an actual aspiration to be reborn in that pure land after death and recite the appropriate mantra. The mantra of the particular Buddha which is usually the mantra of Amitabha or the salutation to Amitabha. (pause) This phase of Buddhism, or this phase of the Mahayana seems to have developed when people started rather despairing of being able to attain Enlightenment on the earth, eh? Conditions seemed so much against that, being so difficult that they started thinking of a higher pure realm where conditions were much more favourable to the Buddhist life. Again others do say this is another development of the teaching that this world is the pureland if you can only see it as such. As you become pure this world becomes pure, and you feel that you are living in the midst of the pureland, huh? This is very much the Vajrayana principle.

Hridaya: See all things as Nirvana, eh?

Si I mean even more than that. See everything as a sort of mandala, as living in the midst of a mandala, eh? not just in the midst of this dirty old world. Hear all sounds as mantras, see all forms as Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.

Uttara: you talked in terms of I think, maybe this is getting away from the point, you talked in terms, in the lecture "Is a Guru Necessary" how in terms of how you can pick a guru to the extent you can pick a guru, how can one pick a guru.

Is it in the same terms of practice. You can't really pick a practice. Is it the Buddha who picks you?

20.

S: If a Buddha is around to pick you. But you can pick a practice. Picking a guru is different because, or not picking, because there are two people involved. If you want to get married you can't get married unless the girl agrees. You both have to be parties to it. It's the same with the guru. You can't say, oh so and so is going to be my guru and accepts me as a

disciple. The guru has to say yes, he has to accept you. It's a two way thing.

Uttara: I was thinking more in the terms of the grace of that particualr deity, the Buddha...

S: It depends on the practice, i.e. you can take, you can decide to do the metta bhavana so one needs to give you the practice. If it's explained to you by someone so much the better, but you don't have to be given the practice in the sense that the practice itself has to consent to be practised, eth? In the case of the visualisation you can say yes, in a manner of speaking, that you have as it were to be given the practice by the deity concerned, but then again you can say really there's no question of that because the Buddha or Bodhisattva concerned is only too willing that you should practise. That readiness is there all the time. It's up to you to make yourself receptive to that. (long pause) I remember one partiwular initiation that the teacher who gave - the guru who gave - explained it in this way: that the function of the guru is to introduce you to the deity. It's as though the guru says to the deity, this is so and so, eth? and then says to the disciple, this is such and such Buddha or Bodthisattva. You're mutually introduced to one another. It's more like that (laughter) It's a two-way thing. (pause) But the general principle behind the pureland is to be you create your own world, eh~ whether now or in the future. Sometimes you can see this with people. Though in a way they share the same world as you they seem at the same time to be living in a world of their own, in a quite different world. Have you ever noticed this, eth? I knew someone once who was very much involved with politics and so on and so forth ans she lived in Kalimpong. I used to meet her now and then. She used to live in a completely different world. All sorts of things were constantly happening that I never heard about (laughter) completely oblivious to. It didn't the same Kalimpong, not one little bit. She lived in a world of plots and counterplots, disasters and cat- astrophies, and threats and attempted assassinations and all sorts of things, and not a murmur of these things ever reached my ears. So whenever I used to meet her she used to describe what had been going on and she lived only a few hundred yards away from me (laughter) and it was as though she lived in a completely different world. She used to say, Kalimpong is a very horrible place I don't know why I live here, absolutely awful, the people are awful, everything is awful, and she seemed really to feel this, to experience this, eth? Her Kalimpong wasn't mine.

Hridaya: The world in which one lives can change can' t it?

S: Oh, yes.

Hridaya: The idea of moving from the realms of the gods to the hungry ghosts et cetera.

S: So people do set up~ world around them. I mean according to the particular mental state they are in, whether positive or negative and so on.

Hridaya: And you can be influenced by that?

S: Yes.

[458]

S: Yes, and you can be influenced there, with the Buddha, and presumably you'd want to influenced; but, you know, just ordinary people, you can be uplifted or you can be brought

down by them. So a Centre should be a little world, a positive world, or at least an oasis, if it can't be a world. So, in a way, when people enter into the Centre, they should feel that they are in a different world. It should look different and feel different and be different, otherwise it isn't really a Centre. This is what we have to try to do at Sukhavati, so that as soon as people set foot in the place, they really do feel that they are in the world of bliss.

Atula: So when people say you can't create a world of your own, you say you can.

S: Yes, quite. Well, actually, you are doing it all the time; the only question is: what sort of world do you create? (Long pause) All right, then, let's go on to Chapter Pour. (Indistinct sentence)

Hridaya: Shall I read the first verse?

S: Yes, please.

Text: Verse 301 (p62)

S: So, in this chapter, Nagarjuna is giving special advice to the king as king, about royal policy. So he starts off on a rather wry note, as it were. He says that "A king. . . not tolerate." He may well not tolerate criticism, so people praise him anyway, just to be on the safe side. "There- fore. . . or not." He's saying, as it were: when dealing with kings, you have to be very careful. So, in this slightly ironical way, he's saying: well, you are a king; maybe I'd better be careful what sort of advice I offer you. It may not be pleasing to you, it may not be the sort of thing that you would like to hear. And presumably he knows the king pretty well, so he can say this sort of thing and get away with it. And kings in those days used to be very fiery, irascible creatures; you'd never know what they would do next. I remember when I went to Nepal for the first time; it was in the last days of the Rana regime, which was a real autocracy. For the previous hundred years the hereditary prime ministers had usurped power from the kings. The kings were kept more or less prisoner and the hereditary prime ministers, the Ranas, they ruled the country. So at that time the ruler was Nohan Shamsheer Jangah Bahadur Rana, a real old autocrat of about 72, who I subsequently met. And on my second visit to Nepal I was shown

459

over his palace, which was also the secretariat from which he used to govern. And it was a really sort of strange place; it was a western-style palace with enormous grounds, and there was the more general part of the secretariat on the ground floor. And one got up to the first floor, where he lived, up tiny winding staircases, iron staircases, and emerged through a trap door on the verandah. This, of course, was to make it very difficult for anyone to get up and in. He could shut himself off completely. So he used to appear every morning on the enormous front verandah. The balcony of this big front verandah looked down into the courtyard below, and people who wanted to see him or speak to him or present any petition had to appear down below in the courtyard. And I was told that if he was in a bad mood people who came with requests for jobs would get sent off to prison, and if he was in a good mood, people who'd been brought for punishment for certain offences would be given jobs. (Laughter) It depended on his mood entirely, because he had all power in his own hand. If he

wanted to sentence you to death, he could; if he wanted to give you a house and lands, he could. It was entirely in his hands. Kings in the old days were like this, especially in the East. They had virtually unlimited power, so you had to be very careful how you dealt with them, had to be very careful what you said. Just a few words and your head might be struck off, or you might be given a million rupees; you just never knew. Perhaps we can't realise that sort of state of affairs nowadays because it just hardly exists anywhere any more; maybe in one or two of the Arab states, not even in the Communist countries. I don't think someone like Tito or Brezhnev has that sort of absolute power anymore. So, "A king who does. . . or not (to say)." Right then, 302.

Text: Verse 302 (p 62)

S: "If useful. . . someone else." Well, even when one is speaking to an ordinary person, it's hard, it's a dangerous thing, to speak something which is useful but unpleasant. That particular person may take offence; one may get into trouble. Not to speak of a situation when one is a monk, that is with no power, no influence whatever, just a beggar - and the other person is a king - not only a king, but a lord of the great earth, a bhrupala (?), that is to say, virtually a universal monarch. He's sort of speaking very politely, not to say flattering the king. So he says: well, even when it's an ordinary person, how difficult it is to give good advice which is un-

(D~~~o

pleasant, and here a. I, a monk with no power, no influence, venturing to speak to someone like you, a king, a great king, a lord of the earth. What could I possibly say? How careful I must be. So he is paving the way for what he wants to say in this very, as it were, cautious and diplomatic manner. All right, 303.

Text: Verse 303. (p 62)

S: It's interesting to notice that he takes it for granted that what he has to say will be somewhat unpleasant to the king, that good advice is generally not very palatable to the person to whom it is offered. (Pause) Right, 304.

Text: Verse 304. (p~62)

5: It's a sort of exercise in perfect speech. Right, 305.

Text: Verse 305. (p 62)

S: So, "true words, spoken without anger." (Pause) "Water fit for bathing" obviously means clean water. Just as clean water is suitable for bathing in, so true words, spoken without anger, are suitable to be heard. So, therefore, one should accept them, just as one accepts the clean water which is fit for bathing. The purpose of the water, of course, is to wash off the dirt. In the same way, the purpose of the true words spoken without anger is to remove imperfections, to remove faults, to improve the person to whom the words are spoken. So one doesn't refuse water for bathing, when it's clean, because it will remove the dirt. In the same way, one shouldn't refuse, shouldn't refuse to hear, true words spoken

without anger, because they will remove one's faults. (Pause) 306 then.

Text: Verse 306 (p 63)

S: "Here and later" means in this life and in future lives.

Text: Verse 307 (p 63)

S: All right, you've got wealth now; where does that wealth come from? As a result of the generosity you've practised in previous lives. If you want to gain further wealth in future lives, you must give from that wealth here and now. You see the argument? Your present wealth is a result of former giving, so if you want wealth in the future you must give now. It isn't perhaps appealing to what is noblest in the king but perhaps that sort of appeal is necessary. You're rich now; if you want to be rich in the future then you just have to practise generosity. One must perhaps realise that

[461]

this way of thinking, this sort of belief, is very, very strong in India traditionally. People believe very, very strongly in the law of karma, and this sort of argument represents a real inducement: that now you are very wealthy, you've come to riches, you enjoy those riches, and certainly you would like to enjoy riches of that sort in future lives. But how did you come by those riches? Because of the good deeds you've practised in previous lives, because of the dana you gave. Therefore, if you want to be rich again in the future, in subsequent lives, in future lives, then you must practise generosity here and now. This is the sort of argument that carries a great deal of weight with the traditionally-minded Indian person. But perhaps it doesn't make a very strong appeal to us. What is the strongest argument, do you think, for people nowadays? To practise something positive, to observe the precepts, or to practise dana?

~a: They produce sort of clear and happy states of mind.

S: In other words, that they would develop. This is the sort of language that one uses nowadays, which is of course a true language. This is, in fact, what happens. It seems as though, in the case of quite a few people in ancient India, you couldn't say that, if you practise dana, you will develop, you will develop in the direction of Nirvana and enlightenment. That wasn't good enough, as it were. But - if you practise dana then you will get in future lives the 5w- riches that you've got in this life as the result of practising dana in previous lives. ~at 'as the argument that appealed. In a way, it's better now, that one can appeal to something more genuine and more noble.

Atula: A bit less material.

S: Yes. . . Yes, well, mindless material. It's rather like someone in prison, and you say: well, if you behave yourself, well, you know, you~~l get promotion, or you'll get ~-privileges within the prison. And, in the case of another person, I mean, he's not interested in getting privileges within the prison, he's interested in getting out altogether, so he's prepared for a much greater effort. Well, you could say it's like telling someone in prison: well, look, if you behave yourself, next time you come in we'll give you the same cell, just as comfortable as this time. But the great thing to do is to not come back. A great deal of Indian religious literature has this rather mercenary attitude about it.

ASitas I think it's because there are sort of poorer standards of living there.

S: It could be that. (Indistinct). . very precarious.

Uttara: There's an awful lot in the Hindu religion. . . . the Brahma. . -

Hridaya: He does seem to be selling it rather cheap, doesn't he? (Pause)

S: All right, 308; Magariuna continues the argument, in fact.

Text: Verse 308 (p 63)

S: You see what he's saying? "Here in the world. . . . journey unpaid." Supposing you want to make a journey. Do you want to take along a lot of provisions? All right, you have to get people, you have to get workmen, you have to get porters to carry the provisions for you. Will they do it unpaid? No, they won't. In the same way, you want to transport all your wishes to your next life; so you need~ as it were, people to carry them there. So the people who are going to carry them there are the beggars to whom you give something. In other words, your dana is a sort of payment that you make, to the beggars and others, so that they will carry your riches for you from this life to the next. (Laughter) No doubt the king found this argument very convincing. (Laughter) This really reminds you of the case I quoted in the "Survey" of the Jaii monk who spent years and years in asceticism and accumulated enormous quantities of merit. But, anyway, he got tired of it all in the end, so he sold the merit that he had acquired to someone who wanted to become an ascetic and with the proceeds he set himself up in business. (Laughter) So punya is regarded very sort of literally, not to say literalistically, by many people in India. So this verse also reflects that sort of way of thinking. How am I going to get my riches from this life to the next? Well, obviously, someone's got to carry them there, as it were. The poor and the beggars to whom you give money are like the porter who transports your riches. And the dana is like the wages that you pay them for so doing. This seems dreadfully materialistic, doesn't it?

Chintamani: You're (indistinct) . . better ways than that.

S: Well, I'm trying to. (Laughter) I'll (unclear) the text a bit more if you like. But I mean it is quite straightforward.

~jita: Could be skilful means probably.

S: Let us hope so, yes. Let's hope Nagarjuna doesn't really subscribe to this mercenary conception of dana: dana is, well, not even just a good invest-

ment, it's just wages paid to people who transport your property from this life to the next. (Laughter)

~jita: It gives a pretty bad impression in that case.

S: Yes, if someone wanted to quote this verse against a Buddhist it would really make a

really bad impression: look how materialistic they are. But, you know, after all, the king was a king, presumably this was the way he would be inclined to think. I don't know, you probably haven't met in India the traditional type, the old-fashioned type of the pious rich man, the religious-minded wealthy merchant. They really are a strange type; and this is very much how they think. They're very pious, but they really look

on it, or look at it~ as a good investment. They've got sort of great faith and great belief, but it's very much of this kind, or within this sort of framework. We don't seem to get people like that in the West, at least not nowadays. Just as in the same way you can meet pious Hindu merchants who'll do a great deal in the way of giving for charity, but their name must be there. And they make this provision quite openly, quite sort of blatantly: yes, I'm quite willing to give so much money, so~may thousands of rupees for opening, say, a charitable dispensary or a hospital or a school, but my father's name must be there. And they have to be invited as the guest of honour and garlanded and they insist that you must get the prime minister to open it, and that they must be introduced to him as the founder of this school or that hospital. There's all this too. This is very, very strong, this sort of element in traditional Indian religious life, nowadays of course mainly Hindu religious life. What seems to be a gross materialism goes hand in hand with quite substantial generosity. There's a sort of attitude of mind, a sort of frame of mind, that's perhaps rather difficult for us to understand. It goes with a very sort of firm adherence to traditional values.

Francis Gritton: I think it's a bit like in this country in the industrial revolution; a lot of the up-and-coming industrialists were pious Christians, Quakers or Methodists or suchlike, and possibly hoped for a reward in heaven as a result of their good deeds.

S: Well, even the Bible encourages that. It speaks of laying up treasure in heaven, "where moth does not corrupt, where thieves break not through and steal." No bank robbers there.

Uttara: Is this not similar to the Egyptian religion, where they get their, all their treasure and that's buried with them? (Pause)

S: Anyway, this is an example of what, you know, we would regard as a very sort of materialistic attitude to religion, but maybe we just have to be careful that we don't adopt the same sort of attitude in our own way. (Pause) 309.

Text: Verse 309 (p 63)

S: Well maybe Nagarjuna feels he's gone a bit too far with his skilful means, so he, as it were, almost corrects himself. Well, "Always be of exalted mind." Well, it wasn't a very exalted mind, apparently, that he was encouraging the king to develop in the previous verse. But, anyway, now he says, "Always be of exalted that are exalted." It's not quite clear what exalted means. Perhaps "exalted mind" means a mind in a high, you know, level of consciousness. "Delighting in exalted deeds." Or maybe it suggests the Bodhisattva ideal.

"From exalted actions artee/All effects that are exalted." Good is the result of good. Or, good creates good. (Long pause) One must also say though, with reference to 308, the Indians take quite a lot of d~light in very ingenious arguments in support of something in which they already believe. You find a bit of this in the Buddhists too. You see what I mean? You already believe something, you accept it, - like the law of karma and the effects of actions and so on. But a very, very sort of ingenious, even far-fetched argument in support of that rather pleases you and delights you. And sometimes One quite likes to see how far-fetched a particular author can be. Not that you need that sort of argument before you will, you know, do that particular thing, you're quite willing to do it anyway, but you quite appreciate these very, very sophist4 toated, even quibbling, hair-splitting arguments in support of what you're going to do anyway. (Pause) Right, 310.

Text: Verse 310 (p63)

Si So, "Create centres of doctrine" - presumably, you know, centres where the Dharma can be taught. "Abodes of the Three Jewels"; I mean, what would be an abode of all Three Jewels? Presw~ably, it would be a place where there was a temple with an image of the Buddha, also a library with books of the Dharma, and accomodation for members of the Sangha, that is, for monks.

SO~ "Create centres. . . . in their minds". The construction of the verse isn't all that clear in the ~GLISH translation. It's as though the king is being asked to create glory for himself, glory such as lowly kings have not even conceived in their minds, through these activities. (Pause) All right, 311 then.

Text: Verse 311 (p 63)

S: So, "it is best. ° . . even after death." ~en here, the oonstruction isn't all that clear, but it seems to me that, if you're going to create centres of doctrine, you know, create really magnificent ones, create such magnificent centres that neighbouring kings when they hear about it will be so impressed, so moved, that the hairs of their heads will stand on end. If you, as a great king, are unable to do this, to create a centre, or centres, of the doctrine as glorious as this - well, it';; be sown to your ill-repute after death. In other words, if you want fame after death, if you want good repute after death, then you must c~ate centres of the doctrine as magnificent as you possibly can. (Pause) All this just reminds me of another personal experience when I was in Nepal the second time, and all the bhikkus who had gone there in connection with the visit of the relics of Sariputta and Mo~llana - about twenty-five or thirty of us - were in- vited to the royal palace where the king by this time had been liberated from the prime ministers; he'd been liberated only a few months before~ Anyway, he was there - that was King Sabugan (?) - and we were all invited to the palace for the ceremonial alms-giving. So we were all seated round this great table in the palace, and enormous silver dishes and plates and jugs, all with silver an inch thick were brought in, sort of dozens and dozens of them, and we were given food. And at the e~a there had to be a discourse by the seniormost monk, offering thanks to the king. So the seniourmost monk delivered - he was a Sinhalese; I won't mention his name; it's quite a long name - he delivered a discourse, delivered it in Sinhalese which I didn't understand, but another bhikku who'd been to Ceylon, an Indian bhikku, had to translate it into Hindi, which the king understood. And in the course of his thanksgiving discourse the monk from Ceylon really laid on the

flattery so thick that the Indian monk who was translating told me he found it really difficult to translate, so he toned it all down, because even in Hindi, which is flowery enough, it sounded so fulsome. But

this is the sort of almost traditional practice. One certainly doesn't find the Buddha doing this sort of thing or indulging in this sort of thing, but it has become customary and traditional to treat kings and, you know, people in prominent position in this sort of way. This doesn't seem at all desirable, or really very spiritual, or very much in keeping with, you know, spiritual life. But it's very much the custom, tradition-ally, in eastern Buddhist countries. And it is to some extent bound up with this idea that if you are powerful and wealthy, it is on account of your previous good deeds; and this reinforces the idea that the wealthy man is the good man - otherwise where did his wealth come from? And that the poor man is the bad man. It does unfortunately reinforce this sort of idea. This is not actually the Buddhist teaching, but it can lend itself to this sort of interpretation. This is the interpretation that the Hindus regularly do give. So that the wealthy man, the pious wealthy man, also has the satisfaction of thinking: well, that by mere virtue of the fact that I'm wealthy, I'm a pious man; I must have had great piety in the past, in my previous lives, otherwise I would not be so wealthy now. So he gives with great sort of self-satisfaction and complacency; and this sort of person is very commonly met with in places like Bombay, where you get all the very wealthy orthodox Hindu merchants. I've met quite a few of these people. They do have this sort of attitude; they're very sure of themselves, very confident. They really do believe that they are good people, that their wealth is due to righteous actions committed in previous lives. They really do believe that the poor are born poor because of sins committed in previous lives. And the poor themselves very often believe that. So there is this somewhat unpleasant twist, you know, sometimes given to the teaching of karma and rebirth, and it is used to sometimes, as it were, reinforce the status quo. Just as is the case in the Victorian period, the poor were told: God has created you poor, God has created the rich man rich. So your duty is to ~~~~ the station in life allotted to you by God. I mean* what is that verse of the hymn which was written, I believe, at the beginning of this century? "The rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate, God made them high and lowly and ordered their estate." This was written, ~~~to know, well, not within my lifetime, within my father's lifetime; I heard it sung in church. ~o

Mo~

~~~~ much the same sort of thing. So what is one to say to this sort of criticism? (Pause) Whether it's made as against Buddhism or as against Christianity, it's as if religion almost sanctifies the status quo; it's on the side of the rich, it's against the poor, it's on the side of the powers that be. St Paul said: the powers that be are ordained of God. Popular Buddhism almost goes so far as to suggest that, you know, a man is born ~~~ing, or maybe becomes a prime minister or a president, because of his virtues, at least those in previous lives. He may not be virtuous, may not be ( . ° ? . . ) in this life, but you can believe that, you know, he has been in previous lives, and that's why he has ~~~ achieved this high position. The same with the wealthy man: he was very generous in his last life; that's why he's wealthy in this life. So how, then, is one to counter that sort of criticism?

Hridaya: I suppose you could start by finding a contented poor man and a not-contented rich

ian with bad states of mind.

B: Well, the fact that he had bad states of mind now wouldn't prove that he hadn't had good states of mind in the past which had, you know, resulted in his being rich in this life.

~A~: What if they exploited people to get their riches?

1: Well, they ~c~~~ believe that, you know. I've even seen people in India, very rich people, who actually do exploit that, but they don't lo~ at it like that. They will sort of reason to themselves, and to you, in this sort of way: Well, I am producing so much wealth. I am giving work to so many people. I use my wealth generously: I built such-and-such hospital, I built such-and-such school. And then they will say: Well, these poor people, they just haven't got the brains; we have to do it. I'm rendering a public service; I'm putting so much wealth into circulation. And they will say this and apparently really believe it: I'm very altruistic; I'm not earning all this money for my own sake; I'm doing it for the sake of god. I'm just what they say. It's very difficult to break this down.

Hridaya: And this has existed in India - what? - hundreds of years? r;":~~

Thousands of years?

S: Thousands of years.

Hridaya: Gives you some idea of how the rich get rich.

Chintamani: What do you say?

S: Well, I used to be left speechless sometimes. (Laughter)

Ananda: Surely the thing is to say this isn't the real spirit of the teaching, it's just become a servant of the state.

S: You just have to go very, very sort of thoroughly and radically into what is spiritual life; what is religion, if you like. I mean Swami Vivekananda rather exploded against this sort of thing. He said: this is a shopkeeper's religion. So one has to sort of emphasise and re-emphasise that spiritual life is a matter of one's individual development, a raising of the level of consciousness here and now. Leave aside the questions of karma and rebirth, as it were; leave aside the question of past and future; what about now? And this is in fact where we find the emphasis: on gaining enlightenment here and now, in this life. I mean, he didn't deny the truth of karma, but he certainly didn't place great emphasis upon it. He certainly didn't speak in terms of simply ensuring for oneself a good rebirth. As far as we know, he did believe that that was possible, but his emphasis didn't lie there; his emphasis was on individual spiritual development here and now, in this life, and gaining enlightenment in this life. So perhaps one has, in the case of people like this, to make a direct frontal attack and just say: well, this isn't religion, it's got nothing to do with religion - and how do you know about your previous lives anyway? That's pure assumption on your part. You might even have to go so far as to say that.

Ananda: It seems that there's an inherent shortcoming of institutionalized religions that, sooner or later, it becomes an instrument of mere earthly modes of power - at least, as soon as you lose the Vision, as soon as you don't have anybody in that religion that has spiritual Vision. It just becomes an institution.

S~: The other possibility: you find someone like Iagarjuna apparently lending himself to that sort of outlook. After all, this is a Buddhist principle: karma and rebirth. But one can think on this: you know, how careful one has to be, that it isn't misunderstood, or that one doesn't oneself present it in the wrong sort of way, or appeal to the wrong sort of motives, you know, relatively unworthy motives. Perhaps also one can say that, in those days kings were so powerful and so independent, so autocratic, and could do so much damage, that you just had to sort of keep

them out of mischief by almost any means, prevent them doing mischief by 1/2~W2-,4c\ almost any means. A bad king was really bad in those days<sup>3</sup> at all costs they had to be kept within the bounds of morality and decent behaviour, and maybe this was just one way of doing that. I mean, what was there to restrain a king except some ethical considerations? Usually there was no other power within the state to constrain him or restrain him. And if the king wasn't of very high intelligence and not very religious-minded, well, you had to appeal to something very crude. You had to promise him later on more or less whatever he had now, only more of it. This perhaps was the only way of keeping him on the right path. (Pause) But still, it

would be better if one didn't have to do that. (Long pause) All right, 312.

Text: Verse 312 (p 64)

S: According to the footnote, "your great exaltation" refers to the king's work of temple-building. Presumably, it means that the lowly should be inspired by those activities of the king. But, "Use even all your wealth to cause the exalted to become free from pride," - what exactly do you think that means? (Pause) Possibly by the preaching of the dharma. And avoid Lust for the preaching of the dharma.

Hrida~~: The exalted would be the exalted in a worldly sense, though, wouldn't it?

S: Presumably. That isn't very clear, because there has been a reference to "if you want to be always of exalted mind, delighting in exalted deeds." (Pause) It does seem to mean exalted in a worldly sense. ~i: Because it says, "To become free from pride."

S: Right, right. Go on to 313.

Text: Verse 313 (p 64)

8: All the wealth that you have used for the doctrine, all the possessions, that you have used for the doctrine, that you've spent on the doctrine, spent on the dharma, "precedes you as good karma" It's the same sort of line of thought: that it's a good investment. Well, maybe it is, but this is not really a very sort of spiritual note to strike. It's still concerned with position within the Samsara rather than with becoming free from Samsara. It's a bit, - I mean the

modern parallel seems to be the purely mundane materialistically-oriented psychotherapy.

Hridaya: It's sort of getting one back into what's normal and regular.

S: Well, you get people to do something, which is positive in itself, but for the sake of a sort of selfish or materialistic reward. (Long pause) Right, 314.

Text: Verse 314 (p 64)

\* SID~ TWO \*

S: So in the same way when you die, your possessions will be taken over by your successor; you've got to provide for yourself in the future, in your future life\* by your good deeds here and now, by the wealth that you spend here and now on the Dharma. (Pause) I used to find personally when I was in India, sometimes it was quite difficult to associate with these sort of people because they'd be doing things for Buddhism, admittedly for Buddhism, yes, - building rest houses and temples and donating images, - but the motive with which they were doing it was so mundane, as it were, that one just didn't feel anything in common with those people, and didn't feel that they were on any sort of spiritual path, and this sometimes became quite a difficulty. I think in our own case, it's better not to have anything to do with that sort of "religion" or that sort of "Buddhism", in inverted commas, at all. I mean\* for instance, supposing we wanted a big image for Sukhavati: it would be quite easy to go off to Thailand and Burma and talk to some rich businessman and ask him for an image and stress how much merit he would get, how well-known he would become, and how famous he would become by donating a nice big image to a temple in London. You could certainly get one in that way. But the motivation on the part of that person would be at least 90% very grossly materialistic and worldly. So you might find that contact quite unpleasant and not perhaps have anything in common with that person at all, even though he provided you with a beautiful Buddha image. So this sort of thing we really must avoid. (Long pause) All right, 315.

Text: Verse 315 (p 64)

S: This is a bit better. "Through using wealth. . . there be happiness?" (Pause) All right, on to 316 then.

Text: Verse 316 (p64)

S: Well, supposing you're dying, and you want to make offerings to the Dharma, you won't be able to do so; you have to make the offerings through your ministers, and they may not choose to carry out your orders, they may

A\*+i j be much more interested in dancing attendance on the new king and doing what they think will please him rather than what they think will please you. So, the meaning is: give now, don't nit until the time of death. This applies to good actions generally; don't put them off until the time of death, do them now. So Nagarjuna goes on to say just that very

thing.

Text: Verse 317 (p 64)

S: All right, go on reading these verses one by one. They are of the same general nature that we've read in a previous chapter.

Text: Verses 318 - 325 (pp 65-66)

S: You notice that Nagarjuna says "Appoint as administrators men who are old," which certainly wouldn't be the modern policy; they retire you at 65. Right\* go straight on.

Text: Verse 326 (p 66)

S: Everything else is included under, "and so forth." (Laughter) (Long pause) Right, 327.

Text: Verse 327 (p66)

S: This lays down a very important principle. "If your kingdom, fame or desire." What is the basic principle of social and political organisation? Social and political organisation is for the sake of the Dharma. Which doesn't mean the doctrine in the sense of, you know, an intellectual teaching. It means Dharma in the sense of the moral and spiritual life. In other words, as Hegel has said, the purpose of the State is ethical. You could say that there were three kinds of state. The state that exists for the sake of desire. What would that be?

Voice: Capitalist.

S: The state which exists for the sake of desire\* for the sake of simply fulfilling people's desires

Voice: It could be capitalist.

S: Well, it could be socialist too, couldn't it? The kind of social and political organisation that is materialistic, that doesn't look beyond the satisfaction of people's material wants. And what about the state or kingdom that existed for the sake of fame? Well, this would be the warlike state\* that thought in terms of glory. So Nagarjuna says: If your state exists for the sake of the doctrine, for the Dharma, not for fame or desire, then it will be extremely fruitful; if not, its fruit will be misfortune. So this is very much the

Cis

Buddhist ideal, for the state\* for the kingdom: that it should exist for the sake of the Dharma. Probably the nearest that one has ever got to this in Buddhist history is in the case of Tibet. The old Tibet really was organised for the sake of the Dharma to a quite extraordinary degree. That's not to say it was absolutely perfect, but it really was a land, a state, a government, and an economic and social and political organisation that, on the whole\* existed for the sake of the Dharma in a quite extraordinary sort of way. Now, I mentioned some days ago, - I forget



whether it was on this retreat\* - a student of mine, a Tibetan~from Tham, a quite ordinary man, a small business man, who once told me about his life, and the life of his brothers in Tham\* in eastern Tibet. And he said a third of their income regularly went to support the ~arma. That was the normal thing<sup>3</sup> that was what everybody did. A third of your income to the Ibarma, and a third for amusements, for gambling, drinking\* entertainment\* - and a third to be put back into the household expenses and to be reinvested in the business. A third for the Dharma\* - they thought nothing of that, that was completely usual, quite customary. If we even tithed ourselves, like, say, the Mormons do, we think we're doing pretty well. But they gave a third of all their income for the Iharma. So that's just an illustration, just an example. Tibet really was organised, Tibet really did exist for the sake of the Ilarma, in the way perhaps that no other state, not even any other Buddhist, ever has done.

Ananda: I know that the Chinese propaganda people saw this as the great fault of Tibet and the reason why it should be eliminated and overcome. They saw people as totally decadent and how the church demanded people's money.

S: People gave very willingly. If you don't believe in religion, if you don't believe in spiritual life, - well, that's how it will look to you. (Pause) So, you know, what Nagarjuna says about the kingdom applies to any sort of organisational set-up. It must exist for the sake of the Dharma; it mustn't become an end in itself. That is quite important. All right, on to 328.

Text. Verse 328 (p66)

S: All right, how should they be? Go straight on.

Text: Verses 329 & 330 (p 66)

7%

S: You should not be as strict as your own ministers. I lean, they should be strict, that is their duty, but you should always temper justice with mercy, as it were. Right, straight on.

Text: Verses 331 and 332 (pp 66 and 67)

S: So, "Especially generate compassion... nature is great." If anyone has fallen, if he's committed any terrible sins, you shouldn't think so much in terms of punishment\* you should think more in terms of showing compassion and feeling sorry for those people. Right 333.

Text: Verse 333. (p 67)

S: Mi, don't think in terms of perpetual imprisonment, or even lengthy periods of imprisonment.

Right, straight on.

Text: Verse 334 (p 67)

S: What is the layman's vow? Laymen's vow means the Upasaka's precepts. "For each one who you do not think to free..", you will lose the Upasaka's precepts you will lose your status as an Upasaka. What do you think this means, why should this be? In other words, Nagarjuna is saying that keeping people in prison indefinitely, even if they have committed offences is incompatible with your Upasaka precepts. Why is this?

Uttara: It's harming other living beings.

S: Well, you could say what about the living beings that they have harmed? By keeping them locked up you prevent them from doing further mischief. Couldn't you argue like that? He does say "think to free", not exactly free. You must at least have the will to free them, if it is possible. You shouldn't enjoy keeping people in prison, you shouldn't want to keep them in prison. You should be happy to release them if that is possible, otherwise you violate your Upasaka precepts. Because you lost the vow, faults will constantly be amassed. (long pause) Right, straight on, 335.

Text: Verse 335 (p ~7)

S: ~ do you think Nagarjuna is having so much to say about the treatment of prisoners?

Alisa: Their cue was particularly bad.

S: Mc, I think the reason is that according to Indian ideas, the King's specific function was to punish, was to administer justice. There wasn't the general idea of the King, you know, being the administrator of an all purpose government, there was no idea of a welfare state, apart from these quite

simple matters of providing, you know, wells and so on which Nagarjuna has already mentioned in the previous chapter\* So, I mean, what was the King's main job? It was to punish offenders. To punish criminals, to punish robbers and murderers to execute them if necessary. This is why one of the terms for politics is 'danda shastra' which means the science of punishment, literally, 'the big stick' 'the science' or 'the law of the big stick'. That was the King's function, to punish. So, therefore, this aspect was very prominent, and punishing meant either executing people or putting them in prison, or mutilating them, and so on. That was considered by many of the ancient Indian law givers to be the King's primary function. Or, if we would say, to maintain law and order. The King was a sort of, you know, police chief, a glorified police chief as it were, and tax gatherer. That was the ancient Indian well, not idea, but very often practice, of kingship. Basically the King collected taxes and he maintained law and order. Well you've got much the same sort of thing in England during the middle ages. Those were the King's two primary functions. So there would be lots of prisoners, lots of people in the jails, so therefore Nagarjuna has quite a bit to say on the subject.

Hridaia: Also Nagarjuna and the Mahayana, the Bodhisattva ideal, would, perhaps, you know, be drawn, like to those areas of this particular subject.

S: Ni, yes. Alright 336.

Text: Verse 336 (p 67)

8: Mm, and this is quite important, this is quite unusual for it's t~me. There isn't any sort of punitive idea, that wh~tever sentence is given should be given with a view to reformation, not with a view to simple retribution, as it were. 10 you get the idea? That if you send someone to prison, or you fine him, the idea is not just to punish him, to make him suffer because he made somebody else suffer~ the idea is to try to reform him, to try to make him a better man. ~ght 337.

Text: Verse 337 (p 67)

S: So Nagarjuna as a Buddhist doesn't beleive in the death penalty. bwen murderers should not be executed. He said they should be banished without being killed or tormented. This ~oesn~t really solve the problem, unless you've got scie distant area, where they can be sent to and where they can't do any further miechief.

Voice: Australia.

S: Australia, yes. bat, you know, you weren't transported in the old days for killing, you were executed for killing, you were transported for stealing a sheep. So it's as though the ~qlish p.nal code was iuoh harsher even two hundred years ago, than that envisaged by Nagariuna was. Whether any King ever put this into practice is another natter, bat some Buddhist Kings certainly did try very hard. Not only in India but in other parts of Asia. ~ght 338.

Text: Verse 338 (p 67)

S: In other words, maintain a CTh. ~, this is mentioned in ancient Indian works on politics, that is Hindu work., and the whole art of espionage, and surveillance by secret polise was highly developed in ancient India. Informers were regularly used. Spys were regularly used.

Voice: Isn't this again promoting dishonesty?

S a In what way?

Joice: (mumbling) °.dishonest...you have to inform...

°S: I saw a lot of this in India, I mean, er, while I was in Kalimpong there was so muoh of this sort of thing going on. Sometimes it was quite unpleasent. One sometimes couldn't trust people because you knew, you know, where they went and (what they said?). So you were careful what you said in front of thei.

Voice: Naybe 'agents' is a provacoative word?

S: Mi.

Voice: 'ling in touch with the people.

S: I don't think actually that is wh~ is ieant, because, er this was the regular practice of Indian Kings to maintain what we would call a OId. It wasn't just to know what people were thinking, also to know, you know, whether anyone was plotting against you. After all, you were, you know, an Autocrat, and iaybe you had gained your throne not be regular successOon, er, but, you know, by force, an£ you' d always be on the lookout in oase somebody else tried to take it from you by force0

Hridava: You might have agents for agents.

S: jtgth~ yes. So maybe, you knOw, Nagarjuna accepts these things as part of the regular order. I7~ean, how else was a ling to govern? He had to know what was going on. Alright 339.

Text: Verse 339 (p 68)

S: Nim. Again, good general advios, eh? light on to 340.

4+4

Text: Verse 340 (p 68)

S: Well here Nagarjuna waxes a bit poetical. The populace is just like a flock of birds, and they 'ewill alight upon the royal tree whioh provides the shade of patience, the flourishing flowers of respect and large fruits of resplendent giving." The king ii imagined U a great tree, in which the birds, i.e. all the peop~e, take refuge ana shelter. Right 341.

Text: Verse 341 (p68)

S: Ni , the people don't mind a strong king, they like a strong government; provi£ed of course he as it were sugars the pill, and he's generous. Actually you find this, I've found this in India, I mean both among Indians and among Tibetans. If you've got people dependent upon you, if you're the master, as it were, they like you to be strong an£ dectsi:e~ en-d give the orders, but to be generous, too, to give them things and look after them. If you do this, well, people are quite happy to have a strong master or strong ruler. This seems to be very much the t.iperament of many people in the East. And certainly it seeis to have been so in the old days. !~e ~i~ whose nature is to give is liked if he is strong, like a sugared pastry hardened with cardamom pepper." Reminds me of, sort of, good old Henry VIII who was hot tempered and haughty and strong, but quiti generous at times, and he was very popular, and this is one of the things that Eaglish historians have found it quite difficult to understand: why King Henry VIII was so popular with the people, even though he was so brntal with his wives. He was sort of strong fisted, but open handed. Alright 342.

Text: verse 342 (p 68)

S: I must say, we were talking about Tibet, in this particular work, he's very well known in Tibet, and taken quite seriously by the Islai Lama's government, not only with regard to the

purely spiritual teaching, b'Lt, you know, with regard to the more practical teachings adressed to the King or th. government as such. (pause) Aright 343.

Text: Verse 343 (p 68)

S: So Nagar~una, as it were, agrees that the ring has become king, he has attained his Kingdom, or obtained his Kingdom, on account of Ms virtues tn previous lives, so he skillfully turns to the King and says: Well, if you won your kingdom by virtue, it's very inappropriate that you try to look after it by any other than virtuous means. So that is, in a way, quite

if+~ D'~o a fair arguient. So, it was won by virtue, therefore to act for it without virtue is wrong. In other words, he's trying, by all leans, to induce the King to follow the right path. (pause) Aright 344. ~ext: Verse 344 (p 68) S: Don't squander the royal resources, otherwise, you know, you'll be short of supplies in the future, presumably, in this life itself. Right 345. Text: Verse 345 (p68) S: Ni, what do you think he means by the iings resources as distinct fro° the Kingdom'.? Possibly he means that share which is set aside for the Kings

personal no.? Or he light even mean his mental and physical resources (Long pause) Aright I think we'll leave the King there for today, because with verse M6 we take up a series of verse a that introduce a somewhat different subjct. Maybe we could go back over what we've done this afternool and see if there is any further point you want to go into. Hasn't been perhaps quite so inspiring as some of the other sections that we've been into. It's plain, straightforward, not very idealistic advice always, but no doubt quite necessary for someone in the sort of position that the King was in.

Uttara: Did you see it all in terms of,well, I think it is in terms of, the King's Pure Land, setting up his Pare Land?

S: Ii a way, yes, if you have a good King, if you have a good governmemt, then, you know, to some extent, within the limitations imposed be the nature of the situation, you can set up a sort of PtLr. Land. You could cay, in a way, Tibet was a sort of Pure lad. Iwen though, you know, people had to work for their living, and you did get the distinction of the sexes, but apart from those things, yes, it was a Pare Land. The Dhaama was very easily available and you could very easily practice it, if you wanted to practice it there were all sorts of facilities, plenty of encouragement, plenty of support. Naly good teachers. You could learn and practice almost anything you waited to, within, you know, the stream of the Ibama. So it was a sort of hire Land. Chairman Mao, of course, claims that China is now a hire Land, but, you know, even though thingd are quite good, they're not, certainly not good from a spiritual point of view. (pause) Chairman Mao I beleive has said that the communists are the true Nahayana Buddhists, and they've turned this land itself, or this Earth itself, in

~~~yffi~\ other words China, into a hire Land, you know, with their Communist prograile.

It's the real happy laid. And to ~me °xtent no doubt it is, but perhaps not a very high level of happiness.

Ajita: Do you think if they brought back the Buddhist principles it would be almost perfect, in a sense?

S: Well, perhaps it would be, but whether that would be possible without some modification of the existing system is difficult to say.

Uttara: The happiness is due to the overall state of the country, it's not individual.

S: There seems to be very little individuality in China, people do things in groups. Individuality of any kind, it seems, is not encouraged.

Hridiia: This work could well be known to Mao Tse Tung.

8: First, yes, his mother, apparently, was a pious Buddhist. I don't know whether it has been translated into Chinese, it's quite possible. But this sort of material could be well known to him, or at least, he could have some acquaintance with it. (long pause) And talking of Buddhist kings, I remember when I was staying in Kalimpong, for six months I was the guest of Prince Luthakin, who was a Burmese prince, who would have been king of Burma, had Burma continued to be a monarchy. Well, he was the nephew of the previous King, King Thibor, and he was the last king of Burma, deposed by the British, and had married King Thibor's second daughter, who was his cousin. And I remember him telling me quite a bit about King Thibor, whom he remembered. Then, he tried to tell me that King Thibor was notorious, because, as a bad King, under the result of the instigation of his Queen Supayorate, who was known as Cobra Woman, he murdered all his close relations, about, oh, between seventy and eighty of them, he had them all trampled to death by elephants, that was in the 1880's. But Prince Luthakin assured me, he was a very pious Buddhist, and always fed the monks at the temples and invited them to the palace every month and fed them, he was a very pious Buddhist. So that's quite significant, And this is not untypical of some so-called Buddhist Kings. I mean, he had all his relations murdered, but he invited the monks to the palace, and gave them alms. So, no doubt, it would have been a very bold monk who had dared to rebuke the king for having his relatives trampled to death by elephants. Specially when the King had just presented him with a good meal. But, you know, it's very difficult for us to

sort

imagine that sort of situation, and that sort of life, that sort of system. This was a very, very, notorious episode in Burmese history, and less than a hundred years ago. I mean, this is within living, well, not exactly within living memory, but I've had it from a person who knew very well, the person who was responsible for it.

Hridi-a: It's a strange kind of (unclear word) that you do come across, (doesn't seem it's) incompatible that you're giving to monks and murdering relatives.

S: No, yes. Well you have parallels in the history of Thibet.

Ananda: Maybe it's just a simple expiation, that you balance a crime with a...

S: Perhaps, but I think in the case of some of these rulers it wasn't that they think so

little of human life, it's just, you know, putting out of the way, liquidating certain people, that have to be removed, they don't think all that much of it. And at the same time they keep up their offerings to the monks, maybe not as spiritual men, but as magicians. I mean, Thibor was always very superstitious. He believed that the monks could give charms and spells to his soldiers, so that they couldn't be defeated by the British, he believed in these things very strongly. But of course, he was defeated by the British when it came to the point, who quite unceremoniously just removed him and packed him off to India, and shut him up there at a place called Zathagiri near Bombay, where Prince Luthakin and his wife lived with him for some years, before they were shifted to Kalimpong. And he was full of admiration for King Thibor, he thought very highly of him. And I remember this same Prince Inthakin, I got to know him quite well, I once asked him: Well, what are the things you've most enjoyed in life? And he again was a very pious Buddhist, he was very interested in Theosophy, by the way, he was a Theosophist, too, and used to belong to the local lodge of the Theosophical Society, and he'd read quite a bit about, you know, meditation, Buddhism, but he was also very fond of hunting, so, he was very fond of rifles, revolvers, and things like that. And when I asked him what were the things he'd most enjoyed in life, he said, ah, two things, he said, meditation, and when I kill something. (Laughter) You see? The two great pleasures in life, very typical. Very typical of a Burmese King. So maybe this King was a bit of that kind. You know, we're not accustomed to meeting these very full-blooded people who can do exactly as they want, who've got unlimited power and

don't hesitate to use it, and who are sort of bundles of contradictions as we would think. But, you know, sometimes you feel angry and another time, you might be getting on with your Netta Bhavana quite well, but if you were a King, what would it mean? You got angry, you had two or three people killed and you felt in a good Netta Bhavana mood, you built another temple (laughter) You know* you do that kind of thing on a big, extreme scale, because you have the power. But maybe if you were in a King's position, if you got really angry, you'd have the person killed. You'd think nothing of it, you're so accustomed to exercising the power, you'd just say, "off with his head." Or, if you felt a bit pious that afternoon, you'd say, well, build another temple, I'd rather like to see another temple. (laughter) (Words obscured by laughter) . . . scurrying around, you know, drawing up plans, and building it, and, hey presto% - in a few weeks time, another temple.

Hridiia: In a sense that's quite an honest attitude, isn't it, maybe we in the west feel so guilty about having the desire to kill someone, or anger, that we would pretend we...

S: Well yes, in a way it is more honest, but it's also worse because other people are actually made to suffer, whereas your angry thoughts don't produce that sort of effect. So this is why, perhaps, it is said (unclear words) power always corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. If you've absolute power, well, you can do exactly as you wish, there's nothing to restrain you, nothing to check you, except perhaps some moral consideration, and then you see how strong or how weak moral considerations really are. So I mean maybe Nagarjuna was having to deal with a person of this sort. Hence the sort of arguments that he uses.

Anaida: I forget who it was, but someone once said, the true test of true morality, or true ethical behaviour, is to think how you would act, if you were totally free from fear, free of all retribution, and if you could only say that you wouldn't do any harm in that situation, with no

possibility of retribution, that is true morality.

S: Yes, right, -. (long pause) All right let's conclude there, for the time being.

Break.

S: Page 69, verse 346.

Text: Verse 346 (p69)

S: Nagarjuna is, as it were, referring to the King as though he fits a Universal
[481]

Monarch. Actually he isn't, but this is just a polite, not to say flattering, way of addressing the King. So he says that "a Universal Monarch rules over the four continents," that is to say over the whole known world. But even though he rules over the whole known world, his pleasures are simply two in number, pleasures of the body, pleasures of the mind. So in that respect he doesn't differ from anybody else. All right 347.

Text: Verse 347 (p 69)

S: Mm, so "fleeting feelings... of pain," To what extent do you think that is true? or do you think it's always true? Can all pleasures, all bodily pleasures, all physical pleasures, be regarded as being simply a lessening of pain? Is there ever any sort of pure, unadulterated, pleasure?

Voice: NO, because everything is suffering, everything is pain, however, there's this underlying substratum of pain all the time, you're just lessening it a bit.

S: Right. So what is that sort of substratum of pain, what is that due to?

Voice: (Unclear)

S: Well, that's the cause, but...

~: If you're losing the physical pleasure?

S: There is that, too, very often you can't enjoy the pleasure properly because you're so afraid of losing it. But, I mean, underlying even the pleasure is the general, the basic unsatisfactoriness of your life itself. Conditioned existence as such, and you never altogether forget that. I mean, it's like when you go out for a weekend and you know that you've got some crisis at the office to come back to, or maybe some domestic upheaval to come back to; the thought of that never really leaves you, all during the weekend. You may in a sense be enjoying your weekend, enjoying various physical pleasures, but at the back of your mind, underneath your superficial consciousness, there's the sort of thought or the feeling of what you have to go back to...(tape ends)

[482]

THE PRECIOUS GARLAND

S: but supposing, I mean supposing, could there be a situation in which you were quite healthy? You didn't have any sort of financial trouble, and everything was alright at home, no trouble with the job. Do you think it would be possible to experience or to enjoy a completely unalloyed feeling of physical pleasure? (pause) Do you think you possibly could?

Hridaya: Only if you were completely absorbed in that situation or circumstance in which there was pleasure. But that (unclear)

S: But then again what does one mean by absorbed? If it's a sort of unmindful absorption, (where) that unmindfulness is a sort of curtailment of one's being. So in a way that is painful. You've limited yourself, and if you're mindfully absorbed then you can't forget the fact that the pleasure that you're enjoying is not going to last. (pause) But perhaps one could say that there is in fact no, you know, physical feeling of pleasure which is completely unalloyed. I mean not only that but all pleasure in a sense is a sort of distraction from the basic pain or, at least, unsatisfactoriness or inadequacy of conditioned existence. I mean quite often you get the experience of gaining, I mean, something that you had looked forward to for a long time, in a sense, you know, enjoying it, but when you're actually enjoying it, right almost at the centre of your consciousness, there is the feeling, well, that it's not all that much after all, that there isn't that much enjoyment in it, even though you may have looked forward to it for a very long time. (pause)

Ananda: Is it not possible for this I mean is the condition of pleasure, one of the conditions of pleasure, that one has also complete mindfulness? Is this pleasure not possible, even within its very limited confines, just by limiting one's mindfulness?

S: Yes, well, you can certainly enjoy that particular object, you know, by limiting one's mindfulness. But the point I made was that, in a sense, the limiting of one's mindfulness is in itself painful. In as much as you're restricting your own being, you're cramping yourself, as it were, so that you could enjoy - that particular thing.

S: (cont) So that produces a sort of uncomfortable or uneasy kind of feeling.

?Punya: Surely all pleasure is dependent on pain for its existence?

S: Well it is in the sense that, for instance, take the question of eating, you know you enjoy eating. Why do you eat? Because you're hungry. Hunger, you know, in a way, is a pain. So you eat to alleviate the pain of hunger. Or when you desire something very much, that desire can be quite painful, because there is an element of frustration there, you're not getting what you want. So you acquire that particular object, not because you really want it, but to alleviate the desire for it. One can hardly speak in those circumstances of, you know, really enjoying something. (pause) So therefore Nagarjuna says "physical feelings of pleasure are only a lessening of pain." There is a sort of basic, underlying unsatisfactoriness of one's ordinary life, one's, you know, general conditioned existence and physical pleasures alleviate that, so, yes, they are pleasures to some extent. But there's only a part of one's consciousness, only an aspect of oneself, which is enjoying the pleasure but there's the same sort of dull ache underneath all the time. In that way when you've got physical pain and you're at the same time eating something that you like, well, you certainly enjoy the taste of that particular thing you're eating, but the pain none-the-less, in your body is still there. (pause)

Ajita: Would that go for sort of, selfless actions, you know helping somebody maybe?

S: But the problem⁴that er, Nagarjuna is speaking of physical feelings of pleasure. It reminds me of Goethes Faust, you remember, there was this bargain struck between Faust and Mephistopholes, and Mephistopholes promised to give Faust whatever he wanted, any worldly thing, any object of enjoyment, even the most beautiful woman who ever existed in history, that is Helen of Troy. What could one offer more than that? Political power, everything. And at any time Faust was to say, "Stop, let me hold on to this, this is a completely satisfying experience." Then his soul was to go to Mephistopholes So Mephistopholes gives him all these things one after the other. But Faust is never able to say that. He never finds anything completely satisfying. Doesn't find anything so completely enjoyable that he wants it to last for ever. So Mephistopholes in the end loses his wager. He doesn't get Faust's soul. So this is, in a way, a sort of parable of the soul of man, if you like, that it can't be truly and permanently satisfied by anything that is mundane, anything which is conditioned.

S (cont) There is always some fly in the ointment, as it were, always some flaw, always some imperfection. There is never a complete enjoyment. You never feel that you'd like to rest in that forever. (pause) So pleasures do exist; there is such a thing as a physical feeling of pleasure, but they're only a lessening of pain. They're not completely satisfying. I mean the comparison that Nagarjuna made before was, "scratching the itch." It's quite pleasant to scratch the itch but it's better not to have the itch at all! (pause) Also one can look at this in a sort of context of neurotic craving. I mean, very often why does one;~after a pleasure? Not because it happens to come one's way, but because of a dull feeling of frustration, boredom and emptiness. So you go after something pleasurable to try to fill that, that void. So in this sense also, physical feelings of pleasure are only a lessening of pain. A lessening of the pain of boredom very often. You don't know what else to do. You feel a bit dull, a bit bored, a bit empty, a bit fed up, a bit dissatisfied. So you go around looking for something pleasureable, even if it's only a chocolate or a cup of tea or something like that or you put a record on the record player, not because you really want to listen to it but because you're fed up with being so bored.

Ajita: What essentially is it, this emptiness and boredom which sort of creeps in?

S: Well what is it?

Uttara: It's not (being) in touch with your deeper ~s. You know it's that, aspirations and things like that. (You crave with)

S: It's as though this boredom, I mean in a way, ~oredom is a very positive state, in the long run at least. It means that, yes you're not in contact with anything deeper within yourself, anything more satisfying, but at least for the time being there are no distractions. Y0u're not enjoying the things with which you usually cover up the fact that you're not in contact with anything deeper within within you. ~o the fact that you're not tn contact, yes, is more nakedly exposed. So boredom can be a very positive experience. The important thing is that one should stay with the experience of boredom and try to feel one's way through into, you know, something deeper, something truer, something more spontaneous within oneself. And then act from or act out of that, rather than try to alleviate the b~redom by rushing off to some distraction or other.

4

S: (cont) If you feel really bored, it's a really good thing just to sit down and let yourself feel really bored, experience the boredom more fully. And after a while you find it passes off and you start feeling quite positive. You start experiencing your- self. And after that just because you feel positive, just because you're experiencing yourself, you'll feel like doing

something. But if the minute you start feeling bored you either turn on the radio or get out a record or ring somebody up then you've lost the opportunity which the boredom presented. Therefore regard boredom as a very positive state.

A'ita: I think I was feeling the dilemma that, I ee like that, I feel that maybe I should be in a positive state, so I run off and try and jog myself into a positive state.

S: Well you should be in a positive state but then the question is, I mean, how do you get into that? I think that one gets into it really most quickly by staying with the boredom. I mean the boredom is a sort of intermediate state between being really in touch with, you know, deeper and truer levels within oneself and just being distracted. For the ti~ne being you're neither the one nor the other, hence the feeling of emptiness. You're neither really in touch with yourself nor being distracted from the fact that you're not really in touch with yourself. There's neitner a more true enjoyment, nor is the~a superficial enjoyment either. It's much more positive to stay with the lack of true enjoyment rather than to rush off into a superficial transitory enjoyment. Usually I think, with a reasonably healthy person, the state of boredom shouldn't last more than a few hours. Has anyone ever tried to do this? Just stay with the state of boredom.

Uttara: Yes it's something you just, you tend to kdrop off or something), but then it maybe if you drop off you sort of wake up refresned and ready for it, ready for something.

S: I mean no doubt you drop off because you feel tired Why do you feel tired? Because of all the energy, I think, that is required, all the effort that is required, to stop oneself going in search of distrations This requires quite an eflort to check this, and you may well feel tired, so you sleep. but, I mean, by sleeping you ossioly ~et into contact, even in the sleep state itself, with something deeper within yourself, so tnat you wake up refreshed, positive and not bored.

Alaya: °They say at Sukhavati there isn't much chance of coming into contact with this feeling because it always turns to

5

S: Feelings of boredom?

V: Oh I don't know so much. Oh I don't know (unclear)

Alaya: Just doing the job I started, when I~was housekeeper I just (found) there's always some~hing you can do so you can never actually even take the opj~ortunity to sit down and

really get bored.

Ananda: Surely you can do a job and yet get bored with the job as well as anything. Even though you're doing it very vigorously. There is an underlying strata of your mind which is not really wanting to do it.

S: So when you're bored with work that you're doing, you're in the same situation. You're not in contact with anything deeper within yourself out of which you're doing the work. At the same time the work itself is not functioning as a distraction.

Alaya: So what do you do then? You just carry on working?

S: Well, depending on the situation. You either carry on working or you decide it would be better-not to. (pause)

Alaya: I really felt the difference coming up here especially last time, you came up to do the (unclear) so much emptiness and quietness.

Uttara: Does the word boredom originate from, or do you think there is any connection with bardo and boredom?

S: I think there certainly isn't. Do you want to know what the word really means? Go up into my study. You'll see there is a four volume dictionary on the bottom row of my bookshelf. Bring the volume which begins 'BO' or includes 'BO'. This is a Webster's New International. (laughter)

V: You must define it as having more energy than the situation requires.

S: More energy than the situation requires? Well potentially at least, yes? (pause) So that the greater part of your energies are held in abeyance. They can't be used.

Francis Gritton: Certain aspects of your job are intrinsically boring; such as carrying out official instructions and things which are intrinsically almost meaningless. You've got to do them.

6

Francis Gritton: (cont) Should you try and sort of create an interest in those things? I mean

S: Well, it depends on what one means by intrinsically boring. Does one mean that

anybody would be bored by them under any circumstances? No, I'm sure there are some people who would find it really fascinating to do that work. But you don't. Maybe you have done it hundreds of times before. (pause) I think it's a question of balancing out. You know, if there are other things that one is doing, perhaps in connection with the same job, perhaps not, but if there are other things that one is doing that one does find interesting and not boring, then your non-bored state of mind should carry on through even those boring activities. But if you have to engage in those really boring activities all day (unclear - tape sticks) There's probably nothing that we do that we wouldn't find boring if we had to do it all the time. (pause)

Ananda: I think it was Keats who said, "death is life's high need" (pause) It's only death which makes life really (unclear - ? free from boredom) I think if it went on forever it would be (unclear)

Uttara: And, you know, the Buddha, I think, said, just reading, you know he says, "the meaning of life is death"

S: (looking up dictionary) I wonder if one is referred back to the verb (pause), - to bore, a hole made by boring? (laughter - pause) V.-(unclear) make a mistake.

