

Pratyekabuddhayana

Tonight we are going to discuss the pratyekabuddhayana. This yana is somewhat a duplication of the previous yana. The distinction between the sravakayana and the pratyekabuddhayana is largely based on the personality types of hinayana practitioners rather than there being a journey from one to the other. We could not necessarily say that those who entered the sravakayana would go through the pratyekabuddhayana next as part of their journey, although the rest of the nine yanayas do have that sense of process or journey. But in this case, it is a question of individual behavioral characteristics and relationship to the teachings. There is nothing more to say about the four truths beyond what has already been discussed at the level of the sravakayana. The pratyekabuddhayana is a slightly further elaboration, but it is nothing greater, nothing particularly fantastic.

Pratyekabuddhas are referred to as either parrots or rhinoceroses. That is to say, there is no happy medium of any kind. In these two approaches, either the person is very sociable or else very individualistic. But the general tendency of pratyekabuddhas is that only a few are sociable, a lot of them seem to be antisocial people. We could relate that with ourselves. Some people would like to just retreat and go back to their own environment. They do not want to relate at all with the energy level of the world or the society that exists around them. Pratyekabuddhayana types of people are arrogant, in the sense that they prefer not to seek a personal teacher or an individual guide. And also such people could be said to have very little desire, so therefore they are not particularly keen on socializing. And also they are highly intelligent and intellectual in some sense— they do actually discover some sense of reality or some sense of liberation. So the general assumption of such people, or their general approach to life is the sense that they have their own resources already and that they can do better without anybody's help.

A pratyekabuddha is intelligent enough to work with his own resources but at the same time he is very arrogant. He does not want to relate with anybody above and he does not want to be under anybody's directions. He would like to search for himself. It is kind of the selfmade person approach. So pratyekabuddhas are very individualistic. Quite possibly such a person would appreciate nature and poetry, and such a person might appreciate hardship, and industrious work. He or she probably does not like any kind of religion. He would like to search in his own way, by his own means, basically. So that is the pratyekabuddha type of person.

I'm sure you are aware that we have such people within our community. And such people are always very resourceful and very knowledgeable from the level of how to tie a shoelace efficiently up to how to survive in the wilderness. They are very intellectual and from that point of view very functional and efficient. But at the same time they do not particularly want to relate with any hierarchy or organized discipline of any sort. Such a person might find that entering a meditation hall is somewhat revolting. "Freedom can be discovered from tying one's own shoelace. We don't need this kind of institutionalized setup"—that would be the logic of such a person. So that type of person is arrogant in some sense. But there is nothing that you can do to put that person on the spot because such a person has less tendency to neurosis. There is the neurosis of his own arrogance, but apart from that there is very little notion of a need for entertainment or any sense of confusion. Usually we have to talk to somebody to try to untangle our confusion or because we need some kind of companionship. But in this case, the whole thing is not based on that.

So the pratyekabuddha is obviously an antisocial type of personality, because if you are socializing you have to give up your arrogance and become friends with others. And you also have to submit to somebody who is seemingly more highly developed and more well-versed or deepened in their particular spiritual journey. But the pratyekabuddha does not want to give in to that. Another factor is that there is very little compassion in such a person. You do not want to bother to relate with anybody else in terms of helping somebody or teaching somebody. You would simply like to be left alone.

So those are the characteristics of a pratyekabuddha. I am not particularly trying to paint a black picture of them, but those seem to be the general characteristics of such people, who could be very admirable people, and nice, wonderful. Quite possibly one of their first virtues is that quite certainly and definitely, they are not being a nuisance to society or a pollution to society. But on the other hand, they do not contribute anything to society either. They do not take part in anything. So they are kind of lone wolves.

The practice or the contemplation involved with the pratyekabuddhayana is study, or an intellectual speculative approach to the world. A student of this nature traditionally wanders around in charnel grounds. He sees a skeleton or a piece of bone and begins to question: "Where did this come from? Where did this come from? This came from death and death comes from birth and birth comes from pregnancy and pregnancy comes from the meeting of two people and the meeting of two people comes from some kind of passion or desire and so forth and so on." So the twelve nidanas begin to develop in that way. It is kind of contemplative but at the same time it is kind of an intellectual way of working things out.

