

Ven Anīgha Reddit Archive 2025

Ven Anīgha

2025

Contents

Ven Anīgha Reddit Archive 2025	1
Do you need a conceptual understanding of paṭiccasamuppāda for the Right View?	1
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-31 12:16:26	1
Intention and Biology	2
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-01 08:35:50	2
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-02 18:04:43 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	3
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-02 19:54:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	3
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-03 04:36:28 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	3
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-03 13:45:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	4
Management through thoughts of impermanence?	4
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-01 08:16:37	5
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-02 18:09:00 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	5
Sense restraint prior to virtue.	5
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-29 06:49:13	6
A few questions about the Six Sets of Six - MN 148	6
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-29 07:11:53	7
Modern Psychiatric Diagnoses: What They Actually Mean	8
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-29 06:52:46	8
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-01 14:59:30 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	8
The Myth of Meditation Techniques (New Essay)	8
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 17:29:01 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	8
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 18:01:54 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	10
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-26 06:29:22 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	11

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-30 06:53:44 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	15
What is animitta samadhi and how can it be developed?	15
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-24 17:58:35	16
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 10:24:07 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	16
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 10:31:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	16
Looking for clarification on faith and dhamma followers	16
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-26 15:55:09	17
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-27 05:18:01 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	18
Intentionality and External Circumstances	19
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-21 18:11:32	19
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-24 04:52:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	19
What should be regarded as being within one's control?	20
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-19 05:04:48	21
Clearing dust while knowingly standing in a dust storm?	21
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-18 06:25:34	22
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-18 16:42:20 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	23
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-20 13:20:24 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	23
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-21 07:49:39 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	24
“Uncovering the choices that you make” questions	24
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-17 19:12:14	24
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-18 05:54:35 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	25
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-20 12:59:01 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	25
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-24 05:27:00 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	26
Dispassion through investigation of experience	26
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-17 06:56:57	27
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-23 08:48:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	27
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-27 11:06:12 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	28
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-30 06:34:02 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	29
Where does the Hillside Hermitage approach come from?	29
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-15 07:24:18	30
Feeling as a general mood vs feeling dependent of contact?	30

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-14 06:23:04	31
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-14 19:34:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	31
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-15 06:56:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	32
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-20 11:00:39 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	33
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-27 10:19:48 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	33
What does the taming?	34
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-13 06:37:29	34
Requesting discussion on SN 12.25	34
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-08 07:09:33	35
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-11 14:28:08 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	35
Distinguishing between citta and mano	36
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-09 10:54:41	36
Anapanasati - Recollecting the breath without focusing on it?	36
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-07 17:32:37	38
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-08 07:06:26 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	39
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-08 17:14:06 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	39
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-09 10:31:05 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	39
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-09 17:27:10 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	40
Useful “Minimum” Duration of Celibacy for Temporary Ordination	40
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-05 11:14:28	41
Do TV shows, music, movies, and books, when consumed as part of a language-learning activity, break the 7th precept?	41
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-25 06:17:58	42
How do you know if you’ve destroyed a fetter, and not just temporarily “subdued” it?	42
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-21 08:59:54	43
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-22 10:51:02 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	44
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-24 08:47:48 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	44
Some questions regarding my practice	44
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-17 06:45:34	46
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-22 10:44:26 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	48
Impermanent Jhana	48
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 05:08:15	49

The Peril of Sensuality (New Essay)	49
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-11 16:43:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	49
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-12 11:21:42 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	49
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 05:16:56 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	50
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 08:48:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	50
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 08:59:31 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	51
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 14:33:32 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	51
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 15:34:21 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	51
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-17 06:59:37 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	52
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-17 14:53:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	52
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-18 10:44:38 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	53
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-19 07:43:26 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	54
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-19 07:47:44 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	54
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-19 10:35:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	55
Why is abortion considered killing?	55
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 15:37:14	55
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-11 06:42:53 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	56
Thought for Food - Eating in Moderation	57
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 15:26:53	58
A few reflections	59
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 07:57:58	61
Choosing to go forth in Sri Lanka	61
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-07 18:02:04	62
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-09 16:47:58 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	63
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 08:13:41 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	63
Sutta that describe extreme emotional reactions to the Buddha's teachings	63
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-04 08:09:31	63
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-05 08:01:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	63

Hillside Hermitage is no longer on Spotify	64
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 07:15:54	64
Why was HH wiki's seven precepts section changed to be less detailed?	64
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-01 17:06:29	64
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 05:29:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	64
Could and would an enlightened person engage in intellectual activities (like math) ?	65
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 07:21:43	65
Stream-Entry Requires Celibacy (New Essay)	65
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 10:12:01 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	66
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 10:38:26 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	66
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 12:18:08 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	66
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 16:53:28 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	67
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 17:08:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	67
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 17:44:59 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	68
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-27 04:54:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	68
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-27 07:40:43 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	68
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-01 16:56:53 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	69
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 06:42:46 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	70
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 07:27:21 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	70
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-03 10:35:24 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	70
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-05 08:45:43 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	71
What is bhava?	73
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-25 15:32:35	73
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 10:32:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	73
Was The Buddha Wrong? Is Celibacy (And Virginity) After All A Handicap In The Practice?	74
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-23 09:47:25	76
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-23 15:58:19 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	76

Would you tell the truth no matter what? (When to stay silent?)	76
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-20 16:06:05	77
Do they teach the Dhamma?	77
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-15 15:12:04	77
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-16 15:38:34 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	78
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-16 15:54:00 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	78
Conceit in speech	78
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-15 15:15:43	79
Confusion in regards to seeing the mind and more	79
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-13 16:42:10	80
Duty toward others vs. Generosity	80
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-13 16:37:13	80
Are the mind sense objects rūpa or nāma?	80
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-13 16:13:41	82
Should I restraint love for my family, friends?	82
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-08 17:57:39	82
Suffering is to be understood	82
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-02 08:20:22	83
The lie of lay life	83
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-28 05:44:11	84
Regarding the 7th Precept.	84
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-27 18:58:22	84
Can't help but focus on the breath	85
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-27 18:32:58	85
HH and Yogācāra	85
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-27 18:27:33	85
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-28 07:12:58 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	86
“Why doesn't Maranasati sink in deeply enough for me?”	87
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-25 13:34:02	88
Were the Suttas primarily meant for sekhas?	89
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-22 05:48:23	89
How attainable are the attainments of a saddhānusārī (faith-follower) and a dhammānusārī (Dhamma-follower)?	89
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-22 05:32:35	89
Would choosing lay life to preserve your own health prevent achieving a higher attainment?	89
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-17 06:48:06	90
On the description of the Buddha entering the jhānas in DN 16 and vitakkavicara	90
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-17 06:27:23	92
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-18 13:45:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	93
Drying Sticks - a progress note	93

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-14 13:11:44	94
Question about Right View and study	94
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-13 13:47:42	95
Confusion around equating liability to suffering w/ Dukkha	95
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-12 12:41:38	96
Usefulness/Danger of Relaxing Situations? (i.e. a spa and massage)	96
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-12 12:22:47	96
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-13 13:01:27 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	97
Nothing is mine, everything is me.	97
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 05:27:29	98
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 05:59:47 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	98
Fear and Anger as Counterparts?	98
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 05:23:35	98
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 09:48:37 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	99
Desire to buy bicycle	99
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-06 04:39:43	99
Un-Opposing the World (notes on mettā by Sister Medhini)	99
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-18 14:27:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	100
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-19 18:10:31 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	100
Idle talk	100
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-30 05:52:17	101
Seclusion	101
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-30 06:06:49	102
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-02 16:57:42 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	103
Describing the experience of reality without the self	103
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-27 12:26:26	103
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-06 04:52:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	104
Two doubts	104
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-25 09:36:33	105
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 05:25:30 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	106
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-30 06:54:01 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	106
Help seeing the problem/danger	107
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-25 07:11:00	107
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 05:02:18 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	107
The Attempt to Try to Change Pain IS the problem	107

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-25 12:02:54	108
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 03:52:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	109
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 04:51:19 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	109
Is enjoying being with my son a barrier?	110
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-22 07:00:11	110
How does distraction work?	111
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-22 06:46:11	111
How soon should someone begin training yoniso manasikara?	111
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 16:22:21	112
Difference between vyāpāda, paṭigha, and dosa (ill-will, aversion, hatred)	112
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 15:55:16	113
Unable to ordain and a hut	113
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-17 18:00:57	115
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 15:13:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	115
The skillfulness of being open about your understanding	115
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-16 17:18:57	116
Revenge of the hindrances, restraint and not acting out vs active contemplations / asubha	116
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-17 05:07:29	117
Making use of a monotonous job- how to tell apart beneficial training & self mortification?	118
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-15 17:58:33	119
Can an action be rooted in both a wholesome and unwholesome intention? . . .	120
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-13 05:27:01	120
What do you make of this contemplation that reduces sensual desire?	120
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-09 05:49:51	121
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-10 05:40:30 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	121
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-13 04:20:28 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	122
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-13 13:17:19 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	122
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-14 06:26:34 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	123
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 15:29:38 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	124
Is suffering always simultaneously present when there is craving?	124
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-10 05:56:44	125
Can I attain stream entry with chronic illness and daytime sleepiness?	125
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-06 06:39:10	125
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 05:19:20 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	125

So I think I understand what I need to do now.	126
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-05 04:45:42	126
Skills for going forth	126
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-06 06:03:31	127
Where and when does Right View exactly begin?	127
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-01 19:06:30	127
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-03 12:07:47 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	128
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-03 17:42:22 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	129
Is the assumption of sensuality fractal ?	129
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-01 17:02:36	129
Meditation at the beginning of the path	130
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 05:55:27	131
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-21 18:26:16 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	131
Dogs and Company	131
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 18:27:13	132
How Hillside Hermitage explains the Migasālāsutta ?	132
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 05:17:13	132
Resistance vs. Pressure?	133
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 05:06:06	133
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-16 03:22:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	134
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-29 18:04:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	134
Chanting	134
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-13 18:47:42	134
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 04:34:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	134
Simple Paticcasamuppada questions (principle of simultaneous presence) outside of the Visudhimagga interpretation	135
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-12 09:47:47	136
The 5 precepts	137
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:36:11	138
Lay Arahats	138
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:19:59	139
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:51:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	139
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-11 17:20:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	139
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-12 05:41:05 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	139
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-12 05:45:17 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	140

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-13 18:31:36 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	140
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-13 19:01:21 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	141
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 05:30:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	141
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 18:05:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	142
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 05:43:47 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	142
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 06:16:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	142
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 06:32:12 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	143
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-17 07:19:51 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	143
What about cultivation (bhavana)	143
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 06:00:19	143
Does becoming a sotapanna require removing the five hindrances first? If so, how far apart is this even from Jhana? Or is it just weakening the hindrances?	144
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:12:17	144
ESSAY - Jhana & “non-assumption of the hindrances = non-existence of the hindrances”	144
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 04:59:23	146
Context = The Significance of the content?	147
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-09 05:30:34	148
Reflexive awareness/self awareness	148
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-08 18:54:50	149
Did I understand correctly?	149
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-07 05:41:34	149
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-09 05:15:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	150
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-09 16:50:24 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	150
The Hillside Hermitage Arahant Challenge	150
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-30 04:56:20	152
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-01 07:31:34 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	153
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-04 05:20:29 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	153
The tick protection dilemma: Is effective protection killing or not?	153
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-28 07:43:24	155
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-28 11:09:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	156
Scratching Without the Itch	156

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-27 07:32:36	157
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-30 11:40:18 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	157
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-07 06:30:49 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	158
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-08 18:37:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	159
Pride in Asceticism	160
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-26 05:22:43	160
Progress with the 5 hindrances: checking my understanding	160
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-18 18:49:45	162
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-24 02:19:48 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	163
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-26 05:59:36 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	163
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-30 05:09:49 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	164
Double-clicking on delight	165
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-18 17:31:33	166
Struggling with the precept of non-killing while doing yard work	166
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-16 05:24:44	167
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-17 19:38:47 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	167
Early Buddhist Teachings, other traditions and Sensuality.	167
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-15 18:12:06	171
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-17 19:04:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	173
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-22 04:38:20 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	174
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-22 04:50:39 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	176
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-24 02:07:44 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	176
A really nice agama sutta.	177
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-06 16:33:51	177
Why kamacchanda feels like the worst hindrance to deal with?	179
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-06 16:10:08	179
Levels of Yoniso Manasikara	180
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-02 12:45:25	181
MN 13: Facing threatening environments on account of earning a living - a peril of sensuality	181
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-02 12:55:08	182
Pīti and Sukha in Modern Meditation Methods	182
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-31 05:54:03	183

I am not sure if Ajahn Nyanamoli is correct when he says that mind gets used to pleasure or pain.	184
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-29 11:48:23	184
Confused of this book of Ajahn Nyanamoli. I am not well versed about his teachings.	184
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-29 02:10:26	185
pornography	185
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-20 05:33:05	186
“True” Sotapatti vs. “False” Sotapatti: How to Distinguish Between Them?	186
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 19:21:37	187
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-23 02:45:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	189
Looking for reading tips regarding ancient India	189
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 13:37:41 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	189
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 14:58:33 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	190
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 18:11:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	190
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 19:29:12 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	191
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-19 04:09:10 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	191
The hermit of Bundala	192
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-14 03:27:09	192
What is “discernment”?	192
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-15 11:03:49	193
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 04:26:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	193
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-19 04:01:19 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	194
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-21 14:40:07 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	194
Question Regarding the Fourth Precept	195
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-12 05:55:50	195
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-14 04:07:28 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	196
Is chronic illness a rare opportunity to develop Right View?	196
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 05:30:09	196
Wandering mind and non-activity	197
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 16:28:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	197
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 16:45:02 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	197

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 17:20:10 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	198
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 04:04:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	198
Celibacy for sotapatti?	198
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 19:02:43	199
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 06:34:03	199
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 19:10:19 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	201
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 19:36:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	201
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 04:05:28 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	201
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 04:22:53 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	201
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 05:21:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	202
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 09:46:22 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	202
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 03:48:46 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	202
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 11:22:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	202
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 12:39:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	203
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 18:16:35 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	205
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 16:06:39 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	205
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-12 03:49:22 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	206
Laypeople Who Don't Give Up Sensuality	207
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-12 05:01:04 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	209
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-16 05:18:23 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	211
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-16 05:28:04 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	213
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-16 17:04:54 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	213
Hillside Hermitage Schism?	214
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-07 16:05:29	214
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-07 17:26:38 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	215
Question about seeing the mind	215

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-07 15:42:28	216
Advice On My Practice Attitude	217
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-06 05:06:17	218
Am I understanding correctly the purpose of developing perceptions?	218
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-06 04:18:30	219
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 02:19:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	220
Anonymity, privacy and taking things personally	221
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 10:51:22	224
Danger in sensuality	225
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-03 15:59:15	225
Mindstream kleshas question	225
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-03 15:07:01 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	225
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-04 04:06:11 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	225
HH Confession Server on Discord	226
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-28 15:14:07 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	227
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-28 16:16:56 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	227
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 04:59:04 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	228
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:15:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	228
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:30:38 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	228
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:39:10 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	229
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:57:49 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	229
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 06:17:37 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	229
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 06:40:00 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	229
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 06:55:31 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	229
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 11:42:30 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	230
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 11:48:00 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	230
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 16:03:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	231
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 16:25:53 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	231

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-30 20:43:03 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	231
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 03:03:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	232
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 03:44:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	232
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 04:00:29 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	233
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 04:04:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	233
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 09:34:56 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	233
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 09:41:43 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	234
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 12:43:11 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	234
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-06 02:28:53 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	234
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 09:57:46 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	235
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 06:07:59 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	235
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-23 14:54:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	235
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-24 08:53:08 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	235
Questions about Lying, Confessing, and Fixing Mistakes	236
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-28 18:07:29	237
Subject Object	237
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 06:36:46	238
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-26 08:51:35 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	238
How does meditation fit into the path?	238
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-24 16:26:38	239
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 06:02:48 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	239
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 14:27:02 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	239
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-26 08:20:07 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	240
A small reflection on sexual desire	241
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 06:45:05	241
Why is this sub tending towards intellectual proliferation?	241
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-23 08:42:27	243

Is there a difference between Yoniso Manasikara and Sati? If it quacks like a duck and walks like a duck, it must be a duck, right?	243
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-19 05:42:38	244
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-24 11:38:05 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	244
Spanish translations	245
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-18 15:51:20	245
Asking advice for going forth	245
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-18 06:49:20	246
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-19 05:49:41 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	247
Question about Right Livelihood	247
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-17 15:32:57	247
Anigha why deleting my posts ... bro!!?? :)	247
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-12 16:02:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	248
Wrong speech, regret, the weight of consequences and Right endurance	248
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-17 15:29:48	249
Making mistakes. Acting out of aversion, seeing through doubt	250
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-13 06:28:26	250
Hey everyone, I've recently started meditating using Ajahn Nyanamoli's instruc- tions and wanted to check if I'm on the right track.	251
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-07 14:29:58	251
Question about right livelihood. (Talaputta sutta).	252
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-07 14:52:23	253
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-09 05:15:35 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	254
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-10 02:42:44 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	255
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-11 03:13:51 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	255
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-12 04:40:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	255
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-12 15:25:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	256
Uneasiness as Indicator for Right Ideas	257
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-07 14:16:50	258
Getting fed up	258
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-05 03:42:38	259
Question about Right Livelihood and investments	259
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-06 06:20:24	259
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-06 10:08:17 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	260
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-19 19:31:26 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	260

Practical implications of the fifth recollection	262
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-04 06:27:20	262
What defilement(s) are causing me to feel awkward in the staff break room at work?	263
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-03 03:00:29	263
What environment is actually necessary for liberation?	263
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-02 02:09:42	263
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-02 05:20:36 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	264
Confessing breaches of virtue- why and when?	264
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 09:56:18	265
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-01 12:22:42 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	266
Private vs public precepts	267
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 05:06:58	268
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-01 11:40:18 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	269
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-02 02:33:35 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	269
New Wiki Page: Virtue and the Seven Precepts	269
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 02:38:36	269
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 04:29:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	269
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 07:01:21 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	270
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 12:12:04 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	270
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-01 18:15:36 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	271
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-06 12:59:44 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	271
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-29 17:43:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	271
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-01 15:44:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	272
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-02 15:46:49 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	273
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-30 10:38:01 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	273
Is this a correct way of practicing?	273
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 03:25:19	274
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 03:27:07 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	274
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-10 03:22:03 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	274

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-10 11:25:31 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	275
I'm trying to reach the point of keeping 8 precepts all the time.	275
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-28 04:34:33	276
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-28 04:45:31 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	276
Seven Grains of Sand (The Suffering of a Sotāpanna)	276
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-26 05:20:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	286
Question about the 8 Precepts & Hunger from Asthma Medication	287
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-25 04:26:35	288
Why ever eat sweets?	288
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-25 04:03:41	290
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-26 03:39:16 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	290
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-27 02:54:40 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	291
Different levels of understanding of the aggregates. Evolution of your understanding through time.	291
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-25 03:34:38 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	292
Can someone please explain the purpose of sleeping on the floor and the purpose of eating one meal a day?	292
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 07:40:10	293
Question about attachment	293
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 08:43:32	294
If we're trying to remove the ownership of the sense of self, who or what is doing the removing ? What or who is owning the sense of self ? Is it the puggala/individual ?	294
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-20 05:53:20	294
Consciousness = point of view?	295
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-15 17:15:56	295
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-17 05:25:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	295
Discerning unwholesome intentions behind seemingly wholesome thoughts . .	296
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-15 07:10:58	296
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-17 07:12:43 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	297
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-20 03:58:32 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	298
Nibbana Is The Ultimate Uncertainty	298
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-15 06:47:29	298
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-17 05:41:22 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	299
HH stand on meditation	299

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-12 15:24:14	300
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-13 04:34:31 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	300
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-14 04:01:24 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	301
Advice on how to deal with a persistent trigger for unwholesome behavior . . .	301
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-12 04:51:16 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	302
Upakkilesa Sutta MN 128	302
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-10 15:34:49	303
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-12 14:11:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	304
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-13 07:31:41 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	305
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-13 17:57:18 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	306
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-21 11:47:36 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	308
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 07:20:25 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	308
A question on the background of experience/peripheral awareness	308
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 06:38:03	308
jhana and jhana or jhana	309
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 07:18:53	309
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 17:16:38 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	310
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 18:10:21 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	310
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-08 06:34:21 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	311
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-09 03:36:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	311
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-09 20:34:31 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	311
Knowing Background Phenomena	312
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-02 14:50:09	313
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-20 05:30:56 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	313
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-21 10:45:33 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	315
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 07:15:18 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	315
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-26 03:11:41 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	316
Looking for a practical model.	316

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 05:47:18	319
Renouncing the renunciation, question for HH and a possible critique	320
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-27 13:22:47	321
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 05:26:21 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	322
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-04 07:08:49 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	322
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-04 13:12:48 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	323
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-05 06:06:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	323
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-05 10:00:20 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	323
How should we interpret AN 5:161, “The Subduing of Hatred”, which recommends developing goodwill for someone if you’ve given birth to hatred for them?	324
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-27 09:25:39	324
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 05:37:29 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	325
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 15:40:29 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	325
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-02 13:47:53 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	326
7 ‘Existences’ vs. 7 ‘Lifetimes’ - for a Sotāpanna	326
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-27 05:40:31	327
Introducing new rules to r/HillsideHermitage	327
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-24 09:57:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	328
Seeking Guidance: Stay Close to Family or Embrace Solitude in a Monastery?	328
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-24 06:43:34	328
Navigating the Balance Between Practice and Health Risks	329
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-24 05:51:12	329
Wakefulness, and the watches of the night	330
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-19 18:05:40	331
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-20 09:48:37 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	331
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-20 15:47:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	333
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-21 10:01:46 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	333
If one stops practicing sense restraint does dukkha return or is some dukkha permanently removed given enough time?	334
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 17:50:34	334
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 07:09:28 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	335

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 09:01:26 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	335
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 15:46:25 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	335
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 16:49:29 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	336
Rise and Fall of the Five Aggregates	336
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 05:59:33	337
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-23 07:05:13 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	337
Question about the Heart of the Trap (upadana and gratification)	338
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 07:48:28	340
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 07:33:02 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	340
If jhana is a natural consequence of sila, how come arahants are not always in jhana?	341
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 06:13:46	341
yoniso manasikara	342
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 07:05:03	342
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 09:27:26 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	343
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 13:44:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	344
Being free from craving doesn't make me feel relief or bliss	344
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 06:38:49	344
Understanding Craving: Personal Reflections	345
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 09:41:40	346
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 06:56:53 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	346
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 12:52:11 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	347
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 17:36:03 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	348
Can I deal with craving this way?	349
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 05:51:52	350
mindfulness of external situations.	351
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-11 06:53:59	351
Dhamma as Inspiration (or Management?)	351
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-08 09:48:08	352
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-09 11:50:59 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	353
How to get over this attitude towards sensuality	354
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-08 10:28:43	354
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-09 13:49:41 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	354

What is Sense Restraint?	355
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-07 07:18:53	355
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-08 06:37:37 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	355
What about tears from sadness or joy ?	356
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 10:06:44	356
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 13:36:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	357
Question About Hindrances and Mental States	357
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 13:26:11	358
A father's perspective	359
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 06:07:42	360
The extent of sense restraint	362
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-31 07:10:41	363
Intense anxiety enduring while contemplating	363
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-30 05:41:31	364
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-31 04:45:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	364
Day in the life of Samanadipa / HH residents	364
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-28 13:47:39 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	365
Thoughts on Unwelcoming Sexuality	365
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-28 13:25:32	366
Questions about internal sense bases and citta.	366
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-27 07:25:06	367
Comfort zone of solitude	367
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-24 19:52:48	368
Clarification regarding Ven. Ñāṇavīra's note on Paṭiccasamuppāda	368
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-28 12:38:15	370
Brahmaviharas from the perspective of a lay person not seeking enlightenment.	370
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-23 06:19:01	370
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-23 15:32:16 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	371
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-24 19:13:54 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	372
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-27 07:11:52 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	372
Homelessness is Nibbana (by Sister Medhini)	373
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-24 11:49:17 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	373
Rebirth	374
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-21 16:37:52	374
'Significance' of mother and father.	375
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-20 05:10:32	375

Whatever has the nature of arising has the nature of ceasing; Freedom from suffering too?	376
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-19 05:34:48	376
Sutta accounts of jhāna while listening to/contemplating teachings	377
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-17 07:00:30	377
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-17 12:21:05 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	378
Two ways of thinking about Jhāna?	378
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 14:38:56	379
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 15:59:41 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	380
What do I have to renounce?	380
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 16:20:02	381
Musings on right intention	381
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 15:23:22	383
“The More You Scratch an Itch..” Further explanation, Please?	383
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 16:21:08	384
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-27 06:52:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	384
What is the appropriate attitude/view to have towards one’s parents?	385
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 13:27:08	386
Signs of the Mind/Practice Check	386
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 16:40:12	386
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 17:49:59 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	387
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 04:31:24 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	387
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 05:09:04 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	387
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 05:36:34 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	388
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 06:32:45 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	388
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 16:48:25 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	389
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-14 04:26:54 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	389
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-14 12:14:28 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	390
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-02 08:33:36 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	390
Isn’t everyone in this community just blindly assuming that free will exists? . .	390
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-10 13:40:56	390
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-10 17:12:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	391

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 06:32:59 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	391
A point about meditation and question about sensuality	392
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-07 15:19:51	392
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-07 15:29:48 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	393
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-07 19:02:15 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	394
Practice for right view	394
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-05 06:17:55	395
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-06 07:04:00 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	395
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-06 11:43:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	395
What is the “you” that chooses what to allow the wild animal to engage with? . .	396
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-04 05:44:37	397
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-05 12:47:34 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	397
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-08 06:49:29 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	398
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 13:15:14 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	398
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-15 05:01:20 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	399
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-31 16:28:57 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	399
Is jhana necessary for enlightenment?	400
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-02 05:15:50	400
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-03 05:03:50 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	401
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-03 05:14:55 (<i>in reply to a comment not included</i>)	402
Getting up early and napping during the day	402
Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-02 05:43:22	403

Ven Anigha Reddit Archive 2025

Do you need a conceptual understanding of paṭiccasamup- pāda for the Right View?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Solip123 2025-12-31 05:20:06

In other words, is it necessary to (in addition to doing gradual training and after one has achieved some degree of yoniso manasikara) study the writings of people like Nanavira/Wettimuny (e.g., who taught it as a timeless structural principle of simultaneity) in order to understand dependent origination on a conceptual level?

What is the official HH stance on this and what do the suttas say about this? I know that (apart from yoniso manasikara) “the words of another” are essential for the Right View. But does this mean simply reading/hearing a sentence like “whatever is of the nature to arise is of the nature to cease” or does it mean an in-depth explanation of DO along the line of Nanavira’s?

In the suttas it seems that they often give only a brief explanation/overview of DO or of each condition or it. While there is obviously no way to know if this is verbatim, it gives one the impression that a deep conceptual understanding of DO is not that important and that a handful of words (merely pointing to what in one’s experience should now be apparent) will suffice if the mind is ‘dry’ enough.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-31 12:16:26

In other words, is it necessary to (in addition to doing gradual training and after one has achieved some degree of yoniso manasikara) study the writings of people like Nanavira/Wettimuny (e.g., who taught it as a timeless structural principle of simultaneity) in order to understand dependent origination on a conceptual level?

No; that is a distraction that many people readily conflate with practice because it’s much easier than going against the grain of defilements (without management) day in and day out, which is what undoes the obstructions for actual insight.

it gives one the impression that a deep conceptual understanding of DO is not that important and that a handful of words (merely pointing to what in one’s

experience should now be apparent) will suffice if the mind is 'dry' enough.
Yes, that's how it works.

Intention and Biology

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** cryptocraft 2025-12-30 20:34:38

Though they are often represented as non-physical, the hinderances can be mapped and understood in the framing of modern biology. Anger and lust are manifested physically, serve some evolutionary purpose, and are programmed into the organism. They can increase or decrease dramatically by modulating hormones. In older men, for example, low testosterone can cause lust to significantly diminish, which is often perceived as a problem.

This contradicted my understanding of the Dhamma, until I read "Unyoked from Biology", which clarified how the existence of unwholesome states, in of themselves, does not indicate progress. Rather, it is one's intentions and reactions towards them that does. This approach does not shy away from the physical component of Buddhist concepts. It is even stated in several talks that experience without reference to the body is inconceivable.

This, however, logically permits many of the concepts to be mapped to materialist notions. For example, there is a therapy for Obsessive Compulsive Disorder called ERP, which encourages one to patiently endure intrusive thoughts and not to either indulge in them or attempt to make them go away. This approach is hypothesized to modulate the neural circuits, with the implication that they operate on a different level than feeling and perception. Thus, one can develop one aspect of the brain that can endure fluctuations in another.

The Buddhist position, however, contradicts this notion. It implies that destroying the physical brain would not destroy the progress one has made in cultivating their intentions. So while changes to intentions may be reflected in changes to the brain, somehow physically reversing those changes, i.e damaging the neural circuits, would not impact one's intentions. This leads me to my question, which is if nothing can be conceived of without reference to the body, where then is this progress taking place such that destruction to the body would not affect it? It seems to imply some non-physical aspect.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-01 08:35:50

It seems to imply some non-physical aspect.

There certainly is:

Take someone whose citta has for a long time been imbued with faith, virtue, learning, generosity, and understanding. Their body is formed, made up of the four principal states, produced by mother and father, built up from rice

and porridge, liable to impermanence, to wearing away and erosion, to breaking up and destruction.

Right here the crows, vultures, hawks, hounds, jackals, and many kinds of little creatures devour it.

But their citta rises up, headed for a higher place. —SN 55.21

On the most primordial level, mind shapes matter. That is why the mental inclinations you develop are what determine the type of body you will be born into (if any). In the same way, in this very life, freeing the mind from passion and developing right understanding will wear away the body's fevers. They are kept alive by the mind's defilements:

“When one abides uninflamed by lust, unfettered, uninfatuated, contemplating danger, then the five aggregates affected by clinging are diminished for oneself in the future; and one's craving—which brings renewal of being, is accompanied by delight and lust, and delights in this or that—is abandoned. One's bodily and mental troubles are abandoned, one's bodily and mental torments are abandoned, one's bodily and mental fevers are abandoned, and one experiences bodily and mental pleasure. —MN 149

This is why practices *aimed* at calming and soothing the body are fundamentally misguided. They can only manage symptoms, while themselves being rooted in the illness of craving. Experientially, not just in theory, that can never be the same type of ease as when bodily symptoms disappear because the illness in the mind is gone.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-02 18:04:43 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Having a mental inclination and choosing to act in line with it are two separate things. Hence both progress and deterioration are always options, and you remain responsible for either.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-02 19:54:55 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

There is no “explanation.” People do whatever they do at the level of deliberate action because they choose to. That's precisely why they *can* simply stop making wrong choices and start practicing towards liberation, and if they themselves don't decide that then liberation will never come.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-03 04:36:28 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If your choices are not explained by something else, then it means they are random - there is no cause to your choices.

It doesn't. It means you will not find a cause of action that's more fundamental than choice. For example, if you decide not to do something unpleasant, you *choose* displeasure as a sufficient reason to not do it. Hence you remain responsible.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-03 13:45:15 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Is there a reason why you choose not to have displeasure as opposed to having it? If there is no reason, then it is random, the fact that you chose one thing over another is a matter of chance.

Choice is more fundamental than reason/logic (all investigation of reason is a choice). Calling it "random" means putting logic first, mistakenly.

Management through thoughts of impermanence?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Accurate_Pineapple89 2025-12-30 05:33:49

Part of my practice is frequently reflecting on impermanence. In particular, I'll refer to SN 22:59 and AN 5:57

Initially, I found these contemplations unpleasant, particularly when thinking about the death of what I hold dear.

I've now begun to find these contemplations pleasant, because they allow the mind to immediately attain an attitude of "not my problem" with whatever arises. This doesn't mean that I'll be careless, just that I won't obsess over what was never truly my burden.

For example, I may be concerned about money. If I reflect on how any loss of wealth is simply a result of never truly owning that wealth or my body in the first place, then the mental concern about wealth greatly subsides.

Another example is that reflecting on the stressful and unwholesome nature of sexuality can temporarily free me from whatever desires are pressuring me, and that freedom is pleasant.

The issue is that this attitude and view is inconstant. I even find myself sometimes obsessively trying to repeat these views as a mantra to get rid of unpleasant bodily feelings.

In a way, any attempt to "think about impermanence" is a way of trying to manage the suffering that has already arisen. I'm still needing to respond to the suffering. However, this kind of response (when done with the right intention) frees me from needing to respond to future pressure.

Should I be trying to simply endure the discomfort of whatever arises, or remove that discomfort by changing the attitude my mind has towards it? I don't see how simply enduring/bearing the pain would free me from it. It makes sense to me that if my mind were to become "established" in this view of impermanence (becomes the default way of

seeing things), then it wouldn't get involved with taking up the pressure, thereby freeing me from suffering.

SN 22:122 is related to this, which states that even an Arahant would reflect on inconstancy, because it brings a pleasant abiding here and now.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-01 08:16:37

I even find myself sometimes obsessively trying to repeat these views as a mantra to get rid of unpleasant bodily feelings.

Yes, that's the "wrong level" of effort that comes from not seeing the signs of the mind. When that's there, pretty much all one does misses the mark no matter how theoretically sound it is (see simile of the cook Sutta).

Should I be trying to simply endure the discomfort of whatever arises, or remove that discomfort by changing the attitude my mind has towards it?

Yes, but first you need to be clear about *what* needs to be "endured." Your description still implies that the pressure that you would endure or not comes from the object. But the pressure pertains to the mind, the experience as a whole, that revolves around the object, and that's what you need to "endure." Not doing so is how you reinforce the ignorance of impermanence that matters (nobody is in doubt that *things in the world* won't last forever; it's the "internal" things, such as their own feelings, that they can't see them as arisen and enduring on their own, and thus not requiring interference).

It makes sense to me that if my mind were to become "established" in this view of impermanence (becomes the default way of seeing things), then it wouldn't get involved with taking up the pressure, thereby freeing me from suffering.

Done with the perspective you're describing, perhaps, but it would be wrong liberation still within the framework of craving and ignorance (SN 45.26). Recognizing impermanence at the universal level, where not even the subtlest activity/intention (*saṅkhāra*) remains excluded from that discernment and given primacy, is the only right escape.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-02 18:09:00 (in reply to a comment not included)

Yes. The dukkha is shifted on to the need to fabricate the impermanence contemplation, so it doesn't even go away. It simply goes under the radar because the recognition of what suffering actually is isn't developed.

Sense restraint prior to virtue.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** need-for-trade 2025-12-28 20:51:38

I recently consumed a talk by Ajahn Nyanamoli Thero published at least a year ago on a sutta wherein a step in the gradual training that is usually formulated prior to virtue was put before it. I believe the step was sense restraint.

If I recall correctly it is in Samyutta Nikaya and expounded by a nun to a layman.

I'm kindly requesting somebody to post the talk or sutta.

Edit:

SN 46.6 was the sutta I was looking for.

The talk is thus: No restraint, No Satipatthana, posted 6 months ago.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-29 06:49:13

expounded by a nun to a layman.

The only Sutta I recall fitting that description is MN 44, and it's not about the Gradual Training.

Two Suttas that do present good conduct in the three doors (not *precepts* as in MN 107 and others) as the result of sense restraint are SN 46.6 and AN 10.62.

A few questions about the Six Sets of Six - MN 148

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-12-27 01:59:09

<https://suttacentral.net/mn148/en/bodhi?lang=en&reference=none&highlight=false>

1. *What does it mean to discern the “rise and fall”?*

The sutta isn't talking about modern noting vipassana. So what is the correct discernment of “rise and fall”? Would noticing that the faculty of sight is dependent on the body as a basis and the body is born and decays count as “rise and fall”? I feel like the “rise and fall of the eye” is even more fundamental than “it relies on a body”. In a way, the eye depends on sights, because if there are no sights, there would be no knowledge of the eye. Following this, the *knowledge* of the eye also depends on eye-consciousness.

If anyone says, ‘The eye is self,’ that is not tenable. **The rise and fall of the eye are discerned**, and since its rise and fall are discerned, it would follow: ‘My self rises and falls.’ That is why it is not tenable for anyone to say, ‘The eye is self.’ Thus the eye is not self.

‘Cakkhu attā’ti yo vadeyya taṃ na upapajjati. Cakkhussa uppādopi vayopi paññāyati. Yassa kho pana uppādopi vayopi paññāyati, ‘attā me uppajjati ca veti cā’ti iccassa evamāgataṃ hoti. Tasmā taṃ na upapajjati: ‘cakkhu attā’ti yo vadeyya. Iti cakkhu anattā.

2. *Can the eye, sights, eye-consciousness and contact all be perceived independently?*

Or can we only perceive contact but the internal sense base, external sense base, and sense consciousness are inferred from contact?

3. *What is “the origination, the disappearance, the gratification, the danger, and the escape” in regards to neutral feeling?*

When one is touched by a neither-painful-nor-pleasant feeling, if one does not understand as it actually is **the origination, the disappearance, the gratification, the danger, and the escape** in regard to that feeling, then the underlying tendency to ignorance lies within one

Adukkhamasukhāya vedanāya phutṭho samāno tassā vedanāya samudayañca atthaṅgamañca assādañca ādinavañca nissaraṇaṇca yathābhūtaṃ nappa-jānāti. Tassa avijjānusayo anuseti.

My attempt:

- Origination = Neutral feeling originates dependent on contact. (This doesn't seem to go deep enough)
- Disappearance = Feelings are inherently impermanent so the neutral feeling will eventually change. Also, if the contact that is the source of the neutral feeling changes, then the feeling based on it would also change (or could stay neutral).
- Gratification = The neutral feeling isn't unpleasant feeling and isn't pleasant feeling. It's certainly more pleasant than unpleasant (painful) feeling.
- Danger = The neutral feeling is impermanent so relying on the neutral feeling for satisfaction is unreliable.
- Escape = Developing dispassion towards neutral feeling, and all feeling in general. When no feeling is valued more than another feeling, it doesn't matter.

EDIT: Adding formatting to make it easier to read. Adding related suttas

Also, here are some related suttas, SN 35.92, SN 35.93, SN 12.19.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-29 07:11:53

1. What does it mean to discern the “rise and fall”?

As we discussed in a previous post, whenever the Suttas encourage understanding something, it's because it's directly connected with suffering, and truly understanding that description will free you from it.

So, indeed, the eye that matters in the context of suffering—the vision infected with craving and defilements that is destroyed for an Arahant—is not always there to the same degree even for a puthujjana. It rises and falls. If the biological eye was being referred to, then rise and fall could never be understood experientially without removing your eyes and putting them back in (closing your eyes does not eliminate the visual field).

Can the eye, sights, eye-consciousness and contact all be perceived independently?

They can be discerned as aspects of one thing (where suffering is involved), and never as fully separate (similar to what MN 43 points out).

3. What is “the origination, the disappearance, the gratification, the danger, and the escape” in regards to neutral feeling?

There is nothing missing from your explanations in terms of their content. The only problem with them is that you’re still not free from suffering, which means what those terms refer to is not sufficiently clear despite a relationship between them being properly defined as per the Suttas.

The only thing that will uncover feeling, its origin, etc., for what it is, “in the flesh” instead of through your assumptions about it, is the Gradual Training. Hence the Dhamma is “beyond the reach of thinking” (*atakkāvacara*).

Modern Psychiatric Diagnoses: What They Actually Mean

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Double-Ad2563 2025-12-26 00:52:33

How would a noble disciple view modern-day psychological labels like narcissism, psychopathy, and sociopathy in light of the Dhamma?