S: Yes (unclear) empty space (pause) I mean it doesn't really say very much, though perhaps a different word from "to bore", in this instance "to make a hole, ~perhaps ennui or dullness as a state or malady originally referred to as a (French?) disposition. Also one who suffers from this affliction. Hence a person or thing that wearies by proximity or dullness. Firesome person or affair, one that causes ennui. But even, I mean, they don't know the etymology, but if it has one I think it's probably connected with "to bore", in this instance "to make a hole", "to make an empty space."

Ananda: Isn't the Greek "boros" connected?

S: Boros or boreus?

Ananda: Well I was thinking of (unclear)

V

S: Well I think that's all one word. Anyway, the connection, if there is really one here, seems to be with emptiness. But there is, as I said, some time ago, this idea of boredom is also connected with being prevented from giving expression to one's own energies. As with when someone goes on talking to you, just goes on and on and on, you might have been

interested to begin with but if you get no chance, no opportunity, to reply or to respond or say something of your own you start feeling terribly bored. Even though, had you been able to interject any comment, you might have found the conversation, or the discussion quite interesting. But the fact that you are not able to come back, as it were, you are not able to have your say, produces a feeling of frustration and boredom. That person is boring into you, as it were. It's too one sided.

So is that the same sort of experience as when you have a repetitious piece of work to do? I mean, in a way it's boring into you. You can't come back because it doesn't stimulate you enough. I mean, the energy is there, the energy is latent, but there's nothing to arouse it, you have to be receiving and receiving all the time. Receiving something that perhaps you don't want to receive. Or even if you wanted to receive it, if you go on having to receive it for too long then you encounter or experience an inner resistance and that is also experienced as boredom, a state of being bored or bored into or drilled into. You're prevented from being yourself. So there's an empty space where there should have been you, an active spontaneous you. (pause)

Ananda: Maybe one could go again on general principles and that because what you said earlier about boredom, the Buddha whenever he felt any fear or anything like that, he would really not do anything at all but just experience it. Could you say more generally about that in connection with boredom?

S: Well this is what I said earlier on that if you are feeling bored don't go off in search of distraction. Just stay with the feeling of boredom and you will, sooner or later, come into contact with something more real and positive within yourself and then be able to act out of that. This is: in fact, the only thing that one can really do, the only sensible thing to do. But boring work, I think that one has to, I mean I think there is a question of balancing out. There has to be at least some things in your life which are interesting. Things you find interesting to do, and the positive state of mind you get in or into as a result of doing those things should carry you through the things that you find boring.

8

S: (cont) I mean, there are quite a number of things, that, as I said, we'd find boring if we had to do them all the time but if we've got other interesting things that we do and we just have to spend a bit of time doing these things, we don't mind, we don't bother. We can even preoccupy ourselves with our own thoughts or, you know, just experience our own general positivity while doing those things, we don't find them boring.

Ananda: It's very much connected with involvement, isn't it? Because some jobs I could do

just all day without even thinking about the time or not eating or anything. I~r quite happy just to go on with it. (unclear) in time doing it. ~ut with other things one gets bored within an hour.

S: Well it depends how much of oneself is involved. Tf one is totally involved then nothing becomes boring because you start feeling bored when too little of yourself is involved. Especiall something which~you've done lots of times before, y do it very well, there's no stimulati~n in it, there's nothing creative. So the~~ a whole, big part of your~elf, that is the more spontaneous, inventive, creative part, that isn't involved in that work, that is not required so that just remains unused, it just stagnates, then you start feeling bored with that particular job. Whereas maybe the first~~~~u did it, when you were still learning that particular piece of work, you found it quite interesting and not boring in the least or maybe when you were a young civil servant and you got an important complicated directive from higher up you might have had quite a lot of fun working it all out and what it really meant, how you were to implement it. But when you get to the 500th one or the 1000th one after so many years of service and you can do it almost without thinking well it just isn't any fun anymore. Or even some rather complex practical operation, it's rather fun figuring it all out the first or even the second or third time, but when you've done it 100 times it gets boring because that inventive, creative, spontaneous side of your nature isn't involved. So if you're engaged in a whole series of activities none of which bring into play that more creative, or at least inventive side, then the whole day is boring. Y0u need to do new tnings, things you have to think about and take an interest in, things that make demands on you in that sort of way. This is why piece work is so demoralising isn't it? Fancy spending your whole life making a button or part~~£ a button.

--

S: (cont) Or devoting yourself to a particular stage Tn the production of a button. Supposing you're the man who stamps the holes in the button and you do this all day. I'm sure there are people in Britain who spend all day stamping holes in buttons.

Attara: When I was working in a place that made cans; oil cans, and there were people (working) on this conveyor line with a little piece of metal which had to go on in a certain position, they used to just sit there and knock this little piece of metal in. I mean they could have had a machine for it but they had to have people for it or something because it's a very sort of They just had to stand there for hours really.

S: Also another thing is perhaps the more creative you are the more easily bored you get (pause) Yeah? I mean leaving aside flighty mindedness and all that. A rather dull unimaginative sort of person doesn't get bored so easily. They can do piece work. They keep

them happy with~little piped music and cups of tea at intervals, that's all they require and a bit of chat in between. They don't mind what you would, perhaps, consider boring repititious work. They can do it year after year.

V: Apparently women, particularly women, are more capable of doing that sort of work than men.

S: Well, I don't know whether 'capable' is quite the word, but I know what you mean, yes, this is said.

V: They grumble less.

S: Yes, well, if that is so and I have also read that, It means that women are less cre~tive.

Ala a: I get the feeling that (unclear) you very quic ly become an angry young man.

S: Amidst all the contented elderly women (?)

V: Yes, that's right!

V: Well you'd think that you'd simply want to smash Tt rather than let them carry on.

Ananda: There was a very interesting dispute recently in the Times, re~orted in the Times, about a factory in Scotland where there was a strike and it was done by wo~flen and the women had gone on strike because they weren't getting paid enough or something, but they said, the management said that the women were

10

Ananda; (cont) °. not really as productive as men. But the women said tney were more productive because the men were always grumbling and finding faults, finding reasons to go on strike and that sort of thing, and that was their argument. I think there's something in that.

S: In that sense women are better workers.

Ananda: In that sense, yes.

S: If it's a question of that kind of work

Ananda: Because they put 1~~p with more and are

7~~noaissatisfied easily (unclear)

S: Anyway this has all stemmed from just these two Tines of Nagarjuna: "Physical feelings of pleasure are only 0 lessening of ~ain. Mental pleasures are made by thought, created only by the intellect."

'Mental pleasures are made by thought.' What do you think he means by mental pleasures? Don't forget he's speaking of worldly pleasures.

V: (unclear) ambitions, plans?

S: Ambitions, plans, yes, these are created by thought. Plans of conquest.

V: Holidays?

S:Holidays, yes. The pleasures that you get from thinking about something, this is just made by thought, created only by the intellect. (pause) I mean you get a certain amount of pleasure from reading the news- paper. How much of our pleasure is created by thought?

V: ~great deal?

V: Anticipation.

Hridaya: I think if you go to the factory situation; I worked for a couple of years in a factory~they did this kind of work, just doing small typical assembly line work. The pleasure there, you got the impression, was caused by thought. By reading the paper. People were just doing the same mechanical activity but you could see in their minds they were turning over the wage packet at the end of the week, a football game, a holiday.

11

S: I got a bit of a shock a few years ago when we started gettThg a Sunday paper that very early in January you start getting the advertisements for your Summer holidays. That seemed very surprising to me (laughter). Why, in the midst of Winter, one was being tempted by these colour brochures and sunny Mediterranean beaches and golden sands and palm trees~ So what I meant was that there must be millions of people who, even in the midst of January, are mentally preoccupying themselves with the anticipation of Summer holidays and no doubt deriving a great deal of pleasure from that. So here is a mental pleasure made by

thought, created only by the intellect.

?V: It comes right after Christmas really, there is a complete exhaustion of material pleasures and then they bring in the Summer holidays - something to look forward to,

Ananda: Literally on Boxing Day isn't it?

?V: Yes it is, because of course, no one wants to have then all the material pleasures people have spent their money on

S: Then of course there's the mental pleasure of dreams.

?V: They've sort of dreamed you up to Christmas, then they dream you up to the Summer holidays.

Alaya: What about intuition, sort of just nature's synthetic pleasure, is that a mental pleasure?

S: Well is it a mental pleasure, or is it a physical pleasure or a mixture of both? Do you ever in fact get a physical pleasure which is purely a physical pleasure, unmixed by any element of thought, (or unmixed with any element of thought)? You don't really. You might get a pleasure which is purely mental though in fact that is doubtful, strictly speaking.

Ananda: Sexual pleasure is one of the purest in that sense.

S: Well even if, for instance, take the case of the Summer holidays I mean, if you get mental pleasure out of projecting yourself forward, imagining yourself on those golden sands; where did you get the golden sands from? The golden sands represent a physical experience which you are recreating, it isn't purely mental. If there is any sort of purely mental experience, it is the experience of, say, meditation or maybe the experience of art.

12

S: (cont) But perhaps one could not even say that the experience of art was purely mental because if you see a painting, well a painting is a physical object. So even though, in a sense, the enjoyment is mental through the mind, the painting itself is a physical thing. (pause) And even, say, with regard to sexual pleasure, if you leave aside the purely organic sensation, there's a whole sort of mental side there too. Mainly made up of projections; (pause) perhaps there are, sort of, pure physical pleasures like on a very hot day you drink a cup of very cold water, well perhaps, that's the nearest you would get to a pure physical pleasure.

Ajita: In massage .

S: I don't know about massage, because with massage, yes you could have the pure physical sensation, but what about the feelings of comfort and relaxation and security and closeness? This can be as much mental as physical. So probably there are purely mental pleasures and probably there are purely physical pleasures, but in between there's a whole wide range of pleasures which are mixed. So it is very difficult to tell to what extent they are physical and to what extent they are mental. But certainly meditation could be regarded, in it a higher stages, as a purely mental pleasure. In higher stages of meditation, sense experience, sense consciousness, is in fact inhibited. You may not hear a sound, you may not even feel anything, that's what gives you your sensation of floating, virtually. (pause) Well, we're on to 348.

Verse 348 Ajita: "All the wealth of worldly pleasures are but a lessening of suffering or are only creations of thought, thus they are in fact unreal."

S: So, 'all the wealth of worldly pleasures are but a lessening of suffering or are only creations of thought.' All worldly pleasures are like this. After all there are only two kinds of worldly pleasure, physical and mental, as Nagarjuna is only saying, as he has already said. So the entire wealth of those pleasures, being either a lessening of suffering or only creations of thought are in fact not real. (pause) In the sense that, if one looks into things, if one analyses things in this way, you begin to wonder whether there's any such thing as pleasure at all. Whether you have in fact ever experienced any pleasure. Physical pleasure or mental pleasure. (pause) To the extent that you wonder whether you have, in fact,

13

Ajita

S: (cont) .. ever experienced any such thing as pleasure, to that extent pleasure is not real. You begin to wonder whether it was ever there at all. Did I really enjoy myself? Or you come back, say, from a day's outing and someone asks, "Did you have a good time?" "Yes, I had a good time, really enjoyed myself." But then you just think well can you really say that you really enjoyed yourself, what actually happened? If you, sort of, look through the whole course of the day, well maybe there were intervals of actual freedom, occasions when you didn't feel at all happy and just in between, sort of, experiences that somewhat alleviated that; which distracted you from it for a bit, made you forget about it. So that is your enjoyable day.

Ajita: It's almost as if you stick a label "pleasure" on the whole sort of experience because you feel you should enjoy it or something.

S: Yes.

Ananda: If you spent £5 on getting to Blackpool, you bloody well got to enjoy it'.
(laughter - pause)

S: In the old days there used to be an expression, "A man of pleasure" or even "a woman of pleasure".

"A man of pleasure" meant a man whose life was devoted to the pursuit of pleasure. Usually eating, drinking, sex and so on. But it was observed, even in those days, that the man of pleasure usually had a sort of haggard, worried and even bored look. (laughter-pause)

A~ita; I think you notice that quite a lot at work, you now working with guys who go on saying they had a really great night last night and they look really terrible. (laughter) They look completely shattered and tired.

S: It's almost that you believed that you enjoyed yourself rather than really know that you enjoyed yourself. You believe that you did. You try to convince yourself and you try to convince others that you really enjoyed yourself. That gives you a certain superiority over them. You really enjoyed yourself, well they sort of envy you and that makes you feel good. (pause) Allright, a further consideration, 349

Verse 349 "One by one there is enjoyment of continents, countries, towns and homes, conveyances, seats, clothing, ueds, food, drink, ele- ~hants, horses and women."

14

S: So don't forget Nagarjuna is speaking to the king and he already refers to him as though he were a universal monarch, so what does that mean? The universal monarch possesses four whole continents; hundreds of different countries: thousands of towns and houses; hundreds and even thousands of conveyances of various kinds, you know chariots and (hahaha) on the backs of elephants. He possesses seats, that could also mean, yes~possesses seats, possesses chairs possesses all sorts of clothes, jewelry,~included no doubt beds all the food in the country is at his disposal~ He can drink anything he likes, he's got thousands of gallons of wine, maybe in his cellars. He's got a whole army of elephants. He's got hundreds of horses to ride on and he's got three or four thousand women, perhaps, in his harem. But you can only enjoy one at a time. (laughter) So if you say the king enjoys all four continents, he enjoys a hundred countries or he enjoys a hundred beds, well he owns them, but does he enjoy them? You can only enjoy one thing at a time. You may have a hundred books, you can only read one book at a time. You may have enormous quantities of food, you can only eat one plateful

at a time. So it's a great illusion for the ordinary man to say- The king must be really enjoying himself, he's got all those horses, all those chariots, all that food, all those women, but it's not as though he's enjoying them all at the same time, he can only enjoy them one at a time. You can only wear one shirt at a time even though you've got a hundred. You can only enjoy one woman at a time, you can only drink one glass of wine at a time. Just one at a time. So this is the king's position, he's no better off than another man. Another man might have just one shirt, well he wears it, the king has a hundred shirts but he only wears one at a time. So they are really in the same position each is wearing only one shirt. (pause) So what is the difference ~agarjuna is suggesting between the king and an ordinary man in this respect? He doesn't enjoy any more than an ordinary man enjoys; he may possess more but you can't enjoy all those things at the same time. You can only enjoy one at a time.

Ajita: I suppose a king wouldn't even be able to enjoy anything more than the ordinary man would; because he had so much hampering him, too much to choose from.

S: Well, you might enjoy the thought of possessing all those things but then also you've got the worry of protecting, guarding, the fear of losing and so on. I mean if you're just wearing your one shirt you know where it is, it's on your body.

15

S: (cont) But if you've got a hundred shirts, well you start wondering what's happening to them. You're wearing one but what about the other ninety-nine, where are they? What happened to them? Are they getting torn? Are they getting stolen? Are there moths in them? (laughter) You know, you've got one suit, you don't have to bother, but if you've got a hundred suits they need a lot of looking after ~nd you can still only wear one ~uit at a time. So the idea that by having more things of the same kind you'll enjoy it more; that is a complete illusion, because you can actually only, you, can only enjoy one thing at a time.

Hrida a: What you would have to do the~i would be, I you like, to enjoy more in depth. For it to become a question of quality rather than quantity. To enjoy one book more fully than a thousand books rather than spread it over horizontally, sort of go into depths with things.

Ananda: And if one did that, in fact, one would come to the point of seeing the limitations of even the single object. You would really plummet to the depths and come through and say, well, what have I really got out of that? Could be that that might lead one to having a spiritual insight. (pause)

S: Allright, 350 then. Verse 350 "When the mind has any one of these as its object, there is said to be pleasure, but if no attention is paid to the others, the others are not then, in fact, real causes of pleasure."

Yes, supposing the king is riding one of his horses, well, he's just paying attention to that. He's completely oblivious to the existence of all the other hundreds or even thousands of horses that he possesses. He's not even conscious of them. So they can't at that moment be causes of pleasure for him. So just because he owns, say, a thousand horses, it doesn't mean to say he enjoys a thousand horses.

End of Side I

The Precious Garland

PG ~, SIDE Th, SESSION 13GTD, (V.347-361)

Side two of cassette Page 1

S: all the hundreds or even thousands of horses which he possesses hah? Hm, he's not even aware of their existence, not even conscious of them, so they can't at that moment be causes of pleasure for him, hm? So just because he owns, say, a thousand horses it doesn't mean to say he enjoys a thousand horses; he enjoys only one, hm? And, while he's enjoying that one he's, you know, as it were unaware of the existence of all the others, uh? They are not causes of enjoyment for him. (pause)

There are further considerations, three-five-one,

Uttara: Verse 351

~~(then (all) five senses, eye and so forth, (simultaneously apprehend their objects, a thousand of pleasure does not refer (to all of them), Therefore at that time they do not all give pleasure."

S: Hm, we've all got five senses - we talk of enjoying ourselves through the five senses, ah, but what actually happens? Hm, err, usually what happens is that you know we're enjoying, er, one particular sense object through one particular, er, sense organ but we're not enjoying the corresponding, er, you know, sense objects or the other sense objects through their corresponding sense organs, ah hm? You might for instance be listening to a beautiful piece of music and really enjoying that, ah hm. So, mm, you know you're enjoying sound, you're enjoying it through the ear but there may at the same time in the room be an unpleasant smell.' So, ha, you are not enjoying, ah, the objects of the senses through all the senses at the same time, hm. You very rarely get a situation in which you're enjoying yourself through the ear, enjoying yourself through the eye, enjoying yourself through the nose, enjoying yourself through touch, and so on. So Nagarjuna points out, usually when we speak of, you know, er, physical pleasure it is only one sense actually which is involved; the others may not be involved at all. (pause) You may, in the same way, be enjoying a good meal, ah, the taste as

such is fine, the smell as such is fine, but you may at the same time be eating it in a very cold draughty room, Hm? So it's very rarely that you are experiencing pleasurable objects through all the five senses at the same time, hm? So there is even that limitation - to have a pleasurable object,er, which you see, a pleasurable object which you feel

2

S: (cont) a pleasurable object that you taste, a pleasurable object that you smell, ah, and hear all at the same time, that's very rare Hm? It's usually one or the other hm? Or, maybe, just a couple together, hm, not really much more than that. There's a beautiful illustration of that (unclear) idea.. " against Nature", nineteenth century Irish novel, in which he builds this beautiful mansion, castle, and completely isolates himself from the, from the,er, feelings and pleasures of the world outside and virtually cuts it off from his consciousness and tries to make everything within that castle, his home, perfectly satisfied. You know, everything is beautiful, everything has the right smell and the right taste and makes the right sound and~ you know, anything slightly wrong - gets rid of it. In the end he just increases his needs all the time.

S: One becomes more and more sensitive.

V: Yeh, (unclear) , he can't , in the end, the whole thing collapses he can't enjoy anything.

S: But at the same time of course, Nwarjuna's pointing out all five senses are actually functioning all the time,mm, yeh -er you know, when we're awake, all five senses are functioning; we hear, we think, we smell, we taste; we touch, yes? But it's only one sense at a time - usually- that experiences something pleasurable. (pause) The experience of the rest is either, er you know, er painful or at best neutral. So what becomes of our so- called physical pleasures ? Uh?

V: ~starts to answer)

S: Once again he's asking almost as if there's any such thing as physical pleasure, er worldly pleasure, or is it a myth? Hm? The (the,the,the,) thing doesn't really exist, huh? Except in the vague, tenuous, you know, transient form. We know sometimes that we experience, huh, or we have an experience of something that seems intensely pleasurable and we enjoy it or think we enjoy it for a while, but a few days later we think back, we can hardly remember it, we can't sort of recreate it in our minds. It's as though it never had been, huh, as though it's just a dream or we can even sort of wonder, you know, did I really experience it or at least did I experience it in that way; or maybe I just fooled myself. You can start really doubting

like that, whereas, had it been a really genuine, valid experience you wouldn't have that sort of feeling or that sort of doubt.

3

Ananda: And also there's the fatigue that the senses experience . You start off, when you experience something very pure, intense reception of it (indistinct) you keep on looking at it but your senses get dulled, you don't experience it.

Ajita: (indistinct) seem to identify pleasure with personal well being, or security or something. With you're experiencing pleasure (indistinct) you get the impression you've found the right formula or something, at last you've made it or something.

Ala a: If you think along those lines then the king's better off because he's always got so much to choose (from). He can always change - he's got a thousand flowers so (unclear) they're slightly different.

Ananda: But his appreciation of them is reduced because of the constant stimulus through the senses.

V: (can't be enjoyed)? therefore it gets more and more you know, just less active.

S: Well, you find this when you go for instance to a big art gallery. You really enjoy the first one or two rooms, but after a while, even though they are extremely beautiful paintings that you really wanted to see, you just can't take in any more. (murmurs) You start resting, you go quite dull and flat. You don't want to look anymore, you just want to go off and have a cup of coffee in the coffee room, hmm? And sometimes you feel quite disappointed - you might have come a long way and it might be just that opportunity, it just happens to often but you feel you can't stagger round anymore. You feel so surfeited, so overblown, hm?, with all this art - you just can't take in any more. So, alright, the king is in that sort of position in a way, you know, he can have a few more things, a few more flowers, a few more horses, a few more women, but - after a while - he just can't take anymore, hm, he gets sort of punch drunk. You know, some kings in history actually did get into this sort of state. They, you know, almost destroyed themselves by actually trying to enjoy all the things that were available to them, they just couldn't do it.

Aridaya: Hm,hm. There is a modern comparison of that in, er, Italy when you have American tourists come in,

S: Hm , hm.

Aridaya: and they are only in Florence for a day and it's arranged that they see almost all the art in Florence in a day, (and they're sort of reeling round the streets)? - laughter.

4

S: I remember a friend of mine - an American Buddhist Triend - telling me how he once went to Sarnath or, rather, he was at Sarnath, when a party of American tourists was being taken along and, er, they had half an hour in which to do Sarnath, yuh, and then they were going up to Benares and he said he found one woman sitting on the steps of the temple, rubbing her feet, and she said, "I just can't look at anything more; I just can't visit anything more." Huh. She'd done the Taj Mahal the day before (laughter); they were only in India for three days - they were seeing India in three days, (laughter) and, yeh, Sarnath, you know, where the Buddha preached his first sermon,yeh, or rather discourse, er youknow, had half an hour~ And I think Benares had three quarters of an hour - they were having lunch there and they were being whirled around India in tnis sort of way. So this is much the sort of thing that is happening now that we do have the possibility of fast travel and, you know, jet planes and all that kind of thing. We're putting a girdle round the world in forty minutes and- all that. But, you know, we just can't take in more than a certain amount. You hear people talking in big hotels, y~know, as if(?), "Well I saw him. Now was it in Paris or was it 3erlin?" (laughter) "I guess it might have been Amsterdam." (laughter) "It was Bangkok, we went to that temple, or it might have been Calcutta." You know. (laughter) This is tiie way you hear them talking It's all blurred. You know Bangkok and Calcutta sort of merge into one vague experience. They can't quite re~ember what or where.

Ananda: Or even less , why. (laughter)

S: Or even less, why. (laughter) All they reall~ know is it cost them an awful lot of money. (laughter)

V? If they think about it.

S: ~~ell, they'll have to wait until they get back home arid look at their slides before they -(laughter)- really s~e anything or have the time to look at anything. So they go on click-click-clicking all the time, you know, with their cameras; at least they'll take pictures they c%n look at in leisure when they get back home. (laughter) They ~on't have time to look at anything just now, hm, but you know this is what, you know, happens most of the time, again, the same sort of mistake that the king might have made: that you have all these things, as it were, at your disposal but your human organism, your physical senses

* and your mind can only take in a certain amount at a time, hm?

[501]

S: (cont'd) ... After that, you know, the whole system just starts resisting, hmm, it won't take in any more. So, how frustrating in a way, hm, you can only enjoy one thing at a time. And you can't even enjoy one thing at a time for too long, you have to stop.

(Ananda?): And then you're not really enjoying it at all.

5: Yeh.

-zHridaa: It really should curtail craving, shouldn't it?

5: It really should, all these reflections.

Uttara: So we shouldn't really enjoy anything then - pause - comments

S: It's not really a question of you shouldn't, you just don't, (Uttara starts to say somethin~ but Bhante continues) - But if you say~you shouldn't? it enquires? er, presup~oses you know you could. But you can't. You don't even have the possibility of enjoying really. So you should just wake up to the fact that you don't enjoy - not in any really deep or full or true sense. You just scratch the old itch a bit, you know, that's the most you can do. (laughter~ Some people, you know, carefully cultivate their itches so they can have the pleasure of scratching them. (laughter) This is called the life of pleasure, hmm.

Ananda: I still feel a bit of confusion about that area, you know, about whether you can enjoy something, because in a sense you can, in the sense that it's leading on to a higher level of consciousness, like in art, the aesthetic experience, there is

S: But if one really is honest, I mean, how many people, even among the people here, have really, very often, really enjoyed a work of art, so, as we say, really they were carried away and so on? ~oes it really very often happen? Uh? Or that you really enjoy a poem? You have to be in a very special mood. You just can't open a book of poetry and at once transport yourself into a world of imagination, really enjoy that. ~re often that not you're just not in the mood, hm. Or you switch on the radio and it's your favourite Beethoven symphony, well, more often than not it just doesn't mean anything to you at all. You just have to be in the mood, Yeh?

6

S: (cont) So, even these sort of higher pleasures - well, we know that, I mean,

meditation is a great pleasure - but how many people can sit down and at once immerse themselves in sukha and priti, hm? And even if you are, you know, deep - having a really good meditation, you know, ar, ah feeling a really positive spiritual emotion well, how long can you sit without your knee hurting or your back aching, or without experiencing - even though you are enjoying something highly pleasurable- without ~xperiencing an unaccountable desire to get up and end the meditation? Hm, this is what happens. It's the old gravitational pull, you know, exerting itself deep down. So even in this question of enjoyment of the arts you have to be quite honest. No doubt some people have ~ greater capacity for enjoying these things than others, ah, but even that capacity is limited. Could you really spend the whole day, you know, reading poetry in a state of, you know, intense enjoyment? At best it's just the odd poem, the odd two or three minutes, hm, even if you spend the whole day reading.

Hridaya: You can see what happens if you've got a day completely to yourself, to do what you want. If you were completely satisfied by one poem then presumably you'd be there with it all day, it's unlikely.

S: At best, you'll feel sort of moderately content. And maybe there are a few sort of gentle highlights through the day when you feel quite good - but it usually doesn't go much beyond that, hm, does it? I mean, days when you feel ecstatic and could bounce around all day, you know, these are quite rare, hm? (chuckles) It also presupposes a certain amount of energy bubbling up. I must say that the mitra retreats were one of the happiest occasions I've been involved in for a long time. You know, they really were almost ecstatically ~py, you know, for quite a lot of the time; really bubbling over. And that was quite pleasant to see and quite unusual. I felt quite a bit of that you know, on the Four Winds retreats - that people really were happy most of the time. And that is quite rare, hmm, hmm, You know, perhaps it wasn't, er, er, quite such a spiritual happiness as one might have hoped, it was definitely worldly happiness, but even worldly happiness is quite rare, hm. I mean, you read some religious texts and they talk about giving up worldly happiness and not becoming too attached to it, but where is this worldly happiness? You don't often see it. (laughter)

S: (cont) It's more like giving up this worldly misery, hm? (chuckles) I mean, if you see people who are supposed to be, you know, wallowing in all the pleasures of life, well, what do they look like? They look pretty miserable, (laughter) hm. They've got all the things that they say they want and enjoy but, then again, are they really happy? Or happy at all? Do they even think they're happy? You know more often than not they don't even think that they

are happy? (pause)

Alaya: °~hen I wa5 a child I thought that when you grew up to be an adult, you grew up to be er, to oe more happy.

S: And when you grew up to be an adult you think how happy you were as a c~~ld. And you tell your own children that ou know that's the happiest time of your life (laughter and you'll never be so happy again. This poor little kid he thb~ks he'll be happy when he grows up and do what he wants to do - be able to eat all the Mars bars he likes and, and er play all dfay and er stay up as late as lie likes at night and never wash his own neck. (laughter)

Alaya: You tend to think that grown-ups are enlightened. That you'll grow up and you will be enlightened.

S: Huim.

Ananda: It's terrible when you find there is no Father

~hristmas! (laughter)

S: No fairies at the bottom of the garden!

V?: indistinct

S: Hm, anyway on to three-five-two.

V:

"Whenev~r an of the five) ob~ects is known As leasurable b one of the five senses, Then the remaining objects are not so known Since the ~e not real causes of leasure

S: "Whenever any of the five objects is known as pleasurable by one of the five senses, then the remaining objects are not so known." -hm. There's a note there. (pause) He's virtually saying the same thing as before and "the remai~ing objects are not so known since they are not real causes of pleasure." (pause) hm, (pause). Hm,hm? Alright, let's go on to three-five-three.

Atula: "When the mind apprehends a past object which has been picked up by the senses, It

imagines and fancies it to be ~leasurable."

S: Hm. What do you think Nagarjuna's getting at Usre?

Atula: Nostalgia.

S: Nostalgia, hm. As we were saying earlier on you can, you know, recollect something of the past, huh, and imagine and fancy to yourself that it in fact was pleasurable, or is pleasurable. You might not have particularly enjoyed it at the time at all or not so much as you like to think. (pause) You sort of try to console yourself, as it were, or even to compensate for the present, you know, by turning over in your mind the thought of how good things were in the past, er, how much you enjoyed yourself in the past, or, even, will enjoy yourself in the future. This brings up the whole question of getting away from the present. Hm. And so much of our time is spent in getting away from the present, ah, hm. Whether reminiscing about the past or, you know, indulging in anticipations of the future, but not really being here now - you know, to coin a phrase. This is one of the good things about retreats. You lose sense of time; you stop thinking about the past - where you came from and what you were doing; and you stop thinking about where you're going back to and what you'll be doing there. Hm. You are much more in the present. (pause) I mean even if you do start looking at railway timetables it all feels rather ridiculous and unreal, as though you're not really going back, or couldn't really be going back.

Uttara: In connection with that, when you were talking about the pleasures, you know I sometimes experience that thing of what are you going back to, and what you have been in as being relatively pleasurable so you sort of start to think, well I'm going back. So in a sense you, when I'm going to a retreat, I know I'm going to experience that thing - you know the leaving of the retreat and you say, oh, is it really worth it going into a situation which is pleasurable if it is only going to bring you -

S: Except that you're not going into it because it's pleasurable.

V: Hmmm.

9

S: Hm~ Well, you're going into it, er you know, again, to coin a phrase, because you believe it's going to do you good. Uh? It's going to contribute to your development. You're not thinking in terms of pleasure exactly. It might be quite a painful, even

upsetting retreat. You ~flight go ti-rough quite a lot as we say, but at the same time it will be worthwhile. (pause)

Ananda: Is it not pernap's the sense of worthwhilness that is the real cause of pleasure rather than the enjoyment of any particular sensation?

3: Hm (Agrees)

Alaya: Why is the past seen as rosy and not its re~lit~ as being quite unpleasant? Why is that?

: Hinm.

Atula: (2 or 3 unclear words) security doesn't it.

S: ~e11, one does tend to soften or to forget the hars(er and less ple~3ant features of the past, uh, becrn~se that is one's natural tendency, is towards one's pleasure. If, for in~tance, you're tninking about the past and the past was painful, then you have a painful thought in tne present - so you're experiencing pain in the present. You don't want to experience pain in the present. You want to experience pleasure, hm? So you can only experience pleasure in the present when thinking aout tne past if you think that the p~&st was pleasant. Hmm, ah. So you start doctoring the past up making the past a pleasanter, or making the past look pleasant so that when you think about the past you have a pleasant i.e. pleasurable thought in the present, hm? (pause)

~dava: There's always the feeling that you don't actually do it yourself, It's an automatic process, it's done for you;

S: Yes, yes, right. It's a natural process-

Hrida~a: - a natural process, yeh. And you think, well, wosoing it? Tnis stran~,e idea of all these sorrowful instances disappearing down some strange hole. They've all gone.

S: And that may mean also , or that may lead you, er, eventually to see that particular past experience, ti~at situation which might have teen really quite painful as so pleasurable that you start thinking in terms of going back into it again. Yeh, you've forgotten. You haven't learnt your lesson. Yeh,hm.

S: (con't) It starts having , you know, a certain attractiveness, a certain fascination about it.. ..'If I was to go back again' - you forget all the sort of painful things about it, or you forget practically, virtually the whole experience was painful, hnm and you, and you're lured back into it and the same thing happens all over again.

Hridaya: It is really useful to write things down, and that's what we were saying yesterday, make a note of

S: Hrn, yes, I mean, to keep a diary. I mean, supposing you look back through your old diaries, well, then do you really realise what you went through. Otherwise you might have gone on holiday and had a thoroughly miserable time - you know like a wretched third rate and a bad hotel and bad food and it rained - if you've got all that down in your diary you'll never be tempted to go back there again, eh. Whereas if you're just sort of mulling it over in your mind you'd like to think, you know, you had a good holiday, that the money was well spent, you know, and you think well maybe it wasn't all that bad, you know, you know I was a bit silly to take it all so seriously, I suppose I really did have quite a good time, after all, you know. You start convincing yourself like that. But if your diary is there to sort of bear witness against you, as it were, you can't do that sort of thing, hm?

~idaa: Down in black and white.

3: Hm, hm.

Alaya: The pain, the pain turns into a sort of pleasant melancholy.

S: Yeen, uh, a sort of wistful feeling, eh?

Ananda: It's like one of those stories by Oshapensky - indistinct - a couple of years - indistinct.. , he goes back and relives over his life again because he's made such a mess of his life before and he meets this magician who can send him back and so he goes back determined to make it, to change it all and to live a happy life, and a pure life and a virtuous life but he forgets, when he goes back, he forgets that he's done it all before and he lives the same old miserable life that he did previously. (laughter)

S: One particular kind of experience or also a period of one's life with regards to which one is very very tempted, you know, to carry out this sort of doctoring operation is one's army life. Yeh?

S: (cont) Men really do this don't they? At the time you really hated it, it was a thoroughly unpleasant experience, much of it, if not most of it. But as the years go by and the decades go by and you get middle aged, if you're not careful you start feeling a bit nostalgic about it and thinking what a good time you had (laughter) when actually it was awful (laughter)

~ancis: And that was all it was! (laughter)

aS: Sight'. (laughter) Yes. And that, I think, is quite good example - almost a classic ~a~j)l~ - yeh.

Ananda: A symbol of joun.

3: Maybe that also, it was, when you were young. But you forget all about those really horrible drill sergeants, uh, and the utterly ridiculous regulations and the absolutely inane people who were giving the orders, you know, and how annoyed and angry you used to get about it, you forget all that. You remember all the drinks you had at the local pub (laughter), you know, and the cups of coffee at the Wayside Cafe, you know in the course of your route marches. You forget all about the blisters on your feet and all that kind of thing. And the day it rained and you got wet to the skin, hm? You sort of doctor it all. You doctor it all up and make it all pleasant and rosy. ~Y~It's, er, like, er, a thought going by, like a, you know, (unreadable) You're relieved from it, that's where the pleasure comes from.

S: It's a relief, right. You're distanced from it. Yes. right, that's true. Yes. I mean the happiness doesn't, the happiness wasn't, you know, in that past experience. I mean the happiness is in the relief you experience contemplating the fact that it's past. Then you're not in it anymore. So, I mean, I can think back for years and years I had nightmares about being back in the army but, at the same time, if one isn't careful, you tend to doctor it up to, to start thinning it ~as~n't all that bad. If you're not careful you can just see yourself talking about your army life to other people ~le- especially young people - as though it's really the best time of your life when it was probably the worst, actually. But one does this.

Francis: It was a good experience.

S: A good experience, yeah. You might not have enjoyed it at the time but it did you a lot of good, you wouldn't really have missed it for anything etc, etc.

12'

S: (con't) You know though, at the time you would have given anything to get out of it. (laughter)

A~ita: There seems to be two types of pain, the pain of regression and the pain of progression.

S: Yeh,yeh,hm. (pause)

Ananda: I'd just like to sort of (5 or 6 words ~~clear) because I feel there's another aspect which we haven't mentioned, and that connected with when I was reading Proust, I think it's 'Remembrance of 'Times Past', a sort of autobiographical novel in which he recounts several very what he regards as 'very, very, intense, poignant joy'ful moments in childhood, and he re-experiences them through some little event or accident in his mature life. And he, more or less, he's saying, if I've got it right, when one really experiences childhood, re-experiences it (in a more?), it produces a sort of transcendence in time and space in one's mind; and that's that transcendence of time and space which is the real satisfaction, the real joy, not but the rosy misapprehension of a particular event or experience.

S: -well, no doubt there are - I mean in childhood especially - you know, intensely joyful experiences which can be recaptured, uh? But I think most people would just tend to, you know, to try and dwell more on those or remember more of those, er, leaving aside all of the painful experiences because in childhood also, I mean, there are frequently quite intense, painful experiences ~'very much an adult perhaps just doesn't experience: intense disappointments and frustrations and feeling of having been let down, feelings of being on one's own, fear and so on-. You know, we tend to sweep all those under the carpet, even though at the same time there are those, you know, feeling of intense joyfulness which may be you never get in adult life.

Aranda: Hm,h~. I think a lot of poets and artists maybe tend to ... try.... their aim really is to recapture that joy through their work ... they're trying to recall this.

S: Hm. This reminds me of something that I was talking about in New Zealand, to the New Zealand friends on retreat there. I forget how it came up, er, I think it, yes I remember now, we, we were studying, or at least we were talking about, er, what it was like in India in the Buddha's day, yeh? And we might have been doing a bit of study of the Ud~na even or, at least, I was referring to the Udana and the sort of material that one gets there, huh, er, how close one feels when one reads the Udana to the Buddha as he actually was in history and the way he lived. And, er, what a strong vivid sense one has of the early

S: (cont) days of Buddhism, what it was actually like, huh? And I was saying that I had a similar sort of feeling in New Zealand itself - I felt that sort of being in that out of the way place and you know, sitting on the side of that river, ugh, and -you know, talking about the Dharma you know we were really in very much the same sort of situation, huh, as the early disciples of the Buddha were. So then I was saying that it is quite easy to feel oneself back into that kind of situation and sort of start imagining that, you know, it's not the twentieth century this is the fifth century B.C., this is India, ah, this is an Indian river, hm, you can sort of even start, you know, feeling that quite strongly. And then I was saying that, um, one of the things one can do is that, er, one can for instance be meditating, nm, and forget all about sort of space and time, hh, and feel that you are meditating in the fourth century or fifth century B.C. and as you open your eyes, sort of convince yourself that that's where you are. So it's the same sort of thing in a way - isn't it? This transcendence of time and space - You can sort of, you know, imagine yourself looking back into, er, you know, previous centuries, previous ages, hm, as though you are actually living in those times, living in those places - not where you are supposed to be here and now, yeh? In that way you do transcend time and space, yeh. So if you do recapture some vivid experience of your own earlier life, er, well you're experiencing what you experienced then - so where are you? Are you there or are you here? In a sense you can't tell. You are both here and there, ha. In that sense - or through that (unclear - one or two words) you transcend time. I mean, when you experience what you experienced as a child are you now a child experiencing that, or not? You're both and neither. So in a sense you're transcending time, eh? And this gives you quite a strange sensation of time being - sort of illusory in a way - you know, hm, your experience is bridging time, it's bridging the past and the present eh. It's as though your experience contained time, eh, contained the - you know, past and the present; that you contain the past and the present; because you're transcending it or to the extent that you're transcending it. So this is a quite useful exercise in a way.

Uttara: That was getting you in touch with something outside time.

S: Yes, hm.

V: I tended to just see more as that alienated situation as the fact of just here and now ... the trees are a thousand years older or whatever, you know, may be getting away from that fact and just feeling that everything is moving,

14

&io

S: Well, it's also quite interesting just to go and walk somewhere and just sort of try to feel or to think at least, you know what this area was like ten thousand years ago, a hundred years ago, you know, ten million years ago. There would be giant tree ferns all over the place.

~here would have been you know ~;reat dinosaurS and brontosaurus roaming through the, you know, jungles of giant tree ferns, uh? hmm. And so on, it's all changed, it's the same place, though it's all ccianged. Or it migit have been sea instead of land. Uh? If you walk on trie downs - you know the ch~l~, er, cliffs - well you know you think this was all ~nder the sea at one time, and here I am walking on top of it, you know, in theopen air, higd~ up. Several hundred feet aooove sea level, but yoi~ knc~w crly a few hundred thousand years ago this was all under wat~r; thfs was the sea bed (pause) Alright, three-five-four (pause)

— "Also the one sense which b~re (in the world

~ithout an object is as unreal As that object is without it."

S: Mm! Well, w~at do you think about that? fflirigrt there's one sense - what aabout the eye, hm, and its object? - which is form. So 'Also the one sense wnich here in the world Is said to know one object',trih. The eye, the organ of sight, knows, uh, perceives the object of the or~an of sight which is the visual horm, hape and colour. So it's said to know one obJect, its own apj)~0 priate object. Without an object it is "as unreal as that 9b;ect is without it". Mmm. ~an yol~ imagine, er, an eye, wit~out anything to see? Can you really imagine that or think of tnat? Is it conceivable? Ah eye witnout its object or wit~out an object. No. At cest you can i~r~agire a patch of darkness :~t thuat darknesss is tne object, uh? Or can you imagine - or can you actually thinK - an object which is not oe5ng seen?

Uttara: Yeh.

S: Jut tnen by imagining tt you're seeing it.

Lttara: Are you imagining, er?

S: Yes.

Uttara: (2 or 3 words unclear) In terms of existence

15

S: There is an object. If you think of a tree, er hm, well, you can't sort of i~a½l he a tree with nobody seeing it, with nobody thinking about it4 Car' you really.

?V: £~h.

S: Ah? So you don't get the object without the subject. Tou don't get trie subject without

the object. hm. They can't exist separably or independently. A thing can't exist except in dependence on some other thing~ can it be said to be real? See, if the eye can exist only in relation to the object of sight, if the object of sight can exist only in relation to the eye, can either of them be said to be real? They are both dependant. They are both relative realities. So in that sense they are unreal, they are not ultimately real.

Hridaya: Both parts of one thing.

S: You could put it like that, but even that, you know, would create difficulties. So, "Also the one sense which here in the world is said to know one object, without an object is as unreal as that object is without it." They are both unreal because mutually dependant. Hm. And it's these unreal things, these dependant things, which are supposed to be producing pleasure for you, ah? So, how can there be real pleasure? You know, the things on which the pleasure depends on, on which the production of pleasure depends on, are themselves unreal; how can there be any real pleasure produced? (pause)

Ajita: Could it be looked on as a chemical reaction, you know?

S: Hmm.

?V: Could it be looked on as a sort of chemical reaction, eh? You and the tree for instance cause a birth of something new for an instant?

S: Ha, .. I don't know. (chuckles)

Uttara: How does it come about then, though, if you haven't seen this country before, and it, though~ you're moving towards it, and you, you know, arrive at the distinction and that it exists? You know, you see it exists but you've never seen it before. And therefore haven't created it because you know So in a

16

S: Ah, no! Nagarjuna's referring to your eyes, hm. If you take your eye do you ever have your eye without something~ your eye sees? And when you have, you know, something, or, in front of your eye as it were, so to say, a visual form, is there ever a visual form there without your eye which is seeing it? Hm, ah? That is what he's saying. (pause) I mean, the possibility of that sort of experience is there all the time. This is why John Stuart Mill, for instance, defined matter as the permanent possibility of sensation. It's not something that is there all the time as a thing but it is the permanent possibility of that sort of experience occurring. There doesn't have to be a thing there. All that really needs to be there is the

permanent possibility. (pause) Alright three-five-six.

Francis: I'd just as a child is -s-Id to be born dependant on a father and mother, So a consciousness is said to arise Dependant on a sense and a form."

S: This is very basic Buddhism indeed: The five or the six senses; the five or the six sense objects; and the six, the five or the six consciousnesses produced by their interaction. Er, so consciousness is regarded as, er, a, er a conditioned thing. That is to say what we call eye consciousness arises in dependence on the contact of the eye, the organ of sight, with the visual object. Visual consciousness, eye consciousness then arises. So there's the six, er the six senses, that is including the mind, in the ordinary sense of the term; then the twelve ayatanas and there's the eighteen Dhatus. That is to say the six senses, er the senses with their respective objects, and then both senses and objects with their appropriate consciousnesses - these all add up to eighteen Dhatus or spheres. I (consider it?) more like bases, huh? So three senses, twelve bases and eighteen spheres. You get reference to this again and again in Buddhist thought especially in the Pali text, the Abhidharma, hm, (pause.) Alright, three-five-six.

Hridaya: "past and future objects and the senses are unreal, so too are present (objects) since they are not distinct from these two"

S: Hm. So "past and future objects and the senses are unreal" - so not ultimately real because they are mutually dependent, ah?

[513]

(From PG7 side B, session 13, verses 347-361)

S: ..."So too are present objects as they are not distinct from these two" and there's a note there which says: "The present must depend on the past and the future in order to be present. But if the present does not exist in the past and future, then it cannot truly depend on them. If the present does exist in the past and future, Then it is not different from them" ha. in other words it's trying to- Nagarjuna's trying to convince you to see that past, present and future are all unreal. Hm There isn't such a thing as the present. Hm. I mean, you can say "the present moment" or you can subdivide that moment: where is the present? uh, hm, The present is only a moving line between the past and the future. The present is the, er the term which we give to the fact that the future is continually becoming past. And this is seen as the present. But, er, every past was once a present; every future will be a present. But, if present doesn't exist, you can't even say that past exists, uh. You know, past is made out of, er, of what has been present. If present doesn't exist can even past be said to exist? or future? So Nagarjuna's trying to get you to feel or experience that time is unreal. Hm. "The past and future objects, and the senses are unreal. So too are present objects since they are not distinct from those. these two." I put it the other way round: past and future are unreal because present is unreal, Nagarjuna says that present is unreal because he's already proved past and future to be unreal: both sense and objects, hm, But it amounts to the same thing.

_____ : (indistinct)

S: The senses are unreal. ha. Ah objects are unreal. And your so-called "real pleasures" are supposed to arise within the framework of all these unreal things. Hm? So can there be a real

pleasure? Arising in dependance on these unreal senses and their unreal sense objects? Past, present and future don't really exist? This is what he's saying, So how foolish to look for any real pleasure, ah, under these sorts of conditions. You say a past pleasure? present pleasure? future pleasure? There's no such thing as past, present and future- these are unreal. They don't really exist at all- not ultimately.

_____ : is being here now, out of time?

S: Well, _____ where is "now"? Being here now really means being out of time altogether. There's no "now" where you can be. There's just sort of a Knife- edge between the past and the future which is moving all the time anyway. We say "all the time" but that is talking rubbish...

_____ : (speaks at same time as S)

S: ... where is that "now" where you can be- pardon?

_____ : Now is the occasion (for being here but how can you be anywhere else ?) ?

-2- 514

S: Well that is because you can't even be there (laughter). You can't be anywhere else it's true: but you can't even be here either, really. So in other words the now where you can be, or (laughter) can only be, in a manner of speaking, outside time, hm, This where Nagarjuna's trying to get you to: out- side time. If you're outside time, you're outside subject, outside object, outside- you know- all the pleasures which arise within that kind of frame- work: outside the conditioned.

_____ : "You" can just be, Then there is no "you".

S: Hmm.Hmmm. Yes. If you can just be yes there is no you. You are,as it were, the product of all these you know or complexed, interweaving conditions, _____ : But then if there is no real pleasure there is no real pain either.

S: No real pain either hum... and that's a comforting thought too, (Pause) But you use the thought of, as it were, of the unreal, or, pain to win your way from the attachments of the unreal pleasure, And then of course you realise you know, that there is neither pleasure nor pain. (Pause) It's as though as long as pleasure seems to be real, you think of pain as being real, or even more real. (Pause)

_____ : We study the past because of the future... that attitude...

S: Yes, it's better to live in the present than in the past or the future, but eventually you have to realise that in a strict sense there isn't even a present for you to live in; you can't even really live in time at all. You can only live out of time... and not paying attention either to pleasure or to pain, and not affected by pleasure or pain. (Pause)

_____: (Unclear)

S: HM~

_____. ... just going on, and you're just watching the whole rigmarole, not being affected by it.

S: But not squashing it in a sort of alienated way.

_____: Hmm. (Pause) Is that why we don't grow? Presumably because we hold t too much onto the past?

S: (Pause) Well this is it. It is just that, in a manner of puttung it, one could say that non growth is holding onto the past, (Unclear) You identify yourself with the past. You are not open to the possibilities of further development. It's alright to go out of the past but not to be limited to the past. (Pause) So therefor one can say in the Buddhist sense that you don't grow; to that extent you are identifying yourself with your own past. Or, to the extent that you identify yourself with your own past, to that extent you don't grow; because you think "I'm this"... in other words, what I have been up to now, ie in the past.

-3-

_____: Because that's the danger too; If, as you say, looking back into the past and just taking from the past, just experiencing from the past the more pleasurable side of it, you are more inclined.

S: If you tend to think as time goes on the past has become more and more pleasurable, then you sort of consolidate the past, and you consolidate yourself within the past; you consolidate your own attachment to the past and keep thinking of it as having been pleasurable when perhaps it wasn't. So you settle

down in the past and feel yourself, as it were, in the past. (Pause)

Line 357...

_____: "Just as due to error the eye perceives

A (whirling) firebrand as a wheel, So the senses apprehend Present objects (as if real)."

S: A well-known illustration. Illustrations don't prove anything, they just make clear, or clearer, something that is indipendantly known, What impression does one get from this? First of all one tries to understand the meaning of the illustration, and then what it is trying to illustrate. You whirl a firebrand in a wheel; you whirl the firebrand around and around... so that gives an impression of a fiery wheel. But is there in fact a wheel of fire there? Hm? (Pause) No, there isn't a wheel of fire there, there's only a firebrand being whirled round and round, It's as though there's an illusion..., of there being a wheel of fire, The illusion is

produced by a motion- a circular motion- of the firebrand. "So the senses apprehend present objects as if real". Now, how do you apply the illustration, or what is the illustration trying to illustrate? The fact that the senses apprehend present objects as if real,

_____: (Unclear)

S: That experience is continuous when, in fact, they are not so. But how do we experience present objects in a way that they are not?

_____: As if they were real,

S: We are thinking of them as real but, you know, in greater detail than this? _____: (Unclear).., set up permanently..,

S: I mean the wheel looks as if it's just there, it's impermanent. But actually it's produced by this movement of the firebrand. In the same way we look for objects taking them to be real,,taking them to be permanent~ fixed, when in fact they are processes, They are in a sort of flux and change.

_____: 'I get a sort of feeling, thinking of that, of mesmerisation, You're mesmerised by not seeing what it is, you have to jolt yourself, or be jolted, to say, "Oh yes, it is just a stick going round and round", but for a moment you think it is just a circle of fire,

--

S: If you can close your eyes and just look at it you could just see a circle of fire quite easily.

_____: You're actually mesmerised, being mesmerised by the world,

S: If you just close your eyes a little bit, as it were, you can convince yourself that it is all real, (Pause)

S: Alright, line 358,,.

_____: "The senses and their objects are regarded

As being composed of the elements Since the individual elements Are unreal, so too are those objects,'1

S: Don't forget that what Nagarjuna's basically trying to convince the king of is the unreality of pleasures, yes? Pleasures are unreal because the senses are unreal, And objects are unreal, Here he is saying that the senses and their objects are being regarded as "being composed of

their elements": earth, water, fire, air, perhaps space- I'm not sure whether five of six are being referred to- but those very much themselves are unreal (Unclear) the object to must be unreal, And presumably, therefor, the senses which perceive those objects Must be unreal, and the pleasures that arise out of their contact (Pause) So they can't be any more real than the elements out of which it was composed, (Pais~) Nagarjuna's arguments are now becoming just a little bit ingenious (Laughter), And perhaps to that extent just a little bit less convincing. Anyway, he carries on,, 359, we're nearly at the end of this series of verses: _____: 'If each element is different

It follows that there could be fire without fuel, If mixed they would be characterless

- And this is true of all other elements",

S: There's a little note there:

"If the four elements were completely intermingled they would lose their individual character"

as explained in line three, (Puase) What Nagarjuna is actually saying is that one can't really mingle these four, or five, or six elements; you can't regard them as different, At the same time you can't really regard them as the same, So in this way, or for that reason, they are unreal, So, in as much as it is out of the elements that the senses and their objects are composed, the senses and their objects too must be unreal, (~~use) Why does it follow that each element is different, "It follows that there could be fire without fuel" ? (Pause)

S: For fuel as it were represents the element of earth,, but could you have fire without fuel? You can't0 That is to say, you can't have fire without

earth. The element fire is not indipendant from the element earth. SO they are not really different~ they are not completely different; otherwise fire would just burn without there being any earth around, any fuel. But if they were mixed together they would lose their specific characteristics. In that sense ther e wouldn't be any elements. So they are neither different nor are they the same. So what are they? They are nothing, they are not real. So out of these unreal elements we make our unreal senses unreal sense organs, unreal sense objects... and these unreal sense organs and sense objects we point at produce an unreal consciousness, and also unreal pleasure. Again pleasure is essentially unreal. (Unclear... la~ghter) alright line 360: "Because the elements are unreal in b~th These ways so too is composition~ Because composition is unreal So too in fact are toisms." HM. (pause) So the elements are unreal and also even composition. Maybe he means the very concept of composition, of senses and organs, While the sense o?rgans and objects being put together or composed of elements~ that too is unreal and so "Because composition is unreal so too in fact are forms". Not only forms but all~the sense objects and the sense organs themselves. You can't really say what you mean by "composition". What do you mean by "one thing being composed out of other things"? If you analyse it deePly~ Nagariuna says that the idea of composition itself is totally untenable. _____ Like the firebrand. S: Yes. Can we really say that the circle of fire the wheel of fire is composed of a n~~er of firebrands? It's not really correct to say that. _____ Could you say that' it's composed of elements, composed of ignorance? S: But what does one mean by "composed"? It suggests a solid thing, a sort of

substance. Is ignorance any such thing? Ignorance is just a word. Is there such a thing as ignorance? If there were such a thing as ignorance it couldn't be removed. You can get rid of it because it isn't there (laughter). You can drop it because you're not holding it (laughter).

Ananda: You can't even say that the wheel is composed of one real firebrand moving. S: No. Because time is unreal. Ananda: (Unclear) Not even composed of an unreal firebrand S: In some text~ Nagarjuna roved - or at least to~his own satisfaction- the fact that movement is impossible. (laughter) These old Indian teachers were really clever (laughter)

_ You're (Unclear) Stand still. S: really getting clever. Or both or neither (laughter). Alright, one more verse and then we'll stop for lunch.

"Also because consciousness feelin~s, Discriminations and factors of composition each Are not self-existent realities in any way1 (Pleasures) are not ultimately real." It's as though the experience (hf pleasure, to be possible in any real sense~ there must be a real framework within which the experience takes place. And Nagarjuna has been concerned to show the unreality of the framework within which pleasure is considered to take place or to~be experienced~ and therefore he has shown that pleasure itself (Break in tape recording)

KI~

You can't have a real pleasure produced through an unreal frame- work1, as it were. You'd demolish the framework that pleasure also being an unreal pleasure collapses. Uttara: (Something about the spiritual life being a framework) S: It's a more real framework. Uttara: What is inherently existent in the Dharma which being outside time, which is more real and lasting. S: It is more real, yes. Or you could say lasting satisfaction is possible only outside time. I mean lasting satisfaction within time- that is lasting satisfaction in the literal sense- is impossible because "lasting" means 'within time'~time means change. So lasting satisfaction- "lasting" inverted commas. Lasting satisfaction is possible only outside timeq where it doesn't last11~ or it doesn't need to last. (Pause) Anyway Nagarjuna' 5 becoming a bit abstruse isn't he? A bit intellectually sophisticated. But you can see what he's getting at, broadly speaking. (Pause) His considerations about the limitations of pleasure~ of unsatisfactorinessr those considerations seemed quite convincing but he becomes more and more~as it abstruse~more and more ingenious in his arguments and in a sense one loses a slight sense of conviction. The commonsens~e considerations in a way perhaps are more appealing. Ajita: It's more mental gymnastics. S: Yes~ quite. The more commonsense considerations are closer to one's experience and you can actually see them as verifiable. Ajita: I think we have to live through day by day... and remind myself of these facts. (Unclear) S: But no doubt in ancient India there were highly intellectual people.

[519]

S: (cont) ... who could only be convinced by very abstruse arguments of this sort, that were, er, of a far more sophisticated nature than the earlier, common-sense considerations, huh?

Alaya: The king was surrounded by a court of advisers.

S: That's quite possible. I mean, I've, er, you know, had the experience myself in India of, you know, giving lectures and answering questions afterwards, and sometimes the

orthodox Brahmins who are there and who put questions, are very, very intellectual people, you just don't get people like that in this country. Their minds are so subtle, so ingenious and they ask such complex and quite difficult questions, which aren't easy to deal with. So I mean, this is the sort of environment within which Nagarjuna practiced, he himself was an ex-orthodox Brahmin, he was quite familiar with this sort of way of thinking, with these sort of objections, difficulties. (Pause) But luckily we're more simple-minded (amusement) which means we can get started more quickly. The super-subtle intellectual Brahmin remains a Brahmin, with all his prejudices intact, more often than not.

: You still need the beginner's mind.

S: Yes. Alright, let's leave it there, from the next verse onwards we get back to slightly more down-to-earth things. Verse 362 -

"Just as a lessening of pain Is fancied to be real pleasure, So a suppression of pleasure Is also fancied to be pain."