The same process could occur with contemporary individuals also, with their particular experience of the world. We could start with: "Where did the pollution come from? The pollution comes from having too much industry, motor cars. And where did those things come from?" and so forth. We could go back that way with all kinds of things. It is a kind of ecological study, basically. Such a study is based on some kind of complete discovery of chaos, not only chaos itself but the result of the chaos, which is immense decay and confusion and a definite sense of unpleasantness. And the attitude of this particular student is a sense of wanting to clean up the world, some revulsion against problems of that nature. He would like to find out about the world. Primarily he would like to save himself or herself from that particular mess. By doing so, his information and knowledge might be useful to people of the next generation, but that is uncertain.

they could actually influence another, don't see continuity of change (impact) from one to the other, so remain caught (imprisoned), poor communication, etc. // SKEPTICISM towards his (Wittgenstein's) ability to be understood. Someone that realized that egolessness made them ALREADY connected, then, they could work (selflessly) with what was already there to communicate with, which is necessarily some other existence, with some set-up, etc. // There's no way you COULDN'T make change. // Here, however, he has isolated himself so the best he has is (what many might see) as very abstruse

Some of the theistic traditions have a similar approach and the earliest ideas of monasticism are very much based on this kind of thing. You are not supposed to socialize. You are supposed to have personal dignity and you should have some sense of a direct link with the divine principle or be a channel of the divine principle. Whatever the school of theism, there seems to be a similar kind of thing. And Zoroastrianism quite strangely has a very similar description to that of the pratyekabuddha, some sense of the development of the individual and the development of his or her own theory of reality. You begin with a certain particular standpoint or highlight of experience and you build from there. So in that whole approach, there is an immense rejection of lineage and an immense rejection of individuality in the sense of complete egolessness.

So there are a lot of suggestions or possibilities of attaining ego-hood. But at the same time, students of the pratyekabuddhayana have achieved what is known as the one-and-a-half egolessnesses. The first egolessness is the egolessness of individuality and the second one is the egolessness of dharmas. The pratyekabuddha has achieved egolessness of dharmas from the viewpoint of transcending grasping but has not transcended fixation, which is the second portion of the second egolessness. The idea of graspingness is the first or grosser level of the ego of dharmas, that is, when you begin to perceive the perceptual world or when you begin to see it, you begin to possess it or to latch onto it. And then after that you begin to develop a fixation on it and the whole thing begins to sort of soak into your sense of existence, basically. That generally takes place. So the pratyekabuddha has achieved a one-and-a-half-fold realization of egolessness.

The first egolessness, of individuality is achieved basically by working back through the twelve nidanas to ignorance. A person who has done that has achieved some sense of understanding but at the same time they are somewhat at a loss. But then that person begins to find again and again that there is some kind of problem taking place in the realm of sort of laying hand on things and beginning to possess them completely. So the first thing is grasping. It is as if you have just picked up an object in the shop and brought it to the counter and said, "I would like to buy this." You have not yet paid money for it and the whole thing has not yet become your possession. That particular object still belongs to the store before you pass your money. Actually, even before you

make the transaction properly, there is still a fixation of grasping or fascination. It is not yet the fixation of possessiveness; you have not quite come to that yet at this point. So at this point the other half of the egolessness of dharmas has not quite been achieved. In other words, the pratyekabuddhayana person has not quite gone through the level of actually finally purchasing the object and taking pride in the ownership of it. That problem still exists even though the person has already given up the idea of grasping, that is, he has already achieved the egolessness of grasping.

There have been some suggestions or discussions by the various schools of thought on this subject—some say that the pratyekabuddhayana person's final attainment should be a realization of both egolessnesses. But according to Maitreya in his work on the *Prajnaparamita Alankara Sastra*, the reason why the rhinoceros type person of the pratyekabuddhayana has not realized the second part of the egolessness of dharmas is because of his fixation on his individuality. So according to that particular guideline this approach seems to be quite reasonable.