<https://youtu.be/6dv8zJiggBs?si=MfC5Vi24rnReL8KO>

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-29 06:52:46

Those are symptoms of the underlying illness having proliferated quite far. Progress in curing it would entail their disappearance (without management and replacements involved).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2026-01-01 14:59:30 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Does existence itself also count as an illness?

Yes, that’s the “underlying illness” I was referring to.

The Myth of Meditation Techniques (New Essay)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-12-24 08:33:02

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 17:29:01 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

A lot of teacher use the simile that samatha/samadhi is to sharpen a knife, and vipassana/pañña is to use the knife, until it gets dull, then, rinse and repeat. It

seems as unsatisfactory as it sounds. However, I've never seen addressed by HH this framing of the wrong instructions techniques. It seems obvious that at some level, for some people, such instructions work at producing insights.

We don't deny that those insights arise. We deny that they play any role in the path or imply any progress in it (I mention why in the essay).

This concept of "sharpening" the mind implies a wrong view of what understanding is from the outset. It's based on the (quite prevalent) idea that there is some "too quick/minute to be noticed with the naked eye" kind of reality that only becomes apparent with a focused mind. That's not how the Buddha described *samādhi* nor its usefulness. He described *samādhi* as a mind fully withdrawn from unwholesome states and pliable (free from stubbornness and obsessions), and the clear seeing that arises from that pertains simply to the four noble truths (what suffering is and its escape). The fact that a lot of people who've gotten insights from "sharpening" their mind have returned to sensuality (or never left it to begin with) shows that their understanding of the 4NT did not advance much, to put it mildly.

Not matter what, if i were to think about spending one hour watching my breath, my citta will lean away, will recoil, and will came up with any excuse to not to do that. Thus... in light of Bhante advice, i should go and watch my nostrils. Why not?

It will also come up with excuses to not go and steal something that might land you in jail. Does that mean yo should do it just because your citta resists it?

Not going along with what the mind is pulling you to do is one hting, forcing it to do random things that it doesn't want to do is another. Conflating the two is how you go down the rabbit hole of self-mortification.

- (c) the attentional drills may be a way to create a simple entry level battlefield simulation in which craving against the present experience inevitable arises and one must not act out of such pressure; unrelieved tension is what trains the mind to lose its compulsions altogether.

Not quite, because the objective of the "attentional drills" is to suppress the movements of the mind without any discernment of which of those are actually a problem. The mere act of focusing on something obscures the clarity of your intentions, and that results in inevitably in falling into either indulgence (in pleasant sensations and the like) or a blind, pre-determined denial (which is how what you're describing sounds like).

if (c), even if there's no insight, no calm, no other goal whatsoever, how is making the animal doing something as stupid and simple as staying with the breath, not a way of taming the animal?

Taming the animal is not the same as enforcing arbitrary boundaries around it (as the Jains were often criticized for). Just like with taming a real animal, some boundaries are essential; others are a waste that distracts from fully establishing the essential ones.

I followed HH instructions gathered here and there, and can present them as “try to discern what eye-rupa is in your experience, still all sankharas, gross as moving, and subtler as me-making, do not grasp at signs and features, and let perceptions to fade away on their own with the attitude ‘they are not for me’”. This sound to me right HH instructions.

The presentation of the instruction is itself part of the instruction. Presenting it in such a way is extremely likely to mislead people into a new “technique,” which is why we never do that. Part of our instruction is also that there is a certain order of the training, and all the terminology in that description aims far higher than the level most people’s training is at.

I did not try to eliminate thoughts. In the foreground of my field vision was my arm, in the background a table. The knowledge of the scene, i.e.: this shape is my arm, did not fade away, but the visual perception of this is my arm, this is a table, was not there. What was left were the perceptions of there’s this light shape, this dark shape, and this frontier between shapes ...

That sounds like what we would describe as a “mystical experience,” and it’s not samādhi. Samādhi is when your mind for a period of time becomes incapable of wanting sense pleasures or getting angry—even when sensual or irritating things come up—out of pure dispassion and clarity of the danger that you diligently cultivated beforehand.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 18:01:54 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

He instructs one to keep one’s awareness open, so it’s not strictly speaking a focusing or absorption practice. He uses the term peripheral awareness as well, though it is underdeveloped. It is meant to keep the meditator from falling into dullness and stupor during meditation and to keep watch of the mind as it tries to divert one from the breath which is used as an anchor for attention because of the undealt with underlying tendencies towards the hindrances.

I’m personally familiar with TMI. And I’m afraid it only serves to illustrate one of the things we *don’t* mean with “peripheral awareness; abandoning hindrances; patiently enduring pressure.”

The perversion I see is that one is overlooking the intention for picking up this practice, confusing it with the right practice (effectively putting it under the fetter of silabbata-paramasa).

True, but your phrasing seems to imply that it could be otherwise. Picking up this practice *is* overlooking the intention (the state of the mind). They are mutually exclusive. The mind might not get wildly out of control, but it certainly remains covered up during that practice.

I decided to just sit and anchor attention on the breath while keeping that peripheral awareness and vigilance, and was pleasantly surprised to find my-

self comfortably in stages 6/7 which from investigating their subreddit I found many people take years to reach. Evidently it translates very well.

That's actually not a good thing. Being *able* to enter such states still implies you can lose your clarity and awareness (the relevant one, the one that the technique actively tries to suppress and whose loss leads to "peace"). That *is* a big problem. Lust or aversion may have faded temporarily, but delusion certainly remains strong. And that's why it's still a polluted state of mind even if it doesn't feel "wild."

I found two cases of users reporting at these stages these qualities don't subside even after weeks with no on-the-cushion practice.

Sure. It's not that it would necessarily take hours or even days for the mind to return to its baseline state. It could take longer. The point is that the mind doesn't go towards sensuality and ill will not because its dispassionate, but because it's still delighted by this other thing that remains on the same level. That's not samādhi at all, not even the samādhi without right view that a puthujjana can develop based on thorough renunciation.

Could it thus have some value, just like regular physical exercise, as "just something one does" for its practical purposes, if one keeps all that in mind, and remains vigilant in regards to discerning and dropping unwholesome intentions that could be behind it as the extent of the wholesome and unwholesome become gradually clearer?

It's not like regular physical exercise, because it reinforces a wrong view of what tranquility is and sustains unawareness of the contexts that matter, which physical exercise does not. So not giving it up means failing to abandon the most fundamental unwholesome from which the rest is born (delusion and wrong view).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-26 06:29:22 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I'm aware of this attempted rebuttal. This post does happen to be a good place to respond to it.

And that Graduated Discourse, the very last part of it, contains teachings on impermanence, contains teachings on the Four Noble Truths, which are part of the Dhammas portion essentially of the Satipatthanas.

That's standard, and he gives that talk many different times. So he does teach the Satipatthanas to laypeople.

This is just bending definitions. Hearing a teaching on the 4NT from the Buddha is not "sit down and meditate."

There's another Sutta in which Anathapindika shows up with 500 laypeople and the Buddha says, "You shouldn't just give dana. You should also basically abide in those attainments essentially that are peaceful, that are pleasant." Talking about the Jhanas.

AN 5.179 is about “pleasant abidings” for laypeople explicitly with right view (it centers around the four factors of stream entry), and it quite conspicuously omits the jhānas. So AN 5.176, if it were in fact directed at a broader audience, could not be referring to an even higher practice. But we can see that it *isn’t* directed at a broader audience because it clearly mentions “ariyasāvaka.”

There’s another Sutta, the most explicit one, with a layman named Pessa who says, “We laypeople practice the Satipatthanas.” He explicitly says it. Satipatthanas are inclusive of breath meditation; inclusive of all the types of meditation that the Buddha recommends.

Counterpoint, counter question there is: **“Well, don’t you think that he was already really advanced? And that he’s only referring to advanced laypeople here?”**

There’s nothing in the Sutta to indicate that.

There certainly is. The Buddha describes him as “wise and of great understanding” (*paññito mahāpañño*) as soon as he leaves.

If he was specifically referring to laypeople who had already done a lot of renunciation, he would have used this more specific phrase. Or more accurately, the monks who compiled the Canon and standardized it at the First Council would have put that phrase rather than this other one.

There would not have been a need for that if there wasn’t a prevalent misinterpretation of satipaṭṭhāna is that turns it into an extraneous practice compatible with wrong intention (intention to pursue sensuality).

The argument is: **“Well, look here, when they’re talking about the Satipatthanas, they’re saying ‘unattached to anything in the world.’ That’s obviously a really advanced state. Do you think that’s an accurate interpretation?”**

My answer would be no. Because in that formula, the Buddha uses the word “OR.” What we see in the Satipatthana Sutta is this gradation of development. You can practice them at a level that’s more coarse and it becomes progressively more refined.

This is a very basic misreading of the text. The abridged version of the satipaṭṭhāna formula that simply mentions “contemplating the body within the body” has *vineyya loke abhiññādomanassaṃ* as well every time it occurs in the canon.

In the part of the video following this point, the view that satipaṭṭhāna is about “focusing” is taken for granted without any justification.

The argument that is put forth is: **“Look, there’s this gradual training. You shouldn’t practice meditation until you’ve done all these other things.”**

Our point is actually that the “meditation” Bhante Joe is referring to is not to be practiced at any point. Whereas the actual satipaṭṭhāna practice *could not* (not just “shouldn’t”) be

practiced before before full establishment in virtue even if one tried, because one's mind will still be fully infected with longing and aversion in regard to the world no matter how "calm" it gets. It will be like a corrupt politician campaigning against corruption.

For one, when monks ordain, they're taught meditation as part of the ordination ceremony. Monks have to recite: *Kesā, lomā, nakhā, dantā, taco*. That is an *asubha kammattana*. That's part of the Satipatthanas.

This is a tradition of commentarial origin and is nowhere to be found in the Suttas or Vinaya.

Another one is that there is a Sutta called the Undakavinda Sutta which is directed to new monks. In that Sutta, the Buddha advises Ananda that he should rouse and encourage monks in being restrained in virtue, in the Patimokkha. That he should encourage them to speak little. That he should encourage them to be restrained in their senses. That he should encourage them to resort to seclusion. And that he should encourage them to have right view.

Actually, one could easily argue that the same order of development is still implicit in the Sutta. The five things are not listed in obvious equivalence as in places like AN 5.1. Furthermore, it stands out that even genuine satipaṭṭhāna is not mentioned.

Monks have 227 rules and thousands of other ones. In these Gradual Trainings, the Buddha recommends becoming consummate in virtue as one of the first things. So, what does that mean for a monk? Should you be totally fluent in every aspect of the rules? Should he not restrain himself when he sees a pretty woman? Should he not practice restraint of the senses until he's fully mastered virtue?

This illustrates quite well the difference between the attitude most monks have towards the Patimokkha versus the development in virtue we (and the Suttas) instruct.

Firstly, the very first stage of the gradual training mentions "being endowed with proper behavior and a suitable environment." So, a monk, new or experienced, preferably wouldn't be going out on the street to begin with. And if he's aware of the context behind the rules he has undertaken instead of following them as mechanical/superstitious commandments as is often done, he would certainly realize that he should not look at a pretty woman. The point about eating would also be covered by "proper behavior," and there are rules in the Pātimokkha covering such things as well.

Further to that, it's assumed in the Vinaya that monks will break the rules of the Vinaya from time to time. That's why the Vinaya is there. So they lay out ways in which you can correct yourself after you've broken a rule. There's the Parajikas; if you break those, you're out of the monastic order. There's Sanghadisesas; those are really heavy rules. And each of them have a way that you can correct it.

Yes, and AN 3.87 points out that to become a sotāpanna, one must be constant and steadfast in the rules that are essential to the renunciate life—the main distinctions between the

lay and monastic lifestyle, such as celibacy—and that breaking minor rules is not an obstruction (it doesn't constitute failure in the first step of the training). Those minor rules did not exist in the beginning, whereas the essential ones are implicit in the Dhamma.

Another problem with that is: how do you know when you've mastered virtue enough to move to the next step? How do you know when you've mastered sense restraint? In order to move on to devotion to wakefulness and practicing meditation all day and night essentially—that's another point, is this devotion to wakefulness includes practicing meditation.

The confusion arises because these practices are seen even by monks as mere modifications of outward behavior rather than as a deliberate internal training of the mind. When they are taken as the latter, you very much know when you have fulfilled each stage: when your *mind* no longer pulls towards breaches on that level, so you don't even need to be on guard to prevent them.

The Buddha was a very skilled teacher. If this were really a categorical teaching, it would significantly impact the way that people were trained. And so you would expect to see more teachings from him on how to determine when you should go to the next step. We don't see any of that.

There are quite explicit teachings with very illustrative similes, such as AN 3.101. MN 107 (and its Chinese parallel I quote in the essay) itself contains a simile about a staircase which could not make the sequential nature more explicit.

So, I basically saw that if I wanted to continue getting the benefits from meditation, then I couldn't be developing this attitude of harming, developing this attitude of wanting to punch people or beat them up.

There's an intimate connection between the practice of meditation and virtue. And both of them feed back into one another. If you are virtuous, then it feeds into your meditation. If you meditate, that can feed into your efforts to develop your virtue better.

So, it's not an escape. You can't think that you're going to murder people and then go on a meditation retreat and just escape. Your meditation is not really going to go well.

This is based on a wrong yet very common premise from the start: that the practice of virtue is just about avoiding *immorality*. Yes, immorality certainly obstructs not just modern meditation, but a bearable existence in general, including things like sleep. That obviously doesn't make sleep part of the noble eightfold path.

Virtue includes abandoning sensuality as well. The entire noble eightfold path rests on not having intentions towards sensuality. Unlike what the Suttas do teach, that is by no means essential for success in modern meditation.

The Buddha gives this phrase frequently and again does not limit that phrase to people who are Sotapannas or close to it or higher. That phrase is *Jayatha*

bhikkhave, which means “Meditate, bhikkhus.” Don’t be negligent. Don’t regret it later. This is our advice to you.

Well, he certainly limited it to bhikkhus, who by default were practicing virtue.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-30 06:53:44 (in reply to a comment not included)

Discussion on sutta central forum: <https://discourse.suttacentral.net/t/the-myth-of-meditation-techniques-by-bhikkhu-anigha/41932/15>

As usual, commenters on that forum seem to lack any genuine interest in engaging with our points, so they rush to rebut them without first understanding them. They overlook even points explicitly made in the essay (e.g., that there being modern practices with the same *names* as those in the Suttas does not mean they are authentic).

This comment is interesting:

It’s based on a disregard for context.

- Citta and Sirivaḍḍha were both declared anāgāmis, so they *were* renunciates.
- Dasama in MN 52 is not being *taught* “meditation” for his personal practice; his question explicitly mentions *a bhikkhu*. That suggests that even if he aspired to, he wasn’t under the assumption that he could’ve followed any of those paths without himself following the same standard of conduct.
- AN 9.41 actually proves our point: a householder who partakes in sensuality will experience the direction of actual “meditation” like an abyss (which is why any meditation, any right effort, mindfulness or samādhi he would do without abandoning his wrong sensual intentions first could only ever be a futile attempted bypass).
- AN 5.179 also supports the same point: even *noble* lay disciples will not be able to access the “pleasant abidings” of renunciates (the jhānas) unless they first renounce sensuality completely. That’s why the Buddha extensively spoke of the peril of sensuality to Mahānāma, a noble disciple who wanted to make further progress, in MN 14. The “meditation” he taught him was contemplating the peril of what he was still entangled with so that he would finally give it up, attain the jhānas with his right view, and never again return to sensuality. Failing that, recollecting the four factors of stream entry is the most he could do. And of course, even that lower practice would not be available for a puthujjana.

The Suttas could not be clearer about the fact that satipaṭṭhānas and similar practices are a refinement of the withdrawal in one’s conduct (AN 3.101). There is nothing to refine, only various diversions such as the modern techniques, for someone who has not established that first step of purification.

What is animitta samadhi and how can it be developed?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Solip123 2025-12-24 05:43:11

It's mentioned in SN 22.80 as an alternative to the four foundations of mindfulness for removing the hindrances.

The suttas - for example, in SN 47.9 - also say that the Buddha entered this state sometimes near the end of his life.

Furthermore, in MN 121 one who dwells in animitta samadhi and recognizes the impermanence of it is said to attain liberation.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-24 17:58:35

It's the absence of passion, aversion, and delusion, and it's one among the many directions that the mind made pliable and workable by the same development of the Gradual Training can be inclined towards.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 10:24:07 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Cetovimutti and *samādhī* are synonyms.

Is it possibly an extension of *yoniso manasikara*?

Certainly. And that entails unbroken precepts, celibacy, sense restraint, and cleansing the mind of any lust and aversion day and night. That is literally how you would get the mind to stop grasping at *nimittas*, and *animitta samādhī* is just one of the outcomes that same trajectory can culminate in.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-25 10:31:50 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The same idea is occurs in many Suttas; this is one instance that explicitly mentions the prerequisites.

Looking for clarification on faith and dhamma followers

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-12-23 22:49:53

I've been reading Ven. Anigha's old reddit posts (https://github.com/f0lie/reddit-ven-anigha-archive/tree/main/pdf_files) and there's something I'm confused about. The faith and dhamma followers have been discussed in the beginning of the 2023 posts.

Here's what we know about faith followers and dhamma followers.

- They have all 10 fetters
- They don't know they are ariyas
- They don't experience the second arrow - <https://suttacentral.net/sn36.6/en/bodhi?lang=en&refer>

As I understand it, the main difference between a faith or dhamma follower and a stream winner is that while the follower believes the correct things, the stream winner has gone beyond belief and directly knows. There are also suttas that point out that a stream winner has almost completely eliminated suffering (7 pebbles remaining vs. what was formerly a mountain).

My confusion is, if faith and dhamma followers are incapable of experiencing the second arrow, how do they not know they are ariyas? Wouldn't it be extremely obvious?

Second, if faith and dhamma followers have removed the second arrow, how much of a difference in suffering is there between them and a sotapanna?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-26 15:55:09

As I understand it, the main difference between a faith or dhamma follower and a stream winner is that while the follower believes the correct things, the stream winner has gone beyond belief and directly knows.

No, that's a common misinterpretation that (conveniently) turns almost every Buddhist into a faith- or Dhamma-follower.

A puthujjana can and often will "believe the correct things," yet still not be anywhere on the path to Arahantship. By contrast, the faith and Dhamma-followers have "transcended the plane of puthujjanas" and are irreversibly on the path to Arahantship. That's why the *noble* Saṅgha formula mentions eight types of individuals rather than 7 (the eighth including both types).

To be *irreversibly* on the path to enlightenment, you can't just "believe." As everyone knows from experience, beliefs can change quite easily.

My confusion is, if faith and dhamma followers are incapable of experiencing the second arrow, how do they not know they are ariyas? Wouldn't it be extremely obvious?

It sounds like you're picturing it as a sudden transformation that would stand out, but the simile of the adze handle makes it clear that the wearing away of the fetters doesn't work like that. You recognize afterwards that you've passed the threshold without ever being able to know exactly when you passed it, because you under no circumstances can objectively examine your own understanding like an outside observer. Every such attempt is squarely guided by your current understanding.

The *recognition* of achievement ("knowing that you know") is what the fruit of stream entry is, and that recognition is what stands out as a milestone. It's the same as when many Suttas describe a monk not just having a liberated mind after completing the Gradual Training, but *knowing* that his mind is liberated.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-27 05:18:01 (in reply to a comment not included)

When I said “believe the correct things”, I meant understand the teachings well enough so it’s possible for them to believe them. Many people could miss the mark with a belief like, “Oh yes I believe in impermanence because electrons are constantly moving so everything changes”.

Right, but even then, becoming a noble one would then be as easy as shedding modern misinterpretations of the Dhamma, no actual internal transformation required.

I was basing that on SN 25. Bhikkhu Bodhi’s translation:

The misconception is actually embedded in the translation itself: the Pali *ime dhamme* becomes “these teachings,” which makes it sound like you place faith or “believe” in *the words of another*. In which case things would be a lot easier than the Buddha stated elsewhere.

What a faith follower is confident in (a more accurate translation of *saddhā*) is the impermanence of the phenomena that he sees in his own experience. Though it’s not full knowledge, it’s a confidence that corresponds to the way things are on the most fundamental level, and that’s why it’s irreversible. Any other way of viewing things is more particular and as a result redundant, and thus they cannot adopt it no matter what happens for the rest of their life.

An ordinary person does not even recognize the eye, ear ... for what they are, so confidence that what they think the eye is is impermanent will not cut it. For them, that’s just one view on the same level as many others, and many things could get them to abandon it.

Are you saying all three of them know, but only the stream winners know they know (have recognized the attainment)?

Yes. And recognizing the attainment is what fully destroys the fetters (without that, some doubt obviously remains, for example).

Does this mean that if a putthujana is practicing correctly (or reasonably correctly), they are weakening the 2nd arrow? Eventually, when they reach faith- or Dhamma-follower, the second arrow is completely gone? And since it was a gradual weakening of the second arrow, that’s why the -followers don’t recognize themselves as -followers?

Yes, you could put it that way. And practicing correctly means progressing in the Gradual Training, of course. Taming your mind through the right restrictions so that it becomes incapable of seeing action, be it internal management or external indulgence, as a valid escape from suffering. That, not intellectualization, is what destroys the view of self as well, i.e. the view of a privileged agent that can prevent *dukkha* by choosing things.

Intentionality and External Circumstances

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** gradual_training 2025-12-17 04:09:07

Recently I was conversating with my brother and a topic that came up was the ethicality of harming someone else in the case of defending another person. I said that in no scenario is it justified for someone to enact physical harm on somebody since the mind-state behind such action has to be rooted in ill-will and passion, thus, from the perspective of one trying to practice the dhamma, retaliating with physical violence should be avoided.

My brother responded by saying that in such a scenario one's intention is to protect, thus one could potentially not be acting out of ill will, but out of the former intention. I then said that the intention of ill will is implicit when one decides to engage in physical violence regardless of the circumstances, thus that intention supersedes any other "valid" justifications one might have.

Now, my question is whether my understanding is correct; in that an act of violence can never be rooted in anything else but ill will and passion? Or can one have passion, but not ill will if they are doing such action to protect someone (which I infer to be no)?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-21 18:11:32

Now, my question is whether my understanding is correct; in that an act of violence can never be rooted in anything else but ill will and passion?

If you mean the use of physical force, no. It's not necessarily rooted in either.

What makes anything you do unwholesome is the perversion that happens when you're passionate about someone (including yourself) and out of that bias lose all concern for the welfare of a being that's attacking them. Such biases are what Arahants are incapable of, and the mere use of physical force doesn't necessarily imply them (in the same as forceful speech doesn't necessarily imply ill will). An attempt at killing absolutely does.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-24 04:52:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

but in what cases could one use physical force without their being ill-will.

There are no fixed cases where something would automatically not involve ill will because ill will is in the mind, not the action.

Could their be a deer hunter who hunts deer out of sport/food while somehow not having ill-will?

They may not necessarily *hate* deer, but they would be hunting out of one of the three defilements. Killing is impossible without them.

Furthermore, if lets say one decides to restrain someone non-lethally using self-defense, while still causing a degree of harm. In such situation, could one

engage in any form of self-defense (excluding evading/running away) while not somehow not wishing harm on the recipient.

You can't start with what you will do and *then* ensure the mind remains unpolluted. You start from "I will never act out of ill will," and then if one day restraining someone in a certain way isn't underlain by ill will in your mind at the time, then you could do it. Whether you end up accidentally harming them or not will be irrelevant because there would be no ill will from the start.

store up pleasures for the sake of enjoyment like he did before when living at home.'

It means storing up things like food, drink, and possessions in general with sensual enjoyment as the purpose.

What should be regarded as being within one's control?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** bodhiya 2025-12-16 21:26:01

These are my present understandings/assumptions, if there are mistakes, please let me know.

1. There is a presently enduring feeling which is beyond the domain of one's control.
2. By either seeking to increase or decrease this feeling, suffering arises.
3. One should instead patiently endure the presently arisen feeling.
4. Maintaining this context, the citta will begin to become tamed as its inability to move the mind is developed.

Assuming this is correct so far, I am still unclear on certain implications of this view. Take for example a situation where someone accidentally says something foolish in front of a group of people. A feeling of embarrassment arises, and it is immediately followed by a seemingly automatic reaction of physically tensing the body, i.e "cringing", and the thought "that was foolish of me." All of this occurs before the person has any sense of having a choice in how to respond, i.e with patient endurance.

How should these habitual reactions be regarded? Are they considered to be in the domain of control, but only appear otherwise because one's mindfulness is not sufficiently developed? Would this imply that the instructions in MN 2 should apply to them, i.e that they should be cut off immediately?

Conversely, should they be considered beyond the domain of control, and thus simply be patiently endured as well, just as the initial enduring feeling of embarrassment was. Is there a distinction between feeling and suffering, and does obtaining the right view involve clarifying that distinction? If so, in the above example would the initial embarrassment be the feeling, and the automatic reaction be the suffering?

I hope this is clear, and I appreciate any response.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-19 05:04:48

Conversely, should they be considered beyond the domain of control, and thus simply be patiently endured as well, just as the initial enduring feeling of embarrassment was.

They should be considered beyond control for practical purposes. That doesn't mean they will never cease, however.

These subtle "reactions" are not dealt with by catching sudden impulses fast enough or anything resembling that, but when the mind has been trained to not resist discomfort or lean towards the promise of pleasure in their nature, regardless of specifics. That's what the gradual training develops.

In that situation, if someone is already well established in the precepts then they should practice enduring the discomfort of embarrassment, without giving in to actions of resistance to it (including mental ones). That would be sense restraint.

Clearing dust while knowingly standing in a dust storm?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** thereof_be_silent 2025-12-16 19:28:30

Apologies for the somewhat rambling post—the upshot is at the end. Any advice would be appreciated, especially by u/Bhikkhu_Anigha and Ayye Medhini.

I am currently in a long-term relationship that I am not ending due to attachment to my girlfriend, though the relationship is guaranteed to end in under 1 year owing to our life circumstances. It may even end in the next 6 months. I've also told my girlfriend about my intention to go forth soon after graduating university, and though she strongly opposes the idea, she accepts that this is the path I want to follow.

All this is to say that I am not keeping complete celibacy for the foreseeable future despite my intellectual view that it is fundamentally opposed to the path. But I would still like to keep the 5 precepts, i.e. not add fuel to the fire **beyond** my relationship.

Some questions are:

1. What falls under "sexual misconduct" in a non-marital relationship? Beyond obvious answers like cheating, seeing prostitutes, etc. For instance, does sexting violate the precept?
2. Does my refraining from masturbation and porn make my incelibacy "less bad"? Obviously there is a binary in that sexual activity cannot be done without unwholesome intention and so will always be obstructive, but it appears to me that there is a practical spectrum of obstructiveness: having sex once a week is "worse" than once a month; engaging in both masturbation and sex is "worse" than just sex, etc. Assuming one intellectually accepts the Dhamma.
3. Is it possible that in the time between my sexual activity, I am somewhat seeing the mind? Can the dust in my eyes start to clear even a little?

Question 3 comes from my attempt to reflect on the inevitability of aging, sickness, death, being parted with the things I hold dear, and my reflections on the peril of sensuality. I notice that in the time in between my sexual activity, reflecting on these things makes me fearful / averse / not incline towards sex and sensuality in general (I don't want to say "dispassionate" because I suspect it is not true dispassion).

My intentions and moods also seem to become clearer. Finally, I seem "less" emotionally dependent on the sensual things I know I am dependent on, in the sense that I feel less pressure to act on my desires for them (especially sex, though I give in anyway).

This alleged increase in clarity is what confuses me. A situation that would strongly pressure me before seems to now only moderately pressure me. But how can that be if I am not celibate and thus not fulfilling even the first step of the gradual training? I don't want to overestimate myself.

I do not have Right View, yet it feels like I am "closer" to it than before since I appear to be starting to relate to my experience differently—this concerns me.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-18 06:25:34

1. What falls under "sexual misconduct" in a non-marital relationship? Beyond obvious answers like cheating, seeing prostitutes, etc. For instance, does sexting violate the precept?

The precept is not only about sexual but *sensual* misconduct (*kāmesu micchācāra*). So it's not about external criteria of what's "allowable," but about the state of your mind. Anything that's based on feverish desire—an itch that will not tolerate any alternative forms of scratching, that disregards harmful consequences of scratching in that way—falls within the precept because it takes your mind in the direction of an animal, even when entirely unrelated to sexuality. Infidelity is only the most obvious example of that.

Does my refraining from masturbation and porn make my incelibacy "less bad"? Obviously there is a binary in that sexual activity cannot be done without unwholesome intention and so will always be obstructive, but it appears to me that there is a practical spectrum of obstructiveness: having sex once a week is "worse" than once a month; engaging in both masturbation and sex is "worse" than just sex, etc. Assuming one intellectually accepts the Dhamma.

Of course. Less is always better in this case.

Is it possible that in the time between my sexual activity, I am somewhat seeing the mind? Can the dust in my eyes start to clear even a little?

Only to the degree that you internally abandon (cultivate dispassion for) the *prospect* of sexual activity entirely, not merely postpone it. This is how laypeople in the Suttas were able to see the mind and gain Right View even within a short period of celibacy: during that time, they fully turned away from any possibility of engagement, however distant.

For such withdrawal to occur, you can't be treating celibacy as a temporary from the outset (which is what everyone does by default). The attitude has to be one of complete abandonment with no prospect of return, because it is the underlying *delight* in sensuality—not merely its enactment—that obstructs understanding. Actual engagement only reinforces the pollution that's always there.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-18 16:42:20 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Thus, one could violate the precept by engaging in a sexual act that externally is considered normal—like consensual intercourse with one's partner for pleasure—but is rooted in an “animalistic” mental state.

Yes. And not just sexuality. Anything sensual, including even things like food, desire for wealth/possessions, etc.

My experiences of “turning away” seem along this direction. That certain sensual situations exert less “pressure” further confuses me.

Who knows, it could be the right direction by the sound of it. But no matter how accurate or inaccurate the attitude of “turning away” is, the fact remains that *intending* to return to sensuality, not just physically doing so, already sets you back on square one. It automatically reaffirms the view that craving is not suffering, that the aggregates belong to you and are not impermanent, etc. So it won't be possible to take the withdrawal and the understanding to the necessary extent for as long as the intention to return is there.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-20 13:20:24 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The other 4 seem unambiguous (you know whether you have killed, stolen, lied or taking intoxicants), but the third seems so vague.

All precepts are about intention. Those other actions are just not intrinsic to most people's lives so they can easily avoid them without much thought, whereas sensuality is fundamental to everyone's existence so the entry points for it are endless.

And yes, you could summarize *kāmesu micchācārā* as “moderation,” but moderation in regard to your intention, not as if certain sensual acts are inherently “moderate.”

Essentially, when there's a desire that's so intense that it makes you blind to inconveniences, short- or long-term risks, and alternatives, don't act out of it. That kind of desire mirrors that of an animal. Adultery obviously falls within that, but the principle extends to any sensual object.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-21 07:49:39 (in reply to a comment not included)

Yes, that's a specific example. If we follow the logic that only what is explicitly stated counts, then digitally stealing money from a bank account or taking what someone gives you while they're confused are not stealing.

“Uncovering the choices that you make” questions

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** keeppcalmknowchange 2025-12-16 15:52:28

Hello friends,

In the most recent video, the implication seems to be that meditative techniques are not beneficial for someone who's still struggling with sense restraint. One should practice being aware of the volitional impulses towards craving, aversion, and delusion, and make effort to stop the actions that feed into those. This kind of daily practice should supersede any attempts at formal meditation.

However, one could say that practicing satipatthāna actually improves the ability to exercise sense restraint. Becoming aware of the body and contemplating its impermanence develops dispassion. Awareness of pleasant, painful, and neutral feelings helps illuminate the link of dependent origination between feeling and craving. Awareness of mind uncovers the underlying mental condition, whether it's of craving, aversion, delusion, or of concentration and insight. All of these help illuminate the impermanence, unsatisfactoriness, and emptiness of the five aggregates.

Once one develops greater mindfulness in meditation, it naturally supports the process of sense restraint and virtue in daily life. Greater perception of the body, its vulgarity, all of the pain it causes, and its impermanence, helps one become dispassionate towards momentary sensual craving that arises. Perception of feelings as a result of contact with sense objects helps detach one from conditioned impulses towards craving, aversion, and delusion, and gives one autonomy to choose how to react to sense impressions. Perception of mind and its condition gives one the space to bring about causes that will focus the mind towards liberation, rather than feeding any hindrance that arises. These all help orient one towards a life of dhamma, recognizing the three qualities in all experience, enabling non-clinging to arise.

TLDR: mindfulness meditation improves virtue and sense restraint, rather than detracting from them.

What am I missing here?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-17 19:12:14

The practices that you're describing are not satipaṭṭhāna *because* they are management of impulses instead of purifying them at their root. Even though they are loaded with

Sutta terminology, they are not the “one way path” to the cessation of suffering that the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta is about. That’s why people can and often do take them quite far even with imperfect virtue, despite the Buddha placing flawless virtue at the very beginning of the gradual training and mental cultivation and discernment much later. They are unrelated practices given Buddhist names.

When you introduce *anything* to help you cope with the discomfort of restraint, you’re blocking the possibility for the mind to genuinely get used to it. The pressure to break restraint will return when the diversions are absent (when you couldn’t practice a technique long enough or at all, or there was too much noise, or random circumstances).

Restraint practiced on its own—as the Suttas instruct it—versus restraint supplemented with techniques is like the difference between handing a child a toy to stop a tantrum and calmly standing your ground until the tantrum runs its course. The former buys you time while reinforcing the underlying habits, while the latter leaves no alternative but for those habits to fall away.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-18 05:54:35 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

isn’t it preferable to do a management technique than to break a precept?

In the immediate moment, yes. But if someone is repeatedly under pressure so intense that emergency management is required, they should really just address whatever is causing that. Their environment may be unsuitable, or they may be carelessly exposing themselves to unsuitable things. If none of those is the case and those episodes are frequent, then their mind might be too wild for the amount restraint they’ve taken on and they might benefit from a more gradual progression to the same point.

Regularly relying on techniques to not break your restraint—or sleeping, or pursuing activities to take your mind off things—is like a frail person using a forklift to move massive weights whenever they go to the gym.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-20 12:59:01 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If your precepts are fine and you’re able to contain yourself in body and speech during those episodes then don’t try to prevent them. Avoiding things that provoke ill will is what the mind already wants to do.

Don’t *try* to expose yourself either, because in doing so you’ll be acting out by mind while regarding it as “work,” and that nullifies any success in regard to body and speech.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-24 05:27:00 (in reply to a comment not included)

If I'm understanding correctly, sense-restraint is what helps one establish Right View, because one cannot see the sign of the mind when still engaged in external attachments to satisfy itself.

That's right. Nor can one see it when one is engaged in internal diversionary tactics that interfere with the arising of craving that came on its own. Craving must not be indulged in for sure, but it also won't be understood and uprooted if it's artificially suppressed.

That artificial suppression is not the satipaṭṭhāna practice the Buddha taught, and not having developed proper restraint beforehand (based on full personal responsibility and urgency rather than management) is the reason why self-hypnosis and cognitive reframing exercises have come to be so widely mistaken for the one way path to the complete ending of suffering.

Dispassion through investigation of experience

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** mentalw0rk 2025-12-16 06:57:09

You can only choose to go for sensuality because the phenomenon of {possibility of sensual experience} is already there on its own, present as an idea. Even as an ambiguous direction, it is present as a mental phenomenon you had no say in. You can choose to attend to, ignore, follow, reject, etc. Regardless of what you choose, you can only choose BECAUSE that phenomenon was just there as an OPTION. And you had no input in the fact that the option was available.

Also the option of "getting pleasure" through an experience is ONLY POSSIBLE because the painful desire IS ALREADY there as a phenomenon. For example, if I told you to "go and get pleasure by staring at that wall" it would be impossible. Its not even an option for you , because there is no desire for that ALREADY there . Even if you exerted all of your willpower to try to "create desire" by convincing yourself of something, the success/failure of that attempt is completely out of your hands. Either the phenomenon of desire "shows up on its own" or it doesn't. If it's not there, even if you engage with the object, no pleasure will be felt., it's not an available option.

You overlook the presence of the phenomenon {vague idea of sensuality} as something you had no say in, and put all the importance on your attention/choice in regard to it, though your choice is actually secondary to that {vague idea} phenomenon being there in the first place. Choice to go for, not go for; either way, you put all the weight on your choice/attention. And that is already appropriation/passion even if you use that ALREADY APPROPRIATED attention to deny everything.

Even if you "create a new idea" with your creativity, that's only possible because the THOUGHT of your new creation was there available as a phenomenon. Or not, in the case of "blinking" or "writer's block", no matter how much willpower you exert. So you

can't really create anything, you can only "appropriate" something that's already there. So your doing, thinking, attention, choices, is only a hand-me-down so to speak. And discerning that, is like a complete buzzkill, deflating all the weight/passion of "me", "my attention", "choosing this over that".

Is this what is meant by "appropriation" and "taking what's not yours" in the suttas? And you eliminate that appropriation by developing clarity that even the most "internal" "vague", or "personal" aspects of your experience AS EXTERNAL, as phenomena that are just there without your say? Which results in dispassion and peace?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-17 06:56:57

Yes, that sounds correct.

It never ceases to be important to remember that those phenomena are overlooked and assumed as "internal" (as "me" or "mine") not because you failed to clarify them as the opposite, but because your actions by body, speech, and thought keep taking them as such.

That refers not only to coarse indulgences that violate the precepts, but any acts based on internal pressure, even when they are entirely mental and seem harmless in their content. What those subtler acts are will only be apparent when the coarser ones are fully gone, however. Hence the gradual training.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-23 08:48:40 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Bhante, shouldn't we try to understand WHILE we are still working on not acting out on any level?

If someone is still acting out in body, speech, and coarse mental conduct, then no. Trying to understand at that stage is a waste of energy; any resulting notions are guaranteed to be skewed and would need to be unlearned.

Whenever you're choosing an option in an attempt to "lean away" from the feeling, your choice is SECONDARY to the options being there as a possible direction, as a phenomenon. BUT ALSO, leaning away is completely inseparable from that feeling. The "solution" a.k.a leaning away, is inseparable from the "problem" a.k.a the feeling you're trying to lean away from. Whenever the feeling ceases on ITS OWN, the option of leaning away ceases. So the solution can never be outside the problem.

Correct. Hence the attempts at managing unpleasant feeling, not just the obvious indulgences, *also* perpetuate the problem. It's the expectation of an external relief that makes the feeling bother the mind to begin with. And you can't just decide to "un-expect" that relief; the impossibility of externality needs to be seen.

All that being said, if we are still acting out on some level, that already means we don't see this clearly enough. But if we want to see it clearer, the solution is to work on the gradual training, so that clearer investigation and discernment becomes possible, right?

Precisely. What "feeling; leaning away; choice" are will not be seen clearly without the baseline of restraint. Even for someone who keeps the precepts well, overlooking and following at face value a strong pressure to see these very things means that the *actual* feeling, leaning towards or away, etc. that are occurring are nowhere to be seen.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-27 11:06:12 (in reply to a comment not included)

Acting out of body and speech seems clear enough, but when you say "coarse mental conduct" are you referring to intentional engagement with fantasies, annoyances, ideas to distract yourself with or something more subtle than that?

It means welcoming thoughts aimed at breaking the precepts and returning to sensuality, or of acting out of irritation.

So when you try to clarify ideas out pressure, is that a more subtle attempt at managing or is that still within "coarse mental conduct"? Either way, it's still perpetuating the same notion of assuming the pleasure to be outside/apart from the pain (Let me "lean away" from this unpleasant lack of clarity by going towards a more pleasant clarity) right?