S: Well, how is that, huh? "Just as a lessening of pain is fancied to be real pleasure" huh? We think that there is such a thing as a real pleasure, but actually what we take for pleasure is only a slight amelioration of pain, huh? And, er, the basic unsatisfactoriness of life remains. So in the same way that we fancy that a slight diminution of pain, er, is in fact a real pleasure, so we imagine that by suppressing, by giving up these imaginary pleasures, we experience something painful, huh? In other words we think, or we fancy, huh, that the bringing to an end of the pleasures with which we alleviate our fundamentally painful state, is itself painful, huh? You see the line of argument? But actually, of course, we shouldn't think that because, you know, by getting rid of our search for pleasures which are only alleviating painfulness, the basic painfulness of existence, that we are preventing ourselves from seeing the basic painfulness of existence, and in that way preventing ourselves from experiencing true bliss later on. So just as we imagine the painful to be pleasurable, in the same way the giving-up of the imaginary pleasure, which will lead later on to true bliss, we experience as painful.

The Precious Garland 520 Side B, Session 13 V356-373 Page 2

S: (cont) So there's a double absurdity in our attitude. We think that giving things up, you know, giving up these so-called pleasures is a painful process, whereas, at least in the long run, it's not any such thing. Alright 363?

. "Thus attachment to finding pleasure And to separating from pain Are to be abandoned because they do not inherently Exist; Thereby for those who see thus there is liberation."

S: This of course draws attention to the importance of the place of pleasure and pain in our ordinary lives, huh? Most of the time, if not all the time, instinctively we're searching for what is pleasurable and trying to avoid, trying to keep away from, trying to separate ourselves from what is painful, huh? So unconsciously, as it were instinctively, we do these two things; we make all sorts of adjustments, all sorts of arrangements, take all sorts of measures, so as to

ensure that existence remains on the whole pleasurable for us, that we continue to experience pleasure, to find pleasure, and to avoid pain and suffering, huh? So much of the time we don't realize the extent to which we do this. Instinctively we go after what is pleasant, try to avoid what is painful, regardless almost of other considerations. We think, "well, it would be nice to do that" and automatically we take it that it's therefore good to do that; or, "that wouldn't be very pleasant", that is regarded as an argument for not doing that particular thing. So, 1, Thus attachment to finding pleasure and ~aratinfromain are to be abandoned because they do not inherently exist,huh? In other words, an~existence which is oriented towards finding pleasure, and avoiding pain, is not an existence which is oriented towards reality; it is an unreal existence. So if one sees this, if one sees through this, then, well, one day there is liberation. I mean, does one ever see the extent to which one is dominated by these two instincts or drives, the instinct to go after what is pleasant and avoid what is painful? Almost regardless of other considerations. So that means that one is taking the pleasure and the pain as something real,huh, which in fact they're not, as Nagarjuna has been trying to show. It's as though, therefore, a life devoted to pursuing the pleasant and avoiding the unpleasant is a life which is based on unreality. It's an unreal life. The conditioned is going in~suit of the conditioned, huh? Alright, 364:

"What sees (reality)? CDnventionally they say It is the mind, for without mental factors ere can e no min and a second mind , Becomes unreal, cannot be simultaneous."
[521]

S: Hum, so what does that mean? There is, er, a little note, which gives some help, though not very much. "Is there a mind which satisfies the existence of a mind-cognizing reality? If there ~prp a second man perceiving the first man and existing simultaneously, it could certify the true existence of the first. However, all minds depend on mental factors, and are thus unreal. Also, the certifier would need a certifier, thus only conventionally it is said that the mind sees realit ." So what sees, or wha sees rea i y?

"Conventionally they say it is the mind", huh? - not in any ultimate sense, the mind, in fact, usually defined as "awareness of an object", that which sees an object, that is the mind huh? But, how do you know that is the mind which sees the object? How do you know it is the mind which sees reality, huh? What you need is a second mind, as it were, to see the first mind, and see that it does in fact see reality, but ~hat requires a third mind to see the second, and a fourth to see the third, and a fifth to see the fourth. This is what you call "regression to Infinity". So therefore it is said "it is only in a manner of speaking," that is, conventionally, that one says that "it is the mind, which sees reality", huh? One mustn't think that mind itself is a really existent thing, having any absolute existence, after all, what we call "mind" isn't a thing, it is a complex of a number of mental factors, and as such it is unreal; so there's no question of, therefore, this unreal mind really, you know, perceiving the object, perceiving reality, nor even of a second mind to see it. Huh?

Hridaya: Conventionally we see and we speak dualistically

S: Yes, dualistically, in terms of subject and object. Also one could say, this is not a point that Nagarjuna makes, and one could give illustrations of this effect, that you no more need a mind to perceive what the first mind perceives, or rather, no more need a mind to perceive the fact that the first mind does perciev~~than you need a light to show you that the first light is giving light, huh? Because by the same light, you know, which the first light actually gives, you see that, that light is giving light, you don't need a second light to show you that the first light is giving light, huh? It's just the same with the mind, the mind is, as it

were, in a manner of speaking, self-luminous, so by the same light that the, er, mind sees its object, you see that the mind is seeing its object, you don't need a second mind to see that. Nagarjuna doesn't say this, I use this argument because that is another way of looking at the same matter. Alright, go on to 36~

"Knowing thus truly and correctly That animate beings are unreal, No being subject to rebirth and without respite (one Passes free from suffering) like a fire without its cause."

The Precious Garland Session 13, v356-373 Page 4

S: Hu\$, this is saying, or in this verse Nagarjuna is saying that true and final liberation from suffering is possible only through wisdom, only through knowing truly and correctly that animate beings, living beings are unreal. Not in the sense of complete non-existence, but in the sense of having only a relative and contingent existence. So when one sees in this way one is no longer subject to rebirth, one is free from grasping, and one is liberated from suffering. Alright, now Nagarjuna starts getting into a somewhat different topic. So let's now go on to this. ~e goes back to the Bodhisattva and via the Bodhisattva makes his way to the Mahayana.

Verse 366

"Bodhisattvas also who have seen it thus, Seek perfect enlightenment with certainty, They maintain a continuity of existence Until enlightenment only through their compassion."

S: So, 'Bodhisattvas also who have seen it thus', that is to say, seen it according to reality, seen it with wisdom, 'seek perfect enlightenment with certainty'. Why is it said do you think that they 'seek perfect enlightenment with certainty'? Or what sort of certainty do they have? What are they certain of?

Uttara: Their goal?

S: Of their goal, yes. They're certain that there is such a thing as Enlightenment, because they've already had some preliminary glimpses of it, they've had some insight into the truth of the non-ego, they have seen that there is such a higher Transcendental dimension, as it were. So 'Bodhisattvas also who have seen it thus seek perfect Enlightenment with certainty.' They really do know that there is such a thing, because they've had at least a tiny glimpse of it already. 'They maintain a continuity of existence until Enlightenment only through their compassion.' This is the, as it were, almost popular Mahayana view that the Bodhisattva in I think Dr Matic's phrase, "hovers between being and non-being," that is to say, neither allows himself to become completely immersed in Nirvana nor, of course, is completely immersed in Samsara. He, as it were, hovers in between. He keeps in contact with Nirvana, with the spiritual dimension, the ultimate dimension through his wisdom, and keeps in contact with the Samsara through his compassion, he continues the series of births and rebirths. This is of course a somewhat popular, as I say, or dualistic way of looking at it.

S: (cont) In a deeper sense he has passed beyond the duality between, er, Samsara and Nirvana. There's no question of him maintaining a continuity of existence through compassion, he sees no difference, as it were, between remaining in the Samsara and not remaining in it. For him wisdom and compassion are one. But as I said, from a, sort of, as it were, popular point of view, speaking very conventionally, the Bodhisattva doesn't allow himself to merge completely into Nirvana, he keeps up his contact with the Samsara, out of compassion and continues to be reborn in it, to help others. (Pause) Alright, on to 367:

"The collections of merit and wisdom of Bodhisattvas Were taught by the Tathagata in the Mahayana, Disliked by the bewildered ~ahaanais~erid~d~~~

S: Nagarjuna seems to be making the point that the Mahayana was taught by the Buddha, huh? But presumably he has in mind people like the Sarvastivadins(?) perhaps, or (Soffranticas?), who did not accept the Mahayana sutras, such as the ~rfection of Wisdom sutras, and who did not agree that the Mahayana, the Mayahfana teaching, was in fact the teaching of the Buddha. So ~agarjuna on the contrary affirms that the collections of merit and wisdom of Bodhisattvas, the collections of merit and wisdom that make up the spiritual life of the Bodhisattvas, were taught by the Tathagata in the Mahayana. It's not clear whether 'disliked'... ah yes, this should be a semi-colon probably: 'disliked by the bewildered the Mahayana is derided because people don't recognise it, don't accept it, as the teaching of the Buddha himself, they deride the Mahayana. They dislike it because they're bewildered, they're mentally confused, they can't appreciate the Mahayana. As I mentioned earlier on, this question of whether the Buddha did teach the Mahayana is not really a very straightforward one. Probably its fairest to say that the Buddha taught the Mahayana in principle, in essence, in spirit, huh, er, but that some of the Mahayana Sutras, as literary compositions at least, are somewhat later works. You can appreciate that in the time of Nagarjuna there was no conception of what we would regard as historical development, you see what I mean? We can look back, we can read through the Pali canon and we can read the Pali suttas, Theravada suttas, we can also read the Sanskrit Mahayana texts, Mahayana Sutras, and we can see how from very simple beginnings the Buddha's teachings gradually grew and developed; if we study the Pali texts themselves very carefully, we can see that the Buddha's teaching as it were grew even during his own life-time. If we study texts like the 'Udana', huh, texts like the 'Sutta Nipata', the teachings seem very basic, very simple, very fundamental, not systematised, not arranged in any way. But when we study certain other texts, like the 'Mayjima Nikaya', then the teaching seems to be very often

S: (cont) much more systematically presented, though it is still, as far as we can see, to a great extent the teaching of the Buddha himself. It also does seem that after the Buddha's Parinirvana, er, the disciples continued expanding and elaborating the teaching, even in a way

developing it, developing fresh ways of looking at it, fresh interpretations, and that of course goes on and on, and from time to time a Sutra will be produced, or later on a work will be written which purported to be the utterance of the Buddha. So the spirit of it may well go back to the Buddha himself in each and every case, but very often the form in which we have it, the form in which it has survived is in an elaborated form, er, which was not given it by the Buddha, but given as far as we can see by later generations of disciples, huh? So this is true of the Hinayana Suttas, just as much as it is true of the Mahayana Suttas, huh?. We conceive the spirit of the Buddha himself in all these works, but, you know, the form in which we have them very often represents a later elaboration. But the early Mahayana-ists and the Hinayanists too, they couldn't see things in that way. They couldn't think in terms of development in that way. I mean, they had these sutras attributed to the Buddha, so to their minds it seemed to be a question of either the Buddha spoke them just like that or he didn't speak them at all. So the Hinayanists adopted the view that the Mahayana sutras were not spoken by the Buddha. They were right to the extent that he certainly didn't speak in that form, in that way, er, he didn't use those very words, those very idioms, perhaps even those particular ideas, huh, er, but the Mahayanists also were not wrong. They said that the Mahayana Suttas were the word of the Buddha, so they were wrong to the extent that he Buddha didn't, you know, put things in exactly that sort of way, but the spirit of the Mahayana Suttas is certainly the spirit of the Buddha, so they were right to that extent. So we can't take the view, really, strictly speaking, either that the Mahayana Suttas were the word of the Buddha, or that they were not, we can see quite clearly that the spirit of the teaching contained in the Mahayana Suttas can certainly be traced back to the Buddha himself, but that the form that has been given that spirit, that teaching in the Mahayana Suttas is quite a late form. Maybe even several hundred years later, than the Buddha himself.

Atula: In one of your early lectures you talk about two different schools

S: Yes, those who attach more importance to what the Buddha said, his actual words, and those who attach more importance to his life and the spirit of the teaching. So in a way, it's an unreal argument, I mean whether the Buddha did teach or did not teach the Mahayana Suttas; well he didn't speak them just like that, in the form that we have them at present, but certainly the spirit of the Mahayana Suttas is the spirit of the Buddha's teaching.

The Precious Garland 3V356-373 Page 7

S: (cont) So Nagarjuna says, "The collections (of merit and wisdom) of Bodhisattvas were taught by the Tathagata in the Mahayana, disliked by the bewildered The Mahayana is derided"; derided as not being the teachings of the Buddha, huh? So in a sense neither side is right and neither side is wrong. Both are right and both are wrong. Alright, 368

"Either through not knowing virtues and defects,

Or identifying the defective as virtuous, Or through disliking virtues, They deride the Mahayana."

S: Why do you think people did deride the Mahayana, what was the reason? Why does

Nagarjuna say, 'through not knowing virtues and defects, or identifying the defective as virtuous, or through disliking virtues', what virtues what defects?

Hridaya: It must have been on sectarian grounds

S: But what is it basically that certain people didn't like in the Mahayana? That they didn't really recognise as a virtue, as an ideal?

Ajita: The Bodhisattva (indistinct word)

S: It's really the Bodhisattva, yes. Er, Nagarjuna has just mentioned in verse 367 'the collections of merit and wisdom) of Bodhisattvas' and it does seem to be the Bodhisattva Ideal that was objected to by some of the other schools, huh? So 'Either through not knowing virtues and defects' they couldn't recognise the virtues of the Bodhisattva as virtues and not defects, huh? They are identifying the defective as virtuous, they thought that the lower ideal, which they had now adopted, of individual Enlightenment, Enlightenment for one's own sake alone, was virtue, huh? Or through disliking virtues they disliked, had a sort of natural repugnance to, according to Nagarjuna, the virtues that were characteristic of the Bodhisattva. And this in fact is historically true, one can say. But one can also say that the Bodhisattva Ideal, as presented in the Mahayana Sutras, even though it is presented in terms which were not used by the Buddha himself, it reflects very faithfully the spirit of the Buddha's teaching, and the Buddha's own life, huh? The Buddha, in a sense, after his enlightenment led a Bodhisattva life, huh? I mean, it is that life that the Bodhisattva is aiming at, not his own individual enlightenment simply. Not a private Nirvana for himself. So certain people, Nagarjuna is saying in effect, disliked the Mahayana because they were unable to appreciate the positivity of the ideal of the Bodhisattva, and in that way they missed the whole spirit of the Buddha himself,

The Precious Garland Session 13, V356-373 Page 8

S: (cont) ... because that Bodhisattva ideal tries to reflect the life of the Buddha, the spirit of the Buddha's life, as distinct from reproducing the words which the Buddha himself might have actually uttered. You see the difference.

Ajita: They hadn't really got in contact with a certain inspiration.

S: Alright, 369

"He who despises the Mahayana, Knowing that to harm others is wrong But that to help them is virtuous, Is called one who dislikes virtues."

S: After all what does the Mahayana say, what does the Bodhisattva ideal say? It says, don't harm others and on the other hand, help others'. So if you dislike that, huh, if you dislike the Bodhisattva Ideal, then you really must be called one who dislikes virtues! You're objecting to people not being harmed and to them being helped. I mean this is all the Bodhisattva Ideal is really all about. So what in fact are you disliking when you dislike the

Bodhisattva Ideal? You're practically disliking the life of the Buddha himself. I mean, admittedly, the Bodhisattva Ideal, as I said, is not presented in exactly the same terms that the Buddha himself used, but you must consider not the form of the presentation, but the substance of the presentation, what is actually presented, what is actually communicated.

Annanda: Presumably the basis of the Hinayana dislike of the Mahayana was they didn't believe the Bodhisattva really was helping people, because he wasn't Enlightened, (three or four indistinct words).

S: No, they didn't take that view, but there were different views, some taught that there was the possibility that the Bodhisattva life (?existed), but only one Bodhisattva was needed at a time, that is, the one who was going to be the next Buddha, so that everybody else should concern themselves with gaining individual enlightenment, you know, for themselves, and you could leave the business of enlightening others to the next Buddha, so there's only need for one Bodhisattva at a time, this was the view of some of them. But the Mahayana took the view that Bodhisattvahood was the ideal for all, because complete perfect Enlightenment was the ideal for all. In a way though even that distinction is an unreal one. In the days of the Buddha, as far as we can make out there were no two distinct ideals, one of the Enlightenment of the Buddha and the other of the Enlightenment of the disciples for themselves, there was just one state, of perfect Enlightenment, which was beneficial to yourself and beneficial to others.

The Precious Garland Session 13, V356-373 Page 9

S: (cont) So when the Hinayana introduced that distinction of, you know, the higher Enlightenment of the Buddha and the lower Enlightenment of the disciples, to that extent they were departing from the Buddha's original teaching; but the Mahayana said, as it were, you know, in its own way that there's just one Ideal, one supreme Ideal and everybody should aim at that. No-one should be satisfied with a lower ideal. But, of course, they were by that time saddled with the Hinayana Sutras, which represented the Buddha himself as teaching what seems to be two different ideals, a high one and a low one. But then the Mahayanists had to say the Buddha taught the low one provisionally and the high one was for those who had already attained the lower and could then begin to see the possibility of going even further. But in principle the Mahayana was saying, "aim for the highest conceivable goal, follow the noblest conceivable ideal." But in the end it all gets rather complicated, doctrinally speaking, partly due to the lack of historical sense in ancient India. The Mahayana is saying, as it were, the Bodhisattva Ideal, aim at the highest that you can conceive of, for the benefit of all, which is exactly what the Buddha said. You know, the terms are different but the message is the same.

Hridaya: Where in the Buddhist scriptures do you find the Buddha talking of these two Ideals, or two goals? S: Well for instance, you find it in the Sadharmapundarika

Sutra, which inherits in that respect the Hinayana tradition.

Hridaya: Sadharmapundarika is a Mahayana text?

S: Yes, you even read in some of the Pali texts, the later ones, you find the Buddha attributed, or the Buddha credited with a degree of Enlightenment which the disciples don't possess. Even though in other Pali texts it is quite clear that the two Enlightenments, as it were, are the same.

Hridaya: It just talks of Enlightenment.

S: Yes.

Hrida a: Isn't it in something like the 'Udana' there isn't the distinction between the Enlightener~ent of the Buddha and the Enlightenment of

S: Yes, right, for instance, there is, er, a passage where Sariputra ~raises the Buddha, in Pali this is 'as the greatest of all Buddhas who have ever lived' and Sariputra, mind you, he is an Arahant, so according to some of those older texts had the same Enlightenment as the Buddha himself, - so the Buddha then rebukes him and says that how can you say that I'm the greatest of all the Buddhas, do you know all the

The Precious Garland Session 13, V356-373 Page 10

S: (cont) ... Buddhas of the past? No. Do you know the Buddhas of the present? No. Do you even know me? And Sariputra says, "No." ~o if he had the same enlightenment as the Buddha he would have known the Buddha, which older texts do make clear, that the disciples do make clear, that the disciples do have the same Enlightenment. So its from texts like, you know that, the Buddha and Sariputra, er that there grew up this idea apparently of there being a higher degree of Enlghte~ment for the Buddha, or even a separate kind of Enlightenment, and a lo~er one for the disciples, and that was taken over by the Mahayana.

[529]

In the Mahayana there wasn't that kind of historical sense and was not able as it were to trace back the history of the Buddhism and to see that originally there had been just one ideal. But it is one ideal that Lhe Mahayana itself proclaims. Only it says "The Buddha did teach two ideals or even three ideal on different occasions"1. It took the Hinayana scr&ptures at their face value; but it says that that was not the Buddha's highest teaching; the highest teaching is found in the Mahayana. We have to go in this rather round about sort of way. But now it is simpler for us to say that the whole distinction is unreal. That Enlightenment for oneself, enlightenment for the sake of others, you cannot really separate these two aspects. So what the Buddha himself originally taught though in a very brief and simple way is what the Mahayana later presented in the Bodhisattva Ideal. Though in as much as there had been in the meantime several hundred years of development of Buddhist thought, the Mahayana was able to present that Ideal in a much richer and colourful form than the Buddha himself had presented it. Of course eventually some of the Mahayana texts presented it so brilliantly and so colourfully that it ceased to be an ideal for the individual struggling Buddhist and became a sort of vast Cosmic Principle, which we saw the other day. All right, V.370:

"He who despises Mahayana. the source of Of all virtue s in that it teaches taking delight

Solely in the aims of others and not looking To one's own, consequently burns himself."

S: So you're going against your own interest in the Bodhisattva Ideal The Mahayana teaches that one should take delight in the aims of others that one should help others. But if you are going against Mahayana, you are preventing you yourself from being helped. Do you see that ? Another slightly ingenious argument ? So you are causing suffering to yourself because by criticising and disliking of looking down on the Mahayana, the Bodhisattva Ideal you are preventing those who might become Bodhisattvas and help others including you from so doing.

AJITA: So depriving yourself of all benefits ?

S: Right. What do you think of this "taking delight solely in the aims of others and not looking to one's own ? Do you think it could

be regarded as extreme ? Do you think it is a bit one-sided ? Do you think in fact you can do this ? You can devote yourself to the interests of others, ignoring your own completely ? In a way it is an unreal distinction. No doubt though it is put like this, this is what the Mahayana does say on a popular level, one cannot take it too literally. But you could say that if you are doing good to others, you

are doing good for yourself. How can you separate the two ? It is not a question of doing good to others at the expense of your own good.

Hridaya: And Nagarjuna said that I think in the text earlier on.

S: So perhaps this just an extreme sort of exhortation to help overcome one's natural selfishness and egocentricity, that you should ignore neglect your own aims entirely. You could take it to mean that you should just include yourself as one among everybody because if you are going to devote yourself to the good of all that includes you too. So it is not you and all others as we usually think, you on one side and all others on the other, but just all others, everybody including you. You include yourself just like you include everybody else, not as anybody special standing as it were over against the whole body of humanity.

Hridava: Aiming at something that you all ()

S: Yes

Ajita: That is the importance of the first stage of the Metta Bhavana

S: Yes, you are not excluded from that You~(so)other living beings.

Uttara: Does that happen with the arising of the Bodhicitta? Do they discover this conflict ?

S: Yes in a way the arising of the Bodhicitta is a reconciliation of the conflict between the needs of self and the needs of others. It is a resolution of the tension between the self and the not-self .You do not have to choose any more. What you are doing quite spontaneously is

good for what used to be you and good for what used to be others. But you don't see them in that way any more because the Bodhicitta has arisen. There's no question of balancing or adjusting the claims of self and the claims of others. When the Bodhicitta has arisen you begin to see that in ultimaterality there is no self, there are no others. So what room is there for conflict? In a manner of speaking yes me, in a manner of speaking, others but those distinctions are not to be taken too seriously. So once the Bodhicitta has arisen you function quite spontaneously and without reference to the as it were separate or even rival interests of self and other as sort of absolute ultimately real and mutually exclusive entities. You could say that analogically speaking it is a bit like though don't press this too far take it too literally, it is like the relation of the mother with the child, especially when the child is very young, the mother doesn't think in terms of what myself and the child. If she's doing something for the child she doesn't think that she isn't doing something for herself because she's so much bound up with the child, the child is so much part of her. There is not that sort of ultimate distinction

so there's no conflict. The mother doesn't think in terms of "I spend my time looking after the child" she doesn't think like that, feel like that~not i~ she's a normal healthy mother. So this is on a lower instinctual sub-aware level. The Bodhisattva is like that on a higher more truly spontaneous and supra-aware level. But the force of the distinction between self and other has been lessened, so there isn't that sort of conflict. He doesn't have to reconcile the rival claims of self and other because he doesn't see self and other in that sort of mutually exclusive sort of sense any more.

Uttara: (Long question about mother's motives-)

S: I said only, not so~ of literally. Not to take it too literally. What it is very often just a sort of attachment, quite instinctual. One shouldn't sort of idealise it. It certainly isn't metta but may be used analogically, resemble it analogically, but the mother doesn't have metta towards the child because she doesn't really realise the existence of the child as a separate individual. There is a sutta which says you should feel the love towards all living beings as mother feels for her only child. The point of the comparison is the comparison is the intensity as it were. But you know a mother's love for the child is very exclusive. It doesn't extend to other children, to other women's babies. It's ~ child it's ~ baby. That's why the feeling is so strong, it is an extension of one's ego. But what one wants is not an extension of one's ego but an extension of one's non-ego. That is the difference.

Ananda: It reminds me of that story of the man who sees the person who is being beaten up and surrounded by a large crowd. And then he finds out that it is his own mother. You should feel like that towards other beings.

S: Yes one speaks in terms of love for the child love for one's mother because one has got to try to give people some idea of what it is all about especially the fact that it is a feeling but that these sort of natural human feelings have definitely got their limitations, they are largely in instinctual and to that extent quite unaware. I mean one is not thinking in those sort of terms but one does want something of that kind of intensity not just some vague sort of lukewarm sentiment.

Ananda: Maybe even in the beginning even that kind of feeling is better than no feeling at all.

To get that intense feeling even of that nature is a progression.

~: All right. V371.

"One with faith in emptiness forsakes it through misconception. Another who is angry forsakes emptiness through disliking it: 'If even the faithful one is said to be burned~ what~An b~ api a

2 "

S: What does this mean, I wonder. Doesn't seem very clear does it? So another who is angry forsakes emptiness through disliking it. He thinks that there is something really there to be disliked. So to that extent he departs from the realisation of emptiness. Faith here seems to mean just liking of trusting or being attached to.

Atula: Friends are more dangerous than enemies.

li But "one with faith in emptiness forsakes it through misconception" Well you forsake it through misconception if you have faith in it as though it were a thing. It doesn't really make much difference if you like emptiness or dislike it, take it for a thing. The big mistake is that you take it for a thing. In that way you miss emptiness either way and as we've seen a miss is as good as a mile (laughter) If you miss something because you like it in the wrong sort of way that's no better than missing it because you dislike it in the wrong sort of way. So it seems to me something like that. "If even the faithful one is said to be burned, what can be said about the one who is disinclined through despising it?" And how much more burned will he be? If it's a mistake even to love, how much more of a mistake is it to hate? I mean if you love thinking that the love is directed to someone or something that is really there, that is as bad as hating something thinking that it is really there; in both cases you forget sunyata, forsake emptiness. So faith here seems to be just liking the qualities of something but you like them thinking those qualities as absolutely existent reality; that's your mistake; so you miss sunyata. It's as bad to miss it in that sense as to miss it through being angry or through disliking, despising it.

Hridaya: It's like a personal faith in something.

S: Yes it's not faith in that sense at all. This with regard say to people to like them for the wrong reasons is as bad as not liking them for the wrong reasons. In each case you miss the person. You can have say a positive projection and you can also have a negative projection as regard to them. In each case you miss the person. So it's a bit like that. You're equally far away from or equally out of touch with out of communication with the person himself whether your projection on to him is a positive one or a negative one. If you like him for qualities he doesn't possess, that is as bad as disliking him for qualities he doesn't possess. You miss the person equally in both cases. You either overshoot the mark or undershoot it either go too far or not far enough. You either see him through dark blue spectacles or through rose tinted spectacles. In neither case do you see him. It's rather like...it's no use saying to someone "It doesn't matter that I project onto you because I project such good things onto

you'1. Projection is projection, you still misz; the person. Alright,

V.372: "Just as it is explained in med~cine

That pois&n can be driven out by poison, What contr~iction is thezre in saying that The injurious can be driven out by suffering "

This perhaps refers back to a previous verse where Nagarjuna refers to the supression of pleasure is also fancied as ~eing pain. You can get rid of pain by pain as it were. You get rid of the suffering of conditioned existance whth the help of the suffering, inverted commas, which is incidental to your spiritual piactice. And maybe it does hurt to get up in the morning and meditate but, even though it does hurt, that hurt, that pain and sufferint is going to lead you bia meditation to a state which is a purely blissful one.

Ajtta: Is that idea of using whatever you have at hand to help our evolutio~ 7

S: I don't quite s~~e why this verse comes in exactly thjs place. It's true but it doesn't seem particularly connected with what has just gone immediately before. Yes it is connected with what comes next, maybe there's a bit of a jump on Nagarjuna's part, he's got onto a slighty ~ifferent topic. Perhaps he's asking the king not to be afuaid of any incidental suffering that he may have to enperience by trying to lead the sort of life that Nagarjuna is recommending, especially by trying to follow the Bodhisattva Ideal. All right what does Na~a- juna say next than ? V.373

~'It is widely known that motivation

Determines niactices and that the mind

Is mosttimnortant. How then could even suffering not be helpful For one who gives assistance with the motivation to help others ~

I mean that is your basi~ motivation as a bodhisattva: To help others So any pain, any suffering that you have to experience as a result of that motivation as a result of helping others that cannot but lie good for you in the long run.

Ananda: Could you also say that it he~ps you understand the suffering of othera.

ii Yes. ~ut if you haven't suffered~ the suffering of others seems very unreal to you~ very unnecessary, as though they are making a lot ot fuss about nothing. It is only when you yourself have had some experience of suffering usually that you begin to be abit sympathetic. Like the person who always enjoys good he~ith finds it qu;te difficult to sympathise with people who are suffering because they are sick, or you could say unwell or you could say physically weak. He t~inks it is all a lot of nonsense, as tkough they're making a big song and

£~ ~!z6

dance about nothing at all. They should just pull themselves together and forget all about their aches and pain.. And that's the sort of attitude that the he&ithy person very often has.

But once he's fallen ill himself and has experienced a bit of suffering in that way, he usually becomes a bit more sympathetic. Then he knows what it's all about. Then if you tell him that you are not at all well or that you are suffering well he knows what you are talking about whereas perhaps he didn't before.

Ananda: It's like the person that's never smoked trying to tell someone to give up smoking.

S: Yes right. "Putting that darned thing in your mouth twenty or thirty times a day. Just give up that stuff: It's ridiculous. What do you mean "You cannot give it up ?", of course you can. Dead easy." That is what they say. Or "What, you've got a pain in your stomach ? So what ? Just ignore it, just carry on, what's a pain in the stomach ? That's nothing" (laughter) "Your back aches ? So what ? Just carry on, don't take any notice of it, it'll go away, stop worrying about it, it'll never go away. Always on about your aches and pains. This what the healthy person is likely to say. But anyway when sickness strikes you then you know then you begin to think a bit. Or sometimes the person who is full of faith cannot understand the doubts and difficulties and problems of the person who hasn't got much faith. So in each case some experience of one's own is necessary before one can enter sympathetically into another person's experience. I mean some of our married friends tell us it is quite impossible to tell what it is like to be married unless you actually are. I mean it is impossible to tell someone what the responsibilities are unless you've had some experience of them. You know these young bachelors and unmarried people say "Take a month off, go away for a month. What does it matter ? It is easy." But they say it's not as easy as that. You only know it when you're in that sort of situation".

Uttara: Sometimes you it is that way.... They're just so engrossed in their situation that they just cannot see...

~ I'm only citing that as an example. I'm not setting up a defence of it. (laughter) Maybe sometimes someone is quite genuinely in a situation where he cannot get away and the person who always in the position of being able to get away when he wants to, he won't be able to understand that very much. I'm not saying that there aren't some people who could get away if they really wanted to because I'm not saying that there aren't some people who are hypochondrially sick and who could get over it if they really want to, I'm just citing these

examples to show that it is very difficult to enter into another person's experience. The person who wears the shoe knows where it pinches, not the person who is not wearing the shoe.

Alaya: It's difficult for the law abiding to feel sympathy for the criminal.

S: Or the criminal to feel sympathy for the law abiding.

Ananda: That's the development of sympathetic joy.

S: Yes and compassion

Ananda: And complementary to that, the development of sympathetic misery.

S: Well that is compassion. Not sympathetic misery. (laughter) Compassion doesn't mean making yourself miserable too. That doesn't help anybody.

Ananda: It gives you a sense of empathy with the person.

S: Well, I stick to Tennyson's phrase "Some painless sympathy with pain" as sympathizing doesn't mean bringing yourself down to that particular person's level if they're all sad and depressed. Anyway, V.374: 1, If even in ordinary life pain can bring future benefit

Accepting suffering beneficial for

One's own and other's happiness of course will help; This practice from of old is known as the excellent method.¹

This is in a sense almost a way of consoling oneself. If you find meditation very difficult even painful if you find sitting painful, if you find getting up early in the morning painful, well just reflect It's all in a good cause - you're going to reap happiness, joy a hundred fold later on because of what you are going through now; thus, it is at least one way of looking at it. That is one which one often has had recourse to.

Hridaya. That kind of thing is going on amongst ourselves. If you feel that meditation is really difficult really hard and that someone says you are really going through it, you're lucky because you're really going through it and you'll come out the other side so much better.

S: I'm not so sure of that. Perhaps you will perhaps you won't.

[536]

Participants: Ven. Sangharakshita, Ananda, Hridaya, Uttara, Ajita, Atula, Punja, Surata (Colin Warren), Francis Gritton, and Alaya.

Side A (Cont.) V. Session 14 v. 1?? (more like 374-5 - 383 _____ 384 - 390

(Indistinct voices - S: I'm not so sure of that) S: Perhaps you will, perhaps not. I don't think suffering (in reality?) does

people good.

Hridaya: It's that kind of encouragement (S.: Right, right)

S: Perhaps, you will later on be yourself more sympathetic to the difficulties of the beginner, remembering your own early struggles, hm? You didn't have it very easy. (pause) In some respects a good teacher is one who never forgets what it's like to be a pupil, or to be a

beginner, huh? I think one really has to be careful about, I pointed this out once or twice, already when I've noticed that °~~rkcd (~w~ear)~~sometimes people taking beginner's meditation classes keep

them going on far too long; they've forgotten the beginner has difficulty in sitting even for 15 or 20 minutes huh? Sometimes beginners' meditation classes are kept on 40 or 50 minutes, which is ridiculous. So people have forgotten what it was like to be a beginner, that means. To really empathize and feel your way into the situation of those people (pause) Maybe now you yourself can sit for 40 or 50 minutes very easily but they can't and you shouldn't forget that. (Pause) Anyway if you do remember your own early experiences and miseries very Vividly, huh? then you'll also be mindful of the needs of the beginner and the difficulties of the beginner, when you are taking a beginners' meditation class. (Pause) If you don't remember well you're then likely to~what? "50 minutes? anyone can sit 50 minutes'. (Unclear - laughter)" It isn't like that. (pause) Alright 375:

Surata? (reading): "Through relinquishing small pleasures There is extensive happiness (later): Seeing the greater happiness, the resolute Should relinquish their small pleasures (now)"

S: Do you think that this is a rule that can invariably be applied? (Pause)

Hridaya: In the long term I would say yes. eVen

S: In the long-term, yes. ---Do you think that you can? or that you/should try to give up all pleasures now, instantly, for the sake of the pleasures which you definitely will enjoy later on? Do you think this is possible or desirable? Why do you think so?

Uttara?: Because the thing you said about that you acquire a lot of harm on the brink(?) instead of more of a natural(?). . .(unclear)

S: This is one of the things I have been saying quite strongly lately. You must be very careful in a way that you are likely not to be deprived of all pleasure. I know what Nagarjuna says about worldly pleasure is true but at the same time you have to keep yourself going, hm? If life is completely devoid of pleasure,

537 page 2

of any kind, you just won't be able to carry on and the chances are that you will turn to the grosser worldly pleasures by way of compensation, hm? So I think it is quite important to have some pleasureable experiences in one's life, hm? but one should try to see to it that pleasureable experiences are at least on the spiritual rather than the worldly side, hm? You see what I mean? Otherwise you just lose interest in things and life becomes so joyless, so dull that you can't go on making an effort. A pleasureable experience, and it is possible to have a pleasureable experience which is skillful, has a sort of tonic effect on one. hm? Otherwise you lapse into a state of lethargy, dullness, indifference and ultimately of boredom, hm? chronic boredom which you find very difficult to get out of so apply this wisely and reasonably, hm? Don't think that by main force you give up all your little pleasures now, you automatically bring nearer the day when you experience the true spiritual pleasures in all their

fullness. . .not necessarily, hm? (pause) You'd be like the man who set off on a journey and wanted to get to his destination as quickly as possible. .so he thought,"well, the whole journey is going to take me about a week, and the lighter I am the more quickly I can travel. Therefore, I won't weigh myself down taking any food". .so he sets off on his journey without taking any food and he travels quite quickly for a while but after a couple of days he needs food but he hasn't brought any food so as to keep himself light and free from weight; but because he hasn't got any food he goes slower and slower and never reaches his destination.. .It's a bit like that - pleasure is like the food that you use wisely to keep yourself going.

Hridaya: It's not the pleasures for their own sake, (S: No) it's to help you maintain a positive attitude.

S: You must just be careful about the claim of pleasures. There's skillful pleasures.. .in the case of those who~work at Sukhatavi - skillful pleasures would mean a day's outing - you know, a day in the open air, even a football match or something of that sort hm,hm? (laughter) I did say even (laughter) but you know going and seeing one of your old girlfriends would not be regard~ed as skillful, huh? because that might lead to all sorts of other things - unless you've got your old girlfriend very firmly under control (laughter) They listen to your discourses on Buddhism, huh? (pause) So there must be some zest in life, hm? - Worldly pleasures aren't ultimately real, huh? but one does need it seems, a little bit of unreality to keep, or positive unreality, to keep one going until you can transcend unreality both positive and negative.. .and get on without either.

Hridaya: I've been thinking of something from Milarepa- (S:Hm) I mean a long section where he'd been without food and nourishment of any kind - he was doing his Puja and devotion and then someone did bring him food (S: Some meat in fact) and it was a very good meal and he sings the praise of that after because he was able to do such a good Puja and put so much into his devotion so maybe it's a kind of sustenance like that really (S: Hm, yes) (Long Pause

page 3

S: Maybe it is a mistake in a way, to give up the small worldly pleasures completely, before you even started tasting the higher spiritual pleasures. Hm? It'll leave your life too dry and too arid, hm? At least there must be some- thing positive in your life, something spiritually positive, before you can, as afford it were, ~~K~ to give up all worldly pleasures, hm? otherwise you may get

to a very dry and hopeless state even then and fall back into the worldly pleasures with a big heavy thud, yes? It requires great skill and greatmindful- ness and great honesty to make sure you're just not rationalizing - ~tionalizing your unwillingness to give things up. (pause) So you don't necessarily, auto- matically make quicker progress by you know, giving up all these smaller -

comparatively harmless pleasures. (long pause),,,But certainly you should make a start on giving them up and try to develop the higher spiritual pleasures

as much as possib~~e. (long pause) 376:

Uttara reading: "If such things cannot be borne, Then doctors giving pungent Medicines would disappear. It is not (reasonable) To forsake (great pleasure for the small)."

S: If in fact it was not possible to give up small pleasures for the sake of great; if it was not possible to experience the pain of giving up small pleasures for the sake of great, then it would not be Possible for doctors to function in that sort of way. . doctors who gave you unpleasant medicines, who restore you to health which is a pleasant state, would just disappear but the fact that you do accept the bitter unpleasant medicine from the doctor for the sake of future health and well~eing shows that you are in fact, quite able and willing to follow this particular course, hm? of giving up the present small pleasures, even albeit with pain, for the sake of the greater pleasures which you experience later on.. it's the sort of thing that we do even i~ our ordinary worldly life, hm? So "it is not reasonable to forsake great pleasure fr~x~~x~~ f~~rthe small" - if you give up, if you refuse to give up the small for the sake

of the great, then you are in fact giving up the great for the sake of the small, which is ridiculous, huh? -- If someone says, "well give me £10 today and I'll give you £100 tomorrow" huh? well if you refuse to give up the £10 today, well, that's ridiculous because you're giving up the £100 tomorrow. Well you say, "I don't want to give up £10" but you want to give up £100 so it's ridiculous to say "I don't want to give up £10 when you're willing to give up £100. (laughter) Se it's ridiculous to say, "I don't want to forfeit the pleasure of worldly life, because I don't want to forfeit pleasure but by doing that you're forfeiting the pleasure of Nirvana. Hm? So alright, it doesn't matter if you're not willing to give up~easures, but ¼~ give up the small pleasure for the sake of the great. Give up worldly pleasures for the sake of spiritual pleasures - that's only rational and logical - but you have to be deeply convinced of the truth of this to be able to act upon it. Some people are very doubtful about spiritual pleasures whether there even are any such things as spiritual pleasures...

page 4

They've heard about them but they've not really experienced very much so far, and if one was to ask someone honestly, 'You know, what are the greatest pleasures I've ever experienced'" well in the case of most people, they woulc~t oe spiritual pleasures, hm? - The pleasures are there of getting drtiril~, or the pleasures of sex, or the pleasures of coming into a large sum of money. These are the pleasures that would really register but pleasures of meditation? Even those who've been meditating for along time - pl~asures of meditaton or pleasures of reading spiritual books or pleasures about taking about the)-harma - those pleasures for most people would seem very anaemic in comparison. Hm? i~ey don't think of spiritual pleasures as a sort of wild ecstasy (laughter) Nothing like that at all, so if you talk in terms of giving up your wor~dly pleasures or think of higher spiritual pleasures for many people it all seems a bit of a joke. hm? All they can see lying ahead is long years of blood, toil, tears and sweat (laughter) - especially sweat hm?

Hridaya: That's why it's so important to have a few people around you who are happy and podtive rather than on a downer about being in the Sa~a(?) (S:Bight) ant) the spiritual life. (S: Yes)

S~: Jell, I think whatever the situation might have been; whatever the conditions might have been in Nagarjuna's time it's not possible for us to advise people too glibly (or even to advise ourselves) to give up these trivial, trashy" worldly pleasures for the sake of the great spiritual Pleasures that you will enjoy later on. It does also appeal to a slightly mercenary motive, doesn't it? - in a way--not as it were Joining the good for the sake of the good because it ~s intrinsically inspiring and attractive but because it's a s~er investment-- "You'll get a good return on your money" - It ~oesn't seem n a way very noble - It is an argument, it is true - no ~oubt what appeals to the king - that's why N.agarjuna' 5 using it but it isn't the most elevated kind of ~ppeal, is it? It doesn't aTheal to the noblest of motives. There's really not much of the

Doddhisattva spirit in it one could say ,':--- \ ~'&JL' ~ Hridaya: The Buddha i~~y r~. Nofli unclear) (S: He was indeed)

S: There's a verse in the Dhammapada to the same effect (Voice: which one's that?

S: A~most the same words like Nagarjuna that "a wise man gives up the smaller pleasures for the sake of the greater." Jell, that's true. hm? But I don't think it's an argument that's likely to appeal ~ery strongly to people nowadays; especially if they have to give up the small pleasure first. I mean most People mi~ht a%~~t a line "well, let me experience that higher greater pleasure" then of course interest in the smaller pleasure will drop out quite natural ly C

(laughter) but it is to some extent a ~ondition of experiencing the hightr

spiritual Pleasure that you give up the lower wor~~d~ly pleasure - to some extent.

page 5 ~%~

Anan~a: Does that verse you quoted say the wise irtan - implying that the wise man would see the consequences of the whole thing(?) (S: Fight, yes) (Pause)

J: Nagarjuna says here "the ~esolute should relinquish their small pleasures They have to be very strong minded to be able to do this sort of thing - very resolute and strong-willed, very ~etermined... sometimes you can see it quite clearly in certain specific issues, like giving up smoking - "of course it'll be better for you" but with regard to the spiritual life as a whole it's much more difficult to see. .Alright 377:

Voice Reading: "Someti~es what is nonally thought unhelpful Is regarded as beneficial by the wise; General rules and thdr exceptions Are highlighted in all treatises."

S: (Re~~ts the above quotation) (T~ong pause) So sometimes things which ordinary people thinkare unhelpful, you know, the wise can see are really in the long run, quite beneficial, huh? So this sort of situation, the genral rules are not held to be true by the majority, anexception which can be perceived by the wise - these are highlighted in all

treatises dealing with the ethical and the spiritual life.. Some people think it isn't a good thing to lose money or to have your house burn down in a fire but sometimes the wisemen see that this can be very beneficial to you. It might really start you thinking. (pause)

Voice: If you go away on Solitary Retreats (S: Yes, right)

b: Maybe a number of people might regard that as a great disaster - to be cut off from everybody else - to be entirely alone for a while "What would you rely on with yourself? How would you pass your time? You could only get bored?" some think.

Hridaya: You would do it just to make some sort of a "sacrifice" (laughter) S: "You must be a masochist" (long pause) They get you both ways: If you enjoy it you're a nut and if you do it to make yourself suffer than you're a masochist too.

Hridaya: Again with something like this, you need to be around other people, who if you like are the wise - who do see that it's helpful otherwise you're just

going to feel doubts in yourself if you're surrounded by people ~~~~~t(~~~~%?gO~~~~ S: padmavajra wrote me from his solitary retreat - it was quite interesting - it was the first time he'd been alone for any length of time for his whole life eh? he said at first he felt quite sorry for himself and he even had a little cry but after a few days he started really enjoying it. (long pause) 375:

Atula reading: "Who with intelligence would deride Deeds motivated by compassion And the stainless wisdom as explained In the Mahayana?"

S: Naturally, Nagarjuna says; "What, Jioes the Mahayana really teach?" "Simply compassion, actions motivated by compassion and a pure stainless wisdom", hm? "So how is it possible for an intelligent person to deride these things?" "This is all that the Mahayana is really about" hm? (long pause) Alright 379:

[541]

Ananda reading: "Due to the great extent and depth

Of the Mahayana, it is derided Through ignorance by the untrained and lazy, who are the foes of themselves and others."

S: So though in a way the Mahayana is so simple, while it teaches simply wisdom and compassion, though it upholds simply the Bodhisattva ideal, at the same time its teachings are very vast, are very extensive and very deep and therefore, difficult to fathom, difficult to understand, huh? and the ignorant who are not spiritually trained, who are lazy and who are foes of themselves and of others, they deride it, they ridicule it. (long pause) Alright 380:

Voice reading: "The Mahayana has a nature Of giving, ethics, patience, effort, Concentration, wisdom and compassion, How; could it ever explain things fully?"

{3: These are the 6 Paramitas plus compassion which is of course, coordinated with wisdom, huh? So in as much as these 6 Paramitas are the very essence of the Mahayana, are the nature of the Mahayana "how could it ever explain things.." that is to say explain the Buddha's teaching

"badly". How could it ever be untrue? to the Buddha's teaching? (L~ng pause) Alright 381:

Hrio~aya reading: "Others' aims are (achieved) through giving and ethics, One's own are (achieved) through patience and effort, Concentration and wisdom cause liberation, These epitomize the sense of the Mahayana."

S: So giving and k&N~~ ethics, Dana and Sila are the first two Paramitas. These are what may be regarded as "other oriented virtues", altruistic virtues, hm? so through the practice of giving, through the practice of the precepts, the aims of others are achieved and through Le~ractice of patience and through the practice of effort, energy, vigour, one's own aims are achieved. huh? These two Paramitas are self-oriented - and then through concentration and wisdom, the other two Paramitas, one attains liberation. Which means one goes beyond the conception of self and others altogether, huh? So these epitomize the sense of the Mahayana - Through giving and ethics, one works for t~r others, through patience and effort one works for oneself - through concentration and wisdom, one wins liberation and goes beyond all sense of self and others, huh? So this in short is the Mahayana, simply this.. working for others, working for oneself, working for that which is beyond both self and others. but could be simpler? ~at could be more straight-forward? hm? (pause) Alright 332:

Ajita(?) reading: "The aims of benefitting oneself and others and the meaning Of liberation as briefly taught (in the Hinayana) By Buddha are contained in the six perfections, Therefore the Mahayana is the word of Buddha."

S; Afterall, what is the Mahayana? The Mahayana consists in the practice of the six paramitas and what are those paramitas? Giving, ethics, patience, vigour, concentration and wisdom. huh? So alright, take the Hinayana scriptures,

page 7

take the Hinayana teaching huh? Do the Hinayana scriptures advocate giving? generosity? hm? p005 the Buddha in the Hinayana scriptures advocate giving? hm? Does he say that it's a good thing to give? Yes, he does. Does he say in the Hinayana scriptures, does the Hinayana teachings say that the practice of the precepts is good? or does he say that it's a bad thing? No, he says it's good. but about patience? to the Hinayana scriptures say you should be impatient? No, they say you should be patient. ~hat about making an effort? Do the Hinayana scriptures say that you should be lazy? No, they say that you should make an effort. What about meditation? do they discourage meditation? No, they say you should practice meditation. but about wisdom? Are the Hinayana scriptures against wisdom? No, they're all for it. (laughter) So the Hinayana scriptures teach giving, ethics, patience, vigour, concentration and wisdom. But they teach them briefly huh? That's the only difference. The Mahayana explains them at greater length. hm? "So how can you say that the Mahayana is not the word of the Buddha?" , basing yourself on the Hinayana scriptures, hm? The Mahayana teaches exactly the same thing, exactly the same virtues, just exactly the same practices as the Hinayana, but it teaches them at greater length, in greater detail, hm? that's the only difference. Therefore, the Mahayana is the word of the Buddha. hm? Here I think Nagarjuna is on very firm ground indeed. This is exactly what one does find. One doesn't find in the

Hinayana scriptures that the six paramitas are taught as a list in that way. hm? You don't find those six terms occurring in that order but you certainly find frequent references to Dana, frequent references to Sila, and so on. So the Mahayana has systematized and amplified hm? One can say that that is exactly the position. Therefore, in spirit and in essence, the Mahayana IS the word of the Buddha. So this is quite a sound argument of Nagarjuna's which still holds good. I mean that this is an attitude which one can adopt very sensible and realistically today. (pause) So if any modern day Theravadian says he doesn't accept the Mahayana as the word of the Buddha; he doesn't accept the Mahayana as being the Buddha's teaching I can say this, "well are you against Dana?" "Are you against Sila?" "bell no." "This is all that the Mahayana teaches the six paramitas. What makes you a Bodhisattva? Practice of the six paramitas." "How can you say then that a Bodhisattva is not a Buddhist?" "How can you say that one who upholds, or one that follows the Bodhisattva ideal is not a Buddhist? How can you say a Mahayanist is not a Buddhist?" as some Theravadans do. What is a Mahayanist? (no who is trying to be a Bodhisattva. What is a Bodhisattva? no who is trying to practice the six paramitas. What are the six paramitas? The same virtues as you find in the Hinayana scriptures.. but in a more systematized and less detailed form, that's all, hm? SO these arguments still hold good even today. (pause) The Theravada might say that there's a lot in the Mahayana other than the six paramitas, that's got very little to do with the six paramitas. All you can say in the

Theravada too there's lots of things that haven't got very much to do with

page

the six paramitas; haven't got very much to do with the eight-fold path. What about the yellow robes of the monks? robes that have any direct bearing with the

eight-fold path? No. What about chanting and performing (word unclear) for

lay people; Cows that have any direct bearing on the eight-fold path? "to. What about worshipping the Buddha's tooth in Kandy, in Ceylon? (laughter) Does that have any bearing on the eight-fold path? No. "You have got these extra things just like the Mahayanists have." Hm? (laughter)

Hridaya?: Monks. (S: Yeah) (Long pause)

U: There's someone in Mahayana stories reciting Om Nani Padme Hum. Well, so what? The Theravadans are always shouting Sadhu, Sadhu, Sadhu. (laughter) Alright, OK~~ you admit that these things are sort of extras but you've both got your different sets of "extras" but you've also got the same fundamentals, the same essentials, right? So overall there's no real difference between the Hinayana and the Mahayana or the Theravada and the Mahayana. (pause)

Hridaya: In the Dhammapadam alone you find quite a lot of all six. (S: Indeed)

Ananda: It seems to me in this whole argument, we're not really likely to come across this very much in people's criticism in the West, but in a different form maybe we are, in that Buddhism being accused of being against other teachings in a more

contemporary sense.

,%': ;~~ome teachings it would be very much auainst - There are teanhin~s ane teachings.

Ananda: I think a point that's important to make is that the Buddha is teaching "f a pat~
~~hich aims at Enlightenment and (unclear) liberation. That is its

essence, not only a orcation which ThTC },~'rofess.

S: Yes, hm. ell I remember some years ago when I was still at the Hampshire Dwdhist Vihara, there was a great to-do ~~~h the Chiswick Vihara because the Prime i4 sister of Ceylon was flying from Oclombo to London and she was bringing with her some relics or alleged relics o:t~' the Buddha. So they organized a pro- cession down Chiswick High St. aw~ they hired from a circus some small elephants, hm because they wanted to have it just like in Ceylon. So this was the impression given to the inhabitants of Chiswick that Budhists were people who went in public n~ocess~on with elephants (laughter) and pictures appeared In the papers of eourse(the ~~~g~e)~Sper~ just loved it: "Budhist Procession with Elephants", an some t~"n'g-j~~ish ~~~dhists, and I must say a]~~,so the Thuddhist Society were so fed up with this, so cispleased at this sort of impression was being given. Sure, in o.eyon there's nothing wrong with having a procession with elephants - it's part of local custom and tradition - but is this the sort of impression you want to create in the 'rest. It associates Buddhism in our mind with a kind of eiTh'c'~~ "The Slephants are Comiug to Town:~~. (laughter) Tt' S much the same thing with some of our Japanese Friem:~s wa%king from Bethnal Green station to Sut~avati, you ;'cnow beating loudly on their little drums and chanting their mantras in their strange outlandish language; wearing their white bonnets and all the rest of it - hat sort of impression does that convey in Bethnal Green? Does it really cenge"y anything of Buo'dhism? as a teachirig, as a practice? NO. It's just a colorful bit of Orientalia - Kt::::~~ nothing to do with the Pharm a (pause)

page 9

Ue have tc avoid these sorts of things.. and not allow people to think "This is buddhism", this is thei)harma. You get this sort of thingin schools - when comparative religion is taught - appreciating other people's cultures and "Th earning what the Buddhist religion teaches". Also some good well-meaning people ask- you about/~o?us~ivals, your marriage customs and all, and your "names". They never ask you the essentials of the teachingC%

Voice: Tocking at it the other way around say, oh well, the Bu6dha was a

perfect Christian (pause)

5: el 1, you can say "We~~, we agree with that. He was the fflTh4-RW~CT Christian. He was the sort of Christian that every Christian throughout history has tried to be and f-aiLed to be. He was the sort of Christian that Christ ought to have been." (laught or)

Anandac:a~Unclear) (An ispiried reply?)

S: You/either knock them down taking a negative stand, or knock them clown taking a

positive stand. Say "Yes". What does Christ mean? It means the "anointed one". What does that mean? hm? Anointed with what? Anointed with the Truth, with the Enlightenment - so in that sense it was only the Buddha who was "Christian". He alone was anointed with Enlightenment, huh? You can take that sort of line. (Long pause) There's a lot of pseudo-profundity around hm? or pseudo-Universalism, hm? (pause) And on the other hand one should be quite ready and eager to recognize the Truth or to recognize the positive qualities wherever one sees them because the Buddha did say "whatever conduces to Enlightenment, whatever conduces to one's spiritual development - that is the Dharma". yeah? It's very important to remember that too.

Voice: And it came out of saying that that I got that reply. (S: Hm. Right) (rest mumbled and unclear)

S: It's a question of knowing what one really means by the "Dharma" - "That which conduces to Enlightenment" and what one really means by Enlightenment. (pause) So don't let people get away with claptrap. Hm? (pause) That is if you can help it. 3S3.

Voice reading: "Those blind with ignorance cannot bear The Mahayana where Buddha taught The great path of Enlightenment Consisting of merit and wisdom."

S: After all, what is it but ignorance that causes one to be unable to accept such a lofty spiritual ideal which in effect agrees with one's own - assuming that the objector is a Hinayanist - If he's unable to appreciate the Mahayana it shows he doesn't recognize the Hinayana either.. doesn't appreciate Buddhism itself, hm? After all what is wrong with a teaching which just propounds the great path to enlightenment consisting of merit and wisdom? hm? Surely that's what the Hinayana teaches too. (pause) in its own way. (pause) The general principle that emerges here "One should not be misled by worldly forms", M~? It means that in a way, you can't, you don't know your own teaching very well, if you can't recognize it, if it appears in a slightly different form. ?~o you see what I mean? hi? hm? If you are a Hinayanist, if you are a Theravadvit

~a~~~e~~

well, you're supposed to know the Hinayana, you're supposed to know the Theravada; you're supposed to know that particular form of Buddhism. but if you can't recognize what is, in fact, your own teachings, - the teachings which you yourself profess to follow, or to accept, when they appear in a somewhat different form - i.e. the Mahayana form then you don't really know your own teachings very well. hm? You're not able to penetrate beyond the letter here? You're not really acquainted with the spirit - otherwise, you'd be able to recognize that spirit when it appears in the Mahayana, hm? So we have to apply that generally. Sometimes, you do encounter, in what one can only describe as Buddhism or the Dharma - or at least the echo or reflection of it - in the most unlikely places. You may be reading your Shakespeare and you come across a line or phrase which strikes you as strangely familiar - it has a quite Buddhist ring.. .511, accept that - that is, at least a shadowy reflection - a distant connection with the Dharma. Or you might read a treatise by a Christian mystic and again there's something that rings very true ~ 50 of it refuses to accept that, and that is the problem - to the extent that it is true.. or at least a tiny part of it & make an aspect of it hm? So this is quite important recognize - the fact that it manifests and not being misled by words

and being able to recognize the intentionally inoperable different formulations.

Hridaya. This thing of tolerance and open-mindedness that people still associate with Buddhism.