I cannot think of anything else to say.

QUESTION: What about the parrot?

RINPOCHE: Well, the parrot type is another type of pratyekabuddha. That is very clever thinking actually—now I know something to say. The parrot type is somewhat in the same situation. It is not so much socializing with each other from the point of view of sharing each other's everything particularly, but it is just a lot of rhinoceroses hanging out together. They are more sort of parrot types rather than real parrots who actually chit-chat with each other and warn each other of enemy attack or have some kind of alarm system always taking place. But in this case, every one of them has a different alarm system if there is any danger. So it is a group of rhinoceroses put together rather than a real flock. So parrot or rhinoceros is saying the same thing in some sense.

Q: The way I understand the division of egolessness into individual egolessness and the egolessness of dharmas, it seems that you are giving a person credit for egolessness just if he has an understanding intellectually that his self does not exist. And yet as he goes through day by day he can watch himself still having these tendencies to grasp at things or to fixate on things. He maybe knows that it is silly because he really is convinced intellectually of the egolessness of his individuality. So you give him credit for that. But he hasn't achieved the egolessness of dharmas because he really has not stopped the functioning of those things, even though he sees through them.

R: That's true, actually. That is very good thinking. There is some sense in which you have learned to say, "I don't exist," "Me not home." But when there is a chocolate bar or some ice cream coming up you still want to eat it. The dharma of ice cream is still there. That particular kind of ego fixation is still there, in spite of "me not home." That doesn't help, you know.

Q: You mean you are really not home?

R: Well, you've got to be home in some ways, because if nobody is home

you cannot even have any ideas of that kind at all. But those two things interact with each other completely. So you cannot say one or the other, particularly. But there is some kind of basic clue that you have no ground of your own individuality. You do not really exist. Purely at the level of the five skandhas you are just pieces put together rather than an individual person holding it all together and being a really definite person. But then there is also the attraction of other experiences which has not been completely conquered. And that tends to make this ego much more solid in some sense.

Q: So it is not an actual egolessness of the individual either?

R: Not in the fullest sense. You are quite right. There was actually a philosophical discussion of the whole thing and the different schools had different concepts about it. If you have complete freedom from the ego of individuality then how could the product of that ego still be operating? So the idea is that there is a basic understanding of the egolessness of individuality on a somewhat intellectual experiential level but you have not quite actually felt it. So the rest of it has not been tapped at all. That is why that kind of problem exists.

Q: Suppose there was a person like you have been describing who was into that arrogance and being on his own and everything. And suppose that just arose out of being in a situation where the only teacher around was Baba Ram Dass? Suppose the only reason he was not with somebody was because there was not somebody around who he could respond to. Would such a person have the virtues of a pratyekabuddha but without being by himself out of arrogance or—

R: Well, I think that is a different nature altogether. That person does not belong to the category of this yana necessarily at all.

Q: Would he fit into any other yana?

R: I think he could fit into any yana. That is a very open-ended question. But in the case of a pratyekabuddha, the person does not especially want to give in. He would like to have some say about his own liberation. He would like to manufacture it by himself rather than somebody else having his dirty hands in his business.

Q: Apparently the pratyekabuddha is following what the Buddha said about being a refuge unto yourself, and yet he is obviously misinterpreting it some way. But I am not sure quite how that should be taken because if you take that very literally what you get seems to be pratyekayana.

R: Not necessarily. That is a possibility but you could take refuge in the Buddha as an example of individual development and the path as a journey and the sangha as companionship. But in order to do all those things you actually have to get into some kind of surrendering. Some kind of giving or formal giving-in situation needs to happen. I think that is probably why there is a need for a formal refuge ceremony in which everybody takes part properly, together. The pratyekabuddha people might have a very difficult and very hard time doing that. They have done it somewhat, obviously, otherwise they wouldn't be regarded as included in this thing. But since they have only partially taken refuge they still have reservations that they could take off and be an unguided missile

in their own right. So I think there is too much humanism—that could be the misled version of pratyekabuddhism. True pratyekabuddhism is a sense of egolessness obviously, a sense of understanding the nidanas, not too much humanistic psychology. It is sort of a reasonable person in some sense.