You could regard it as a subtler kind of mistake. But if the coarser mistakes are already well gone, then acting out of pressure at that subtler level (which for you won't feel subtle anymore) is what will perpetuate the very unclarity that you're trying to get rid of (the ignorance of what craving is and how *it alone* is the problem).

2. The only part of pain that actually "hurts" is that you're pressured to go towards what you (wrongly) assume is a solution? But if you understood that it's not actually a solution, there would be no pressure towards it, and the initial problem would cancel itself out?

I see what you're trying to say, but putting it this way implies that the pain is this objective thing that remains the same when you stop wrongly assuming a solution. And although that's somewhere in the ballpark, it's still taking an outside standpoint over your own experience. The entirety of the pain *exists* because of ignorance. There is no pain, no feeling, no consciousness, no aggregates in general anywhere apart from *avijjā*.

As the Suttas describe, the "mass of suffering" is completely destroyed when ignorance is gone; it does not merely "stop hurting."

I am trying to see these things.....because I am leaning away from the pain of not seeing them

.....as if the pleasure of seeing them can be “independent of” from the pain of not seeing them?

Yes. Or you could simply say “pain exists at all because I still assume an outside standpoint to what has arisen.”

You need not be expecting a definite pleasure. You need only assume that you *could* have a thought in relation to that feeling that isn’t entirely secondary to that feeling’s unownable arising (i.e., fail to see “feeling within feeling”). And that’s what makes that feeling exist to begin with.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-30 06:34:02 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

one needs to become aware of the painful desire that REMAINS THROUGH-OUT while thoughts of potential escape (which are currently felt pleasantly) are there.

Yes. That’s how you would cease to overlook and go along with your *citta*’s pulls.

You are “atrophying the mind” by acting out of sensuality.

Indeed. Not just by acting physically, but by welcoming it mentally.

If in the middle of your effort to engage, the painful desire were to go away, there would be no pleasure in imagining getting the object anymore.

Correct.

But this seems like the kind of thing that needs to be maintained (on the basis of restraint obviously) for a while, because it’s quite an ingrained habit of “separating” the pain and the pleasure. But over time, you would chip away at that idea of “separation” and you could never imagine the pleasure & the pain separate again.

The pain would cease to arise to begin with. Its presence is a lingering symptom of how you’ve been training yourself to only see the pleasure.

Where does the Hillside Hermitage approach come from?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** cryptocraft 2025-12-15 02:38:40

I have been practicing Buddhism for around fifteen years and listening to the teachings of Hillside and Samanadipa have profoundly transformed my understanding of the Dhamma.

I have not heard the Dhamma explained in this way before, or perhaps if I have I did not understand it in the same way. I am curious where this approach to the suttas originates from, i.e Nanavira, the Galduwa tradition, the Thai Forest Tradition, etc.

Similarly, outside of the suttas themselves, are there other teachers that have a similar approach and understanding? Thank you.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-15 07:24:18

I am curious where this approach to the suttas originates from, i.e Nanavira, the Galduwa tradition, the Thai Forest Tradition, etc.

The closest would be Ñāṇavīra. Not his entire approach, which we consider overly intellectual, too divorced from the indispensable prerequisites for understanding, and highly likely to mislead/distract people even when correct. His most important contribution is the attitude of treating the Suttas as the sole authority on what needs to be practiced and understood—and, importantly, is *not* understood for as long as one suffers—rather than as a supply of helpful pointers to guide practices and ideas originating from later traditions (“meditation” being the prime example).

Similarly, outside of the suttas themselves, are there other teachers that have a similar approach and understanding?

We haven’t found any so far.

Feeling as a general mood vs feeling dependent of contact?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-12-12 20:58:28

Is there a difference between the background feeling HH talks about and the feeling that is dependent on contact as described in the Six Sets of Six (MN 148)? How does this relate to satipatthana?

I often hear HH talk about one’s general feeling as sort of a mood. Does a person feel good, bad, or okay. And this background feeling influences the other aggregates. For example, if one is depressed even if they see beautiful things, it doesn’t bring about pleasure. So the bad mood affects everything.

But in the Six Sets of Six (MN 148) it talks about feeling as dependent on contact. The way I interpret it is if you see something beautiful, there’s simultaneously a pleasant feeling. If you see something ugly, there’s an unpleasant feeling. And if you see something that isn’t ugly or beautiful, there’s a neither-pleasant-nor-painful feeling.

Dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises; the meeting of the three is contact; with contact as condition there is feeling; with feeling as condition there is craving.

...

Bhikkhus, dependent on the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises; the meeting of the three is contact; with contact as condition there arises a feeling felt as pleasant or painful or neither-painful-nor-pleasant. When

one is touched by a pleasant feeling, if one delights in it, welcomes it, and remains holding to it, then the underlying tendency to lust lies within one. When one is touched by a painful feeling, if one sorrows, grieves and laments, weeps beating one's breast and becomes distraught, then the underlying tendency to aversion lies within one. When one is touched by a neither-painful-nor-pleasant feeling, if one does not understand as it actually is the origination, the disappearance, the gratification, the danger, and the escape in regard to that feeling, then the underlying tendency to ignorance lies within one. Bhikkhus, that one shall here and now make an end of suffering without abandoning the underlying tendency to lust for pleasant feeling, without abolishing the underlying tendency to aversion towards painful feeling, without extirpating the underlying tendency to ignorance in regard to neither-painful-nor-pleasant feeling, without abandoning ignorance and arousing true knowledge—this is impossible.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-14 06:23:04

I often hear HH talk about one's general feeling as sort of a mood. Does a person feel good, bad, or okay. A

Feelings are not quite moods. Moods are along the lines of *citta*. They involve a degree of intentionality.

But in the Six Sets of Six (MN 148) it talks about feeling as dependent on contact. The way I interpret it is if you see something beautiful, there's simultaneously a pleasant feeling. If you see something ugly, there's an unpleasant feeling. And if you see something that isn't ugly or beautiful, there's a neither-pleasant-nor-painful feeling.

This echoes the kind of reductionist/objectivist analysis of *phassa* that the commentaries came up with, but this is not quite how it works if you examine your own experience. Even for a *puthujjana*, it's not like every single sense object *touches* them. Certain things arise as irrelevant and are not even felt. And that is why, as MN 74 says, at any given time there can only be *one* feeling. There can only be one thing that's actually *touching* you at any given time, in the sense of pressuring you to act. Hence, when there is *phassa* there is not just feeling but also necessarily intention.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-14 19:34:13 (in reply to a comment not included)

It's moods that involve intentionality.

Can we be pressured by moods in the same way we are by feelings ?

Both moods and feelings are the result of being pressured (SN 35.93). With ignorance you have pressure, and with it both feelings and moods. Craving is automatically there.

When there is no ignorance and thus no touch/pressure, as in an Arahant, there is neither a feeling nor a mood nor craving.

This comes back to the issue with OP's and the commentaries interpretation of contact: it conflates *phassa* with the external event of *encountering* things. If that's what the Buddha meant with *phassa* then no escape would be possible. Furthermore, he would've talking about something other than suffering and its escape—providing analytical explanations of how irrelevant experiences “work”—and that is something he explicitly said he never did (the famous “This Dhamma has only one taste...”).

The *puthujjana*'s problem is not one of being touched by everything all at once, by merely seeing, hearing, etc., but of being *liable* to be touched—emotionally aroused or disturbed—by certain things in that domain due to their ignorance.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-15 06:56:50 (in reply to a comment not included)

Bhante, so there is one feeling, but many sights, sounds, smells, etc?

Broadly, yes. But to reiterate, the Dhamma is only concerned with suffering and its cessation. So whenever sights, sounds, smells, and so on are spoken of in the Suttas, it is only in relation to those where there is *dukkha*, where there is pressure, passion, aversion.

What is the difference between neutral feeling being ignored and not being touched in the first place?

The difference is that, as the Buddha said, neutral feeling that is not understood is painful (and the opposite when it is understood). Practically speaking, for a *puthujjana*, an actual neutral feeling will carry uneasiness, a more low-key *dukkha*. Not being touched in the first place applies to countless things you do not even register or remember at all even though you technically perceived them, such as the vast majority of trees you pass while walking through a forest. By contrast, an Arahant remains untouched not only by such inconsequential things but also by the most significant ones, including death. Not because their significance has vanished, but because ignorance has. And that's the direction of the training.

I was constantly touched by all sorts of sense objects but I didn't notice them, so they must have been neither-pleasant-nor-unpleasant, and I was exhibiting the underlying tendency to ignorance.

If that were the case, you would effectively have to be omniscient in order not to be ignorant, rendering Arahantship impossible.

Also, when a sutta says, “dependent on eye and sights, eye-consciousness arises...”, would that mean eye-consciousness *can* arise, and not that every sight that meets the eye necessarily arises into eye-consciousness?

It means that eye-consciousness *with suffering*, as described in *paṭiccasamuppāda*, arises when you are touched by a sight, which itself occurs on account of ignorance. The Sutta

is not concerned with every sight that meets the eye at the level of mere biological perception. So it's the type of consciousness that does not exist in an Arahant.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-20 11:00:39 (in reply to a comment not included)

Is it correct to interpret your words as meaning that there are aspects of experience—for both a puthujjana and an arahant—that are utterly irrelevant to suffering and thus not ever what the Suttas are talking about?

No doubt about it.

Is conceiving suffering to have something to do with the foreground—when it does not and cannot—one way of describing the mistake that causes suffering, or at least something related to it?

Not seeing the background to begin with (making into a foreground when attempting to see it) is what causes suffering. Though this doesn't become apparent through mere reasoning, but by ceasing to act in wrong ways in regard to the foreground.

When both are seen, background and foreground are not disconnectable. It's one tree whose root is no longer covered up. The contrast exists only when the background is invisible (which is how it inevitably starts).

If the five aggregates were only ever supposed to be about what is involved with suffering, then **using the same phrase to talk about the experience of an arahant** seems like a guaranteed way to cause confusion. It is confusing to me, at least. I feel l

I don't recall any Sutta saying "an Arahant has five aggregates without *upādāna*."

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-27 10:19:48 (in reply to a comment not included)

Is this an interpretation you would still agree with

No, and the Buddha didn't explain it that way for a reason. Whatever *phassa* you can possibly imagine is contact with "I" involved. That's what makes it "contact" in the first place.

or do you nowadays feel that any discussing of things like *phassa*, *nāma-rūpa*, etc. which is not relevant to the experience of *dukkha* (which is found sometimes for example in the work of Ñānavīra) is only theoretical and not relevant to the subject matter of the Suttas?

Well, the Suttas themselves do talk about those things. But only to people who are in the position to understand them (which is obvious from how in many cases they become Arahants after hearing the discourse). There is some benefit in clarifying these things because most people are coming with a lot of baggage from modern traditions that is not

in line with the Suttas, but you'll want to make sure that it doesn't carry the implication that you will reach enlightenment *because* of such clarifications. Study and clarification of such concepts should be regarded as mundane efforts that *could* support the actual practice, but must not be done at the expense of it (of not acting out of a blatant pressure of restlessness for instance).

What does the taming?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Difficult-Strain-580 2025-12-11 18:21:30

Regarding the latest Samanadipa video titled "The way to develop a fearless and harmonious mind"...

To what extent should the mind be regarded as "other"? Isn't it the mind itself that wants to tame the mind? I find it helpful to see the mind as this external wild animal, but what is it that wants to do the taming then?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-13 06:37:29

but what is it that wants to do the taming then?

The untamed mind is also what pressures you to do the taming. That's why the Buddha said that craving is overcome through craving.

That doesn't mean every craving to practice is wholesome though. Only when craving is directed at the right aim—the destruction of *all* lust, aversion, and delusion, without exceptions or wishful thinking introduced—will it cancel itself out eventually.

Requesting discussion on SN 12.25

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Accurate_Pineapple89 2025-12-08 02:23:04

I came across this sutta and found it insightful. I'd appreciate a deeper analysis of this sutta, either in the comments or as a video.

<https://suttacentral.net/sn12.25/en/bodhi?lang=en>

The part that stood out to me is as follows:

Ānanda, when there is the body, because of bodily volition pleasure and pain arise internally; when there is speech, because of verbal volition pleasure and pain arise internally; when there is the mind, because of mental volition pleasure and pain arise internally—and with ignorance as condition.

[Similar for verbal and mental]

"Ignorance is comprised within these states. But with the remainderless fading away and cessation of ignorance that body does not exist conditioned by

which that pleasure and pain arise internally; that speech does not exist conditioned by which that pleasure and pain arise internally; that mind does not exist conditioned by which that pleasure and pain arise internally. That field does not exist, that site does not exist, that base does not exist, that foundation does not exist conditioned by which that pleasure and pain arise internally.”

This sutta appears to state that pain and pleasure come from an active intention, right there and then, which results in pain or pleasure. For example, when I see a disagreeable sight, I have an intention of aversion, which results in a painful bodily feeling. This is how I'm struck with 2 arrows, rather than the 1 arrow of the disagreeable sight. These intentions of greed, aversion, and delusion are like a bad habit. If I take responsibility for them, then they'll cease, and so pain and pleasure will cease. So these intentions can only occur as a bad habit - they depend on delusion. However, the sutta states that one can deliberately intend this, which doesn't make sense to me, at least for an intention resulting in pain.

By uprooting the ignorance which these intentions depend upon, they can no longer exist. For example, speech can still exist, it just cannot be rooted in greed, aversion, or delusion.

The difference between an ordinary person and an ariya is that the ariya has understood this to the extent that no matter what happens, they can always take responsibility for that intention and put an end to the suffering of it. For an arahant, these intentions cannot arise in the first place, as all ignorance has been uprooted. So for a sotapanna, they might have understood this to a sufficient extent, but there's still lingering bad habits which can come up.

Have I understood this sutta correctly? I assume that to some extent, I've misunderstood, otherwise I'd be at least a sotapanna.

Thank you for all your efforts.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-08 07:09:33

See this discussion.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-11 14:28:08 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Would this also apply to a sotapanna, or can a sotapanna still have intentions rooted in resisting contact and ignorance?

A *sotāpanna* would still have those intentions to a reduced degree, but along with the right view to recognize them and the way to their cessation. Whereas a *puthujjana*'s notions of non-resistance are still infected with resistance without them realizing it. They have not understood craving nor its absence.

Distinguishing between citta and mano

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** cryptocraft 2025-12-07 22:33:47

The teachings on the distinction between citta and mano have been very beneficial for me. I still have some confusion I was hoping others could clear up.

Do all thoughts fall into the realm of mano? I understand that mano is in part defined by intentionality? What about so called “intrusive thoughts”, i.e thoughts that seem to emerge spontaneously. Here I do not mean pictures in the mind, but specifically vocalized, internal statements. Are these still in the realm of intentionality, but just happening so quickly that it feels spontaneous?

The more it becomes clear to me what is citta and what is mano, the more I understand what should be patiently endured and what should be immediately abandoned. Thank you.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-09 10:54:41

What about so called “intrusive thoughts”, i.e thoughts that seem to emerge spontaneously. Here I do not mean pictures in the mind, but specifically vocalized, internal statements. Are these still in the realm of intentionality, but just happening so quickly that it feels spontaneous?

The distinction here is not really between *mano* and *citta*, but between something that’s merely perceived and the giving of attention to the secondary details of it (“grasping the signs and features” as the Suttas call it).

You are not in immediate control of the fact that certain perceptions push themselves on you—it’s because of your currently wild citta—but you are in control of the further engagement with those perceptions. Hence the sense restraint refrain: *having cognized* a mental phenomenon (with mano), one does not grasp at the signs and features of it. They don’t say “one *does not* cognize a mental phenomenon.”

So, practically speaking, the right setup is to leave the “intrusive” thoughts to be like flies hovering around you, but not letting them *land* (i.e., their details come into focus). And to be able to do that, you obviously need to be well trained in not following intrusive thoughts in any coarser ways (precepts, celibacy, etc.)

Anapanasati - Recollecting the breath without focusing on it?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-12-05 21:54:10

Is it essential to sit upright for anapanasati? Can it be done lying down or in all postures?

How do I recollect the breath without it becoming an object of attention?

I'm working on the core or "0th" tetrad of anapanasati. I'm finding it very challenging to recollect the breath. When I try to recollect, I bring the breath to the foreground instead of leaving it in the periphery. I have spent many years doing breath object meditation, which I think makes it harder to leave the breath in the background.

The "0th tetrad" MN 118

And how is mindfulness of breathing developed and cultivated to be very fruitful and beneficial?

It's when a mendicant—gone to a wilderness, or to the root of a tree, or to an empty hut—sits down cross-legged, sets their body straight, and establishes mindfulness in their presence. Just mindful, they breathe in. Mindful, they breathe out.

Dhamma Within Reach instructions Chapter 12 (abbreviated):

A simple knowledge of your breathing happening right there "beneath" whatever you are going through. And you don't have to stop enduring on account of it either. It's there together with the pressure of sense restraint. You can see that breath happening to you, so to speak, while you are gripped by temptations and hindrances. But the breath remains underneath it, coming and going. Unchanged. And it's that knowledge at the back of your mind of something there, that we often refer to as "peripheral awareness". So, you are not trying to distract yourself from your patient endurance and the unpleasantness of sense restraint and watchful guarding of the sense doors. All you are trying to do is maintain the knowledge that there is an enduring act of breathing, happening at the same time right there.

...

The knowledge of breathing in and out doesn't require any special effort. Just a mental recognition. You don't need to go to it and make it your primary focus. Quite the opposite. If you keep it at the back of your mind without focusing on it, it will be done without any strain or force. That's why it will calm down your current strain of enduring.

That's how you practice anāpānasati in the right direction. It's a perpetual bodily activity that you choose to not completely forget. If you cultivate such recollection of the present breathing, regardless of what you are focused on at the same time, it will also eventually prevent hindrances from hindering you.

...

I cannot emphasize enough the point that if you are doing anāpānasati as a technique, a method, you are doing it at the expense of the enduring container. And that's a mistake. There is no right samādhi without the right sense restraint being there as its basis. So, don't use your meditation as an escape from the pressure of sense restraint. If you do, that means it will be rooted in your aversion towards the discomfort of sense restraint. Any act rooted in

aversion towards discomfort, of any kind, is in its nature an act towards sensuality (i.e. avoiding discomfort for the sake of pleasure or less discomfort).

EDIT:

If knowing I am breathing should be the background, what is the foreground? Can the foreground be anything: thinking about the dhamma, looking at a Buddha rupa, noticing an emotion?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-07 17:32:37

First of all, you have to ask yourself whether you're still internally close to unwholesome acts (including the pursuit of sense pleasure) in body or speech if the suitable conditions arise. If that's the case, the mind is too clouded for the breath, or any phenomenon, to stay as a background (i.e., seen where it always is whether you remember it or not). Before anything else, you have to tame those lingering intentions simply by not acting on them, along with adjusting your environment to support that restraint. That is why Anapanasati and Satipatthana were not taught to laypeople in the Suttas: laypeople live for the most part with clouded minds—constantly in the vicinity of unwholesome acts because their lives are built around facilitating them, which keeps them in the vicinity of them. A vicious circle.

If those acts are distant—your mind genuinely wouldn't be pushing for them if you just left it be, not because you're gripping it tight—but there is still some liability to the unwholesome on the *mental* level, then there might be enough room to see the background *as* background.

As to how you do that, the first thing is to entirely dispose of the idea implicit in modern techniques that breathing is measured by sensations. Everything within such a perspective will be a foreground, no matter how subtle it becomes. Rather, see breathing as an *activity* (of the body) that is occurring simultaneously but below all the other activities that will inevitably feel “more important”. It's an activity that won't be going anywhere even if you completely ignore it, which is why it comes *first* even if you don't regard it so.

If you get lost in observing sensations due to past habits, or anything else that might captivate the mind, don't try to “restart”; simply notice that the actual breathing that's keeping you alive has been happening all along *anyway*, irrespective of your getting absorbed in things.

Persisting in this is, with all the prerequisites in place, is what will de-nourish the sense of the body being something that exists *because* you attend to it, which is the implicit view of a *puthujjana* that the modern interpretations of *anapanasati* simply help proliferate. When that fades the sense of volition remains, but no longer as what's primordial.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-08 07:06:26 (in reply to a comment not included)

Sitting is necessary only for the further 16 trainings. Not because of a need for one-pointed focus or anything related to the widespread interpretations of APS, but because breathing has to be the coarsest ongoing bodily activity to have space to train discernment on those subtler levels.

The basic Anapanasati outlined in the Ariṭṭha Sutta, without which none of the 16 trainings are possible, doesn't mention posture.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-08 17:14:06 (in reply to a comment not included)

the middle between “doing” it and otherwise assuming it doesn't need to be done at all,

Both of those mistakes will occur in different forms as long as you don't have the right view. There is no *sammāsati* without *sammādiṭṭhi*. But you can be sure that you're falling into them the least you can by (1) not neglecting all the things that come before satipaṭṭhāna in the gradual training and (2) not forgetting what the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta quite conspicuously starts with.

That is, you're doing this to free yourself from the slightest traces of *liability* to suffering, not just suffering that's right in front of you. That will make you unable to be content with poetry, like the common “we're already enlightened”—or, as somebody listening to our talks might twist it, “the body is already there.”

If on the other hand you find yourself having to “do” and watch closely over *anything* to be free from suffering, that is evidently suffering in itself. So that too is off the right track. By making sure you are not doing *either*, you're getting closer to the middle.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-09 10:31:05 (in reply to a comment not included)

The issue I am running into with your second paragraph (months after you first wrote it) is that without the Right View it seems that even attempting to approach the yoni through specific things inevitably also leads to hypostasizing abstract ideas, and failure and vexation more generally.

Yes. So the development as a *puthujjana* is not doing it more right, but less and less wrong (less hypostatization/abstraction/poetry and less craving-bound hyper-concreteness). Until there is so little wrongness left that it becomes right, just less accurate than the discernment of an Arahant. That's *sotāpatti*. And that process will be a grind, just like becoming proficient in anything that you are initially completely in the dark about.

But you don't endure the pain blindly, leaving it up to some magical future revelation

to sort things out. If vexation is what your attempts at satipaṭṭhāna lead to, don't feel absolved from maintaining perspective over that vexation. That is closer to the "right level," where you're not creating anything new, but ceasing to look past what was always there while your craving was projecting you elsewhere.

If *any* displeasure hurts, it's not because of the displeasure but because you are still doing something on top of it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-09 17:27:10 (in reply to a comment not included)

In other words, that statement seems to convey that the problem of not understanding the instructions stems not from not being ready to understand (i.e., not enough GT), but from the displeasure (or relative lack of perspective) of not understanding.

Lack of "drying up" from sensuality and misconduct is always the primary obstruction that nothing else can make up for. Someone who is well distanced from those things but has not overcome the hindrances entirely *could* have a sufficiently pliable mind to understand the Dhamma or at least make progress towards it. But they cannot measure in themselves how internally distant they truly are, nor even what really counts as progress, except in hindsight.

Without being the Buddha, let alone over the Internet, you also can't know that about someone else for sure. So the instruction has to be a mix between reminding about the prerequisites *and* giving pointers about what needs to be understood. Because laypeople almost always lack the former and it's by far the most urgent, it's hardly worth going in depth into anything else.

Useful "Minimum" Duration of Celibacy for Temporary Ordination

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** account-7 2025-12-04 16:28:06

While I have some personal reservations about the sutta interpretations that lead to HH's requirement of celibacy, I can see the absolute all-encompassing nature of sexuality and how much of a hinderance it can be.

I'm in a relationship that is quite healthy (and ironically, sometimes a powerful tool against lust for me), but I plan to take temporary ordination at some point soon (and likely at various points in my life).

While monastic life will offer me a plethora of benefits, I see the biggest change from my regular life will be in celibacy. Given that, what duration would you all say is the minimum useful time to take on celibacy for, in order to really allow mental/energetic shifts and defense mechanisms to establish themselves?

I respectfully ask that this thread doesn't turn into a debate on the requirement of celibacy for stream-entry (as much respect I have for the general HH position). Thank you for your time and thoughts.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-12-05 11:14:28

First of all I wouldn't recommend temporary ordination. It erodes the significance of the robe for yourself. That significance is important because it creates some friction between desires that will inevitably arise and the decision to give up the training. You will have a lot less of that friction if you ever decide to ordain permanently having already disrobed before.

Above all, don't go for bhikkhu ordination. Firstly because it's dishonest: at the end of the ordination procedure, you accept that you will not engage in intercourse and the other *pārājikas* for the rest of your life (which, incidentally, sets the context for every Sutta addressed to bhikkhus, which is most of them). Secondly because never having been a bhikkhu would keep at least one line that you haven't crossed before, to maintain that friction I referred to.

As for the minimum timeframe to benefit from celibacy (which you could easily take on as a layperson at a monastery) the benefits begin whenever it feels like you've done it long enough. That's when the initial inspiration of the new environment will have worn off, and your mind starts showing its true colors. The opportunity to tame your craving begins then. The more distractions and novelty are available at the place you go to however, the longer that will take. Probably several months at the very minimum. And if you keep yourself busy with internal entertainment like meditation techniques, then that time might never come.

The benefit will cease not when you physically return to sensuality, but as soon as you start *making plans* to return to it. The growth stimulus will disappear already at that point. Hence in someone with actual right view, wrong intention alone, even without speech or actions to follow it yet, collapses the entire rest of the noble eightfold path. It's not about whether you still have external ties with sensuality that you could hypothetically return to, but about what your intentions are internally. That's what I was pointing to in the recent essays.

Do TV shows, music, movies, and books, when consumed as part of a language-learning activity, break the 7th precept?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** RazzmatazzFit6906 2025-11-24 17:32:45

I'm not a native English speaker, and a few years ago I began practicing immersion in the language with the goal of learning English. Since I don't live in an English-speaking country, I try to simulate an English-language environment at certain times of the day. Series, music, movies, YT videos, podcasts and books have been crucial for this learning

so far, mainly because they expose me to many different kinds of situations and greatly expand my vocabulary, expressions, etc.

Today, I'm only able to listen to Dhamma talks and read HH books because of this daily effort. I'm still far from fluency, especially in speaking and writing (to write here, I use AI to translate).

So I'm left with this dilemma: to properly practice the 7th precept, should I give up these things and replace them only with Dhamma talks and Dhamma books? Or, if they are approached as a form of "study," would they not break the precept? Or do entertainment items break the precept under all circumstances?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-25 06:17:58

What matters is your state of mind. The fact that it's for language learning will not do anything to prevent the wrong state of mind (delight, enjoyment, distraction) regarding the content you're consuming. Certain things will be so appealing for you that those states will arise no matter how much you try to focus on the practical aim of language learning.

So try to find things that you are not interested in and use those to study, and stop using them when interest and pressure develops. Particularly with English, you will never run out of options. And since it's for language learning, it won't be a problem that the advice in most Dhamma resources is misguided.

How do you know if you've destroyed a fetter, and not just temporarily "subdued" it?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** craveminerals 2025-11-19 16:25:53

What's the difference between someone who (temporarily) transcends sensuality and someone annihilating the fetter of sensuality in an irreversible way? Maybe the former could be convinced that they're completely done with it, as the desire for sensuality has apparently ceased, (as in old age perhaps) but in fact that's not the case.

I've been thinking that the former may, as in the case of a brahma god, after some time descend to lower realms again and be born as a human or rat, or whatever, after their time is up in their heavenly "desire-less" state— so apparently the fetter of coarse desire is still there but lay dormant so to speak.

So, how do you know if it's really destroyed?

On this point, seems there's quite a big difference between coarse desires 'of the flesh', and more subtle desires for what may be called realms of luminous form, and formless realms. As expressed in AN 10.13 (at least by Bhikkhu Sujato); "What are the five higher fetters? Desire for rebirth in the realm of luminous form, desire for rebirth in the formless realm, conceit, restlessness, and ignorance. These are the five higher fetters."

HOW DO YOU KNOW IF YOU'VE DESTROYED A FETTER, AND NOT JUST TEMPORARILY "SUBDUED" IT?43

These fetters must likewise be hard to know if they're truly destroyed or not.

If I were to guess it has to do with having wisdom, and right view. You clearly know the gratification, the danger, and the escape from feeling, form, and the formless. But I'm just wondering if it's rather easy to fool oneself about this.

Any thoughts? Or references I can look up? Thank you.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-21 08:59:54

What's the difference between someone who (temporarily) transcends sensuality and someone annihilating the fetter of sensuality in an irreversible way? Maybe the former could be convinced that they're completely done with it, as the desire for sensuality has apparently ceased, (as in old age perhaps) but in fact that's not the case.

An ordinary person in old age does not transcend sensuality even temporarily. At most they lose desire for the particular things that for *most* people arouse desire. Their sensuality still has to find expression somehow, at best less blatantly.

They would still delight in the memories of sensual joys they had in the past even if now they can't pursue them because the body is crippled. They would be elated at the prospect of regaining their health and youth to be able to experience those things again.

A person who has transcended sensuality temporarily (i.e., thoroughly recognized the danger in it) would, even within reach of the greatest sensual opportunities, want nothing to do with them.

And that's why if they maintained that state up until their death, they would be reborn in the Brahma realms. They would have zero desire for anything lower than that. Yet, if they are puthujjanas, their desire for the Brahma realm would be completely unseen and taken for granted, and the carelessness resulting from that is the pathway for the old sensual desire to return sooner or later.

So, how do you know if it's really destroyed?

You would know for sure if after giving up all manner of striving and guarding your mind for a while, there is still no inclination towards the things associated with a certain fetter.

For instance, the person who transcends sensuality temporarily does so *completely*. As this simile implies, the dust is *gone*, not just covered over like what people often expect.

But if they are not free from the fetter, becoming busy with mundane activities and neglecting seclusion—not in ways against the precepts since the pathway for that wouldn't be there—the dust would slowly make its way back. If the actual fetter was destroyed, it never would.

Realistically though, you won't even need to go that far. Most of the time it's easy to recognize that the mind is still pressured by unwholesome things long before you've let go of the practice for a time, which means you can't afford to let go of it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-22 10:51:02 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Indeed. Rightly contemplating the impermanence and perishability of sensuality for someone who still pursues it can only result in two things: losing their minds due to “vertigo” (noticing the deadly drop awaiting them due to remaining on things that *have* to fall), or ceasing to pursue sensuality completely so as to practice the Dhamma and eventually come down to safe ground.

They need not *think* “this is permanent, everlasting, etc.” By pursuing sensuality, climbing even higher on the tree, they are seeing it as such implicitly.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-24 08:47:48 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Is this correct?

Yes. The fetters are essentially the fact that you don’t discern certain layers of craving (or none at all), which is what makes them able to exist.

Though those cravings might be completely absent in the present, not just covered up by favorable circumstances, not understanding them clearly means that you are *able* to have them. It may take an inconceivably long time, but they will have to come back one day simply because the space for them is still there.

Some questions regarding my practice

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Consistent-Buy5570 2025-11-15 02:55:50

Hello,

Three weeks into intentional restraint, I keep either breaking precepts or being muddled by a lot of doubt and hesitation. The doubt is usually about where to place my attention. I used to do a lot of object-based meditation, where I would let my attention go wherever it needed to and just remain there. This would immediately clarify doubts and bring instantaneous clarity. It would also make my meditations full of sensuality and encourage a shamelessness toward more sensuality.

But now I am trying to do nothing at all, and I am not sure what to attend to. I often lose context, especially when I get distracted; I’ll suddenly find myself already scrolling.

Sometimes, withstanding the pressure of doubt brings clarity, but it just feels extremely uneasy in my body.

It seems I’m keeping certain precepts, like those regarding speech, sleep, and entertainment, more ambiguous.

When I try to attend or work with the context of craving, it stirs a lot of doubt since it's not a palpable object for my attention to remain with.

My questions:

- 1) Since I forget the context too often, should I stick to the five precepts with celibacy until I am virtuous in those five?
- 2) My major doubt is this: I have a sense that the immediate suffering of craving can be uprooted by the correct perspective. So, I find myself jockeying for position, discerning this way and that, especially with craving/lust. Once in a blue moon, this successfully removes the craving and the space for it entirely. But, the next day, I try to return to this sense of yonisomanasikara, and I am overflowing with doubt again. So, how do I work with doubt? And is it possible I'm appropriating yonisomanasikara for myself when what I'm doing isn't truly that? How does some one without any management techniques bare and endure when they are just getting started?
- 3) How do I work with hesitation? Certain duties related to schoolwork and finding a job seem daunting. It manifests as laziness and reluctance. Due to my exposure to non-duality, "nothing to do" philosophies, and relaxing meditations, I have become extremely lazy. There is also a more existential hesitation or doubt that appears with fear sometimes. It happens when I'm looking and looking for something to do, but nothing feels satisfactory (not in a mystical way). This is very prominent throughout the day.
- 4) Is immersion a bad thing? When I am outside my home, I generally experience a sense of immersion that feels wondrous. It isn't manufactured, but maybe I become more heedless and conceited because of it.
- 5) What is the stance on somatic practices that calm the body down? Sometimes in the morning, I experience bodily restlessness with a lustful warmth in my body. I usually gave in or calmed it down with a cold shower or an exercise called TRE, which involves tremoring to release and relax the hips, pelvis, and other parts of the body. Is this against the principle of enduring hindrances? Or does endurance only apply to mental attitudes?
- 6) When I engage in seemingly mundane but required chores, like sweeping the floor, I have a hell-like aversion and impatience. Do I work with this aversion in the same manner as enduring lust—by noticing the preexisting attitude of reluctance and actively engaging in the activity without room for doubt? Am I provoking the mind too much by this?

Sometimes, enduring feels impossible, making me full of doubt and amplifying the pre-existing mass of resistance.

This is a repost. I have clarified some of the above questions since I last posted.

I have a few new positions:

1. I decided to stick to the five precepts but not engage in sensual eating.
2. I have realized that this temporary sense of immersion isn't to be cultivated, and I have to actively choose to mystify it to make it "valuable". It probably isn't yoni-

somanasikara even though it feels like “peripheral-ness...” because it isn’t rooted in the safety of the precepts. It is also not something that encourages dispassion because it makes me want to make it sustain, and I feel the liability because of that. It also makes me focused overly on subtle defilements, when there is plenty of course defilements to work with.

I had a wrong notion that I had to endure at the correct level, and if I did, I would make me free faster... So I would try to endure the sensuality when it is too unsafe to do so. So now I decided to take a less immediate approach to protect the precepts. Like changing environments, predicting where my behaviours are headed, and questioning my motives. So currently I have no immediate experiential resolution to the suffering.

That should be everything.

Thanks for reading.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-17 06:45:34

> But now I am trying to do nothing at all, and I am not sure what to attend to. I often lose context, especially when I get distracted; I’ll suddenly find myself already scrolling.

That might be one of the major issues. Don’t try to “do nothing at all,” rather focus on ensuring that whatever you do isn’t against the precepts. Acting in unwholesome ways is how you truly lose the context, not simply forgetting to think about it for a period of time.

But, the next day, I try to return to this sense of yonisomanasikara, and I am overflowing with doubt again. So, how do I work with doubt? And is it possible I’m appropriating yonisomanasikara for myself when what I’m doing isn’t truly that?

It might genuinely be the right direction. I can’t tell without further detail. But the bottom line is that not being sufficiently confident in virtue will make your attempts at subtler forms of yoniso manasikāra hit or miss.

How does some one without any management techniques bare and endure when they are just getting started?

They don’t have to “bare and endure” everything indiscriminately. They should focus on enduring the wild mind trying to get them to break precepts, and that’s it. Anything they would add on top of the endurance to make it easier would be management by definition, even if not a well defined “technique.”

If *just* keeping the precepts is absolutely unbearable for someone, then they should take on the precepts more gradually, still keeping full restraint as their goal.

3) How do I work with hesitation? Certain duties related to schoolwork and finding a job seem daunting. It manifests as laziness and reluctance. Due to my exposure to non-duality, “nothing to do” philosophies, and relaxing meditations, I have become extremely lazy. There is also a more existential hesita-

tion or doubt that appears with fear sometimes. It happens when I'm looking and looking for something to do, but nothing feels satisfactory (not in a mystical way). This is very prominent throughout the day.

Anyone can have resistance to doing things, but whether that automatically leads to not doing them depends on how restrained in regard to their mind's pulls they've been.

- 4) Is immersion a bad thing? When I am outside my home, I generally experience a sense of immersion that feels wondrous. It isn't manufactured, but maybe I become more heedless and conceited because of it.

Delight in any sense object, not immersion per se, is the issue.

- 5) What is the stance on somatic practices that calm the body down? Sometimes in the morning, I experience bodily restlessness with a lustful warmth in my body. I usually gave in or calmed it down with a cold shower or an exercise called TRE, which involves tremoring to release and relax the hips, pelvis, and other parts of the body. Is this against the principle of enduring hindrances? Or does endurance only apply to mental attitudes?

That certainly is management if you're doing it in response to lust or restlessness. But I wouldn't worry about avoiding all management at this stage as long as it's not fully sensual activities (which would break the precepts anyway).

- 6) When I engage in seemingly mundane but required chores, like sweeping the floor, I have a hell-like aversion and impatience. Do I work with this aversion in the same manner as enduring lust—by noticing the preexisting attitude of reluctance and actively engaging in the activity without room for doubt? Am I provoking the mind too much by this?

Same as above. It's because of insufficient restraint developed beforehand in regard to *any* unwholesome mental pressures that such states have such a grip on you. When everything else has been dealt with you could focus more on the purely mental attitude and "mode of attention" during such instances. The same way you would only bother brushing off dust after you've already cleaned off the grease and mud.

I had a wrong notion that I had to endure at the correct level, and if I did, I would make me free faster... So I would try to endure the sensuality when it is too unsafe to do so. So now I decided to take a less immediate approach to protect the precepts. Like changing environments, predicting where my behaviours are headed, and questioning my motives.

Deliberately exposing yourself to things you're lustful for is always a mistake. Even if you don't act on the lust completely, it's not a success. You'd keep revolving around the desire and giving it room to linger just by exposing yourself intentionally as some sort of "challenge."

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-22 10:44:26 (in reply to a comment not included)

It is just too ambiguous for me to not go a bit crazy or double down a lot into sensuality or distraction, because it feels like a big abyss.

Right, which is why there is no point in making efforts at that level if the basics are still shaky (the precepts). Being unsparing with those will generate all the pressure you need for now.

I thought perhaps investigating the nature of my attention or doing forms of concurrent attention practices by inferring and trying to adjust the radio knob left and right might be a form of “wrong” practice, so I dropped it altogether.

It is. It implies that you can assess the quality of your attention as an independent observer, when in reality anything you do happens within the wrong attention (affected with craving).

You “grow out” of that confinement not by a special type of doing, but by the Gradual Training. Restraining wrong types of doing progressively, as your discernment of them increases.

Here Bhante, when I refer to “endure sensuality when its unsafe to do so” I refer to not changing environments, such that something like masturbation won’t happen rather than purposefully doing something sensual to see if I can bear it or not.

Yes, that’s what I understood from your description.

Even if you don’t end up acting sensually through masturbation or similar, deliberately exposing yourself to what you’re lustful for is already a lustful act. Willingly subjecting yourself to peril implies not seeing it as peril.

Impermanent Jhana

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** bodily_heartfulness 2025-11-13 17:58:24

Jhanas, as I understand it from the HH perspective, are akin to the brahmaviharas, in that they are divine abodes. One has withdrawn from sensuality and the other four hinderances so thoroughly that restraint becomes one’s norm and acting out of the hinderances requires effort, instead of the other way around. In addition to this, one’s mind has become unshakeable and crystal clear, as the weakeners of wisdom, the hinderances, have been dispelled, at least for the time being.