7: This is true tolerance, hm? (pause) Well, it's more than tolerance - it's acceptance. The recognition of what is your own - tolerance suggests your tolerating something which belongs to somebody else but it's not a question of that, hm? here in this case it's a question of being able to recognize your own - when it's dressed up in a guise that's slightly unfamiliar to you, hm? I mean, the mother should be able to recognize her child if he comes back after a few years wearing a slightly different dress or if he's cut his hair in a slightly different way or if he's grown a moustache or even a beard. The mother should be able to recognize her own son or the brother should be able to recognize his own brother, yeah? So what is in essence the Parma comes back to you, when it comes back at you in a form that is not quite the form that you're accustomed to, you should still be able to recognize it. hm? You might recall a book on Occultism translated for the JWDON - you might normally recognize books on Occultism translated from the Tibetan - but you should be able to recognize the features of the Parma. h? (pause) so not to be misled by words or terms that have become familiar or over-familiar. hm? Again this doesn't mean twin in a sort of; spiritualism but being able to recognize one's own - being so familiar with the spirit of the teaching - you can see it, as it were, shining through familiar guises, hm? unfamiliar expressions (pause) and not in insisting in having the truth always in a way says the exact form of words.

p. ago 11

You can say that truth can't really be tied down in that sort of way. (pause) But of course, if you haven't yet made contact with the spirit of the teaching, well, it's safer to stick to the letter which you're familiar with and through that to

to penetrate to the spirit. (pause) Universalism does not mean comparing letters of different traditions but trying to get through to the spirit. Hridaya: The S is the Buddha had the fetter of the rites and ceremonies - S: Well, it isn't really rites and ceremonies, huh? It's sila, vrata, etc..

ep? 1 rig: on ethical rules and religious observances as ends in themselves, hm? (pause) I mean, no formulation - final, ha? This is the final mista' - e, in a 'C.y. of the Itinayanistic - they believe that Buddhism existed solely, and they still believe this, in that the form that the Buddha himself, so they believe, actually gave it. ha? Whereas the Mahayana believe that the Buddha was capable of development, ha? In the Yogitarvatu(?), one of the seven Mahayana books, the Theravada explicitly reject that the Dharma can be renewed, made new - hm? Well, 'which is not reform' in a positive sense but presented in a different sort of way - given a different formulation, a new formulation, hm? a new expression, ha? a new body, if you like. But this must be done and it seems it must be done in every generation, hm? The same fundamental principles have to be intelligible to be applicable to, relevant to, you know, each fresh generation as it comes along and that means a slight change of form. It's more than just that, it's not that you have a thing called

the 'substance' which remains unchanged, and a thing cannot be the 'form' which is changed. Not that. You have to assimilate the Dharma if possible totally and then represent it, recreate it in your own way, in accordance with the needs of the actual concrete situation in which you find yourself.

Hridaya: They have the example of the Buddha, don't we, talking in the Pali scriptures in different ways to different people (S: Right) using long terms, short terms, colorful ones, dry ones (S: Verses, prose, parables) to suit the situations (S: Yeah, yes.)

S: We ourselves do that in our own way when we meet different people. Hridaya: It's part of communication (S: Exactly, yes.)

Thnd of Si~~~ A

page 1,?

SILL; B

S: .. They use verses, prose (Hridaya: to suit the situation), lists, yes -

we ourselves do that in our own way when we meet different people -

Hridaya: It's part of communication (S: Exactly, yes.) (pause)

Ananda: It's what I personally quite admire in the ~~~Kirtic~ tradition in

that they have a - almost no doctrinaire approach at all - They are very flexible (to the ~~~ particular (?) living (?) - completely adapt to their present situation.

S: I'm not quite so sure about that - you try telling a Sufi that there's no God, huh? or that everything is one (pause)

Ananda: In terms of the language that is used I think~~: they're quite flexible from what I've heard.

S: They're certainly flexible in language - that is true (pause,~ I think you

have to be careful that you - not to say everything is the Truth in such a way that the faith is really lost sight of. hm? (long pause) This is what I call 'religious-Universalism'. There are some teachings which do not lead to enlightenment under almost any circumstances - those one should reject and have nothing to do with. hm? (pause) Anyway, I think that's as far as we're going to get today. Is there a general point about Nagarjuna's defense of the Mahayana? an justification of it as the teaching of the Buddha? (long pause)

Hridaya: It seems he doesn't have to go quite so far to convince one this time

as he'd done in the pages before (S: Yeah) ... (unclear)

Voice ~ould the kirig have come in contact with the teaching - with the two schools?

S: It's to be assumed that he had - but we don't really know. We only know the events of the (unclear), itself.

Same Voice: They were (?) widespread at this time.

S: Yes, mean the Hinayana was very wide-spread especially in its Sa:stivar-tan form and the Mahayana was also becoming very wide-spread. (very long pause) of which
~, ~ Scottish Voice: There seems to be a (unclear)

~: right A ~ wasn't mentioned that much earlier on apart from the discussion of the marks.
(very long pause)

Atula: ~oes the Mahayana sort of use the Hinayana teachings as well?

~ell, yes, yes. Very often it gives them its own interpretation. Now for instance, the Mahayana uses the teaching - the 4 Noble truths - uses the teaching of the 8-fold Path - not so much as it uses the teaching of the six Paramitas.

Atula: Does the literature of the Abhidharma also come (unclear)...

S: Yes, the Abhidharma literature is Hinayana; yea? according to modern scholars
now? this seems to be correct, the Abhidharma was the work of the teachers who came after the Buddha, hm? though basing themselves on the ~w? Theravada teaching. The Mahayana does have a sort of 'Abhidharma' of its own. The

Yogacara School did develop the Hinayana Abhidharma in accordance with its own
institutive teaching. huh? for instance there is a famous work called The 300 (Si&dhi?)
which does just this. The next work we'll be studying on this

page

stewart's retreat is "The Buddhist Psychology" which is a translation of a chapter of a
Tibetan Abhidharma work in the Yogacara Abhidharma tradition. he? That is to say, it
continues the Hinayana Abhidharma tradition - in this case, it's the (unclear) one, but with a
somewhat Mahayanistic, especially Yrigaoaran slant, hm? Then again, the (Madhyamaka school
and the Yogacara school are sometimes said to be the Mahayana Abhidharma in as much as
their approach is, as it were, we might call "philosophical".. Abhidharma meaning in a
general way, a sort of systematic, rational, rather analytical interpretation of the Buddha's

teaching.

Atula: The things like the Heart Sutra and this sort of thing especially sort of point to that...

S: Of course, the Heart Sutra is a sutra - so it's attributed to the Bodhi, huh? but it is concerned to make some essential points and as Gonda has pointed out, it gives its own view of certain basic Hinayana teachings or at least terms, ha? ~or

instance, it says 'no production, no stopping', in a way this is a reference to the attainment of the 4 Noble Truths... no production of suffering, hm? (unclear, , no stopping

of suffering. (from the Noble Eightfold Path) - not in the ultimate sense, huh? What in a perspective of Sarnjaya, huh?... So sometimes the Mahayana takes up the Hinayana teaching and adds to it, sometimes it takes it up and elaborates it; sometimes it takes it up and gives it a very, very much deeper meaning; sometimes almost to the point of negating what the Hinayana originally said - but more often than not it never really goes very far away from the Hinayana, hm? The Hinayana is always there as it were, as sort of basis - as a sort of foundation. Usually the Hinayana as formulated by the Sarvastivadian not the Theravadian - the Sarvastivadian was a somewhat later school - more broadly speaking than the Theravadians are aware of course, in the Theravada Pali literature, we get some very ancient works that probably do take us right back to the time as it was actually taught by the Buddha himself - 'so again, in the Pali Canon, there are quite a number of works which are very late formulations of teaching's... very late additions of essentials of it which convey a quite different feeling from the very archaic texts convey. The archaic texts like the (unclear) Udanna.

Hridaya: Is there anything felt to be earlier than the Sutta Nipatta(?)

S: I don't think so at all though even the Sutta Nipatta isn't all equally old - two chapters are the oldest of all - maybe the oldest parts of the entire Pali

Canon with the possible exception of the verses of the Udanna - only the verses and just a few other short things of that kind. (-pause) The two chapters being the - ----- vakkammi and the Sutta Nipatta on the - (unclear) In the commentary

is the whole part of the scriptures - its text refers to the oldest parts of the script

uresas though it existed already. That shows it is very ancient indeed, whereas in the story of the young monk who goes to see the Bodhi and the Buddha as his

what did he learn (and this is already in the Nikaya texts) and he says I learned the Atanarika and he seems to recite it straight on from there so that shows it's very ancient indeed - that shows it was current in that form in the Buddha's own day and it was learned in that form by monks who had personal contact with him.

~aze l~ ~

It was already in circulation, and presumably was approved by the Buddha so

we're very close there to what the Buddha actually said even if he didn't actually compose verses, he seems to have ~~~ regarded them as reflecting

what he actually thought - what he actually did teach. So we're getting very close to the Buddha and his own teaching in the form in which it was given by him, not just the substance of it but pretty much the form. hm? The terms that he used in the sense that he used them; the way that he used them.

Voice: 'That's that called.

5: That is the ~AtaJ~a~~~~~) The section of the 8 - each sutta consists of 8 verses.

Voice: How do you spell it?

3: Atthak~vagga - ~a~~~ 11The "(ay to the Other Shore" - P-a-r-y-a, these two chapters out of 5 chapters of the Sutta Nipaka(?) are regarded as the most ancient. Then there are the verses of the Udanna that are very ancient... (long pause) alright then, let's leave it there.

ErltB ~~~IS SE~S\$~3~

page 15

1\L.XT :SRSSI().N PRO.' VERS~~384

S: AlriHnt 384:

Voice reading: "A Conqueror is said to have attributes that cannot be conceived because The attributes (which are his causes) are inconceivable like the sky, Therefore let the great nature of a Bw~~a as LYADlained in the Jahayana be accepted."

S: Hm. (pause) This touches on something that has already been mentioned - that is to say, the inconceivability of the Buddha's nature, hm? The Buddha possesses inconceivable attributes which are the result of inconceivable virtues, huh? (pause) This ~~~erhaps has been made clear before, but why does Nagarjuna say: "Therefore let the great nature of a Buddha as explained in the Mahayana be accepted." ~~~~~hat does that refer to? (pause) Or what does that suggest?

Utarra: It's the Bodhisattva ideal.

S: In a way... doesn't it suggest there's a difference between the way the Mahayana looks at the Buddha and the way in which the Hinayana looks at the Buddha? hm?

Voice: The Mahayana is not confined to the historical Buddha (unclear) 7: it seems from the context, especially from the next verse, that Nagarjuna has in mind the historical Buddha, huh? but don't forget that Nagarjuna wouldn't have been making that sort of distinction between historical and ideal, that we make, hm? For him the historical Buddha was the ideal Buddha. The ideal Buddha was the historical Buddha, huh? The Buddha was the Buddha as it were. So it's as though we understand that the nature of the Buddha has not been fully appreciated in the Hinayana, huh? (whether there were any doctrinal grounds for that or not it's difficult to say, but this is clearly what Nagarjuna feels or what he is in fact asserting. (very long pause) Alright, next verse -- 500 if that makes it clearer..

Hridaya reading: (385) "The ethics of the Buddha were beyond the scope of Sariputra, so why is the inconceivable great nature of a Buddha not accepted?"

S: The Mahayanist, that is to say Nagarjuna, is trying to hold the Hinayanist with their own pettard. He says according to you, according to the Hinayana, according to the Hinayana scriptures, even the Buddha's ethics, not to speak of the Buddha's meditation and wisdom were beyond the scope of Sariputra. So? So can you not see, even from your own scriptures, even from the testimony of your own scriptures, that the Buddha's nature, hm? was something inconceivably great...as in fact we assert in the Mahayana. hm? (long pause) And he's referring to? (unclear) Sariputra?

S: I don't know which particular text Nagarjuna can be having in mind but as I said the other day, there's a passage in the Mahayana which may have been paralleled in the Sanskrit Sarvastivada Canon to which Nagarjuna apparently

page 16

is referring, hm? which makes it clear, hm? that Sariputra did not understand, according to that text, the true nature of the Buddha, hm? For you remember that passage he refers to? He says: There is no specific reference in that passage to ethics, to Sila, hm? but it does certainly make it clear that Buddha considered Sariputra had not even understood him, not to speak of all the Buddhas of the past and all the Buddhas of the future. So as I said in connection with that passage, it does raise the question of whether the Buddha had the same Enlightenment as Sariputra or if Sariputra the same Enlightenment as the Buddha, hm? There are passages in the Pall text which make it clear that there's no difference between the two. Sariputra, that is the disciple, realizes, following the teaching of the Buddha, the Buddha realized without following anybody's teaching but it is the same Enlightenment. That both realize - so in this way

in fact it's rather difficult to accept that the (unclear)... there were two

Two different levels or two degrees of two levels - one of the faster and one of the slower.

That is certainly the impression you get from other sources, from other passages, from other texts and Nagarjuna seems to accept this point ~~~~~, an even to quote the Hinayana scriptures in support of it. (~~~~y~~~; 'of course, the Hinayana itself introduced this distinction to begin with, of the idea of the 3rd stage of the Yogi's attainment of the ~~~~~ of the lower level of Nirvana in the sense of individual liberation - the enlightenment of the disciple. The Hinayana itself had introduced this or at least the Mahayana ~~~~~, and 'therefore, the Mahayana cannot be blamed for accepting this distinction, and'

pointing out even according to your own scriptures, the Buddha's nature was inconceivably great, beyond the comprehension even of people like Sariputta, ~~~~ as even the Hinayanists will admit, only Arhats. The only ~~~~ difference between the Hinayana and the Mahayana in this respect is that the Mahayanists regard the individual enlightenment of the Disciple, regarded Nirvana in the Hinayanic sense, as only a provisional goal, in a sense as only a stage on one's progress to the complete enlightenment of a Buddha. ~~~~ which as far as we can see from other Hinayan texts, including Pali texts, which are envisaged as the goal for all anyway, huh? It's a rather complex historical paradoxical (?) situation. ~~~~ but as I said also the other day, the Mahayana point of view is, that the highest that one can attain ~~~~ in the way of a spiritual ideal should be regarded as the goal for all ultimately, yeah? And with this early Buddhism, very early Buddhism, at least for (unclear), agreed? (Very long pause) Arrr~ on to 336:

titara reading: "The teaching in the Mahayana of non-production ~~~~ of extinction in the Hinayana are the same emptiness (since they show that inherent existence) is extinguished And that nothing (inherently existent) is produced; Therefore let the Mahayana be accepted (as Buddha's word)."

S: Nagarjuna is saying that according to the Hinayana, all Dharmas which arise, in dependence on causes and conditions, ultimately cease. The permanent cessation of all dharmas is Nirvana, hm? That the Mahayana on the other hand ~~~~,

page 17 ~~~~

says that in reality, no Dharma has even been produced. hm? The Hinayana talks in terms of cessation of unreal Dharmas, the Mahayana speaks of the ultimate non-production of unreal Dharmas, eh? but both come back to the same emptiness so in a sense there's no difference. The Hinayana says that all Dharmas are empty in ~~~~ much as ~~~~ produced - they cease, hm? The Mahayana says that they're empty because in reality they're not even produced; they only appear to be produced; only appear to cease but what you're left with in the end is one and the same emptiness, eh? so there's really no difference in the Hinayana and the Mahayana in this respect. hm? Neither ~~~~ regards Dharmas as inherently existing, hm? The Hinayana regards them as not inherently existing because they automatically cease, sooner or later, The Mahayana regards them as not inherently existing because they aren't even produced in reality. In other words, the Mahayana's point of view is perhaps intellectually, metaphysically more subtle but it comes back to the same thing in the end as the point of view of the Hinayana. So there's no point in rejecting the Mahayana

- that it can be accepted by the Hinayanists as the work of the Buddha because the non-production of the Hinayanists, of the Mahayanists comes back to the same thing i.e. the voidness as the cessation of the Hinayanists. So if you really understand the true meaning of cessation, you'll be able to accept non-production; if you won't see that non-production leads you to the same Sunyata as cessation has, you haven't thoroughly understood cessation, hm? (pause) So if you accept cessation there's no reason why they shouldn't accept non-production, - if you accept the Hinayana, there's no reason why you shouldn't accept Mahayana in this respect. You notice that in these verses, Nagarjuna is not really trying to show that the Mahayana is superior to the Hinayana; not yet anyway - but he's trying to show that it isn't really different and that if you are a Hinayanist and if you accept the Hinayana teaching, there's no logical reason why they shouldn't accept those of the Mahayana too. (verj\ long pause) Alright 337:

Voice reading: "In emptiness and the great nature of a Buddha are viewed thus with reason, How could what is taught in the two vehicles Be of unequal value for the wise?"

S: That if you look at things in this way - if you look at the question of emptiness, -- if you look at the question of the great nature of a Buddha, -- if you look at them reasonably, rationally, then how could you possibly see any

-difference, between what the Hinayana has to say - what the Mahayana has to say? When you see what is taught in these two vehicles as being the same.. as being

of equal value - not necessarily unequal value for the wise - that is to say, these who can see at things dispassionately and impartially, yes? (pause)

Alright 33-8:

Voice reading: "What the Tathagata taught with a special Intention is not easy to understand. Because he taught one as well as three vehicles You should not turn yourself through indifference,

age

S: What is this special intention? with which the Buddha taught? (pause) Ugarra (?): To help people grow?

S: Um, yes, to help sentient beings? but in what way? There's almost the suggestion of a technical term here.

Atula: To each his need.

Ye-s -- yes. Also there is a reference here to, I think, to the fact that according to the 'i:-;ahayana, the Buddha sometimes taught, as it were, ~Tith a "hi~Thden intention" - eh? that the meaning was not alm~ys on the surf~ace - hr-?

so what the Bw%Tha taught with a special intention is as it were, hi' den intention, not h~d-den from everybody, but hir~'~~~'n from those other than thtr~~ person e ~oers~ps to whet the~teaching was actually addressed. Sm? The u'u ~ne- qight be sp~e~:ine~ to somebody and what he has to say might convey a lff rent meaning to that person but it might apocar to thors, for whom it as not intended, if ycu just happen to e'erhear it as conveying a quite~~ different :~~een~ng. hm? Sc in a way there are two e~feanings the e'eanin&& as uno~~~stoo5 by the persen to whom the teaching- m-as actually ~irect~~i, and the ~~~eaninE- as un~erstoo by others to whom it was not actua]Dv directe__ to whom it was n~t o~eant in a sense, hm~ "0 the second is/the it general intention; the first is the~ ~ ~cij] intention. hi'? Perhaps one can give a sort of example semeti-es it ha-noens that one gives or listens to a lectur~ huh? In the first case there is the gen~al meaning of the lecture -- the general applicability hr~ '-OuTh'~Thoo1 n--__o~ instance, one is taming about impermanence or death - while you're listenin to a talk about impermanence or --jeath - so there is actually ~4~at is being saiD in a very general sort of way - but someone might be sitting there, or you mi~ht be sitting there listening to the lecture and you might feel ehab is being sai- refers 'directly to ycu - eh? -hich refers to something you did or you saiW last

- you ~i~ht know the lecturer~knows all about it and actually, though he see~s to be spe--aking very generally, he is tar~~ing about you, eh? or he has you inm~n~ , hr~ so that's swI?posing that this is a situation that actually ha~~-pens even the-ugh more often than not, the l~~cturer hasn't got you in qind - he's only epe'a~~'inp£-' ceneraDly -- he doesn't e-ven T~~~now that you're there - he d-oesn't know what yen F id-' last week --- but what he says, not only has a genera~ app iCeThi~ ity to~ everybody but else 5CC'½--5 tn 'nave this se~~cial aTDy?~icabi ity to your- case - Sr this ha~~~~eno. But eQ-pose- it's the BuDdha spea]~ing, hm? accl&din-e- to tho K~:ah-o~~moa, the D'u-?~&i~ ~~~ows what yen ~i-D, as it were, last wee-, eh? so the ~uDdha coul s-soak- in such a way that theic m~s a generally appl icable o~~eanin--#- e ~ --verybe at the same time, a special neaning, a sp~ecial nessa c for you ~h~ So this would be the Eu ?dhs' '-~~ --ecial intention" -hm? So nobody else ~~~0~~D know, ~hat the m~w?~:~?Lha T~~)as sayin~~e -be yoi~ - an to you it woli I seer as if the -u-" dha was sP~ocn~4inf~--- Very generally - what he was saying was truc in a -e~cn~a~ sense b~t ap%li cable to everybody - but you woul a know that there was a special anojicabiDltv to your case. ha? a soecial reference to your case and that would- be

~oage ~

~Lt

in the case of the -;?Jue?-f~?ha, "his special intention" hm? -So this is soncti~~~es said t~~t to be one of the Buddha's specia] faculties which eve-n the -Thahants Don't nossoss - of beinl able to sf~oa in this way to be able to s-neffl~ with a ~~~eral meaning~ for everybodj~ an-i' a special meaning for a certain ino~ivio~~ua in- ivi~~uals. hr~? So "what the Tathagatn~ taught with a special intention is not easy to un: e-rstan;-". Mm? Am in a way you never

--now whether the Buddha is teaching with a special intention or not - Ah, you know what the Buddha taught in a -oeno-raj- way - you can see its applicability in a general way to everybody, but it's special applicability to all kinds of people? in certain situations? that you can't always see. You're not even sure whether that way - it has certain people in mind or not, hm? Then what the Buddha taught with a special intention, is not easy to understand -- to understand it fully you have to take these special intentions, as it were, these special references into consideration and -- they may be much more difficult to fathom. (pause)

Voice: ~;--as it the same as this when he held up the flower?

~: You could take that as an example -- well, some might say "well the Buddha just held up a flower - he just wanted the disciples to admire the flower." -- The Buddha was saying earlier on "Lovers, flowers are beautiful - you should be just like this - be just like a flower, be just like a lily of the field - toil not - Don't spin etc." Some might take it in that way as a sort of general teaching, - ~'just be like this flower, blooming in the midst of the world - all beautiful, peaceful, harmless, eh?" but the Buddha knew there was a quite different meaning - he got the Buddha's, as it were, special intention, in holding up the flower, in which nobody else got -- they might have got all sorts of other beautiful meanings out of it which in fact might have happened.. (long pause) "Because he taught one as well as three vehicles you should protect yourself through indifference" - That is this a reference to this teaching one as well as three vehicles? The Mahayana and the Triyana. The highest particular text is that reference to?

Atula: The Burning House

'3: Yes, the Burning House - White Lotus Sutra - The Pundarika Sutra, hm?

So what are these three vehicles, these three yanas?

Scottish Voice: Hinayana, Mahayana, and Vajrayana

S: So, no. That's another three yanas

Voice: Shravakayana, Pratyekabuddhayana, ...

S: Am Bodhisattvayana, sometimes Bodhidharma So what is the Mahayana? --The Shravakayana is the yana of the disciple - the hearer. That is to say, it is the yana of the Arahant, hm? upon whom according to the Hinayana, one accedes -- in to the Mahayana view of the Hinayana, aspire after Nirvana, for his own sake. Aspires after individual emancipation, hm? with the help of a teacher -- following a path shown by a teacher. The Pratyekabuddhayana is the yana or the Way or the path of the Pratyekabuddha - the private or solitary Buddha, that is someone who without the help of a teacher experiences Nirvana, experiences emancipation -

particular

for himself alone and subsequent? does not teach, does not have disciples, hm? The

arahant also by the way, does not teach, does not have disciples -- though in a sense this
 classification breaks down, because many of the four Arahants and Arahant Disciples
 did have disciples occurring - just as he had out -- Jay, when the three%flc~~a~ssificTh,
 scheme-matically in this way, the Arahant is a :disciple, but has no d"isci-o~~les the
 ~%~atyekabDdha neither is a disciple nor has disciples, and the Buddha or the
 &o&hisattva, is not himself a discip]o but has -'isc~~~Drs.. as least so far as his last life is
 concerned. So these are the three yanas. An~nDJ~ Could'~ you explain m-hy therx~~'a
 roference to the- Sud-ana P-undari?~:a Sutra-- I don't kno:-;- if I foun~~i the connection? .
 for the one yana.

S: Because in the Sn-ana Pun-#rika Sutra there is the parable of the B-urning House,
 yes? and it 1 5 in connection -tith t'~~~ parable of the~~ Burning House , that the buddha
 speaks of the three yanas and~ the one yana yes? so that 's why I said it was conn et ~~~
 ~ith that -- that is the locus faoicus(?) for this partic u~~ar reference.

Uttara: Is it like the SuDama ~-uno~aria 5-utra could be in terms of s-o~ecie]

intentions - teachings for special intentions (S: hm.) Pause- one I-: ?~hat is eeant by t~r::~~
 yanas as ~:ell as three yanas9 T m-ran, t:-o'v~~ seen in

what sponse there are three but in T:hat sense is there one yana? Is that r-ne yana a fourth yana
 ---- ~parate from the other three?

Voice: The othec three ~tight ::~~~:::~::~~?f~ the one.

:~: ~n ~that way do they i:~akc up tho ~ne?

Voi:::e: They all lead~ into it.

2-: Yes, the-y all l--ad- into it. ~o in a way, the first t.~o are te-al¼ sta-es of- the third--, hm?
 so in that sense there's only one yana Skavana w~ich is the So dhisattva yana or
 BuD-eUoayana an? the Shrava-kayana an-f the J-2raty&rn'ab&:~D'~ayana

these are regarded' as simply sta-es on that-- ho-? because, you kno~~~, whe~~n you
 fol~ow-eD'~ the Shravakayana for a while, well once you become- an Arahant, there in~t the
 pssibility 0: seeing t there are still stages of: the -oath -daich you have~~n' t traversed and
 the same -y~ith the Pratyeyi:abuddwna - or you way un-- orstand- riE~&nt fror~~ the
 bogiuning that there' 5 ust one path with Different stao;e s. ~:hat the ~¼u--Idha was
 oinC~~: in the Sudhana Pundarika Sutra, or ---hat the ahayana was &oing., was sim:oly to
 maT---e~~~it do-ar that there wan Just in fact, on:--- rath do:: c~~ll, ultimately... whcih is
 e:~ct] 'f ~r~hat the historical Pi::DYTi~~ orig~~ nalD~ he s~~id bl:t not havl ng &-J~y
 s(~~~n~e of hiotee-ical d-e~~ve~ lotrent, they have to C~~JO c-bout re"-ftatin~ it in this
 rather round--a bout ---ay, huh? (sausage) -ut &y these tw-o things] ink - th&~ ,D~P-ciai
 intention 4 the one or the thre----- veh~ dc-s, JDng-arjune is as?:ing the Hinayananto be:
 ve--ry careful about jurming to coneD~~~usions. D~irst of all he remiws him that "(hat the
 Tathagata taught with a s-oeciaJ- intention is not easy to und~stand". hm? According-- to~
 the Su;~hanea ~?u~Dari\~ Satra, he tau~ht one vehicle as well as three vehicles "so you
 should bherefore protect yourself with Im-: iffere--nee." Indifference, here means taking a
 neutral stand,bm? I~on't take sides -- - on' t say that the ?ahayana is not the teaching of the

Bu: '~ba - Ion' t look --(-own upon it. ((hat the BmleTha taught is very difficult

page 21

to un~'erst and. 'ometimos he ta~~htene yana, sometimes he-- taught thre... - tho-re's something you fim t.-iff~icult to understam - something you can't acce't -' don't just reject it.. try an'~. aD-o:ot a neatral attitude just wait an-' se--c, ho:? "so you shou:ID p~~rotoct yourse?'f throng-h inDifference.-, h~i~? throu-gh neutrat~ity, ho:-? ¼-ecanse if you -c ---- 15'-Di50 the ?~ahayana that is not in the lcn~~~; run goor~~ '0? vou yeu:rsel. (long pause) Alri-ght rew'd the next, 389:

Utarra: "There ~ is no fault with in-'--ifference, but there is fa£.t Prom espising it; how then could-. there be virtue-? Therefore-, those who see'-. 9-00-?. for theosolves:: howl~ not Despise the :-- ehAran.9..

'Therd is ne 'oult ~-'ith inDit~fernce~' in the sense- t~:t of ne-ntrali%J, ho:? rner~e' 5 no fault in not taking up any port' 0::'] ar stanD --- net toJ---ln~ anv :oart - icularn side but there is fault in ~ esp- sin- the ?ahayane~ - so how coul the-re be virtue then? "Those who seek goo~. for th--emselves shoul'd'~ not despise the ..ahayana?~ - It SC ':5 as though 1~;%ThrJ~~ is trying to got the Hinayanist at

?!.~e.ast to snspe-nQ juDD.Jr-'Ont - ho? atleast not to jump to the conclusion - that the ?'.ahaye~ne. is not the teaching of the BudDha - that it is to b~---: C.ff DiSC .~,

He--' 5 re:nin"dJ'ing him that the Pu~:~(?ha' 5 teaching is not easy to understand. - tha.t th Bu- 'na has sal-. a number of ~iffcront things at -Different tlrrriO~~5, in "'ifferont senses -- so]nst suspenD jugmont until you have a better unD-.erstandine at leas Do that don't just imme-e--.iately -:-e-sr.~ise the t;-a~ayana - that 'mIl not be for your ---cod (lcn~g pause) How about 39-0:

Voice r--oa-:ing-: "Since all the aspirations, deeds an'--. Dedications o:: bo hisatt~as :ere- not explain~:'. in the Hearers' vehicle-, ho'. then (-'0£ one become a BoD-hisattva t~zugh its nath?"

S--'; ~..oesn't this contra'.~iot what Nagar-'una saiD.- some verses ago? do you thInk? Dome- verses ago he was Very much concerned to sho'- that the y..arae:itas Tre~re tought in the Hinayana scritures h'~? and if one accepted them in the Minayana. scriptures, :-)nC accepte--) the -no.ra'ritas then what else id th- - ~h~-.j~n& teach than the parasitas? Practice: by the-. Bod-.hisattva but now he says "Sinco all the aspirations, d..eeds anD; dehcations of Bo--'hisattvas were not explained- inthe -Joarors' vehicle, hoe then could: one become a BoD~hisattva t~ug-t its pa.th?" But weren't thev ox-slain-. in the Hearers' vehicle, the -Shravaka' 5 ve-hicle, the Hinayana? But he d~oe~s Day 'all of the aspirations,)eeD.~s

an-? de~D.loiti.'ns" oh? So what --' o.----s that suggest?

k~ri- - aya.: That they idn' t go far enouoc-'-h.

S: P~.i~n't a-c f& enoug'h, '~eren't full onough, eh? anD. this is infact w.haTh he Did-s-ay originally - that the paramitas were explained in brie-P, oh? in the Hinayane. sutra.s. ~o" all the aspirations and the emphasis must be on the all, eel-s an--- dedications of Be'" hisattvas were not exp~lained in the Hearers' vehicle, how then co£~-' one become a Bc.-'" hisattva th~u~h its nath?"

Lt'~?D P SI t P- B

p~~e 1

THE P?L~~CIOUS GARTA~T SENINM~ AT P~OY:ALS-'A

5j1": A - Prom 39C--f Session 14? --

S: (continued from previous tape with some overlap).. how then could one become a Bodhisattva through its path?" But weren't they explained in the Hearer's vehicle, the Shravaka's vehicle, the Hinayafla? But he (iQes say "all of the ~pirations, ceeds and dedications" eh? So what does that suggest?

Hridaya: That they didn't go far enough.

S: Lidh't go far enough, weren't full enough, eh? and this is in fact what he -Did say ori~ina~ly - that the paramitas were explained in brief, eh? in the Hinayana Sutras. So "all the aspirations and (the emphasis ~must be on the Al-F) deeds and dedications of Thodhisattvas were not explained in the Hearer's vehicle, how then could one become a Bodhisattva through its path?" eh? ,---hat one must also admit that in the Hinayana scriptures, yes, there is much mention of dana, much mention of sila and. so all the paramitas, but they're not brought together as they are in the t';ahayana - they're not given the same strong emphasis - eh?- there isn't that very positive orientation in the direction of E-:nlightenment for the sake of all in the full and explicit manner that there is in the ?--'ahayana. It's there if you care to search for it - eh? - and the Buddha's example is there above all, hm? but the '-?ahayana does bring it out/Vm?l~ more po~crfully and one may even say in a very much more attractive form... a much more positve an inspiring for~. (pause) On~. may even say a much more unmistakeable form-, hm?

(long pause)

Hrldaya: Could you say it's a question of ideal? You can explain dana but it only goes as far as its "Ideal" - the ideal in which you explained dana.

S: Yes. Dana is as I said, mentioned in the Hinayana sutras, but not to any great extent - hm? The idea of sort of making a total offering of oneself, as it were, this is not brought out strongly or clearly (long pause) Alright 3)1:

Atula read--Ing: "(In the Vehicle of the Hearers) Buddha did not explain The bases for a Bodhisattva's enlightenment; at greater authority for this Is there than the Conqueror?"

S: ---'hat i-.o you think ~'is meant by "the bases of a Bodhisattva's enlightenment~? 'hat are the bases?

Voice: The paramitas.

-S: But he did explain the paramitas heh? - in effect, eh? but/ha)W in that

page 2

particular systematic form. So what are the bases? hm?

~::~~f~?: Vows, Bodhicitta.

-3: Yes, vows, Bodhicitta, yeah, the need for compassion ~to all sentient beings, yeah, (pause) .I think probably, principally, it's the vows which are meant, hm? the paramitas, in effect, are explained, but the paramitas are one aspect of the relative bodhicitta - the other aspect is the Bodhisattva's vow - that is certainly not explained in the Hinayana Sutras. The bodhicitta itself is not referred to (not using that particular term) but if one goes through the Hinayana (3 sutras carefully you can make out some meaning of that sort but it's certainly

isn't very clear. hm? Then Nagarjuna says: "What greater authority is there than the Conqueror?", the Buddha himself - that is to say, the Buddha himself in the Mahayana Sutras, has said just this thing but are not made these things clear in the Hinayana Sutras, therefore, I am now making them clear in the Mahayana Sutras because Nagarjuna regards Hinayana Sutras and Mahayana Sutras as being the word of the Buddha - so in fact, in the Mahayana Sutras, the Buddha does say; "that what I did not make fully clear in the Hinayana Sutras, I am now making clear in the Mahayana Sutras." Of course, the modern scholar would take rather a different view -- because he would tend to regard the Mahayana Sutras (in their present form at least) as the production of later generations and it isn't so much the Buddha himself supplementing his own teaching - his later teaching supplementing his earlier teaching - but the disciples supplementing the Buddha's teaching and putting the later teaching, as it were, into the Buddha's own mouth - eh? This would be the view of the modern scholar - but as I said the other day, "concentrate more attention to the spirit than the letter..."

Voice: {;i~ ~:~g~~~ju~~/~~~~fl~~ve that the Mahayana Sutras were written D.n~.~~eo in the time of the Buddha?

S: Well it's not a question of writing; -- or -- but it's a question of the Dharma actually being taught by the Buddha eh? or whether they were written down or whether they were transmitted by word of mouth, I mean, that's irrelevant. We certainly regarded the Mahayana Sutras as having been taught by the Buddha. Not all the Mahayana Sutras have appeared in Nagarjuna's time -- Don't forget. He is very early. He cites works like the Perfection of Wisdom in 3000 lines - he refers to the White Lotus Sutra - he refers to the Vinaya, the Nirvana Sutra. There are quite a number of other Sutras like the Lankavatara that Nagarjuna doesn't refer to at all in any of his works - which seem to have appeared later. That's not to say, they didn't exist in his time in any way, some

where, somehow but they hadn't been written down or the teachings that they contain had been written down in that particular form in that particular time.

page 3

or at least were not accessible to Nagarjuna. They are generally regarded as later works, works of the Bodhisattvas (pause) But anyway, the situation is interesting; when you've got a number of Sutras attributed to the Buddha, and some schools regard them as not really the word of the Buddha and other schools regard them as really being the word of the Buddha... then the question arises -- what is the word of the Buddha? in what sense is one to understand this? Is the Buddha really teach one yana or three yanas? etc. etc. huh? that the general tendency of the Mahayana

seems to have been , . to get back to what the Buddha really did teach; to connect back to the spirit of the Buddhist Saccin - but due to their (maybe I shouldn't say) lack of understanding of the process of historical development but because they didn't think in that way - in terms of historical development... they had to get back to the spirit of the Buddha. In the end, it appears to us to be a rather roundabout and clumsy fashion, huh? (long pause) i.e. can say from this point of view - so far to the time of the Buddha - there were three stages in the development of Buddhism: 1. the 'Archaic Buddhism'; 2. what we may call the Hinayana; and what we may call the Mahayana. (roughly) The Archaic Buddhism means: the teaching of the Buddha himself and his early disciples; the Hinayana means: the development or elaboration or systematization, etc. of the teaching of the Buddha and the early disciples which was carried out by still later generations of disciples, especially by the Theravadians and the Sarvastivadins. (The Abhidharma is connected with this particular stage) (p. 400) So by the end of this second stage you've got Archaic Buddhism and you've got Hinayana. Both are regarded as the teaching of the Buddha. Then comes the third stage - the 'early Mahayana' as I've called it. In this stage are not satisfied with the Hinayana teaching, huh? but they feel that the Hinayana teaching has narrowed down the Dharma, huh? So you see what I mean? If they had a historical sense; if they had a sense of historical development, they would have distinguished between the Archaic teachings and the Hinayana teachings - between Archaic Buddhism and Hinayana Buddhism.. they would have said "Well, the Hinayana is a later Development - it has narrowed down the Buddha's teaching somewhat - it has become a bit individualistic.. let's go back to Archaic Buddhism" huh? but they did not at that time think in terms of the process of historical development. They had Archaic Buddhism, plus Hinayana Buddhism both hallowed down to them as the teaching of the Buddha. yeah? - They couldn't reject the Hinayana because they did take it as the teaching of the Buddha himself. yeah? They did not have that historical perspective which would have enabled them to see the Mahayana as an historical development - yeah?

So they would as it were, reject the Hinayana, or reject what was narrow in the Hinayana and go back to Archaic Buddhism because they believed that the Hinayana too was the teaching of the Buddha, yeah? So what was the way out?

[561]

pages 561-580 need rescanning or retyping

[581]

Alaya: Isn't it quite hard to know, when you are (...) working on your self and what you could be saying that you are working for, you know a whole thing.

S: Well Nagarjuna is saying that, you know, that at the beginning of your spiritual career, you have to think in terms of working on yourself which in a sense means working for yourself, but no doubt that will have its effect on others, at least indirectly. But perhaps he is suggesting that at the beginning of your spiritual career it's almost dangerous to think you know too much in terms of helping others even though that is your ultimate objective. Like you might miss your meditation thinking that, you know, you ought to be busy helping others, instead of meditating. You might think that meditation is selfish but in the long run it's the meditation that is going to help both you and others. You notice that Nagarjuna doesn't say take up the ideal of individual emancipation. He says take up the discipline of individual emancipation. Your ideal remains of that of the Mahayana, but at least for the time being

your discipline is that of individual emancipation. In the same way one can say one's ideal may be perfect spontaneity, but the discipline that you take up at present may be something quite strict and even narrow because that is what you need just now even though your ideal may be complete spontaneity, but at present you are not capable of that. So Nagarjuna is saying that once one is (...) which means really once one has distinguished oneself from all worldly obligations and is in a position to give one's whole time and whole energy to the spiritual life then you should do just three things: energetically observe the precepts; take up the discipline of individual emancipation; and study and try to understand the scriptures - the tradition.

Right on to verse 402:- "Then knowing the small faults, forsake the forces to be

forsaken; With effort you should realise fully the fifty seven faults".

S: Here is an Abhidharma touch, as it were, a list for fifty seven faults. Fifty seven unskillful mental states let's just go through them, one by one and just very briefly and broadly see what they are - get a sort of general picture of them. On to verse 403 then:- "Anger is a disturbance of mind, enmity disturbs it further. Concealment is a hiding of faults, resentment a clinging to faulty ways."

S: We've got the terms in English, we don't know what the Tibetan originals were, nor the Sanskrit originals of the Tibetan terms so we just have to make out the general meaning as best we can. 'Anger is a disturbance of mind'. You notice that anger comes first on the list. Any special reason for that do you think?

Atula: It seems the worst.

S: It's seen as the worst, yes.

Hridaya: It's directly against the Bodhisattva vow.

S: Yes. I'm just wondering though, whether it's hatred rather than anger. Do you think that one should distinguish between hatred and anger? What is the difference do you think?

Surata: Anger arises out of hatred.

S: Anger arises out of hatred? I would have thought it was the other way around. That hatred arose out of anger. Supposing you sat that you became angry with someone and supposing you say 'I really hate that person', then what is the difference?

Hridaya: One is almost a follow on, from the previous condition.

Surata: I always thought you could have said cold, cold hatred but just really (...) angers.

2.

S: I think you can have cold anger too, actually. To me it seems that anger is more sort of momentary and of a more explosive character. Anger is more like what you feel or what you experience when you encounter a sort of frustration, when your energy is, as it were, frustrated. You want something, you can't get it, or you want to say something and you can't say it. There is a build up of energy and eventually it just explodes. But hatred would seem to be when that anger is associated with a definite intention to harm somebody. You can get angry I think without actually deliberately intending or wishing to do any harm to anybody. Yes? But hatred suggests that you want actually to harm someone. So it's in a way going a stage further. So I think where anger, if anger becomes very frequent, and with regard to the same object, the same person, then it can go into positive hatred. But hatred would seem to be a more extreme form of anger. So anger is a disturbance of mind, well that's pretty obvious isn't it then? It probably disturbs the mind more than any other fault. More than any other unskillful mental state. You certainly can't meditate when you feel angry. Yes? And enmity disturbs it further. What is enmity? Well enmity seems to be rather like - taking the English word literally - seems to be more like a settled and persistent, almost systematic hatred. You try to think up ways of harming the other person. Yes? So these are clearly unskillful mental states. It has been said that hatred is the feeding of suffering connected with the idea of an eternal cause. You can feel angry on account of suffering, but it's as though that anger doesn't turn into hatred, unless and until you identify someone or something as the cause of that suffering and then you feel towards that the thing or that person actual hatred and will therefore try to do harm to it or to him. In other words to remove. In very extreme cases you may even try to harm that thing or that person, even without benefit to yourself. There is a term for gratuitous hatred, this is called malice, and malice is the delight in harming others or inflicting suffering on others for its own sake, even when those others have not done you any harm. But that is an even more extreme degree of the same kind of thing. So one could say that there is anger, hatred, enmity and malice.

: Cruelty would come under malice?

S: Cruelty yes, yes. But hatred again suggests, simply a certain mental attitude but enmity is the adopting of definite ways and means, definite methods of causing harm to the object of the hatred, even over a period of years. 'But concealment is the hiding of faults', seems to be something like hypocrisy. What is the opposite of concealment? What is the opposite of hiding the faults?

_____: Openness

S: Openness.

_____: Sincerity.

S: Sincerity. But an even more direct opposite, you know, one we should be quite familiar with.

_____: Forgiving (?) Forbearing (?)

S: Yes, but even more specifically opposite. Concealing your faults eh? And on the other hand doing what with your faults?

_____: Confession of faults.

S: Confession of faults. Yes? I mean great importance is attached to this tradition in Buddhism, that one should not conceal one's faults, but that on the other hand you should confess your faults. What do you think? What sort of psychological effect do you think confession of faults has?

_____: Not fooling yourself.

S: Not fooling yourself, not fooling others either ha? Well usually you don't fool others. I mean generally you just succeed in fooling yourself. I mean others know you better than you know yourself.

3.

_____: Relief, as well.

S: Relief as well. Yes. Because it's quite a strain you know keeping up the pretense of being other than you are. I mean some criminals report this that you know when they are arrested, part of having been on the run, I mean for being for months or even years, they feel a sense of relief. In a way there is a sense of relief in being known for what you are. Yes? But why do you think that people do conceal their faults? Why don't they make direct confession of their faults?

_____: Because we have a certain idea and you know yourselves and you want to stick to that idea.

S: Yes. But why do you think we have it? Do we have it for ourselves or for other people?

_____: To keep this image up. To keep it up, you know for other people.

S-: But why do we want to keep up that image?

_____: Could be a fear of losing other people.

S: A fear of losing other people. Really? But why should we think that we will lose other people if they come to know us rather than the image that we presented.

_____: Well we don't trust, we don't trust them. Other

S: Well why shouldn't we trust? Well how is it that we can trust them with our image, but we can't trust them with our own self.

_____: We don't like, don't like the part we hide.

S: Yes we don't like, we ourselves don't like the part we hide. O 1 wonder why we don't like it. I mean what sort of things do people usually not like about themselves, or what sort of parts of themselves do they usually not like and want to conceal? And to create an image to ah...

_____: It's the negative parts.

_____: Oh no, maybe it's a good quality, a positive thing.

: Our bodies for a start.

S: You try to conceal that, you know, you think you know for some reason or other, or one reason or another will be unacceptable to others. And you have this basic sort of human need in a sense to be accepted, to be thought well of by others. I mean supposing, supposing you committed a theft, well, you won't speak about that, you won't confess that particular fault, to other ordinary people but if you find yourself, you know, in the midst of a gang of thieves, and maybe you are a member of that, you'll talk about it quite openly, quite freely, because you know that they can accept that, they can accept you despite that or even because of that. ?o, this, this concealment comes from wanting to be accepted by people, but feeling that what you have to offer as it were, you know, this or that aspect of yourself, or even yourself in total is not acceptable. So do you think, you know, does this feel- ing that, that particular part of you, or that particular aspect of you is ai~~ays in fact not acceptable? Or do you think that sometimes it may be acceptable, but you ju5t think it isn't for some reason or another?

_____: Or, seeing (...) work (...)

_____: If that's you, it should be acceptable, most people feel, in that. that's you at that time.

S: But don't you think, that sometimes it happens, that you think t~at a certain part of you is unacceptable whereas in fact it might be quite acceptable to people,

4.

but for some reason or other you think it isn't?

_____ (...) said that more often than not it's a positive

S: Right.'

_____ It's just not trusting oneself.

_____ Lack of self - self confidence.

S: Sometimes it may well be that there is some part of oneself which actually would not be acceptable to other people, and you know that quite well. Then you either have to, to show that part of yourself nonetheless and accept the fact that people do disapprove of you, or you have or you know, not to show it which means that you conceal it. And sometimes it might be a quite good part of you, that people are quite wrong in not, you know, wanting to accept. I mean for instance when you are younger you might have an artistic side, you might want to be an artist, but your family, the people in your immediate social environment, they might find that quite unacceptable or they may, you know, regard being an artist as being something quite disreputable and disgusting, so you tend to conceal those interests and that aspect of yourself. But anyway here is a case where, you know, it isn't a fault but certainly it is regarded as unacceptable and so you tend to conceal and the concealment itself doesn't really do you any good, even though you are concealing something that is positive, and should be accepted. But Nagarjuna of course is referring to, you know, concealment of faults and indirectly to confession of faults. So, so far it's a question of concealing, you know, actual faults, it means you don't really trust people to accept you for what you are. So why do you think one feels that? That, you know, do you think it's always based on previous experience, or is it mere assumption, or is it because you don't accept yourself? And what do you mean by acceptance? I mean should you accept a part of you which is a fault? Should you accept your own faults? What do you mean by other people accepting your faults, or accepting you together with your faults? Does it mean they must condone them or agree with them, or go along with them? It really in a way suggests that you're not it's not possible for you to confess your faults unless you want to get rid of these faults. So long as you don't want to get rid of those faults you won't confess. Because if you confess them, you know, then you have to confess them as faults, and as it were bring them to the notice of other people, as faults. And why should your faults be accepted by other people. I mean why should you even accept your own faults? So what does one mean by saying that people should accept you, you know, despite your faults or as well as your faults. I mean why should they?

_____ : That's kinda like saying that you're static, and that's the way you are, sort of thing, you know?

ej: Yes. So one doesn't really confess one's faults until one is prepared to get rid of them. In fact you could say that, you know, confessing your faults to others is almost like a promise that you, you know, are going to get rid of them. And confessing them is in fact the first step in that direction. If you confess without intending to, to get rid of the faults you are confessing, it isn't really a sincere confession. It's almost boasting of your faults. So what does one mean by acceptance by other people, if one doesn't mean acceptance of oneself with all one's faults.

_____ People won't sort of hold it against you for having done such a thing, some kind of thing that isn't right or something.

S: Yes. If people accept you, it's despite your faults. It really means that people accept and recognise your capacity and willingness to change. So, when you confess your faults, it's as though you express your confidence in the fact that people will recognise your readiness and willingness to change. Not that they will accept your faults in the sense of, say, that it doesn't matter that you have got your faults or that you are alright even though you've got

those faults. Not that, you confess the faults, so you actually see them as faults. You know you see them as something to be got rid of, and you confess them as an expression of your willingness to change - to try to get rid of them. And some people accept them in that way, they

5.

accept you in that sort of way, in that sort of spirit. They recognise the fact that you're willing to try and get rid of your faults, that you want to change and that you'll make a definite effort in that direction.

_____ Is it possible to realise fault in yourself and just work (...) in trying to change little bits without telling anybody?

S: I think that is possible, but if you can confess your faults, first of all it means also, you get into a communication with people, you break down the false image which you yourself created, yes? And which no doubt is getting in the way of communication. So there is this aspect too, by confessing faults you also improve your communication with people. By being open you improve your communication with people. By not concealing you improve your communication with other people, and not being hypocritical. But I think one shouldn't expect that people should accept you just as you are, you know, in a sort of indulgent mother-like way, as if to say well the faults don't make any difference they're not really faults that we love you just as much with them as without them. In fact we almost love your faults, we almost love you because of them, you know they just endear you to us all the more. That isn't really a very positive and healthy attitude. The attitude of a real friend is to say well I do like you, I don't like your faults. You know I'd be really pleased if you could get rid of them, I'd like you a lot better, you know, if you could get rid of them. That is more positive.

_____: (...) almost rejoice in how frail our ego's getting.

S: This is right. Yes. Anyway we'll be hearing quite a bit about confession later on. In the year in connection with the Sutra of Golden Light, this is almost the central theme of that particular sutra-confession.

_____ Whom are you confessing to in this?

S: Well anybody who is available, at least you can confess to, in the mind of the Buddhism Bodhisattvas, but traditionally one confesses to one's teacher, to one's good friends, to the world at large even. You confess in a sense to whoever you have been trying to take in. You confess to whoever you have been trying to present this image to.

_____ Should one confess faults to enemies?

S:~Well if you've been trying to take the enemies in too, well why not?

Sometimes even those are things you are getting at sometime, even more turn than that. No they can't turn that against you ... in some cases.

S: (...) in some cases turn nasty. But it may be it is your concealment and your false image that has contributed to the enmity. It could be that, and when you show yourself as you really are, it may be, perhaps not in all cases, that it will change to mitigate the enmity. So concealment is the hiding of faults, with (...) clinging to faulty ways. So what is resentment? Taking the English word quite literally not enquiring into what the Sanskrit or Tibetan word was. Resentment. Resentment is rather like brooding on the wrongs which others have done to you, in such a way as tends to the development of hate~, yes? You turn it over in your mind, he did this, he said this, he said that, and you go on thinking in that sort of way, you go on brooding over the injury that has been done to you. You might do this for weeks, or months or years even. It's something that sort of festers in the mind, that even ends up by poisoning the whole mind.

: It's not necessarily injuries or wrongs either, it could be frustration of some kind. The authority thing, you know, where a person will resent someone ~or their authority. Almost getting in the way.

S: Yes, but then in that case the person or the figure has done some injury right, he has got in the way. The mere fact that he is there, mean that as an authority

6.

as a more powerful figure, means that he is doing something. He's ~nhibiting you, he's making you feel small, so from your point of view he's doing something. He might be quite oblivious to you and your reactions, but that's how you t~e it, that's how you feel, that he's doing something to you, and you resent it. Resentment also perhaps ties up with envy and jealousy which are separately enuneration as we shall see. Do you get the impression that there's quite a lot of resentment around in, well maybe I shouldn't say the World, but around in the circles that we, you know, usually are in contact with.

_____ Yes I suppose they are. A lot.

S: You do. And now I'm not speaking within the comparatively smaller circle of the Friends but, you know, a bit ~mtside that.

°: Couple resenting each other.

_____ People resenting their children. The children resenting their parents.

S: Why do you think this is? You know, where does the resentment come from?

They get in each others way. People getting in each others way.

S: But how does it come about that people get in each others way? There's especially in the case of couples, I mean, they wanted to be together, to do everything together, you know, how do they, how come they get in each others way?

_____ Well there's the conflict that there's the split into half that gets in the way of~ half of them cause the other half of them cause that's firmly established in being attached to it. But there's the part that really must feel, you know, that it's interfering.

S: Yes. Well what about parent and children. I mean how do parents get in the way of the children. Children seem to have more freedom than ever these days, seem to have more pocket money.

_____ By resenting freedom.

S: Parents can't win then, can they?

No, but then nor can the children.

S: Well why should children feel resentful? Do parents really actually get in the way of their children always? I mean surely the good parent brings the children up, and helps them, smooths the way for them?

Well I guess sometimes the particular direction the child perhaps wouldn't necessarily choose.

S: Yes. Do you think that children have always felt~resentful? Or is this a modern development? Or is something even inherent in the process of growing up?

_____: Yes I think it must be.

S: Do you?

: Getting what you need in some way.

S: Or do you think it changes from generation to generation?

: I think it changes.

: Well just in the last couple of generations, well just my experience is that, you know, this side of the War, you know it seems really . . . children and parents.

S: Yes. I certainly don't have any recollections of it from my childhood. I don't think I have any recollections of, you know, friends of mine, of my own age expressing resentment or feeling resentment. No. I think it is a sort of post War phenomenon, in this country any~ay, I don't know about other countries.

_____. The thing from my own experience I could suffice to say it's the rule rather than the exception - the families that I've met and the families that

S: Yes. Well perhaps it is to some extent due to what's sometimes called the generation gap, also, and that is due no doubt to the fact that the pace of, you know, technological development is so fast, that children when they go to school learn so much that the parents, you know, didn't learn, because it just wasn't around to be learned in those days. So there is a definite gap, educationally, and in other ways between the parents and the children, and you know perhaps therefore in the children do feel that the parents don't share their interests, don't share their attitude, their points of view. And the parents correspondingly find that the children are, more and more out of touch with them and don't respond to, you know, their attitude or their points of view, so, you know, miscomprehension is increased, resentment is increased, perhaps this has a lot to do with it, that the pace of change in the World is vastly accelerated. Anyhow I remember when I went to school I had several teachers who had taught my father in the same school. I'm sure we must have studied more or less the same text books, and I was sort of at school say what, twenty five years after my father was, it may be not even that, and there wasn't that same process of change even just before the War. Change wasn't so fast, but I mean I doubt very much whether, you know, twenty five years later they'd be studying with the same teacher or the same text books, you know, in between. So much would have happened, so much had happened in fact.

_____ It seems to be, in values maybe, just rejecting those values. It doesn't seem to be so strong between this generation and their children, doesn't seem to be that resentment at all. Seems to be more cooperation.

S: Well we will have to wait and see. But it does seem that, you know, that there is quite a lot of resentment around, as far as one can tell, more than there used to be. If such things can be qualified, even though the reason for that may not be very clear. But certainly one does meet, one does encounter, you know, quite a few people who seem to feel quite a lot of resentment, a lot of sort of generalised resentment towards life, and certainly a lot of resentment towards their parents. One thing though I feel, one thing that I pick up from people - I used to when I was; in London more, is that people, especially younger people feel resentment that everything isn't laid on for them, that everything isn't provided for them. This might sound, you know, a rather old fashioned point of view but this is what I actually noticed, and I used to notice it very much at the centre itself, that people who came along seemed to sort of take it for granted that everything should be provided, everything should be given them and without any sort of effort or exertion on their part, and if it wasn't, and they just didn't get what they wanted they just felt resentful.

_____ I don't think, it's just the young who have experienced it. It's young and old, in most cases.

S: Well I say young, because it was mainly young people coming along to the centre. It's as though you expect not to have to make, you know, any effort yourself. But - why should I have to make an effort? Why can't it be~provided, as though nature ought to provide it. As though, if you want, if you want a motor car well it should just be there, you should just be able to have it, you know. Not that you, you know, ~hould work for it and then get it, but you know you ought just be able to go out and get it. So it's as though, you know, in modern society, in modern technological society all these things are available, you can have cars, you can have a helicopter even, you can have your private jet, you know, you know you can have all sorts of things that people couldn't dream of before, but what is the condition - that the majority of people in that society have to work, and it is as though more and more people want to be able to experience the fruits of the technological civilisation without having to work for them. It's not that they are prepared to give up the goods so that they don't have to work they want it both ways very often. They don't

8.

want to have to work for them, but they want to be able to enacy them, and the res- entment seems to spring in many cases from the fact that they can't do that, and maybe in post War days, post War years, the Welfare State in this country, one has been as it were subtly conditioned into thinking or expecting that everything should be provided for you. Everything is going to be laid on for you. Yes? And if that doesn't happen, in all the ways you would like it to happen, you start feeling resentful.

_____ ° It's like (...) dangling in front of you.

~~: Yes, things are dangled in fron~ of you, and when you, you know, when you want to and when you grab hold of them or try to grab hold of them you're told 'No' No, you've got to work for them.

_____ ° ~id this not, no, did they not in, during the War were they not promised, not promised that you know, if they won that war, then at the end of tt, you know. in Britain, they would get, you know, there would be a better country, and they would get all they desire.

S: I think this point was empha~ised when the first World War was being fought. I ~on't think th~t this was emphasised during or mentioned during the second World War. but in the first World War the slogan was 'Homes fit for heroes to live in' Yes. This is what the heroes promised. The heroes being the poor so and so's who were sent to the front. Well, 'homes fit for heroes to live in' when they came back. Not the sort of hovels, you know,,that they had been recruited from, but the heroes didn't get homes fit for heroes to live in, so I think nobody was inclined to swallo' that line anymore, so I don't remember that this was actually promised during the second World War.

_____ ° °-) seen in another way that, you know, people are so used~to sitting back in their

worlds and things like that you know, and that sort of whole attitude that conveyor belts moving things along in conveyor belts, and you drop out, and you still expect something to pass by your way...

S: Well I've heard people in their mid twenties expressing the view that everything ought to be provided. Why should you have to work for anything? Why should it be any effort to, to obtain, you know, if you want to, a car you should just be able to have a car. The government should supply you with a car, and if you want to go on holiday, you should be able to go on holiday anywhere you like. Why shouldn't you be able to. It's almost the attitude of the world owes you a living, or, no, not a living, a holiday, you know the world owes you a holiday, and the resentment seems to spring from the frustration of this expectation, that you've been, you know, that you've been conditioned into. I mean...

_____: I was going to say when I was sort of working that you meet the sort of attitude that to work for the children as much as possible and just thinking that perhaps resentment occurs that when you see the result - that the children have got everything that they want. Sort of biasedness?