Q: Wouldn't that kind of understanding—about the nidanas and about the chaos—lead to compassion if it was properly understood? Wouldn't a pratyekabuddhayana person grow through it?

R: Very hard, very difficult.

Q: Why?

R: Well, you have made a discovery which actually works for you and you do not want to particularly mingle in further problems. You have a sense that you have figured out your own problems completely. That is a big enough project for you already, so you do not want to take on the further project of sorting out somebody else's twelve nidanas.

Q: Are they involved in the path in terms of suffering and pain?

R: Yes, definitely so. Absolutely. But that is a very personal thing. And there is no hint made in the pratyekabuddhayana of any notion of charity, apart from not destroying people and not bringing harm to others. That is as far as the socializing goes. Everything is very cut and dried. Everything is individuality, basically. That is also why pratyekabuddhayana people limit their discipline to the level of individual salvation or *soso tharpa* (so.so.thar.pa). It is very hard to inspire compassion when you have something to work on. It is very hard. Such people regard their discoveries as their own property. So it is very demanding for them to ask them to share it. They have already put a copyright on it and they don't want to be bothered by any problems. It is like somebody who has a good business deal and does not want to share it with anybody else.

Q: I thought that as you grow in understanding of the path the distinctions between people begin to disappear more and more. It seems like a tremendous ignorance that would go on.

R: Certainly, that is why the whole idea of egolessness has to become much more mature. And having attained two-fold egolessness completely, there still has to be the giving birth to bodhicitta. That still has to be done, otherwise it is not proper. If you meet a sensible pratyekabuddha-type person, he obviously would say, "Sure, I'll drive you to your home or lend you money." That is purely the arbitrary level of being nice. But he does not want to have any big trip about it. In his heart of hearts you know that he still does not believe in that kind of thing, letting people be involved in his life. That is one of the biggest problems of compassion. When you begin to work with somebody, it is not so much that you are surrendering service to them but you are inviting them into your territory as well, which is very hard for people to do.

Q: Could a pratyekabuddha be called an arhat?

R: Could be. Yes. Definitely so. Actually they manifest their style of

teaching by attaining arhatship and manifesting the various kinds of miracles. They prefer not to talk, they would rather perform miracles to show people how things work. Some people refuse to talk but prefer to do miming, teaching by pantomime.

The best he can manage is deparately trying to communicate his ideas, yet not feeling fully satisfied at that. // The SHOWING. << Because there is no faith in what is already connected. // The emphasis on GESTURE (on showing). "This is the best I can do." LOOK look look!!! (rather than on the impact that that VERY statement HAS on who he is speaking to.

Q: What is the outcome of the sravakayana then? It doesn't seem like the same type of person.

R: Well, it could be the same type of person but at the same time it could be different. These two yanas are not really yanas as such, they are just a description of different developments in different types of people. So a sravakayana person could become a pratyekabuddha and do his individualistic trip or a sravakayana person could join the mahayana later on. That is a possibility too.

Q: I still do not quite understand the one-and-a-half-fold egolessness. If Maitreya said that pratyekabuddhas have not realized the second part because of the fixation to their own individuality, that would seem to be more related with the egolessness of individuality than the egolessness of dharmas. Maybe the experience of egolessness is more like half each, as far as that goes, than one-and-a-half-fold egolessness.

R: This whole thing means that individuality has been experienced but that the sense of fixation is still there. The individuality there is simply that their individuality is imposed on the realization of the egolessness of nongrasping alone.

Q: So they have realized the complete egolessness of dharmas and it is the egolessness of individuality that is not complete?

R: No, the other way around. The egolessness of individuality is completely realized, but the egolessness of dharmas is not completed.

Q: How can the egolessness of individuality be completely realized if they have this arrogance and the rhinoceros quality?

R: Because they are clinging to phenomenal messages. They are still bound by formats. They have already achieved some kind of egolessness or centerlessness but their centerlessness is dependent on some kind of format, some kind of accommodation.

Q: So, related to the sravka notion of path, they would have overcome the third one; the notion of ego or self--

R: Mm-hmm.