Now, in light of all that, wouldn’t one who lives in jhana, live in jhana for the remainder of their life as long as they maintained their physical seclusion?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 05:08:15

Now, in light of all that, wouldn't one who lives in jhana, live in jhana for the remainder of their life as long as they maintained their physical seclusion?

Not necessarily. They might spend most of their time in it if they're an anāgāmi or Arahant, but it's not automatic. *Jhāna*, as the very name implies, is a type of contemplation. It's not some passive "state" that one gets locked into, unlike what the commentaries and most modern traditions believe.

What they would always be free from if they're an Arahant (with or without seclusion) is the five hindrances. But that's not the same as *jhāna*. It's the necessary basis for successful *jhāna*.

Nothing stops anyone from right now dwelling on the thought of never again partaking in sensuality. That is essentially the "theme" of the first *jhāna*, hence it's called "the joy born of renunciation" (*vivekaja pītisukha*). The problem is that to the degree you are not free from the five hindrances (due to lack of virtue, sense restraint, etc.) and haven't clearly discerned the danger in sensuality, that contemplation done rightly will feel be painful rather than gladdening the mind, calming down the body, etc.

The Peril of Sensuality (New Essay)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-11-11 08:52:07

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-11 16:43:14 (in reply to a comment not included)

If so, are you implying that *all* those stories in that book have value, i.e. should be treated as part of the "texts"?

Not at all. That was a mistake; I should have linked the SuttaCentral translation. It's fixed now.

The point of that story was the Buddha's reaction to an act of intercourse done for a purpose that some might regard as not lustful. Prior to any established rules to boot, showing that he expected the wrongness of such acts to be entirely obvious just from the teachings.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-12 11:21:42 (in reply to a comment not included)

So even if one could lock themselves in a room and enjoy all their favourite things for the rest of their life, there is still the underlying anxiety that your organs or anything else in your body could start falling apart, because you still value the body as a basis for pleasure, and that puts you in the body.

Certainly. The most immediate peril is the impermanence of one's own body. But that peril will be abstract for as long as one is still bound by passion for very particular sense pleasures (partners, children, possessions, etc.) The peril first manifests concretely through the liability to destruction of those.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 05:16:56 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If you're sure it's a strawman, could you provide one instance of a living teacher saying that pursuing sensuality means abandoning the Dhamma, whether one is a complete beginner or on the path to anāgāmi?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 08:48:15 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Clearly you have specific teachers in mind, if you are willing to make such an accusation.

I don't see any point in calling names when the claim applies to the vast majority, if not everything, you will see if you search "Buddhist teachings" online. I would happily change my mind if proven wrong, since the situation as it seems is not something I get anything positive out of. It would be much better to be one among hundreds of aligned voices, and thus not to have to be a voice at all.

You also claim that Buddhists often don't reflect on impending separation from what is dear to them. This is another accusation that you just throw out there without having any evidence to back it up.

Well, where is the evidence to the contrary? Are people silently deviating from teacher's instructions by frequently reflecting on the imminent demise of their spouses, children, family, friends, and themselves, rather than following their breath sensations and similar practices? I very much doubt it, given that if they were reflecting like this, there would be no space for those other practices left. Their redundancy and lack of connection with the goal of complete dispassion would become apparent.

Why is it that you can't just make your point without putting others down, unless maybe your point is to put others down?

I could, but there is a practical purpose in being very explicit about the difference with mainstream teachings.

It is very easy for some to fail to see that difference, as they wouldn't examine the deeper implications of what's being said. They would fill in the blanks with what they've heard elsewhere, thereby misunderstanding the message.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 08:59:31 (in reply to a comment not included)

I'm well aware of instances like these, and they prove my point. Speaking about the dangers of coarse sensuality is one thing; actually telling people that there is no eightfold path without abandoning it *completely* is another. If it's not complete, then what they're advocating for abandoning is not sensuality itself but specific things within it.

The fact that someone would teach relishing of pleasant tactile sensations, the fifth cord of sensuality, as the *escape* from sensuality—to people who still engage in it in even coarser ways to boot, as a way of “substituting” those coarser desires instead of abandoning physical desire full stop—only goes to show that they don't actually see nor rightly encourage others to see the danger.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 14:33:32 (in reply to a comment not included)

but what these teachers have said and written is that sensuality will be and must be abandoned,

So why do they teach (their interpretations of) advanced practices like *satipaṭṭhāna* and *samādhi* and higher doctrines like the Four Noble Truths, to laypeople who they know are not fully withdrawn from sensuality and thus still take refuge in it? Not as an occasional misjudgment, but as their standard approach for decades. That means they don't see sensuality as an obstacle to practicing the Dhamma (and thus any success in those practices does not pertain to the Dhamma either).

Admitting that smoking needs to be given up in some vague future is not the same as regarding each individual cigarette as failure starting today. Most smokers can get on board with the former, not many with the latter. And only the latter attitude would do justice to the similes the Buddha used for sensuality.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-15 15:34:21 (in reply to a comment not included)

I would recommend you to ask these teachers personally, to learn about the intentions behind their approach.

I've no doubt that they are teaching people what they genuinely believe is the Dhamma. I wouldn't accuse them of intentional deception.

Their intentions are not the issue; what's been produced by them is. And to judge that, it's not necessary for me or anyone to ask them. The fact that it's not what the Buddha taught would be apparent to anyone who examines those teachings without an existing emotional need for what they provide.

This is why I was asking you why you choose to put forward your ideas and emphasis about the dhamma, while seeming to put other teachers and practitioners down.

And I explained why. Making the same points more quietly would mean even more people getting the wrong impression that we're saying the same as what they've heard elsewhere.

If I'm taking the trouble to say anything to begin with, it's worth making sure that the effort is as effective as possible. If that means falling below some people's ideal of polite speech, so be it. That will not change what I know my intentions to be.

In my experience, people who use this approach are either insecure or arrogant, or may just genuinely enjoy being provocative.

Perhaps that is the case more often than not. But the first person who met the Buddha after his awakening accused him of arrogance as well.

That goes to show that one better go by the content of what is said rather than the intentions one projects onto the speaker.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-17 06:59:37 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The only difference is your tone and habit of accusing other teachers to not teach things that you teach.

If that really is the only difference, as you say, then I'd expect lay followers of those other teachers who aim for attainment to treat celibacy as non-optional. Yet when someone is arguing against our point that celibacy is required, it's because they've picked up the opposite message from Theravada teachers, including ones in robes.

So, whether they accuse me of arrogance or not, I don't think one can claim in good faith that the sole difference lies in my tone.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-17 14:53:57 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

To be fair, I believe their arguments against your last essay (if that's what you are referring to) is more nuanced than how you're framing it now. There seems to be some disagreements around how to define celibacy, for one thing.

I don't mind discussing the nuances around those disagreements, but that's not what this conversation is about. You were trying to say that there is no difference between what we're saying and other Theravada teachers. There clearly is, even if we chalk it up to a different way of interpreting the Suttas. And we can't in good faith claim that a distinction as big as allowing actions rooted in lust sometimes and never allowing them wouldn't change one's progress on the path of non-lust.

Getting lost in the weeds of putting a magnifying glass on one type of sensual indulgence vs others is likely not helping anyone.

If someone is truly never ingesting poisons because they don't want to die, what's the problem with putting a magnifying glass on the type of poison that is most deadly—unless there was the plan to ingest it at some point?

As for your comment on my approach to presenting the teachings, I invite you to look into how the Buddha was criticized for showing no respect to the traditions of his time and unambiguously placing his teachings above all others. If you had lived in his time and went by the criteria you are using now, you might have well dismissed him.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-18 10:44:38 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Are you saying that monastics should not offer teachings to laypeople who do not want to develop a higher level of renunciation and work towards the stages of enlightenment?

No, I'm not saying that. But I've never heard a Theravada teacher telling laypeople that they can only hope for higher rebirths unless they're celibate. I'm only aware of us saying that.

I'd be happy to be proven wrong, but what I've seen time and again is people being taught (a highly questionable interpretation of) the practices the Buddha taught for Arahantship to laypeople keeping only five precepts. In other words, completely bypassing Right Intention (not to mention Right View) and jumping straight into the last three factors of the path. And that alone, even without going into their specific details, is why those practices are unable to bear the right fruits.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding is that following the rules merely to "check the boxes" is not what makes someone a Sotopanna. A

True. But does it follow from this that certain boxes *should* be left unchecked? Absolutely not.

I don't see why you'd see a connection with a "just checking boxes" approach when considering what we've said, especially given how often we've stressed the need to abandon mental delight in sensuality rather than merely follow rules by the letter.

Before one is on the path, they may try to be celibate through willpower or a feeling of obligation to "follow the rules" - but the intent behind that decision is what differentiates someone who is on the path and someone who is learning about being on the path.

They may start with that, but does not knowing how to use a knife properly in the beginning justify never grabbing it? How else are you going to learn?

Also, why then keep *any* precepts, even the five? Why not go and kill people instead of “just following the rules”?

For example, it's not that you need to be celibate to reach Sotoapanna stage

Celibacy and complete withdrawal from sensuality is required for stream entry because, as I wrote in the essay, you are ignoring the most blatantly obvious layer of impermanence if you still delight in such acts (which is the necessary basis for engaging in them). The Buddha explicitly mentions in MN 16 how one who still delights in sensuality cannot achieve progress and growth in the Dhamma, and this is precisely why.

So, as I mentioned before, saying “celibacy is required for stream entry” is actually downplaying the true requirement. Indeed, as you said, mere abstinence is not enough. “Mere” abstinence AND complete dispassion internally are required. And you can't have the latter without the former.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-19 07:43:26 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, I completely agree with you putting the understanding and view over the act of withdrawal.

Just to be clear, what I'm saying is that the act of withdrawal (complete physical celibacy) is the first and non-negotiable step. Withdrawal is not the right understanding and view, but there will not be right understanding and view without it.

Aren't the changes made from enlightenment permanent?

Yes. But a sotāpanna's freedom is not defined by dispassion for sensuality. It's the destruction of the first three fetters, and the irreversible understanding of what the path is. They can't lie to themselves about the path requiring complete celibacy, but they can postpone following the path further and thus not be celibate.

The Right View cannot arise unless all passion for sensuality has been abandoned. That passion can return *afterwards* because the fetter of sensuality is still there. I explained this in the previous essay.

And if it's correct, can someone reach other stages of enlightenment, even arahant, and then regress in their views and conduct?

No. Each of the fetters is destroyed completely irreversibly.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-19 07:47:44 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

They might mean that while engaging in intercourse stream entry is not possible. Believing the opposite would be too ludicrous.

I highly doubt they meant that one needs to completely abandon even delight in intercourse, not just the external engagement in it as a form of “just following rules.”

Usually the view is that if you're not assailed by coarse sensual desire currently, that's enough. But that's just being distracted from the problem. The hindrance is in whether you *would* become attracted to sensual things if they suddenly popped up in front of you.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-19 10:35:13 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

As a normal person, you would not see acting on a craving for excrement as acceptable even if it arose. So sensual craving should be regarded as an abnormality in the same way, and never welcomed even if it arises.

Why is abortion considered killing?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ToLazyToPickName 2025-11-10 05:13:49

I know HH has a video mentioning how an intentional abortion is considered intentional killing. But I don't understand how it is considered intentional killing rather than intentional “not helping live / letting die.”

If someone had tapeworms (or another parasite) and chose to have them removed from the body, I would not consider this killing. Even though the parasite needs a host to survive, I am not intending to kill the parasite, nor am I intending to save the parasite (e.g. find them another host). The intent is to remove them from my body to be healthy.

If a zygote (or some other stage in development of an unborn human), were to be removed from the body, this appears to me to be choosing to not help some organism develop/live, rather than intending/choosing to kill them. In the same way, not choosing to help people starving in poorer countries who will die if they are not donated to is also choosing to not help someone live, but it is not “intending to kill.”

If abortion is considered intentional killing, does that mean removal of a parasite (e.g. tapeworms) & choosing to not donate are considered intentional killing?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 15:37:14

“not helping live / letting die.”

That's a convenient re-framing of the action that doesn't change its kammic character at all.

In the same way, not choosing to help people starving in poorer countries who will die if they are not donated to is also choosing to not help someone live, but it is not “intending to kill.”

That's an erroneous comparison. Your starting point here is one of no involvement whatsoever in the livelihood of those starving people, so choosing not to donate to them is just continuing the *status quo*.

When you choose an abortion, your starting point was one of a human depending on you for its survival, and you deciding to end its life. Even if you don't directly kill the embryo/fetus but merely remove the conditions for its survival, you still deliberately interrupted the status quo in a way that constitutes killing.

A fair comparison would be people in poorer countries depending on medicine for life-threatening conditions that *you and you alone* could provide to them. Having been providing them until now, you intentionally stop doing so when you still could (rather than failing out of some accident). The intention required for that is the intention of killing.

Edit:

Even if you don't directly kill the embryo/fetus but merely remove the conditions for its survival, you still deliberately interrupted the status quo in a way that constitutes killing.

In fact, every act of killing is indirect. You can only interfere with the *conditions* for a being's survival. So there is no fundamental difference between "pulling the plug" on a being's lifeline and shooting them in the head.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-11 06:42:53 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If abortion is killing, how would one get rid of tapeworms from one's body without killing them? (Since removal of the tapeworms from one's body would be removing their conditions for life).

You'd have to kill them to remove them. Nobody denies that.

What is the deciding factor that determines what is killing vs not killing? If it is just the removal of conditions for life (without replacing the conditions), then choosing to stop being deeply attentive to the floor to not step on bugs (after you once were deeply attentive) before walking would be killing (as the conditions for life was deep attentiveness).

No. The condition for the bugs' life would be not being stepped on. That condition overlaps with your deep attentiveness in the example, but they are not the same. You could lose the deep attentiveness out of pure forgetfulness and "kill" some bugs (or none in the end), whereas you couldn't forgetfully decide to undergo an abortion.

I wouldn't consider it killing to unplug the connection as it is continuing/maintaining the status quo / starting point of not being plugged into (e.g. not being pregnant, not being infected with tapeworms).

That's not how the concept of status quo works. It refers to what is the case *now*. Regardless of the sequence of events, somebody's life depends on conditions exactly as they are *now*, and you intentionally abolish them. That is killing.

I think one is choosing to not help in both cases here (i.e. removing plug, hitting hand away).

They are not equivalent. In one case you are intentionally *taking* life away, breaking the status quo, in the other you are refusing to provide it, maintaining the status quo. It's the same as stealing vs. refusing to be generous.

To make the donating example more comparable: if someone is mistakenly taking money from you to save lives and you stopped them by fixing the mistake, I wouldn't consider that killing, but instead choosing to "not help."

It's still not comparable, because money itself wouldn't be a condition for life. It would only be a peripheral one. As with the bugs example, there could be a wide window in which your choice results in no deaths.

How wide that window is would determine how unwholesome the choice is, and it wouldn't be full killing unless the window were nil (at least from your perspective)—such as in the case of abortion.

There's no scenario in which abortion doesn't end a human life; if it didn't, it wouldn't have been an abortion.

Thought for Food - Eating in Moderation

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** knwp7 2025-11-09 18:56:12

Progress Note

Another progress note. This time it is about food. Over past 4-6 weeks I have transitioned to OMAD (one meal a day). It is a significant achievement for me - much more than awakening my kundalini/chakras (Burbea-jhana) or experiencing dissolution (Goenka-vipassana). Overcoming my food habits has happened thru yoniso attention and many retries after failures. I had a spontaneous break-through a few weeks ago - the body, kind of, gave-in. I have had no hunger-pangs since. Only craving is from the citta (not the body). I am losing weight but have not yet hit the point of equilibrium where I feel hunger from the body - and I have been without food for 24-26 hours at stretch, a few times. (I don't plan to test this)

Thoughts of food-craving do not seem to arise anymore - craving only seems to arise in contact with senses - eg. if I am in the same room with fried snacks in the evening. The bait is revealed by a simple question - "is the body really hungry?"

Current State - seeking guidance

I have also been completely celibate - in body, speech and thoughts - for last 4 months (since I joined the confession server); the lustful thoughts have mostly vanished.

So the gross-sensual deeds and thoughts seem to be under control.

I am currently dealing with other thoughts proliferating in my head. These thoughts are sensual in nature - about entertainment that I have consumed and relished in the PAST - music, themes, stories, characters, situations. I don't see desire to seek entertainment and I have kept the precept on entertainment for 4 months now - except slipping a few times when watching TV with my kid.

The thoughts are not from my lived-past - longings, incidents, real-life experiences, etc. - I keep a check on those. But I am not able to stop proliferating the thoughts around past-entertainment. I believe I need to upgrade my sensitivity and start seeing danger in these "benign" thoughts that often take me for a ride into proliferation.

Some years ago, I made a wonderful relationship with my breath - that kept me anchored and at peace most of the time. I seem to be missing that these days.

I would appreciate guidance from Venerables in this regard.

Background - on Eating

I have been on Intermittent Fasting since late 2018 - experimenting with various eating-windows and times of the day - finally settling for 5-6 hours from 10 to 4. All my life I have struggled with food and weight, always been over weight, though not obese. Exercise has kept my health in check but in past few years I began to see the danger of not training my mind to rein in my eating-habits: if I cannot exercise - because of illness, injury or some other circumstances, my eating indulgence will lead me to obesity, high-BP, diabetes, etc.

Mundane-right-view convinced me to keep the 5 precepts - and later on, 8 precepts. 5 were easy for me because of my lifestyle but when I extended it to 8 there was struggle. It has been the right kind of striving to keep the precepts. I now see what perfecting the precepts mean. With food, I have now gone beyond the rules - the hours, food-choice, etc do not matter - when I know that the beast is tamed. When the beast is tamed, maintaining precepts becomes easy-peasy. I only must not get careless and return to sensuality again - "don't provoke the beast".

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 15:26:53

The thoughts are not from my lived-past - longings, incidents, real-life experiences, etc. - I keep a check on those. But I am not able to stop proliferating the thoughts around past-entertainment. I believe I need to upgrade my sensitivity and start seeing danger in these "benign" thoughts that often take me for a ride into proliferation.

Yes, you need to see the danger in them, but also make sure that you are properly restrained in other avenues of unwholesome proliferation or even conduct. Otherwise

you'll only be springing into action to diminish the fire when it starts bothering you, continuing to fuel it the rest of the time.

You don't need to deny the fact that the mind is interested in those thoughts. You have to not let it "get" them *while* it wants them. And it can only "get" them through your intentional choice to think them.

Some years ago, I made a wonderful relationship with my breath - that kept me anchored and at peace most of the time. I seem to be missing that these days.

That doesn't sound like the right kind of peace. If the mind stops chasing after bad things in exchange for a special treat, then you're simply not training it. You're just delaying the eventual return to the unwholesome.

A few reflections

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Dhingy1996 2025-11-08 17:02:57

Side note: I feel (somewhat) established within the 8 precepts and have done so for a few months now. Occasional slip ups on entertainment and eating do tend to happen though so I'm not sure whether that qualifies as establishment proper.

The latest HH video featuring Ven. Anigha and Ven. Nyanamoli (as well as the previous one being the Sutta study on the simile of the man carrying oil) addressed a theme that's been prominent in my experience lately; namely, that of not becoming absorbed in sense objects.

Until fairly recently, I was pretty unaware of how often I'd be completely 'lost in thoughts' or just in the particulars of experience altogether. Especially when just sitting or walking, I would be completely oblivious of how my 'contemplating and rehashing ideas and words of others' was, in fact, coming out of a compulsion to always be *doing something*.

Now I've started to sort of "catch" myself doing this - almost a 'waking up'-moment - and recognize that I'd lost the greater context of my overall situation (where I am, what is going on etc.). It really feels not much different from being lost in mundane daydreaming or absorbed in a particular task.

And then keep making an effort to not allow oneself to lose the context (the context of not acting out of unwholesome states).

This has become easier to recognize now, not only as I'm sitting but also during bandwidth-requiring tasks such as when I'm working or when I'm having a conversation with someone. I've recently taken up the precept on idle chatter and that one in particular seems to highlight this aspect of making sure to 'keep my head above water' and not allowing myself to become overly absorbed/engaged in the conversation due to some emotional pressure to say the next thing, appear a certain way/feel socially included and so on. It is definitely tough at times to keep an eye on the mind and not lose sight of it.

Noticing that this tendency to ‘become lost’ in experience and forget the greater context can happen with almost any activity suggests to me that *anything* can sort of become ‘entertainment’ (or a hindrance?) if one is not keeping an eye on the mind.

A few things I’d like to get some clarity on as I am not sure if my reflections are off the mark:

- Is recognizing this tendency to become absorbed and then maintaining (i.e. refusing to let oneself get ‘pulled back into’ what had captivated you) part of seeing the signs of the mind/abandoning the hindrances?
- Especially lately, I’ve noticed very strong feelings/moods where on one day there will be a lot of clarity, perspective and things making sense and a sense of elation. And then the next day, a lack of clarity, strong doubt and just a very harassing mind. In the last instance, it can be very difficult to ‘wake up’ and maintain perspective as the mind just keeps pulling and pushing and it can feel almost impossible to *not* act out of the enduring unpleasant feeling. At the same time, it can be fairly easy to become careless and stop being watchful when there is that sense of clarity and pleasantness overall. Are these fluctuations a sign that I’d been doing something wrong leading up to that or is that to be expected?

I know that the same practice of neither giving in (i.e. becoming absorbed/proliferating/dwelling on) nor resisting the discomfort of not having given in applies here with regards to these strong moods too. But it can be so overwhelming sometimes to not get carried away when these colour the entire experience (in particular when everything suddenly seems incredibly hopeless and gloomy). Recognizing that subtle expectation of “*When is this mood going to end? I don’t think I can endure this much longer.*” and not acting out of it can be really hard to maintain. Especially as one is filled with doubt in those moments.

- If there *isn’t* that palpable pull/tendency to dwell on and become absorbed, say, in the idea of having a sweet treat as part of a meal or grabbing a cup of coffee, wouldn’t that suggest that that action would not be rooted in craving?

If I question myself (as honestly as I try to anyway) and tease the idea of *not* going through with the action - and there isn’t that sense of discomfort at the prospect of not getting it - it’s fine, isn’t it? The child is not screaming, it’s just asking kindly and hence it can have it. However, with this, I sometimes get unsure if I am just bullshitting myself. But lately, I would then recognize unsureness as doubt (as it would often lead to a tendency to start becoming absorbed in thoughts of “*Should I do it?*” and “*No, you’re acting out*” etc. and then refraining from proliferating that further.

I know this is a lot but this is just something that’s been on my mind lately. Feel free to also address the stuff that wasn’t marked with a bullet point.

I’d appreciate to also get a perspective on all this from one of the venerables.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 07:57:58

Is recognizing this tendency to become absorbed and then maintaining (i.e. refusing to let oneself get 'pulled back into' what had captivated you) part of seeing the signs of the mind/abandoning the hindrances?

Yes.

Are these fluctuations a sign that I'd been doing something wrong leading up to that or is that to be expected? ... But it can be so overwhelming sometimes to not get carried away when these colour the entire experience (in particular when everything suddenly seems incredibly hopeless and gloomy).

It's both. Due to not clearly seeing the mind, it's inevitable that you will do things that worsen it's state. Regardless of why the bad state came about though, the practice doesn't change.

An unpleasant state will inevitably influence your actions to some degree. You can't step outside of it even if you try. But what you do have to stay away from is the specific actions that go a step further and "embrace" the unpleasant state of mind fully (whether through indulgence or impatient attempts at escaping it). Those are the ones that are unwholesome.

Breaking the precepts is of course the basic form of this "embracing," but over time you start seeing that the principle extends well beyond that. An action that initially would've been seen as fine may not be so once the precepts are well developed.

If there isn't that palpable pull/tendency to dwell on and become absorbed, say, in the idea of having a sweet treat as part of a meal or grabbing a cup of coffee, wouldn't that suggest that that action would not be rooted in craving?

If I question myself (as honestly as I try to anyway) and tease the idea of not going through with the action - and there isn't that sense of discomfort at the prospect of not getting it - it's fine, isn't it?

Correct. And yes, of course, that reflection could become mechanical over time—you could start doing it *after* you already decided to go ahead with the action—but it does shed light on the mind's current attitude if done genuinely.

What can also happen is that you think asking that question is a one-and-done deal, and everything that follows after is automatically fine if the initial decision was. That means you will not even see yourself going for it when some not-fine option presents itself. That's why you can't have too much (right) mindfulness, which boils down to having that very question at the background of whatever you do.

Choosing to go forth in Sri Lanka

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** suparv03 2025-11-06 06:05:11

Based on Bhikkhu Anigha's assessment that Sri Lankan monasteries are generally better suited for sincere practice than those in Thailand, and given that obtaining a Sri Lankan visa is easier for me as an Indian citizen, I have decided to go forth there. I am now considering where to begin as an anagarika. The Galduwa tradition is known for its strict Vinaya, and I have researched several monasteries within it. Bhikkhu Anigha mentioned that Na Uyana is no longer ideal because it is now focused on becoming a Pa Auk international meditation centre. I would like to ask whether Nissarana Vanaya is suitable for someone seeking seclusion, minimal duties, a strong Vinaya environment, and a non teacher centric approach. I am still a puthujjana, though progress has been steady thanks to a better understanding of the suttas through HH's guidance. Would I be allowed to bring an MP3 player with HH's audio archives and a pair of earphones for study? Also, can I bring printed copies of works by Ajahn Nyanamoli and Nanavira for reference? Lastly, could you please advise what items I should carry with me when arriving at the monastery? Thank you for your guidance. This is a crucial decision for me.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-07 18:02:04

I would like to ask whether Nissarana Vanaya is suitable for someone seeking seclusion, minimal duties, a strong Vinaya environment, and a non teacher centric approach.

I never spoke extensively to anyone who lived there, so I can't say. It might be better than Na Uyana in some respects, though the inconvenience of having a very specific "official" way of practice will exist in both places. That's not inherently a deal breaker though; it is only if they aggressively pressure you into it (which Na Uyana nowadays does).

If you can, I suggest visiting and assessing the situation there. You can get the most relevant and sometimes not immediately obvious details from talking to ordination postulants and freshly ordained monks.

Would I be allowed to bring an MP3 player with HH's audio archives and a pair of earphones for study? Also, can I bring printed copies of works by Ajahn Nyanamoli and Nanavira for reference?

Yes, that is what I did. Though it might be better not to go around mentioning that. Most local monks there will not know what HH even is, but it might be a problem simply because it's not what it's taught there, and is based solely on the Suttas and rejects Commentaries/Abhidhamma. Some foreign monks could also automatically dislike you on account of it.

Lastly, could you please advise what items I should carry with me when arriving at the monastery?

Anything that is very specific and not common in a rural area.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-09 16:47:58 (in reply to a comment not included)

I wouldn't worry about it unless you are going out of your way to give the impression that you follow and agree with their method in order to get a spot. If you are, then that would be deceptive.

With a monastery it's different, as the requisites are broadly intended for monks to practice towards Nibbāna. The fact that most in the monastery might be doing something else, even if that unrelated practice is what the head monks enforce, cannot make someone practicing rightly undeserving.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-10 08:13:41 (in reply to a comment not included)

Yes to both questions. Regarding the second one it's worth keeping in mind that once you get a residence visa, it's going to be under the sponsorship of a specific monastery. You can still move, but some places could try to scare you into staying by threatening to cancel your visa.

That said, once you find a place that fits the basic criteria, you shouldn't move unless something drastically changes and those criteria are no longer met.

Sutta that describe extreme emotional reactions to the Buddha's teachings

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Old-Snow84 2025-11-02 06:25:52

In this video at 16' Ajahn Nyanamoli talks about a sutta where people react strongly to the teaching of not self. I'd like to read this sutta but was unable to find it using sutta finder and Google.

Would any of you know which sutta is he talking about ?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-04 08:09:31

It was probably MN 22.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-05 08:01:14 (in reply to a comment not included)

Yes. And not only that; it's the same orientation, even if not explicitly defined to that extent, that one cultivates by not seeing sensual pleasure as perilous and pursuing it.

Hillside Hermitage is no longer on Spotify

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-11-01 05:23:04

I don't know if this is intentional or if Spotify removed it, but the English HH channel has been gone for at least a week.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 07:15:54

That wasn't an official resource, so no idea what might have happened.

Why was HH wiki's seven precepts section changed to be less detailed?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ToLazyToPickName 2025-11-01 04:57:02

I noticed that the wiki on the 7 precepts has been updated. u/Bhikkhu_Anigha, why was the table on the 7 precepts replaced with a list?

I found the table to be more detailed and helpful for understanding how to practice the 7 precepts. Was there something wrong with the chart?

The old version is available on internet archive, but I think having the old version (or at least the chart) available in addition to the new one would be helpful for people who need further explanation.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-01 17:06:29

They were wrong not in their content, but in a didactic sense.

If people adhere to such detailed guidelines in a rote manner (which is the only thing I saw happening), it becomes a distraction from what virtue actually is.

Developing individual clarity as to the motivations behind their actions while sticking to the broadest definition of each precept—which means having to put up with doubt more often than not—is the only way one would be able to understand what those guidelines were pointing to internally. But then one wouldn't need them.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 05:29:57 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I'm not sure if excluding detail would be overall beneficial as doubt will occur either way.

Yes, but more detail only sets the precedent for trying to end doubt by adding even more detail, which people are already predisposed to try but doesn't work.

COULD AND WOULD AN ENLIGHTENTED PERSON ENGAGE IN INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES (LIKE MATH)

I still found the table helpful when I was practicing the 8 precepts, as one of my first thoughts was loopholes/workarounds.

No matter how much detail you add, you're only closing a few loopholes out of an infinite pool. In fact, more detail often creates new ones. If I say "don't open the white, brown, and red doors," it immediately suggests that maybe the yellow one is allowed.

Feeling pressured by lack of clarity about where the lines are and fearful of making mistakes is what keeps one on edge at the right level. If the watchfulness shifts from that on to fulfilling technicalities, one might keep the precepts outwardly for eons but the mind will not be inwardly tamed and develop individual discernment of wholesome and unwholesome. That is what happens to most monks, and the level of detail that the Vinaya provides—detail that didn't come from the Buddha—plays no small part in that.

Could and would an enlightened person engage in intellectual activities (like math) ?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** helios1234 2025-11-01 04:18:20

Could and would an enlightened person engage in intellectual activities (like math) ?

Are such activities an obstacle to liberation and should be abandoned?

If not, how does one reconcile that the Buddha did use his intelligence and cognitive powers to solve the problem of suffering and teach the Dhamma?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 07:21:43

Could and would an enlightened person engage in intellectual activities (like math) ?

In theory yes, but that doesn't answer the question of whether such activities would be wholesome for *you* at any given time. If they are rooted in delight in distraction and intellectual stimulation, they should not be done out of that motivation if you want to tame your mind. If they are a means to some practical end connected with your livelihood, then sure.

Stream-Entry Requires Celibacy (New Essay)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-10-26 08:58:42

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 10:12:01 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

In MN 73 (Mahāvaccagotta) the Buddha speaks of many lay disciples who are “white-clothed, enjoying sensual pleasures” (odātavaśanā kāmabhogino) who “with the destruction of three fetters are stream-enterers”. This seems to describe lay stream-enterers still engaged with sense pleasures. Why would celibacy be required if “kāmabhogino” is explicitly allowed among stream-enterers?

It seems like you barely read the essay or made little effort to understand it. A lot of people react with the same objection, which shows how the nuance, as carefully as it is often pointed out, completely evades them.

A stream-enterer can still engage in sensuality; there is no question about that. The point is that to *become* a stream enterer, the mind needs to be free from hindrances, and someone whose mind is not content with celibacy is by definition not free from the hindrances.

you might have discouraged Dhamma practitioners striving for stream entry but still subject to sensual desire to pretty much “give up” on trying just because they cannot deal with celibacy. I think that would be very unfortunate and increases the scrutiny you should expect from publishing this.

Well, as per MN 16 which I quoted, what those Dhamma practitioners would have achieved without getting used to celibacy wouldn't have been progress in the actual Dhamma.

The fact that celibacy may be difficult for someone in the beginning doesn't mean that they are hopeless. Everyone starts like that. But they do need to train towards *that* in order to be in the position to attain stream-entry, and in not any other modern contrived practices that make no difference to the mind's contentment with renunciation and dispassion for sensuality, i.e. the actual five hindrances.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 10:38:26 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I don't see you presenting any actual counterargument or even sincerely trying to grasp the points made, so unfortunately I have nothing to add until that is the case.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 12:18:08 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The second problem affects everyone who is not at least a non-returner, but the first problem, that of the wrong view, only affects ordinary people.

Actually, the Buddha did say (MN 11) that even a *puthujjana* can completely overcome the assumption of sensuality (*kāmapādāna*). So the Right View is not essential for that.

Training in the precepts, celibacy, and sense restraint is.

An ordinary person who is not at least a stream-enterer is not so because they can still give in to sensuality, but because they have a wrong understanding of happiness and unhappiness, which is inseparable from feeling.

Yes, an ordinary person has a wrong understanding of happiness and unhappiness, but as the very first Sutta quoted in the essay says, there is no possibility for that understanding to change unless they free from the five hindrances. No amount of “trying to understand” with a mind still within the hindrances will correct the wrong view, and for the same reason the Buddha didn’t teach people the noble truths until their minds had fully lost interest in sensuality and instead delighted in renunciation.

Not being able to distinguish between these two completely different problems — the problem caused by an absence of the right view and the problem caused by heedlessness

Heedlessness is the reason why an ordinary person still doesn’t have the Right View even though they might have been reflecting on the Dhamma for decades. As AN 10.61 points out, is it due to misconduct of body, speech, and mind (read: non-celibacy and pursuit of sense pleasures, among many other things) that the hindrances, and thus ignorance, remain.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 16:53:28 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It depends on the exact nature of the relationship, namely whether it would still survive despite the sexual/romantic/delight-in-company aspects being removed from the picture. If it does endure past that removal, then that relationship would cease to be an obstruction.

If yes then what can they do to atleast lessen the damage?

Even with all else remaining equal, adopting physical celibacy within the relationship. For most, that alone would open up plenty of room for internal growth and taming of the mind. When that becomes easy, the celibacy can be refined further on the mental level, as described in AN 7.50.

As I point out in the essay, taking on too much all at once can be counterproductive. It’s better to take small but concrete steps, making sure not to shift the goalpost at any point.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 17:08:55 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Any pursuit of sense pleasure where desire takes over to the point where basic human traits like patience, moderation, modesty/shame, foreseeing future consequences, and regard for others is lost, should be considered misconduct in regard to sense pleasures

(which is the actual meaning of the term *kāmesu micchācāra*). Those are the things that cultivate the mind state of an animal and thus make such a rebirth more likely, and there is an endless range of things that can fit that criterion beyond cheating on one's partner. Gluttony is one example. Visiting sex workers even for one who is single would be another.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 17:44:59 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Here it is.

There are also other Suttas more explicitly confirming the existence of such people outside of the Buddha's dispensation, such as AN 6.54, AN 7.66, and MN 142

Edit: Fixed link for MN 142

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-27 04:54:52 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

To me, no one is truly free of the hindrances or content with celibacy besides anagami's and arahants.

Then unfortunately your view is contradicted by many Suttas, including the very first one I quoted in the essay.

Even before and after someone attains the Sotapanna stage, they're not free of the hindrances but only sometimes momentarily suppressed them, sometimes longer, sometimes shorter durations.

This view of Theravāda orthodoxy that a lot of your points are based on collapses when you carefully examine how the Buddha describes the abandonment of the hindrances in Suttas like MN 39. As I highlight in the essay, those similes clearly disprove the notion of mere "temporary suppression."

In your further comments you cite a story from the Dhammapada commentary. Just so you know, those non-canonical stories carry no weight whatsoever for us here.

There *are* other stories in the actual Nikāyas showing that a sotāpanna may not be celibate after (and even shortly before) their sotāpatti, and that doesn't stand in contradiction to the points in the essay at all unless one barely made effort to grasp them.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-27 07:40:43 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Sometimes engaging in forced celibacy has the absolute potential of backfiring with people with an under developed mind. And a hyper fixation on sex and overshooting the mark completely.

For sure, which is why it's important to take things gradually, as I've already mentioned. At the same time, one shouldn't forget that it's precisely because of that under developed mind that those people wouldn't be ready to get the Right View. So, rather than trying to squeeze the Right View into a place where it won't fit—thereby turning *sotāpatti* into something entirely different as often happens today—those people should train to the point where celibacy won't overwhelm them anymore.

Just because someone engaged in a sensual activity in the past, does not mean that they haven't been practicing the path out right. A small drop of die into a great lake as an example.

Well, they were not practicing the path when they engaged in sensual activity for sure. Undeniably, sensual intention is wrong intention (MN 117), and that applies whether one is a layman or a monastic (SN 45.24).

But, as I clarify in the essay, whatever happened in the past is not important (case in point, the story of Aṅgulimāla). What matters is whether *presently* the person looks at sensuality fondly— i.e., still plans to act towards it, by for example not resolving upon celibacy—in which case they are most certainly not free from the hindrances or confident in renunciation, as is required for the Right View to land.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-01 16:56:53 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

None of the opposing replies on that thread truly address the very simple premises that lead to the main argument of the essay.

- (1) In order to enter the stream, the mind needs to be free from desire for sensual pleasures, and they need to be clearly perceived as dangerous.
- (2) If you currently have even the most vague intentions to engage in something in the future, you are not free from desire for it *here and now*. You still perceive it as safe.

Conclusion: If someone wants to become a *sotāpanna*, the willingness to engage in sexual activity that they currently have will have to go, and a thorough perception of danger in regard to the entire sensual domain —of which sexuality is the grossest and most recognizable instance—will have to be established. That is synonymous with saying that they will have to give up any intentions towards sexuality they might have. If that giving up—read: undertaking of celibacy—doesn't happen, no perception of danger was established in any meaningful sense.

The “requirement” specified in the title refers solely to the above—and, *as pointed out in the essay, it is the above that people would be terrified of doing*.

Now, can someone establish that perception of danger without having spent a lot of time deliberately practicing physical celibacy? Yes, the Suttas prove that amply, and that's clearly not the point of the essay for anyone who read it carefully.

But is it even remotely advisable to try that? No. That will only make it even more terrifying. Still, that is a practical rather than categorical consideration, and doesn't reach the level of a true "requirement."

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 06:42:46 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

is it possible for a layperson to engage in sexual activity with their spouse in the morning and then, let's say, hear a discourse on the Dhamma at lunchtime and attain stream-entry? Yes? No?

If that discourse on the Dhamma at lunchtime results in them wanting to give up their spouse (along with any other sense pleasures they might have held very dearly beforehand), then undoubtedly yes.

(Is there a likelihood of a discourse that effects such a sudden and profound change being delivered by someone less skilled in the Dhamma than the Buddha or perhaps a chief disciple? I don't think so.

Furthermore, is a person realistically capable of such a noteworthy feat if after encountering the Dhamma and knowing they are still puthujjanas, they don't make effort to be celibate? I also don't think so.)

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-02 07:27:21 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I didn't say "yes but no." I said yes, and provided a context that would be misleading not to include.

Venerable, is the presence of the Buddha or his chief disciple mentioned as a factor for stream entry anywhere in the suttas?

No. That is why I said "I don't think so" rather than simply "no." It's an opinion that could be debated. What isn't debatable is the mind state that the person needs to be in to see the Dhamma.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-03 10:35:24 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

And the only exception was when the Tathāgata himself directly guided someone. Indeed, in every Sutta where a householder attains stream-entry merely by listening to the (accurate) Dhamma, the common factor is that they were listening to the Buddha or his chief disciple with similar abilities in person.