_____: I think also that a lot is in cause in general, in society in general there's a kind of feel that you're (...) that you can just be disposed of when you're not you know, (...) start a job

S: That was a sign of the past, more than it is at present. Yes? I mean in the past here in this country you could be just thrown out of your job just by the mere word of the boss on one hour's notice, five minutes notice, one minutes notice. Get out. Go get your cards, it was just like that. It isn't like that now, you've got the union up in arms - unions didn't have that power you know in a generation or so ago. Certainly in a way there ought to be less resentment around. Ah well there isn't, there's more. But another factor is I think is the political one. Politicians, political parties have got into the habit of promising things that they aren't in a position

to give you. They promise in order to get your vote and then they don't deliver the goods. Yes. They can't, - and even when they promise they know that they can't,

9.

but they promise and there's always a sort of competition between parties - who can promise more. But neither party, I'm splitting this into the two parties, though there are more, neither party can in fact give the voter what it promises, and so again frustration and disappointment, again resentment.

_____ But I think a lot of the resentment comes from the opposite to that, you know, you had all the sort of basic material things that you want, and it just, just nothing there really, and you resent, and yet you're getting this 'working hard for you', so you can have these things, but you

don't really want them, they're worthless to you, and yet you've got nothing else you can really put your energies into. You don't want to gain those things. 0 where else do you put your energies into. It's blocked.

S: If you're starving then obviously all your energies will go into getting some food, you won't have time to think of what you know what basic issues, but when everything is provided for you, you are brought up against the, the basic question of life itself, and what is it for, and there you're given no guidance whatever.

_____: Society just seems to be geared to that, and you, so you resent society and you resent the people you see who form that society. Your parents in each direction.

S: Maybe the society that has given you everything, but not, not taught you what to do with it.

. Yes. Maybe there's a kind of awareness of the unsatisfactory nature of materialistic goals creeping in there, and that's why people get more sort of resentful.

There's almost been made to sort of wonder like, you know to wonder like, about what to eat like.

S: There is of course very much less freedom around, there is much more governmental interference and restriction, that there used to be. I really noticed this when I went to New Zealand. In New Zealand you hardly see any trace of the government or the administration, especially if you travel around outside the two or three big cities, even in small towns and villages you don't even see a police station. The only sign of any sort of government or administrative station you ever see is the post office. The country as far as you can see seems to run itself and apparently I'm told it used to be even more so under the old, not exactly conservative, but, you know, counterpart of the conservative administration, but no one bothered, no one interfered with anything. But after the new labour government came into power, things changed a bit, but it's still very slight interference compared to what is now in this country. So there are now all sorts of things that you have to do now, which you didn't have to do before. Things that you're not allowed to do, that you could do, all sorts of petty restrictions and petty rules. I think a lot, quite a lot of people get quite fed up with all these. Again that could contribute to the general feeling of resentment.

_____: You feel like a battery hen chicken that's been let loose and you just don't know what to do with the freedom.

S: What to do with your new found freedom.

I think that this false idealism of facing materialism which has been sort of fed to us over quite a long period is now collapsing. This is what I think people are basically resenting. The fact that they have been fed with this goal of acquiring a lot of things. The good life sort of thing, that's all collapsing even if we've got it...

S: Well they've been fed with the myth that 'the good life' is the good life.

: Right, but those who haven't got it are maybe sort of forgetting, losing the

10.

hope that they'll get it. Those that have got it are realizing that it's not...

S: Well in a sense Utopia has arrived. That's the whole trouble. {}o you'd only keep people happy by keeping them a bit dissatisfied and dangling a bigger and better~ utopia in front of their noses, just to distract them from the fact that this utopia isn't working, isn't working in the sense that it's not giving them the happiness that they were led to expect it would. I mean, before the war if you told the average working man that you'd get a house of your own, a decent house, a council house, you'd have a car, you'd have a radio set - there was no television in those days - you'd only work five days a week, you'll be drawing say forty-fifty quid a week. He'd say: " My God." That's absolute heaven, I'll be in absolute heaven if I can have all that. I'll just have nothing else~ to wish for. Life will be just bliss, but now he's got it, you know, and a good deal more, and is life bliss? This is what is happening. Well I can remember the day when the working man got three pound a week and was glad to get it, you know, happy to be off the dole, that's only, what, fourteen years ago.

_____ It's when families talk about the dole queue.

S: I remember seeing the dole queues, the shabby men in cloth caps queuing all the way down the high street, and lot~ of men a bit older than me can remember that, and can remember standing in those queues, and they must have thought, as it were. if you could have a house, and a car, and a refrigerator, well that's heaven on earth. Yeah, but they've got it now, I mean in their relative old age, their children have got it even more, their grandchildren have got it, but it isn't heaven upon earth. So you, you know, begin to question quite a bit; where is happiness? why hasn't happiness come? why am I not happy? And you feel quite cheated.

_____ Its a little like the sort of situation of the child who's been promised a lot of good presents by father, but the presents have turned out to be worthless. Not real presents at all, and the child feels cheated. I think we feel cheated on the...

S: You've got, you feel cheated, because you've got what you were promised, I mean you haven't been cheated in that respect, but you have been cheated in as much as you were told that what you were promised, what you now have would make you completely happy and you just wouldn't want or wouldn't need anything more than that. And maybe this is one of the reasons why people in the communist countries, apparently, are much more contented and satisfied, they've got much less, but they are told that its all for the sake of, you know, of communi~, its all for the sake of the ideal situation in the future, and they believe that. I mean the ideal situation in the future hasn't arrived yet, so they, you know, there's no question of them being dissatisfied with it.

_____ So long as the goal is in the distance, in the future, you can go on being satisfied with it, so the idea of the taking and not questioning so much the reality

S: Well in Britain, on the whole, we have got, you know, the things that we were told would make us happy. 'Cause some people still don't see that, and they talk in terms of three hour week and, you know, a hundred quid a week for the work and thank well, that's going to be happiness. The trade union is, I'm afraid, a very thick-headed lot, most of them, you

know, and still pursuing this sort of policy. Two cars, three refrigerators, you know, like they have in the States, a television set in each room. Colour television in the bathroom, that'll make you happy lads, you know. We'll just demand more pay so that you can have it.

_____ There's a lot of that in our emptiness, 'cause you have it all don't you.

S: So resentment, we've said quite a lot on resentment but perhaps that's significant.

_____ We're also getting a few letters. When I wrote the letter to the guy (...)

II.

I got a ...

S: Yes, which was printed'.

_____ Just incidentally. I got a reply from, let me get it right, I think it was the managing director of Hoover Ltd., and he was, it was a very short letter, he~ just wanted to know what Buddhism basically taught, but you know I got very much the feeling from him that he'd been through this whole materialism trip and this feeling that his empire just shabby, just a dream you know. He said to me something to the effect, you know I found my life is, how can I make my life deeply satisfying even though I've got all these things. That's what he was really wanting to know.

S: So what did you reply?

_____ I sent him a letter (laughter).

S: I think you ought to have invited him to Sukhavati.

_____ Yes, this was very much in the early days.

S: I was wondering 'cos that was (...) . Well again, that's another thing that everybody has got now - a hoover.

_____ : We could do with a hoover in Sukhavati.

_____ : I don't think the chairman of Hoover is in a position to give hoover away.

_____ : ... golden handshakes.

S: Alright, let's go on then to the next verse - 404:- "Dishonesty, extreme deception dissimulation, crudeness of mind. Jealousy is to be hurt by the good qualities of others. Miserliness is a fear of giving."

~: %o dishonesty is extreme deception, that's to~say dishonesty is systematic deception. Dishonesty is a sort of total living out of deception. Dishonesty is of course connected with

concealment, in the sense of hiding of faults, hiding the faults~ Well concealment is a form of dishonesty. But dissimulation is crookedness of mind. What is the difference between dissimulation and dishonesty?

_____ What is dissimulation?

S: Dis~imulation is a sort of, a game pretending to be other than you are, for certain very selfish purposes, of your own. Yes dissimulation differs from conceal- ment in as much as, concealment is the hiding of your faults, but dissimulation is deliberate pretending to be better than you are, to gain some selfish advantage for yourself. So dissimulation is crookedness of mind.

_____ Works like the con man.

S: The con man yes, it's like, you know, the sincere approach in advertising. A good example of dissimulation. "Jealousy is to be hurt by the good qualities of others." Now why on earth should you be hurt by the good qualities of others? Why should you be so perverted, so twisted in your mind as to be actually hurt, just to see or to hear of the good qualities of others?

'cause you haven't got them, you don't possess

S: Yes, why shouldn't~you feel inspired to develop them?

_____ Maybe 'cause you haven't got the strength, or at least you think you haven't got the strength.

S: Perhaps it means you don't really have any feeling for those good qualities as

good qualities. If you are ... I think if you were really sensitive to, really open

ffi2.

to someones good qualities, as good qualities, you couldn't possibly feel jealous, but perhaps you see or you feel that certain advantages are associated with those good qualities, maybe that particular person is more popular or better liked, and that's why you are jealous. I mean you would like to be popular, you would like to be better, but you are not and you see the other person is popular or is liked on account of certain good qualities, so you are hurt by the good qualities because they are, you know, causing him to, to obtain the sort of thing you would like to obtain, but which apparently you are not qualified to obtain.

_____ ° It's very much connected with the feeling, the feeling of inferiority.

S: I think so yes.

_____ ° ° of being unwholesome, of being incomplete.

S: What are the sort of things that one is usually jealous of? What sort of good qualities in others usually hurt one?

_____ People being a bit more than yourself.

S: Being a bit more creative. That means that you feel that you're not cr~ative.

_____ Or confident.

~~: Or confident. Or more beautiful yes? Or handsome.

_____ ° (...) jealous of other friends' good looks or something like that, 'cauo-e you're not good looking.

S: Yes. I mean it's not that you really appreciate good looks, but you're very conscious of the advantages that come to you from having good looks. o jealousy is clearly the opposite of sympathetic joy, isn't it? So that means where there is jealousy there's no metta. In sympathetic joy there's an expression of metta, so if you feel jealous there's no sympathetic joy, it means that there's no metta there. It's as though metta really ... Chances are that there's no metta towards yours~lf, as well as not metta towards other people - the people you feel jealous of. So the antidote to jealousy really is metta. Develop metta for yourself and for others then you can learn to rejoice in the good qualities of others, instead of feeling hurt by them. But " Miserliness is a fear of giving", utinginess is not giving, but miserliness, which seems to be an extreme form of not giving, or extreme form of lack of generos- ity, is a fear of giving. Not just not giving but being afraid to give. Why should one feel afraid to give?

What you give won't be acceptable.

S: Yes, that's one pos~ibility.

_____ ° You lose your security.

~: Lose your security. Yes, there won't be enough left for you, or even be any left for you. Yes It's your security, you're afraid of losing.

_____ I often found in connection with that feeling, and attitude, that children who've been starved in affection in their childhood (...) grow up with this sort of possessive attitude that they equate owning/owing things, especially money and success with affection thatr~hey didn't have, and they're giving away, they're giving 'cause the people they're losing their affection.

S: In the same way it is said, I don't know, you know how correct this is, but I have read somewhere that, that well to do women who go into shops and steal thing~, are just kleptomaniacs, are quite often women who feel a lack of affection, and their stealing represents, so some psychologists say, an attempt to appropriate affection for themselves. ;o, "Miserliness is fear of giving~". Alright let's go on.

Ver~e :- "To be unembarrassed and unashamed is insensibility to oneself and others. Inflatedness leads to disrespect. While evil effort is a pollution from anger."

S: ~"To be unembarrassed and unashamed is insensibility to oneself and others." This seems to translate ultimately from the Sanskrit 'hiri and ottopa; or 'ottopa and hiri', perhaps it should be. What is embarrassment? When do you feel genuinely embarrassed, as distinct from making some really conventional social blunder or gauchness?

_____ When you've shown yourself for what you are.

S: Yes, when you've shown yourself for what you are, and what you are happens to be something rather unpleasant or unskillful. ~~o this embarrass~ment shows a certain sensitivity to the opinions or feelings of others. Embarrassment in this sense is considered a virtue in BudThism. To be embarrassed, that is to say to feel uncomfortable when you do something unskillful, which sensible people or wise and intelligent people - your friends and your spiritual friends - will just not be very happy to see. Not be very happy to see you doing, or hear you saying or know that you are thinking. ~~o this sort of embarrassment, on account of your own unskillful thoughts or words or deeds, when these become known to others is considered quite a positive mental state, quite a skillful mental state in itself, and it can act as a restrain~ing influence, or, my kalyana mitras would not like me to do this, they would be not happy if I did such and such. This is quite distinct from doing or not doing something out of a feeling of guilt. Do you see the difference? I mean you're not afraid of their withdrawing of their affection, you know quite well, you know that they will continue to, to feel friendly towards you, but you know that if you do a certain thing that this will mean that you fall below, eh, you know, the ideal which you both or you all have in common. That they will not be happy to see you, you know, falling below, well it's not only their ideal, but your ideal. They'll be, they're not happy that, to that extent you're not developing, that you've fallen back, that you, you know, backslid. So you know that, so this, this feeling of embarrassment helps you not to do unskillful things and to do skillful things. The feeling that your kalyana mitras would not like you to do anything unskillful so you feel embarrass~ed at the idea of doing anything unskillful. So this is embarrassment, sometimes translated as shame, but here they translate it the other way round, and this is because, it's a quite positive thing, you get the idea? This is shame in a positive sense.

_____ And perhaps it's not such a long way away from confession of faults.

S: Yes right, the shame prevents you from committing faults, the sense of shame.

_____ Where does shame really come from? Is it connected with the knowledge that one should really be above of what is ... essentially above committing the fault?

C~: Well it's more, according to the BudThist, the traditional Buddhist speculation, Tt's a sort of feeling of inappropriateness, that you ought not to be doing this. Not that someone has told you, that you shouldn't do it, but that it is not really in accordance with, not consistent with your own nature, it is unworthy of you, it's more like that. And that others will see you doing something that is not you, which is unworthy of you, so your reluctance to do anything of this kind is this, this virtue even of embarrassment or shame. And the other one, to be unembarrassed and unashamed, the virtue of being ashamed is a, is more like, actually sort of having a conscience, you see the difference between the two? In the case of embarrassment,

or shame that it is (~..) you are sensitive to what others would think, others would feel, if you did anything unskillful, but in the case of, of ottopa or conscience, but leave aside the customary meaning of the word conscience, you're sensitive to what you would think about yourself, what you would feel about yourself, but if you've done something unskillful, you're feeling: "Well I've let myself down, I should've done that." It's the sort of feeling, it's the feeling of self-reproach, that's what it literally means. So these two things, so what is translated here embarrassment and shame, these are considered in Buddhism, the two guardians of Sila - that one is sensitive to how others would feel about one's unskillful actions

14.

that is others in the sense of sensible people - your well wishers, even Your kalyana mitras, and the fact that you are sensitive to what you would feel about yourself, you know, performing unskillful actions, these too. To be unembarrassed and unashamed means not to care what others think of you in a negative sort of way, and not to care what you think of yourself to go against your own conscience.

_____ I think that's considered quite manly, necessary ... have a bash, take quite a lot, well you think you're good looking (...)

S: Yes. So the point is, made very much by Buddhism that you should care what others think about you, but not others in general, others in the sense of sensible people that have got your welfare at heart, your true friends, your spiritual friends, you should care what they think about you, what they feel about you. You should be sensitive about that, you should be sensitive to what you feel about yourself. If a -' sort of inner voice says to you, you shouldn't be doing that, well listen to that inner voice. If the inner voice says well this isn't really worthy of you, this isn't really consistent with what you are trying to do, well again listen to that inner voice. So this is not conscience in the sense of somebody else's introjected demands and expectations laid upon you. This is much more like that better part of yourself, which is genuinely there and is making itself felt. So therefore, Nagarjun says to be unembarrassed and unashamed is insensitivity to oneself and others, it's insensitivity. So you should be sensitive to what others think and feel about you, sensitive to what you think and feel about yourself, and these are virtues. It's not a virtue to completely disregard what others think and feel about you, nor is it a virtue to just go against your own inner feelings, your true inner feelings.

_____ You think conscience - conscience can be sort of (...) or skimming through and sort of saying it's not in accordance with

S: Yes, yes. So one may even lightly disregard what the world at large thinks and feels about one, but as regards one's own circle of friends and true friends, you should be, you know, very mindful of what they think and what they feel about you, because you know that they are your true friends, they have your true interests at heart, and also that they are sensible, maybe more sensible than you are. So you should be quite sensitive to what they think and feel about anything that you may do or not do. It's a really good sort of (...) i.e. you're thinking of doing something or not doing something. How would they feel about it? Would they be happy with it or not? Right, "Inflatedness leads to disrespect". What is inflatedness? It's more of like thinking too much of yourself, being full of your sense of your own importance. Being too big for your boots. Well this obviously leads to disrespect. How or

why do you think people get inflated? In what sort of circumstances, in what sort of situation? How are people likely to become inflated?

_____ Power (...)

S: Power, yes, success too. When things are going well. I mean when things ~re going well, when you're being really successful when you've got a certain amount of power then you must be very much on the guard against inflatedness. It's the sort of unmindfulness that creeps over you when you experience a sort of euphoric state. It's perhaps akin to infatuation. ~o when things are going well, when you're being, you know, being successful, you do tend to 'Ah things are going very well, I'm very succe~ful, I've done it alright, I must be quite clever, you know quite capable, I can do anything. No one can stand in my way, I ca~ do whatever I like.' In this way unmindfulness overpowers you and you start becoming careless, you start committ- ing mistakes, then you start getting a bit angry. You don't think that it's due to your own mistakes, that you're not so successful, you only think it's due to people being jealous of you and your success. In this way you become blinder and blinder, so inflation is a very dangerous thing. When you're not succeeding, when things are going badly you're much more likely to be careful and mindful and cautious, but when things are going well, if they've, you know, been going well for a long ti ou've been very successful, achieve~ perhaps quite a position of power, then one mha~s~ obe really, really careful about inflatedness, it can really easily creep in. Even when what you are doing is a really good thing it can taint and spoil everythi~:'g.

IS.

"While evil effort is a pollution of anger". What does that suggest? That the effort is directed towards harming others. You're certainly making an effort, you're using lots of energy, but it's an evil effort, because it's polluted by anger, is a poll- ution from anger. "So arrogance is haughtiness, nonconscientiousness well - have we read this? No. Whose next?

Verse 406:- "Arrogance is haughtiness, nonconscientiousness is to neglect virtues. Pride has seven forms, each of which I will explain"

S: So arrogance is haughtiness, it's really explaining one term by another, you could say haughtiness is arrogance. Which do you think is the more extreme - arrogance or haughtiness?

_____ Haughtines~?

S: Haughtiness, what is haughtiness?

_____: Arrogant' arrogance.

S: How do people show their haughtiness?

_____: Nose in the air.

~&: Nose in the air.

_____: Masquerading.

_____: It's disdain of others isn't it?

S: ~isdain of others, yes.

_____: I would of thought it was the other way round actually. That arrogance was the more extreme. You know, like haughtiness sort of, you know people have an air of haughtiness, but arrogance is like sort of

S: Behaviour yes, haughtiness is more like a way you, haughtiness is more like thinking a lot of yourself but, arrogance is perhaps more like trying to put that over on other people. In some societies arrogance and haughtiness are considered virtues, I remember being a bit surprised by this, among my Tibetan friends those especially belonging to the Tibetan upper classes, the officials and aristocrats, and you know, we might be talking about someone, maybe who T didn't know, rn'~ybe som~ of my Tibetan friends would be, you know, trying to give me some idea of what they were like, and especially with regard to some of the wives of the aristocracy, they would say oh, she's, you know, she's quite a good woman you know, comes from you know, a very good family and is very well behaved and she's so haughty as if this were a sort of crowning virtue, almost in someone of the aristocrat~c class that they should be haughty. They were expected to be haughty, and some of them really did behave in a haughty fashion, at least when they arrived in Kalimpong, but even- tually many of them had to get out of there.

_____ It's interesting how some4~4~~ of the non virtues are attractive, thinking of the pop music business, seems to thrive on arrogance, and resentment - rudeness, performers apparently actually spitting on the audience, things like that.

S: Yes, and the audience loving it.

_____ (...) _____: I really resent arrogance.

S: You really what?

Resent arrogance.

16. cc\g

S: You really resent arrogance. So why do you think people have this sort of att~¼~~ itude? Why do they enjoy being spat on, and all that? What do they get out of it?

_____ ° -Don't forget a lot of them that are going are teenage girls.

S: Is there some obscure, or maybe not so obscure Freudian significance? Is it gen- eral masochism?

_____ ° It's a release of their own.

S: (...) even though it is directed against them? You know they identify with that particular person, and perhaps he is enacting their own feelings, their own attitudes.

_____ ° In a big crowd it's usually~ someone else whose getting spat at.

S: Yes. After all even for a pop star it's rather difficult to spit on 50,000 people It would take rather a lot of spit~ wouldn't it? Alright, enough of arrogance, on to the next - nonconscientiousness~, this is to neglect virtue. I think the term here is really non heedlessness which means mindfulness, unmindfulness is to neglect virtues, meant to be unmindfulness of what, unmindfulness of positive qualities, unmindfulness of the fact that~you need to develop them in order to progress, in order to develop. Then "Pride has seven forms each of which I will explain". Alright let's go through these seven forms of pride.

Verse~~:- "Boasting that one is lower than the lowly, or equal with the equal, or greater than or equal to the lowly is called the pride of selfhood".

S: Yes. So what are you doing essentially here in this pride of selfhood? Essentially~ You're comparing, you're comparing yourself with someone who is lower~ & saying that you are lower, comparing yourself with someone who is equal, comparing yourself to someone who is equal and saying that you are greater and comparing yourself with someone who is lowly and saying that you are greater. This is called the pride of selfhood. So this pride arises when you compare, do you think you can avoid comparing? Isn't it inevitable that you compare?

_____ ° It's almost innate in our society isn't it?

S: Well could you say that there is a skillful and unskillful comparing? A positive and a negative comparing? Could you say that?

_____ ° Yes, I think you could use it on a positive person you look up-to as a kind of belief, that's how you could be, you know?

S: Yes. But are you comparing in this sort of sense?

_____ ° No, you're saying what you're lacking.

S: Well what is comparing really then?

_____ ° It's sort of judging the distance you're comparing.

S: Judging the distance, judging the difference.

_____ ° Judging the worth.

S: Yes, really.

_____ ° You're finding a place in yourself, see where you are, you're

S: Ah yes it's comparison, it's more in a negative sense, it's more like, finding a place for yourself in relation to others so that you may feel secure. Either secure as equals, secure as lower, or secure as higher, but secure. And comparing

in a more positive way, would be just to ascertain where you stand in relation to

17. ~Th

others, so that you can grow. Or so that you can help, or so that you can communicate. So there would seem to be a difference between a positive healthy comparing and a negative unhealthy comparing. If you're comparing is based on a sense of an insecurity, if it represents an attempt to find a niche for yourself in relation to others, you know, either, you know an equal niche, a superior niche or an inferior one, this is a negative attitude, a negative comparing. But if you're just trying to ascertain where you stand in relation to others so that you can grow, that's a different matter, and sometimes you can almost feel a need to be equal with someone in a very negative sort of way - not that you're really equal but just say "Oh yes, we're equal". But you want to make a point of you're being equal. The chances are that you feel very unequal, which therefore you insist on the fact that you are equal, and you compare in that sort of way, "Yes we are equal". So clearly you can compare yourself with somebody else saying that you are equal or compare yourself saying that you're inferior or compare yourself saying that you're superior in either a positive or negative way. The fact that you regard someone as inferior to you doesn't necessarily mean that you are looking down on him, in a negative sort of way. And comparing yourself with someone and thinking that someone is superior to you doesn't mean that you're grovelling. So you know, all three can be either positive or negative. Though this is perhaps significant therefore that the word boasting is used. "Boasting that one is lower than the lowly, or equal with the equal, or greater than or equal to the lowly is called the pride of selfhood". 'Cos why should you boast? Why shouldn't you just see and recognise? You boast, because you know of your insecurity, but some people say that you shouldn't compare at all, but that would seem to make thinking totally impossible.

_____.v Could be in the Buddhist tradition that comparison was a guard.

S: Right indeed.

_____ (...) feel metta towards those that are equal.

S: Yes, quite.

_____ that confession (...)

I'm still not quite sure how you can say that you are equal to someone in a positive way.

S: It's a sort of recognising that you are on the same level, and that therefore there is a possibility of, as it were, even communication between you, that you can be to the other person as much as he can be to you. Whereas when you recognise someone who is inferior,

you recognise that you can do quite a bit for him, but he's not in the position to make any return, and do anything similar for you. In the same way you recognise someone as superior, then you see quite objectively he can do quite a lot for me. He can help me, I can learn from him, but he can't learn much from me. There isn't that sort of equality. So when you recognise someone as equal, you know, you recognise that there can be a sort of equal exchange, that as much as he gets from you, you can get from him, and vice versa. So that is recognising the two of you as equal. Sometimes, of course it is very difficult, you know, in the case of people whether you are in toto taking everything into consideration, equal or superior or inferior, more often you can be quite sure with regard to certain qualities, that he's a better carpenter than I am, or he's a better painter or I'm not so good at public speaking but when it comes to comparing person and person, that's much more difficult to know whether there is a general equality or general inferiority or general superiority just as regards the two persons.

Sometimes be where you can't do it, you can't do it.

S: It's very difficult indeed, it may be possible in extreme cases, as when, you know, the Buddha is definitely superior to Angrelimala (?) but that is an extreme case, and there are not many extreme cases. You can even say, well, Angrelimala was a better bandit than the Buddha. Obviously banditry is not the point of comparison. The Buddha is a better man than Angrelimala, you can say that quite confidently. The Buddha was a better man than Devadata but, you know, to judge whether

18.

Devadata was on the whole worse than Angrelimala that would be much more difficult. So I think one shouldn't be in a hurry to compare, or to think in terms of whether one is equal to or better than or worse than somebody else. I think it's always better, to begin with, to assume that you're pretty well equal, and just be open, and if in fact you're not equal, you'll find in the course of your communication with the other person that either he's getting more from you, or you're getting more from him. In the first place, if he's getting more from you, then you're superior. If he, on the whole, over the years, in the general course of a relationship, is, you know, giving you more, then he is superior. But, you know, very often will know that only in the course of years, and again it may change. You know, it may go through phases, one time you may be getting more from him, and another time he may be getting more from you. So at one time he is superior, another time he is inferior. I mean people know this very well, sometimes you know if you are say a mitra, your kalyana mitra may be going through a heavy patch and may need a little help from you, and on another occasion it will be just the opposite, just the other way round. So on the whole, who is superior to whom? It's very difficult to say. But if, say, you've been relating to each other for, say, five or six years, and it's always been the case that you are the one that is being helped, and you're the one who gets more out of the relationship, well then he's the superior and you're the inferior and you just happily and objectively accept that. But sometimes it's very much a give and take, up and down sort of business, and it becomes, you know, quite meaningless to talk of superior and inferior. I think that most cases are like that, so one need not bother, you know, to take it that you're, you know, more or less equal, or pretty much equal. Even though equal/unequal in certain

specific respects, and just be open and flexible, recognising that, you know, that according to phases that you are going through and according to the particular kind of things that you're doing at one time, one may be as it were superior and another time the other may be as it were superior.

_____ Sort of degrees of integration.

S: Degrees of integration too. So even like, it is true, yes, there is, you know, a positive comparing possible even that one shouldn't be much bothered with, or too much concerned with. You certainly ...

[599]

S: ...So you certainly don't have to arrange yourself and all your friends in a sort of heirarchical order (laughter) and know exactly where everybody stands. But sometimes you can see this. I noticed this on the Women's Study Retreat. I could... I quite spontaneously saw they were all strung out as though on a sort of graph, and it was quite clear who was at the top and who was just behind her, who came quite a bit after that, and who came right at the bottom I'm afraid. It was all pretty clear, in fact very clear. But I think that is quite exceptional (pause) and admittedly this was within the purely spiritual context.

Ananda: I find there's quite a reaction on the part of people outside the Friends, this whole concept of superiority in the Order, mm, the Order being...

S: Well that's very significant, that there's a reaction against the idea of superiority.

Ananda: The very idea of it.

S: The very idea that someone might be superior to you! Good Heavens! (laughter) Well thank heavens there are some people who are superior to us, uh? Where would we be if there weren't? We should be thankful, sort of go down on our knees and thank the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas that we are not, in fact, superior to everybody else, that there are some who are superior to us, uh? Be really thankful for that. I mean then there's someone to look up to, some hope for our own future development and growth, uh? That there's some source of help available, uh? I mean, how terrible it would be if parents, you know, knew no more than their children, uh? I mean when the children are young; by the time the children are about twelve usually the children do know more than the parents. (laughter) I mean, supposing if you wanted to learn something there was no-one to turn to, no-one who knew any more than you, no-one who was superior to you in any respect.

Ananda: I think that goes back in a way to what we were talking about before. This touches on that quite deeply I think that, sort of, children do feel, or used to feel, that the older generation don't really know anything more, have let them down in some way.

S: But at any rate it's natural, huh? for the child to expect that the... well, the parents, say, should know more, should be able to guide them, should be able to advise them. In a way it's not the parents' fault, you know, that they are living now in a technological world, you know, in which they were not brought up, and for which they were not brought up, hmm?

I mean supposing I had a son and he asked me what sort of car to buy, I wouldn't know, I wouldn't have a clue, hm? I mean to me cars are big - er - you know, big and small, and medium sized, and some are blue and some are red (laughter). That's all I know about cars, and some go faster than others (laughter). Well I couldn't give any advice about how to buy a car. Not to speak of television sets, I don't even know what kind of camera to buy. So if I had a teenage son who really needed, you know, advice from his dad on this sort of subject, I'm afraid I'd let him down completely, I just wouldn't be able to help. He'd probably feel quite resentful (laughter). I just wasn't brought up with those things, I didn't even ride in a motor-car till I was, you know, I can't remember when, certainly not in my teens. I think maybe not until I was in the army. There weren't all that many cars around when I was in my teens. You only had a car if you were rich. I had a scooter. (laughter)

Surata: A motor scooter?

S: No! (loud laughter) It was made out of, you know, pieces of wood, and wheels with sort of... wheels with ball bearings, eh? I scooted it up and down the street (loud laughter). Whereas nowadays young men have got great big motor bikes, eh? Or, you know, second-hand cars of their own eh? (laughter) This was forty-five years ago; almost to the very day (laughter). Good heavens, nearly half-a-century ago (laughter). Verse 408 hm? "Boasting that one is equal to those who by some quality are better than oneself, is the pride of being superior." You see how the pride of being superior differs from the pride of selfhood? The pride of selfhood is(?) comparing at all in any way with a negative motivation. But boasting that one is equal to those who by some quality are better than oneself is the pride of being superior? This pride is thinking yourself superior, thinking yourself to be equal to someone, when in fact you are not in a certain respect. This is the pride of being superior. Thinking that you are as good as somebody else in a certain respect, when in fact you are not as good as him in that respect. This is the pride of superiority. So do you see this, do you see how people do this or, you know, how one does it oneself? This is thinking that you're equal to someone in a certain respect, when in fact you are not. That is the pride of being superior. Fancying yourself equal when you're not. I think quite a lot of people nowadays do this. They think 'Oh, I'm just as good as anybody else.' Anyway, no need to dwell on that, let's hear the next one, the third one: "Thinking...

_____: "Thinking that one is higher than the extremely high who fancy themselves to be superior, is pride greater than pride."

[601]

S: Him! Ha, so what's that? For it's 'like an abscess in a tumour' it is very vicious." The thinking that one is higher than the extremely high, who fancy themselves to be superior. So in this case you think you are higher than those who wrongly or falsely fancy themselves to be superior. So this is pride greater than pride. I mean someone falsely thinks that he is superior; you think that you're superior to him. So this is pride greater than pride. Like an abscess in a tumour it is very vicious. Alright what's the next one?

_____ "Conceiving an "I" through ignorance in the five empty aggregates which are called the appropriation. is said to be the pride of thinking ~~I~ .

S: This is pride in the sense of ego sense. "Conceiving an "I" through ignorance in the five empty aggregates." That is to say form, feeling, conception, willing, and consciousness, w~ are called thea ro nation, which are called the grasping, or appropriating, aggregates. This is said to be the pride of thinking "I". This in a sense is basic pride, isn't it? Thinking of oneself as being in reality an ego, separate and unchanging. Alright, onto 411, eh?

_____ "Thinking one has won fruits not yet attained is pride of conceit."

S: That's the next one, hm? Thinking that you are better than you are, not just better than you are - er - but that you already are what you are in fact only trying to be, or just thinking to be. This is pride of conceit. It's like supposing you're just an artist and you're just learning - you're just learning to paint, but already you think that you're a really great artist when you're not; maybe you will be in the future when you - if you keep on trying, keep on practising, but you're not a great artist now, you just think you are. This is the pride of conceit. "Thinking one has won fruits not yet attained is pride of conceit." And obviously you can have this pride of conceit in the spiritual or pseudo-spiritual context very very easily. You think in fact that you're better than you are - er - with respect to those things that you're engaged in, you think that you're more advanced in meditation than you are, that you understand Buddhism better than you do. This is the pride of conceit. Alright, the other half of the verse.

_____ "Praising oneself for faulty deeds is known by the wise as wrongful pride."1

S: Hm. Yes. This is praising oneself for faulty deeds. You're proud of your unskillful actions. This is wrongful pride. (Pause) Some people are

~/ 4.

very proud of unskillful actions, proud that they're such good liars, that they can bluff others so easily, proud of the way in which they cheated someone, or misled someone. So this is wrongful pride. Or proud of how drunk they got the other night, how many times a week they get drunk. Really proud of these things. Proud of all the swear words that they know... well, y.u can think of dozens of examples. Wrongful pride. Alright, what's the next one, which I think is the last one?

_____ "Deriding oneself. thinking "I am senseless" is called the pride of lowliness. Such briefly are the seven prides."1

S: Hm, The pride of lowliness. Oh, I'm worse than anybody else. I'm the lowest, I'm the least, I'm inferior to everybody else that I know. This is called the pride of lowliness. You pride yourself on it actually. (laughter) Do you ever actually meet people like this?

Uttara : I myself used to be this way, myself and somebody else.

S: I'm worse than anybody else. I'm really bad (laughter), nobody is as bad as me

(laughter).

Uttara: It was in the context of being... ugly, or whatever; it was like... it started off as just, how would you say, a patter, in order to get attention. So that... I'm not as nice really, I'm ugly, I'm the ugliest person in the world sort of thing (laughter). It was really another way of saying that you were. .

Ananda: At least you're different! (laughter)

S: It reminds me a bit of a story about different religious orders, Catholic orders in Paris, some of you have heard this story before I am sure. There was a discussion as to who was the best at what and so on and so forth, so apparently the Franciscan wound up the discussion by saying, "Well, I agree. When it comes to learning and educational works, you know, the Dominicans are the best, uh? And when it comes to the propagation of the Catholic faith, well yes, the Jesuits have really got the edge on every- one. But when it comes to humility, we Franciscans..."(loud laughter) So it's a bit like that, the pride of lowliness. So pride has these seven varieties: The pride of selfhood, the pride of being superior, pride greater than pride, pride of thinking "I", pride of conceit, wrongful pride, and pride of lowliness. "Such briefly are the seven prides."¹ So pride seems to be really versatile. A many sided fault. It's hardly to be expected that one will altogether escape.

Hridaya: Is there any positive place for pride?

F -- --

5/5.

S: Er - yes. Well in a sense pride in the positive sense is included under conscience: how could I do such a thing... It's more like that. And it's very much amplified in the tantra: You think "I, basically a Buddha, how could I do such a thing? Is such a thing in accordance with my Buddha- nature? I mean how could a Buddha perform such an action? Is it possible? So this is called Buddha-pride. It is in a sense a dangerous attitude to adopt. But a more modest form of the same attitude is: "How could I do any wrong? I mean I've been adopted into the family of the Buddha. I would disgrace that family if I did anything evil, if I did anything unskillful. How could I possibly do it? I am a son of the Buddha, how could I disgrace my own father? This sort of pride, this is sometimes called family pride, you know, pride in the Buddha family to which you belong. So this is clearly positive, it's an incentive to skillful actions, and avoidance of unskillful actions. Airight, any query on what we've done so far this afternoon? We've not got a very long way through our fifty-seven faults, but perhaps we'll make better progress tomorrow.

Atula: Do you think, on this question of pride, that most people at some time have got to be on their guard against... the question pops up in some form or another all the time.

S: Yes, right. Well, there are seven forms of it, and it's almost certain that at least one of them will catch you out. Either one compares negatively for the sake of personal security, trying to find a niche for oneself, or you falsely think that you're better than somebody else, in a certain respect. Or you falsely think that you're better than somebody else, who falsely thinks that he's better. Or else you just think in terms of "I", you experience yourself as "I" anyway - well that form of pride you're practising all the time, virtually. And then one thinks that one has attained something that one hasn't attained, that one is better than one really is at something, that's another form of pride. The you're proud of those things that you really ought to be ashamed of, again that's another form of pride. And then you're proud of the fact that how bad you are, either at this, that or the other, or just how bad you are in general, worse than anybody else. You take a certain perverted satisfaction in that, you know, that's pride. (pause)

~: I suppose there's a kind of national pride too.

S: There's the national pride too, yes. But where would national pride come? This would be a collective form of one or another of these. It could be a collective form of more than one of them. I could be connected

with the pride of thinking "I", thinking it's ~ country, it's the country

5/6. ~tt

that I belong to. So in that way it's an extension of the pride of thinking "I". Or you could think that, say, the English are better, say, than the Italians at something or other. And that would be a pride of being superior. Or you might think that the British are worst at everything, always ~et beaten, always defeated, they're not as clever as the French, they're not as joyful as the Italians, and they're not as well organised as the Germans, - so this would be the pride of lowliness - when you knock yourself all the time.

Alita: I think some tourists come here, to Britain, feeling that we're a really unorganised people and that we're kind of bums in the world, that kind of thing. You know, proud of the fact that we're so inefficient.

S: Alright, let's leave it there for today, and carry~n with the remaining faults tomorrow morning.

* * * *

S: Verse 413. We're still concerned with the fifty-seven faults.

_____ "Hypocrisy is the control of the senses for the sake of goods and respect. Flattery is to speak pleasant phrases for the sake of goods and respect."

S: So it seems that hypocrisy and fl&ttery are quite closely connected. Obviously hypocrisy is also connected with concealment, which was discussed in verse 403, and

dissimulation, which was discussed in verse 404. In the case of dissimulation perhaps, one is trying, you know, to create a good impression in general, whereas in the case of hypocrisy one's actually trying to gain some material advantage by doing that. Hypocrisy is to control the senses for the sake of goods and respect. Clearly that presupposes an environment in which a certain amount of respect attaches to control of the senses. Perhaps in modern times that might not be the case always. You might have to pretend not to control the senses. It can be put in that sort of way. ?~~~~~ry is to speak pleasant phrases for the ~ofoodsandresect." This is m~re, like buttering somebody up to get something out of them. Well, do you think we always flatter others for the sake of goods and respect? Or do you think there are other reasons some- times? Other motives. I mean, what is flattery?

Atula: Seeking approval.

S: Seeking approval also. I think it's also very often based on fear, you try to placate the other person. We try to put him in a good frame of mind, so as to render him less dangerous. In India one very often finds that flattery is very gross and open. People flatter you to your face in the

5/7.

most bare-faced fashion. Without any hesitation at all sometimes. Like when they're introducing you before a lecture, they extol you to the skies, and you~re supposed to swallow all this. Some people indeed do, they sit there, you know, while they're being introduced, beaming upon the audience and looking more and more happy and satisfied, and nodding agreement with whatever the introducer says (laughter) as if it's only their due. They also try to look modest. But Indian flattery can sometimes be quite embarrassing. And it's often considered the right thing to do, with important people. I suppose it comes of living under an autocracy for so long, being so dependent on people who are more powerful than you, you have to be constantly placating them, so therefore constantly flattering them, constantly trying to put them in a good mood. In general the Indian assumption seems to be if you flatter someone sufficiently he can't refuse you anything that you ask. And to reject the flattery and refuse to grant the request is considered generally very ungracious. Alright, let's go on to verse 414.

_____ "Indirect aquisition is to ~raise the wealth of others so as to win it. Artful aquisition is to deride others in order to aquire their goods."

S: So "indirect aquisition is to praise the wealth of others so as to win it..." You know, to cast your eye on somebody's book or picture (4 words indistinct)..."I really do like that." In such a way that they're almost sort of obliged to give it to you. This is an indirect aquisition. That about artful aquisition?"...is to deride others in order to aquire their goods." I don't know whether it's to deride the others or to deride their goods, I would have thought that that was more fitting, hm? You deride the goods of others, you know, deprecate them, "Oh that isn't very much - you know - that couldn't have cost you very much - I'm sure you don't really want it, after all it isn't worth anything, it'll do for me though. This is artful aquisition. (pause) Right, 415.

_____:"Desiring to add ~rofit to ~rofit. is to praise previous
----~--aquisitions."

S: So what are these previous acquisitions, uh? You know, presumably it means saying how pleased you were, you know, with something that somebody gave you on some previous occasion, how much you liked it, and how useful it was, and how much you enjoyed having it, and how grateful you were for having been given it, in such a way that they're almost obliged to give you something more, or another object or article of the same kind. So

5/ 8.

desiring to add profit to profit, desiring to add gain to gain, one praises previous acquisitions. Right, second half of the verse.

Ajita: "Reciting faults is to repeat the mistakes made by others."

S: That's pretty obvious isn't it? Why do you think we do this, why do we recite the faults? Or why do we repeat, rather, the mistakes made by others?

_____ To lower them in someone's estimation.

S: To lower them in someone's estimation.

_____ Or make you feel free of that fault.

S: Or make him, or suggest that you are free of that fault, because you can see it in others and laugh at it. I'm just trying to think in what context I talked about something of this kind not so very long ago. For instance if you take some of these Zen stories where there's a rather stupid disciple, and a rather wise master, and the point of the story is just apparently to show... a traditional story to show how stupid the disciple was and how he missed the point, and how wise and how clever, how enlightened the master was. If you tell one of those stories, what happens?

_____ People identify with the master.

S: Identify with the master. Tell one of these stories, people laugh, they laugh at the stupidity of the disciple, they identify with the master, yes? But do you think they, as it were, rightfully identify with the master?

Why don't they identify with the disciple? But they do identify with the master. In other words, I mean they've understood, usually intellectually, the point of the discussion, which is not to say that they've really understood it, or realised it. But they might laugh at the stupidity of the disciple, identify with the master because, you know, that gives them a feeling

of, as it were, superiority, that they've understood that point. I think this is one of the reasons why these Zen stories are so popular. You can go on identifying with the master in all sorts of different situations. And end up with the feeling, oh, how wise you are, how intelligent you are, how clever you are compared with all those hundreds of stupid disciples who didn't know what the master was talking about. But you of course knew quite well, you could see the point of it every time. Hm? So you become a sort of Master yourself, you always identify with the master. I think I mentioned this in one of my reviews, didn't I, of a book on Zen, that's right, a little book of Zen stories and anecdotes brought out by Irmgard Schloegle, I touched on this point. A year ago.

5/ 10.

not making any effort to overcome the clinging, to overcome the attachment. And they're not even attached to anything worthwhile. They're attached to bad possessions, things that don't really do them any good. Things that maybe do them harm. Right, 417.

_____ : "Making differences is discrimination obscured through desire, hatred, or confusion. Not looking into the mind is explained as not applying it to anything."

S: So, "Making differences is discrimination obscured through desire, hatred or confusion." So what does this suggest? It suggests that there's a difference between making differences and discrimination. It suggests that discrimination is positive, but making differences is not. So making differences is discrimination obscured through desire, hatred or confusion. It isn't wrong to discriminate, but that discrimination must be, as it were, objective, hm? It must be a seeing of things as they really are. And you remember there is a Wisdom, the Wisdom of Amitabha, which is the discriminating Wisdom, the Pratyavechchana Jnana, which sees the minute particularities of things, sees the uniqueness of things, discriminates truly one thing from another, sees the unique indefinable essence of each thing. So there's nothing wrong with discrimination. What is wrong is when your discrimination, your true, objective discrimination, is obscured either through desire, hatred or confusion, so that you make differences where differences do not in fact really exist. So when you make differences, the subjective factor comes in very strongly, it distorts your vision, obscures your vision, even blinds you completely, so you aren't able to discriminate truly. You just make differences, maybe differences that don't exist at all, which have no basis whatever in reality. Or you may just give a sort of subtle twist to discrimination so as to distort it. Right, "Not looking into the mind is explained as not applying it to anything." What is this not applying the mind to anything? It's basically not concentrating the mind. It's not unifying all the mental energies, and not placing them on one object. It suggests a lack of integration. So not looking into the mind is explained as not applying it to anything. Why should not looking into the mind be explained in this way?

Hridaya: Not examining it so that you can concentrate, you can unify...

S: Quite. You can unify only as the result of a process of weeding out, as it were, weeding out the unskillful mental states, developing the skillful mental states. And gradually bringing the skillful mental states themselves into harmony, placing them all on a

single object, concentrating

5/11.

them, unifying them, unifying the mind. 418?

_____ "One who through laziness loses respect and reverence for those doing practises that are similar is a spiritual guide who follows not the ways of the Blessed One. He is regarded as bad."

S: What is this respect and reverence for those doing practises that are similar? I mean similar to whom?

_____ Similar to oneself.

S: Similar to oneself. In other words you can't recognise there were other people doing things basically similar to what you doing yourself, huh? And this is due to laziness. How does laziness come in do you think?

_____: Not making an effort to see.

S: Not making an effort to see. And not making an effort to be objective. So why should it be "is a spiritual guide who follows not the ways of the Blessed One"? That is the Buddha. What was the Buddha's way?

Uttara: Making an effort.

S: Well did the Buddha even need to make an effort? I mean the Buddha gave appreciation where appreciation was due. This came out very strongly when we went through the Aryaparyesna(?) Sutta, that is to say the Buddha's sort of biographical discourse, when he recounted his earlier experiences. And he recounts how he was first with Aralakalama, then with Uttarakama-putta(?) and he learned from each of them all that they had to teach. And when he had learned, from each of them in turn, all that they had to teach, what was their attitude? They recognised that and they offered to share with him the leadership of their group. They didn't experience any envy or any jealousy. They showed a very noble minded attitude. So subsequently, when the Buddha gained enlightenment he remembered this, he remembered how good they were, and wanted to proclaim the truth that he had discovered, that went far beyond anything that they had experienced, to them first of all. But subsequently came to understand that they were dead. So in the case of the Uttarakamaputta(?) and Aralakalama they had respect and reverence for the Buddha, recognising that he was doing practices that were similar to their own, that he attained as they had attained; they didn't show any envy or jealousy. In the same way the Buddha himself rejoiced in the qualities of his disciples. He praised the good qualities of his disciples. Alright, 419.

_____ "Attachment is a small entanglement. arising from desire.

5/ 12.

When strong. it is a great entanglement. arising from desire."

S: So desire comes first. Desire leads to a small entanglement, or a great entanglement, as the case may be, and then attachment arises. Attachment is therefore a sort of later, more confirmed, stage or form of desire. When you get a bit habituated to the enjoyment of that particular thing.

Hridaya: It reminds me I think of a line from the Buddha: "And he saw great danger in small faults", or "see great danger in small faults". It's almost as if it's tip of the iceberg. Not just the small fault in itself, there's much more behind it.

S: Yes. And usually if we want to indulge in some unskillful mental state, or perform some unskillful action, what we usually do, or what we usually say is: it doesn't really matter very much, it's a very small matter, it's just a trifle. I mean that is the sort of rationalisation as it were. So the very fact that we're regarding it as small, as a trifle, is itself perhaps a danger signal.

Ajita: It's like when you're weeding in the garden and you leave a wee bit of bramble in the ground. It's only a small piece and before you know it the whole ground's covered.

S: Well that is nature of weeds. That is also the nature of faults. In a way there's no such thing as a small fault. Any more than there's such a thing as a small weed.

Atula: It's the fact that you have to rationalise it that means it's quite dangerous.

S: Yes, otherwise if it was really a small matter you probably wouldn't talk about it at all. You wouldn't even say that it was small, you wouldn't feel that there was any need to bother with it, or to offer any sort of explanation or excuse.

Ananda: Why do we then? Is it because that action or that fault is symptomatic of an underlying state of mind, which itself can give rise to...

S: Well I suppose it means not being able to face up to the fact that you've got some really big faults; that there are some really enormous obstacles standing between you and what is supposed to be your goal, and that you're not really prepared to make the effort to get them out of the way. It really means that. Although sometimes there is an opposite attitude, people considering it as important things that really don't matter very much at all. So why so you think they do that?

5/ 15. 6(3

_____ "Irreligious lust is the libidinous ~raise of women⁴ who are in fact to be abandoned. ocrac is to pretend that one ~possesses good qualities which one lacks. while desiring sine."

S: Irreligious lust. Does that mean that there is a religious lust? No, it means lust which is irreligious, by its very nature, or which is against the dharma. "...is the libidinous ~raise of women who are in fact to be abandoned." What is meant by libidinous praise? I take it you know what libidinous means?

In unison: No.

S: It's *fröi* libido. Libido is a sort of strong craving. Often regarded as basically sexual craving. So libidinous is the adjective form of that term. It means excessively or, well I can't say lustful, because that word has been used already, but it's excessively craving and desirous.

Hridaya: Enthusiastic.

S: Enthusiastic, or, yes. So what sort of praise has Nagarjuna in mind? That is this libidinous praise? How do you praise libidiously? It's like for instance when you draw attention to a woman's secondary sexual character- is this in a rather indecent sort of way, huh? expressing your own lustful appreciation of the same, huh? This is libidinous praise of women who are in fact to be abandoned. So, you know, what is meant by abandoning women? That's a rather strong expression.

Atula: Abandon lust.

S: No, it doesn't say abandon lust, it says abandon women.

Uttara: Practising celibacy.

S: Er, possibly, but maybe even that isn't enough.

Uttara: Seeing the real nature.

S: Yes, seeing the real nature, yes.

Alaya: Does it in fact mean women, all women, who are to be abandoned. Or just some women? I was thinking of prostitutes.

S: It seems to mean all women doesn't it? Oh you could - yes - you could look at it in two ways, that, the abandonment of those women who are libidiously based, or the abandonment of all women, or you could say it is the abandonment of those women in connection with whom libidinous praise is likely to arise. Or, perhaps, I think actually though the real meaning is that, irreligious lust is libidiously praising women instead of

abandoning them. The right thing that you should be doing is abandoning them, but instead of doing that you libidinally praise them. So irreligious lust is the libidinous praise of women who in fact are to be abandoned. The appropriate attitude is to abandon. Don't forget he's envisioning the king becoming a monk. So irreligious lust is libidinally praising women, instead of doing the right and appropriate thing, which is to abandon them. What does one hope to gain by that? In what sense does one abandon ~hea?

Atula: (indistinct).. abandoning desire.

S: But do you think it is easy to abandon the desire while at the same time keeping company with them? That's quite difficult, unless you're an absolute hero in a way that very few are. You get quite a bit of this libidinous praise in one form or another in advertising. It also means that you don't see women as they really are. Either in the, you know, metaphysical sense, or even in the more human sense. I mean, er, there are various forms perhaps, of indulging in libidinous praise. You could say that the wolf-whistle is an example of libidinous praise.

_____ Or, "Corrrr!" (laughter)

S: Quite. But "hypocrisy is to pretend one possesses good qualities, which one lacks, while desiring sins." We've had hypocrisy before. It seems as though, as I said before, there are several words in Tibetan and Sanskrit which are a little bit different, but which have to be rendered by the one English word "Hypocrisy". So hypocrisy is to pretend that one possesses good qualities, which one lacks, while desiring sins, huh? Yes. Hypocrisy for - er - for instance, say, to pretend that you are very learned and very pious when in fact you are not. Far from that, no~ only do you actually lack those qualities, those good qualities, you are actively desiring qualities which are bad.

Atula: A lot of politicians have been pulled down on this...

Hridaya: This is the way we usually find the word hypocrisy used.

S; Yes, quite. Like in the French comedy Tartouffe(?), Moliere's comedy. The archetypal villain and hypocrite. In fact there is a word "Tartoufery"(?) Yes, going back a bit to the first half, one could translate - instead of saying "of women who in fact are to be abandoned", I'who are to be left alone . Do you see the difference? That, if you indulge in libidinous praise, if you wolf-whistle after them, as it were, this is embarrassing to the women themselves. So a better and more appropriate attitude is to leave them alone.

It's more like that, than abandoning in the sense of, sort of, rejecting and

5/17.

throwing away. Yes, it's more like a leaving alone. Two or three of the women I've talked to

about their experience of - er - you know, women's retreats, have said that they find it a great relief to be left alone, in this sort of way. And they, they say normally, with men around, in their less mindful moments they enjoy having them around, in that sort of way. But on the whole, when they really think about it, they prefer, as I said, to be left alone and not to be objects of libidinous praise and so on. And when they are on their own, as in women's retreat situations, they feel as though quite a sort of weight was lifted from them. They feel that they, as it were, are not being threatened as they usually are in this kind of way. That's of course in their better moments.

_____° They particularly would need it, if they want to get on with anything creative.

S: Right, yes. Alright, 422.

_____° "Great desire is extreme greed. gone beyond the fortune of knowing satisfaction. Desire for gain is wanting to be known always as having superior quality."

S: "Great desire is extreme greed0 gone beyond the f~eofknowin satisfaction." Tho or what symbolises this kind of extreme greed, huh?

Atula: Hungry ghosts?

S: The hungry ghosts. "They've gone bevond the fortune of knowing satisfaction.11 It's quite a strong expression, yes, that your greed is so extreme, so excessive, so neurotic, that you've gone beyond even the possibility of satisfaction. You can never be satisfied, yes.

Hridaya: There's a parallel between that and drug addiction where at first there is pleasure, you get to the point where it's no longer the case, it's almost keeping you alive.

S: Yes. "Desire for gain is wanting to be known alwa~s for having superior q~lities.'t So what is - what is wanting to be known always as having superior qualities? It's almost like, you know, wanting to be permanently identified with a sort of ideal image of oneself, that one has created for other people's benefit, and trying to keep that up. This sort of desire for gain in this sort of sense.

Alaya: Holier- than-thou.

S: Holier-than~thou, right, yes. I get the impression that some of the moral crusaders are doing that kind of thing. And also some of the workers for so-called progressive causes. One gets a very strong impression of that

5/ 18. 4(4

sort of thing from them. The holier-than-thou attitude, yes, when they profess to be absolutely horrified and outraged by this, that and the other, and they go all out against it, and make speeches. It's to suggest they've got a much more sensitive conscience than anybody else. Or perhaps they have in some cases, but one suspects not, in a great many cases. You

know they're very vociferous people and, er, trying to attract attention to themselves, and trying to advertise the fact of their greater sensitivity of conscience. And trying to put other people in the wrong, and make others feel in the wrong. You get used to the odd vegetarian doing that kind of thin~, when they happened to meet the unfortunate meat-eater.

Atula: Puritanical.

S: Yes. You get it in, in the world of politics. I mean some people think you should be absolutely outraged at the idea of buying, you know, a tin of tinned pears of South African origin for instance. That you are actively co-operating with the South-African government in maintaining apartheid if you buy this, you know, tin of tinned pears in the supermarket.

Uttara: In an indirect way you are.

S: In an indirect way you are, yes.

Uttara: So in a sense is it, you know, is it...?

S: Th, but it's the disproportionateness of the indignation. Yes, and also it's the selectivity. I mean there are all sorts of things going on in all parts of the world that one doesn't agree with one little bit. If you stop, you know, having any sort of association with, or any connection with all those parts of the world, well you end up pretty isolated. I was - I told once the story of a man I met in a train in - in India, who thought every- body should be into helping the lepers. That was the only thing, you know, that any sensible person would ever think of doing. If you weren't doing that, well, you just weren't doing any good at all. You know, disproport- ionate importance was attached to that. Admittedly yes, it was a very good thing, but that became that person's yardstick. You know. If you weren't into that, well, you were just no good at all. Thatever else you were doing just wasn't worthy of consideration, it didn't count. ~he only thing that mattered was, was helping lepers. So in that Way, I mean he was of course helping lepers, yes, so this puts him a very strong position, a very strong moral position with, vis-a-vis, those who aren't helping, ~ou know, lepers and can, you know, enable him to feel very, very superior. ~at he's, you know, one of the very, very few, if not the only person who's doing the right thing. He's better than they are, superior to them. So in much the same

5/ 19.

way, you know, with these people who, you know, take up these various social and political causes. I mean the more importance they give to them the more importance they give to themselves by identifying with them. I'm not saying that this applies to all cases, but I suspect it applies to at least 90~ of them. Especially to those who, you know, who seem to want to attract a great deal of personal attention, who get a lot of personal publicity. Of course they say it's for the sake of their cause, but the spotlight seems to be on them, rather than on what they stand for, very often.

_____: Couldn't they be sort of resentful that more isn't being done in that particualr

area?

S: That may well be so. It may be true that - er - not enough i~ being done. But i~ you're not careful you can very easily identify with the cause that you're supporting, you know, in quite a negative sort of way. Alright,

onto 423.

_____ "Non-endurance is an inability to bear inlury and suffering. Impro~ri4ty is not to respect the activities of a spiritual ~de or teacher."

S: Hum, "Non-endurance is an inability to bear iniury and suffering."

I mean this is pretty obvious, yes? "Impropiety is not to respect the activities of a spiritual guide or teacher." How would one not respect the activities?

_____ By hindering them?

S: Hindering them. Well it's, it's for instance - er - misbehaving, not behaving properly when a spiritual guide or teacher is giving a discourse or giving a lecture. It is creating noise and confusion and distracting people's attention, all that kind of thing. Alright, 424.

_____: "Not heeding advice is not,respecting counsel from those of similar practice. Intention to meet with relatives is loving attachment to one's kindred."

S: So,"not heeding advice is not respecting oounsel from those of similar ~ice." Why from those of similar practice? Or who are those of similar practice?

Atula: Teachers.

S: Yes, teachers. Maybe fellow disciples, hrn. So if they have similar practice, what does that suggest? They've got a common ideal, a similar ideal. That's why they have a similar practice. So why should one

5/ 20. 4~o

respect the counsel of those of similar practice, not those who are not of similar practice?