Q: --but they would not have overcome the fourth one, the notion of ego-fixation?

R: Yes.

Q: Got it.

Q: I do not understand the difference between grasping and fixation. You

FORMAT. THIS way, is IT, the only way, yada yada. // Strong insistence on one point of view (one open point of view). Wittgenstein could be an example. // Open opinions, original insight into a variety of given phenomena (based on coming from an inside-out approach, so as to be genuine). // Nonetheless, always put back in HIS format, rather than WORKING with another's (through their eyes).

used the example of going to a store: when you have already picked out an object but have not actually purchased it, that means that you have gotten over the grasping but not the fixation. Does that mean—

R: It is not that you have gotten over it, but that is the process of ego trip that is involved. First you grasp, then you possess.

Q: So, how does that fit in with the half there?

R: Well, half is that a person who has achieved the second type of egolessness has some sense that the grasping isn't there.

Q: I don't understand.

R: Well, he doesn't buy anything. If he did buy, he wouldn't grasp, he would just simply pay money for something.

Q: So where is the fixation?

R: The fixation is in our admiration and ownership. The sense of ownership is still there but the sense of fascination is not there. In other words, you could own something and have a sense of ownership about it but you needn't be fascinated by it, necessarily.

Q: And the fascination is the grasping?

R: Yes. So that might make you a good buyer in some sense, if you are not overwhelmed by the merchandise. If you somehow have sort of a lighthearted view of the whole thing, probably you would pay better money. Whereas you could be cheated very easily if you were completely stuck on an object when you saw it or when you handled it.

Q: The attainment of the pratyekabuddha—is that the same as the attainment of the Taoist yogi or the Shaivite forest yogi?

R: It sounds very close, except that this particular approach is nontheistic and it does not have any particular ideals to live up to, like cultivating the truth or worshipping nature or anything like that. But apart from that, it is similar.

Q: I still don't quite understand the parrot and rhinoceros metaphor. The parrot type is still socializing with everybody but not sharing anything?

R: They are simply hanging out together.

Q: But isn't that what the rhinoceros is doing too?

R: The rhinoceros is not hanging out with anybody.

Q: Would getting over the last half of ego, the ego of dharmas, correspond with the metaphor of the clouds moving away from the sun? And would bodhicitta arise spontaneously?

R: Not quite yet.

Q: No?

- R: Not quite yet. There is a long way to go still.
- Q: Even if both egos are gone?
- R: Yeah. I'm afraid so.
- Q: What is still obscuring it then?
- R: We think that if we get rid of the ego problems we are going to be there immediately.
- Q: Well, not there, but just that bodhicitta would arise, or compassion.
- R: Well, maybe the clouds will move.
- Q: Not buddhahood, just bodhi.
- R: The clouds might have moved out but you still have some sort of hangover from the clouds.
- Q: Can you put a name on that at all?
- R: Well, there are a lot of technical terms coming up. Maybe we could discuss that during the bodhisattva path period.
- Q: Rinpoche, I would like to sort of get a handle on this as related to the current Theravadin schools and some current teachers we have in this country. Are both the sravakayana and the pretyakabuddhayana still existing in the current Theravadin tradition? What kind of style would someone like Mahasi Sayadaw, who is dead, or Dhiravamsa, who is now teaching in this country, be representing? It seems to me that these people almost have a mahayanist style to their teaching, the way they sort of spread themselves around among a lot of students and so on.
- R: You are quite right actually. This sounds very chauvinistic but the living hinayana tradition we have in this country, this world, is the Theravadins. And when they become mature and old and they have gone through centuries of disciplines, they begin to pass down wisdom through the lineage and they become ripe and mature, so they become almost mahayanistic. That seems to be what is happening. And that also used to be said about the mahayanists by the tantrikas. They said that when you become real old, an old mahayanist, you are almost a tantrika. That is the same kind of situation. I would say that Mahasi Sayadaw is actually beyond the hinayana category. He likes to teach people and he would like to work with others. A sense of compassion and softness begins to develop. That very softness began to develop particularly in areas of the world where the Theravadins sat a lot, predominantly Burma and Thailand. And where there was the least mahayana influence was in Ceylon, where people were only studying and theorizing the whole thing and never sat properly. So they still have a stronghold there.
- Q: You mentioned that compassion involved inviting people into your territory. Is there any sense of arbitrariness in that? For instance in idiot

compassion you might go out and give somebody a ride home in a completely arbitrary way. Is there a sense of arbitrariness in inviting people into your territory? In other words, is there any excuse for not inviting somebody into your territory?