Yes, that's true. With "debatable" I rather meant there is no "hard proof" for that position in any specific Sutta.

Even then, there is no “hard proof” in the Suttas that a householder of any sort, celibate or not, can attain stream entry *without* the Buddha’s help either, so people’s skepticism is often conveniently biased.

They allow themselves the room to *infer* that “surely a conversation with the Buddha can’t be an indispensable condition” when there is no explicit proof against that being the case, meanwhile there *are* many Suttas disproving the idea that one can progress towards enlightenment without giving up sensuality. But somehow it is too much of an inference to say that those also apply to laypeople, even in light of Suttas like SN 45.24.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-05 08:45:43 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

But why do you think the Buddha never explicitly said that it is required? He never said that laypeople must be celibate to reach stream-entry, as far as I’m aware, and I’d think there must be a reason behind that.

I wouldn’t take it for granted that he never did. For one because he never said the opposite either, and secondly because many passages in the Chinese Agamas—which were compiled several hundred years after the Buddha’s passing and thus probably involve dilution of the message already—show a more hardline stance on the harmfulness of sensuality and the need to give it up.

At that time, there was a layman named Mo-nan (Mahānāma) who came before the Buddha, bowed his head to the Buddha’s feet in reverence, and said to the Buddha:

“I often hear the Buddha’s teachings, and they always stay in my mind. I have heard the Buddha say that the human mind has three states: the state of lust, the state of anger, and the state of delusion. Since I heard this, I have always kept it in mind, and I reflect: ‘If there is no lustful state, the mind is naturally correct; if there is no angry state, the mind is naturally correct; if there is no deluded state, the mind is naturally correct.’ I reflect further: ‘If I constantly hold to these three states without wavering, why is it that I still do not fully understand?’”

The Buddha said: **“If one had resolved the mind of lust, anger, and delusion, why would one still live together with a wife and children? It is because of the presence of greed.** A wise person should consider: ‘Although there may be slight suffering now, there will be great joy in the future. Living with a wife and children brings momentary pleasure, but in the long term, it leads to great suffering.’”

— T 54 (parallel of MN 14)

Samyukta Āgama 1042 gives the same requirements for stream entry as for rebirth in the Brahma world and attaining the jhānas:

“Venerable One, what kind of lawful conduct, what kind of righteous conduct, is it that, upon the breaking up of the body after death, one is reborn in heaven?”

The Buddha told the Brahmin elders:

“It is by abstaining from taking life ... up to having right view, that one, through the causes and conditions of the ten wholesome courses of action, upon the breaking up of the body after death, is reborn in heaven.”

The ten wholesome courses of action as defined in the Pali version (MN 41/42) only include abstaining from sensual misconduct, not full celibacy. Further below it says:

“If, moreover, those who practice such lawful conduct and righteous conduct wish to be reborn in the Brahma heaven, they too will attain that rebirth.

Why is this so? Because by practicing righteous conduct and lawful conduct, maintaining pure precepts, **and with minds free from desire**, whatever they wish for will certainly be fulfilled.

...

If they wish to cut off the three fetters and **attain the fruits of stream-enterer**, once-returner, or non-returner; and to obtain immeasurable spiritual powers—the divine ear, knowledge of others’ minds, knowledge of past lives, knowledge of birth and death, and knowledge of the destruction of the taints—they will all be attained.

Why is this so? Because by practicing lawful conduct and righteous conduct, maintaining pure precepts, **and with minds free from desire**, whatever they wish for will certainly be fulfilled.”

Another factor is that we find no examples in the Suttas of people staying in the lay life yet aspiring towards stream entry solely through their own effort, as is often the case today. Every known layperson who became a sotāpanna did so in a conversation with the Buddha, not while living at home after hearing the teaching. So a statement that laypeople should be celibate to attain the Right View would have been redundant if those didn’t get it right away but seriously aspired to it ended up going forth as a rule.

Lastly, even with the Suttas we currently have, the common statement that “practicing in line with the Dhamma” is a requirement for stream-entry should be sufficient for anyone who does not hold a blatantly mistaken view about what the Dhamma even is to see that sexuality must be renounced in order to practice it. Someone who thinks otherwise has such a warped view of what the goal is that they will not be on the right path even if they *are* celibate. It’s akin to someone who thinks they don’t need to stand up in order to walk, showing that whatever they think walking is is way off target.

What is bhava?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Pretty_Struggle_2777 2025-10-22 20:13:52

The Right View Sutta says:

A noble disciple understands being, its origin, its cessation, and the practice that leads to its cessation. But what is being? What is its origin, its cessation, and the practice that leads to its cessation? “There are these three states of existence. [7] Sensual being, material being, and immaterial being. Being comes with assumption. Being ceases when assumption ceases. The practice that leads to the cessation of being is simply this Noble Eightfold Path ...

I don’t understand exactly what being (bhava) means here.

I thought that “being” means “existence” of all things in my experience of reality as a whole. But if being includes everything in my experience of reality, how there can be “something else” (assumptions) that is a cause of being? Aren’t assumptions also part of being?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-25 15:32:35

Your bhava is the extent of your entanglement in your current circumstances (current feelings, perceptions, state of your body, etc.) You have 3 “types” of bhava in the sense that you can most broadly divide the type of circumstances where you can be entangled into three: sensual, material, and immaterial.

As the Buddha put it in DN 9, just as there is no butter to speak of in a glass of milk, there is no material or immaterial being to speak of for as long as there is sensual being, i.e., for as long as lust for the five cords of sensuality still lingers. So, unless they are among the tiny few who rightly train their minds, a human lives their whole life within *kāmaabhava* without interruption.

This is why the rather common understanding of *bhava* as “becoming” is wrong. It implies you start from a neutral position from which you could refrain from *bhava* if you chose to. But unless you have completely surmounted sensual desire, every single thing you do, including your attempt to overcome *kāmaabhava*, is still within it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-26 10:32:13 (in reply to a comment not included)

But don’t those external circumstances also participate of the same bhava? I mean that if for example someone abandons *kāmaabhava* and then dies, he will be reborn in an environment (that he can’t completely control) that fits his non sensual inclination.

Yes, of course. Even in this life, freeing the mind from *kāmaabhava* changes the state of the body as well (i.e., removes a whole layer of agitation and pressure from it), as the passages

on jhāna often describe.

But you can't abandon bhava by changing change the circumstances; that would be upside-down and simply won't work. Particular details of your current situation can change even accidentally (e.g., hormone insufficiencies), but the fundamental attitude towards the entire thing is where the bhava lies.

Was The Buddha Wrong? Is Celibacy (And Virginity) After All A Handicap In The Practice?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** dukkha1975 2025-10-22 16:21:57

Hello. I've come across many lay people and even respected Theravada monks that say that indulging in intercourse has helped them tremendously in the practice. Obviously this was before they ordained, but many of them say that first-hand experience with sex made them realise that sex didn't bring happiness and they learned a valuable lesson otherwise missed out on if they had stayed celibate.

This is a reply from a well known monk u/Bhikkhu_Jayasara that I found on r/Buddhism on the post "How has sex helped to your spiritual growth?" (Important parts highlighted in bold by me)

https://www.reddit.com/r/Buddhism/comments/4w9axf/how_has_sex_helped_to_your_spiritual_growth/

It was after a sexual encounter that I had one of the most interesting periods of my practice. I was deep into my practice by this point and had already started contemplating becoming a monk. I was contemplating sexual desire post encounter and bam.

For a straight month I had 0 sexual desire discernible in my mind... period. I do mean literally, not even a desire for self pleasure, nor an experience of looking at a woman and going DANG!. It was extremely peaceful and wonderful to not have these drives, nothing nagging me, pushing me, it was a glimpse into further down the path. Now of course as insights and experiences like this tend to do, they don't last forever, after a month the human sex drive came back, **but it was severely diminished. I'd say probably was cut in about half.**

From that point on I had no desire to date or find a mate, nor a drive to search for sex, now I never turned it down if the chance arose, but each time further it felt less satisfying and i became more more contemplative. **So I guess sex really helped my spiritual growth quite a bit ;).**

Even now as a monastic I can't say its 100% gone, I still get desires here and there, but they are so diminished and easy to let go of. It won't be until I am in the higher levels of awakening(non-returner I believe) nearing Arahant that

WAS THE BUDDHA WRONG? IS CELIBACY (AND VIRGINITY) AFTER ALL A HANDICAP IN THE PRACTICE

it will be gone fully, but the practice naturally lessens these desires if you are sincerely giving the practice your best shot.

A lay practitioner in the same post said:

Having explored my sexuality, I am no longer obsessed with it. I no longer feel compelled to take a second glance.

(This probably entailed lots of indulgence with sex and women)

I'm asking all of this as I'm a 50 year old unkissed involuntary virgin (due to mental, social and self-esteem issues that started in my teens), and I suffer tremendously every single day, and have been ever since adolescence. I turned to Buddhism these last few years to help me ease my suffering and now I'm contemplating achieving enlightenment as a lay person through celibacy (as I masturbate a lot). But monks and lay people saying these things above has absolutely CRUSHED my motivation to practice, as I've realised my virginity is a HANDICAP in the practice. Why you may ask?

Well, having intercourse helps to demystify sex, and people then get first-hand experience of it, and that way it's far easier to see the drawbacks of sex and relationships if you have personal knowledge. But an old virgin has put sex on a pedestal, and all that pent up lust and longing remains glorified, since there is no first-hand knowledge of sex to challenge these accumulated yearnings and longings.

So I ask the monastics here these questions (others are also free to chime in):

1. If first-hand experience of sex is so important on the path, why is this not mentioned in the suttas?
2. Is being a virgin with no sexual history a handicap when it comes to the practice? I assume the drawbacks of sensuality are far more difficult to see if your mind is clouded by many decades of pent-up lust, whereas sexually active people have a more down to earth view of sex, and therefore less lust overall.
3. What is Ajahn Nyanamoli's and other monks like u/Bhikkhu_Anigha's view on this, since they VERY STRONGLY stress celibacy for lay people who want liberation?
4. If having sex only brings more lust, and worsens the sensual cravings, why did sex do the opposite for these people mentioned above? It lessened their lust. It just doesn't make sense.

I feel so de-motivated now after reading all of this.

Thank you.

EDIT: It's interesting that none of the replies have answered my numbered questions. Maybe too hard-hitting questions, and they don't have a good answer? I expected more from this sub.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-23 09:47:25

It might be true that more sexual experiences can make someone more disinterested in *further* sexual experiences of the same kind, but that doesn't in any way mean that the fetter of sense desire is any less strong. It's just a result of diminishing novelty, and even that circumstantial decrease in interest is not guaranteed. You *probably* won't want any more pizza once you've had it often enough, but will that liberate you from the craving for food once and for all? No chance whatsoever.

Every single time you act out of the craving for sense pleasure can only worsen that fetter. Judging by their ideas about what the practice is, these people don't even have the basis to see what a fetter is, so it's no wonder that they can't see the effect of their past actions on that level.

Being a virgin is neither a handicap nor an aid. It's irrelevant. Simply by virtue of being born human, even a virgin will have had more experience than they need with sensuality, and there is nothing new that sexuality would bring to the table except in somebody's wrong assumption of a different sense object making any difference to the overall picture (and it's precisely that assumption that keeps people roaming left and right within the sensual realm for eons).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-23 15:58:19 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Having no sexual experience would have perhaps been easier to bear in the Buddha's time due to the culture of brahmacharya, mendicants, spiritual gurus etc.

Probably. So, since celibacy and sense restraint were still a requirement even back then, the chances of success when making compromises today—where every slip, even small, easily opens an endless rabbit hole of further indulgence accessible at the click of a button—are even smaller than none.

Would you tell the truth no matter what? (When to stay silent?)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** craveminerals 2025-10-17 19:27:38

Lying / deception is one of my serious bad habits and something I'm trying to overcome. I made a post earlier with some of my thoughts on this topic but deleted it. I thought I'd make a new one to ask questions instead because I'd like to hear your thoughts on any or all of these questions.

1. Would you tell the truth no matter what, no matter what the question is? (For example, in response to a person with Alzheimer's who's asking where their dead partner is everyday)

2. When do you think staying silent or disregarding is appropriate, in the face of certain questions? (Like the Buddha did at times)
3. When does staying silent turn into lying by omission?

Thank you ☸

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-20 16:06:05

The topic of lying is something that I see many people overthinking in a way that only serves as a distraction from actual faults that they probably haven't overcome.

There is a certain baseline of truthfulness that you need to have always, which is what is often described in the Suttas: when explicitly asked something that you know to be true, don't try to convey that it is false, or vice versa. Doing so would always be unwholesome.

If you feel the need to more "truthful" than that, ask yourself why. If it's just a sense of external moral obligation, that's not the right motivation, and it will be rooted in some sort of compulsion. You will never reach the goal of virtue (a tamed mind) by following that direction no matter how far, since it maintains the same problem through the very attempt to solve it.

Do they teach the Dhamma?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Double-Ad2563 2025-10-13 06:37:44

https://youtu.be/CGtWQl6_haE?si=QIwsFjDZUCVBtMR

I guess this is more of a question towards Bhikkhu Anigha and the Sangha for obvious reasons.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-15 15:12:04

A good number of people seem to have the perception that they are presenting an "easier" version of what we teach. From what I recall, some of those videos give the impression that one can achieve right view without living up to the same requirements we often talk about, i.e., celibacy, non-delight in company, giving up the misguided safety of modern Buddhist views and practices, etc.

So, I think those people probably find the Dhamma Hub teachings "easier" not really because of their teaching style, but because those people have already pre-decided to make compromises in their virtue and their awareness of uncomfortable truths, and they don't want to have to wrestle with guilt. That means, those people want to avoid the actual training without at the same time admitting it and feeling bad about it, and you can't stray further away from the Dhamma than that: lack of *hiri-ottappa* in regard to unwholesome qualities. If someone enables that attitude, they are by extension not teaching the Dhamma.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-16 15:38:34 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I see. Well, regardless, I was primarily concerned with warning anyone who hopes they can get what sounds like the same result with less work and difficulty, whether it's because that is what is explicitly stated by some teacher or because that's the idea they automatically walk away with when things are not stated bluntly enough.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-16 15:54:00 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Bhante, I noticed that your previous reply seemed somewhat indirect.

Yes, that was on purpose. Rather than offloading the responsibility to an authority who decrees what is Dhamma and what is not, people should be transparent enough to realize for themselves when a concession to their defilements presents itself as the Dhamma. They need to be capable of seeing the genuine, probably uncomfortable-to-admit reasons why they might sometimes find one teacher or teaching more pleasing than another.

That applies universally, and it needs to be understood on that level rather just decided with one specific teacher. Why? Because you can (and realistically will) distort what even the best teacher in the world says in line with your wrong views, and then it ceases to be the Dhamma even if it originally was in the way the teacher meant it.

If they can't have that level of transparency, then that person will not get very far despite having the Buddha face-to-face as their sole teacher.

Conceit in speech

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Consistent-Buy5570 2025-10-13 02:46:31

Hi, I was previously a person who was thoroughly into nonduality. I have watched videos of various contemporary buddhist-nondual videos... that talk about anatta, and non duality. The premise is either noticing thoughts and dissociating into a space of not thinking, investigating the sense fields... doing emotion work... Putting yourself into situations that are unsettling or emotionally disturbing to withstand them and clarify the emotions etc.

My practices revolved mostly on focusing the objectivity of the senses, clarifying the non-duality in sound, sensation, and immersing yourself more and more into the senses. I would be absorbed, sometimes be pleased and relieved that the contemporary definitions of jhana support my experiences, and reify a view of being already awake to neglect the uneasiness of doubt.

But from the suffering POV i was still suffering quite a lot, and I could manage it quite well... I would experience absorption into the senses more and more...

But as HH expounded on the wrong views I had been holding directly, without making it grey... or giving any space for me to be complacent, I realized I was no sotapanna, and despite being very uneasy I was a bit relieved that there was actually a possibility of uprooting suffering to such a degree that its not possible anymore and due to the clarity expressed I could take it up on faith.

But I am in a few of these nonduality discord servers and have a bunch of friends who talk about nonduality... and I find myself often trying to fix there wrong views, trying to clarify them... and it isn't coming from a place of wholesomeness or it is coming from illwill and reaction and a lot of emotion.

Sometimes I stop and contemplate what is going on here, but I lose that context quite fast and see myself being unable to restrain.

Hopefully by making this post I make this more serious for myself and receive feedback

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-15 15:15:43

Conceit and ill will is bound to pollute your speech at times if you haven't perfected the precepts yet. That impurity cannot possibly be absent if coarser ones are still ongoing.

Confusion in regards to seeing the mind and more

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Novel-Commercial2006 2025-10-12 22:27:22

Good evening everyone,

I have been watching hillside hermitage and Samanadipa Hermitage videos for about a month now. They have been great theoretically to build understanding but when it comes to actually putting these in practice, such as yoniso manasikara into practice I find myself feeling almost bewildered/a great amount of confusion like I am grasping in the dark. All the theoretical understanding and reading I had done seems to melt away almost instantaneously and it is just me fixating on various things, unable to get anything to really "stick" in my actual experience.

I know that keeping the eight precepts is one of the biggest and most important aspects of coming to actually see these things. I am failing in keeping all eight, essentially breaking the entertainment and eating aspect. I have had moderate success in not engaging in sexuality but to be totally honest, I have always had a rather weak sexual drive and I still am not completely abstinent due to giving in a couple times with masturbation. Which is even more pitiful as it is essentially the easiest for me to implement yet I am still failing. And I know better but here I am still going in circles around the same goalpost week after week, never really "going against the grain" when I see it.

I was thinking should I instead just try to keep the eight precepts and not watch videos by hillside and samanadipa hermitage because it seems like I end up confusing myself even more than before and am not really understanding anything. My mindfulness is so weak

when it comes to seeing what they speak about it seems like being able to have any sort of “enduring context” is just so far off for me and I’m not even sure if what I have in mind would be an accurate description of what it would be. Are these things that even someone of a generally lower intelligence could come to understand? Why is this so hard to even understand on any level?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-13 16:42:10

You should remember that the measure of successful understanding is your ability to keep the precepts. If you have that attitude then you won’t get sidetracked from the basic work that’s right in front of you. Losing that context, not listening to the talks per se, is the dangerous mistake.

Duty toward others vs. Generosity

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ConversationGlass17 2025-10-11 21:05:20

I can’t see my intentions clearly sometimes, especially when it comes to distinguishing duty from generosity. I think it’s important for me to discern the difference and I think the difference can be very subtle.

I’m sure there are all sorts of philosophical approaches to this situation, but I’m only interested in those that involve the Dhamma.

And no surprise, I think that perhaps this issue is cloudy for me because I am not yet secure in virtue or sense restraint. If I were, then the craving that blocks true generosity would be greatly diminished or gone.

I will guess that true generosity praised by the Buddha is probably free from fear of any loss or fear of inconvenience to the giver? So, it’s beyond virtue and sense restraint.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-13 16:37:13

“True generosity” (or rather, “giving up,” which is what *cāga* literally means) is about giving something up with the aim of training your mind to abandon craving.

It doesn’t matter if there is fear or resistance. It will be beneficial as long as it’s an act of giving something up against the grain of the mind’s worldly desires, and it’s through that practice that that fear or resistance would eventually subside. The fact that your giving up might also help others is just a bonus, and is not a measure of its efficacy.

Are the mind sense objects rūpa or nāma?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** meshinthesky 2025-10-10 08:26:29

Are the sense objects of mano (dhamma?) considered as rūpa? Or as nāma? If it not in any of those two categories... what are they considered to be in the wider categories used by the Buddha?

I always considered that forms, sounds, odors, tastes, touches, and mental objects were considered as being part of rūpa in the nāmarūpa. Main reasons for that:

- it is said that senses are formed by five aggregates; using eye and form as the pattern, I thought that in all other senses, their aggregate of rūpa referred to the sense objects in themselves.
- in the suttas, nāma is explicitly defined as feeling, perception, intention, contact, attention.
- in some places AN defines rūpa as behaviour, or resistance, while nāma as designation; all senses objects behave, in some way or another (the designations used on them are not the senses objects in themselves, but part of nāma, like perceptions).

Yet:

- in some suttas dhamma seems to mean any phenomena whatsoever, including both, phenomena could be considered as rūpa and phenomena can be considered as nāma. However, since dhamma is quite of a flexible word, so I am not sure if in those passages one can understand such dhamma as referring exactly to the sense objects of mano.

On the other hand:

- some buddhist are definitely of the opinion that rūpa is materiality and nāma mentality, thus, dhamma is not rūpa, but nāma. (Further, in some places AN translate rūpa as matter).

I have studied the suttas a bit on my own, and could not found any definitively answer.

EDIT to further clarify my assumptions and/or misunderstandings:

In some sutta is it said, “what is rūpa? the four great elements and shape (rūpa) is what’s called rūpa”. It seems to imply forms, shape, rūpa to be purely rūpa. [Yet, at the same time, when we know forms we know them as nāmarūpa as a whole.]

If forms are said to be rūpa I can’t help but assume sounds must be rūpa too. Subjectively, the way I experience both of them are alike.

In the same way, if eye visual shape images are said to be rūpa, mind visual shape images, or mind sounds must be rūpa. Other mental objects, that are more fuzzy and cannot be said to be mental images or mental sounds, seems to share the same characteristics of the mental images or sounds, though.

This is what I assumed from the very beginning of learning about Buddha’s instruction, which was a learning based exclusively in practice, and without caring about concepts. Years later, when listening to Ajahn Nyanamoli and reading HH texts, the “rūpa is what behaves, nāma what designates”, just reinforced such initial assumption.

An additional doubt that plays here: dhamma as used for “any phenomena”, include perceptions, ... and the whole *nāma* and *nāmarūpa*. Yet, is this usage of dhamma and the usage of dhamma as *mano* objects (like for instance the one used in *sabbasutta*) describe one only category/phenomena/behaviour or different ones...?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-13 16:13:41

They are both. You cannot rightly see them as separate things even in your imagination. When you imagine something as being solely *rūpa*, you overlook that that thing partakes in *nāma* by the simple fact of being thought. When you imagine something as being solely *nāma*, you overlook that that phenomenon comes with its own independent liability to change, i.e., it partakes in *rūpa*. And yes, that applies even to objects of *mano*. That's how you end up forgetting things even though you don't want to, for example.

Should I restraint love for my family,friends?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Severe-Cream4599 2025-10-06 02:20:43

Love is also a sensual pleasures but it feels pure. Also sympathy for people who are suffering,wanting to help them,love them. Is restraint for this necessary according to buddha? And also why impermanance is look upon like it's some kind of bad thing. In my perspective, impermanance makes the things In life more precious,valuable,appreciative if one acknowledges it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-08 17:57:39

Also sympathy for people who are suffering,wanting to help them,love them.
Is restraint for this necessary according to buddha?

Yes. That doesn't mean you need to deny or suppress those emotions though. It means that when they arise and persist, you recognize that they make you liable to great suffering, so it's not worth embracing them. If you stop embracing them then they will slowly die out.

Then, you will never again help someone just because your feelings for them would torture *you* mentally if you didn't help them. That is the only type of help that counts as genuine, and you would be free from biases towards some individuals and implicit hatred towards others who oppose them.

Suffering is to be understood

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** buddho_007 2025-10-01 02:13:31

Hello, I was listening to the YouTube video from Hillside Hermitage titled “Suffering is to understood”. The video talks about the need to practice sense restraint and virtue as

the basis for developing right understanding of our suffering which then allows one to explain its cause and escape without relying on external references.

I am trying to understand the above guidelines wrt to my current problem which is emotional distress due to my mother's ill-health. How does one develop right understanding in the immediacy of my current experience which at the moment is quite distressing? Is virtue in this situation simply about being present to whatever emotions and images that come up within and not giving in to the unpleasant feeling by reacting emotionally? There is immense dukkha, sorrow and helplessness in my inability to alleviate her suffering. Intellectually I do understand the impermanence of all conditioned things but the raw feeling and anguish of losing the very person who brought me into existence is very hard to cope with.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-02 08:20:22

Is virtue in this situation simply about being present to whatever emotions and images that come up within and not giving in to the unpleasant feeling by reacting emotionally?

Virtue in every situation is about not acting in ways that are directly rooted in passion, aversion, or desire for distraction. That's not going to directly help you with the situation in any way, but it will remove the fuel for you being affected by it.

It affects you right now because your actions and lifestyle as a whole so far have maintained and probably further strengthened the default attitude of chasing after pleasure and resisting displeasure this way or that. Now, although you may not want to resist this displeasure, you can't stop that craving because your mind has been well trained to have it through all the other things you've been doing.

The lie of lay life

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** xpingu69 2025-09-27 11:33:13

Can you really see the Dhamma as a lay person? Why would I remain lay except for the wrong reasons? There is no reason to be a lay person except the sensuality and the imperfect safety. How can I see the Dhamma without adjusting my lifestyle too? Without going forth? I don't think it's possible. It seems like a daunting task, but honestly I don't think it's possible otherwise. You can't see Dhamma and at the same time hold the opposing values, like career, family, possessions etc. That's my current understanding. I would need to give those things up. And if I am honest to myself, if I give them up, there is no reason to remain a lay person. None at all. So **giving them up internally would mean going forth externally too.**

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-28 05:44:11

You can't see Dhamma and at the same time hold the opposing values, like career, family, possessions etc. That's my current understanding. I would need to give those things up.

That is certainly true.

At the same time, not being formally ordained doesn't automatically imply holding those opposing values, and being formally ordained does not by itself imply *not* holding them. Not keeping the eight precepts, and in general acting in line with those opposing values is what does. And that is something you are fully responsible for each and every moment regardless of the clothes you wear. If you don't see that then you won't be ordaining for the right reasons.

Regarding the 7th Precept.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Arc-Enemy 2025-09-27 07:56:09

I've been trying to keep the 8 precepts for a while and a few questions regarding 7th Precept keeps bugging me.

What is causing me trouble understanding right now, is where would say reading dostoevsky stand in this position ?

Is it just a waste of time or a form of giving into desire ??

Past few days my mind has been ruminating on the question of why engaging in art of any form is abstained from. Which was a result of my mind thinking about the art that I've consumed. I don't feel much of an urge to engage with any form of media (as of now at least), but Just pondering on the "vibe" of it.

Best way I can describe it is that my mind has romanticised random mundane things, and they act as a trigger for getting lost in a Euphoria of Feelings. (Like the cliché of "Oh Ocean, how majestic and serene, What heavenly beauty, may this last forever....." but unironically)

How do I tackle this state of mind ?

Not get lost in it or simply abstain from thoughts that keep this state sustained ??

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-27 18:58:22

Is it just a waste of time or a form of giving into desire ??

It is a form of giving in to desire only if there is desire in the background while engaging. That is something you would need to discern on every individual occasion.

As for a waste of time, it most likely is. Any aid such reading might provide on the quest to free yourself from craving would be extremely tangential and replaceable, so it doesn't

justify the downside of it quite likely fueling your hindrances through worldly content and ideas.

How do I tackle this state of mind ?

First of all by not consuming art anymore. Otherwise you're feeding the existing fire. Then, with what you're left with, recognize the line where there is the delight but you're not the one "putting" it there. You see the delight as a dangerous bait that you shouldn't fall for, you're certainly not planning to ever act out of it, and yet you're not trying to force it to disappear. And that's how it eventually subsides in the right way.

Can't help but focus on the breath

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** gradual_training 2025-09-26 02:59:29

Before encountering HH, I used to practice breath meditation and could often spend long periods of time in focused attention. For some time now I've set that aside as a method for developing understanding and clarity.

One thing that still lingers, however, is that when I sit and "do nothing," I automatically shift back to focusing on the breath. This often leads to tension in my throat, making it uncomfortable to contemplate or sit for extended periods. I've also noticed that it mainly happens when I'm seated.

Has anyone else experienced this? What might be the causes, and are there ways to ease or remedy it?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-27 18:32:58

You could avoid sitting as a practice altogether. You will not lose anything of significance by doing so. In fact it might be beneficial in that it would indirectly force you to give up lingering misunderstandings about meditation built up from before, so that you realize that the work is exactly the same regardless of your posture.

You do obviously have to be alone though.

HH and Yogācāra

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** None 2025-09-25 13:02:14

[deleted]

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-27 18:27:33

All of the key tenets you listed fall within the types of speculation that the Buddha denounced as *ayoniso manasikara* in MN 2. I don't see any similarity with our teachings at

all, and some of those ideas directly contradict the Suttas (just like the bulk of what is standard doctrine in Theravada).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-28 07:12:58 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

MN2 lists questions concerned with the existence or non-existence of the self or the world. None of the points I listed deal with that.

I would seem so if you don't look beyond the mere words. All of what you listed seeks to provide *explanations* for the way things are, and that is the spirit behind all those wrong directions listed in MN 2. The fact that the word "self" is not used doesn't change the fact that it's a speculative theory about precisely that which is taken as self (consciousness, mind, etc.)

The core difference between an explanation and the actual Dhamma is that with the latter, nothing has been understood unless your mind is automatically liberated from the very *possibility* of dukkha purely by virtue of that understanding, with no additional steps required.

Whenever the Buddha talked about *paticcasamuppāda*, it was in the latter and not the former context. That is the main point that all the other interpretations of PS I'm aware of, including both Theravada's Yogacara's, fail to take into account. The deepest issue is that fundamental difference in spirit, not solely their individual details (but those also miss the mark and stray outside the Suttas to boot).

As to similarities, I am predominantly referring to the view that Yogācārins have that the primary task is not to focus on an object in meditation

That's better than the alternative, but at the same time it's a very broad distinction. There is plenty of room to go completely astray even without any object-focusing.

by understanding that the attributes we ascribe to objects "out there" are simply a projection of our mental conditioning.

This is another instance of the proverbial mistake of blaming the way things appear for one's suffering in regard to them, and it's something we've refuted many times already since it's a common thread to all wrong views. What that implies is that despite doing everything wrong, one could be liberated by accident if the distortion were suddenly corrected by some external factor.

What we and the Suttas teach is the exact opposite. Since craving is your responsibility alone, nothing other than your own rightly directed effort can be the cause for freedom, even hypothetically. Accidental liberation not just impossible in practice; the very concept is inapplicable even in theory.

“Why doesn’t Maranasati sink in deeply enough for me?”

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Mountain25th 2025-09-22 20:31:37

Posting this question for hopeful answer from one of the venerables at HH, from a friend

Homage to the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Sangha, homage to the venerables of Hillside Hermitage and their teachers,

I’ve been trying to keep strict sense-restraint by practicing the eight precepts (and avoidance of sensuality in general). Because of my daily mental workload, I am not too strict about how much food I consume, but I keep my sleep to about four hours to have more time for practicing contemplation and mental discipline. I’ve found that, with a basis of sense-restraint, maranasati becomes much easier to practice, and by maintaining the context of death I am much less susceptible to sensual pulls and worldly worries.

Still, death remains something I take for granted. For example, when I want to practice maranasati, I turn it into an idea that I then try to bring up in my mind, and I let it endure as a context peripheral to all else that might appear in front of me (the sense doors, desires, thoughts are all “part” of that context, as “particulars” of it). But it feels superficial or too “abstract” sometimes—it’s seen by me as an ambiguous, elusive, “taken-at-face-value” thing, and I find that it doesn’t sink in deeply enough (it makes me slightly anxious; it is “felt” anxiously in a sort of ambiguous way, but it doesn’t make me deeply, existentially concerned with avoiding sensuality for the rest of my life). How do I stop keeping it at arm’s length by conceptualizing it as an abstract idea, and how do I let that context genuinely sink in?

Heidegger says that for an inauthentic person, death shows up as an “actuality” and not as a “possibility”: “Death is certain, but it will not happen now.” That “now” keeps extending, and in that sense the person avoids the real possibility of death every time. He doesn’t feel “touched” by it because he has pushed away the possibility of death (which is implicit in its appearance) and conceptualized it; he has “covered” it up.

When I think of death as an actuality—a “thing” that will happen to my body—I turn it into an image. Then I try to imagine its implications, and I get a sense of how the “perishing” of this “physical body” (with which the ever-elusive and ambiguous sense of “self,” the “I,” is tied up; it doesn’t matter where exactly it is, but in itself it is determined by the body, by *kāyasaṅkhāra*) would inadvertently undermine my sense of self as well, but that still remains too abstract and ambiguous for me. Thinking “this is my body” isn’t the actual body, but a thought of what the body is; what the body is, is that as a result of which I have the possibility of being aware of a “presence of the body being there”; it’s a possibility that precedes my actualization, remembering, or reflection of it, as that which precedes any reflection of it. When I think of “the body being liable to dying,” I turn that into an actuality; by trying to think in any way about death, it becomes an actuality and not an already enduring possibility that precedes any actualization of it, and all attempts at thinking about it in this way conceal the possibility of it in one way or another. By trying to “discern the background of things being liable to death,” I still turn it into a “thing,” and

not a context to all things (but how do you make a context into something different from a thing? I still have to think about “death” as a thing to discern its context, and then apply the context of a thing to another thing, and this, in general, allows me to see that death is a context to certain things that might arise in my experience, but in a sort of “disconnected” and “abstract” way as well).

In general, when trying to find where the “I” is, one will always be confronted by a sort of elusiveness or ambiguity of it; it is neither “here” nor “there.” Although I don’t know if this is correct, I usually see that “the experience of elusiveness” is in itself an experience, and if I remain focused on the “nature” of an experience (as an elusive thing as such), I still undermine the elusiveness or any appropriation that results from it, but I still find that sometimes it does not sink in deeply enough, especially in the context of maranasati.

How do I see through the “ambiguity” and elusiveness of my idea of death so I don’t keep it at arm’s length anymore? How do I let it sink in deeply enough so it undermines everything within my life (rather than being perceived as a “thing among things in the world,” and instead as “the ultimate inescapable context of all things within the world”)? Is it enough to simply think about the idea of death and try to imagine what possibilities that would hold for anything else that might appear in my experience for it to have effect? How do you discern it as a context that is not as superficial as just another “idea,” and what is different between one’s “idea of death” and the “context” of death?

Although I don’t think the issue is in lack of sense-restraint (which I am trying to work on daily), but on the fact that I can’t practice Maranasati because I don’t understand what Marana or Sati is yet, I am willing to do anything to try and understand what they are exactly (which is what I have been reading Nyanamoli, Nanavira, and Heidegger and more philosophers for). There is no understanding taking place without sila, but the context still must be learned to be discerned which I find it very difficult to do, your help and advice is deeply appreciated, thank you.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-25 13:34:02

Death is relational. You will only find the “actual” death—the one that you cannot be unafraid of unless you’re an Arahant—as the negative of your sense of safety or well-being in the broadest sense. It is the ever-present possibility of that safety being destroyed completely. And so if the idea of death feels abstract or even dull, it’s because you are not contrasting it with what you hold as safe (and there is plenty of opportunity for that holding even within a restrained lifestyle).

The second point is that you shouldn’t constantly try to fabricate a sharp sense of fear in regard to death. Sometimes it won’t feel as sharp as other times. The goal is just to not completely forget about that context regardless of how it feels. If you try to force it to feel sharp, then through that very attempt you are obscuring the direction of death, which is always opposite to wherever your sense of control is. If anything is taken as safe, it will be the sense of control at the very least.

Were the Suttas primarily meant for sekhas?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** WebSubstantial6325 2025-09-21 13:29:39

What is Hillside's position when it comes to whom the Suttas are directed to? Do most already presume the listener to have the ariyan right view? For example, is one capable of understanding what *ayonisomanasikāra* is without an understanding of *yonisomansikāra*?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-22 05:48:23

Do most already presume the listener to have the ariyan right view?

They at least presume that the listener recognizes that they are ignorant about what's being discussed.

That's not unique to the Suttas but a basic attitude that would underlie any serious attempt at learning anything. It only needs reminders because modern spiritual culture tends to regard enlightenment as something that one can define for oneself. So unless they are told, a lot of people wouldn't read the Suttas with the same natural humility they would have when approaching almost any other subject they know they are in the dark about.

How attainable are the attainments of a *saddhānusārī* (faith-follower) and a *dhammānusārī* (Dhamma-follower)?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ComprehensiveCamp486 2025-09-20 18:53:59

From what I've read, these seem far beyond mere intellectual belief common in many Buddhist circles. Wouldn't someone at this stage already be like 80–90% of the way to stream-entry, and what exactly have they understood or realized to be called such?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-22 05:32:35

They've understood all of what a *sotāpanna* understands. They are not *puthujjanas* anymore; they have the right view and are irreversibly destined for Arahantship.

In practice, it is a state that nobody can rightly regard themselves to be in, as there is by definition no self-recognition of one's attainment of right view up until full stream-entry. In other words, every actual *saddha-/dhammānusārī* will still see themselves as a *puthujjana*.

Would choosing lay life to preserve your own health prevent achieving a higher attainment?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ChairOk548 2025-09-16 17:03:26

If a putthujjana with chronic health issues (not life threatening) decided to remain a layperson out of a sense of responsibility for their own health, and probably also unavoidably out of desire for better health or aversion towards chronic illness, would that likely prevent them from reaching stream entry?

Similarly, if a sotapanna in a similar situation decided to remain a layperson, would they be unable to become an anagami? Anagami are free from sensual desire, but would a desire for better health or aversion towards chronic illness be sensuality?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-17 06:48:06

If a putthujjana with chronic health issues (not life threatening) decided to remain a layperson out of a sense of responsibility for their own health, and probably also unavoidably out of desire for better health or aversion towards chronic illness, would that likely prevent them from reaching stream entry?

Not per se. Not questioning their internal motivations behind their attempt towards better health is what would prevent them. That attempt will often go beyond the practical purpose of sustaining the body for the sake of practice and become infected with the assumption of ownership and entitlement to health. If one regards the external attempt as acceptable in itself, those underlying attitudes will not magically be uprooted and the perception of non-ownership developed.

Those underlying attitudes are exemplifications of the wrong view of a *puthujjana* (or, in a more refined degree, the lingering conceit of a *sotāpanna*).

On the description of the Buddha entering the jhānas in DN 16 and vitakkavicara

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** brousseqc 2025-09-15 19:33:19

Good day,

I would like to adress my question directly to Bhante Bhikku Anigha, or anyone else in this reddit community who is knowledgeable and well-versed in the understanding of the position of Hillside Hermitage regarding the jhānas.

The questions I will ask here come from a very sincere and humble wish to correct my understanding of the jhānas relying only on the suttas. There is no other agenda or ill intentions in challenging, adresssing the views mentionned here ; only for the sole purpose of clearing my ignorance and grow a better understanding.

My first question is about the description of the way the Buddha “entered” from the first jhāna hrough the fourth, all the arupa samapatti, and in reverse order back to the first jhāna just before he died, from DN 16 :

“Then the Buddha entered the first absorption. Emerging from that, he entered the second absorption. Emerging from that, he successively entered into and emerged from the third absorption, the fourth absorption, the dimension of infinite space, the dimension of infinite consciousness, the dimension of nothingness, and the dimension of neither perception nor non-perception. Then he entered the cessation of perception and feeling.”

My question regarding this passage in light of the Hillside Hermitage position of the jhānas, is this : If, from my current understanding, part of the Hillside Hermitage’s position on the jhāna is that they are not absorptions but “lifestyles” that one embodies as a kind of default mode of being by the very end of the path — mode of being which is pleasant from the seclusion from sensuality and unwholesome states, and that the states becomes more refined and insightful the more we deepen our insight of the nature of experience and sensuality, meaning going forth to the higher jhānas... And that the Buddha is devoid of any craving for pleasant experience, liberated from craving, sensuality, living in the utmost peaceful state possible to live, that even all the “lower” states of being (like the jhānas) are less powerful and are more gross than the living state of a Buddha/Arahant...