Alaya: Because it's advice:, not just opinion.

Alita: Because they have experience of the path.

S: Yes, because advise must be relative to what you're trying to do. You know what you really want, so how can that sort of advice be given to you by people who aren't really trying

to do what you are doing and don't share your ideals, huh? T-O don't understand your ideals perhaps. So you can in fact ever only ask for advice from those who share your ideals, if you're trying to follow a spiritual path. It's no use asking advice from someone who is not sympathetic to your following of that spiritual path, how can they possibly give you advice? You have to ask the advice of those who are on same path ~ou are yourself, share the same practices, the same ideals. In other words advice can be given, sort of really narrowing it down, only within the spiritual community. That is, if you yourself are within the spiritual community. You can't get advice from outside. I mean supposing you were to go along to your parents even, who perhaps didn't share your spiritual ideals* who weren't very sympathetic towards them, or maybe not at all sympathetic, and ask them: should I give my job up? What do you think? Well, can they really advise you? They can't. But supposing you ask, you know, those who are on the same spiritual path, "Well, this is the situation, I'm thinking of giving my job up, should I or shouldn't I?" Well, they'll take into consideration what the effect of giving up the job will have on what you want to do, on what you are trying to do. They will look at it in that light and try and see what would be better for you. They might come to one conclusion, they might come to the other. But they'd look at the matter from your point of view. Not from a different point of view of their own.

So not heeding advice is not respecting counsel from those of similar practice. So not heeding advice doesn't mean not heeding the advice given you by others who are totally out of sympathy with the path that you are pursuing. You can very well ignore all that sort of advice. It isn't really advice.

Hridaya: It's interesting that - that bit about the family and relatives do come in the same paragraph as this one.

S: Yes. "The intention of meeting of relatives is loving attachment to one's kindred." If you keep on thinking of ~eeting them, going to see them, well it's not so much for their own;good* or your own true good. But it's

[621]

because you still have that loving attachment.

Hridaya: That's where a lot of people would think of going for advice.

S: Yes, right.

Hridaya: Perhaps this is why in Buddhism it talks about the Buddha family.

S: Right, yes.

~aa: You'd seek advice in that family and those kind of relatives.

Alaya: That's quite a difficult one, that. "The intention to meet with relatives."

S: In what way?

Alaya: Well, you do often feel you should go, just for them, for their sake.

S: But that's alright if you really do feel that, and if it isn't a rationalisation. Yes. I mean it

certainly doesn't mean one should cut off contact with one's relations. I mean the Buddha certainly didn't do that. He went back after his enlightenment. There's no record that he went back before that. He certainly went back afterwards and re-established contact, but on

a different basis. So intention to meet with relations is loving attachment

to one's kindred~ So when one does think of going to see one's relations just make quite sure it isn't out of a sort of natural attachment, that you really are going to see them at least mainly for their own good. I mean so that you can perhaps, you know, help them to find their way onto the spiritual path. So you can help them develop. But again one might say you naturally would like everyone to develop, so why pick on your relations? There are lots of other people you could help. But then one might say, well, you happen to get on quite well with certain of your relations, already there's quite a positive relationship. Well, why not make good use of that. That may well be so. But still one has to be a bit careful, or even quite careful about this whole question of the loving attachment.

Ananda: The way it's put seems to make it inevitable that if one has intention to meet relatives and parents, that must be loving attachment.

S: But in a way it must be, or at least force of habit. Why should one go, say, to see one's parents, I mean more than anyone else? What is actually the reason?

Ananda: Presumably for the reason you said. That one has established a basic communication.

S: Yes, if one has established that basic communication fine. But as quite a few of our friends write to me from time to time and say well, I went to

5/ 22.

see my parents, I went to see my father, I went to see my brothers... "it was as much as I could do to spend an afternoon there. I was thoroughly bored after two days." This is the usual sort of report that one gets. But they seem to sort of feel the need to go from time to time. They can't avoid it. But why is that? Why can't you say "Well, that's finished. There's no point in seeing them again, when we're leading such completely different lives and we really don't have anything in common. So, you know, what's the point of keeping up the connection?" Why doesn't one say that? Or why doesn't one feel that?

Alaya: Well I have been back. Last time it was just really painful. Then I felt, well, it's almost as if it's your duty to visit sometimes.

S: Well, there is that too. Is it in fact a duty? Don't take it for granted that it isn't. But, you know, do you in fact have a duty?

Uttara: It's a case of you still feel you owe them something.

S: Well perhaps you do. You have to consider that possibility too.

Ananda: I think it's a perfectly natural sense of gratitude.

S: But, I mean, is that the feeling with which you usually go? (break in recording) or is it more often than not a feeling of resentment? Because you can be drawn by resentment as much as by gratitude, or attachment. But do you think one has not a duty to go back; as it were your objective duty? Is there such a thing as duty to one's parents in the abstract? I know it sounds very unfashionable to think that there is.

_____ Yes.

S: Is there? In what sort of way or how?

Ajita: I often thought maybe the karmic consequences of (several words unclear) ...of certain people given you life, like.

S: Yes, there is that consideration.

Ajita: Yes, I partly do justice to that, in a sense paying them justice... (several words unclear)... I suppose there's a danger in that attitude.

S: Well, how I see it is this. Having been born of both particular parents, and having under normal circumstances lived with those parents, and been brought up by those parents over a period of quite a number of years, in some cases it's even twenty or twenty-five years. It's usually at least fifteen or sixteen, you know, except in a few unfortunate cases where you were separated from your parents, or lost your~parents for one reason or another. So what does that mean? That at the most impressionable period

5/ 23. ~Z3

of your life, for quite a number of years, you were very closely connected with those particular people. Leave aside the fact, for the moment, that they are your parents, you were very closely connected with them. So what is the result of that?

Ajita: (unclear)

S: Not necessarily, you may hate their guts! (laughter)

Alaya: You're conditioned by them.

S: You're conditioned by them. But even, say, more generally than that. I think there is a definite tie. Whether you like it or not there is a tie, there is a connection. And you can't break that tie simply by going away, you may be living apart from your parents. But they have, as it were, put their stamp upon you. Not only that, but even though you've gone away in most cases, there is still this quite emotional tie, with the parents, of one kind or another.

You don't abrogate it merely, you know, by living somewhere else when you get older. So, whether you like it or not, whether you live with them or not, there is quite a strong, a very strong emotional bond with the parents. Now this emotional bond can either be positive or negative. So supposing, well, I'm using positive and negative rather loosely, let's use them in their ordinary, popular sense, you know, a positive bond meaning you like your parents and get on well with them, negative meaning you dislike them and get on with them badly. So this means the bond is either positive or negative. Let's assume the bond is negative, so what does that mean? You have a quite negative attitude towards your parents who have played such an important part in your life for such a long time. So if you've got this negative attitude towards your parents how does that affect your overall character and attitude even to other people? Well it affects it quite a lot doesn't it? Because for so many years your parents are the most important people in your life. So supposing your attitude towards them is on the whole negative. So what does that mean, huh?

Alaya: Your whole attitude.

S: Your whole attitude is likely to be quite negative. You've been affected quite badly. So in that case what must you do?

Alaya: Make a positive contact.

S: You have to try and make it positive, you know, in your own interests. As you try to develop, as you try to grow, it means that, you know, from being negative you have to become positive. So that means that negative attitude towards your parents you will have to work on and try to transform

5/ 24.

into something. Into something positive. So that may well mean keeping up contact with one's parents. You may be able to make some progress on your own, but sooner or later, probably, if it's at all possible, you must have it out with your parents and be quite open about it. And ideally transform your negative attitude towards them, your negative relationship with them, into something positive.

Alright, supposing your attitude towards them is positive, in the ordinary sense. Well still there's a lot of attachment there, a lot of clinging, so you've got to work on that. And what does that mean, huh? Well you can work on it by yourself, but it also means probably keeping up some contact with them, and trying rather more relating to them not just as your parents, but as to other individuals. If they permit that, well, fine. Then there's a completely different relationship possible, and, you know, if you can relate to them as individuals there's no reason why you shouldn't go on seeing them, just as you go on seeing other people. If you can't relate to them as individuals, if they don't permit that, then you may have to consider breaking off contact with them altogether, or reducing your contact to a minimum. The minimum that you can bear, as it were. So do you see what I'm getting at? The parents I mean do play such an important part. Your attitude to your parents does modify your whole attitude to such an extent that you can't, as it were, be indifferent in this matter. You've got to

do something about it.

[625]

Verse 424;- "Not heeding advice is not respecting Counsel from those of a similar practice. Intention to meet with one's relatives Is loving attachment to one's kindred."

_____: This seems to relate to how far this attitude or philosophy of working out (for want of a better word) a karmic situation with the object at present relating. And how much one can work that out with the person. And how much one has to be alone to work it out in relation to women. Would one apply the same approach to women in general?

S: Well, I've talked about parents. But what about mother? It may be that a lot of the difficulties one has with women if one does have difficulties, stem with difficulties with mother. So maybe if you sort things out with your parents, especially your mother if you are a man, you may find a lot of other things are sorted out at the same time and become very much simplified. In the case of the parents, and let us say the case of the mother, there has been this very deep, very close, very strong relationship from the beginning of your life. Your life for many years is identified with that. But in the case of some woman whom you met last week, maybe last year, there is not that depth and continuity of relationship. Or if there does seem to be, very often it is something which is projected into that relationship from your relationship with your mother. So it is best to deal with the relationship with mother anyway. I think for the ordinary human being, leaving aside the question of spiritual development, the relationship with the parents and especially the mother is the most important and far reaching in one's life. It affects one more than any other relationship. To a great extent it determines the nature of the other relationships because the relationship with the parents is, as it were, a paradigm for all relationships into which one subsequently enters. So I think it is quite important to look into this matter and if one possibly can: 1) have a positive relationship with one's parents 2) that one relates to them as individuals and not just as one's parents. If one can do these two things what is the necessity for avoiding one's parents or cutting off the relationship with them, or cutting off contact with them? If they accept you for what you are now then fair enough. The fact that they have that attitude towards you can be extremely helpful towards you and helps you to resolve the natural dependence, emotional dependence that one feels even when one is quite grown up on one's parents and on that whole situation. If they accept the fact that you have gone forth. If they accept the fact that you are free. If they accept that you are an individual. Then that will be extremely helpful for you. You will be lucky then. If they cannot, then you just have to work on it by yourself and with the help of your spiritual friends. If your parents accept what you are doing, at least in a general way, that is an additional boost so far as you are concerned.

Ajita: They stop worrying about you in a sense?

S: Right. So if one's intention to meet with one's relatives is simply loving attachment you are just keeping up the same old pattern. You are still attached to them. You still feel a child in relation to them. Then that is not very positive. Not very good. Not very useful to you. But if you keep up your contact, if you have the intention to meet with them, to work on your relationship with them, to try to resolve anything that is negative and have a good working relationship with your relations. You respecting them as individuals and they accepting you as an individual. Then that is only positive and quite a good thing for you. But one must be quite honest with oneself and be quite sure that that is just what one is doing.

Ananda: Bearing that proviso in mind then, would you apply that same teaching to the opposite sex in general? One's relationships with other women or men.

S: In what way?

Ananda: Well, in the sense that if one is quite sure that a creative and developing

and open situation. That one can really use the relationship for a spiritual purpos

2.

Then ...

~.: If one is thinking of relationships and proper spiritual purpose, I don't see why one need be bothered by that it has to be a member of the opposite sex. If one is just thinking in terms of spiritual fellowship why does one, or even some people, insist that it must be with a member of the opposite sex?

Ananda: I was thinking more in terms that if one feels that one's got a certain situation to resolve or work out, which comes up in connection with the opposite sex, what you said about being with the parents, about being with them in order to resolve it, could be applied to that, to women or men.

S: Well you see on the one hand there are not just parents in general. There is you and your specific parents. So in the same way, if it is a question of one specific or one individual woman then maybe there is something to be resolved or tidied up. You have to see her and talk it over. But I think one has to be very very careful about that. Not under the guise of working something out in fact be indulging some- thing. So in the case of your parents, whilst they are your parents. They were your parents from the beginning. You are landed with them whether you like it or not. You have got those particular parents. So there is nothing you can do about it. You are not landed with that particular woman. You've gone into that situation, ideally, quite voluntarily. So it does not represent a given fact of life which you have to deal with whether you like it or not. Your parents do represent such a fact. You did not choose them. You found them already on the scene as soon as you started becoming aware of it at all. Whether you like it or not you have been affected by them and whether you like it or not you've got a positive or negative attitude towards them. You have no choice but to work on that in your own interests. It is not the same with regard to your relationships with people other than your parents. You enter into relationship with them as an adult. As a matter of free choice. So usually when you say with regard ,to such people you want to stay with them to work out some- thing, it is much more likely to be that you want to indulge in something. There is a vast difference between one's relationships with one's parents on the natural plane, the ordinary human plane, and one's relationships with anybody else. I think this is not sufficiently appreciated. Even by psychologists. So I think if there is any relationship in life on the ordinary human level to be sorted out, it is one's relationships with one's parents. Not one's relationship with one's husband, wife or girlfriend. These are comparatively late and

superficial relationships. The relationship with parents is, in a way, the basic human relationship. The most important and most far reaching in its effects. The only other relationship that can compare with it at all is the relationship with one's spiritual friends and spiritual teacher on the spiritual plane. But in modern life we place all the importance on relationships with husband or wife, boyfriend and girlfriend. I think that is a misplaced emphasis. We have given too much importance to that. I am inclined to think that people who have positive healthy normal individual relationships with their parents will have very few other problems in life of the ordinary human kind. I would go so far as to say that. So it is much more important that you should work on your relationship with your father or mother or even brother or sister, especially if you have grown up with a brother or sister, than on your relationships with some other person of the opposite sex whom you have met comparatively recently. If of course you find in your parents a lack of sympathy, a lack of understanding, even after you have spent quite a bit of time with them talking things over with them. Well you just have to leave it there and just make sure that your own attitude towards them is positive. That you accept them with all their limitations even though they do not accept you. Resolve anything negative in your attitude. Maybe keep up a bit of contact objectively for their sake because it would be, in a way, very cruel not to.

Ajita: Would you say it was the duty of a son or daughter to nurse their mother who is crippled or something like that? Who is, more or less, stuck with it. That is their responsibility?

S: I would say no. It could not be your duty. If you wanted to do it. I do not see ~~~~~hat it could be laid upon one as a duty. I think one might feel terrible resent-

3.

ment. As many sons and perhaps more daughters have done, having to look after aged mother, aged father and deeply resenting it. No, if one does feel that one really cannot do it, one really does not feel equal to it, I think no blame attaches to one. At least do what you can. See that some arrangements are made. So that your parent's looked after, if not by you, then by somebody else or in some other way. I think it is not the duty of the son or the daughter actually to live for the parents. No. It is the duty of the parents to live for the children and not the other way round. I think there should not be any burden of gratitude or duty placed on the shoulders of the children. If they feel like doing things for the parents when they are grown up fine. But no sense of obligation should be there. I think most children who have got a healthy attitude towards their parents will do whatever they can for them. I do not think that anyone should be expected to devote themselves to their parents to such an extent that the living of their own lives is interfered with. I think there can only be resentment there. The only sort of person who is capable of that is someone who is quite extraordinarily spiritually developed. I think it is too much to expect of the ordinary, even positive human being. Maybe they can stand it for a few weeks, even a few months but probably not longer than that. If one cannot stand it longer than that, one need not feel any guilt. You are not

superhuman.

Uttara: Why is it that in the practice of (...) you have your parents sitting on your shoulders?

S: Well, not only your parents. In some forms of the practice on one shoulder your father at the head of all men, and your mother at the head of all women. In other words it represents the fact that you are not just doing this for your own sake but for the benefit of all. So you imagine everyone doing it with you. So when they bow down, well here is your father on one shoulder, mother on the other. They are bowing down with you. All living beings are bowing down with you. All men are being led by your father. All women led by your mother. Because in the natural order of things your mother is the most important woman in your life. Your father is the most important man. Leaving aside spiritual considerations, ie if you have got the guru, in front up there. Those are the spiritual relationships. You have got the members of the Sangha up there. In the natural order in ordinary human relationships father and mother are the most important. So they head, all men and all women.

_____ Do you think this would help in any way, doing that every day in your relationships?

S: I think it would. If you did feel quite positively and strongly. You may not be able to feel that all your parents are doing it with you. But I wish my parents also share in the benefits of this. I wish that this practice makes me able to communicate better with my parents. I wish that this practice will enable me to explain things more clearly to my parents so that they may come to understand and sympathise. One can certainly wish and aspire in this way. I think there is a saying of Gurdjieff or someone of that tradition, that a good man must love his parents. You cannot be a good man without loving your parents. Loving in a truer sense, in an objective sense. If you hate your parents or dislike your parents you cannot be a really good man. There is some negativity in you which will work itself out in other forms and show itself in your life generally. It is very important to have this positive relationship with one's parents and people waste so much time bothering about positive relationships with the opposite sex and they neglect what is much more important - putting right their relationship with their own parents. Which does not necessarily mean spending a lot of time with them or talking a lot. But at least one is sorting things out in one's own mind and developing a positive attitude towards one's parents and resolving anything that is negative. If possible establishing a human and individual relationship with one's parents, whenever one happens to see them. Sometimes in works of fiction one comes across some rather odd attitudes. The first instance you might read in some romantic story that the sweetheart or the mother or the wife becomes jealous of the husband's or boyfriend's mother. As though just having met her he can now just at a stroke sever his connection with his mother and

4. 6z~

sort of transfer all his affection to the woman. which is quite impossible and unreasonable to expect. Very often this is expected isn't it? If the son wants to keep up a positive, warm relationship with his mother this is considered somehow wrong or unnatural. All sorts of Freudian interpretations are given to it to make you feel ashamed of it. To make you feel as though there is something wrong with you. If you reflect, supposing you are a young man of twenty and have lived at home. You have spent twenty years with your mother. How can you suddenly forget that or put it aside? Or abandon it? It is just impossible. This just has to be

accepted. And wives have to accept that when men get married that all their affection is not suddenly transferred from one woman to another. That is just not possible. The wife would be lucky in a few years if she even gets 10 % of it really.

Ajita: Maybe that is why the 'mother-in-law' syndrome happened. She dislikes the mother-in-law, that kind of thing. The one where she dislikes the son's mother-in-law.

S: Well there is a certain competitiveness with the man and the wife sometimes feels, correctly feels, that he is still more devoted to his mother than he is to her. Well I think this may sometimes be the case. One should not regard it automatically as something wrong and unnatural. After all, he has lived with his mother maybe twenty years. He has only lived with you for two. And why is he living with you? Maybe because of sexual infatuation, which in some cases does not last very long and then he is landed with you as an individual, if you are an individual. You cannot expect him to have the same sort of warmth and affection towards you if you are the wife as he still has towards his mother. You have to accept in a way that maybe until he has lived with you for twenty or thirty years, that mother is still the most important woman in his life. It is rather odd that nowadays this is regarded as a joke almost. That mother is the most important woman in your life means that there is something retarded about you or you have not grown up properly. Well, in some cases maybe not but not necessarily so. (pause)

Alright let us go on to verse 425:- Attachment to objects is to relate their qualities in order to acquire them. Fancying immortality is to be Unaffected by concern over death~"

S: So, "Attachment to objects is to relate their qualities in order to acquire them.' We've come across this before. We relate to qualities of things. Care for qualities of things so that we can be given and get those things. "Fancying immortality"

is falsely believing just as you are you are going to go marching on after death. So you're not both relieved by the thought of death. You're "unaffected by concern over death". Because you think death is not really going to affect you. This is a form of eternalism. Thinking that you will survive death unchanged and therefore death is nothing to bother about. It isn't much of an experience. You just wake up on the other side exactly as you are on this side. Then be reborn or select a rebirth at your leisure. Or spend a few hundred years in some pleasant heavenly world. So this "fancying of immortality is to be unaffected by concern over death". This is what "fancying immortality" is, to be unaffected by concern over death. You ought to be concerned over death. Death is a terrible experience. It is a traumatic experience. It is a dangerous experience. You're very attached to the things of this world whether you like to admit it or not. You are going to really suffer when you are torn away. So you should be affected by concern over death and what happens afterwards to you. Don't think it's all just going to be smooth and lovely and that you'll make an effortless transition, just as you are, to some other state. Alright, verse 426:- "Intention endowed with making One's qualities understood Is the thought that due to the appearance of knowledge And wealth others will take one as a guide."

S: You notice this sort of thing happening when people who don't know each other

meet. They drop little hints to one another, some clue as to what they are and

5.

what they do and how well off they are. They say things like: "when I was at the Riviera last weekend", "When I took my Cadillac into servicing". They drop little casual things like that just to convey to the other person who they really are and what they are really like, what sort of social position they occupy. They say: "Of course my last book didn't do all that well", you know, they think he's a writer who publishes books.

Ananda: Er, "I'm just collecting my pearls".

S: "Oh, I've got to go and see my accountant next week". So, endowed with the intention of making one's qualities understood. This is what one is doing. With "the thought that due to the appearance of knowledge and wealth" or social position and power, "others will take one as a guide". Others will respect one. One has a - certain influence with others, a certain prestige, a certain position, or the prestige of a certain position. So this is what happens all the time in social life. All the time one is dropping these little hints or giving these little clues to establish one's own position. Obviously as favourable a position as possible. (long pause) Presumably Nagarjuna has in mind more particularly the specifically religious context. "Oh, when I was in my cave in the Himalayas", or "When I was in my second three year meditation retreat". - (laughter) - something of that sort. Or, "The last time I went to Buddhagaya". (laughter) Or, "When I was in that Zen monastery in Japan" - or, "The last time I met the-Dalai Lama". That kind of talk is intended to establish one's religious prestige and spiritual position.

Atula: What precept affects this?

S: Ah, There is a precept for monks to the effect that one should not claim false; spiritual attainments and powers, yes. But it's a matter here of giving indirect hints. You're not openly claiming. You're just dropping hints to the effect that-. Which in a way is worse.

_____ One does it unconsciously?

S: Yes. In social life, as I said, it happens all the time. Sometimes it may mean just doing it in a straightforward way to establish your position in relation to the other person. There may not be a thought of establishing yourself as superior. But nine times out of ten one does it anyway. Because you don't know how to relate. To some extent it may be necessary to know this before you can get into communication. But a lot of you have just stayed there and go on swapping these clues and never get any further.

_____: It was interesting hitch-hiking...

S: You are always asked what you do and all that kind of thing.

It is a standard opening gambit isn't it? To find out what you've done and what the other person's done and where you've been.

S: As in India they always ask you your caste. Then they know where they stand

in relation to you because they know their own caste. What is it in this country, do you think, that people usually try to establish first? Job, huh? Which school you've been to? where you live? That sums it up doesn't it?

Ananda: North or south-of Birmingham?

S: North or south of the Thames, huh? It's interesting that job comes first. Why do you think job comes first?

Alaya: Money.

S: Money, huh?

_____ A good indication of social status.

6.

S: What about marital status? It used to come in a lot didn't it? In the old days. Doesn't seem to enter into it so much now. Not in the case of men anyway. But job is certainly important. Do you think that job is important just as a means of earning money? Is it just on account of the money?

_____ No.

S: What is it on account of then?

Interest.

_____ Social life is quite tied up with that too.

S: It also gives you a sort of identity doesn't it? You don't any longer really get your identity from the social class that you come from. Or even so much the school that you went to. You certainly seem to get it from your job. The kind of work that you do.

Uttara: Yes, when you're hitch-hiking that's the first question the person in the car asks you, what do you "do"?

S: There must be some reason in it. Not what you are by profession. "What do you do?" as though "doing" means working. "Doing" is working.

_____ Or "How do you fill your time?"

_____ It's as though they take the other areas as unimportant. Even the football match or the pub at the end of the day.

S: They don't usually say "What football team do you support?" That might follow automatically from your place of residence.

Ananda: The implication is that simply that one's job is one's life.

S: If you know what work a man does it means that that will give you more knowledge about him than you could get by asking him any other question. If you ask, "Are you married?", he could say, "Yes, married". It doesn't really tell you anything at all except that he's married. But if he says that he's an executive in a car manufacturing company, then you know quite a bit about him. What sort of life he's been leading and what sort of tastes, what sort of associates he'll have and all that kind of thing, you know.

Ananda: And whether it would be profitable to get to know him.

S: fImm. That's true, Isn't considered good form still to ask a man directly what his religion is or what his politics are. That is usually allowed to come up when it comes up, if at all, very much later in the game, hmm? (pause) But it's an acceptable question "What do you do?". It gives one a pretty good idea from a worldly point of view as to what that person is like. What his interests are. That his connections are. How he spends his time. So when you ask that one question you're really asking a lot of questions in one, calculated to produce from the other person the greatest amount of information about himself. (pause) Because his work is his life. Do you think it's a good thing that someone's work should be his life?

_____ Not if he wants to spiritually develop.

S: Well, it depends what work is to him. I was thinking more especially of gainful ~~~~employment. If you're lucky you can thoroughly enjoy your work, even in that sense, find great fulfillment in it.

_____ He'd be very lucky actually.

S: A lot of people do, I think, still enjoy their work. We mustn't overlook that fact because most of us, most of our own friends, have a sour and disgruntled and

7.

disillusioned attitude towards work. I don't think we can conclude that everyone has. We mustn't generalize from our own limited experience.

Uttara' Jinamata, she was talking about this. ~he says the German people enjoy their work because when she's been over there, she's never...

S: Again we mustn't generalize just from our own experience in England. When I was at the theatre the other night I just looked around me and there was quite a lot of, well the entire audience was clearly consisting of reasonably prosperous people. There was some people from university. Others who were well-to-do farmers in town for an evening out with their wives. No-one all that young, but no-one all that old. And they were clearly prosperous, healthy and reasonably content. You could see that they were reasonably satisfied with their way of life. You didn't see any great discontent on anybody's face. (...) or any great disgruntlement. And had you asked them, you know, they would have said they were quite reasonably satisfied with their life. They have a quite happy life, thank you. It's not ideal, it's

not perfect, but that's life. That's what most of them would have said. So we must not go on for our own benefits and edification with a dramatic picture of millions upon millions of people deeply resenting having to work. No, I think the majority of them, if anything, rather enjoy it. Certainly those who have got a measure of freedom and independence in their work, as many people have in this part of England. Lots of small businesses, small farmers. People working in factories might probably have something to say. But I feel that quite a lot of people do enjoy their work and feel it's the right niche for them, that they're reasonably happy, comfortable, prosperous. They're reasonably satisfied except in the odd moment when they do think a bit, when everything does seem hollow and empty. And maybe by the time they come to retire they may wonder what it was all about. What it was all for. But if they've got children, and they're married now and doing well, they would think, "Ah~ well the torch of life is passed on from generation to generation and that's what it's all about, to keep the whole thing going, the whole thing ticking over. And they don't wonder too much about it. The archetypal Archers if you like. (laughter) It's pretty normal, pretty healthy, pretty dull. That's how it is for most people. Well, they're pretty satisfied by it.

Ananda: Another category of people also not only enjoy their work, not only feel fulfilled from doing it but also see it as improving the general state of mankind. That's a central thing for them. Not something to be eschewed.

S: Also lots of people have got loads of energy. A bit of a rather crude kind but they want to use it and they feel happy using it. They feel happy doing things. They like their work because it gives them an opportunity, you know, of using this energy that they've got. Which they are not able to use up in any other way. You see these young businessmen dashing around and seeing young sales representatives and young executives much of the time thoroughly enjoying it. At least for a few years until things turn a bit sour. They don't get the promotion they expected. They're not doing all that well and maybe their marriage is not all that successful. Then they start pondering and wondering sometimes in a more sober moment, or perhaps in their more drunken moments. Right, 427:- "Intention endowed with desire is a wish To help others motivated by desire. To be affected by harmful intent Implies that one wishes to harm other~

S: "Intention endowed with desire is a wish to help others motivated by desire." Well, desire for what? what does desire suggest here? It suggests that one is getting something out of it which one is not acknowledging. You get some sort of kick out of it. There's something in it for you. You're not in it just to help others. You get another kind of satisfaction from it. Basically an egoistic kind of satisfaction. Maybe you enjoy being known as "the one who helps others". Maybe it puts you in a superior position in relation to them. You enjoy being in that superior position. You're the helper. You're the one whom everybody looks up. You're the person who hands out good advice.

_____ In a way this covers what we did before.

8.

S: In a way, yes. It's probably very difficult to have a completely disinterested wish to help others. That's probably very rare. There's almost always something in it for you, even if only that you accumulate more merit or you may get to heaven when you die. But that all

constitutes an impurity of motive, a taint. But it's very, very difficult to wish to help others without that sort of mixture. Well we must not go to extremes and stop doing anything for other people until such time as one's motive is completely pure, no. We have to do what we can to help others and at the same time work on our motivation for doing it.

_____: Accept the first motive until the next (...)

S: Right, yes. But doing it mindfully will enable you to purify the motive itself. In the old days people used to say sometimes they didn't want to ask for ordination they could be sure that their motivation was completely pure. I used to say in that case, well, you'll wait for ever. Your motivation will never be completely pure. There is sure to be a mixture of motive but never mind. If on balance you feel that your motive is predominately pure, that is enough. And the Going for Refuge, the actual Going for Refuge will help you to purify your motive for Going for Refuge. But as you go on your motive for Going for Refuge will become increasingly pure, increasingly the right motive. Eventually, of course, when your Going for Refuge is completely pure in the fullest possible sense then you will at the same time gain Enlightenment. You will then have Gone for Refuge. Not before.

_____: This is what we find isn't it? That we learn about going for ordination, commitment, Going for Refuge. We look back after a few years.

5 Well, it's the same with meditation. You don't learn all about meditation when you start meditating. You learn a little bit, and then you start meditating and you know then to a certain extent what meditation is like. And in light of that actual experience of meditation, though limited, you start correcting some of the ideas you had about meditation before starting. And on account of which you did start. And thus the process goes on. That's why I sometimes say that the reasons for which people stay with the Friends is sometimes quite different from the reasons with or for which they originally came into it. If you've grown in the meantime, they must be to some extent. You may end up staying in for a completely different reason from which you came in.

What's important though is the general direction. You may have come in for various reasons.

S: It's the direction in which they all pointed. Or in which direction they ever more accurately point. So, "to be affected by harmful intent" implies that one wishes to harm others. Well that's pretty obvious. (pause) Alright let's stop there then. It is time. Any general points about what we've done this morning? We're still going through the fifty-seven faults. What impression are you getting from Nagarjuna's list of faults? Do you think it's pretty comprehensive so far?

Atula: If anything too much an area of (...) (laughter)

Ajita: It's really making me aware of the complex nature of faults. They're not too obvious.

S: Especially those seven kinds of pride. One might have thought there was only one kind. There's at least seven. And the different ways in which you can be hypocritical.

Ananda: It's quite significant that Christianity counts pride as one of the sins. One of the major sins.

S: One of the seven deadly sins.

Buddhism, Buddhism at least analyses it and expounds the whole thing.

S: Some of the Christian theologians do that.. they do.. like Thomas Aquinas.. they

9.

do analyse things. But perhaps not quite in the practical, down-to-earth way that Buddhists do.

Ananda: One can really get a precept out of it as a method of development and develop oneself around it.

Atula: In the way that, that it splits down form and analyses skandas. C~tripping everything down to see exactly how you are.

S: Like stripping a car down isn't it?

Ananda: Emphasises to me, Buddhism makes specific nature a means of doing something about yourself. Christianity is saying: "Look, this is what you've got, you're a pretty hopeless case aren't you?"

Uttara: You have to rely on the 'Grace of God' to sort it out.

Hridaya: I've been bearing this in mind as we've gone through the faults, that it's moving on to something positive like, "Cease to do evil, purify the heart, ~tart to do the goodt.

S: All this is the application of mindfulness. You're doing the preliminary sorting out of your own mind. Trying to distinguish skilful from unskilful mental states so that you can develop the skilful and eschew the unskilful. In that way more effectively realize the ideal which is an attractive and positive ideal. An inspiring ideal. One mustn't forget that there is an ideal. For the sake of realizing which one is taking this long hard look at the lower contents of one's own mind at any given moment.

Ajita: I find it quite interesting because it means that, for example, how it manifests in situations with people and that...

S: Hmm. Alright, let's leave it there.

Verse 428:- "Dislike is a mind that is unsteady, Desiring union is a dirtied mind, Indifference is a body without Effort, a laziness of lassitude."

~: ~o we are still concerned with the fifty-seven faults. "Dislike is a mind that is unsteady". Why is this? How is this? How is it that dislike basically is a mind that is basically

unsteady?

Alaya: Like the image of boiling water.

S: Turbulent, hum. "Desiring union is a dirtied mind". What sort of union?

Ajita: Sexual union.

S: Could be sexual union. Or any union based on neurotic desire or craving, huh? So desiring union is a dirtied mind, a sullied mind, an impure mind. ~o why does one desire union? Union of any kind? Is union possible?

Uttara: Ignorance.

S: It's obviously due to ignorance. But what is actually happening?

Ananda: It will isolate you.

S: It will isolate you, yes.

Hridaya: As though you were making yourself strong or stronger or unifying some-. thing.

10. S: Or complete. In other words union involves ~rojection. A feeling of inadequacy for one's own part. "Indifference is a body without effort, a laziness of lassitudN' Just like the laziness, the indifference of a snake, huh? That's just swallowed a large animal and is completely gorged, completely replete. Which doesn't feel like doing anything at all. Huh? It's quite incapable of moving, quite indifferent to everything. But "Indifference is a body without effort", a laziness, a lassitude. Anybody familiar with this state? Ever been familiar with it?

General: Yes.

Ananda: Like a snake it can easily be captured.

S: Hmm, yes, captured by Mara, yes? (pause) Alright on to Verse 429:-

"Being affected is the influence On body and colour by afflictions, Not wishing for food is explained As discomfort due to gorging."

S: "Being affected is the influence on body or coloured by afflictions." I wonder what afflictions he has in mind? Presumably mental afflictions, that affect one, have an influence on one's body and one's complexion. In other words on one's psycho-physical health. One's health of body and mind. This isn't very clear. Tts a bit general. Maybe the translation isn't precise. "Not wishing for food is explained as discomfort due to gorging". Not wishing for food is a fault. ?o youre not wishing for food out of any skilful motive. You're so uncomfortable due to over-eating you just can't wish for any more food. So that sort of not wishing for food is a fault. It's not a virtue. Tt's not anything meritorious. ~o not wish- ing for food is explained as discomfort caused by gorging.

_____ Are you still being affected by all these that have gone before?

S: You mean afflictions that have gone before? It could be those that have gone before. It could be those that are still continuing. (pause) Alright, next one, Verse 430:- "A very weak mind is taught As timidity and fear, Longing for desires is to desire And seek after the five attributes."

S: '~~o, "A very weak mind is taught as tim~~~ity and fear". To be very weak minded Ts a fault and it's due to timidity and fear. So timidity and fear makes one quite weak. Huh? Saps one's energy, one's confidence, one's strength. And the Longing for desires is to desire and seek after the five attributes". The five karmic (rulers?), that is to say, the five sense objects. (pause) Alright, we'll go on to Verse 431:- "Harmful intent toward others arises From nine causes: having senseless qualms About oneself, one's friends and foes In the past, present and future."

S: So three threes are nine, hum? So, "Having senseless qualms about oneself, one's friends and foes in the past, present and future". How can that give rise to harmful intent? You harm others out of fear, hmm? Either on one's own account or on account of one's friends or foes, in the past, in the present or in the future in each case. Because you have these baseless fears, apprehensions, anxieties, insecurities, you are motivated to wish harm to others, or even try to work harm to others.

Ananda: Could you also interpret that senseless qualms as projections and false imaginations?

S: Well it involves that because it's a sort of paranoia. You lash out thinking that you're threatened. (pause) Alright, onto Verse 432:-

11. "Sluggishness is non-activity

Due to a heavy mind and body, Sleep is slumber, excitement is a Lack of physical and mental peace."

S: "Sluggishness is non-activity". When do mind and body become heavy? What do you mean by heaviness of body or heaviness of mind? Then is the body usually heavy?

_____: Sleep.

S: Er, yes, but when else?

_____ Through overeating.

S: Yes. Also through overwork. But perhaps most of all through overeating. So 'sluggishness is non-activity due to a heavy mind and body". ~o how do you get a heavy mind? What is a heavy mind? You've got a heavy mind and body mentioned together. This suggests that when the body becomes heavy the mind becomes heavy too. You usually find this. Your stomach is overloaded. There is a flow of blood to the digestive system to digest your food. So that means blood leaves the brain. The brain has got less nourishment.

So it doesn't function as well. You get sluggish mentally when your stomach is overloaded just after a good meal, even a too good a meal. So one becomes sluggish. So, "Sluggishness is non-activity due to a heavy mind and body". "Sleep is slumber"? Sleep is being fast asleep. "Excitement is a -- lack of physical and mental peace". As when people are jumping all over the place, talking wildly, having all sorts of ideas, changing their minds every few minutes. That is excitement.

Atula: Is sleep and slumber supposed to be a fault?

S: Yes, presumably it means excessive sleep. It does in fact say simply sleep. Sometimes it is said that the monk should stay awake for two out of the three watches of the night. Only sleep for four or five hours. If you sleep more than that, that would be considered as a fault.

Hridaya: These are two of the hindrances to meditation out of the five.

S: Yes.

Hridaya: Restlessness and anxiety, and sloth and torpor.

S: Well, Verse 433:- "Contrition is repentance for bad deeds Which arises afterwards from grief, Doubt is to be of two minds about The truths, the Three Jewels and so forth."

S: Usually contrition is used in a positive sense. I think it really should be rendered as remorse. Remorse "is repentance for bad deeds which arises afterwards from grief". So why is this remorse or contrition considered a fault? In what way does it differ from repentance as a positive skilful quality?

Uttara: You could get bogged down by it instead of ...

Surata: It suggests self-pity.

Ananda: Dwelling in the past.

S: "Which arises afterwards from grief? So what sort of grief? It is not a positive request that you've committed that unskilful action. ~c what is it then?

Atula: Perhaps someone's death?

S: Maybe you grieve because your bad deeds have produced consequences you haven't

12. foreseen.

Alaya: It does sound like it's grief out of self-pity.

S: Self-pity, yes. The "contrition is repentance for bad deeds which arises afterwards from grief". Maybe the bad deeds aren't particularly successful, so you feel upset and sorry. You grieve. So you feel remorse on account of a bad deed. Not because they're bad but for some

other reason. Either that they failed or they got you into trouble and you had to suffer because of them. Or because they earned you a bad reputation. You're not feeling contrite on account of the badness of the bad deed or the unskillfulness of the unskillful actions but for some other quite different reason. "Doubt is to be of two minds about the Truths, the Three Jewels and so forth". Presumably "Truths" means the Four Truths. The Three Jewels are of course the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha. "Doubt is to be in two minds about the Truths, the Three Jewels and so forth". What does- it mean to be in two minds?

_____ Your mind isn't integrated.

S: Your mind isn't integrated. You're split. You're divided. This is a quite interesting phrase, a quite interesting idiom. "To be of two minds". I don't think you quite find that idiom in other languages. (pause) "To be of two minds". You're divided to that extent. It's as though there are two minds within you. One mind is saying one thing, the other mind saying the other. So as long as you are of two minds about anything you can't be sure about that thing. You don't have faith in it. You don't have confidence in it, can't commit yourself to it. So "Doubt is to be of two minds about the Truths, the Three Jewels and so forth". How could you be of two minds about the Three Jewels for instance? Well you could be unsure as to whether the Buddha was Enlightened or not. Unsure whether there was such a thing as the Sangha or not. That about honest doubt? Do you think that's different? Do you think there is such a thing as honest doubt?

Uttara: Yes.

S: In what sort of way?

Uttara: Attempt an analysis.

Ananda: Not taking too much on trust.

Alaya: Not blind faith.

S: Not blind faith, uh?

_____ Sincere questioning.

Ajita: . . .you don't see different things as like permanent.

S: What is the characteristic feature then of doubt in this negative sense? Doubt as a fault. Compared with that other honest doubt which is presumably not a fault.

: Openness for one thing.

You're prepared to try it.

S: Yes. But doubt isn't just being of two minds. It's almost not wanting to be anything else. Allowing yourself to be of two minds about something. Not making a vigorous effort to ascertain the truth of the matter. Because once you have ascertained the truth of a matter you might have to take up a definite attitude. Whereas with the others you are unable to commit

yourself. ~o doubt isn't a sort of suspension of belief until such time as you have sufficient grounds to be able to make up your mind. Doubt is almost deliberately refusing to make up your mind. Allowing yourself to be in a vacillating mental state. Perhaps even so that you will not have to commit yourself either one way or the other. Alright, Verse 434:-

13. "Householder, Bodhisattvas abandon the above While those who keep a monk's vows strictly abandon more. Freed from these defects The virtues are easily observed."

S: So, 'Householder, Bodhisattvas abandon the above', that is to say the above fifty-seven faults, "while those who keep a monk's vows strictly abandon more". It's as though there isn't a great difference in kind between a householder, a Bodhisattva and a monk. They both abandon the fifty-seven faults but the monk abandons even more faults. He is not even satisfied with abandoning fifty-seven. He abandons a few more. "Freed from these defects, the virtues are easily observed". The virtues are the opposite of these fifty-seven faults. That's quite easy to ascertain. Once again though, there is the negative emphasis rather than the positive or rather the negative presentation, or the presentation in negative terms rather than the presentation in positive terms. There's getting rid of fifty-seven faults rather than cultivating fifty-seven virtues.

Ananda: Is there any particular reason for this being fifty-seven?

S.: I think this list probably came down to Nagarjuna from one of the AbiTharma Traditions. There are quite a number of these lists. All of positive mental states, negative mental states and so on. That's what we should be going into mainly in 'Mind in Buddhist Psychology'. That deals with the positive factors mainly. (pause) Alright, Verse 435:- "Briefly the observed By Bodhisattvas are Giving, ethics, patience, effort, Concentration, wisdom, compassion and so forth."

S: So here there are six paramitas plus compassion and so forth, but presumably refers to the rest of the ten paramitas. There are two lists. One of six and one of ten. So in the list of ten the seventh is upaya, which is skilful means. This is regarded as synonymous with compassion. So Nagarjuna mentioned compassion as the seventh paramita and then adds "and so forth". Presumably indicating the remaining three in the list of ten.

_____ What are they?

Ss Upaya, Pranidhara, Bala and Jnana is knowledge. Upaya is of course skilful means. PraniThara is vow. Bala is power and jnana is knowledge. When you get this list of ten, jnana signifies the higher knowledge of the Mahayana. Knowledge of the Void. I explained this in "The Survey" (p. 445). Alright let's see what Nagarjuna has to say about the Paramitas. Verse 436:- "Giving is to give away completely All one's wealth, ethics is to help others, Patience is to forsake anger, Effort to delight in virtues."

S.: So, "Giving is to give away completely all one's wealth". This is a simple basic definition. To give away all one's wealth. Do you think this impossible? Do you think a man could give away completely all his wealth?

Ajita: I don't think so. Not unless it was a monastic situation where one is being supported

or something like that.

S: Even in India, it's quite difficult. Well it says "all one's wealth". All ones

T...). Everything. Well Milarepa did just that but there aren't many others in the course of Buddhist history who have been able to do that. What about one's clothes? Are they considered part of one's wealth? Has one to give away all one's clothes as well? Even clothes are a form of property to say nothing of books, and one's boots. (laughter) And one's camera.

: Does this mean all property?

14. S: I think it does yes. This is the ideal of giving: to give away completely all one's wealth. Why do you think people find this so difficult apart from the inconvenience of not having a certain amount of wealth at your disposal?

_____: Fear.

_____: We are so much attached to our material property.

S: Well you depend upon it, don't you? Especially about money. You feel quite helpless without it. Quite vulnerable. Even quite powerless, quite impotent. Because if you want something, you can't buy it. If you want to go somewhere, you can't go because you need to buy a ticket. Nowadays at least. If you feel hungry you can't just buy something to eat. You have to wait until somebody gives it to you. If you feel thirsty, you can't just buy a drink. You have to wait until someone asks you, invites you. So it means in a way that you are reduced to the position of a child. So people like to have money. They like to have wealth. It is a form of power. If you've got money, you can do so many things that you can't do without it. Or can do without only with difficulty until somebody else's kindness. People get quite a lot of satisfaction from spending money, don't they? Out of buying things. What does that represent? In a way, a sort of self-expression almost. Self-assertion as an exercise of power. Until spending money, it's not exactly expressing yourself, but you carry out what you want to do. What you feel like doing. Anybody had the experience of being without money?

Atula: Yes, all the time.' When I was working at 'c'.ukhavati.

Hridaya: There can be a certain feeling of relief that seems to come with the simplicity of the situation. Even though you might have to wait for someone to give you something. There is a certain ease in that situation.

Atula: You don't seem to experience it while you are on good days, when you've come down I find...

Hridaya: When you want to buy something to perk yourself up.

S: To compensate for your down state and you can't do that.

Alaya: I went begging for about six months. It was quite nice begging.

S: I've found in India at a time when I didn't have any money, deliberately, that it's much easier being completely without money than just having a little. It was much better to have touched rock-bottom and to have touched it quite deliberately as a matter of choice and to have stayed there. If (...) had just a little money I afterwards discovered it was much more troublesome and difficult than if you had nothing at all. If you had a little you'd try and make both ends meet and you were not sure whether you'd buy this or buy that. Which, of course, you didn't ~0, you couldn't do if you had no money at all. It may be a toss-up between a packet of cigarettes and a Mars bar. (laughter) Or a pint. Agonizing decision. Or a new pair of socks even.

Ananda: I was reading a book about, I forget who it was, a university professor who deliberately lived a tramp's life for quite some time and although he had a lot of money he refused to touch it. A sort of vow that he would live without money a certain period of time. The book really shows the agony he went through, of him sticking to that vow. When he had the money but he couldn't even buy a cup of tea.~ He had to wait until somebody gave it to him. He was in London. He got into a terrible state, his clothes ragged, he couldn't afford a bath. The conflict between having had the money and knowing that he had it.

Ajita: I think you've got to have an ideal. If you're not going to have money, you've got to have an ideal in front of you. The thing is that you're not just an ordinary person. You can easily come to crime. Nicking your bread, you know.

Hridaya: If you use money as a means of compensation then you use something else to compensate for different ... you know. An ideal can (...) in that simple way.

IS.

S: ~o "Giving is to give away completely all one's wealth. Ethics is to help others? Sila is to help others? That's the basic principle of ethics according to Nagarjuna. From the Mahayana point of view to help others. "Patience is to forsake anger". Patience is the opposite of anger. Anger the opposite of patience. The practice of patience means simply giving up~anger. Santideva, you may remember, goes into this in considerable depth and in great detail in the Bhodicyavavata. It's one of his great topics. 50, " Effort is to delight in virtues". Now what does that mean? Why is it that delight in virtues does constitute effort?

Alaya; Enlightenment comes through making an effort. If there is no delight you can't make an effort at all.

S: Well one could put it in this way; if you delight in virtues you don't need to make an effort. The effort, as it were, becomes spontaneous. Effort suggests, er, struggle. Suggests that you almost have to force yourself. Er, but if you delight in virtues, if you really enjoy them, if you enjoy practicing them, enjoy experien- cing them, then the effort becomes quite natural, quite spontaneous. So this is where the attractiveness of the ideal becomes so important. In a way the beauty of the ideal becomes so important. In a way the beauty of the ideal we were talking about some days ago. &o effort means to delight in virtues. You can't push yourself around all the time. Though you might, may occasionally have to do so. You have to be drawn. You have to be pulled from in front by the attractive power of the ideal. By the fascination of the ideal. So, "Effort is to delight in virtues". To delight in positive qualities, to delight in

spiritual qualities. To delight in the spiritual qualities of the Buddha. To delight in the life of the Buddha. To delight in the beauty of the ideal. If you can do that then you'll make an effort quite naturally and spontaneously and comparatively easily. This is why it's so important to present people, and oneself also, with a positive ideal which is inspiring and attractive. Not some ideal that puts people off. You notice that people work all the better when they enjoy their work. Then they're taking delight in the purpose for which they're doing the work. The work then goes with a swing so much more easily. So if one wants to develop mindfulness, one would delight in mindfulness. You find the ideal of mindfulness very attractive. (pause) Alright, what about verse 437:- "Concentration is unafflicted onepointedness, Wisdom is the ascertainment of the meaning of the truths, Compassion is a mind that savours only Mercy and love for all sentient beings."

S: So "Concentration is unafflicted onepointedness". Perfect onepointedness. This is pretty obvious. "Wisdom is ascertainment of the meaning of the truths". Ascertainment of the meaning of the Four Noble Truths. Or ascertainment of the meaning of the Dharma. Ascertainment of the meaning of Reality. "Compassion is a mind that savours only mercy and love for all sentient beings." Why this word 'savour'?~What does 'savour' suggest? It suggests tasting or even relishing. Savouring mercy and love. Love is to like, delighting in virtues. You don't simply practice mercy and love, don't simply develop them, you savour them, you taste them, you relish them, you enjoy them. So compassion is a mind that enjoys mercy and love for all sentient beings. Karuna and maitri. And one notices it is "for all sentient beings", not just some, not just a few

All right V0438: '1. From giving arises wealth,

from ethics happiness,

From patience a good appearance, From effort effort in virtue. Brilliance, From concentration ease

[640]

From wisdom liberation

From compassion all aims are achieved."

So here Nagarjuna is specifying the particular results of the seven paramitas that he mentions. From giving there arises wealth, you give and you get back, presumably material wealth. From ethics happiness, From patience a good appearance because anger distorts the features so if you are patient if you are not angry you will be reborn with a good appearance, handsome beautiful. From effort in virtue brilliance..What is this brilliance ?

. Radiance.

S: It's more like radiance, energy is like that energy is radiating energy is of a radiant nature. So carried to an extreme it becomes a sort of brilliance a sort of effulgence a sparkle if you like and from concentration peace. That's pretty obvious. From wisdom liberation From compassion all aims are achieved. This shows how high the Mahayana places compassion. i.e. that from compassion all aims are achieved, All right v.439

"From the simultaneous perfection of all those Seven virtues,

s attained the sphere of inconceivable wisdom, The Protectorship of the World. "

So, "From the simultaneous perfection", if you bring them all to perfection at the same time then that is tantamount to enlightenment. Tantamount to attaining the sphere of inconceivable wisdom. The wisdom of a fully enlightened Buddha and "The status of the protectors of the World" What is this protectorship of the world ? In the puja there are references to the protectors. who are these protectors ? In Sanskrit, it is lokanatha.

: Bodhisattvas.

S: Bodhisattvas, yes. It generally refers to both Buddhas and Bodhi- sattvas. Here it refers to the Buddha himself. So in what way do the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas protect the world.

Hridaya: Through one being able to go for refuge.

S: By being able to go to refuge to them. It doesn't mean as some Buddhists believe, protectorship from calamities, sickness, or from loss of wealth, dying prematurely. Sometimes natha is translated As saviour. But that suggests someone coming and just saving you virtually by force and that is not correct. So to protect means to function as subject of refuge so to protect the universe means to be for living beings in the universe an object of refuge. So what does even that mean ?

[641]

Uttara: Something you can rely on to take you away from the negative side.

S: But what do you mean by take you away

Uttara: Help you get out.

S: Yes help you , even if only by providing you with an ideal. So the protectorship of the world means the position of being an object of refuge to all the beings in the world. It doesn't mean protecting and looking after the world as .. in a providential sort of way. It doesn't mean saving it from earthquakes and eruptions and famine and flood and so on.

Alaya: What do you mean by "tantamount"

S: Equal to, meaning the same as.

Right v.440:

"Just as the eight levels of hearers are explained in their vehicle So are the ten bodhisattva states in the Mahayana. "

What are these eight levels of hearers ? and who are the hearers ? _____ : Shravikas

S: But in general ?

Uttara: In all stages of the Sangha.

S: It's those Aryapudgalas. Shravikas in the sense of those arya- pudgalas who make up the Sangha at least from the Hinayana point of view. So what are these eight levels ? They are also called the eight purisapudgalas in the vandana for instance. So who are these ?

Uttara: Four pairs of individuals.

S: Yes. so what are these ? There were four pairs making eight all together. So what are these four pairs ?

Hridaya: Stream entrant, once returner, Non returner, Arahant.

S: Yes that is four but how do we get eight.

It's a distinction of what is called Ma~ha and Phala, these two states. Of actually traversing , to doing those things that actually make you a stream entrant is the path and experiencing the results of the path is the fruit. So there is this distinction introduced to every stage of attaining the path of the stream entrant and experiencing the fruit of being a stream entrant. It's a rather subtle scholastic distinction. So, "just as the eight levels of hearers are explained in their vehicle" which vehicle is that ? The Shravika and the Hinayana in general. "So are the ten Bodhisattva stages in the Mahayana". Do you know the technical term for these Bodhisattva stages in Sanskrit.?

. Bhumis

S: Bhumi literally means earth, something on which you place your foot, something on which you stand. So the ten Bhumis are the ten earths, the ten levels or ten stages of the Bodhisattva. You get it

ii such words as Bhumi-pala or Bhupa~~, being lord of the earth or Bhudeva, god. of the earth. Who is the god of the earth ? That's how the Brahmins describe themselves as the bhudevas, the gods on earth. The other gods in heaven are the Brahmas

Ananda: I'm just wondering why those two the eight levels and the ten bhumis are put together in that verse. Is there some sort of attempt at correlation between the two ?

1: I don't think so except to the extent that Nagarjuna says just as the eight levels of hearers are explained in their vehicle so so the ten Bodhisattva stages in the Mahayana.

Atula: (Unclear question)

S: This raises quite a sort of difficult question which is connected with what I was talking about the other day about this recapitulation of three stages of historic development. You see there is the Hinayana formulation of the path and then the Mahayana formulation of the path. The Mahayana regards its stages usually as being more advanced than those of the Hinayana but at the same time you can see that in a way the Mahayana path is a restatement of the Hinayana path. It's an attempt to broaden out the somewhat narrow interpretation of the path given by the Hinayana when it had become rather rigid and literalistic. So there are certain things in the Mahayana path which do correspond to certain things in the Hinayana path, but it isn't always easy to sort of tick them off item by item, systematically and say that this in the Mahayana corresponds to this in the Hinayana all the way along the line. That is not always possible. But one can say that in the life of someone who follows the Hinayana the stream entry is the decisive point, the crucial point, the turning point. In the same way the arising of the Bodhicitta is the turning point, the crucial point for one who follows the Mahayana. So in a sense this stream entry corresponds to the arising of the Bodhicitta. At the same time there is a difference in as much as the whole context of the Mahayana is much broader and richer. It takes into account the altruistic perspective to a far greater degree than the Hinayana itself did.

&tu1A£ (agaj~n indistinct)

PG/1~~

S: on the other hand one cannot help wondering when you see these different formulations of the path what bearing do they all have on one another. In a sense the path is one. All these different formulations present different aspects of the path. But the different aspects of formulations of the path are formulated from different points of view. Bearing in mind this factor or that factor. So it is not easy or possible to get a sort of precise almost mathematical coincidence or correspondence between them all. The path one could say is multi-dimensional. I think I can say the account I gave the other day of the five main stages of the path in a very general way does leave room for all these different formulations, because it is very broad and very general. One can also say that in the case of Stream Entry it is the negative side that is stressed, not even stressed. Stream entry looks at the spiritual life or spiritual progress in terms of fetters that have been broken rather than in terms of any positive attainment. And the bodhicitta keeping with the overall positive approach of the Mahayana is a more positive conception. So perhaps in a way looking at it in that way the two do represent complementary ways of looking at things. Even though you might not be able to say well you know Stream entry is just the negative counterpart of the arising of the bodhiditta. perhaps it isn't so simple as that but there is a certain complementarity between the two points of view of the two ways of looking at things. On the other hand of course there is another stage of a bodhisattva's career which is irreversibility. So that also corresponds to Stream Entry because after attaining stream entry you become irreversible. But there is a difference: irreversible from your own individual enlightenment. If you look at it in strictly Hinayanic terms. But the Bodhisattva's irreversibility is irreversibility from Supreme Perfect Enlightenment.

Uttara: You think this where people got the impression of Buddhism being a rather selfish religion; in terms of Stream entry and things

S: I don't know about that because in Christianity you have the idea of saving your soul and going to heaven. That seems selfish enough. I think the Western impression, if it does still in fact exist, that Buddhism is selfish probably springs much more from the emphasis of Buddhism on the whole and the Theravada especially on monasticism: leaving home, leaving work, leaving wife, leaving family. And this is generally regarded as very selfish. You go forth in search of your own enlightenment and your own salvation leaving everyone

PG/Z~~

behind to manage as best they can. Some people are deeply shocked by the idea of the Buddha leaving home, leaving his beautiful wife and his lovely child and just going off into the forest in search of truth. Some people say "how shocking, how selfish. If one meets this sort of criticism what do you think one should say, how should one meet it?

Atula; By his teaching other people ?

S: That is one way, but he didn't know presumably when he left home that he was going

to spend 45 years teaching other people. Perhaps he hoped he would but he didn't know.

Surata: It's not as if his wife and everyone else would want to go off with him in search of the truth.

S; Well clearly it is his duty to stay with his wife. But how do you put it across without sort of trying to make excuses ? If you say for instance that well he made up for it by teaching so many people afterwards. (laughter) you half admit it was some sort of wrong doing on his part.

Uttara; Resentment.

S: Well they might say he should try to overcome his resentment like everyone else.

Hridaya: It is very difficult sometimes to answer a question like this. Perhaps the mention of the Four Noble Truths as being the Buddha's experience. The impression of this was obviously so important.

S; Well suppose some one said what could be more important than your own wife and family, your main responsibilities are there.

Nridaya: Well he saw in the Four Truths that they were liable to death, old age, Sickness.

Swell they might say if you leave her they are still liable . It doesn't make it any better.

Uttara: He had everything but he still wasn't satisfied so from that....