R: Well, I think your territory has to be properly cleaned up. Otherwise you cannot arbitrarily invite somebody in. They might fall into a big pit or run into all kinds of accidents. Once your territory is cleaned up, then you can invite them arbitrarily because everything has already been worked out.

Q: Sometimes you feel like you are closing off to somebody and you feel that you could have opened up regardless of whether you knew that they were going to fall into a pit or not. What about that, where you did not really investigate that you had a pit?

R: Well, I think it is important to be considerate. You cannot just watch somebody falling apart without any implication, you know. There has to be some kind of concern. We are not talking in terms of operating in the vajrayana level, necessarily. If that is taking place, then there is a different kind of psychology, a different kind of concern, which ordinary people might have difficulty understanding. But apart from that, if we are talking about just the sensibleness of the hinayanists and mahayanists, there has to be some kind of concern and some kind of respectability.

Q: A couple of lectures back you talked about the twelve definitions of cessation. Number nine was exception, and in our discussion group we were confused about the quality of exception of transcending the passion and neurosis of the human realm and the formless god realm. Now, I'm not really sure what the question was, but we were not sure whether you were talking about the six realms or the three realms, or what the difference between the six realms and the three realms is.

R: Yes. Well, the neurosis of the formless god realm is that you are completely high on emptiness, the bliss of emptiness. You are so blissed out that you have no sense of individuality anymore. And the neurosis of the human realm is a sense of immense passion and achievement orientation.

Q: Is this related to the six realms or the three realms or neither?

R: The three realms are usually called the realm of passion, the realm of form and the realm of formlessness. Those are the three realms. The formless realm is part of the devaloka, part of the sixth realm. The realm of the gods is divided into a lot of sections, and the last section is the realm of the formless gods. And human beings are included in the realm of passion.

Q: What would happen to a pratyekabuddha who grew up in Tibet? That is, is there any place for a pratyekabuddha in a predominantly vajrayana atmosphere?

R: There doesn't seem to be.

Q: So he becomes a shameless heathen or—

R: Well, there does not seem to be anyone like that, actually. That is how the karmic situations sort themselves out. The minute they were in Tibet they were somehow in connection with vajrayana buddhism. And so there was no problem. And we also did not have any problem with immigrating lower level buddhists.

Q: You've talked about pratyekabuddhas in the scene which would be--

R: Well, we could study pratyekabuddha type persons, you know, the kind of person who wants to be alone. Such a person would still like to have his own scene going, his own achievement going. That is a possibility. But I would not particularly want to point them out and say that you are one of those.

Q: It would seem like a curse, actually.

R: Yeah. A lot of people are like the rhinoceros type. Although lately everybody has become very talkative and begun to socialize a lot. So there are very few of them. There is a last foothold of occasional uptight people who do not want to have anything to do with that. But I have experienced or heard that even those people have been cracking occasional jokes. So we are breaking the ghetto of rhinoceros type people very speedily. We do not seem to have very much of that.

Q: It seems that there is almost a sense of a sociological phenomenon here.

R: What? Sociological phenomenon here?

Q: I mean in terms of the American sense of individuality and standing on one's own two feet.

R: Well, I think that has been one of the movements, you know. And more recently, there has been a movement taking place quite definitely, which, interestingly has not yet come out in the newspaper realm or the publicity realm. It is still brewing, in my guess, very heavily. And that is that those people who were mass converted all the time by all kinds of gurus and sub-gurus or whatever are beginning to feel they have been conned. And they are extraordinarily resentful of the whole thing. They would like to search for their own individualistic spirituality. A lot of that has been happening actually and you may be surprised in the next year or half year. A lot of those things will come out onto the surface. And they may actually begin to proclaim their own little doctrines.