Why would the Buddha go through the jhānas in order and reverse order? What would be the purpose of that, for an awakened being like him? What I don’t understand specifically, is that if the jhānas are “lifestyles”... Why would he go down to lesser states than his already purified and unconditioned state of being? Why would he switch “lifestyles” of contemplation to grosser one? In my limited understanding of this, it seems kind of odd to imagine this supreme teacher switch “lifestyles” rapidly. I have a hard time making sense of this, making it coherent. Other traditions do generally interpret the jhānas as meditation absorptions, so it can make sense for them. But in this case, how is the notion of the jhānas as lifestyles applicable to the Buddha before his death?

My second question is regarding the same position of the Hermitage of jhānas, but specifically concerning vitakkavicara. Some people here or elsewhere on forums, discord, sutta-central, dhammawheel, etc had critique the way Bhante Anigha describe the contemplation in the jhānas states : it is interpreted that Bhante seems to suggest pondering and thinking, even in a less obvious way, is present all the way from the first jhana through the cessation-of-perception-and-feeling, which is most probably not what Bhante meant but still, I am wondering what is left for developing dispassion without vitakkavicara from the second jhāna on to the upper : after some discussion elsewhere, some people suggested that it would be a kind of direct non-discursive, non-conceptual observation of experience, as a kind of felt interplay between perceptions (sanna) and feelings (vedana) that produces the purpose of dispassion toward experience, without the use of vitakkavicara, that allow one to develop further up the next jhānas. Would this understanding of the jhānas according to Hillside Hermitage or “What The Jhanas Really Are” essay correct? Or should I rectify it?

This is for example, the way Keren Arbel in her book “Early Buddhist Meditation : the Jhānas as actualisation of Insight” describes the experience of developing insightful dispassion toward the nature of experience from the cessation of vitakkavicara in the second jhāna up to the next ones. Still, in this reddit post (<https://www.reddit.com/r/HillsideHermitage/s/MUEC0gYGkq>) Bhante Anigha responded

to someone regarding Keren's Arbel book :

"Yes, I came across that one. It was not bad, relatively speaking. But if you read closely, you'll see that she still thinks "thinking" is somehow in and of itself an obstacle. It's hard for people to abandon that notion, because that's when you get in the realm of *actually* having to become dispassionate towards the entire world correctly (which is experienced *through* your thinking, nothing else), not run away from it."

I don't see the contradiction between Keren Arbel's and Bhikku Anigha perspective. Both think vitakkavicara ceases in the second jhāna. Am I right to think that both see the deepening of insight from the second jhāna as non-conceptual direct and active observation of nature of experience (dukkha/anicca), but not from thinking ; intimately and simply through sanna?

Thank you for your time and consideration, I wish you all a great day

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-17 06:27:23

Why would the Buddha go through the jhānas in order and reverse order?
What would be the purpose of that, for an awakened being like him?

Being able to go up and down the jhānas at will is the result of complete mastery over one's *citta*., which in turn implies complete freedom from craving. It means that the mind does not become enchanted and refuse to look beyond any arisen state, no matter how refined it already is, nor does it resist returning to states that are coarser. Such a *citta* would have to be purified from even the most refined forms of passion.

At its core, awakening is not about a specific "state" but about the fact that there is no room for passion in regard to any state.

None of this means that the jhānas are absorptions. A state of absorption has nothing to do with taming the *citta* and is thus of no lasting benefit at all. It is simply about controlling what the *citta* gets to look at so as to appease it momentarily, like locking a wild animal into a special room where it will stop blatantly displaying the wildness that still very much remains.

after some discussion elsewhere, some people suggested that it would be a kind of direct non-discursive, non-conceptual observation of experience, as a kind of felt interplay between perceptions (sanna) and feelings (vedana) that produces the purpose of dispassion toward experience, without the use of vitakkavicara, that allow one to develop further up the next jhānas.

I would recommend ignoring such descriptions, as they often come from people who one way or another still approach the practice with the overall attitude of absorption. If a person started out with a state where they need to remain focused on something to keep the mind calm, then in whichever way they refine that, it will never be the second jhāna nor any of the following ones.

It's worth noting that the Jains denied that overcoming vitakka-vicāra was possible at all. That should give pause to anyone who takes their idea of the second jhāna for granted.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-18 13:45:13 (in reply to a comment not included)

Still, I must admit I have a hard time understanding what those states that are mastered consist of.

That's expected, and it'd be better to keep it that way than to think you understood them without attaining them. They are not things that you can understand intellectually. And that's not because they're mystical. It's because what they consist of is the complete cessation of every attitude with which you currently relate to any phenomena, including them.

To give a simile, they are not sights that you have not yet seen with your current eyes. Being in jhāna is having a completely different set of eyes that have no overlap with your current ones, so it's pointless to try to imagine what someone in jhāna sees for as long as you have this set of eyes. What isn't pointless is to stop maintaining the causes for your current type of vision—by unconditionally adopting the eight precepts, restraining your senses, and learning how not to welcome the five hindrances throughout your day.

That is why she claims it must not be absorbed, non-discursive, broad field of awareness, not narrow.

Absorption or non-absorption is a secondary distinction. The fact remains that, as is standard in modern spiritual circles, she thinks that there is some sort of “more fundamental reality” that thinking inherently obstructs, i.e., mysticism.

That view alone perverts everything: it becomes about replacing one kind of experience with another one that is somehow better and more lofty, while the underlying attitude towards either experience remains unaccounted for. Whereas, the refinement of *samādhi* lies in decreasing the *extent of engagement* with the entirety of experience, not about replacing its content. It's the extent of that engagement, not the “illusory conceptual layer,” that obstructs discernment (of the fact that engagements/*saṅkhāras* are suffering).

Drying Sticks - a progress note

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** knwp7 2025-09-12 04:39:52

I can feel my sticks drying up. I have been in similar situation before but did not carry the momentum long enough. Last few times, I did not see “the danger in slightest fault”, took it as granted and soon relapsed.

I can feel the freedom from the pressures, the lightness of it. I can see the choice I have of not acting-out. If I don't intentionally break it, this momentum can continue to build.

The line of questioning this time has been “do I really have to?” - trying to see gratuitousness of my actions. Few months ago, it was “what's pressuring me right now?”. They both

help me see my intentions.

Right now I am at a neutral ground where I am not pulled too much. Now is the time to work on contemplating the bait of sensuality. To turn away from it even more strongly. Drying up makes the abandoning easier.

The confession-server is helping cultivate accountability and shame. I did not realize it could be so useful - or I would have joined earlier!

- Even though I had (still have) dis-passion for media (music, TV, movies), the habit of checking news had crept-in; that leak had widened into bouts of social-media browsing for “harmless” fun. For the last two months, my thoughts are free of politics and happenings everywhere - whether sad or amusing. (The initial dis-passion arose upon realizing worthlessness of media and ideas compared to Dharma)
- Eating food more deliberately and questioning - whether I must give-in to the urge to indulge - is helping craving subside.
- Signs of lust are appearing earlier and earlier because I am trying to actively avoid attending to sights wrongly. A peripheral look or glance at a woman is enough to alert me - “do I really have to look again?”. Sexual dreams merely wake me up; I refuse to indulge or recollect the details later in the day. All this, coupled with withdrawal from media - has helped the craving subside.

This progress is still subject to disruption by travel or a major-event in family or extended-family. Keeping solitude is not entirely up to me and so the progress in these spheres is circumstantial too.

I would appreciate guidance from Ven. Anigha please.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-14 13:11:44

True, you do want to cultivate more of the same. But to that end, you must not allow yourself to exclude the anticipation or excitement that might be building up towards “drying the sticks more,” because the sticks will start getting wet again if you do so. Though it’s not explicit sensual indulgence, that attitude implies passion, and passion is what keeps the sticks wet, not just specific sense objects.

So do maintain vigilance in regard to sensuality specifically because that is the greatest pitfall, but remember that any leaning of the mind towards anything whatsoever needs to be included in the quest of “drying the sticks.”

Question about Right View and study

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Global_Ad_7891 2025-09-12 02:02:48

I’m wondering what level of reading and intellectual study is really necessary for just Right View. Is it possible to simply keep the precepts for a long time, live more withdrawn, and then at some point start contemplating directly?

I notice many people seem to have all the concepts and phrases worked out, but I don't operate that way. I find it easier (and more enjoyable) to just keep the precepts and avoid over-intellectualizing.

If there *is* an intellectual component, is there a kind of rubric or progression, specific suttas to read, in a particular order, or key concepts to understand first? Or is minimal study enough, as long as one is practicing restraint and withdrawal?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-13 13:47:42

You certainly don't need to spend all that much effort in gathering information and systematizing concepts for its own sake. But you do have to remember that everything you do—no matter how “simple,” like keeping the precepts—has certain views behind it, and those views will be wrong (most broadly, leaning either towards laxity or excessive denial). Progress lies in correcting those views, which does mean that you need to be thinking, questioning and clarifying quite a lot. But in a targeted way that has a chance to correct those concrete, “lived” misunderstandings rather than just providing theoretical knowledge.

Confusion around equating liability to suffering w/ Dukkha

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** DragonflyAnnataman 2025-09-09 19:18:34

As it's my first post here, just want to start off with a big expression of gratitude for having found HH subreddit/teachings on YT/the 2 books from Ajahn Nyanamoli Thero. After years of wandering around contemporary desert of mainstream Buddhist/mindfulness land, finding this has been a refreshing oasis, and has already begun clarifying things in my mind (ie. WHY virtue/precepts/sense-restraint important, the beginnings of insight into annata, etc.).

My question is from the “Managing Your Suffering is a Trap” video (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I>) . I know it's discussed in the video, but I can't seem to get my head fully around the part about “liability to suffering” in the present moment is itself Dukkha. I understand that at the current moment, regardless of my state of mind, I am subject to/liable to suffer in the future. But obviously there are moments in the day where I know my mind is not currently suffering on account of lust/aversion, etc.. But Ajahn Nyanamoli seemed very clear in the video that just the liability by itself (even absent of other apparent defilements) creates some degree of dukkha/suffering in the present.

Sorry if my question is a bit clumsy. I just think this is a very important one for me to understand this part clearly—like it may somehow be a key aspect of understanding dukkha itself, and ability to maintain urgency of the training (e.g. train as though head is on fire). I even wonder if my overall tendency towards distractibility in the present moment relates to my ignorance around this point. Thanks in advance for any tips.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-12 12:41:38

But obviously there are moments in the day where I know my mind is not currently suffering on account of lust/aversion, etc..

The key is in the word “currently.” Yes, everyone (even animals) will have times where their mind is not currently suffering. But if they didn’t stop there, they would notice that there is still an uneasiness from the vague recognition that certain things (even just thoughts) could bring back the suffering. And so the training only really begins when you start addressing *that*, not just the currently arisen things.

As the similes in the Suttas strongly imply, even the overcoming of the five hindrances is the ending of that *liability*, not just a state where the mind is “currently” pure but would easily cease to be so if you made a wrong move. That is why there is a sense of safety and relief that is wholesome, as it is not based on ignorance and selectively constricting one’s perspective, but the very opposite.

Usefulness/Danger of Relaxing Situations? (i.e. a spa and massage)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** account-7 2025-09-09 16:56:12

Hi. I’m just wondering what is the pros and cons of being in a relaxing environment (i.e. hot springs, a spa, or simply a beautifully designed room) and undergoing relaxing actions (i.e. a massage, a warm bath, etc)

On the one hand, I clearly see the risks and downsides. Reliance on sensual pleasures to relieve suffering or any pressure. And even from a coarser level, the level of exertion is significantly greater than the oft critiqued here meditative relaxation techniques. Any kind of reliance on any of the aforementioned examples seems incredibly dangerous and a huge hinderance on the path.

On the other, with some level of restraint and guarding of the sense doors, I see potential upside. The mind is naturally calmer in such situations or after a massage. There are tremendous long-term health benefits in engaging in these kinds of activities or being in these kinds of environments. But alternatively, I see benefits in aiming to be exclusively in more neutral environments and being tasked with contenting the mind only internally.

Would appreciate any thoughts and feedback. Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-12 12:22:47

The risk is not necessarily in “sensual indulgence.” A spa/massage does not necessarily imply that. One could in theory partake in such things purely for health reasons without expecting the slightest spiritual/mental benefit from them.

The danger is in the view that the mind is truly “calmer” after such activities, i.e., the same misunderstanding and non-seeing of the mind that underlies meditation techniques. It’s confusing calming of the mind with calming of the body, which temporarily masks the underlying tendencies of the mind.

Done with that view, spa/massages would be the same as doing breath focusing on top of the actual gradual training thinking that it will somehow aid it. The attempt itself implies a misunderstanding of what the training is (and of *what* ought to be trained).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-13 13:01:27 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

So it’s strictly a matter of understanding the conditional, unsatisfactory nature of any sort of “calm” it produces when going into these experiences?

I don’t think it would even make a person “calm” unless they were mentally leaning into the signs and features of the bodily experience in an unwholesome way. Deriving mental calm out of bodily experiences requires a level of intoxication and forgetfulness of the broader picture. It’s the same principle behind any form of sensuality, just in a more moderate format.

but could you see benefit in certain circumstances (like if an addict is overcome by craving, and just need some space to even enter into sense restraint)?

It will be worse compared to anything in the world that isn’t too distracting and doesn’t break a precept. There is bound to be the wrong view that one is practicing sense restraint and weakening craving/hindrances through such practices, while one is in reality just denying the senses mechanically until one can no longer do so. At which point one will be right back to where one started (like the second herd of deer described in MN 25).

An “addict” is more likely to progress in sense restraint by doing some knitting while their mind is overcome by craving, since they will then have to learn how not to open the gates for thoughts that are still pressuring them in the background. That middle ground is where sense restraint is practiced.

Nothing is mine, everything is me.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Many_Relation_2784 2025-09-08 16:50:30

I’m curious to hear a response from Bhante Aniga here, because I am well versed and deeply understanding the Buddha Dhamma and especially the teachings at HH. Nonetheless, the sentence posted at the title “nothing is mine, everything is me” is the best description of the freedom the Dhamma has catalyzed. I’m wondering, Bhante, if you know what I mean by that statement?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 05:27:29

I'm wondering, Bhante, if you know what I mean by that statement?

After reading your other comments, yes: something that I definitely wouldn't call the Dhamma.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 05:59:47 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Sure. You asked for my opinion, so that's what I replied.

Fear and Anger as Counterparts?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** upasakatraine 2025-09-05 15:17:40

Bhante, u/Bhikkhu_Anigha

I have been observing some patterns in my experience, and I wish to put them before you for guidance.

I have noticed that when fear arises, anger often accompanies it. It seems as though the mind responds to fear by invoking anger as a kind of protection, and in expressing anger it tries to appease its own fear. For instance, when I or someone dear to me is ill, or might be ill - I find myself reacting with mild irritation — “Why did this happen now? Couldn't they have been more careful in not going out in the rain?” etc. — which I can see is not really about the illness, but about the fear underneath.

I also notice that when fear is exposed, there is often a recoil. Anger seems to be one way of covering over that recoil. Lately I am working on not avoiding the recoil, but enduring it, taming it. I can see this dynamic fairly clearly, but I still feel the pressure of it. I wonder what this tells you about my practice, and what I should focus on. I would also be grateful if you could advise me on what I can sharpen in my practice, and what I might tighten further.

Finally, I notice that when fear is present, there is a tendency to recall: “Here is fear; here is what needs to be done (or not done); here is what Bhante has taught regarding this situation.” I wonder if even this recollection is a subtle form of seeking stable-ground, rather than staying with the raw presence of fear itself. How should I relate to this tendency?

Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 05:23:35

All of these states are just various manifestations of the same thing.

What you need to sharpen is the clarity of where your direct responsibility lies. It's not in the arising of the fear but in the careless acceptance of what it's pushing you to do (be it to get angry or whatever else offers itself to cover up the fear).

but I still feel the pressure of it.

Make sure that that remains the case. The fear takes root and expands to the degree that you do things in order to not feel its pressure (similar to scratching an itch).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-10 09:48:37 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Insofar as this is conditioning the 'animal' to view irritated speech as a legitimate and acceptable outlet (regardless of whether fear was present or not)

Just for the sake of clarity, the problem is not "irritated speech" in terms of the tone or choice of words. That's besides the point. What matters is the fact that it is serving as an outlet for something. Hence the gentlest and most polite speech in the world is equally unwholesome if it's a way of scratching an internal itch that you don't want to endure (passive-aggressiveness being the coarsest example).

Desire to buy bicycle

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** xpingu69 2025-09-05 13:20:16

I have this desire to buy a new bicycle. It's like pressuring to buy it. I really want it, even though I don't strictly need it, I could buy a very cheap one too. I have enough money for it though. I just think it's greed so I won't do it. But I feel this desire as a pressure to buy it, like almost like I need it on an emotional level, not a practical one. I think it would be wrong to buy the bicycle. Only because I think it's affected with greed, even if it's subtle. But for how long do I have to endure this desire? And does it mean I can never get it? Or can I buy it in a moment when it's not affected by greed? I really want to have it, but I think it's unwholesome. Also when the desire goes away and I reflect on it, the bicycle appears as nothing special. But even then I would buy it. But with the desire it appears as something special.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-06 04:39:43

If there was no pressure behind it—in which case there would be no grief at the prospect of not getting the bicycle—then it would be fine. But it sounds like there is obviously pressure.

Un-Opposing the World (notes on mettā by Sister Medhini)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-08-31 19:51:41

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-18 14:27:50 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

what can we do?

Apart from working towards permanent eight precepts, come to terms with the fact that whatever you do when it comes to the Dhamma will not be right. The effort then becomes about understanding what makes *any* effort right, rather than taking up X, assuming it to be right as it is, and hoping for that to lead to some result.

So it's not that a puthujjana should never make any effort towards mettā, but that they should never forget that their current understanding of mettā (or any aspect of the Buddha's teaching) is the very reason they are not a sotāpanna.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-19 18:10:31 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

So it's about incremental understanding and being less wrong, until there is perfect understanding, which is sotāpanna?

Yes.

How can a puthujjana make an effort towards mettā if they can't see their mind?

Any effort towards mettā would have to involve trying to see their mind and learning how to tame it.

They can't just grab the tool and use it; they need to remember that they can't even grab it properly yet. But they can and should train in grabbing it properly.

Idle talk

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** baubleballs 2025-08-27 21:22:39

Hello, I'm living at a monastery now and I'm aiming at ordaining. I'm struggling with being engaged in idle chatter. I don't blame anyone. It's definitely normal. People feel awkward and rush to talk. But it's compromising. I see the need to have an uncompromising basis in the 7 precepts to do anything else, and I want to seal this hole off.

The main difficulty is in telling what's unwholesome and what isn't. People will ask questions about me, which will mean I give a real answer instead of just a platitude (I enjoy being honest to people, and I'm not good at pretending in that way) which then excites my mind. Then I lose sight of the picture, and I start welcoming the conversation even though internally I want to slam the breaks—but I can't stop it then because my awareness is on listening and responding rather than on the big picture. Occasionally I do continue conversations slightly further than socially needed out of delight (maybe this is the only place where I'm breaking the precept). I'll make sure to stop doing that. However, the

main problem is that it's expected to *always* be talking, so if I'm forced to be around anyone for a long period of time for some reason (like the work shifts, or driving people) it seems like we'll be talking the whole time.

I also will sometimes talk to monks about the Dhamma, but it's still unwholesome because it's more likely rooted in avoiding the silence than anything else. It doesn't help either of us due to the difference in views.

I don't seek out conversation and try to sit alone. I suppose I could be a bit more curt? But my mind does *enjoy* the conversations, so I laugh, smile, etc.—can't really stop it—so it gives off the wrong signal and encourages people to keep talking...

I see the benefit in going to Sri Lanka or something because there you can establish your own communication preferences. Still, I hope I can make do here.

☒

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-30 05:52:17

Since it seems you're not seeking company and distraction to a blatantly unwholesome degree, I would not take that desire at face value and instead focus on clarifying exactly why you want to minimize conversations further. There could be an underlying aversion to the mental pressure that contact with other people naturally generates even when not laced with delight in company, and that aversion follows naturally from insufficient discernment about where the delight/danger begins.

If there is that aversion, it doesn't mean that you need to start socializing, but that you should overcome the pressure in the right way instead of finding ways to avoid it. Forceful memories and thoughts about conversations that you did not even initiate or particularly enjoy will be coming up, and you train your citta to be unmoved by them by not allowing those thoughts to suck your attention. Through such training (which requires physical seclusion and prior abandonment of the deliberate pursuit of company for entertainment) you would extirpate the very root of every issue related to human contact, including the delight, even if you speak to people quite frequently.

Seclusion

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Naxglazar 2025-08-27 19:52:07

Hello everyone.

I want to ask about practice. I've been keeping the 8 precepts for about 3 months, not perfect but getting better, and tightening the restraint where I've noticed leaking that didn't technically break the precepts. I also know that leakings can move to other activities.

I want to ask if this would be correct practice and also about seclusion. I have a lot of free time besides a bit of work and various chores. So I spend a lot of time by myself just walking or sitting and at those times it's when I can see what's up with my mind, which

is usually nothing good, a ton of anxiety or anger or doubt. Lust doesn't come up at all, it's mostly aversion. And then I might contemplate how I really want to practice and keep the precepts and my mind starts boiling and it gets to a point where I back off because I know who wins the contest.

Now I see that this is when I really see my mind to whatever degree this is. So I keep doing it, but since it's always mentioned to not mechanize the practice I doubt this practice. But this is taking the mind in account, it's actually to see it, so is it fine? Also these states are strong and I was wondering once they become revealed it seems any actions would count as unwholesome, because at the very least it would be distraction, but it's not plausible to go on and on indefinitely.

Also from what I understand one shouldn't attempt to purify the mind unless one is accomplished in the precepts, which I'm not sure what that would constitute because only Arahants and Anagamis? are completely accomplished in them from what I understand. So I doubt this practice of mine again, yet solitude is recommended and I also can't see how one would become aware of these states of mind while going on about daily life with all it's interactions and so on they would never come up unless they are already quite coarse I imagine?

So should I just focus on the bodily and verbal level or is there any merit to going into solitude and letting things come up and endure them? Is there any point to going into seclusion in the begining? I just don't seem to get where the balance is. In AN 9.3 a monk goes into seclusion and has a bad time from what I understand and he was in seclusion for like an afternoon not even a long time.

How did the monks go about it in the Buddha's time? Because in my experience as long as I'm restrained in the precepts and disengaged these things end up coming up on their own. What was their practice? Because if it was about being engaged while trying to be virtuous in the begining they could have remained in lay life yet they ordained yet that monk in AN 9.3 had a bad time just in an afternoon of seclusion and in another sutta (AN 10.99) the Buddha tells another monk to live with the Sangha and not go into seclusion and mentions that seclusion is for pretty advanced practitioners.

These are doubts that I have had for a while, hopefully I can get some clarification, I just want to know if I'm on the right track because I'm practicing like this and I see results but then I also see what I'm going against and I'm not sure if I'm doing it the proper way or I'm trying to skip ahead.

Thank you in advance.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-30 06:06:49

And then I might contemplate how I really want to practice and keep the precepts and my mind starts boiling and it gets to a point where I back off because I know who wins the contest.

In what way does it start “boiling”? And when you don’t contemplate in that way, does the resistance against the practice and the precepts still come up?

Also from what I understand one shouldn’t attempt to purify the mind unless one is accomplished in the precepts, which I’m not sure what that would constitute because *only Arahants and Anagamis? are completely accomplished in them* from what I understand.

No, far from it. Being accomplished in the precepts means that keeping them has become your natural, constant state and no longer requires active effort. It doesn’t mean that you will never break them under any *unforeseen* circumstance.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-02 16:57:42 (in reply to a comment not included)

But right now there is no problem contemplating the same I think, and as a baseline I have the intention of keeping them.

Then you need to guard that better state of mind by noticing what are the things that make it liable to “boiling” (anything based on sensual desire or annoyance/irritation) and not engaging with those. If it ends up boiling, it’s because you’ve already been raising the temperature for a while somehow. It can’t get to that point suddenly.

Describing the experience of reality without the self

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Pretty_Struggle_2777 2025-08-26 07:45:19

Hello all.

How is it possible to describe my experience of reality without implying that there is an external subject who is describing it?

For example if I say “all things in my experience are X” I’m assuming an external subject who considers himself not-X .

It seems to me that there is no way to describe the entirety of my experience without making a step back and observing my experience from a real or hypothetical external point of view. The very act of starting to describe reality in any way seems to create the wrong view of an external observer.

Should I just “stop thinking” then?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-27 12:26:26

The sense of self is not there because you think about or describe your experience wrongly. It’s there because of the passion that underlies that experience. So, if you want to “undo” or even diminish the self, you do so by starving out your desires through not acting out of

them, not by trying to ferret out what the “real,” supposedly ignorance-free structure of experience is like.

Anything you might intellectually land on while the passion underneath remains will have no bearing on your actual sense of self, which you can indirectly gauge by seeing how much fear and resistance there is towards losing things you hold as dear and essential.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-06 04:52:15 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

As I understand (correct me if I’m wrong), the passion itself is in the citta, therefore I can’t control it, at least not directly, while my only responsibility is to make a choice by saying “yes” or “no” to the options offered by the citta, like a sort of switch that stands between the citta and the sense objects.

Correct. You can’t “do” passion yourself (and many people know that from experience; they want to be passionate about or “love” something but can’t if their citta doesn’t go along).

By doing this, isn’t one reinforcing the idea of a hyper-controlling self which constantly watches and controls everything from above? Or is it a wrong way to see it?

No. The sense of self is not due to an intellectual conceiving of a certain entity but due to passion. Passion and the assumption of control are one and the same thing. Passion covers up the fact that all control, no matter its extent, is unreliable.

In other words, the assumption of control is due to the untamed citta, not due to some wrong intellectual notion.

Two doubts

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** None 2025-08-24 20:06:34

About three months ago I started listening to and reading Ajahn Nyanamoli Thero’s teachings. I find them very insightful, and they shed light on many problems I’ve been dealing with. However, I still have two doubts about them. I’d be grateful if someone more knowledgeable than me could give an explanation—maybe I’m misunderstanding something.

1. Is abandoning worldly/sensual goals really a sensible end state? I agree that “taming the wild animal of the mind” and overcoming the naturally addicted mind is a worthy and difficult goal. But it still seems to me more like a tool for becoming a stronger person than an end goal in itself. That strength can then be made useful. Human beings need something we might call meaning or purpose—a goal that lifts a person beyond their individual suffering. Without such purpose, a person degenerates into the pursuit of pleasure.

For example, why would someone who delights in solitude and is beyond earthly matters bother making YouTube videos, writing books, or establishing a hermitage? Those are worldly pursuits after all. It seems to me that if being free from suffering were truly the highest goal, such a person wouldn't bother with those activities but would simply live peacefully in seclusion unless he finds mentioned meaning in them.

2. Disregard for the body that underlies the mind. If I understand correctly, the idea is that you take full responsibility for your actions and completely overcome the pressures of the body. Basically, the body becomes secondary and bodily needs are externalized—one no longer identifies with sensual craving.

But what do we do with the simple fact that even to understand the Buddha's teaching, you need a well-developed brain? It's not just a matter of intellectual decision—there's a physiological reality underneath. It's no coincidence, for example, that infants don't resist their cravings.

Physiological laws still apply to a person, no matter how enlightened they are. Hypothetically, we could degrade an "enlightened" person's brain by sleep deprivation until they became fully identified with the craving for sleep. Needless to say, they wouldn't be enlightened anymore, and it wouldn't be their decision either.

So I think a person is determined by their physiological setup—the body and brain, which are susceptible to change and eventual deterioration. That is tragic, but I don't see a rational way around this fact.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-25 09:36:33

For example, why would someone who delights in solitude and is beyond earthly matters bother making YouTube videos, writing books, or establishing a hermitage? Those are worldly pursuits after all. It seems to me that if being free from suffering were truly the highest goal, such a person wouldn't bother with those activities but would simply live peacefully in seclusion unless he finds mentioned meaning in them.

Because none of those things are the issue, and thus they are not what needs to be abandoned. What needs to be abandoned is passion, not things that one *could* be passionate for. While it may seem at first glance that one cannot do anything without passion, if you examine your own experience carefully, you will see that you do many things throughout your day with little or no passion underneath. The goal is for that lack of passion to extend towards everything you might do (or think) so that you no longer suffer whenever things don't go as you anticipated. The goal is not to stop doing things per se.

And to achieve that goal, specific acts that in and of themselves infect the mind with passion need to be given up completely, and that's what the seven precepts are for. Everything other than those things would involve passion because of your own untamed mind, not because of the act itself.

But what do we do with the simple fact that even to understand the Buddha's

teaching, you need a well-developed brain? It's not just a matter of intellectual decision—there's a physiological reality underneath. It's no coincidence, for example, that infants don't resist their cravings.

You do need a healthy body to practice, which is why the Buddha said that the four requisites *must* be used. Not doing so would compromise the training. But that is only so that you can eventually be unaffected even by your body breaking apart (which will happen sooner or later).

Physiological laws still apply to a person, no matter how enlightened they are. Hypothetically, we could degrade an “enlightened” person's brain by sleep deprivation until they became fully identified with the craving for sleep.

Well, if one really wanted to be scientific, one would not settle on a conclusion for which there is no reliable evidence. And there is no reliable evidence because it's not a given that anybody in whom such “laws” would've been verified was actually enlightened even if they claimed so.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 05:25:30 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, that's a good point to highlight. It's not that each and every use of a requisite is justified, but rather that one will have to rely on them at least to *some* extent to keep the body sufficiently comfortable. The point at which that reliance becomes internally unwholesome can only be determined through authentic reflection on one's present state of mind, and yes, only the right view guarantees the ability for such reflection.

Still, just to be clear, if a person is still struggling with precepts/celebracy, they shouldn't yet be concerned about a potentially excessive reliance on requisites and material comfort. Doing so would distract them from the much more pressing liability they still have.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-30 06:54:01 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The assumption, then, is that we must extinguish passion but not necessarily other intentions for physical action.

Passion is not a specific type of intention; it's *in regard to* intentions. Every intention either has passion associated with it or not, and the associated passion is what needs to be given up such that every intention becomes based on non-passion.

Are they all worth acting upon? What are they rooted in? And so on.

As far as the Dhamma goes, both of those questions are irrelevant. When there is no passion, there is no suffering, and that's all we're concerned with.

Help seeing the problem/danger

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** mqk4 2025-08-24 07:39:30

What would be the problem with the householder way of life? Someone keeps 5 precepts is generous, has things he holds dear, knows they are impermanent (not the same on the same level as a sotapanna of course), when they go suffers on account of it but eventually moves on like most people. This is how most people seem to go about their life and even though they suffer on account of it, they just bear it. What would be the problem with this situation?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-25 07:11:00

when they go suffers on account of it but eventually moves on like most people.

That ability to “move on” always depends on a very delicate set of circumstances that could change at any moment and sooner or later will do so for sure. That is the problem.

Whereas, if you stopped holding things dear, there would be nothing to “move on” from because you wouldn’t end up suffering to begin with.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 05:02:18 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The danger is simply that a mind which is allowed to delight will be that much more tormented by the inevitable event of not getting what it wants or getting what it doesn’t want. Even if you happened to be the most fortunate person in the world to whom nothing bad happens, getting too much of what you want will in and of itself lead to not getting what you want anymore (desires proliferating and the mind becoming increasingly “picky”).

It’s not about forcing the mind to stop wanting things, but about not letting it delight in what it wants or push away from what it doesn’t want, since that is what will make you pay the price sooner or later.

The Attempt to Try to Change Pain IS the problem

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** mentalw0rk 2025-08-23 14:29:37

If this post breaks any rules related to entertainment, please let me know so I can alter it or remove it

In the show Avatar: The Last Airbender, there is an episode where the protagonist, Aang (who has the potential to eventually bend all 4 elements) is trying to learn how to bend earth. He is naturally an airbender, and the whole approach behind learning airbending is one of re-direction, finding the path of least resistance, using creative solutions, or

dodging attacks altogether, and that is also his habitual approach to life. He keeps struggling to learn earthbending because it requires the complete opposite mentality: head-on, firm, directness, rigidity, not moving regardless of the force acting on you (like earth).

As he fails to move the rock, he is puzzled. His stance was identical to his teacher, the movement was the same, etc. He tells his earthbending teacher, Toph, that maybe there is another angle where he can hit the rock, something creative he can do to make it move.

Toph: **No, that's the problem. You've got to stop thinking like an airbender.** There's no different angle, no clever solution tricky-trick that's gonna move that rock. **You've got to face it head on.**

And that is precisely the same problem with our craving against painful feeling. We keep trying to figure out ways to outsmart the pain, to dampen it, re-frame it, rationalize it, psychologize it, contemplate about it (even using "Dhamma information" to do so), etc. There's infinite ways we can come up with to try to reduce the pain. Even if you do the "right" contemplations, precepts, etc. If **at that time** you are doing those things with the implicit hope that it will **lighten the pain, that is already wrong because of that underlying motivation of craving against pain.**

That mentality itself IS the problem. All of our actions are rooted in the fact that we keep trying to lighten the load in one way or another, to avoid the head-on presence of pain. **We have habituated the mind to resist in the presence of pain. And rather than training the mind gradually to stop that habit, we subtly try to change the pain in one way or another. As long as we keep doing that, we are just instilling even deeper the same habit of craving that we were supposedly eliminating with our Dhamma practice.**

And just like your body compensating with bad form when lifting a weight that's too heavy for it, **you won't even notice all the various ways that you're doing it at first. Or even if you start to notice, you don't want to admit it to yourself.** It takes self-investigation and transparency to start to notice it.

And just like with looking for flaws in your form, **you need to begin with the attitude that you are currently doing something incorrectly.** You need to actively look for the mistakes that you **must be making by definition, because you know you are still liable to suffering to some degree.** It's okay to admit that a certain weight is too heavy to face **right now**, but it doesn't remove your responsibility to start **training at smaller weights now** so that you can eventually handle the heavier ones without folding under their force.

Ultimately, Aang succeeds only when his attitude has fundamentally changed. When he finally stops trying to re-direct the rock (like an airbender) and learns to become immovable in the face of it (like an earthbender).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-25 12:02:54

There's infinite ways we can come up with to try to reduce the pain. Even if you do the "right" contemplations, precepts, etc. If at that time you are doing

those things with the implicit hope that it will lighten the pain, that is already wrong because of that underlying motivation of craving against pain.

That mentality itself IS the problem. All of our actions are rooted in the fact that we keep trying to lighten the load in one way or another, to avoid the head-on presence of pain. We have habituated the mind to resist in the presence of pain. And rather than training the mind gradually to stop that habit, we subtly try to change the pain in one way or another. As long as we keep doing that, we are just instilling even deeper the same habit of craving that we were supposedly eliminating with our Dhamma practice.

Yes, exactly, and it's why the Buddha in his very first discourse, under the first noble truth, said that suffering is to be *understood*, not avoided. If you can stop yourself from trying to avoid it (which is precisely what the untrained mind is already trying to do), you create the opening to see the simultaneously enduring cause of it, which is craving. And only then can you reach the actual cessation of it, rather than the change of circumstances that you would've inevitably conceived the cessation to be prior to discerning the craving.

The catch is that you don't just expose yourself to any arbitrary discomfort and try to not crave against it. The discomfort that matters is the one that you cannot remain indifferent towards because it hits like an arrow to the heart. It's the one that is brought to light when your conduct of body, speech, and mind is purified from sensuality, irritation, and careless distraction. Hence the non-negotiability of the precepts and sense restraint. Only once such restraint is kept permanently and unconditionally and poses no difficulty is there a reason to look for further discomfort to train the mind in regard to.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 03:52:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, that's all correct. It's all because, as abundantly as it may arise, a puthujjana does not see his own craving (or suffering) clearly. And that's the result of already being too caught up in it by default, which makes it very painful to fully acknowledge it while it's present (as becoming aware of it always requires ceasing to give in to it). It's a catch-22.

So that is why it all hinges on putting a lid on one's actions rooted in it so that one stops taking the craving at face value to such an extent. Only then is there any chance to discern it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 04:51:19 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

In essence, when one discerns that their untrained mind is resorting to its default mode of "trying to avoid" - they are at that very instant, also discerning craving 'as it is' (yathābhūta)?

Yes. Although all actual avoidance ceases to the degree that craving is seen for what it

is; the two cannot coexist. Only the impulse towards avoidance can remain, and by not being welcomed, that too fades eventually (the animal is tamed, not just restrained).

In reading the quoted sentence, it seemed to my reading that: there is the phenomenon of the mind resisting ; and there is a simultaneously enduring cause.

No. Quite crucially, there is no separate cause apart from the mind resisting. But in order to see the mind resisting, one needs to know what the mind is (by not placing it on any specifics whatsoever and instead noticing the nagging pull to attend to the specifics, whatever they are).

Is enjoying being with my son a barrier?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** 2footie 2025-08-22 04:49:36

Bhikkhus, without having abandoned six things, one is incapable of [practicing the four satipaṭṭhānas]. What six? Delight in work, delight in talk, delight in sleep, **delight in company**, not guarding the doors of the sense faculties, and being immoderate in eating. Without having abandoned these six things, one is incapable of practicing the four satipaṭṭhānas.

— AN 6.117

Is it considered delight in company? How does a parent who loves their child practice? Is it possible? What about practising when the child is at school?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-22 07:00:11

Is it considered delight in company?

Yes, if the pleasure you get from it is the motivation for being with your son. It may not always be.

How does a parent who loves their child practice?

By de-emphasizing the love aspect and not letting it take center stage, and instead emphasizing the more neutral parental responsibility aspect, thereby wearing away the intoxication and coming closer to the attitude you would have towards taking care of somebody else's child . And this change of outlook is only possible if you're already practicing the precepts, celibacy, and sense restraint; otherwise there will be no basis for you to practice on the level of a purely mental outlook. The intended change of attitude will just be an abstract idea.

You would then engage with your child just to the extent of fulfilling your duty, not seeking any emotional satisfaction from it. This would also ironically make you a better parent, since love only serves to narrow down your perspective and incline you towards choices that prioritize your own desires over objectively helping the child.

How does distraction work?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** robkhaw 2025-08-21 04:36:52

Why does distraction (e.g various forms of entertainment) seem to “work”, if only temporarily, to relieve present unpleasantness?

For example, if I am sick, I can distract myself for a while by engaging with some entertainment or having a conversation. The unpleasantness of the sickness is not felt as sharply while I do this. Why exactly is that?

Is it just that it's a natural property of attention? Or maybe that the distraction acts to remove the resistance toward the unpleasantness temporarily?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-22 06:46:11

Why does distraction (e.g various forms of entertainment) seem to “work”, if only temporarily, to relieve present unpleasantness?

It doesn't if you look hard enough.

The unpleasantness of the sickness is not felt as sharply while I do this.

Indeed, but the critical point is that that unpleasantness was never what was making you suffer to begin with. It was the resistance against it, and so by trying to turn away and distract yourself from it with something more pleasant, you are doubling down on the root of the problem and making it worse even though it doesn't feel like it.

How come it doesn't feel like it? Because the less you have trained yourself to see the signs of your mind, the more you will be overlooking the truly relevant but more subtle dukkha that is still equally present and *growing*, and you will only see the also present but very superficial pleasantness of the distraction. But if you were to abruptly stop the distraction, you would immediately recognize the dukkha that had been there all along and that has now only intensified.

As the Buddha put it, it's like a hungry dog gnawing on a bone with nothing but blood on it. The bloody bone “feels” better than a fully clean one because it provides a pleasant taste, but absence of a pleasant taste was never the issue to begin with. It was the hunger, which is only being worsened and highlighted even more.