Well how selfish, just because he wasn't satisfied. ~What about their feelings. ?

(laughter) He was unsatisfied staying at home and they were unsatisfied when he left.

Uttara: Then we just have say it was a selfish action.

S: Well you have to think in either of two ways. I won't say justifying it, but sticking up for it. One: there are certain situations in life where you just cannot do anything other than what you do. There are certain situations in life when you just don't have a choice. You just do what you feel you must do and nobody can stop you. It is not something you work out, you weigh up the pros and cons, there are certain situations in which you are irresistibly impelled to do something of other and you cannot possibly do anything else and that was the situation clearly in the case of the Buddha. He just could not stay at home any more so he didn't. So the question right or wrong doesn't arise at all strictly speaking. Another the sort of way of meeting the objection is to meet it head on and say What is wrong with selfishness ? Even if the Buddha was selfish

~L~ PO/13

in leaving home you are taken as if he was the only selfish person who ever lived Why do you think he got married ?

If you say leaving his wife is selfish why didn't he get married, that was selfishness too wasn't it ? Why did you get married ? It wasn't for the sake of humanity. It was for your own sake wasn't it . The Buddha was selfish, O.K. but what is wrong with selfishness. There was a healthy sort of self interest, he wanted to grow and wanted to develop and he couldn't do that at home. A man's got the right to look after himself and do the best that he can for himself. It is this sort of enlightened self-interest that will in the long run enable you to do good to others. But you're not

justifying it on those grounds. you've got a right to your own life ultimately. Stick up for it boldly ~ that way. I think that is much better. Otherwise people will -- criticise you and say supposing you want to lead the sort of life that you want to lead that it is very selfish. Well who isn't selfish you can say. You are selfish too. You are doing what you want well I'm going to do what I want What is the difference People make this sort of criticism as if they were angels of unselfishness. Ajita; I remember Dr. Bronowski (?) said on the TV that he was upset that the young people in the modern age were getting back into the ancient religions and they were regressing by becoming involved in things like Buddhism and Zen.

S: Regressing ? Well what about regressing to Christianity ? (laughter)

Ajita: He felt may be that they should looking ahead to the new discoveries in science and

progressing in that way. He thought it was a bit selfish.

S: well~how is it selfish ? If you do what you want to do that is selfish. If I do what I want to do that is being unselfish. That seems to be the message, doesn't it??

Ajita;~ felt that somehow they weren't giving into the evolution of mankind because they were going back to the ancient scriptures and things like that.

S: Well this is to look at human knowledge as a whole and human life as a whole in terms of science which is quite wrong. For instance in science knowledge grows by incrementation. The scientist of today knows more than the scientist of yesterday did. The scientist of tomorrow will know more than the scientist of today knows. Because that is due to the very nature of science, scientific knowledge itself. Scientific knowledge just gathers facts. It adds one fact to another, and then it draws conclusions from those facts. This is basically how scientific knowledge advances. So in each generation there is more scientific knowledge. But you cannot apply that to other spheres of life. For instance take literature. Milton came after Shakespeare. Is Milton necessarily a better poet ? T.S.Elliot comes after Chaucer. Is he necessarily a better poet ? No. there is no sort of accumulation in that aspect of life. Poets don't get better and better as the centuries go by. Artists don't get better and better, spiritual teachings do not get better and better. So why is this ?

Because they are distinctively and essentially achievements of individuals. And each individual has to start all over again. Because he can certainly benefit from what his predecessors have done or gain from their inspiration. But simply because he comes later he doesn't necessarily achieve more. I mean to take an extreme example: what about Chaucer, what about Dante. These are all ancient poets, but we haven't

PG/z14 696

surpassed them. Even though we've come later. So if you want the best you have to look back. So in the same way it's just the same with spiritual things. Very often for the best you have to look

back. So you cannot but in that sense regress. So you cannot apply

the criterion of science here. It is completely inapplicable. So even if your interest in scientific knowledge, yes you want the latest most up to date information and education. But if you are interested in spiritual things well you may well have to go back a few hundred years. Because the latest is not the best. Here time is quite out of place, quite irrelevant. You have to go to the greatest individuals, the most enlightened people of all ages. Here the latest is not the best, not the greatest. If Jacob Bronowski did say that sort of thing he was sadly astray and confusing the different kinds of knowledge and different kinds of human experience and their respective criteria.

Ajita: That was on his T.V. programme "The Sent of Man".

S: It also means that that is forward for man is not just an increase in Scientific knowledge. That is just more scientific knowledge.

Surata: Modern science seems to be creating a lot of problems by its discoveries.

S: Well there is a confusion of technological progress with true human development. It is a confusion between these two things. You cannot necessarily be a better or more developed human being just because you have at your disposal greater scientific knowledge and greater technological resources. It is just the same with a human being we are not better than our forefathers just because we come later and we are not necessarily worse either, that being the opposite view. But we have to try to develop ourselves as individuals. We may do better than they did, we may not. It depends upon the amount of effort we put into it. But we are not better just because we live after them, nor are we necessarily worse simply because we live after them. But the scientist of today knows more than the scientist of yesterday. The schoolboy of today knows more about science than did even the greatest scientists of a few hundred years ago. But the schoolboy of today is not a greater poet than Shakespeare, nor does he know poetry better than Shakespeare, nor is he more enlightened than the Buddha just because he lives 2,500 years later. It is a different order of experience. It is really amazing that quite

PG/z15

intelligent people like Bronowski make the silly sort of judgements and confusions which even a child can see through. Even a child can understand that if you got two lollipops you are not necessarily better than the child that has only got one lollipop. (laughter) The more lollipops the better the child you are. America is greater than say Switzerland because America has got greater technological resources. This doesn't necessarily follow. It is a childish way of thinking. I don't think even a sensible child would or could think in this way.

Ananda: Actually I'm quite surprised to find people making statements like that, because there is so much literature going against that.

S: Regressive? Why do so many young people regress in this way? It is because they find in Zen or Buddhism or in Eastern teachings something which will help them with their lives as human beings, with their development as human beings in a way that modern science and technology just cannot do by their very natures.

Hridaya: You just get tired of listening to someone's theory. You can see it is not working. It is just not convincing.

S: I was looking up in the alternative England and Wales a few things and there's an organisation apparently called the "Diggers". It takes its name from the 17th century English movement and one of the things it wants to do is virtually dismantle modern technology and reduce production and the standard of living. It's interesting that nowadays this is becoming a serious point of view. That we have gone too far. It is not that there is a high standard of living for everybody. No there is a high standard of living for a minority at the expense of the majority and at the expense of the world's natural resources. I mean Western Europe and America are in a way in a most abnormal state which cannot possibly be sustained

indefinitely, economically speaking. This cannot be made a general world wide thing and can only be an object of greed, jealousy and resentment on the part of so many of the people of the rest of the world, who would like these things but cannot have them. I forget the figures, but I think America uses 60 percent of the world's resources of raw materials, something like that. That is quite staggering. Far, far far more than her sort of fair share.

Ananda: It is interesting to look at those figures and compare them with what America does in other parts of the world, like trying to liberate underdeveloped countries, like Vietnam (laughter) It is a sort of psychological compensation for the general feeling that they are consuming far more than their real share. They try to

Po/zis

balance it out psychologically in different ways. It isn't really giving

S: Well the giving is only too often the lending of money to foreign countries to buy your goods from you. It's credit that you give to buy your products, not just to buy products anywhere in the world. Anyhow how did we get onto all that? It was you mentioning Bronowski. All right onto the Ten Bodhisattva stages. V.441

"The first of these is the very joyous since the Bodhisattva is rejoicing, he forsakes the three entwinements and is born into the lineage of the Tathagatas."

S: yes the three entwinements are viewing the mental and physical aggregates which are a transitory collection as a real self, Afflicted doubt and considering bad ethics and discipline to be superior. What are these then? That is quite interesting. It is rather wrapped up but these are the first three fetters. So if you break the first three fetters you become a stream entrant. So presumably according to this interpretation becoming a Bodhisattva, entering upon the first of the Bodhisattva stages which is only possible when the Bodhi citta has arisen, is equivalent to or corresponds to stream entry in the Hinayana. This is no doubt an annotation from oral sources. This may not be the general view of the Mahayana, but certainly a view taken by some of the Tibetan teachers. The three entwinements, it is really three fetters, samyogina.(?)

Ananda: Is that one of the first of the Shumis, joyousness?

S: Yes, it is promudita. So the first of these is "very joyous" since the Bodhisattva is rejoicing because he has taken this momentous step. He forsakes the three entwinements and is born into the lineage of the Tathagatas, into the family of the Buddhas, into the Aryasangha, that is to say the spiritual community in the very highest sense.

Hridaya: It is interesting to correlate that with the pull of the unconditioned.

Uttara: Is this term "the company of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas" to be taken literally, do you actually

S: It's as though you are on the same wavelength as they are. Your spiritually in their presence. It may not be that there are Buddhas and Bodhisattvas physically around, but you

era in harmony with them, you are on the same wavelength as them. So you are in a sense in contact with them, in communication with them, in their peesense. All right V.442

"~hrough the maturation of these qualit~~es

Perfection of giving becomes supreme He vibrates a hundred worlds And be~omes a great Lord of the world."

PG/z17

S: So there's a sort of spiritual result and there's also a material result under the law of karma with respect to his future rebirths. Through the maturation of these qualities, presumably the qualities previously mentioned. The perfection of giving becomes supreme. He practices the first of the paramitas, dana, to an extreme degree. That is not to say that he hasn't practiced it before, but here he really does give away all his wealth. He really does sacrifice life and limb. His perfection of giving becomes supreme, he vibrates a hundred worlds. What does that mean, how does he vibrate a hundred worlds ?

Utters: With his compassion

S: Yes especially his giving. His giving is so extreme, it goes so much against the grain of the ordinary person that it is a shock to a hundred worlds, so that they vibrate. It's said in some of the Jetika stories that when the Bodhisattva gave away his wife and children, the whole universe just shook, it was such a shock to it. Just like when the ordinary person hears about the Buddha leaving home it is a shock. He or she sort of vibrates usually because it goes so much against their grain. So when the Bodhisattva performs his great acts of generosity, sacrifices his wife, children, life and limb, being prepared to give up everything, gives away his kingdom, it is such a shock that even a hundred worlds can hardly stand it and start vibrating. Clearly this is not taken to mean literally but you can see the significance of it. And becomes a great king. Because he has given away so much he gains so much, when he comes to be reborn.

Ananda: In this second line does it mean that giving is the supreme of the perfections ?

S: No, it means the perfection of giving is itself perfected in this stage. All right, V. 443.

"The second is called the stainless because the ten virtuous actions Body , Speech and Mind are stainless

And he naturally abides in them.1'

The stainless, Vimala. Because the ten virtuous actions, the ten skillful actions, in other words the ten precepts of the upasaka. The ten silas are practised in their purity to complete perfection and he naturally performs these ten skillful actions it is no effort by the time he reaches this stage. They flow forth naturally and spontaneously Therefore this stage is called the stainless.

Hridaya: They are the natural expressions of themselves. There is no effort. It is almost like saying that it is above and beyond the concepts, good and bad.

PO/ZIS

S: flight . O.K. v.444

"Through the maturation of these qualities the perfection of ethics becomes supreme

He becomes a universal monarch, helping beings,

Master of the four continents and seven precious substances,"

So through the maturation of these qualities the qualities produced by the practice of the ten virtuous actions of body speech and mind, the perfection of ethics becomes supreme, he perfects the paramita of sila and as a result, when he comes to be reborn, he's reborn as a universal monarch, helping beings. Reborn as a righteous monarch, master of the glorious four continents of Indian cosmography and of the seven precious substances, the seven jewels. You know what these are: the jewel of the Minister, the jewel of the horse, the jewel of the elephant, the jewel of the wheel, the jewel of the woman, the jewel of the treasurer, the jewel of the wish fulfilling vase, these are the seven jewels or seven precious substances which belong to the Universal monarch. You notice the close association between a spiritual attainment and worldly as it were, recompense. So you can see from this that it would be very easy if you meet a king or a great ruler to regard him as a sort of Bodhisattva in the second or third stage and this we find in fact sometimes done. But there is a sort of truth in this in a way. In as much as spiritual attainments do act, as it were, upon the world! Yes. So you see what I mean. The two don't remain completely dissociated. If you develop highly spiritual states of mind, these will act all the way down as it were, on all the lower levels including even on the physical. There will be some effect felt on the physical body itself as a result of your changed state of consciousness. All right, onto. V. 445.

"The third stage is called the Shining Because the purifying light of wisdom arises. Concentrations and clairvoyance are generated while desire and hatred are extinguished completely."

So the purifying light of Wisdom arises, one begins to see into the Truth. The Concentrations, this may mean the samadhis, it may mean the vimuktas(?) and clairvoyances, the supernormal powers are generated, while desire and hatred are extinguished completely, but not ignorance you notice.

Ananda: I was surprised when you said that desire is extinguished completely, isn't there still some remnant, a subtle level at each stage which accounts for rebirth in the world.

S: This is true, this is also said that the Bodhisattva retains a sort of subtle desire for rebirth. Otherwise he would as it were disappear into the void of Nirvana and not come back. So this in a sense if you

if you take it literally contradicts that, that other M~ayana teaching Perhaps it is ag~~in a queStion of motivation. I mean the Bodhisattva retains that desire. Why ? He retains that desire so that h can help others, c'ot for selfish purpose~. So perhaps it is just the selfish desire that is intended here. Though the tradition does say the Bodhi- sattva retains desire so aS to be able to be reborn on the earth and so to continur to help others. But the ultimate motivation is altruistic. All right, V. 448

"Through the maturation of these qualities He practices supremely the deeds of patience And putting an end to the desire he created Becomes the wise king of the gods".

We've come to Shanti. He goes up one stage as it were in the hierachy of conditioned ebeing when he comes to be reborn. The descr~ptions of the bhumis you notvce become very very general. Go onto V. 447.

"The fourth is celled the radiant Because the light of true Wisdom arises In which he cultivates supremly The auxiliaries of enlightenment"

These are the Thirty seven Bodhi pakshadharmahas C?) All right onto V44S. The names of these stages are little more than lables in a way. They don't really tell us very much about the nature of the stages.

"through the maturation of these qualities

He becomes a king of the gods in heaven

Without combat he is skilled in quelling thi arisal of the view For the transitory collection of the rea4 selfq"

The transitory collection of the aggregates that is to say He is skilled in quelling the arising of the view that the aggregates constitu~e the real self. Onto V.449

"The fifth is called the Extremely Difficult to Overcome Since all evil ones find it extremely hard to conquer him; He becomes skilled in knowing the subtle

Mae Meanings of the noble truths and so forth.

You notice Na~arjuna tries to distribute all the main Buddhist teachings over these ten stages, so that at each sucessive stage the Bodhisa~tva peneteate~ into of understands of practices another of these teachings. This is probably one of the earliest attempts to distribute all the different practices and teachings amoung all the stages of the spiritual path.

Utters: Is it similar to the Voice of Silence in any way ?

S: I don't think there is any detailed descri~ption of the stages there. Though there is a mention of the seven paramitae. All right, onto V.450

PG/Z20

~£t~o "Through the maturation Cf the qualities he becomes A king of the gods abiding in the Joyous Heaven,

He overcomes the sources of afflictions And of the views of all Forders."

The Forders are the 90 called heretical teachers. Onto V.451 and 452.

"The sixik is ~~~ "approaching'~

Because he is approaching the qualities Cf a Buddha Through the familiarity with the calm, abiding in special insight He attains ~~~h'0~ and is thus advanced in wisdom." What is this calm abiding in special insight It is samatha and vip- assana. In the sixth stage he completely masters samatha and vipaseana.

"On the maturation of these qualit~es he

He becomes a king of the gods in the heaven of li~ht and Heroes cannot surpass him

He pacifies those with the pride of superiority."

Here it seems he goes all the way beyond the Hinayan~ levels. Because with the perfection of calm abiding in special insight he has attained apparently Nirvana in the Hinayanic sense.

Ananda: Is that why it is translated as cessation, because it is purely the negative aspect ?

S: Yes. f9iyht onto V.453

"The seventh is the one art

Because the number of qualities has increased. Moment by moment he can enter the equi- poise of cessation."

Atula: What is equipoise ?

ss Equipoise is balance. What exactly equipoise of cessation means is not clear. Sometimes it is said that the gone afar Ourangama means gone far beyond the purely Hinayan attainment and realizations. Onto V.454 We are getting into rather rC"r-fi~d levels4

"Through the maturation of these qualities He becomes a master of the gods in the heaven for control over other emanations, He becomes a great leader of teachers

Because he knows direct realization of the Four Noble Truths "

Not just a teacher, not even a great teacher but a great teacher of teachers. He's still only in the seventh stage, all right let's go on. V.485

"The Eighth is the immovable the youthful and a Transcendentalist

PG/Z2S

Immovable is Achala, the youthful stage. I wonder why it is called the youthful stage. It is by the way the stage of irreversibility. The Bodhisattva cannot fall back. It is the youthful stage because he never grows old, he is eternally young. Manjugosha especially represents this aspect. Through nonconceptuality he is unmovable. What does that mean? Free from all concepts. It is having concepts that causes one to waver, to be uncertain and the spheres of his body, speech and mind's activities are inconceivable. You cannot really say anything about his functioning. He is a sort of supra individual sort of cosmic spiritual force or energy. All right V.458

"Through the maturation of these qualities He becomes a Brahman, master of a thousand worlds, foe destroyers and solitary realizers and so forth Cannot surpass him in the meanings of the doctrines"

Who are the foe destroyers? The Arahants. Arahant is often interpreted as destroyer of foes. Arhi is enemy and ante is end (C?) so someone who makes an end of enemies or foe destroyer, the Arahant. Solitary realizers of Pratyeka Buddhas. That is to say the Arahants, the Pratyeka Buddhas, all the other Shravakas cannot surpass him, the Bodhisattva of the eighth stage. That is to say in establishing the meaning of the Dharmas. He understands it better and can explain it better than them, any of them. Well, V.457

"The ninth step is called good intelligence.

Like a regent he has attained right individual realization And therefore has good intelligence."

Why is he called like a regent, what is a regent? A regent is one who rules in the place of the king, like the Prince regent during the illness of his father King George IV. He was the regent, so a regent has all the powers of the King without actually being the king. He can do everything that the king can do but he still is not king. The Bodhisattva in the ninth stage is virtually like the Buddha, he can do everything that the Buddha can do. The only difference is that he is not a Buddha (laughter). So he is like a regent, he has attained correct individual realization and therefore has good intelligence. V. 458

"Through the maturation of these qualities

He becomes a Brahma, master of a million worlds,

Foe destroyer and so forth and

None can surpass him in responding to questions in the thoughts of sentient beings."

Cannot surpass him in responding to questions in the thoughts of sentient beings. This is said to be one of the differences between the Buddhas and the Great Bodhisattvas on the one hand and the Arhants on the other

PG/Z22

That is to say from the Hinayana point of View which was later adapted by the Mahayana there being a difference between the two. The Arhant can certainly teach and explain the doctrines but they don't really know what is going on in the minds of other people, they cannot speak, as it were, directly to them. They cannot read their thoughts in a way But the Buddhas and the Great Bodhisattvas can do this, they're sensitive to the needs of other living beings even though not expressed and can teach the dharma taking those into consideration. all right onto V.459.

"The tenth is the cloud of doctrine

Because the rain of the excellent doctrine falls The Bodhisattva is consecrated with life by the Buddhas.1,

In the previous stage, the Bodhisattva was compared to a regent, here he is compared to a Crown Prince who was consecrated as king by his father in his own lifetime. This was the ancient Indian custom. It seems that the king consecrated his successor. Consecrated him by as it were baptizing him, that was the royal consecration. The Bodhisattva is consecrated by the Buddhas with light. So the tenth is the cloud of Doctrine, Ohammamegha, because the rain of excellent doctrine falls, the Bodhisattva is consecrated with light by the Buddha. This symbolism of baptism and consecration of the crown prince was also taken over by the Vajrayana and used in connection with the Abhisheka which is the Tantric Womb initiation ceremony. So this is, the Tantra is supposed to start, the Vajrayana is supposed to start at the tenth Bodhisattva stage So, when people tell you that they are into Tantra, just remind them of that. (laughter)

Uttara: You have to be a Buddha before you can get into it ?

S: Right, or as the Zen people say if you know want to climb a mountain start at the top. (laughter) V.480

Through the maturation of these qualities

He becomes a master of the gods of Pure abode

He is a supreme great Lord, master of the sphere of Infinite Wisdom.

In other words he becomes enlightened, he becomes a Buddha, in the tenth Bhumi. Onto V.461,482

Thus these ten stages are As the ten of Bodhisattvas. the stage of Buddhahood is different

Being is all ways inconcievable.

It's boundless extent is merely said To encompass the ten powers, Each of his powers is immeasurable too, Like the limitless number of all migratories.

PG/Z"23

S: So these ten stages are renown or well known as the ten of the Bodhi* sattva. It is said that it is in the tenth stage that the Bodhisattva becomes a Buddha, so in a way that is the stage of Buddhahood, but in another sense not. Buddhahood is not a stage. It cannot be strictly classified in this way. The stage of Buddhahood is different, not that it is another stage. But that you cannot think of it in terms of stages at all, being in all ways innumerable.. It is boundless, extent is merely said to encompass the ten powers. So there is a list of the ten powers the ten Dasabala (?) of the Buddha which the Buddha possesses and not the Arahant, Shrivaka, or Pratyaksa Buddha according to the later development in which there is some difference between a Buddha's enlightenment and that of the disciples. Each of his power is immeasurable, like the limitless number of all migratories, Well not very much can be said about the Buddhas. All right V 463 to 465.

The limitless of a Buddha's Qualities is said to be like that Of space, earth water fire And wind in all directions.

If the causes are reduced to a mere

Measure and not seen to be limitless One will not believe the limitlessness Of the qualities of the Buddhas.

The causes are limitless, the effects the qualities are limitless. If one doesn't believe in the one, one won't believe in the other.

"Therefore in the presence of an image Or reliquary of something else Say these twenty stanzas

Three times every day.

All right what sort of impression do you get going through these Bodhisattva sages ? Or do you get a very definite impression or not ? You can't get a very definite impression . You get a glimmer of an impression for the first couple of stages but after that you rather lose the Bodhisattva.

Uttara: Expansion.

Heidaya: That sort of feeling which comes sometimes with association Mahayana writing, the kind of width and vastness , colour

S: Yes something that the mind cannot grasp, it is not meant to grasp, you are meant to be left

rather bewildered, rather overwhelmed.

AJITA: Something glimmering, just out of reach

S: Quite a few of the names of the stages are poetical rather than analytical like the stage of Shining. There is a stage called the radiant,

P(3/Z24

The stage of Approaching.

Ajiti: There is a transparent quality about them, something crystalline.

S: They're not too definite nor are they meant to be you know from the ordinary human point of view they cannot be tied down. V.4S7

"Going for Refuge with all forms of respect

To the Buddhas excellent practice,

Supreme Community and dharmas

I bow down to all that is worthy of honour."

You'll notice it is a form of the sevenfold puja, really very similar to that of Shantideva's arrangement of the seven parts and Shantideva has clearly taken these twenty verses as a sort of model. You'll notice that Going for Refuge comes first then Vandan and after that you'll see the Confession of faults. So let's go all the way through it and then we'll

talk about it.

467 From all sins I will turn away And thoroughly maintain all virtues, I will admire all the merits Of all embodied beings.

468 With bowed head and clasped hands I petition the perfect Buddhas To turn the wheel of doctrine and remain As long as beings transmigrate.

469 Through the merit of having done all this and through The merit that I have done and that I will do May all sentient beings aspire To the highest enlightenment.

470 May all sentient beings have all the stainless Powers, freedom from all conditions of non-leisure, Freedom of action And good livelihood.

471 May all embodied beings Have jewels in their hands and may All the limitless

necessities of life remain Unconsumed as long as there is cyclic existence.

472 May all beings always be [Born] as superior humans, 49 May all embodied beings have Wisdom and the support [of ethics].

?q i/~~ 473 May embodied beings have a good complexion, 6~Th
Good physique, great beauty, a pleasant appearance, Freedom from disease,
Power and long life.

474 May all be skilled in tile means [to extinguish Suffering], and have liberation from it, Absorption in the Three Jewels, And the great wealth of Buddha's doctrine.

47S May they be adorned with love, compassion, joy, Even-mindedness
[devoid of] the afflictions, Giving, ethics, patience, effort,
Concentration and wisdom.

476 May they have the brilliant major and minor marks [of a Buddha]
From having finally completed the two collections [of merit and
wisdom] And may they cross without interruption The ten
inconceivable stages.

477 May I also be adorned completely With those and all other good qualities, Be freed from all defects and possess Superior love for all sentient beings.

478 May I perfect all the virtues For which all embodied beings hope
And may I always relieve The sufferings of all sentient beings. --

479 May those beings in all worlds Who are distressed through fear
Become entirely fearless Through merely hearing my name.

480 Through seeing or thinking of me Or only hearing my name may beings attain great joy, Naturalness free from error, Definiteness toward complete enlightenment,

481 And the five clairvoyances Throughout their continuum of lives. May I ever in all ways bring Help and happiness to all sentient beings.

482 May I always without harm Simultaneously stop MI beings
in all worlds Who wish to commit sins.

483 May I always be an object of enjoyment For all sentient beings according to their wish
And without interference as are the earth, Water, fire, wind, medicine and forests.

FG/Z2S 484 May I be a~ dear to sentient beings as their

Own life and may they be very dear to me, May their sins fructi~ for me And all my virtues
for them.

48S As long as any sentient being Anywhere has not been liberated, May I remain [in the
world] for his sake Even though I have attained enlightenment.

486 If the merit of this prayer Had form, it would never fit Into
worlds as numerous As sand grains in the Ganges.

S: So these are the 1S'(e~ty verses which Nagarjuna asks the king to recite three times a day.
That is to say it is usually considered to be morning noon and evening. Why do you think three
times, is there any reason for this ?

_____ The sun

S: The sun, the rising of the sun, the setting of the sun and midday. This was in ~ sense a
previously established Indian tradition. The Brahmins recited the _____, that is to say the
mantra of salutation to the sun three times a day from the Vedic period, that is to say at
dawn, midday and sunset. so that traditions may well have influenced this. There does seem
to be something quite special about dawn and sunset and midday. So what sort of impression
does one get from these two verses ? you notice a transference of merits takes up by far
the greater part of the text, any particular point that isn't clear, it seems all quite straight
forward.

_____ A very similar flavor to Shantideva's

S: Very much, we can see really the connection between Shantideva and Nagarjuna. You can
see how they do very much belong to the same tradition There is this sort of quite clear
penetrating philosophical insight, at the same time quite intense devotion.

Ajita: Seems to be the culmination of the previous things we talked about.

S: Right. A few words about the S three times a day. How helpful do you think it or how
helpful do you find it to recite things regularly like for instance the Seven fold Puja we do the
Seven fold Puja quite frequently ~o how would you feel about doing it three times a day

So what sort of effect do you think it would have do you think you would get more and more into it or do you think that after a while it would start going off a bit and you would feel as though you were merely reciting

PG/Z27

the words without very much feeling ? How do you feel about doing it a Sukhavati ?

Atula: It goes up and down, stale at times , fresh at other times.

S: But do people tend to miss it if they are not feeling very bright ?

Voices: Agreement.

S: But is that wise do you think; one should do it none the less ? It is the opposite.

S: Yes that's right . If you really feel like doing it , it doesn't matter so much if you don't but if you don't feel like doing it then you really ought to. It is almost like that.

Hridaya: sometimes if you really feel like doing it you don't get anything out of it. You go there feeling just good and you just don't like the puja at all, you are just there feeling rather good, almost indulging. But if you went there with the attitude of: I've got to work..

S: But sometimes you feel as it were not at all in the mood for it. Well the same happens with meditation and thinking that nothing much is going to happen, you are just going to go through the motions, but then again you may have a very positive experience of the puja of the meditation.

Hridaya: So it seems important for quite a long while to have this discipline like three times a day.

S: Yes right, I suppose at Sukhavati, it has become a bit difficult, if people start thinking there is some sort of pressure on them to go along even though they might not feel like it and then they start reacting not just to the idea of doing it every day but having to do it or being at fault if they don't. Or possibly being hal led over the coals if they miss too many times.

Ajita: I think it should really be an expression of your natural enjoyment of the puja, because I found that when I step it up, doing a lot more than usual

Hridaya: You cannot really tell people that they have to go to the puja in that way. You cannot really approach it in that way. You have to go at it , like sit down and talk about the puja, or even Buddhism or growth or something because otherwise they miss the point of doing puja.

S: Yes get them a bit enthusiastic. There is also the point that Nagarjuna seems to be assuming

that the King will. The King will now be presumably a monk, will be reciting this office on his own so this Sort of suggests that you do everything yourself, that is to say you set up your shrine

PG/Z28

you arrange the flowers and so on. Where's very often if there is a lot of people you simply sort of walk in and take your place, it is sort of laid on for you. Where you are able to prepare the shrine and arrange the flowers and so on this helps put you in a proper devotional mood. If you are doing it congregationally well there isn't quite that opportunity, unless of course you do have the individual offerings, but even that is not quite the same. I found it really quite interesting at the time of the mitra retreat where we had Jyotipala's ordination. So the question naturally arose as to the decorating of the shrine. So that was to be Mark's responsibility

End of tape

[661]

S: So the retreat organiser was assigning tasks for the work period and he assigned a task to Mark. So Mark said, 'Oh no, I can't do it. I'm getting the shrine ready for

the ordination." So the retreat organiser said, "Well that will only take you an hour or two." So there were cries of indignation from the mitras who said, "No, that will take him the whole

So I thought that showed a very good sort of spirit. You know they took it for granted that you had to spend a lot of time over it and do it really properly. And he did, He spent the whole day, virtually, getting it ready and it was a really beautiful - beautifully decorated shrine. He put a lot of work into it and clearly thoroughly enjoyed doing it. So this is very important. (Silence) So you notice the sequence here?... which varies slightly in different sources): first of all the going for refuge, then the Vandana. After that the confession of faults, rejoicing in merits, prayer and entreaty and then dedication of merits. You notice there's no puja specifically mentioned. Sometimes puja and vandana are mentioned together as I have mentioned in the "Survey". Have you ever gone through the Sevenfold Puja at Sukhavati and studied it?

Voices: Yes

S: You are at the moment? Good. But, "May all embodied beings have jewels in their hands." What do you think this means? It may be: "May they be born wealthy. May they have everything that they require." So the dedication of merit also becomes a sort of wishing. You wish that by the power of whatever merit you have gained from reciting this office, from your going for refuge and so on, there may be such and such different kinds of happiness and positive experience for all living beings. Then it becomes what the Tibetans call a sort of prayer of good wishes, which represents a very, very positive attitude towards other living

beings. (Silence) Yes, in V.480, Nagarjuna says, "Through seeing or thinking of me or only hearing my name, may beings attain great joy; Naturalness free from

~This error; Definiteness toward complete enlightenment etc" presumably means - or only hearing my name after I am a Buddha. This raises the interesting question of the connection between thing and name. I was thinking about this a while ago and it occurred to me that usually for us the thing and the name of the thing, or the person and the name of the person are inseparable. For instance, supposing you do the metta bhavana, supposing for instance you're doing the Order metta bhavana, and you want to think of each and every Order member in turn, how do you usually do that?

Page 2 The Precious Garland Session 19, V.466-500

_____: By saying their name.

S: Ah! So supposing you were to try to think of them without, as it were, saying their name, do you think you would find this easy? Or how would you call up, as it were, the mental picture of that particular order member without saying their name? Do you think it would be possible or do you think it would be at all easy?

_____: I think it would be possible.

S: You think it would be?

____. ?

_____: You could call up the image.

S?: But how would you call up the image? How would you call up one image rather than another?

Atula: By bringing attention to a certain person you sometimes experience

_____: You just see them.

S: But do you in fact just see~ them? You see there are so many Order members. I mean supposing you want to call up, you know, the image of one particular Order member rather than another, how would you go about that? You can go about it just by repeating their name and then you just see the person's face. But supposing you didn't want to repeat the name then how would you go about calling up that particular person?

: You would see their face first.

S: But how would you know who's face to think of?

: You would just see their face.

S: But when you say 'their face', what do you mean?

: It's like trees. I don't know the names of trees but I can call up any sort of tree. I've got no way of identifying it but I have a mental picture.

Uttara: But you know the name of that person. So that, in a sense, would get in your way.

S: I wonder actually whether you can do this. I rather wonder whether you can. For instance, in the case of trees, you've got sort of a vague picture of a tree, the name of which you didn't know and you could call that up. You could have a big green bushy tree. It would only be a very sort of vague picture.

Page 3 The Precious Garland Session 19, V466-500

S: (cont) A person, you know, is something much more concrete, much more definite, much more sharply distinguished from others.

For someone you know very well maybe

I think I can do it, certainly with trees. I think I can do it without any names.

S: But do you think you could do it with human beings, say, with Order members? I suggest you try it, those who are interested, next time you do it and just see whether in fact, or how far you can get with it; whether you could in fact call up a picture of each and every Order member in turn ~4\no~~ saying to yourself, mentally, the name.

Ananda?: I think as soon as one evokes the image there is a name connected with the image like a package.

S: I think it depends. For instance sometimes you may find it quite difficult to see someone mentally. It's quite easy to recall the name. You recall the name. You repeat the name and gradually you see the image of the person. I think this is usually what happens. If you know them very well the image appears rather quickly. But you index them in your mental filing system by name as it were. You don't usually index them in your mental filing system by their visual appearance. So usually you go from the name to the visual appearance. Or from the name to the person.

____ You can't really do it without thinking of the name because you just think I'll call up so and so but I won't think of their name.

S: Right, just exactly what you might be doing.

Uttara: You can do it with a neutral person that way.

S: I don't know.

Uttara: No, if you don't know their name, you find out that way.

S: Ah, yes, right. You can think of a face you've seen, if you remember the face. Then you'll get to it by recalling the circumstances under which you saw them. So there. Anyway what I'm trying to get at is how closely associated 'name' and 'thing' is in our mind. This is one of the reasons why Nagarjuna speaks of - "Or only hearing my name may beings attain great joy." You know, by hearing the name of the Buddha, you think of the Buddha. You even see the Buddha, feel the presence of the Buddha, that particular Buddha, I mean.

~~Lt

Page4 The Precious Garland Session 19, V466-500

S: (cont) So this in a way is connected with the recollection? of mantras of different ~uddhas and ~odhisattvas. A mantra is like their name. It may not actually be their name or form from their name, though sometimes it is. The Tara mantra is formed from the name 'Tara', itself or from the same word or say root from which Tara is named. But the mantra of say, Avalokitesvara isn't formed in this way. But even so the mantra is the name in a sense, the sound syllable of or for the ~uddha or ~odhisattva. So that when you recite or repeat the mantra, you recite or repeat the name and that puts you in touch with the ~uddha or ~odhisattva whose name it is. And this is why the repetition of the mantra one of the reasons why the repetition of the mantra is considered so important. If you repeat the mantra, the ~uddha or ~odhisattva, in a sense, cannot but be there. You establish some kind of contact, however indirect* however remote.

Hridaa: There is always, I think, a feeling of quality wie name. There is a feeling content which goes with the name.

Ajita: Yes, when I think of one of the Order members, say Uttara, jñSt say, it evokes a kind of feeling of

Uttara: Transcendental virtue'. (laughter)

S: It should be 'Supreme'

Ananda: I suppose this is the principle behind not translating the mantra. The name is within the mantra.

S: In a way it is quite a short and simple prayer, to use that term for the time being. So if one wants to recite it, towards the end especially, one would be identifying oneself with the \$uddha that one aspires to become. Do you see what I mean? So by the time you reach the end of the prayer you are virtually speaking as a uddha or speaking as the Buddha:

"As long as any sentient being Anywhere has not been liberated, May I remain in the world for his sake Even though I have attained enlightenment."

You, as it were, identify yourself with the Bodhicitta, as it progresses towards enlightenment.

All right, let's go on then, verse 487 -

Page 5 The Precious Garland Session 19, V466-500

S: (cont) V487 "The Blessed One said so, And the reasoning is this: The limitlessness of the merit of wishing to help limitless realms Of sentient beings is like the limitlessness of those beings."

So the beings are limitless.¹ Worlds of beings are limitless. The merit accruing from your wishing to help those limitless beings in limitless worlds is itself, limitless. It cannot be numbered.

All right - V488

'I These practices which I have Explained briefly to you Should always be as dear To you as your body.'

'These practices which I have explained briefly to you,' in this work, that is. 'Should always be as~dear ~~to you as your bod.' That's a common idiom. Sometimes it's said 'as dear o you as your own eyes'. You carefully protect your body. You carefully protect your eyes. In the same way you should carefully protect, you should maintain, you should keep up these practices and look after them just as though they were your own body.

Right, V489

"He who feels a dearness for the ~ractices Has in fact a dearness for his body; If dearness for the body helps it; The practices will do just that."

Yes, 'He who feels a dearness for the practices has in fact a dearness, a feeling o dearness, 'for his body. Because on account of his practices, on account of the merit accruing for the practices, there will be in the future a positive and happy experience even for the body itself. So, if dearness for the body helps it the practices will do just that. So if the reflection on the dearness of the body helps you to practice even the practices in turn will benefit the body in the long run; another of those slightly ingenious arguments.

Hrida a: It ties up with the attractiveness of the practices and with the attractiveness of the virtues.

The Precious Garland Page 6 Session 19, V466-500

S: You should be attached to them in a normal healthy sort of way as you are to your own

body. You look after them as carefully as you look after your own body. You feed your body. Feed your practice'. You~nourish your body. Nourish your practice in the same way. Care for it. Cherish it, keep it healthy.

: Keep it alive. (laughter)

S: Keep it alive'. Don't let it become weak, miserable, ailing, almost extinct - at the point of death - practise! Right V490:

: "Therefore, pay heed to the practices as you do to yourself, Pay heed to achievement as you do to the practices, Pay heed to wisdom as you do to achievement, Pay heed to a wise man as you do to wisdom."

S: Hmm, this is quite interesting. 'Therefore, ~y heed to the practices as you do to yourself,' that is to say to your own empirical self, especially to your physical body. This is what is already said, and then, 'Pay heed to achievement as you do to the practices.' It's not enough just to practise mechanically. You should ask yourself, ~'ell, where are the practices getting me? What am I achieving. Am I making any progress? What difference are the practices making? Am I eliminating the unskillful and cultivating the skillful? Am I progressing as a result of the practices? Am I achieving anything?"

So, "Pay heed to achievement as you do to the practices." Make sure that you really are developing as a result of the practices. Make sure that your practices are in fact nourishing your spiritual development.

Then, "Pay heed to wisdom as you do to achievement." Well, even meditational achievements aren't enough. You may be in a very positive mood. You may be radiating friendliness, compassion, sympathetic joy, equanimity. Even that is not enough. You have to develop wisdom too. So, "Pay heed to wisdom as you do to achievement." Achievement here seems to mean especially meditational achievement. And then, "~ heed to a wise man as you do to wisdom." So what does that mean? Well surely if you've got wisdom why should you pay any heed to a wise man? Well if you're paying heed to wisdom, what is the need to pay heed to a wise man? Why does Nagarjuna mention that?

____: If you pay heed to wisdom then you act on it.

The Precious Garland Page 7 Session 19,V466-500

S: Well in a sense there's no such thing as wisdom! There are wise men but no such thing as wisdom. 'Wisdom' is just an abstract term, just a name. I mean if you encounter a wise man then you really do encounter wisdom. (silence) There's no wisdom apart from wise men. So:

"Therefore, pay heed to the practices as you do to yourself, Pay heed to achievement as you do to the practices, Pay heed to wisdom as you do to achievement, Pay heed to a wise man as you do to wisdom."

I mean, you may fancy that you've developed wisdom. But how is that to be known? How is

that to be tested? Only if you come into contact with a wise man, only if there is that sort of dialectical exchange,~ that almost existential contact. That's the only thing that can test whether your 'wisdom' is really wisdom. So you need to pay heed to a wise man as much as you do to wisdom, to the wisdom that you've developed or think that you've developed.

(Silence)

Now, 491:

____: "He who has qualms that reliance on one who has Purity, love, intelligence and helpful appropriate speech would be bad for himself, Causes his own interests to be destroyed."

S: That's a rather obscure construction, the sentence Rere. 'He who has qualms that reliance on one who has purity, love, intelligence and helpful appropriate speech would be bad for himself,' that is to say reliance would be bad for himself. 'Causes his own interests;to~ be destroyed.' He who has any qualms, he who has any doubts that reliance on paying heed to a wise man would be bad for him, that is bad for himself, causes his own interests to be destroyed. (Pause)

: "ould it be more meaningful to say that he has fears that reliance on these things would be bad?

S: You could say 'fears' but involving doubt. You fear because you doubt. You have qualms because you doubt. Or, 'he has reservations' you could say.

: In other words he would think that they might be bad for himself.

S: No, it's the reliance that you're doubtful about. Nagarjuna is saying that the wise man, to whom one should pay heed, has purity, love, intelligence and helpful appropriate speech. but if you think that reliance on such a wise person with those qualities would in fact be bad for you you simply cause your own interest to be destroyed.

The treacherous Garland Page 8 Session 19. V466-500

S: (cont) You work against yourself. You work against yourself by having qualms about relying upon someone, that is to say a wise man on whom, in fact, one should rely. So in as much as you would benefit yourself by relying on him you harm yourself by not relying on him; by having doubts about the advisability of relying on him.

These two verses suggest that wisdom is not something abstract, you know, it's something living, something that is, as it were embodied in living beings. I mean, for instance, you can think yourself quite wise. You can go through books. You can study Buddhist philosophy in that way and you can really think that you've understood it, that you know it, that you are wise, but the real test is what happens, how you get along when you meet a wise man! The book can't answer questions. The book can't answer back. The book can't ask questions

either but the wise man can. So, you know, contact with the wise man is much more demanding than contact with the book. If your wisdom is just a product of your own study and your own thought then you may think that you really are wise but when you come into contact with a wise man who can really test you and ask questions and cross examine you, then you realise that your so called wisdom was very shallow and very superficial, but unless you come into contact with a wise man then you may not realise that. You may really think that you know all about it. Maybe not even a wise man, even if you just come in contact with some intelligent fellow disciple and he just, you know, puts the odd question. Then, you know, it becomes sometimes evident that you don't know, you don't understand as well as you thought you did.

This is one of the reasons why I said the other day that you don't really start learning until you start teaching. Because through teaching you come in contact with other people and then you start really coming to understand what you do know and what you don't know. Whereas before that you might have felt that you knew it. You might have felt that you knew it, that you understood it, that you grasped it quite well. But when people start asking questions and you actually look more deeply into your own understanding of something or other, then you start realising perhaps that your understanding wasn't as good as you thought it was, that you need to think about it a lot more, that you need to go into it much more deeply. So contact with other people, especially with others who are wise or at least intelligent has this very useful function.

You come to know through your exchanges with them whether your own wisdom is a real wisdom or not. Because sometimes the opposite can happen as I also mentioned. You become aware - in the course of your exchange with others that you know certain things that you had not realised that you knew.

The Precious Garland Page 9 Session 19, V466-500

S: (cont) Things start coming out or coming out into consciousness which you hadn't known were there. So this is also very important indeed, maybe even more important than realising that you don't know what you thought you knew. You realise that you know what you didn't know that you knew. So exchange and communication are quite important. But why should you even think that relying on a wise man with all those good positive qualities would be bad for you? What should ever cause you to think that? One would have thought it was only too obvious.

Uttara: Because you would lose your fixed identity.

S: Yes. (Pause) Right V492

"The qualifications of spiritual Guides should be known in brief by you; If you are taught by those who know Contentment, have compassion, ethics."

____: Shall I read on?

S: Yes.

"And the wisdom which can drive out your afflictions, You should know how to rely on and respect them. You will attain the supreme achievement By following this excellent system."

S: So, 'The qualification of a spiritual guide should be known in brief by you,' And here Nagarjuna is being very short and simple. 'If you are taught by those who know contentment, have compassion, ethics and the wisdom which can drive out your afflictions.' You notice Nagarjuna says 'the wisdom which can drive out your afflictions.' That's all you need. He doesn't say 'absolute wisdom', but enough wisdom at least to drive out your afflictions, to solve your problems, to help you get over certain negative~unskillful states. That is all you can expect or all that you have the right to ask, as it were.

: ~ Perhaps all that you would understand really.

S: All that you'd understand, yes. Why do you think contentment is important in a spiritual guide? What has Nagarjuna got in mind here? Contentment with what?

: The three jewels.

S: With the three jewels? It could be.

N

6: The Precious Garland Page 10 ~ionl9V466-500

S: (cont) I think it's though, more with himself. Not sort of satisfied with himself but content with himself. In a way centred, one could say. And, 'have compassion', well obviously if he hasn't got compassion, he's not going to, you know, help you. And, 'ethics', that is to say observance of basic precepts; 'And the wisdom which can drive out your afflictions You should know how to rely on and respect them. You will attain the supreme achievement by following this excellent system.' - or this excellent system which now follows.

____: When he says 'you should know', how does he mean that?

S: 'You should know how to rely.....'

: Know how?

S: Well it suggests that it's not always a very easy or obvious thing to know how to behave with regard to - how to rely on, how to respect the spiritual guides. So the question arises. Well in fact, how should one rely on them? What is meant by relying? How does one rely on a spiritual guide? What does that involve.

: Taking their advice?

S: Taking their advice.

____: Trust.

S: Trust. Ah, but there's also perhaps a distinction between relying and depending. Yes? I mean in a way, in English relying and depending come to much the same thing. But we can, I think, make a distinction, from our point of view, that relying is not depending. Depending is not relying. So what is the difference between relying and depending?

: 'Depending' suggests that you're not making any sort of effort of your own.

S: Hm,yes.

: You just keep falling back on the teacher all the time.

S: 'Relying', means that you accept the advice and you try to put it into action. You try to act upon it. But when you depend it's as though you expect the spiritual guide to do it all for you. So reliance is objective. Dependence is subjective.

The Precious Garland Page 11 Session 19, v466-500

S: (cont) In fact when you depend on the spiritual guide you're not depending on him as a spiritual guide. Maybe you're regressing. Maybe you're taking him as father or even mother, and getting a certain feeling of security from that dependence. But that is 'not relying on a spiritual guide as a spiritual guide. There has to be a sort of middle way. You shouldn't, of course, be so afraid of being dependent that you keep away from the spiritual guide and don't even rely. And some people say - "I don't want to.... I'll stay on my own. I'll go it alone. I won't go along to any group. I don't want to be dependent on anyone."

Well, this is really throwing the baby away with the bathwater, ('.') very often a rationalisation. So it is reliance that is required, not dependence. So, "You will attain the supreme achievement by following this excellent system." Well alright what is that system? Verse 494:

Ajita: 'Speak the truth, speak gently to sentient beings, Say what is by nature pleasant, What is beneficial, most difficult to find; Speak to a plan, not defaming; Speak independently and well."

S: Why do you think he mentions speech first?

It's the first

S: Well, you see he's addressing the king who has become, presumably, a monk. The king aspires to practise the ~odhisattva ideal. The ~dhisattva is very concerned with beings. So what is usually your first contact with beings?

____: Speech.

S: It's through speech. So therefore he~mentions first about Wpeech; 'speak the truth, speak gently to sentient beings. Say what is by nature pleasant, what is beneficial, most difficult to find; speak to a plan.' This isn't really good. It's more like speaking methodically, in a rational sort ~of way, not in a confused not in a °... what shall I say? Not in an unsystematic sort of way.

____: ~isjointed.

S: Disjointed way - yes. Not in a confused, not in a disjointed way. But not defaming - not running other people down. Speak independently and well. So quite a bit about speech.

ANANDA: Why does it say - 'Say what is by nature pleasant'? Because elsewhere ~ he says that the best teaching is not always necessarily pleasant.

The Precious Garland ~Th~ Page 12 Session 19, V466-500

S: Ah, 'Say what is by nature pleasant,' say what is truly pleasant, not necessarily or not simply what sounds pleasant. Say what is by nature pleasant whether you have to say it pleasantly or unpleasantly. Alright 495 -

"Be well-disciplined, contained, generous, Brilliantly attentive, of peaceful mind, Not excitable, not deceitful; Not procrastinating, but steadfast." So this verse refers to actions of body and mind. So: "Be well-disciplined, contained, generous, Brilliantly attentive, of peaceful mind, Not excitable, not deceitful, Not procrastinating, but steadfast." These are all quite obvious qualities.

: (What about) excitement?

S: 'Not exciteable.' 1Exciteable', means susceptible to excitement, easily excited.

: (Does that mean one should never be excited?)

S: Well, one should never be excitable. 1~hat do you usually mean by an excitable person? Well, a person who gets excited very easily and, you know, very often for very trivial causes.

: Not usually very aware.

S: Not very aware, not very stable, maybe slightly hysterical. ttterally of course, it means

'able to be excited'. (pause)

: It's a bit like being possessed by things.

S: Hm, yes, easily taken over. That can happen, say, in the theatre. In a show you can see people are not really themselves. They've been taken over by the performance in excitement.

Atula: (indistinct) reactive?

S: Reactive, yes. You react very quickly, are very easily aroused. You're very bubbly.

: One could be excited by positive emotion.

S: I don't know if the word "excited", would be used quite Tn that way.

The Precious Garland Page 13 Session 19 Tt774-

: Uplifted , maybe?

S: Uplifted , more enthused, inspired, but not excited, T would have thought. Would you say, 'That was a really good puja, I felt really excited?' Would you say that? Or would you say, 'I felt really uplifted, really inspired'?

____ Well people sometimes come out of the puja seemingly in an excited way.

S: Or do they?

A lot of (indistinct) feel excited.

S: Yes, I know what you mean. I think they've been a bit bubbly. I noticed this once or twice on the mitra retreat. They all come out a bit excited. I think they were just bubbly. There had been quite a bit of giggling on those occasions in the course of the puja. I think that's when ene~rgy is a bit toose and not v~ery integrated. If you're excita~ e it means you've got a lot of, sort of, scattered energy which is quite easily aroused. You react very quickly. So it isn't altogether a positive state. Y'Jhat about 'procrastinating' do you know what that means?

____: Yes, it's putting off till tomorrow

S: Yes, putting things off till tomorrow. It means in a way adopting the attitude of, you know, 'Never do today what you can do tomorrow.' (Laughter) But steadfast, Hmm?, Be steadfast instead. ~lright V496

"Be certain like the moon when it is full And radiant like the sun in autumn, Be deep like the ocean And firm like Mount Meru."

Here Nagarjuna is being more poetic - 'Be certain like the moon when it is full', I don't know if 'certain' is quite the right word.

: (several indistinct words)

S: Doesn't it?

: More characteristically (indistinct)

S: No, when it is full.

YLt

The Precious Garland Page14 Session 19, V466-500

It's only full once a month. (laughter)

S: Yes, but it yes, "when it is f~ll." You know, forget about all the other days. Forget about the rest of the month. It's poetry, not science.

: When it's full it's not going to be half full.

S: I think it's more like 'perfect'.

Uttara: Hm.

S: 'Be perfe~ l~ike the moon when it is full.' Because If something is perfect, if something is really beautiful, eh, it can raise an impression of inevitability, therefore of certainty. It could not be otherwise. It just has to be exactly what it is. Nothing could be changed. Maybe it's a sanskrit or Tibetan word that we can't quite reproduce in English, but it's a sort of definitive perfection. Be definitively perfect like the moon when it is full - hmm- 'And radiantly clear like the sun in Autumn, 'Why in Autumn? Well, there's a beautiful clear blue sky, usually in Autumn, after the rains and the sun shines forth very beautifully. 'Be deep like the ocean and firm like Mount Merm', Right 497 -

_____ "Freed from all defects, adorned With all the virtues, become The sustenance of all sentient Beings and be omniscient.~

S: Hmm, 'Freed from all defects, adorned with all the virtues~ become the sustenance of all sentient beings and be omniscient.' This is the ideal in brief as it were. Be omniscient means "become a Buddha - be a Buddha." Right 498:

: "These doctrines were not taught Merely to help kings, But with the wish in any way to help other sentient beings."

S: Hmm. The work is addressed to the king but it is really intended for everybody. (pause)

Alright 499:

Atula: "O King, for you it would be right Each day to think of this advice So that you and others may achieve Complete and perfect enlightenment."

S: Hmm. So Nagarjuna in conclusion, as it were, suggests that it would be a good thing if the king were to think of his advice - eh? Think of what he has said in this little work everyday so that he and others may achieve complete and perfect enlightenment. Right so then we conclude with another verse in a different metre for the sake of, as it were, emphasis and winding vtp the whole work.

~Th~ The Precious Garland Page 15 Session 19, V466-500

S: Alright 500:

Ananda: ~For the sake of enlightenment the diligent should always abide with ethics, patience, non-jealousy and non-miserliness; Always respect a superior teacher and help Altruistically without hope of reward those bereft of wealth, Always remain with superior people, leaving the non-superior and maintaining thoroughly the doctrine."

S: Hm. Who are these superior people? It seems to be a term for arjuns. Always remain with the arjuns leaving the non-arjuns and maintaining thoroughly the doctrine. 'Aryan', here meaning the spiritually minded, those who are bent on the higher evolution. Remain with people whose company will help you to evolve. So, "For the sake of enlightenment the diligent," those who are mindful and aware, "should always apply themselves to ethics, patience, non-jealousy and non-miserliness. Always respect a superior teacher," that is to say a spiritually minded teacher, a noble teacher; "and help altruistically without hope of reward those bereft of wealth," whether material or spiritual. "Always remain with superior people," always remain with the spiritually minded, the noble, "leaving the non-superior," those who are not spiritually minded, the ignoble, and maintaining thoroughly the doctrine", the Dharma, maintaining it by your own study and practice and teaching.

~o, what do you feel about, what do you notice about these last few verses in comparison with all that has gone before? Do they seem different in any way?

: Much more inspiration.

S: Much more inspirational, and , on the whole, much more simple.

ALL: Hmm, yes, yes.

S: Eh, much more practicable in a way. And though, well within the range -- well within the capability of the king, well within his capacity.

A~ita: Yes there's a feeling of sort of handing over and instinct~

S: Yes, quite. He's left finally with something he can actually practise so that he wouldn't be left with a feeling that the ideal was so lofty and the practices so difficult and so advanced that he just hadn't a hope of really getting anywhere.

The Precious Garland Page 16 Session 19, V466-500

S: (cont) So Nagarjuna concludes with a quite simple, straightforward and comparatively easy teaching for the king. He~ comes back, as it were, to earth. Alright that brings us to the end of the (Naragnagali? - sanskrit) Any general impressions about the work as a whole? Feelings about the work or feelings about Nagarjuna? and the particular tradition?

Ajita: I think this would be a difficult sutra for a person just studying on his own without any contact with a teacher.

S: Hm, yes. Almost all the texts seem like that. Don't they?

Ajita: Yeh.

S: What do you find the most difficult parts? What did you find

Ajita: I think the ego part

S: Hm, yes, I think quite definitely. You mean the non-ego parts, (laughter) the wisdom parts, yes? These are very much more difficult than any - any of the other parts. Do you think that the text gives a quite, sort of, good idea about the essentials of the Mahayana~ as it were?

All: Hm, yes, yes.

S: Do you think you do get a fairly good general picture? Anything perhaps that doesn't quite accord with ideas that one had about the Mahayana before? (pause)

Atula: (several words indistinct) unsure about the ~odhisattva.

S: Before you mean?

Atula: (indistinct~)

T7tends to sort of - (several indistinct words)

S: Hm, yes.

Ajita: (indistinct) the idea that lamas are, sort of, reborn through different lives. I just wondered what contact eh, what connection that has to do with the ~odhisattva ideal.

S: Well, in Tibet many lamas were believed to be ~odhisattvas (indistinct) who remained in the world and did not enter into Nirvana, so that they could help other living beings eh, and of course it was believed that they could be identified and rediscovered and then brought back to their original base their own monastery. But I think one must distinguish two things here: Everybody is reborn ,hm?

'K

The Precious Garland Page 17 Session 19, V466-500

All: Hm, yes.

S: So the fact that you can identify someone as the reincarnation of someone who died, say, an abbot who died a few years before, doesn't prove that he's an incarnate bodhisattva, to use that expression~ It only proves that you know, he is the reincarnation of that particular person. If that particular person was a bodhisattva, yes, well the reincarnation is a bodhisattva. But that is the whole point. You know, was the original person, even assuming that the reincarnation has been correctly identified - was the original person a bodhisattva? Eh?

All: Hm,hm.

S: The mere fact that you have identified, say, a small child, a small boy as the reincarnation of the abbot of such and such monastery who died five years ago or ten years ago doesn't prove that the little boy is an incarnate bodhisattva. It only proves that he is the reincarnation of that abbot, yeh? If that abbot was a bodhisattva then the little boy, you know, was a bodhisattva, but if the abbot wasn't a bodhisattva then how on earth could the little boy be a bodhisattva, even though he is the reincarnation?

I remember in this connection, Christmas Humphreys made a very sort of interesting and almost witty remark. We were talking about, you know, these reincarnate lamas one day and he said to me, "I don't know what all the fuss is about incarnate lamas, reincarnate lamas. What are they after all? It's only the Buddhist equivalent of the local vicar reborn." (laughter)

I But actually in certain cases this is quite true. It is the local abbot reborn, yeh? Hm? So the fact that it is the genuine rebirth doesn't mean that he is to be considered an incarnate bodhisattva.

All: Hm,hm.

S: So actually in Tibet this is what the more, you know, the more learned and more wise of the lamas believe. That there are a few great lamas who are incarnate bodhisattvas but the

rest are the local vicar reborn, the local abbot reborn, hm? They themselves distinguish~but, you know, here in the west we are very impressed if such and such is the thirteenth or the fourteenth reincarnation of, you know, such and such abbot of such and such monastery. Well, that's interesting you know* that they have been able to keep up the line in that way and discover him each time after he's dead, (let's assume that that is all correct). But that doesn't mean that he is an incarnate ~odhisattva. In fact some of I remember (Dundo or Dhardo) Rinpoche telling me that it was his personal opinion and also the belief of quite a number of lamas that in Tibet there were not more than six or seven, or at the most eight~ incarnate lamas who really were incarnate ~odhisattvas, which of course is quite a good number.