Q: Rinpoche?

R: Yes?

Q: Would it be possible for someone on the level of the pratyekabuddhayana to be practicing samatha-vipasyana meditation?

R: That is what they do.

Q: They are involved in this?

R: Yes. That is what they do.

Q: But they are still caught up, somehow.

R: Well, they are caught up in their own practice rather than postmeditation. The postmeditation experience is not particularly emphasized, which is problematic. The meditation in action aspect is not being emphasized properly.

Q: It seems like a pratyekabuddha could be stuck at some point. Where is the aspect of working through the yanas in the sense of journey, how does the pratyekabuddha approach that?

R: Probably he couldn't care less—as long as he can work out his own twelve nidanas and begin to experience the sense of ignorance in everything. The recycling process is taking place and the pratyekabuddha mentality is that if you recycle and recycle and recycle, after recycling things are going to be purified. So you can actually work your things out. And the final and last recycling process is kind of inspirational, the arhat level. So you have no problems. This journey is more a circling journey rather than a straight journey. So from the mahayanist and vajrayanist points of view such people are quite alien in some sense. Actually it is almost that we have to pay lip service to the pratyekabuddha-yana because it is included in the nine-yana setup, but I think it is actually outdated.

Q: Is there some way you can bypass it or something?

R: Well, I don't think we can quite forget them because they are already playing an important part. And there is also that possible style taking place in the American psychological or spiritual journey, as well, the nonbuddhist types of pratyekabuddhas—pratyekabrahmas or pratyekachristians or whatever. Those kinds of things are still taking place. It is an interesting approach to a spiritual journey, so we do not want to bypass it. We have already bypassed it in some sense in that we have already started on the basis of buddhism, sitting practice at the samatha and vipasyana level. Beyond that, there is just entering into mahayana, so we have bypassed a lot of little niches already in some sense. But we do not want to bypass too many things. Otherwise, we could probably hit the highlight of vajrayana without having any understanding of what we are. So we have two poles put together at once, our own neurosis entering into vajrayana, which makes some kind of very powerful atomic bomb which could destroy everybody, each other. Well? Did you raise your hand? How's the foot?

Q: As you can see.

R: Hmmmm?

Q: As you can see. There it is.

R: Ummm.

Q: What do you think?

R: Pretty juicy. [Laughter.]

Q: Rinpoche, my question has to do with how a teacher would deal with a pratyekabuddha type of situation. But as I am asking this question I can see that if the pratyekabuddha even comes to the teacher or opens his mouth some—

R: —which he usually doesn't—

Q: —some food would be given and he would not then be a pratyekabuddha.

R: Yes. Quite possibly. But I did have or I do have some sense of people like that coming to me all the time with their own variations. There is always the type of approach in which you really do not care about helping anybody else but you are only concerned about your own little things. And also there is unconcern with having respect for the lineage. Such a person has already done some kind of search, or research. So therefore there is no need for information. But somehow they keep coming back. I am not quite certain sometimes when I have interviews with such people and I am sometimes speechless, actually not knowing what to say to them. They want some kind of check, to check with me and make sure that they are doing okay. But if I tell them they are doing okay they don't buy it because they do not want to listen to anyone. So they are still arrogant. But it is a very strange relationship and I end up offering them cigarettes or a glass of sake or something like that. And we begin to talk about the weather or their family history or something, which makes them much softer. I have a very hard time relating with such people. That has happened in many cases in my interviews. So we do have those kind of people and my personal feeling is that if you really want to work with them, you have to try to present passion as important because it is connected with compassion and invite them for dinner or invite them for a drink. Something like that is more important than just talking about philosophy, which makes them more and more distant all the time.

Q: Is it like they are caught in a realm?

R: I think the neurosis of pratyekabuddha type people is very helpless and hopeless and horrifying. They are really on some kind of a tightrope but a circular tightrope. So they go round and round all the time in midair.

Well, shall we say goodnight? Thank you.