How soon should someone begin training yoniso manasikara?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-08-18 22:09:34

In the gradual training, training yoniso manasikara isn't an explicit step. Is this something one should do from the beginning or is there a better point to start?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 16:22:21

Apart from keeping the precepts—which strictly speaking isn’t even virtue but the outward approximation of it—there is no training happening at all without *yoniso manasikāra* (hence it is mentioned in every single section of MN 2).

You cannot even restrain your actions of body and speech rightly unless you are discerning the state of your *citta*, and that is already the cornerstone of *yoniso manasikāra*.

Difference between *vyāpāda*, *paṭigha*, and *dosa* (ill-will, aversion, hatred)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** xpingu69 2025-08-18 10:58:25

I often see the terms *vyāpāda* (ill will), *paṭigha* (aversion), and *dosa* (hatred/anger, one of the three roots). But I’m not clear how they differ in practice.

Here’s my example: There’s a person I “hate.” When I come into contact with this person (the idea rather), my mind starts narrating : “*Here they are again, behaving badly, doing wrong, etc.*” Angry commentary, judgments. The inner voice saying those words. I don’t mean an angry feeling. There is a feeling, but it comes before the thoughts. I mean the actual speech in the skull.

My questions are:

- Are these thoughts themselves *vyāpāda* (ill will) or *dosa* (hatred), just because of their content?
- Is *paṭigha* the deeper movement of resisting or pushing away what arises — e.g. when I think “I’m a Buddhist, I shouldn’t be angry,” and then try to suppress, avoid, or not acknowledge those thoughts? In other words, is the real ill will not in the thought content, but in resisting and fighting with it?
- How should I orient myself? Should I practice **not resisting whatever arises** (even ugly thoughts of lust, anger, greed) and subsequently not delighting in beautiful thoughts, or should I aim to **change the content** of the thoughts directly? Try to somehow prevent them from arising in the first place?

In short: what exactly is the difference between *vyāpāda*, *paṭigha*, and *dosa*, and how do these map onto this lived example?

In my own experience I suffer more if I try to resist and deny the “bad” thoughts, whereas when I just let it be I feel fine. But letting it be doesn’t always work, if I am not mindful enough or don’t properly attend to it, then the resisting happens, I sort of get lost in the story and try to change the story (by resisting). It’s a slippery slope.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 15:55:16

Are these thoughts themselves vyāpāda (ill will) or dosa (hatred), just because of their content?

No. The attitude behind them is. Try thinking those same thoughts in regard to someone who you rationally know is doing something wrong but that doesn't emotionally affect you at all, and you'll see that the thoughts are not the problem.

Is paṭigha the deeper movement of resisting or pushing away what arises — e.g. when I think “I’m a Buddhist, I shouldn’t be angry,” and then try to suppress, avoid, or not acknowledge those thoughts? In other words, is the real ill will not in the thought content, but in resisting and fighting with it?

Paṭigha or resistance is the “background” leaning away from the feeling that is unpleasant. And that background is where your *citta* is, i.e., the attitudinal background to the thoughts that you have no direct say in but is rather fed or starved by your intentional actions (e.g., of welcoming the fault-finding thoughts that offer themselves as a defense mechanism against the unpleasant feeling, or refraining from doing so).

How should I orient myself? Should I practice not resisting whatever arises (even ugly thoughts of lust, anger, greed) and subsequently not delighting in beautiful thoughts, or should I aim to change the content of the thoughts directly? Try to somehow prevent them from arising in the first place?

You should practice distinguishing the thoughts and their content from the attitude of the “wild elephant” (*citta*) behind them, as well as recognizing that accepting such thoughts is a problem only when/because it reinforces the *citta*’s existing resistance to the unpleasant feeling. You will never find that resistance by looking at the content of the thoughts themselves because it’s not there. That is why one needs to learn to see the (necessarily indirect) signs of the *citta* in order to understand what actually is wholesome or unwholesome.

To use an analogy I often give, the fact that you shouldn’t let a child who’s throwing a tantrum go to the park is not because *going to the park* is bad, but because of the tantrum that is inevitably being taken at face value and caved into when you take the child to the park *at that time*.

Unable to ordain and a hut

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** FenixCoan 2025-08-17 07:58:08

Hello, I would like to go through the main thoughts I have been having regarding my present situation and see if anyone feels like sharing how they see it.

I am transgender. Many consider that to be a paṇḍaka and that therefore I cannot ordain. Others don’t and would ordain me under the condition that the fact that I am transgender remains between the abbot, the preceptor and I, or the small resident community and I.

I feel uncomfortable about this. To me it seems a bit deceitful to visiting monks, creates uncomfortable situations if ever moving, could “force” me to lie, and worries me regarding Pāṭimokkha recitations with unknowing monks. There was another option, which never formalized, about ordaining openly. I then came to the conclusion that I should not ordain. Being open would expose the Sangha to criticism, discussions, and even conflicts, and although different, this has already happened with female ordination. I am not saying it is wrong or should not be done, but my goal is Nibbana. Ordaining surrounded by controversy, Sangha disagreements, and Vinaya ambiguities does not feel like a pure, carefree, blameless life. It seems I would be discussing “mundane issues” (transgender people, Vinaya technicalities) quite often, and not only that but I would be supported by them. So I decided against ordaining. I have remained a lay person, wandering around, visiting monasteries, and working seasonal jobs. I have also remained with not many possessions, in celibacy, and attempting (and failing) to live under the eight precepts. This is the seventh year I live like this.

The circumstances are such that I can now move permanently into a secluded place (there are two options, actually), and not worry about working and money. I need about 50€ a month to live there, which can be covered initially by some savings and afterwards by two people who have told me (without my asking) they are willing to support me financially (in general). The conditions, for not being a bhikkhu, seem quite lucky and pure. I could dedicate all to Dhamma without interruptions, distractions, or lay livelihood concerns. As of now, the plan is to move to one of these places in one or two months. However, I have concerns, and this is generally how I have been thinking about them:

Especially in one of the places, I would have (likely) no human contact for as long as I stay there. The other place does have two farmers nearby, but when I was there I barely saw them twice a week, and we didn’t talk much. Of course, I have the Suttas and other books, so I would be in good company. I would also visit a monastery when I feel I may need it (Samaṇadīpa is not extremely far from one of the places). But it concerns me not having personal checks; I feel I am bound to fall into deep delusions again and again and struggle to come out of them, maybe fail completely to do so. I worry that I am bound to go astray without frequent interactions with wise people (friendship is not half the path, but the whole path...). Of course, I don’t have frequent interactions now either, and live in environments that are generally less supporting. But I feel as a bhikkhu you are directly supported by the Sangha and the Vinaya. Without that, as a putthujjana, could I ever find the way in solitude? I truly feel I need a more suitable life. I have previously benefited from solitude, so why not do it full time? It seems to me the best of lives available to me right now.

Will appreciate any thoughts. Does it seem like a good idea? Is such isolation not recommended in some way under these circumstances? Are there better ways to go about my situation? I know I can only answer myself, but still others may point to things I had not considered. Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-17 18:00:57

But it concerns me not having personal checks; I feel I am bound to fall into deep delusions again and again and struggle to come out of them, maybe fail completely to do so. I worry that I am bound to go astray without frequent interactions with wise people (friendship is not half the path, but the whole path...).

That is a valid concern. And it's not only about interactions with wise people; that's certainly helpful, but lack of it is by no means a dealbreaker for one who is really earnest if at least the true teachings are available.

Living around other people to a degree* is important even if they are completely misguided. It keeps you from falling into the false sense of comfort that can easily come from having your environment and daily activities too much in your own control. Settling into that circumstantial safety to the degree that you start overlooking the direction of actual practice and acquiring further wrong views is not unlikely for most, and you wouldn't know for sure whether you're a rare exception to the rule until much later. If it turns out that you're *not*, you might not definitively know precisely because you would lose the perspective that would reveal that to you.

Have you considered ordaining as a novice indefinitely? That might be more likely to get a pass, avoid all the complications you described, and also gives you the truly essential bits of the monastic life (the 10 precepts and the heightened accountability).

* Not to the point of building emotional bonds though, and ideally still being alone for a large chunk of the day.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 15:13:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It has always been the case that being a novice comes with daily kitchen work (or other kind of works), and that the option would never come to retreat a bit more.

That is a non-issue. As long as you get to spend a chunk of your day in seclusion and the work you have to do isn't overly social (it likely won't be in most reasonable monasteries), you will have more "retreat" time than you can even realistically put to good use—certainly for the first several years at least.

The skillfulness of being open about your understanding

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** place_of_coolness 2025-08-16 10:17:19

Something I've struggled with a lot is the question of how to share your understanding of the Buddha's teaching with other people. It seems like it would be quite unwholesome to spread an incorrect or faulty explanation of the Buddha's message to others, but without

the willingness to do so, the message can't be shared at all. Sure, you could quote what other people have said about it, but there's no guarantee that they had a correct understanding of it either. You could quote suttas, but those are prone to misinterpretation in a world where misinterpretation of them abounds, not to mention the problems in the various translations.

Furthermore, Ajahn Nyanamoli says that it's important to speak from your own understanding and to not just repeat what others say, and not to be afraid of looking like a fool in doing so. I resonate strongly with that encouragement, but at the same time I wonder about the kammic consequences of doing so. Even if you're not formally adopting the role of a teacher, you're still responsible for the views you're putting out into the world with your speech.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-16 17:18:57

Sharing your views with the world is only truly perilous in a specific context: when someone treats you as an authority and lacks sufficient ability to judge whether what you say is right or wrong.

In that case, you should as a rule refrain from giving anything but the most rudimentary, impossible-to-be-wrong advice like "keep the precepts, read the Suttas, and reflect on the sufferings that you're still liable to," when you know you don't see the Dhamma for yourself yet. But other than that, it's worth trying to put your understanding into words, as that in itself can show you that there isn't as much of it as you thought there was. You just have to keep discussion within limits when the other person isn't significantly more advanced than you, as things can then quite quickly drift into aimless chatter that in the end fails to get either party any closer to the goal.

Revenge of the hindrances, restraint and not acting out vs active contemplations / asubha

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Lemon_3675 2025-08-15 18:57:59

I'm now at 8 months of keeping (externally) unbroken celibacy, which is far beyond my previous attempts. For some time now it has been relatively effortless, but surprisingly sexual desire and thoughts suddenly came back stronger again in the past 2-3 weeks. I still don't feel like there is a real risk of acting out externally, but it has happened in dreams and I noticed more frequent intrusive sexual thoughts / daydreams. (For the sake of completeness of context: I am also keeping the rest of the 7 precepts to the best of my ability with the occasional minor slip up, usually in the direction of distraction/entertainment/idle chatter)

Is it normal for hindrances to come back in waves or is it necessarily something I did to cause that? Because I can't remember doing anything out of the ordinary. On the contrary, on average I would say I've improved my restraint and for a month now I've made it a daily

habit to try to usually spend at least 1-2h in the forest in seclusion. And I say on average because for example this week I've been more tired and then I am more likely to click on youtube video suggestions out of distraction/entertainment when I otherwise wouldn't.

This also strongly highlights to what extent I'm still liable to be bothered by the hindrance of sensuality when in the past at other times it seemed like I'm relatively more safe and more of a peripheral phenomenon. Lately it has been more in my face and my mind is clearly still delighting in the prospect of pleasure and that's clearly a problem.

So now the question arises of whether I should simply continue trying to endure it without acting out so that I can then see it as anatta, or if/when it is the right time to try to actively discern the danger or asubha.

I noticed that in the HH talks the way the instructions are presented shifted from more focus on talk of "doing the work", to more emphasis on what you "don't do". Or at least that's the impression I got.

That certainly seems to be a safer way to frame it because of the risk of trying to do something to *get rid* of the pressure, but that leaves the question of the right time and place for asubha or other active contemplations.

If I would try to answer this myself, I would think that the endurance has to be established first. I have to be able to see the pressure, the suffering *there* in the indefinite/unconditional sense. Then *within* that I could simply leave it as is and try to maintain mindfulness of the pressure that implies that craving is there without acting out of it, or I could try to set up the context of the disgusting aspects of that which the mind desires while the desire/pressure/dukkha remains and leave it like that. Or I could think about the danger in sensuality.

The question is, does it matter what I choose at that point? (If my thinking so far is correct of course).

In any case, it's clear that I can't *get rid* of *that* in the immediate sense, it's something I am subjected to. Still and again. In some way it seems like it's the same pressure that continues, that I am under, that I am enclosed by. Day after day. Even if superficially it's alleged objects that pretend that they would relieve me of it, it seems like the "same" pressure.

And I suppose this is also where (again?) faith comes in, because it seems like whatever way of mindfulness/contemplation I choose, I could only apply it over and over again without any immediately visible results. And that raises the question of how (if?) I can be sure beyond doubt that I am doing it correctly.

Thank you for reading, I would appreciate any advice.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-17 05:07:29

Is it normal for hindrances to come back in waves or is it necessarily something I did to cause that?

It's normal.

So now the question arises of whether I should simply continue trying to endure it without acting out so that I can then see it as anatta, or if/when it is the right time to try to actively discern the danger or asubha.

Although you technically could “do the right reflections” regardless of the underlying state, the problem is that they will almost automatically be done with the wrong motivation of wanting to get rid of the pressure if the underlying state isn't somewhat stable. An unstable mind is nothing other than a mind that craves to get rid of pressure harder, so everything done within that naturally gets infected with the same goal. Even “enduring the pressure” will often be done to get rid of it, but even then it won't be as inaccurate as doing asubha as a way of management (as would easily happen when the pressure is too strong).

Asubha, etc., is done properly when it highlights the nature of the pressure that you are already capable of enduring so that the mind becomes even less likely to falter in the face of it—more like a battle elephant.

(Incidentally, this is quite contrary to the spirit behind most people's practice, which is softening the threats experienced by the elephant as much as possible. That tendency is a natural result of insufficient virtue and sense restraint—with little endurance developed, the one possible direction to go will be further management).

Making use of a monotonous job- how to tell apart beneficial training & self mortification?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** craveminerals 2025-08-14 17:51:49

Friends,

Us laypeople have no choice but to make use of ordinary daily life for developing the mind. Even though it's a compromised and non-ideal environment, you have to make use of what you got.

Currently I have a monotonous job at a factory where I basically do the same sets of tasks every week, in which I have plenty of time to reflect about Dhamma while doing this, or to simply train in enduring the monotony. (It's also not a very social job, unless you make it so. I'm lucky in that way)

A little over half a year ago, I listened to audiobooks, music, and dhamma talks etc. to distract myself from the monotony. Then I begun listening to pretty much only dhamma talks. Then I thought, maybe I could stop distracting myself from these tasks and just do them in silence all day (though interspersed with some dhamma talks some days / now and then)

So this is what I've mostly done the last few months, especially now since I took the precept on entertainment, but I want to be careful not to slip into self mortification. Question

is, how do I notice when I do?

My mind is mainly either simply bored, or constantly groaning and complaining, longing for the next break. I've been trying to watch and learn from the mind as it moves around under this pressure, as I endure its moods, while also trying to calm it within this context. But it's almost always stressful and frustrating, and at times I've wondered if it's overly so.

Most days, except some few and far between, I feel like I'm in stress, with unpleasant physical symptoms like tight ribcage, unconsciously tensing muscles, etc. (though this has been the case more or less for years) Even my sleep is stressful. Previously I've chalked it up to past kamma, and it being a necessary phase to go through while training in the 7 precepts, as I have only been training in all of them a short while, but I'm wondering if I'm also making this worse because of inadvertently mortifying myself or something.

Self mortification is, as I've understood it, when you think that pain or suffering is always good for practice (and all delight or pleasure is always bad). But that's not how the problem of suffering is solved, because you're overlooking the craving behind this mortification and inadvertently feeding it. You're punishing or tormenting the mind even when it's not doing anything wrong. This is why trying to "do nothing" and enduring that no matter what isn't helpful, because you're not teaching the mind anything nor learning from it.

From what I've gathered from some of Bhante Anigha's comments and HH's main messages is that in this context I can still allow myself to do things like listen to dhamma talks, or other "neutral" themes, as long as my mind doesn't throw a tantrum if I stop in the middle of it. So I'm thinking of doing that from time to time, but mainly enduring boredom, or whatever emotional states, most of the time. And just keep on trying to calm it within this pressure.

Lately I've also thought it to be important to let it roam freely within this context, and let it ponder this or that, and also to bring up wholesome themes now and then to try and gladden it, etc.

What do you think, does this sound like something beneficial? Or is there something I should be aware of, that I'm probably missing?

Again I realize this isn't an ideal environment in any case but I wanted to see if you have any feedback or suggestions.

Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-15 17:58:33

You should question either of the two decisions (just doing the work vs. adding something on top) every single time. That is the only way to not fall into indulgence or self-mortification, which are just two superficially different ways of assuming an action to be fine by not seeing the underlying motivation.

That means that you will have to accept the uneasiness of not knowing what to do in advance, and that's pretty much the whole point. That's how you train yourself away from

sīlabataparāmāsa and make the recognition of your own presently enduring citta the sole reference point for what's beneficial or unbeneficial.

Can an action be rooted in both a wholesome and unwholesome intention?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-08-11 13:38:05

Here's an example. I was considering having coffee, which is something I normally abstain from. I was tired and thought that if I had some coffee I'd be more alert and could study the dhamma better. However, I also noticed a desire for the taste and for the caffeine buzz.

Is this an example of having wholesome and unwholesome intentions? Or, do I need to reflect more clearly and see which is the true intention?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-13 05:27:01

The "true intention" is not something you reason out; it's where the affective compulsion is. So you don't need to sit down and try to figure out what the intention is; you just need to admit to yourself what's already there and not act out of it if it's clearly unwholesome (desire for a specific taste being such an instance).

On that front, intentions can only be either wholesome or unwholesome (i.e., they will either feed the already arisen craving or starve it).

What do you make of this contemplation that reduces sensual desire?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** spiffyhandle 2025-08-08 10:44:53

A technique I learned outside of HH is to practice seeing all experience as mental. In one of Ajahn Nyanamoli's videos, he's mentioned something similar. Ultimately, an attractive person or a tasty cake are mental experiences. They are simply sights, sounds, smells, tastes, and touches. When I eat a cake, I am experiencing a pleasant taste, not a "cake". The idea of "cake" is a mental construction based on past experiences, desires, and cognition.

When I recall that all experiences are mental, the desires for sensuality decreases and a sense of peace and happiness arises. After all, what is the big deal about a sight of a person? It's just a sight, it's not a "real existing thing out there" for me to pursue.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-09 05:49:51

When I eat a cake, I am experiencing a pleasant taste, not a “cake”. The idea of “cake” is a mental construction based on past experiences, desires, and cognition.

This seems to be based on the idea that things are “not ultimately real (or somehow not substantial) because they’re just labels/concepts,” and would be one form of the commonly but falsely conceived dichotomy between appearance and reality, which is one of the quintessential wrong views. There is no higher reference point for what is real apart from labels/concepts, and there *cannot be* (except in one’s assumption).

For the same reason, such a contemplation would not truly reduce sensual desire but rather obscure the *trigger* for it (the original attractive significance of the experience), and that’s basically what management is. It’s the same as focusing on the good aspects of a person and ignoring the bad ones so that the ill will towards them subsides, overlooking that the actual ill will is the resistance against the negative aspects *when they are there*. In other words, ill will is the *resistance against the unpleasant feeling*, not the absence of a pleasant/neutral feeling in regard to the person.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-10 05:40:30 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

What if this is done only as a perception and ontology is put aside?

Still, the most acute problem is that it’s only managing the trigger rather than training the mind out of the response. Wrong “ontology” is also not purely an intellectual mistake and doesn’t happen by accident; regarding things in a certain way can provide a premature sense of relief while simultaneously covering up the lack of true safety that remains.

What is the difference between doing metta in neutral mindset to prevent ill will vs doing this perception in a neutral mindset to reduce sensual craving?

Since you haven’t specified how you understand the practice mettā, it wouldn’t be a fair comparison.

As a general principle, anything can be done as management, and it almost certainly will be when someone isn’t sufficiently established in restrained conduct. They won’t be able to face the pleasure/displeasure and tame their lust/aversion in regard to *that* because for them, facing the actual trigger rather than their tampered version of it will be too overwhelming and put them in the vicinity of acting out.

The only type of samādhi that is beneficial requires enduring the arisen pressure of things, however it arises. Only on that basis can one cultivate actual mettā.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-13 04:20:28 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Could you please help clarify the difference between what you are criticizing and what Ven. Sāriputta is suggesting here?

The difference is in where one perceives the problem to be.

What that Sutta points at is that if you see your citta—which anyone who sees benefit in contemporary mettā practices does not—you can highlight the factual positive aspects of a person as a way of balancing the picture. The irritated citta will want to fixate on the negative things and actively ignore the rest, and if you let it do that, its irritation will only be maintained.

Crucially, that effort would come with the tacit recognition that attending to what's positive in someone is not what mettā is, and conversely, attending to what's negative is not what ill will is (and that recognition is automatically absent to the degree that the citta is not seen). And that is why one could overcome ill will completely without ever making an effort to think a single positive thought about anyone, instead taking other approaches that identically result in not giving center stage to thoughts of annoyance whenever they try to pressure you and thereby indirectly taming the citta.

If you were to practice what that Sutta describes rightly even once, you would be capable of freely and fearlessly dwelling on the negative aspects—the “trigger”—without the previous ill will coming back, because the actual citta would've been purified at least momentarily (rather than the objects managed).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-13 13:17:19 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It seems to me that they will go wrong by blowing whatever positive qualities they can find way out of realistic proportion, creating a caricature

Yes, that's how it quite commonly plays out. But the core problem is much broader, i.e., not seeing one's citta. You just can't take any significant steps towards putting out a fire that you don't even see—not with any reasonable degree of reliability, at least. All you will realistically be able to do is not be reminded of the smoke through some secondary management or other (a mask, plain and simple avoidance, etc.).

The least wrong thing that someone who doesn't see their citta (a puthujjana) can do is not try to resolve the discomfort of the irritation but instead leave it there without acting out of it even mentally, until gradually the place where the fire actually is becomes clear, which it will provided everything else is in place (precepts, celibacy, sense restraint, right instructions). Trying to *do* anything in response to what they perceive to be the ill will, even if not a coarse “thinking caricaturized positive thoughts,” is almost guaranteed to take them in the direction of management still. It will be aimed at the sense objects and how they feel about them, and all of that will ironically be going along with the citta's

resistance and its inability to endure things without interference.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-14 06:26:34 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Would you translate it the same way, or more like “attend” and “not attend”?

Certainly the latter.

But if it’s simply “not attend”, it’s not that I should actively ignore anything (which is always a distortion of reality to eliminate the unpleasantness of the actual situation), but rather that you can only attend one thing at a time, so naturally if you attend to the positive aspects you will by default not be attending the negative aspects.

Exactly. And it’s not like the word “ignore” is in itself wrong; it’s the views and connotations that it normally carries for people: that they can intentionally “delete” something from their consciousness, overlooking that in order to not give attention to something, they have to be peripherally conscious of it.

You could also say it’s about not letting the negative aspects take center stage—not because that is wrong in and of itself, but because such attention *at that time* will automatically be polluted by the arisen irritation and feed it further. And not letting them take center stage means that you still know full well that they exist; you’re just not intentionally “picking them up,” so to speak.

Because our starting point is that citta is effortlessly “magnetized” to the negative aspects of others. Even if I am not putting any effort to see the negative aspects of the other person, they simply “pop out” more than any other aspect, like they are obvious, and the citta will be revolving around them when it is overcome by ill will.

Correct. The starting point is that the citta revolves around the negative aspects (or even the positive ones) *because* it doesn’t want to endure the displeasure and is scrambling for a resolution to it. Everything, whether positive or negative, is being approached through the citta’s unseen wrong attitude of “how do I get rid of this,” i.e., craving.

So that’s why whether you blatantly proliferate the negativity or you try to focus on positivity as a solution in itself, you will still be giving in to the same thing. If you see your citta though, then you could give attention to the positive aspects as a way of *not letting it* try to get rid of the displeasure by focusing on the negative like it wants to do. Incidentally, discernment of the citta was likely taken for granted in the Sutta in question given that it was directed to bhikkhus.

So with this perspective established, I can actually start to practice not resisting the unpleasantness of the person. That way, I am taming citta so that, it learns that it’s better to be unmoved even in the presence of factual displeasure. So in the future, even if a situation or person factually has nothing but

very negative aspects, it makes no difference to the citta (as it has now been trained to be unmoved by the pain), so it will not be triggered into ill will.

Yes, that's right.

So, the picture is skewed, it's not an accurate representation of the person, it's overemphasizing the negative aspects.

You will never have a perfectly accurate representation of anybody. The picture will always be skewed simply because it comes through your point of view. And that's fine; the sole problem is when the picture is skewed even further by greed, aversion, or delusion.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-19 15:29:38 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, that's exactly what I was trying to convey.

Is suffering always simultaneously present when there is craving?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** aravindp84 2025-08-08 06:12:46

@Bhikkhu Anigha Kindly help me see this

I'm not always able to see suffering present simultaneously in my present experience when there is a craving present, as explained by patticasammupada.

For example, when there is a sweet (or any sensory indulgence) near me and I have a want to eat that sweet, I cannot see in what way or form suffering is also present simultaneously during that time, in my experience. I can think about the various ways that this craving can lead to suffering by - leading to a craving for more sweets - forming a habit of addiction - not leading to a lasting satisfaction or pleasure - leading to discontent with lesser and lesser pleasure when repeated multiple times - I may end up with a situation where I cannot fulfill my craving by getting the sweet due to some change ..and so on

But practically for me, at that moment of craving for the sweet, these forms of suffering are only possible (or even definite) experiences in the future and not present now. So, these recollections don't completely undermine the value of the sensory experience of the sweet at that moment and hence don't work all the times. (If there is no sweet with me but I'm craving for it then I see the suffering simultaneously present there. But, even in some situations like this, there is a doubt sometimes, that whether this is suffering if the wanting is not bothering me immediately and is something I can fulfill at a later time).

Since I can't see the suffering present simultaneously with the wanting (as in Paticasammupada), I'm valuing the sensory experience at that time. (I think at that moment that this is the pressure of both sensuality and doubt, present at that moment, but even

that doesn't make me undermine its value at times). I understand that precepts need to be followed, but I feel that seeing the suffering simultaneously present in the experience at that time, will help me even more.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-10 05:56:44

You see the danger as simultaneously present with your craving by recognizing your *liability* to unpleasant outcomes instead of focusing on any one of those outcomes. None of the unpleasant outcomes would necessarily manifest right away, but by welcoming craving, you absolutely are putting yourself *here and now* in a vulnerable position where those things would affect you. And that is in and of itself fearsome—like being in the middle of a warzone even if no bullets have landed on you yet.

Can I attain stream entry with chronic illness and daytime sleepiness?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Global_Ad_7891 2025-08-05 20:25:33

Can I attain stream entry / become a faith or dhamma follower with a chronic lung condition and meds that cause relatively poor sleep, leaving me drowsy for a large portion of the day? I keep the precepts, but I know wakefulness is to be cultivated — not sure how much that matters for simply right view. Curious about my chances.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-06 06:39:10

By the time wakefulness should become the focus, you will have already covered the bases for stream entry. Proper establishment in the precepts and sense restraint will take years realistically. During that time, it's not that you're free to indulge in sleep all the time and it doesn't matter, but it's not the end of the world if it's less than perfect.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-28 05:19:20 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Would you say this refers to something where over the years, the context of your experience shifts and you gradually lose much of your interest in eating for enjoyment, socializing, entertainment (movies, TV, video games), etc.?

Not necessarily. "Losing interest" can happen for totally tangential reasons like getting old, clinical depression, or developing new interests, and it's the sort of result that one can get from wrong practices as well. Establishment in virtue and sense restraint means that no matter how much interest there may be, your default mode is to not let that interest become the impetus for any action of body, speech, or thought.

How can I best use this context of sickness to strengthen my practice?

Recognize that even though you may be losing interest in the things that for most people are associated with defilements, unless you're an Arahant, there has to still be a liability for unwholesome interest towards *something*. Whatever that thing is, don't try to get rid of it or the interest (since it will only shift to something else); simply don't allow your perspective to become fully captivated by it (which will more often than not mean not engaging with it), and remain aware of your liability to sickness if you ever end up engaging with a valid motivation (which the mind will not want to do in regard to that specific thing because it ruins the enjoyment). This is of course assuming that it's not something against the precepts. If it is, then you would have already forgotten about your sickness simply by engaging.

So I think I understand what I need to do now.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Little_Carrot6967 2025-08-04 15:35:22

In order to achieve enlightenment, I need to dwell within the citta and watch mind. Every time cetasika of dosa or cetasika of lobha arises, I need to recollect the same thing that I just thought but without those cetasikas. I need to do this over and over, hundreds of times, thousands of times until my citta flips.

Doing this will require heightened mindfulness so I'll have to do nothing but sit there watching mind for as long as it takes which may be days.

To be honest I actually started doing it last week for a couple hours. I didn't go all the way because I wanted to wait till after my family visits. I thought at the end of the year I would make the big push. Now however I think I'm out of time. That first stroke probably won't be the last. Although, NGL it would be hilarious if it didn't happen and I just showed up next week being like "hey guys!"

Anyway, I wanted people to know what I did just in case I don't survive it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-05 04:45:42

Every time cetasika of dosa or cetasika of lobha arises, I need to recollect the same thing that I just thought but without those cetasikas.

In case that's what you understood from our teachings, no, that's not what you need to do (and the concept of a "cetasika" is Abhidhammic nonsense that is better thrown out the window).

Skills for going forth

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** place_of_coolness 2025-08-02 11:14:39

As someone who intends to go forth once I can pay off my debt, what kind of secondary skills would be wise to develop in the meantime? It seems like some facility with carpen-

try is commonly in demand at monasteries, and of course it would be helpful to learn relevant Asian languages, maybe some survivalism. Any other ideas? I'm frankly not a very "handy" person.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-06 06:03:31

I wouldn't say that having (or making known) "useful" skills like carpentry is a good thing in most monasteries, since it will tend to drag you more than baseline into projects that are neither necessary nor useful, i.e., a large portion of the "work" that goes on at monasteries past the initial setting-up phase. The extra involvement that will come from it will also make it harder to keep to yourself, which is ideal in most places given that you'll be surrounded not only by wrong views but also quite often by idle chatter.

Where and when does Right View exactly begin?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** 2footie 2025-07-31 08:19:13

Suppose someone's been following the precepts, and they have a general idea of dhamma theory, and HH theory as well.

At what exact point does right view begin according to both dhamma and HH theory, but mainly HH?

- When Idappaccayatā is understood, seen, and applied?
- When Patīccasamuppāda is seen? (With reflexion)
- When craving is truly discerned and not confused for feeling?
- When craving is briefly *intentionally* ceased, due to applying Idappaccayatā (i.e. having awareness on the right thing) and seeing Patīccasamuppāda?

.

I realize one does not have full control over the situation as they're going in blinded with ignorance, so could it be a matter of letting pressure build up without releasing it to sensual desire, to a point that right view must happen if one has sati, even wrong sati, set up? For example the pressure is like gunpowder/natural gas and the miccah sati is the spark, together they result in samma ditthi and samma sati?

Or can this question not be answered and instead one must look back after a long time, as per the simile of the finger grooves in the Adze handle? (SN 22.101)

Thank you

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-01 19:06:30

All of the things you listed (except the last one; true insight can never come from a "brief moment" of anything) are theoretically landmarks of the right view according to the Suttas. But without external guidance from the Buddha or an actual noble disciple, many

people falsely conclude that they understood any and all of those things and are thus sotāpannas. The Dunning-Kruger effect is even more pronounced in the Dhamma than elsewhere because of the fully internal nature of insight and because of the easy-to-overlook difference between making perfect sense of the teachings and actual wisdom.

Rather than trying in vain to gauge the sufficiency of your understanding directly, you instead look for the symptoms that the right view necessarily comes with. The most important one is the inability to be touched by arisen suffering, which you know beyond doubt cannot diminish or be threatened regardless of circumstances—including anything you yourself may or may not do.

“Here, Ānanda, a bhikkhu understands: ‘It is impossible, it never happens, that a person whose view is perfected should treat any formation as permanent—no such possibility is found’, and he understands: ‘It is possible that an ordinary man should treat any formation as permanent—such a possibility is found.’

“He understands: ‘It is impossible, it never happens, that a person whose view is perfected should treat any formation as pleasurable—no such possibility is found’, and he understands: ‘It is possible that an ordinary man should treat any formation as pleasurable—such a possibility is found.’

“He understands: ‘It is impossible, it never happens; that a person whose view is perfected should treat any dhamma as self—no such possibility is found’, and he understands: ‘It is possible that an ordinary man should treat any dhamma as self—such a possibility is found.’

— MN 115

If someone who has fulfilled the actual prerequisites for right understanding (i.e., the precepts, celibacy, sense restraint... and not all the other entirely tangential things so often emphasized these days) believes they have “got it” through those means and nothing else, what they should do is train themselves to see *that very realization* as impermanent, suffering, not-self—a disease, a boil, a dart, and so forth, so as to completely “vomit out” any trace of a view that there might be real safety there. And that would be the actual perfection of view that cannot deteriorate no matter what—i.e., *saddhānusāri*-hood at the very least (see SN 25).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-03 12:07:47 (in reply to a comment not included)

No. *diṭṭhisampanna* is a term used unambiguously throughout the Suttas to refer to a noble disciple, i.e., anyone who has attained Right View. The translator of the text I quoted happens to translate *diṭṭhisampanna* as “perfected in view” rather than “accomplished in view” or similar, which isn’t necessarily wrong either. An Arahant is more than perfected in view; he is perfected in knowledge and liberation as well (the “tenfold” path that some Suttas describe).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-03 17:42:22 (in reply to a comment not included)

“A stream-enterer (or above) might unthinkingly act as if something were permanent (etc.), but on reflection they would know right away that this is not the case.”

That’s not quite what it means for there to be “*no place, no opening* for someone accomplished in view to regard any saṅkhāra as permanent.” The reading in that comment reflects the common impulse to lower the bar for right view, even at the cost of flatly ignoring the text (a tendency also seen with the Arrow Sutta).

It’s because of that same incapability to regard things anything wrongly at the most fundamental level that a noble disciple cannot be struck by the second arrow *ever*; they’re not just free from it “on reflection.”

Is the assumption of sensuality fractal ?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** obobinde 2025-07-30 16:58:01

So, let’s say I have a sudden desire for going to a music festival. Delight in the thought of it already provides pleasure on account of alleviating the pain of being pressured by this desire which is felt unpleasantly.

The question is, where does the more general unpleasant/neutral feeling fits ?

Is the pleasure felt **ONLY** a by-product of relieving the pressure related to this particular phenomena ? or is there another layer where a more general pressure, one born of a more general unpleasant/neutral feeling, one usually unnoticed but the actual source of the desire to listen to music as a way to alleviate/distract from the pain, getting relieved too ?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-01 17:02:36

Is the pleasure felt **ONLY** a by-product of relieving the pressure related to this particular phenomena ?

The pressure isn’t related to the particular phenomenon; that’s why if getting that specific thing that was initially wanted begins to seem impossible (or the thing ceases to be appealing for whatever reason), the same pressure of desire simply shifts to something else.

That pressure arises because the mind is currently susceptible to lust for the attractive, and that’s simply because of previous careless, unrestrained attention (and of course actions) in regard to anything attractive.

The pleasure felt is a by-product of an assumption. When the full picture is taken into account, getting the desired thing doesn’t actually “relieve” anything. That’s the whole

point. The objects of the pressure might change if you act out enough, but that's actually irrelevant to the pressure itself—which will have gotten worse. But that's enough to give a sense of relief to people who can't clearly see their own citta and only see that they no longer want *this* particular thing.

It's like feeling relieved because you got a free meal at a high-end restaurant after your car was stolen or your family was kidnapped.

or is there another layer where a more general pressure, one born of a more general unpleasant/neutral feeling, one usually unnoticed but the actual source of the desire to listen to music as a way to alleviate/distract from the pain, getting relieved too ?

I'm not sure what you mean by this, but it sounds a bit like an over-rationalization.

Meditation at the beginning of the path

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** MonumentUnfound 2025-07-17 01:47:35

It's clear in the suttas that meditating - sitting in seclusion, free from distractions - is the culmination of the gradual training, sometimes even stating that there is no meditation without the Right View. But I cannot help but see the presence of meditation even at the very first step of the gradual training. By renouncing entertainment, unless one is quite busy with their duties (and ideally a bhikkhu wouldn't be), or insists on spending all their free time with others (which presumably would be frowned upon for a bhikkhu, even a novice), there is going to be time where one is alone without recourse to distraction. At that time, one will be restraining the mind and not merely bodily or verbal activity - unless one is just thinking of random things with no discernment whatsoever.

It only becomes more pronounced as the gradual training progresses. Already with guarding the senses we are restraining relatively subtle movements of the mind - which benefits from seclusion. The section on wakefulness is explicit: sitting and walking, purifying the mind. Furthermore, presumably throughout the whole process of the gradual training we should be examining the intentions available to us, trying to determine whether they are skillful or unskillful, and restraining the unskillful as best we can. With good teachers (like Ajahn Nyanamoli and Bhikkhu Anigha) to clarify the practice in accessible terms, this kind of contemplation becomes rather subtle and profound pretty much immediately.

So even at the beginning of training one will be *outwardly* appearing as a meditator (sitting in seclusion) and *inwardly* acting like a meditator (clarifying and restraining the mind). So why is the language of meditating reserved for the end of the path? In what way are we not already sitting in seclusion, purifying the mind of the hindrances at the very beginning, unless we are overly preoccupied?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 05:55:27

There's a big difference between restraining unwholesome mental activities while your focus is somewhere else (your bodily and verbal conduct) and having your focus mainly on restraining unwholesome mental activities, which assumes that everything "below" that is firm and secure. Needless to say, for the vast majority of people, it isn't.

Edit: Also, not all unwholesome mental activities are on the same level. It would be rather pointless for someone who isn't well established in the precepts to focus on perfectly restraining restlessness, for example, which is something that you *would* do in later stages, when you are able to clearly see what restlessness even is without conflating it with movement per se. But they certainly should do their best when it comes to obvious sensual or hateful thoughts. It would be very hard to succeed in physical celibacy if you were constantly indulging sexual fantasies.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-21 18:26:16 (in reply to a comment not included)

This is the time where I'm not clear what I should be doing

The reason for the confusion might be the very assumption that you must have something specific to "do." Anything taken on with that mindset will become a "technique" and will be unbeneficial for that reason alone. The entire training is simply about what you *don't* do. So on such occasions, all that matters is that you remain mindful of what you're not going back to—without turning that into an overly defined activity.

If done right, being aware that whatever you are doing right now is *not* that which you shouldn't be doing is effortless, and you become properly established in the precepts when you understand that—when it ceases to be about you actively performing the abstinence from things and instead about simply not doing those things. That doesn't require active effort at all because those things you are supposed to avoid are always fully deliberate and cannot occur accidentally.

Dogs and Company

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-07-14 23:55:37

I've been following HH channel for a while and in many talks there were mentions of the unwholesomeness of love and relationships of all sorts, including friendship as it involves company.

At the same time I saw Ajahn express kindness and love towards the dogs and so it made me wonder "isn't that contradicting?". Dog is still a being and still company even if it doesn't say anything

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 18:27:13

“Attachment” is determined by what would happen if you were permanently and abruptly separated from the thing in question (suffering), not by how you interact with it externally. The suffering that will sooner or later come is the sole reason why attachment is a problem. As long as you are not making yourself liable to that suffering—and you need a lot of self-honesty to see whether you are—you can do whatever you want externally, and it will not be attachment.