The Precious Garland Page 18 Session 19, V466-500

S: (cont) But when you consider that there were about two thousand (tulku)s as it were officially recognised, well two thousand incarnate ~odhisattvas out of a population of at the most four million; it's incredible. Hm? But seven or eight out of those very ideal conditions which did exist in Tibet. Well that is not impossible.

All: Hm,hm.

: If a young boy remembers (several words indistinct) would that imply that he was on a higher level and perhaps a ~odhisattva?

S: No, it would imply that he had a psychic power. But people can have these psychic powers and people can remember previous lives without being bodhisattvas, without being stream entrants, without even being ~uddhists, without even going for refuge. So it's interesting and it certainly is a supernormal faculty. If you remember your previous life but it doesn't prove that you're an incarnate odhisattva. So we mustn't take the evidence as proving more than it actually does.

All: Hm,hm.

: That's just like thinking that people who are in robes are arahants.

S: Right. So all people who remember their previous lives are incarnate ~odhisattvas? No, not a bit of it! After all everybody is reborn. Everybody is a reincarnation of someone or other. But it happens in the case of these reincarnate - 'incarnate', lamas as they're called that the reincarnation is actually identified. But that only proves that he is the reincarnation of whoever he is the reincarnation of. It doesn't prove 'ipso facto' that he is an incarnate odhisattva who has voluntarily given up the prospect of Nirvana for himself in order to remain in the world. So it's very important to bear in mind this distinction. Otherwise someone comes along from Tibet and you're talking to an 'incarnate lama' etc etc and you might, sort of, jump to the conclusion that he is an incarnate odhisattva and you would be rather disappointed when he seems to be behaving in a way that you hadn't thought incarnate ~odhisattvas would behave, eh? I mean read this little article~ about Trungpa. I mean, he's a very good person, a very good teacher but he doesn't seem to be an incarnate ~odhisattva though he has been identified as the -, I think it's the twelfth or thirteenth reincarnation of the

original abbot ~ that particular monastery, which is fair enough but it doesn't make one an incarnate bodhisattva. Quite a few people in the West have confused these two things.

All: Hm,hm.

The Precious Garland Page 19 Session 19 Verse 466-500

A~ita: So even if you are practising bodhisattva virtues it doesn't necessarily mean you've got to be a bodhisattva?

S: Oh no,no. A bodhisattva is one in whom the bodhicitta has arisen and also an incarnate bodhisattva would be someone who had reached the stage (this is the eighth stage) where the renunciation of Nirvana as a natural possibility for himself becomes possible. That is a very advanced stage~, indeed according to the Mahayana Nagarjuna himself, according to the Buddhist tradition, is a bodhisattva of the second stage. So one sees how difficult it is.

Uttara: Did you say something about the first three fetters?

S: The first three fetters are: first, the belief in an unchanging ego, that you yourself as you are are something ultimately given, that you can't be changed. You are what you are so there is no point in trying to change and experience, even spiritual experiences are something added on to that fundamental 'you'; that fundamental ego identity which continues to exist unchanged. So that (indistinct) in the scene of (sanskrit) which is clinging to silas, eh, ethical rules or precepts and (sanskrit) religious paths, religious observances as ends in themselves and not as means to an end, the end being, of course, sometimes spiritual development and ultimately human enlightenment. And then the third is 'avikilsa?' which doubt, uncertainty, inability and even unwillingness to commit oneself definitely. Hm?

Hm.

S: These are the three So that

Uttara: In the first one isn't it a case of, you know, I mean, what we heard through the seminar about the ego and things like that Isn't it just a case of whether we have understood it on an intellectual level (indistinct) perceive it.

S~:"Too intellectual understanding is necessary but it means very much more than that. It means breaking that fetter. It means very much more than just having a correct understanding of those particular Buddhist teachings.

Uttara: And the same with what you were saying about the other ones. Isn't this frequent conditioning of all kinds, not just religious conditioning.

S: Hmm.

_____: But it relates to quite deep feelings within. You can on the surface quite quickly see

through... you understand ... (in a sense you have broken the three fetters~ but you feel

The Precious Garland

Page 20 Session 19, v466-500

S: Then again, that's where proper study comes where it's so useful. But anyway you can begin to see that you haven't really understood very deeply. You've just got a superficial knowledge. (pause)

Ananda: Ok, there are times when I feel although I don't 77eeI understand something, I could in certain types of (indistinct) I could understand ~ust by asking a question about them ?? Maybe one just has to stay with the.. just accept the non-understanding because (indistinct)~ Do you think that's a true (indistinct) Do you think that by asking a question and really making an effort to really understand what has been said, one can really understand it in all its depths?

S: Well one can, but it certainly isn't easy.

Ananda: You wouldn't say there are some types of knowledge which just simply cannot be understood as intellectual teachings.

S: Well, in a sense, nothing can be understood intellectually, just intellectually. But an intellectual understanding provides a sort of basis or support for understanding which is more intuitive. But the great mistake is to mistake the intellectual understanding for the real intuitive understanding. So the proper attitude should be that one says, 'I Well I certainly understand that and I generally feel that I understand it, but I can appreciate at least the abstract possibility of the fact that what I genuinely~ly believe to be my understanding and genuinely believe to be my correct understanding is in fact not an understanding at all.'

* One learns this if you like by (teaching to the world)

S: () another level of meaning, another deeper level of understanding. Very often one finds this; that you thought you tLnderstood something but even when you do somehow or other attain to a slightly deeper understanding then you ~o look back on your former understanding and think, "How could I ever have kidded myself that I understood that. I didn't understand it at all. I thought I did.~t So then you apply that to your present understanding and say,"Well maybe I should be a bit careful about thinking that I nearly understand it even now. Maybe in another year or two I shall see things much more deeply and differently." So always be open to possibilities of further understanding. Don't think that you know it all even though you may feel within yourself, "Yes, I really have got to the bottom of it at last~" But don't be too sure of that. (pause) Can any of you t~nk of any subject that Nagarjuna left out? -

Any inportant aspects of the Mahayana?

[681]

The Precious Garland Page 21, Session 19 V466-500

S: (cont) There's one topic that later on became very Tmportant but he doesn't mention it because it apparently wasn't developed in his time; that is, the three kayas. We did touch upon this. He mentions the two - (Dharma kaya and Nir~ana~~~aya). This is probably, in a sense, the most important omission from that point of view. But in a way it doesn't matter because it's good to understand the distinction of the two kayas first before going on to try to understand the distinc~tion of the three kayas.

: He doesn't practically teach any meditation.

S: Eh, no he doesn't, apart from the (Subhu bhavana) and even that is not really in detail.

: I feel the text on the whole is quite difficult because in a way it's sort of concentrated. I mean, even in a line like, "Be certain like the moon when it is full," you could be (several indistinct words) even though it looks a short text.

S: Yes, quite.

: It's really meaty.

S: Most of these sort of texts which were written by Wacharias" the great teachers, in verses were definitely

meant to be studied with a teacher. I mean, to begin with the original author himself, (2aissing words here) and really m~lled over and properly discussed, or were meant as an aid to one's memory so that you could memorise the teachings and turn them over in your own mind, and reflect upon them in that way, not just something to be read and then you've read it and that's that. : It almost seems like a brief summary for something

itte a ten volume work. (laughter)

S: Yes, right, yes.

: Perhaps you could take any one of these verses and use them as a sort of practise (indistinct words) (silence)

: That prayer in twenty verses~, would that have been chanted?

S: Well originally all these sort of verses were chanted.

Eh? It seems in a way that the ancient Indians never read anything. When they read aloud they chanted. They still -do that even now.

'K

S: (con't) If you go to India and you hear children Teaching their lesson, they learn by repeating them aloud in a sort of chant; and all of these particular sanskrit ("ritas") have got tunes connected with them . When you chant aloud you chant in that particular tune. So all would be chanted if repeated aloud. I mean for instance, the Baghuad Gita, it's ~ever read aloud, it's always chanted aloud, the same with the Buddhist works.

Uttara: He doesn't oh yeh, he doesn't mention specifically 770 her teachers around those times (indistinct)

S: ~ell he was as far as I recollect, the earliest of the great Mah,ayana Acharyas and in many ways the greatest of them all~. I mean Aryadeva was his disciple, Chundrakirti came later, Chundragomi came later. Shantidevi came later, (Dignarga) came later. I mean there were ather great Acharyas of the ... of the Hinayana tradition, but even their greatest came much later, like Vasubandu. So he is very often considered as the greatest teacher immediately following upon the Buddha.

_____ (several words indistinct.)

S: In Tibetan, yes. There isn't very much information though, even in that We don't really know very much about him. What we know about him is contained in about a page really; that he was a Brahmin of South India, studi d the Vedas and Hindu works, then became a Buddhist, pop~ arised and propagated the Perfection of 'i~isdom teaching, and wrote a lot of books. That is really all we know about him. We don't know anything more than that.

Uttara: Was he around before Padmasambhava?

S: Oh, long, long before that! Yes, eh, six hundred years before that. Well over five hundred years befbre that.

_____: The legend that he went to the Nagas for the Prajnaparamita scriptures, when do you think that sprang up?

S: I don't know. That probably forms part of the earliest biography. I don't know really how old that tradition is or how far back it goes. (pause) You know it's quite surprising. Nagarjuna is such an important figure, maybe the most important figure in Indian Mahayana but we know so very little about him. We know infinitely more about the Buddha although the Buddha lived f~ve hundred years earlier.

: If we know about the teachers through a disciple - Twdisciple () it on. I'm

thinking about Milarepa. We know so much of Milarepa because he passed it on, like the Buddha and Ananda but perhaps with Aryadeva it was more...

The Precious Garland Page 23 Session 19, v466-500

S: Aryadeva was more interested in dialectics, (pause) There are other Nagarjunas. There are at least two others. One of whom was a tantric teacher, an alchemist. Western scholars regard these as separate figures. According to the Tibetan tradition though, they're just one and the same Nagarjuna living for several centuries. But Western scholars don't agree with that. They think that there were two or even three Nagarjunas; which is very likely the case (they weren't). (silence.) So Nagarjuna is generally regarded as the founder of the - Madjamika tradition, and in some ways he's not exactly the founder of the Mahayana because he certainly wasn't the author of the Mahayana sutras; but certainly the great populariser and upholder of the Perfection of Wisdom tradition. He 'brought out' the Perfection of Wisdom sutras, whatever that might mean. It seems that in the least one can say that they existed before his time but obscurely. Perhaps

END OF TAPE

[684]

Session 20 Side A

S: ... to bed early, but I think no harm, a little extra time for working on your notes, or whatever. Any final point? (Pause) Because in the afternoon we'll be going through the verses on the four mindfulnesses.

. Where it says always remain with superior people even when non-superior does that, that means like (unclear) you must

(separate?) yourself?

S: In a way it means that, don't forget the king by this time has become a monk, yes, so presumably he'd be living in a vihara, he'd be associating with the others who were monks. For someone who is living in the world obviously that is a counsel of perfection. Then simply one, all that one can then say is well associate with spiritually-minded people as much as you possibly can. This is what the Hindus call satsang and, and avoid those who aren't spiritually-minded, at least until such time as your own commitment is so firmly established, so strong, you know, like Mount Meru, that it can't possibly be shaken (laughter) even though you do associate with those who are not committed themselves, not spiritually inclined themselves.

: So it's better in a sense to spend all one's time with friends in the Sangha.

S: It really is, yes, yes. I suppose everybody notices what happens when you as it were go out into the world and you associate with people who are not at all like-minded, whether it's you know in your work place, or at college or whether you're out shopping for the after-

noon or whatever. (Pause) Do you think it would be a good thing if one for instance never had any contact with worldly people at all and confined oneself entirely say to well Order Members, Mitras and Friends, do you think that would be a good thing?

: No, I don't think so.

: No, not really, not never. I mean we've just come from that course retreat where people were complete beginners and never even been in contact with the FWB0 before arriving at (?) station.

S: But then it was a situation which you set up, yes? It wasn't just you meeting them somewhere. You were meeting them under you know carefully selected not to say contrived conditions, you know (laughter) under which they would you know gradually go your way and they cue at least if not intending to do that, but they're open to that possibility. So that is a bit different, isn't it?

2

: It is a bit different, but at the same time it's different among Friends and Mitras and Order Members.

: I see it more in terms of the contact you know, a basic reminder, you know, of the effort that has to be made.

S: Yes, right, yes.

: You start thinking (unclear) Order Members and Mitras we'd start to believe the whole world was like that.

S: Yes, you'd be sadly disillusioned on those occasions when you did come out.

: You must in some ways keep contact with the things happening in the world, I think.

S: Do you think so? What do you mean? What things happening? You mean, political things, economic things?

: (Unclear).

S: Well maybe some people do but I think the majority at the beginning need not bother much about those things. When I was in India I didn't bother for years on end. I never read a newspaper or looked at a newspaper for years on end. I don't think it did me any harm. I mean, I didn't read a newspaper at all until the time of the Chinese invasion and the Dalai Lama's flight, I wanted to follow that, then I started reading a newspaper I think, but I think all the time I'd been in India before I hadn't read a newspaper. I think the only occasion on

which I looked at a newspaper before that particular incident was when Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated, I think that time I did look at a newspaper but not any other time. It's not easy to know what's going on just by reading the newspapers.

. True.

S: It just makes you wonder, well what is going on? (laughter) : I was just thinking in particular of certain things that

you see happening and when you reflect on them you can see that it does bring you down when you come in contact with the things that are happening ...

S: Actually you can't cut off contact altogether really, but certainly one should take the opportunity of associating with like-minded people as much as one possibly can.

. And perhaps even consider it of primary importance to be with and to develop contact with like-minded (working at the Centre?) ...

S: I mean I had a letter this morning from Buddhadasa and one of his

3

complaints is that people don't reply to his letters. He says there's only two people who regularly reply to his letters and with whom he had a regular correspondence - one's me and one's Devamitra and he says he's written to various other people but not even had an acknowledgement. He feels a bit disappointed. He thinks that there should be more communication of that sort you know within the Order. I know sometimes it is difficult because one just doesn't have time. I can't always reply to people's letters but certainly one should make the effort and keep up regular correspondence with a few other people with whom one isn't in regular you know personal contact. Thiddhadasa is of course out there in Finland with contact with only two or three other Order Members. Bodhishri is of course overhere so that leaves only Vajrabodhi whom he is in regular contact with, Maitreya whom he sees sometimes, and Gunavati who has only just been ordained.

° It seems for a time that we need to keep our energy and our interests flowing in amongst ourselves ...

S: Yes.

° ... rather than taking outside, even in the sense of visiting friends

S: Right, yes, right.

° ... and putting our energy into that. We could perhaps make much more of getting our energy going with each other.

: Unless one is able to help one's friends to come into the Dharma . . .

S: Right, yes, yes.

° .. and then only if it is possible.

S: Well that sort of contact is worth keeping up. Yes, yes.

° Does your lineage belong to the Nagarjuna school?

S: In Tibet they unified the two lineages. For practical purposes it's the lineages of the Bodhisattva ordination, so the Tibetans have unified the two lineages of the Madhyamikas and the Yogacarins, that is to say of Nagarjuna and Shantideva, and Vasubandhu and Asanga. When one gets the Bodhisattva ordination, according to Tibetan tradition, it's as if it were the joint lineage of the Madhyamika and the Yogacara.

° Does that go back to Padmasambhava and back through Padmasambhava to the Madhyamika and Yogacara?

4

S: I'm not sure, I think it's more likely to go back through Shantarakshita, and of course Atisa.

: Were Shantarakshita and Shantideva contemporaries (unclear)?

S: No, Shantarakshita was a bit later.

They were both connected with Nalanda, weren't they?

S: Yes, yes. Shantarakshita was somewhat later ... at the same time as Padmasambhava. Shantideva seems to have been as far as we can make out a hundred or maybe even two hundred years earlier. We don't really we don't know very much about Shantideva either, very little indeed. We know he was the son of a king in Gujarat, we know that he went to Nalanda, we know that he wrote these various works. That's about all. (Pause) Anyway what about the transcribing? Have you decided about that? To do it?

: We are (unclear) take it on. I think it needs one of us to take the responsibility of (unclear) with you to get these reels to Mahavira to the tape department to have them copied on to cassettes.

S: Yes, right, yes, and then distribute the cassettes.

° Yes, then the reels can stay with him and the cassettes would be with us at Sukhavati and then once we do the transcribing Francis will help out with the typing.

S: Good, great.

° And probably we could (unclear).

S: Good, that is really good. Then it may well be that that's the next one to be transcribed and typed maybe even edited complete. That would be really good.

S: Though negative grammatically may not have conveyed a negative feeling. Like our word immortal which means not mortal - immortal contains you know conveys a positive feeling. And then again the Buddha himself did make extensive use of parables and stories and illustrations, similes which some of the later teachers didn't make so much use of. So in the Buddha's case you know his more sort of as it were apparently negative analytical approach was balanced by his use of these more poetic methods. Whereas in Nagarjuna you just get the odd simile but really not much more than that.

(unclear)

S: Whereas it seems the Buddha himself relied quite a lot on parables and extended similes to convey his meaning.

Do you think the king would have asked Nagarjuna for a teaching

5

or Nagarjuna's sort of looking round for a sort of royal patronage in a way.

S: We just don't know. I mean either is possible. It could be that he knew the king and wanted to strengthen his devotion to Buddhism and wrote this specifically for him. It could be that I mean the king perhaps had gone off Buddhism a bit and Nagarjuna was a bit concerned about that and so wrote this work dedicated to him. Or it may have been that the king had said to Nagarjuna, "Well you know I am really interested but you know the Mahayana isn't really easy to understand. Please write me a short easy work", so Nagarjuna wrote this work in the form of a letter to the king, this is quite possible also. We don't definitely know, but all these things were possibilities, these things you know these sort of things did happen. There is another work by Nagarjuna called the Surileka, the epistle to a friend which may have been addressed to the same king. It's a more general, simpler work. One could also say that these sort of works the Madhyamika works are very important for the Gelugpa tradition in Tibet. Tsongkapa's writings are very much modelled on Nagarjuna. So there's a very definite line from Nagarjuna to Shantideva to Tsongkapa, even though Tsongkapa does incorporate elements of the Yogacara, but he's much more like the Madhyamika tradition than he's like the Yogacara tradition. The Gelugpas generally today have this sort of emphasis, and this sort of approach. (Pause)

~like a lot to try and understand.

S: Mt-n, I'm afraid there is.

: (Unclear)

S: Right, pianissimo (laughter) fortissimo. Yes, some study, seminars are very pianissimo and others are very fortissimo. No names, no pack drill. Now don't forget when you transcribe, transcribe everything, even to indicate where people laugh, etc.

The places where people correct themselves, in fact, do we need that?

S: Do it exactly if you can and then leave it to me to sort out. That would be best.

S: Let's do the introduction first (unclear). This little work, the Son~ of the Four Mindfulnesses.

: "The second work in this volume is a short poem that contains within it the essentials of sutra and tantra:

1 The admiration for one who teaches the path to enlightenment. 2 The thought definitely to leave cyclic existence and the consequent

6

wish to attain highest enlightenment in order to help all sentient beings.

3 The simultaneous and swift collection of merit and wisdom through

imagining oneself as a deity who is qualified by emptiness.

4 The realisation of emptiness which is coupled with its application

to the world of appearances".

S: Right, carry on to the end.

: "For the sake of easy memorisation and subsequent application in meditation the Seventh Dalai Lama (1708-57) versified these concise teachings which were originally given by Manisri to Tsonkapa. The translation is based on oral transmissions and explanations of the text received from His Holiness Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, in Dharamsala, India, in May and August of 1972."

S: So, the introduction says that the second work in the volume, which is a short poem, contains within it the essentials of sutra and tantra. Where does the tantric element come in, do you think?

In the visualisation of the deities.

S: Yes, everything else is Mahayana and corresponds to much that we've studied in the (?). It is the imagining oneself as a deity which is the purely tantric element, though we'll go into that when we come to it. When it says that these concise teachings were originally given by Manjusri to Tsongkapa what does it mean? And how did Tsongkapa receive them from Manjusri?

In a sense(unclear) meditation ..

S: Yes, he didn't receive them from any human teacher. They were as it were original with him and not original in the sense of having been thought out intellectually as a result of his studies and reflections, but being received from a higher level of consciousness, true wisdom, by way of inspiration, as it were, or, to put it in the fully traditional way, given by Manjusri. Tsongkapa himself is regarded by the Gelu~pas, in fact by all Tibetan Buddhists, as a manifestation of Manjusri. All right let's go on to the text then.

: "Instructions for Meditation on the View of ~vptiness. The Son~ of the Four Mindfulnesses. Oausin~ the Rain of Achievements to Fall".

S: These achievements of course are spiritual achievements. Do you think this particular idiom has any special meaning, causing the rain of achievements to fall, or is it just a poetical flourish? What does it suggest?

A

7

: Without discretion.

S: In a sense without discrimination.

Discrimination.

S: It suggests a sort of cloud-burst, almost an explosion. As though you (sing?) on earth and (cause a reaction?)

happening above.

S: Yes.

Like the rain cloud.

S: Right, like the rain cloud in the White Lotus Sutra. And you notice it's instructions about meditation on the view of emptiness, instructions for practising meditation on the right view of the emptiness of all phenomena, so as to transform that right view into a perfect vision, i.e. into an actual spiritual experience. (Pause) All right, verse one then.

"1 Mindfulness of the Teacher. On the seat of the immutable union of method and wisdom sits the kind teacher who is the entity of all the refuges. a Buddha who has perfect abandonment and wisdom is there. Forsaking thoughts of defects. make a petition with pure perception. do not let your mind stray. place it within admiration and respect. maintain your attention unforgetful. maintain it within admiration and respect".

S: Right, this verse also contains a well almost a somewhat tantric element, that is to say regarding the teacher as the embodiment as it were of all the refuges. So the text says "On the seat of the immutable union of method and wisdom". (Pause) (Two sneezes) Method is of course upaya, wisdom is prajna. So what does it mean - what does the text mean by saying that the immutable union of method and wisdom is the seat on which the teacher is seated. I mean if you visualise the teacher then you can visualise him you know sitting on the lotus throne with a white mat on it, on top of a white mat a red mat, sometimes it is said that the white mat is wisdom, the red mat is compassion, so that is as regards visualisation~ But what does it mean? What does this double seat of the immutable 'union of method and wisdom mean? What does it mean to say that the teacher is seated on there?

He's no longer separate from the practice.

S: It means that that is as it were his foundation, he is rooted in that, his whole being is founded upon or rooted in the immutable, the unchangeable union of method and wisdom in other words wisdom and compassion, samsara and nirvana have become fully unified in him,

8

and that is the foundation as it were of his whole being, his whole life. Not only method and wisdom but all those other pairs of opposites, like merits and knowledge. So "On the seat of the immutable union of method and wisdom sits the kind teacher who is the entity of all the refuges". This is how one usually visualises the teacher in the going for refuge prostration practice as the embodiment of or the true being of or the essence of all the refuges, the refuges being of course the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha. (Pause)

In the refuge tree it just depends on what lineage it is?

S: Yes. If you belong to or if you follow the Nyingma lineage then you visualise Padmasambhava and you visualise your own teacher in the form of Padmasambhava. Sometimes it's said that there are four refuges, that is the guru, Buddha, Dharma and Sangha,

but strictly speaking the guru isn't a fourth refuge. Each of the refuges has an esoteric aspect. Have you come across this teaching before? I've mentioned it a few times. The esoteric aspect of the Buddha is the guru, the esoteric aspect of the Dharma is the yidam, the esoteric aspect of the Sangha is the dakini. Have you come across this before? No? So what does this mean, when you say that the guru is the esoteric aspect of the Buddha, what does one mean? Well, esoteric it doesn't mean anything sort of secret or mysterious. It means something more like directly related to your individual needs. It's as though, it's as though one says that the Buddha is very far away, so the human historical Buddha. He lived 2,500 years ago. Certainly he gave the teaching and one can read about that teaching but sometimes it seems very general, not directly related to your individual spiritual needs. So you need a teaching which is directly related to your individual spiritual needs and you can get that as it were from someone who knows you as an individual, and who can give teaching according to your actual concrete needs. So this is the function of the guru. So the guru is as it were the Buddha in more specific form. The guru is the Buddha in general, the guru as it were is the Buddha in particular, one may say. So in this sense the guru is the esoteric aspect, in other words the esoteric aspect of the Buddha in other words, the Buddha as directly relevant to your spirit(tape jumps)

: That the ideal closer and more comprehensible ..

S: Yes, yes, yes. More real in a way. This is of course the Vajra- yana way of looking at things. The Mahayana would not look at it in quite that sort of way.

y

9

: I'm not really too sure what esoteric means, actually.

S: Well it usually translates the Sanskrit guhya, which means secret, but it doesn't mean secret in the sense of kept hidden, it's more like true, or real, existential, it's more like that.

: Would the yidam be the object of the visualisation in the meditation practice?

S: Yes. We will come on to that in a minute. (Pause) So it, the fact that the guru is the esoteric form of the Buddha means that for practical purposes once one gets on to the spiritual path, once you start actually treading it and come up against difficulties, need personal help, need advice from someone who knows you as an individual, who understands your difficulties, it means that for practical purposes the Buddha is the guru, the guru is the Buddha. The Buddha in the sense of the human historical Buddha is almost like a book, you've just got the scriptures, but sometimes those are much too general. It's rather like when you're sick you need a doctor, you don't need the god of healing or the Buddha of healing, you need an actual concrete human doctor. ... to look at you and to find out what is wrong. It's something like that. So in the same way the yidam is said to be the esoteric aspect of the

Dharma, the Dharma refuge. So what is the yidam?

Is it that contact between you and the guru?

S: Pardon?

The yidam is you

S: No, no, no. Strictly speaking there are two, there are two senses of yidam. One is the stricter, more technical sense, the other is the loose popular usage. In the strict technical sense, yidams are Buddha forms belonging to the anuttara yoga tantra, in wrathful form and in yabyum attitude. Strictly speaking a yidam is only of that kind. These sort of Buddha forms that is to say the wrathful forms in the attitude of union with their female counterparts, these are found only in the anuttara yoga tantra. So strictly speaking it is only this class of Buddha forms that can be yidams, but more loosely a yidam means any particular Buddha or Bodhisattva who is your main object of concentration in meditation, devotion, visualisation, and so on. So the yidam in either of these senses is as it were the esoteric aspect of the Dharma. So how is this? So it's in much the same way that the guru is the esoteric aspect of the Buddha. The Dharma is vast, the Dharma contains so many teachings. Not all of them may be relevant to your needs. So the yidam represents what you need here and now, not in an abstract form but a concrete form, even in the form as it were of a person, that is to say a Buddha or Bodhisattva. So your study and practice of the Dharma comes down as it were simply to this, that you

10

visualise, you create in front of you the figure of the yidam and you concentrate and meditate on that. That, for you that is Dharma. The yidam becomes for you the embodiment of the Dharma. Do you see this?

Voices: Yes. (Pause)

S: Then what about the dakini? The dakini is the esoteric aspect of the Sangha. So dakini can be looked at in two ways, internally and externally. What is the Sangha? The Sangha is the whole spiritual community. But the spiritual community is very big. It's not only the spiritual community that exists now but the spiritual community of the past and future, on all the different Aryan levels. So though spiritual fellowship is very important you can hardly have spiritual fellowship with the whole of the Sangha at one and the same time especially if you are a beginner. So for you the Sangha is those people or even those inspiring principles in which you, with which you come into direct and immediate contact. So one can look at, so the dakini represents that. So one can look at the dakini in two ways: first dakini as a sort of psychological~cum-spiritual principle representing your own inspirations, the energies and powerful devotional feelings that come surging up within you, and in the company of which as it were you practise the Dharma in the sense that, without that, without that inspiration, without that strong devotional feeling you won't be able to practise the Dharma. You see this? And then dakini also represents externally the few

people, maybe even the one person, whose company spiritually speaking you find very, very inspiring and helpful to your practice of the Dharma. In the context of the tantra this is very often represented as a female figure. The female is naturally stimulating to the male, so - that is in the ordinary way, on the ordinary human level - so the dakini being in female form represents a person who spiritually stimulates the practiser on the spiritual level in the same way that the female on the ordinary biological level stimulates the male human being. So it's the principle of inspiration and stimulation, either internal or external. There's been - there is quite a bit of misunderstanding about the dakini, the sexual partner with whom you practise the Dharma, but it isn't really quite like that.

Is it a sort of positive anima figure?

S: Yes, except it isn't necessarily female, I mean, the form is - though there are dakas, daka is the masculine form, daka or vira, dakini is the feminine - but it means in the ordinary sort of almost social sense a very close friend with whom you practise the Dharma, and whose company inspires you and encourages you to get on with your practice of the Dharma, with whom you have a very special relationship

ii

which is as it were closer even more intense than what you have with the spiritual community in general. Some tantrics do take quite literally the femininity of the dakini and they say that you should practise with a female partner who rouses all your energies including your sexual energies, and then you can, you can then divert them on to the spiritual path. But this would seem to very rarely happen, so I think it's safer and wiser to take the dakini as representing either that internal principle of inspiration or a particularly close friend with whom one practises the Dharma and in whose company one feels great spiritual inspiration.

Would this ever be given to you by a teacher in the sense either of a physical partner .

S: ~i, no, a teacher may indicate you know that such and such a person is the right sort of person for you to practise with. Some of the texts do seem to describe the teacher as giving to the disciple, the disciple a female sexual partner, but teachers nowadays usually say that that is not to be taken literally, or they say that there is nobody nowadays that is able to practise in that sort of way.

The guru and dakini could be the same person?

S: No I think it's, I think it's probably important that the dakini is someone more or less on the same level, with whom you have, you know, a feeling more of companionship, I think.

: More like sparking one another off.

S: Yes, right, yes, yes.

: As regards the yidam (unclear) dakini I have heard maybe wrongly that when you get, when you are given a practice you meditate on the yidam the corresponding dakini (unclear) by the yidam. I don't quite understand on what level that is to be taken.

S: Well, if it is a yidam in the strict technical sense that is to say a wrathful Buddha form in union with his female counterpart, well that female counterpart is called his dakini, yes? That is also a term for on a higher level for the female Buddha form especially when in union with the male Buddha form. That is a Dakini with a capital "d" as it were. But again one is not in the realm of biology. I mean, these represent you know two different poles within the individual, within the individual enlightened mind, if I can use that expression in complete union. It's the immutable union of method and wisdom, it's not two people coming together sexually. It's the complete union, the integration of the two poles, if you like the emotional and the intellectual, the active and the contemplative

12

within oneself. So "On the seat of the immutable union of method and wisdom sits the kind teacher who is the entity of all the refuges," the embodiment of all the refuges, the embodiment of Buddha, Dharma and Sangha in the sense that it is the teacher who is able to give one specific advice, who gives you also your yidam and assigns to you your dakini. In that sense the teacher is the embodiment of all the refuges. "A Buddha who has perfect abandonment and wisdom is there". This again is the purely tantric or Vajrayana attitude of regarding the teacher as the Buddha himself. Abandonment and wisdom, again another pair. Abandonment is probably meant to correspond with the Sanskrit word *lisarna* which is opposite of going for refuge, sort of disrefuge. Do you see what it means? When you take refuge in something you regard it as a true security, but if you see that something is no true security then you don't take refuge in it, you abandon it. So you see that the world offers you no true refuge you abandon it and you go for refuge to the three jewels. So abandonment, the attitude of not going for refuge, is your attitude towards the world, and going for refuge is your attitude towards what is not of the world. So that constitutes wisdom. So on the one hand there's abandonment, on the other there is wisdom. It's another pair you know, corresponding to merit and knowledge, compassion and wisdom, one relating to the conditioned, the other to the unconditioned. So "Pursake thoughts of defects. make a meditation with pure recollection. not letting your mind stray. place it within admiration and respect. Making your attention unforgetful maintain it within admiration and respect".

1/4

From P G 6 The Song of the Four Mindfulnesses 13

Session 20 Side B

S: So the mindfulness of the teacher is meant to inculcate, as the introduction says, the admiration for one who teaches the path to enlightenment. In other words a very strong positive attitude towards the spiritual ideal as embodied in a particular person. So this is called mindfulness of the teacher. It's not just mindfulness in the sense of an awareness, without feeling. It could be said that the tantra attaches great importance to what we can only

call personification. Instead of the Buddha you have the guru, who is a person, instead of the Dharma in almost the abstract principle you've got the yidam, again which is a person, or Bodhisattva, or whatever. Instead of the Sangha in general, you've got one individual daka or dakini, so it's each time a person, and you find that if you look through tantric iconography they tend to personify, inverted commas, almost everything. Everything becomes a god or goddess. So why is this? I don't think this has ever been properly discussed, why the tantra personifies everything.

It's helpful to feel an approach towards that (unclear) if you dress it up and give it colour and shape.

S: I said personification inverted commas, but is it really a sort of just dressing up? I mean I don't know if you are familiar with Martin Buber's thought: he said that you begin with a distinction between "I" and "it" and then you progress as it were to "I" and "thou", and according to him the sort of spiritual attitude is to regard everything as "thou" not "it". In other words not - you are a person, to see everything as it were personally, in personal terms. It's as though the personal is higher than the abstract, the person is higher than the principle. So the tantra seems to see things in this way. There's no such thing as Buddhahood, there's only the Buddha, yes? There's no such thing as the Dharma, only the yidams. There's no such thing as the Sangha, that's just an abstract expression, there's only the actual person with whom you are in contact. So it's as though the tantra's seeing all things in terms of persons doesn't represent a sort of personification, but a sort of deeper insight into reality~ So from the tantric point of view one lives not in a world of things but in a world of persons. There's no question of egos or selves.

Could this be sort of paralleled with for instance the Greek gods embodying the virtues, sort of thing.

S: In a way, but the Greek gods seem to embody the virtues in a rather lifeless sort of way, yes? That is why I said it's not really

14

personification, we use the word personification we don't have any other, but it isn't really like that at all.

It makes one much more aware of the kind of beautiful aspects of enlightenment.

S: Right, yes, yes. After all, we could say that person is the highest category that we know. So, you know, if one is to see things and experience things as truly as one can, one experiences in terms of persons, not in terms of things. It doesn't mean personifying in the ordinary sense - you could personify a flower but that's only a sort of sentimental gambit, because you don't really think it's a person or feel it as a person, you think it's a flower, just a thing. You as it were pretend it's a person and treat it accordingly. But the poets for instance don't see it like that, the poets may actually see the flower as a person. For the poet the flower may be a person. He's not just pretending it's a person for you know for poetical purposes, he

really feels it like that.

He sees it as a sort of living organism, you mean.

S: Well no, more than that, a person. Blake sees the sunflower as a person, he sees the fly as a person.

: In Turner, the sun is god. A slightly different level.

S: So in the same way you see the sort of principle of enlightenment or ideal of enlightenment in personal form and that is the teacher. And you feel the corresponding emotions of admiration and respect or admiration and reverence. All right, let's go on to verse two.

: "Mindfulness of the altruistic aspiration to highest enlightenment, In the prison of the sufferer of limitless cyclic existence wander the six types of sentient beings bereft of happiness, fathers and mothers who protected you with kindness are there. - Forsaking desire and hatred. meditate on endearment and compassion, not letting your mind stray place it within compassion. making your attention unforgetful maintain it within compassion".

S: So "Mindfulness of the altruistic aspiration to highest enlightenment" i.e. the Bodhicitta. "In the prison of the sufferer of limitless cyclic existence". Cyclic existences, existences within the wheel of life, "wander the six types of sentient beings". Do you know what these six types are? -

: Hungry ghosts.

S: Yes, gods, men, hungry ghosts, animals, asuras, beings in hell, animals. "Bereft of happiness", without true lasting happiness.

"Fathers and mothers who protected you with kindness are there . One should think of them according to the Tibetan tradition as having

15

all been once upon a time your mothers and your fathers who protected you and looked after you, so that you should feel friendliness and goodwill towards them. "Forsake desire and hatred meditate on endearment and compassion" - presumably endearment means metta. "Not letting your mind stray place it within compassion. Making your attention unforgetful maintain it within compassion". So the text is drawing attention to the importance of metta and karuna as the foundations for the development of the Bodhicitta. One should try to see how many living beings there are, how much they suffer, and that they should be naturally near and dear to one like one's own parents and that one ought to develop the aspiration to supreme enlightenment so as to be able to help them out of the samsara. (Pause)

It stresses unforgetful.

S: Yes. "Making your attention unforgetful", as in the previous verse. (Pause) So broadly speaking this verse emphasises the importance of metta and karuna in the generation of the will to enlightenment, the Bodhicitta. This is more or less the same sort of ground that we've covered in certain parts of the (?). All right on to verse three then.

: "Mindfulness of your body as a divine body. In the divine mansion of ~eat bliss, pleasant to feel, abides the divine body which is your own body of pure aggregates and constituents, a deity with the three bodies inseparable is there. Not conceiving yourself to be ordinary, practise divine ~ride and vivid appearance, not letting your mind stray, place it within the profound and the manifest, making your attention unforgetful maintain it within the profound and the manifest".

S: So what is this - mindfulness of your body as a divine body? Body here doesn't just mean physical body, it means the whole being, the whole personality, the whole psycho-physical~spiritual organism. What do you think is the purpose of this practice? What does the practice represent? It represents the sort of spiritual rebirth after the experience of sunyata. That is to say it represents the new being that comes into existence on the death of the ego. This is why usually before the visualisation of oneself as a divine body one meditates on sunyata, sunyata representing the complete dissolution of the ego. And then out of that sunyata there as it were arises spontaneously the new divine body. That new divine body is something not separate from sunyata, at the same time not identical with it. The divine body is form, the sunyata is sunyata. But you know sunyata is form, form is sunyata at the same time. They're distinct and yet they're not distinct, or distinct and yet the same, the same yet distinct. So "In the divine

16

mansion of ~eat bliss ~pleasant to feel abides the divine body which is your own body of pure aggregates and constituents." Pure because they've passed through what Mr Chan used to call the fires of sunyata.

Didn't Mr Chan say it's only, only vulgar magic if a visualisation practice ...

S: Yes, right, yes.

° ... didn't have the sunyata experience.

S: Right, yes. The sunyata experience means the experience of self-lessness, putting it in very general terms. Not that there is a thing called emptiness which you have to experience.

° And you help get in touch with that with the development of metta and karuna.

S: Right. So just as you are transformed by the sunyata experience, the ego dies, your

own, your body disappears and a divine body takes its place. In the same way the world disappears when the ego disappears, too. So when the divine body is produced then there is an appropriate world for the divine body to inhabit and that is the divine mansion or palace or mandala, if you like. So you become the deity, the god, the Buddha or Bodhisattva and the world becomes the divine mansion or palace or mandala. So instead of you in world there is deity in mandala, yes. If you pass through the fires of sunyata to emerge as deity, simultaneously the world as seen by you passes through the fires of sunyata and emerges as divine mansion. In other words if you are transformed your surroundings are transformed, or you experience the world differently. So "A deity with the three bodies inseparable is there" the three bodies being the dharmakaya, sambhogakaya, nirmanakaya. In other words, the Three bodies of the Buddha. "Not conceiving yourself to be ordinary", I mean not thinking of yourself as Mr So-and-so, or Mrs So-and-so, "Practise divine ride" means think of oneself as being that particular Buddha or Bodhisattva. "And vivid appearance" and make that experience of your being the Buddha or being that Bodhisattva a very vivid one. "Not letting your mind stray. Place it within the profound and the manifest". The profound void and the manifest form, sunyata and rupa. "Making your attention unformal. maintain it within the profound and the manifest".

° Wondering about the word inseparable in line three why it says that. Does it mean that one actually sees the thing as ~ as ..

S: No, the three bodies are inseparable - where's there the dharma-kaya, there's the sambhogakaya and nirmanakaya. They cannot be

1/2; separated from one another. They are inseparable. The three are

17

inseparable.

° What is vivid appearance?

S: The vivid appearance is if you visualise yourself as deity in front as it's called then you see that very vividly, or if you visualise the deity as yourself here, you experience that very vividly, powerfully, strongly. In other words don't have any doubt about it, let it be a very definite experience.

° Is this the same as the personification inverted commas we spoke of in the previous verse? Sort of identifying ... no ..

S: No, no, it's ... there are actual practices. There are two, there are two ways of visualising oneself. This is called the stage of generation, incidentally. The generation of oneself as a deity and the generation in front. You can either visualise outside as if when you build up the picture of the Buddha or Bodhisattva in front of you, but it's you that you build up. It's as though there was a mirror there and you see yourself in the mirror. You see it out there but it's in fact you. Or you can see, that is to say feel, yourself here as the deity without

visualising it or building it up out there as though in the mirror. There are these two ways. One is called generation in front, the other is called self-generation. But they both represent mindfulness of your body as a divine body, in the words of this particular text. You try to experience yourself as that which you're trying to become. You try to have an actual experience of your own as it were higher being, higher personality, to use those expressions which aren't really very Buddhist. (Pause) It's rather like ... it's a sort of creative process, this stage of generation. It's like ... suppose you write a ... all right .. or to put ... suppose you paint a picture. The picture is something out there, it's something objective. But what is the connection between that picture and you, your mental state? In a way the picture is you, yes? Whatever you create in the way of picture or poem is you, you objectified as it were. So creating it, producing it you can as it were see yourself more clearly. So it's just the same with the visualised form, the mere fact that you create it, that you produce it out there means that you know you bring out something which is within you. You experience it and realise it more vividly than you did before. So one of the ways of you know putting yourself into contact with your own sort of higher being is by visualising it out there. In that way it becomes more real to you, you experience it more concretely, more vividly.

[701]

- ° You meditate on the qualities which this being possesses.

S: M~mmm, you actually visualise the form, the golden colour, etc., the jewels, the lotuses, and also reflect on the qualities, or you are aware of the qualities and in that way you bring them out from you know the depths of your own being, you experience them, you realise them, and you begin to become those qualities.

- ° Does it sort of act as a kind of light which shines up our imperfect parts in a sense?

S: Well, there aren't any imperfect parts at that stage because I mean all the imperfect parts have disappeared into sunyata, they've been dissolved. (Pause)

° When you said yourself as you can become, I think you said wasn't Buddhist, what did you mean?

S: No, I was referring to the expressions of higher being, higher self as not being really traditional Buddhist expressions, I am just using them in a loose sort of popular J~nglish sense.

- ° Fault of the ~nglish language, really.

S: Right, yes, I mean there are visualisations in which one visualises oneself as being literally spiritually born. You visualise a father Buddha and a mother Buddha, you visualise their sexual union and your- self as born from that, but born as a spiritual being. That's another way of practising the generation stage. But the main point here is that you put yourself into contact with what you really are by visualising it out there in concrete form. This is what it really means. And just as the poet puts himself into contact with what he really thinks and feels by actually writing the poem which is then an object out there, which other people also can read and experience. So this is as it were creativity on a higher spiritual level. You create yourself and in that way experience yourself and realise your- self. So "not conceiving yourself to be ordinary", not thinking of yourself as just so-and-so but as the Buddha, the Bodhisattva, "Practise divine ~ride and vivid a~nearance. not letting your mind

stray. ~lace it within the ~rofound and the manifest. making your attention unforgettable0 maintain it within the ~rofound and the manifest". This in a way refers to the other stage which is the stage of perfect- ion. In tantric meditation broadly speaking there are two phases, stage of generation and stage of perfection. The stage of generation is the stage of producing the visualised figure of the Buddha or Bodhi sattva from the void, and the stage of perfection is realising the non-duality of form and void with regard to that particular visualised form, as seeing it as inseparable from the void and experiencing both

19

simultaneously the void and the form1 form being the visualised form, the form and the void at the same time. That is called the stage of perfection. (Long pause) All right go on to verse four, then.

: "Mindfulness of the view of emptiness. Throughout the circle of appearing and occurring objects of knowledge pervades the space of clear light which is reality. the ultimate. an inexpressible mode of being of objects is there. Forsaking mental fabrications, look to the entity of immaculate emptiness. not letting your mind stray. place it within reality. making your attention unforgettable, maintain it within reality',.

S: So "Throughout the circle of appearing and occurring objects of knowledge", this means the circle of existence itself, not circle in the sense of the wh~eel of life, but the totality of phenomenal existence. So throughout that totality of phenomenal existence pervades the space of clear light which is reality, the ultimate. In other words, all phenomenal objects, all worldly things, are pervaded by reality itself. "An inexpressible mode of being of objects is there'1. So objects as pervaded by reality are as it were inexpressible. They exist as it were in an inexpressible manner, in other words they are phenomenal objects, they have a sort of conditioned existence, but at the same time they are pervaded by reality itself. So they exist in a sort of inexpressible state in a way neither real nor unreal, or both or neither. "Forsaking mental fabrications look to the entity of immaculate emptiness~, see that all these things in as much as they are pervaded by reality are empty. "~ettin your mind stra~ place it within reality. Making your attention unfor- getful. maintain it within reality". So it's as though the author is saying, try just to see things in their true, in their true being, see them as pervaded by the light of ultimate reality, see them as fundamentally void. Not void in the sense of emptiness, but as non- different from that ultimate reality, and place your mind within that ultimate reality.

° This is the stage of perfection, is it?

S: One could look at it like that, it doesn't clearly say so.

° ~xperiencingat the same time the voidness and the non- voidness.

S: Yes, yes. Though in the caSe of the stage of perfection it is more

with regard to that particular you know divine form though ultimately
that is to be extended to all forms whatsoever.

1/4

20

° What are these mental fabrications?

S: Which imagine things and selves out there as though they were absolutely real.
(Pause)

° How could we put this in, more in our own terms? Could we say, "Not lettin~ your mind stray", having, keeping oneself in contact with the ideal.

S: frin, one could say that. Though it's more than that.

° It's more than that, but it you know ...

S: It's more like seeing all things in their true perspective.

Clear comprehension?

S: Clear comprehension.

° I just keep thinking that one can't just like that place one self within reality.

S: No. This, no, this presupposes quite a lot of you know meditation. It's instructions for meditation on the view of emptiness. (Pause) The next verse elaborates a bit more on this view of emptiness. Let's go on to that.

° "At the cross-roads of the varieties of a~nearances and the six consciousnesses is seen the confusion of the baseless ~heno- mena of duality. the illusory s~ectacles of the deceivin~ ma~cian are there. Not thinkin~ they are true. look to their entitv of em~ti- ness. not lettin~ your mind stray. ~lace it within annearance and emntiness. Makin~ your attention unfor~tful. maintain it within annearance and emntiness".

S: This goes back to that old illustration of the magician. A magician at a cross-roads conjures up all sorts of things, a horse, an elephant, a city, and makes people see them when in fact they are not there. So "At the cross-roads of the varieties of a~nearances and the six consciousnesses 'I, the six consciousnesses being the conscious- nesses arising in dependence

on the five sense objects and their respective sense organs and the mind and its objects. "Is seen the confusion of the baseless phenomena of duality". So the author is saying that there are two things: there are the varieties of appearances that is to say of falsely perceived objects out there, and the six consciousnesses which falsely perceive them, these two coming together, crossing each other form a sort of cross-roads, and there the magician as it were conjures up the illusion of a world. So "Not thinking they are true look to their entity of emptiness".

Not taking them for ultimate realities, see into their true nature, see how in truth they are empty. Just as you see a magical delusion,

21

even though you see it, even though you perceive it, you know that in a sense it isn't really there, it's only magical show. So in the same way don't be deceived by the magic show of the world. It's only arisen at the cross-roads where as it were subject and object meet. So look to its fundamental true nature which is emptiness. "Not letting your mind stray place it within an appearance and emptiness, making your attention unforgetful maintain it within appearance and emptiness". (Pause) "The confusion of the baseless phenomena of duality". They're called baseless because they don't exist in ultimate reality, they arise in dependence on causes and conditions. "The illusory spectacles of the deceiving magician are there". It's as though the magician you know gives you a pair of spectacles and makes you see things that aren't really there.

Doesn't it mean spectacles in the sense of a sort of mirage?

S: You could interpret it like that yes. Show in the sense of shows, yes, yes. In the sense of delusory exhibitions, of a deceiving magician are there. Right read the conclusion then.

"These instructions on the view of emptiness for one who uses the four mindfulnesses which are special necessities actually bestowed, bestowed by the holy Maniughosa on Tsongka-pa, a kind of doctrine were composed by the Buddhist monk Losan ..

S: Kaysang. : ... S: Gyatso. : Gyatec. S: That's how it's spelled in Tibetan so you can (unclear) (laughter)

° "For the sake of his own and others establishes .. re ..

S: Predispositions.

° "Predispositions for the correct view".

S: So what general impression do you get from this little work? (Laughter) In a way it's more difficult than Nagarjuna.

° It's really concentrated.

S: Mtu:"m, yes.

: AjlOt of ground in a few lines. S: ~wniin, rn-In.

: Could you tie up or correlate the experience that's

mentioned in the fourth stage with any particular like distance along the path ... with in any way .. coreelate ...

S: Well it's all you know a form of vipassana, you could say Maha- yana vipassana.

22

And in terms of attainment this would be going far beyond stream entry?

S: Well, it depends how you regard stream entry whether you know within a Hinayana perspective or Mahayana perspective. If one

reflected and meditated on this one could develop insight which would destroy the fetter of belief in a permanent self-hood and that again would tend towards stream entry.

It's just that as I was reading the last line thoughts were going through my mind, are these experiences within the grasp of most people if you like, practising say within one life-time?

S: I think they are. It's also a question of degree of practice and extent of practice. I mean the form of the expression here is definitely Mahayanic and in a sense quite advanced but the essence of the matter is you know insight into emptiness, insight into egolessness, and that is what one is trying to develop so as to achieve stream entry. So one can look at stream entry either within the original somewhat narrow Hinayana context or within the later, more developed, broader Mahayana context which is more the sort of content you know which is described here but it all comes basically to the same thing, the development of insight, and without that then there's no stream entry. So it's not ... it's in a way quite dangerous to sort of try to find out where other people stand. (Laughter) In a sense you can, but in a sense you can't.

It was more in terms of well if he's a stream entrant then it seems if it's possible in our life time well it depends on how far (unclear).

S: If you start trying to .. if you sort of find out where one person is then you want to know where somebody else is and then you want to know where somebody else is and then you sort of start thinking in terms of grades and degrees and that can introduce a quite unhealthy sort of atmosphere or attitude. So this is generally discouraged in Buddhism, it's not done, you know, one never asks, or one never thinks. You're quite satisfied to think that

well someone is you know quite highly developed as far as you can see more highly developed than you are, and that's all you need to know. You don't sort of try to ascertain the exact degree or stage, in a sense you can't. I mean if you met a Bodhisattva of the seventh stage how could you tell him really from a Bodhisattva of the eighth? (laughter) You wouldn't be able to. It's enough you ... it's enough for you to know that he's an advanced Bodhisattva as far as you can see. Any question

of the exact level is meaningless you know so far as one is concerned one self.

° When could you practise such a meditation as this?

S: Pardon?

° When could you practise such a meditation as this?

S: Well this isn't in itself a meditation, this is more like verses to be recited and reflected upon, but you know verse three does refer to quite definite and quite well-known meditation practices, visualisation practices which can be very lengthy and elaborate and take several hours in some cases to go through.

° Would that coincide with our sort of visualisations?

S: Only if there was the preliminary sunyata practice which is contained in the full practice - for instance I don't know if anybody has it, the Avalokitesvara sadhana, the Manjusri sadhana, they both contain this. It's represented by the mantra you know "Om svahabha shudha sarva dharmaha, svahabha sudho ham~. (?)

From P G 5 The Song of the Four Mindfulnesses

Final Section (~ of a tape)

S: This is the mantra that one repeats in order to meditate upon sunyata, though you know one should carry it further than that. And then one does the visualisation.

When you say further than that you mean study and recitation of other things?

S: Well you can meditate very systematically on sunyata, you can reflect for instance or meditate on the four degrees of sunyata, the emptiness of the conditioned, the emptiness of the unconditioned, emptiness of the distinction between the two, emptiness of the very concept of emptiness itself, and then go on to the visualisation. Or one can you know visualise or one can practise emptiness by way of the eight no's of Nagarjuna: no arising, no destruction and so on, no existence, no non-existence.

Is it enough to recite and reflect upon the Heart Sutra?

S: Yes that would certainly, that would certainly be a way of practising sunyata, yes, yes. Also of course the six element practice is in a way a sort of sunyata practice at least a very

good lead into it. The six ... not the, not the visualisation of the stupa the six elements not that, the other practice. So in a way if one wanted a more or less complete and systematic you know meditation practice, one should start off with the mindfulness of breathing, and be quite well into that, then take up the metta bhavana which would develop one's emotional positivity and refine one's being, then go on to the six element practice, which would develop some insight into the egolessness of the person, the individual, and then go on to the sunyata practice of the Mahayana, and then the visualisation practice of the Vajrayana which represents the birth of the new as it were enlightened per~onality. This would mean a quite comprehensive practice.

: Is that ... that's all one sitting, like?

S: Oh, no. Well you could do it in one sitting, but no, no, I'm thinking of one's whole practice of one's whole life.

Oh yes.

S: Yes. Well you could you know do it ... you could spend a day, you know, espe ci ally on solitary retreat going through these practices in this order, or they could be done you know on an intensive retreat, but you know essentially they're practices spread over one's whole

A life-time. You start off with mindfulness, you learn to be very

25

mindful, that may in fact take you several years to get any real improvement, and then, I say then, but that is putting it in the way of the path of regular steps, you don't have to wait until your mindfulness is perfect before you take up metta, but then you you know you perfect your positive emotions, not only metta, but karuna, mudita, upekkha, and then you can take up ... that ... these two are samatha practices, then you can take up vipassana especially take up the six element practice which will sort of disintegrate the old self and pave the way for the birth of the new self so to speak. Then one can get further into that by practising the Mahayana sunyata meditation and then you know the Vajrayana stage of generation and stage of perfection. So this would give one a complete meditation practice as it were from beginning to end, in a very simplified form. So this is essentially the sort of path that we follow as regards meditation practice within the Friends, or well within the Order.

Do you think it's important for most of us to spend at least a short time of each year more concentrated in more full time meditation?

S: I think that would be really good, even if it was just a week or even a weekend, come to that. It would be better than nothing. (Pause) ~imun, any further points arising out of that? It also makes it clear I mean how close is the connection between the Vajra yana and the Mahayana, yes? The Vajrayana practice, the tantric visualisation, is you know based on the

sunyata approach, or sunyata attitude.

It's rather interesting that this song comes at the end of the Nagarjuna text, yes?

S:)~, yes, yes.

This in a sense is a preparatory path for the view, for the experience of emptiness, I think.

S: Well, no, the(Ratnavali?) is a purely Mahayana work. The four the Song of the Four Mindfulnesses ~how's as it were you know very briefly the application of that practically in the Tantra, or it shows the tantric application of that in terms of actual you know meditational practice.

° It sort of links up a little bit with what we were talking about seeing the unconditioned in the world

S: frn1 ~ mmmm, yes.

° ... the idea of a divine mansion, or something.

S: Right, yes, yes, seeing the world with metta and seeing it more beautiful, yes.

26

: Yes.

Would you say that the experience of sunyata had this strong feeling element .

S: Oh yes, yes, right, yes, yes.

: ... with great bliss.

S: This is why for instance there is this term dakini which I've already mentioned, which is from a root meaning space, so the dakinis are the ladies of space, yes? Or those who traverse space. They're sort of moving over the surface of reality as it were, and they represent feelings and inspirations. So the sky, the sunyata, is not blank and empty and lifeless in any manner, it's traversed as it were by all these currents of inspiration and feeling. (Pause)

° Could you say it's almost outside the label of Buddhism in a sense?

S: Pardon? ° Could you say it's almost outside the label sort of Buddhism? S: What is? ° Sort of sunyata. S: Well, sunyata's outside any label including the label of sunyata.

You could say ... if it's outside the label of Buddhism, how much more so would it be outside

any other label? If it can't be labelled Buddhism then I don't see that it can be labelled anything. (laughter)

° If people come across the term sunyata at classes, it's quite important to get across you know a positive feeling.

S: It's rather unfortunate that Guenther has chosen to translate it nothingness. Well in a sense he's right, it's no particular thing, no thing in particular, but you know if the newcomer encounters this word emptiness, voidness or nothingness, they get a wrong impression. It's got nothing to do with emptiness, nothing to do with voidness in the literal ~nglish sense, nothing to do with nothingness.

° I think I said that when we did that course a couple of weeks ago it was easier to ... it seemed better to leave such terms in the Sanskrit original

S: Right, yes, yes.

: ... and make people ask, and talk about it.

S: Yes, inn, otherwise if you translate it emptiness, well they think they know what empty means, so it's just a state of being empty, obviously, it's quite straight-forward. They don't think there's anything to ask about. They think they've understood it quite clearly, because the word emptiness is understandable. But sunyata

27

is not emptiness.

° It's a pity some people aren't keen on translating some of the texts .

S: Mnn~.

° ... and so every time it has to be translated, could be (unclear) (Pause)

S: All right then let's leave it there and have a cup of tea. In texts like this you either have to say just very little or you have to say a great deal. (laughter) Either ten minutes or ten days, there seems to be no middle way.

° Had you come across this text before? The four mindful- nesses .. had you come across ..

S: No I hadn't~ no, no.

° Had, you read the Precious Garland before?

S: Pardon?

° Had you read the Precious Garland before?

S: Yes, I have seen this in another version. I wish I could have got the Sanskrit text. I think I'll try to get it before I you know edit the seminar, so that I can refer to the original text. It has been edited by (Touchy?) It's not ... as far as I know, it's not in print but I may be able to get a copy.

° Of the Sanskrit original?

S: Yes I may be able to get a copy, a photo-stat copy from some library, or maybe Doctor Conze has one.

° He's still teaching (unclear)?

S: (Touchy?) has died. (Unclear) (Pause) (Laughter) Wait to drop. (Laughter) Oh, he dropped both (laughter).