Can you express affection toward a human in the same way you could with a dog without being attached to them? Perhaps, but it’s a lot more unlikely, and it could never be romantic/sexual affection because separation absolutely will hurt in such a case. Anybody who thinks otherwise is conveniently overlooking the obvious.

And why is there that difference? It’s just the way it works. The depth of connection with an animal is inevitably very limited, and a person has to give in to irrational fantasies about the animal’s range of cognition to lose sight of that. Even then, it’s very unusual for people to grieve for a beloved animal as much as they would for a human, so the attachment cannot proliferate to the same extent even when you want it to.

How Hillside Hermitage explains the Migasālāsutta ?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Remarkable_Guard_674 2025-07-13 17:16:35

Isidatta and Purana were two Sakadāgāmi brothers. Purana constantly lived under the eight precepts, and Isidatta continued to live a married life. However, Isidatta had deeper wisdom than Purana. In terms of ethics, Purana surpassed him.

Migasālāsutta.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 05:17:13

I suppose you’re asking how it’s possible to have deeper wisdom with lesser virtue if, as we often say, there can be no wisdom without virtue, and celibacy is not optional for attaining higher wisdom.

The answer is spelled out more clearly in the other version of the Sutta. Isidatta had a better grasp of how to put an end to his own defilements, but he was not putting that understanding into practice. Purāṇa lived with fewer defilements, but he was not as proficient in dispelling them if they arose.

We’ve never said it’s impossible for someone’s wisdom to outpace their virtue. What we’ve said is that it’s impossible to continue progressing in wisdom without fulfilling virtue, and that clearly held true for Isidatta as well. He didn’t become an anāgāmi despite his wisdom because his virtue was lacking. Furthermore, he would never have become a once-returner if he hadn’t previously been free from the five hindrances—and that’s impossible to achieve without celibacy.

Resistance vs. Pressure?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** None 2025-07-12 16:22:10

Friends,

Is there any difference between my resistance to an enduring feeling and the pressure exerted by the citta toward or away from that feeling? Or is my resistance the action of mentally following that pressure?

Both seem like the necessary basis for suffering. If I'm pressured, I'm suffering, and if I'm suffering, I'm resisting what is felt.

But that might be an example of how the puthujjana who does not yet see the mind as a phenomenon differs from a Noble Disciple. The latter may not automatically suffer in response to pressure, and never in the manner of the puthujjana, because they recognize the distinction between the citta's agitation and their choice to resist that agitation.

In that scenario, non-resistance to agitation is effectively non-agitation from the standpoint of someone who is fully identified with the mind's activities and who, thus, cannot recognize the full extent of craving/suffering. Whereas the sotāpanna knows that complete freedom from the possibility of suffering requires the citta to become incapable of being activated by craving.

Does that make sense?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 05:06:06

Is there any difference between my resistance to an enduring feeling and the pressure exerted by the citta toward or away from that feeling?

No, they're the same thing described differently. The citta is what resists.

But that might be an example of how the puthujjana who does not yet see the mind as a phenomenon differs from a Noble Disciple. The latter may not automatically suffer in response to pressure, and never in the manner of the puthujjana, because they recognize the distinction between the citta's agitation and their choice to resist that agitation.

The noble disciple recognizes the distinction between pressure and the citta becoming agitated on top of it, which is a further layer of suffering that they can never give rise to anymore. That's the distinction between the first and the second "arrows."

A puthujjana cannot discern the difference between the two arrows, just as you will not find ghee in a stick of butter no matter how hard you look. You'll only be able to see ghee (the first arrow) when water (the second one) is no longer there.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-16 03:22:52 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I assumed, because only the arahant's citta is fully tamed, that there might still be some agitation in the Noble Disciple's mind in response to pressure until pressure has "ceased" to be pressuring, as it were.

There certainly is still some agitation in the noble disciple's citta, which is the very presence of pressure. In an Arahant, there is no pressure—no first arrow, no dukkha.

What the Arrow Sutta describes is that on top of the arising of pressure, which is itself already suffering and comes from ignorance, a puthujjana has a whole other layer of suffering.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-29 18:04:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I wouldn't concede that the term "*sutavā ariyasāvaka*" used in the Arrow Sutta applies to an Arahant. Every instance of that term in the Pāli that I've come across clearly refers to one in training (*sekha*), even more so when it is being contrasted with "*assutavā puthujjana*".

Chanting

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Future_Plastic_9910 2025-07-12 15:45:43

How close is Chanting to music? Can it be an obstacle? In practice its difficult to avoid in monastic environments.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-13 18:47:42

How close is Chanting to music? Can it be an obstacle?

If group chanting is for you anything more than paying a minimum "price" for a stay at a place where the eight precepts are the standard, then yes.

Ignoring the obvious wrong view that chanting has some sort of spiritual/meritorious power, sometimes the sound of chanting itself can be pleasing to the ear even if you don't ascribe fancy narratives to it, in which case you would need to be extra mindful not to start delighting in it even if your main motivation is just to avoid a scolding.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 04:34:55 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

chanting was already a thing in the early Sangha when the Buddha was there and soon after?

Definitely not in the present form, i.e., turning into a group activity that is supposedly wholesome in itself, covering up the delight in company underneath and removing the chance for any accurate reflection, and not understanding what you're even saying but assuming that it must grant some spiritual benefit to utter it anyway because it's Pali.

Simple Paticcasamuppada questions (principle of simultaneous presence) outside of the Visudhimagga interpretation

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhava_bhavana156 2025-07-10 16:28:27

1. Avijjapaccaya sankhara

How does ignorance, lead to sankharas being simultaneously present? Would an Arahant stop breathing, thinking, moving, eating, after attaining Nibbana?

2. Sankharapaccaya vinnana

Would this mean that sankharas (the body being there, breathing, thinking, speaking), are more fundamental than consciousness? Would an Arahant stop being conscious after attaining Nibbana

3. Vinnanapaccaya namarupa, namarupaccaya vinnana (namarupa = name and matter)

If experience is already all mental (ie, it is experienced), then how can it also be dependent on matter (if it is only experienced within PoV of experience?). How does the Buddhist 2-stacks-of-hay-leaning-on-each-other formulation, differ from idealism? How is the mind-as-forerunner doctrine, also different from idealism?

3.1 How is namarupa different from the 5 aggregates, or are they the same thing?

4. salayatana paccaya phassa, why not namarupapaccaya phassa?

If salayatana are the 6 physical basis for the senses (brain, body, musculature of eyes, optic nerves), and salayatana the 6 internal basis, then what is phassa? Sure, all these 3 are the same (no sensory information can occur without one of them being present), so what differentiates each of them?

5. Bhavapaccaya jati

Wouldn't it make sense for "birth" to come first, then "existence"? Why does "existence" precede birth, if for something to exist, it must have arisen first? Wouldn't it mean that something's arising would be its condition then?

6. Tanhapaccaya upadana, upadanapaccaya bhava

How does craving, lead to "holding"/assuming, and assuming, to "existence"?

7. Is paticcasamuppada a "hierarchy of awareness"?

8. If Paticasamuppada isn't about cause-and-effect, but rather, it's timeless, then how is it, that tanhapaccaya ahara (craving conditions physical food)? Wouldn't this be cause-and-effect then? (the cause for eating food, is craving)
9. How does ignorance cease?
10. If Paticasamuppada isn't about cause-and-effect, then how does an Arahant stop future lives?
11. Which chain within the Paticasamuppada explains the cessation and arising of self-view?
12. Does jatimarana affect avijja, or not? Is it a linear set of dependences, or is it also linear

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-12 09:47:47

1 & 2. Ignorance doesn't *lead* to saṅkhāras, nor does any factor in paṭiccasamuppāda *lead* to the next. It's not about causality.

What paṭiccasamuppāda is describing is that whenever one thing is present in a puthujjana's experience (e.g., saṅkhāras), the preceding thing will be present in the background as its foundation or support. That means that, colloquially speaking, you have to start by "finding" the second thing so that you can then discern the preceding one where it actually is, as the "womb" of it.

If you start with the first thing, you will always end up with an abstract explanation, which will be wrong for that very reason even if correct in theory.

So *avijjāpaccayā saṅkhārā* means that whenever the puthujjana finds himself engaging in an activity (most broadly, breathing, thinking, feeling-and-perceiving) that activity will always have ignorance in the background, and so the work is to undo that ignorance (rather than trying to stop the activities directly, which will never work) by fully understanding the nature of saṅkhāras.

You can't imagine what remains after ignorance is gone because that imagining itself—that activity—sits on top of the very ignorance you're supposed to transcend. So yes, from the external point of view, the Arahant's lungs are obviously still functional and so on, but it would be a grave mistake to think that you can therefore imagine (let alone engage in) breathing without ignorance as a puthujjana. That would defeat the whole purpose behind *paṭiccasamuppāda*, which is to subvert the entirety of your present experience affected with avijjā without first stepping outside of it (which is impossible).

3. Matter can only be perceived on account of the mind, but it can nevertheless be discerned as the necessary basis for mind to be there. Similar to how the perception of your mother or father is just a perception of a person just like any other, and nevertheless it's the perception of the person owing to which you exist. Idealism is wrong insofar as it misconceives the mind as somehow more real than all other perceptions. In the Buddhist view, one sees the phenomenon of the mind on

account of which everything is experienced (or any other supposed “ground of being”) as being itself a perception. Thus, it includes the entire picture and allows no room for a stable and immovable “first point” from which everything else comes—for less-than-complete dispassion and abandonment of any perception, no matter how fundamental it is in a secondary sense.

3.1. The dyad of *nāmarūpa* + *viññāṇa* is practically speaking the same as the five aggregates.

4. The Buddha did put it the latter way in DN 15.
5. “With existence, birth” means that the details of your manifestation in the world—as a human being with a particular body, life history, proclivities, etc.—are possible only because you exist first and foremost. It thus becomes apparent that none of those particulars are somehow “sacred,” e.g., the particular family or country you were born into, or anything else that might have become a part of your life in the course of time. All of it is secondary and could’ve been otherwise.
6. Again, it doesn’t “lead to” it. You find yourself already assuming things (e.g. gratification being possible from sensual pleasures), and you must then see that assumption can only be there because craving has arisen as its foundation.
7. No. It’s the fact that there is something simultaneously “below” your attending to such ideas or any others.
8. The *puthujjana* finds himself already “feeding” on things. He must then recognize that the background of that feeding is his simultaneously arisen craving. He is then able to stop taking his feeding for granted, which he wouldn’t be able to in any other way, even if he never ate again.
9. By sufficiently understanding *paṭicasamuppāda*, which requires great proficiency in seeing the signs of the mind, which requires unwavering virtue and sense restraint.
10. He doesn’t stop future lives as such. He stops *craving*, which means that he does not give rise to *bhava* even in the present. It is on account of craving in the present that one is reborn once death becomes the present.
11. All of them. A *puthujjana*’s self-view is the non-seeing of any instance of *paṭicasamuppāda*.
12. Not sure if I understand this one, but practically speaking, you could say it does. Experiencing suffering makes it even more difficult for a *puthujjana* to go “against the grain,” which is what *paṭicasamuppāda* is about.

The 5 precepts

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Remarkable_Guard_674 2025-07-09 17:34:55

I would like to know if Hillside Hermitage approves of this: As long as one is under the influence of sensuality or the 10 saṃyojanas, observing the five precepts completely without any flaw is impossible. Only an arahant has a pure and perfect sīla without the slightest trace of defilement. In this case, even a sotāpanna can still break the 5 precepts.

Note: This opinion is shared by the monks of the monasteries I follow. I also think that a sotāpanna does not have a perfect sīla.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:36:11

As long as one is under the influence of sensuality or the 10 saṃyojanas, observing the five precepts completely without any flaw is impossible.

No, we would strongly disagree with this. A person breaks a precept because they choose to do so, not because they are not free from X fetter.

And what is the undertaking that is painful now but results in future pleasure? It is when someone is by nature acutely passionate, averse, and muddled. He often feels the pain and sorrow born of passion, aversion, and muddledness. **He leads the complete and pure celibate life** in pain and sorrow, weeping, with a tearful face. When his body breaks up, after death, he reappears in a good place, a heavenly realm. This is called the undertaking that is painful now but results in future pleasure.

—MN 45

Of course, a sotāpanna has the *potential* to break all the precepts because mentally they are not free from the fetters and are still liable to unwholesome thoughts internally. But that doesn't mean they would *necessarily* break any precept before becoming Arahants. They would only do so if they became heedless.

In fact, AN 3.87 makes clear that unless one is steadfast in the essential brahmacariya precepts (which are the five with celibacy), one will not attain stream entry, and one who is already a stream-enterer will not be able to fulfill the training in the higher mind.

Lay Arahant

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Many_Relation_2784 2025-07-09 17:26:43

This question is for Bhante Aniga. Wouldn't a layman who understands, with perfect clarity, that restraint of bodily, verbal, and mental action is for the purpose of containing the pressure of feeling until citta understands the four noble truths directly, be able to attain Nibbana regardless of external circumstances?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:19:59

If by “layman” we simply mean somebody who hasn’t received formal sāmaṇera/bhikkhu ordination but nevertheless lives a homeless life, then yes. If we mean someone who holds a job and/or participates in the duties of a household, then no, that’s impossible even if he has rightly understood the four noble truths and keeps the eight precepts perfectly.

Living in such external circumstances is a continual choice, and that choice cannot be made without a degree of passion involved (not necessarily *sensual* passion, though, which is why a layman can certainly attain non-return).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:51:52 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I would tell them that if they truly were a stream enterer, then they would have no difficulty recognizing that they have to abandon their family in order to become an Arahant, as they would directly see the craving that is inescapably bound up with any involvement in such affairs. They would be unable to hold the quintessential wrong view that they could free themselves from craving while acting out of it.

Nevertheless, they could still strive for a higher attainment whether or not they give up their family, but that requires complete celibacy as the very first step.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-11 17:20:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I’ve explored that channel before.

While I think the broad strokes of their teachings might be helpful for complete newcomers, especially compared to much of what’s out there these days, I see them ultimately conveying a different understanding of the practice and the goal.

The overlap in jargon, concepts, and motifs with HH is a superficial similarity. Looking deeper, it’s often quite clear that what is actually meant isn’t quite the same. Other times, it’s just too vague and diluted to point in the right direction practically (except again for a total beginner).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-12 05:41:05 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Those are recordings by Sister Medhini before she discovered HH, after which she eventually concluded that her views at that time were severely missing the mark.

I haven’t listened to the recordings myself, but from her accounts in hindsight, it was ultimately still about managing the symptoms while the root issue remained overlooked—

despite often using all the right terms and following mostly the same standard of virtue at the external level.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-12 05:45:17 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

does a sotāpanna see their mind with absolute clarity at all times, or is it still possible for them to mistake it for themselves?

Compared to a puthujjana, they do see it with absolute clarity at all times (the same as how they are free from suffering at all times in comparison). Only when one is already a sotāpanna oneself can one accurately see to what extent ignorance is still possible at that stage (which, compared to an Arahant, is quite a lot).

A puthujjana will remain a puthujjana if they allow themselves any room for ignorance (or suffering).

Edit: added clarification

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-13 18:31:36 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It's not about any of the things you listed but about the fact that a householder is at heart, even when completely penniless, *one who is able to provide for himself*. That is an insurmountable obstacle to Arahantship even if he's celibate, restrained, and so on (which he needs to be anyway).

For one who is still within avijjā, providing for himself, even without any dependents let alone sensual engagements to speak of, cannot but maintain the existing passion/sense of external safety/concern for life. Hence, going forth and thereby making one's livelihood uncertain is a necessary condition for Arahantship.

This doesn't mean you absolutely have to live very austere to become an Arahant. It means that whichever comforts you have must be circumstantial. Whatever you happen to have at any given time, even if somewhat luxurious, isn't in your direct control, is uncertain, and is not guaranteed. You can't just go and get it back with your own resources if you lose it, or get something better—no matter how justifiable the reason. Sometimes you might be able to ask those who've extended an invitation to do so, but even then, the procurement remains uncertain.

And that setup is exactly what (right) monasticism creates.

I suppose it's possible in theory for somebody who is already an Arahant to provide for himself without passion if there is a compelling reason. But not before that.

“Bhikkhus, possessing six qualities a bhikkhu is incapable of realizing arahantship, the foremost state. What six? Here, a bhikkhu is without faith, morally shameless, morally reckless, lazy, unwise, and concerned about his

body and life. Possessing these six qualities, a bhikkhu is incapable of realizing arahantship, the foremost state.

“Bhikkhus, possessing six qualities a bhikkhu is capable of realizing arahantship, the foremost state. What six? [434] Here, a bhikkhu has faith, a sense of moral shame, and moral dread; he is energetic and wise; and he is unconcerned about his body and life. Possessing these six qualities, a bhikkhu is capable of realizing arahantship, the foremost state.”

—AN 6.83.

As usual, giving something up is first and foremost reflected in the way you live. You can't give something up on a purely internal level while continuing to do things that are underlain by it externally.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-13 19:01:21 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Sure, I'm fine with that.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 05:30:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

And, do you think this culture of comparison and dismissal is helpful?

Just as with everything, it depends on the motivation for it. Conceit, vanity, and ill-will make anything unwholesome, and that will no doubt be the motivation for many. But none of those are worse than delusion and wrong view masquerading as right view, which is a categorical obstacle.

“Bhikkhus, someone with five qualities is unable to enter the sure path with regard to beneficial qualities even when listening to the true teaching. What five? They discredit the talk, the speaker, or themselves. They're witless, dull, and stupid. **They think they understand what they don't understand.** Someone with these five qualities is unable to enter the sure path with regard to beneficial qualities even when listening to the true teaching.

—AN 5.152.

After all, anyone who truly understands the Dhamma knows for themselves that they understand, and they then know their own genuine freedom from suffering.

It's very easy for many people to think that they “understand the Dhamma for themselves” when they don't (or at least not sufficiently) and to overestimate the degree of freedom that they've achieved. The result of that is complacency. The more ingrained that attitude becomes, the harder it is to retrace your steps and make an effort towards actual freedom from suffering.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-14 18:05:55 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If people are going out of their way to criticize others, it reveals the critic themselves to be unlearned and ordinary, so their advice is not useful anyway.

It depends on what you mean by “going out of their way.” If someone just goes on a rant for no reason other than to release the pressure of being displeased with something, then yes. But the Buddha quite often criticized other teachings quite openly and encouraged his accomplished disciples to do the same, on appropriate occasions and with the right intention.

The main issue is when, as the Suttas put it, you criticize by exalting yourself and putting others down (instead of simply pointing out what you see as wrong and not making it personal), since that automatically comes not only with conceit but with ignoring your own shortcomings or at least being complacent about them. Seeing no other way to criticize and thus developing an apprehension toward criticism itself indicates just as much a lack of discernment between wholesome and unwholesome at the right level as regularly criticizing out of conceit and ill will.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 05:43:47 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I had no plans to proceed immediately. I won't have enough time for several days.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 06:16:40 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Wouldn't you agree that the well supported Bhikkhus who have all the food, water, clothing, medicine, and shelter they need, without being burdened by the exploitation of economic systems stand in a place of much more apparent security than the people who live outside those monasteries ...

Some bhikkhus might (depending on the monastery), but not if the Vinaya is decently kept, even if the place is well supported.

As my comment above implies, the fact that many laypeople live more austere than monastics is secondary. That was not an unlikely situation even in the Buddha's time, which is why there are stories in the Suttas of people ordaining for the sake of material comfort.

The hindrance to Arahantship is the fact that the only thing that prevents a layperson from going and directly getting what they factually need when they need it is circumstance, not a fixed boundary. They are therefore always open to that possibility at least mentally (which is the level that matters most in the end; action is intention). Thus, they cannot completely give up all passion.

If they were to set such a fixed boundary (i.e., take on the 10th precept on top of all the others), they wouldn't qualify as laypeople anymore even if they weren't formally ordained, which is why I mentioned that formal ordination is not strictly necessary. Nothing stops a layperson from saying no to sensual pleasures, though, and that's why they can certainly become non-returners.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-17 06:32:12 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, that's exactly it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-10-17 07:19:51 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

That already happened. I decided not to make it public because a lot of it contained personal details about Florian, and the main gist of the conversation was in no way new: you *actually* have to commit to the precepts and giving up sensuality without compromises, otherwise your understanding cannot but remain abstract.

What about cultivation (bhavana)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Many_Relation_2784 2025-07-09 09:05:09

It's evident that the Buddha taught cultivation that culminates in liberation. After liberation, freedom is unconditional. If we look at the suttas, it could be said that the gradual training is restraint (from unwholesome behavior), cultivation (of wholesome qualities), liberation.

But HH teachings seem to suggest that cultivating wholesome qualities is a form of management, and therefore samudaya, the origin of dukkha. How should we understand this discrepancy?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 06:00:19

But HH teachings seem to suggest that cultivating wholesome qualities is a form of management, and therefore samudaya, the origin of dukkha. How should we understand this discrepancy?

It's more like what is generally regarded as a wholesome quality in modern Buddhism is not wholesome to begin with *because* it is management (or more accurately, a cover-up of symptoms rather than an actual resolution of the underlying illness).

The things that do cure the underlying illness should certainly be developed, such as the recollections taught in the Suttas—when done at the right level that is made available by unwavering virtue and sense restraint.

Does becoming a sotapanna require removing the five hindrances first? If so, how far apart is this even from Jhana? Or is it just weakening the hindrances?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Lumpy-Compote-1744 2025-07-08 12:37:50

It is clear that becoming a sotapanna (stream enterer, to get Noble Right View) requires a present dispassion towards sensuality (not necessarily permanent) and other unwholesome states to be able to understand the actual 4 Noble Truths. It also requires not delighting in company and seeing the signs of your mind. A sotapanna still has the fetter of sensuality so that's can't be what is meant by dispassion to sensuality in that context https://www.reddit.com/r/HillsideHermitage/comments/1khp8rd/comment/mraliwz/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web3x&utm_name=web3xcss&utm_term=1&utm_content=share_button

https://www.reddit.com/r/HillsideHermitage/comments/1khiejs/comment/msksxwt/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web3x&utm_name=web3xcss&utm_term=1&utm_content=share_button

“And when he knew that Upāli’s mind was ready, pliable, rid of hindrances, elated, and confident, he explained the special teaching of the Buddhas: suffering, its origin, its cessation, and the path. **Just as a clean cloth rid of stains would properly absorb dye**, in that very seat the stainless, immaculate eye of the Dhamma arose in Upāli...”

If this is the case it seems like a stream enterer should already be close to jhana or brahmavihara. So why wouldn't they quickly just get that? They already have the 4 noble truths, it seems a short step away. They could just go into seclusion that day and get jhana very soon.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 05:12:17

If this is the case it seems like a stream enterer should already be close to jhana or brahmavihara. So why wouldn't they quickly just get that?

Because jhāna isn't something that you just “get,” as if it falls on you by itself. You need to be well versed in abandoning the hindrances, which requires a subtle type of effort that is neither too tight nor too loose. And you will only be able to fathom what that effort is if you have developed the entirety of the gradual training that precedes jhāna, which most of the people who attained stream entry in the Suttas had not done (and did not do afterwards either).

ESSAY - Jhana & “non-assumption of the hindrances = non-existence of the hindrances”

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** anicca142 2025-07-07 18:36:05

Upādānā paccayā bhavo (with assumption, being is simultaneously present

There are two ways of attending to a phenomena:

- a) the situation: that there is a lustful mind
- b) this particular phenomenon which is the thought: “There is a lustful mind”

The puthujjana, is used to attending to things in the situation he already is (ignoring the fact that the phenomena which exists is more fundamental than the situation). By perverting the order of things, and assuming that the situation of the hindrances/feelings, to be more fundamental than the phenomena of the hindrances/feelings (putting second whats first and first whats second), he assumes the “existence” of the situation of the hindrances

upadānirodhā bhavanirodho hoti (with the cessation of assuming, there is the cessation of being)

By stopping to assume that the situation of the hindrances that he is in, is more fundamental than the “phenomena” of there being a hindrance present (he can only discover the situation on top of the thing already existing there), he stops assuming the existence of a center of experience centered around the situation of the hindrances. Thus, when he stops assuming the wrong order of things, he isn’t “hindered” on account of it anymore (without assuming something to exist, it ceases existing)

If yoniso manasikara meant wise consideration/appropriate attention, then whatever the puthujjana would have done to be abandoning the hindrances, would only be done on top of the assumption that fuels them. Thus, he includes everything in his “wise consideration” but his assumption that his “wise consideration” is superimposed on (that is, on top of an already pre-existing sense of self which assumes itself at the centre of experience; nothing you think through the sense of self being able to directly override it)

Through the principle of yoniso manasikara, the bhikkhu experiences the 8 jhanas: **By assuming that what one experiences, is more fundamental than the experience, the existence (of a new centre of experience) is simultaneously present (because its assumed); by ceasing to assume that what one experiences is more fundamental than the experience, the existence ceases (because there’s no “self” for that “experience” to “fall on”).**

“There is the case where a monk — quite withdrawn from sensuality, withdrawn from unskillful qualities — enters and remains in the first jhana: rapture and pleasure born from withdrawal, accompanied by applied and sustained thought

Applied and sustained thought → speech

By ceasing to assume that the speech one breaks into, is more fundamental than the applied and sustained thought preceding it; by stopping to assume the speech as the centre of the experience and all else as secondary to it, he enters in the first Jhana

“Furthermore, with the stilling of directed thoughts & evaluations, he enters and remains in the second jhana: rapture and pleasure born of composure, unification of awareness free from directed thought and evaluation — internal assurance.

Intention → applied and sustained thought

By ceasing to assume that one’s applied thought and sustained thought is more fundamental than the intention preceding it, he enters in the second Jhana

“And furthermore, with the fading of rapture, he remains equanimous, mindful, & alert, and senses pleasure with the body. He enters & remains in the third jhana, of which the Noble Ones declare, ‘Equanimous & mindful, he has a pleasant abiding.’

(the meditator abandons intention?)

“And furthermore, with the abandoning of pleasure and stress — as with the earlier disappearance of elation and distress — he enters and remains in the fourth jhana: purity of equanimity and mindfulness, neither-pleasure-nor-pain.

By ceasing to assume that the breath is more fundamental than the experience of the breath, by stopping to assume breath as external, he enters into the 4th Jhana Arupa Jhanas

“With the complete transcending of bodily sensations, with the disappearance of all sense of resistance, and not heeding perceptions of diversity, thinking, ‘space is infinite,’ one enters and remains in the Sphere of Infinite Space.” With the complete transcending of the Sphere of Infinite Space, thinking, ‘consciousness is infinite,’ one enters and remains in the Sphere of Infinite Consciousness. “With the complete transcending of the Sphere of Infinite Consciousness, thinking, ‘There is no-thing,’ one enters and remains in the Sphere of No-thingness.” With the complete transcending of the Sphere of No-thingness, one enters and remains in the Sphere of Neither Perception nor Non-perception.”

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-10 04:59:23

Though not wrong in theory, it sounds like seeing the right order would at once undo the hindrances. But that’s not how it works. The more hindered the mind is, the more momentum there is towards the assumption of the wrong order, and the less it will feel like recollecting the right order does anything at all (which is one way that doubt would still be able to creep in). Only when that momentum has fully drained away have the

hindrances been overcome. That's why it's like tying a wild animal to a strong post until it stops thrashing and flailing.

Context = The Significance of the content?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** mentalw0rk 2025-07-06 23:02:07

I've struggled to get a consistent, clear sense of what is meant by "background", "peripheral" or "context" in the past. So this is an attempt to clarify what my current understanding is and hopefully get some helpful pointers if it's off.

To use a practical example: maintaining mindfulness while eating.

The content in two different instances may be identical: the same food, the same pleasure, even the same thoughts about the food. Even if both times you're having the right "dharma thoughts" while you're eating, that's still foreground/content.

However, the **significance** of all that content can vary in both instances. The **significance of that experience/content is what the context is**. That's why the context is always in "the background". The significance of the experience as a whole is not something that can ever be pointed at, it can never be narrowed down or made more concrete. It's not even a particular thought or theme of contemplation. It's more like the "light in which everything in the room is seen", the "filter applied to the picture". It can change everything, even if the content is identical. I believe Ajahn Nyanamoli once used the example of a watch, the significance/meaning of it can change completely if you find out the watch is very expensive, or it belonged to your grandfather. And also the context is always **personal**. **It's about what that experience means for you at that time. The intentions in regard to the content, and those background significances/intentions is what your citta is.**

It doesn't necessarily mean the same context has been established in both instances of eating, even if both times you're thinking "I should not eat for pleasure, the purpose of this food is sustenance of these organs, this food will be digested by organs and become something repulsive", etc .etc. Even if you're thinking dharma thoughts, the **significance of that whole experience could be "me trying to contemplate the dharma"**, rather than the context you unsuccessfully tried to establish, **"the repulsiveness of eating"**. But in a different instance, if the context has been successfully established, you wouldn't even have to actively think about the repulsiveness of eating. Everything would be seen through that context of repulsiveness, effortlessly, for as long as the context remains there.

That's why the context is directly related to mindfulness. If the right context is established, there is **effortless mindfulness** (recollection) because it's not something you actively do or think about. Yes, you may have to think about it at first, but if it's been properly established, it's what remains on its own. Almost like if you hit a gong hard enough, you only have to hit it once for the sound to reverberate effortlessly for a certain period of time. The sound permeates and affects the entire experience, no matter what other particular things you do. while the sound is there. You don't have to do anything until the

sound has fully disappeared. In the same way, you only need to actively do something to re-establish the context if it has been fully lost.

Additionally, that's why the correctly established context of death (mindfulness of death fully established) is so powerful and all-encompassing. Whatever you do, even if you're not actively thinking about death, is seen "in light of death". The significance of every experience, no matter the content, would be the significance of death. The significance that all of this can be snatched away without warning. And the sense of urgency would **have to arise, if done correctly**. On the other hand, if done incorrectly, even if you do nothing but think about death 24/7, you may not necessarily develop the sense of urgency. Because although the foreground thoughts are "thoughts of death", the context/significance of those thoughts for you might be "me calmly philosophizing about death" if you're not careful and sensitive to that background/significance.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-09 05:30:34

You can simply say that the context is where the citta is. The citta is what "holds" the context, not you. That is why, in your example, mechanically thinking thoughts about "not eating for pleasure" will not necessarily make any difference to an arisen context/citta of eating for pleasure. The wild animal can be lustful, and you can be completely ignoring that lust where it actually is and instead focusing on reciting the right words or conjuring up various ideas while eating.

That's why it's essential to learn how to "communicate" with your own mind—learn to actually have an influence on the arisen context—and that becomes possible only when it has been contained by virtue. Otherwise, your very lifestyle is already feeding the wrong context constantly.

Reflexive awareness/self awareness

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** obobinde 2025-07-06 15:21:46

I have a question concerning self awareness. Usually when I'm commuting or just walking, self awareness has a tendency to naturally be there and almost effortlessly continuous. Since hindrances are absent (or undetectable) and the mind is mostly quiet, with even elation sometimes, in which satipatthana category should self awareness fit? Does knowing those characteristics entails putting it in cittanupassana?

Also, each time I'm mindful of my breath in daily life I'm always surprised that it is already there. If I keep this breath in mind as something enduring without my having me having a say about it yet being the condition for my whole existence, it does trigger a slight feeling of unease and sometimes anxiety (feeling a bit trapped). I understand this to be quite useful as a strong reminder of the urgency to keep striving on the gradual training. But I wonder which of the two, plain self-awareness or contemplation of the breath as I mentioned, should be more developed?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-08 18:54:50

Taking for granted the foundation of unbroken seven precepts and sense restraint, what needs to be developed is awareness of underlying motivations within that already contained behavior. Without that awareness, let alone the even more basic foundation of restraint, no satipaṭṭhāna is possible, as any effort to discern and contemplate will be coming out of unnoticed and already-welcomed hindrances. But if that awareness and the aforementioned level of restraint are there, then it doesn't really matter as long as the motivation is correct and you're not trying to contemplate out of an unwholesome pressure.

Did I understand correctly?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Remarkable_Guard_674 2025-07-06 00:35:14

From what I understand from Hillside Hermitage,

1. It is impossible to create a schism (Sangha Beda) in today's community because modern Theravada is not exactly what Lord Buddha taught. The bhikkhus' noble Sangha doesn't exist anymore in the majority of monasteries because of the division that occurred in the past.
2. The teaching has been corrupted and the practice of breath meditation is not the true meaning of Anapanasati.
3. Understanding Annica is not just repeating to oneself that everything is impermanent to become an arahant.
4. The Jhanas that people practice are not stable Jhanas since they are not born from the complete abandonment of sensual pleasures and those who practice them continue to enjoy sensual pleasures.
5. To become a Sotāpanna, one needs to associate the right view, not associate with a meditation cushion. Real meditation is born from right view.

Please correct me if I made a mistake. ☹☹

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-07 05:41:34

Understanding Annica is not just repeating to oneself that everything is impermanent to become an arahant.

Not just that. Impermanence can only be rightly understood, i.e., at the level that actually frees, by a tamed mind, for which virtue and sense restraint are not negotiable. That's the only thing that can make the Dhamma concrete and directly visible.

The Jhanas that people practice are not stable Jhanas since they are not born from the complete abandonment of sensual pleasures and those who practice them continue to enjoy sensual pleasures.

It's not that they're "not stable"; they simply aren't jhānas—*because* they continue to enjoy sensual pleasures, having at no point truly internalized the danger in them.

One who achieved the pleasure that is apart from sensuality would not return to it. That pleasure comes precisely from understanding the danger in sensuality, and you wouldn't return to something if you truly perceived it as dangerous.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-09 05:15:50 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The Paṭhamanānākaṇasutta can explain this difference if we look deeply in that. Is that correct Bhante?

The modern jhānas are below what that Sutta (and any other) describes. Delighting in the first jhāna, even if "anariya," would mean delighting in renunciation, and to that extent there can be no delight in sensual pursuits. The modern jhānas do not achieve even that, so they cannot lead to the Brahmā realms. If they did, they would be well worth developing even without right view.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-09 16:50:24 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Bhante, I think it is possible to develop Jhānas without right view. Alara Kalama and Uddaka Rāmaputta are examples of Puthujanas who have achieved that. They did not have the right view, Bhante, they were not even sotāpanna. It is possible to have jhānas without right view.

I'm not disputing that. I'm saying that it is possible and that "anariya jhāna" would actually have great benefit in contrast to what modern meditation practices lead to.

What those practices lead to is not jhāna because sensuality has not been overcome even temporarily. What happens is that the person becomes too immersed in the pleasure and novelty of a yogic state—and in their wrong views that severely inflate its significance—to recognize that the mind's passion for sense pleasures has not diminished and that it is still operating within the five hindrances.

In order to arrive at the Brahmā realms, one needs to actually give up passion for sense pleasures, like the teacher Sunetta. If somebody has even "anariya jhāna," it can only be because of a permanently celibate and de-sensualized lifestyle—something far from universal among so-called "jhāna" practitioners today.

The Hillside Hermitage Arahant Challenge

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Little_Carrot6967 2025-06-29 23:01:31

The Hillside Hermitage Arahant Challenge.

Based on several of Ajahn Nyanamoli's dhamma talks, I've pieced together a challenge. He says that anyone who can sit in a quiet room with nothing but jhana and their thoughts for an entire day without getting bored is close to Arahant. The idea is that an Arahant can sit indefinitely this way and never be discontented.

The rules that he defined were 4 but I'm adding a couple extra and going further with some of the others. (*Different videos and his book "The only way to Jhana". One of those videos can be found Here*)

1. You fail if you become bored at any time.
2. You must sit peacefully. (You may not pace, though you may get up to go to the bathroom, grab water or change positions.)
3. You're not allowed to **intentionally** practice mindfulness techniques and you must try to avoid altered mental states. (All forms of hypnosis including rest, keeping your eyes closed, daydreaming and any form of object exclusion.)
4. You're not allowed to **intentionally** distract yourself with anything. (That includes picking your clothing, flicking a string, singing, humming etc.)
5. You must fast for the duration.
6. Have taken some precepts and have been practicing seclusion.

#####This challenge can be undertaken for several durations.

- Tutorial- 1h
- Normal- 3h
- Hard- 6h
- Going forth- 7h-15h
- Very hard- 16h

#####This challenge is meant to test.

1. Your resistance to the direct experience of the nature of your condition.
2. Right view in regards to various aspects of your practice.
3. How well acclimated you are to being withdrawn. (Dependent on engagement.)
4. Your relationship with your mind. How far you've come and how well you've tamed it. (or not)

The key to this seems to be accepting the reality of the base experience by removing internal resistance to it. Also this isn't a masochism challenge. If you aren't enjoying every minute of this, you're missing the point. Additionally, I recommend that even if you fail the challenge on the first 3 difficulties, you still finish the full time allotted. The benefits of doing so are also part of the purpose of this.

If you decide to participate and manage to finish any of these difficulties, comment here and I'll add your name to the original post listed under the highest difficulty you've completed. If you decide to undertake and complete the challenge multiple times, make sure to double post so I can see it.

Additional Information.

!Explanation- This exercise will push you into a kind of involuntary Dham-mānupassanā meditation which is a form of Samatha. Because there's no stimuli whatsoever you'll experience all kinds of mental resistance to the base experience. In theory, if you could make it to 16 hours you'd be close to Arahant or Anagami. (Tip- Resistance is born of resistance.)!<

!Excerpt from the Ajahn's book ("*The only way to Jhana*")- "That reality of the body will first present itself as unpleasant and confining, because you will experience the fundamental patigha that you have towards it. So, you are going to experience this physical resistance, this sickness, the self-loathing, because you're withdrawing from the entire domain of "sensual being" (kāma-bhava). What you have to abandon is that patigha, that aversion towards your own senses which are no longer engaging with sensual distractions. That's why sensual desire is so powerful, because the aversion towards being confined within the body underneath it is even more so and the only means of escape that an ordinary person knows is sensual pleasure, which is no escape at all." (For more details, the entirety of chapter 8 "The pleasure of boredom" covers it.)!<

#####Completists

-Tutorial-

-Normal-

-Hard-

-Going forth (7-15h)-

-Very hard- Little_Carrot6967

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-30 04:56:20

The rules that he **defined** were 4 but I'm adding a couple extra and going further with some of the others.

I'm very certain that he has never defined or even hinted at anything along these lines. In the video you linked, he does say that if you never get bored, you could be an anāgāmi or even an Arahant, but that means *for the rest of your life*, not for X amount of hours. Succeeding in such a test for whatever amount of time is not even a sign of right view, and thinking that it might be is a very clear sign of *wrong* view (misunderstanding what practice and progress in it are).

To boot, the test itself is an activity that will be keeping you engaged and covering up your true liability to boredom, so it by nature obstructs the very thing it sets out to achieve.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-01 07:31:34 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If you think that you're actually "sitting with nothing," then that's because you're not seeing what is still there, lurking in the background. Even in the most refined states of samādhi, there is always something, some activity.

During these periods of contrived non-activity, there is going to be some background pressure and mental movement that's less blatant and defined than what you're used to but still well within the five hindrances. And you will not see that because of the view that you're not doing anything.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-04 05:20:29 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

My point is that the space that should be for remaining aware of your motivation for engaging in *anything* gets occupied by trying to do the challenge. It's not a passive thing; you're actively imposing a list of prohibitions (which I still don't see where they even came from). That's a mental activity that is taken for granted throughout, i.e., a gaping blind spot. It's a kind of "Hillside Hermitage technique," which means it ironically falls within exactly what we criticize.

Anything you might get to recognize within a structured exercise is just a distraction from where you should really be looking, i.e., the "why am I doing all this in the first place?" bit. That level is where the base resistance/craving would be, and remaining aware of *that* is what's truly challenging. There can be no fixed structure there apart from never breaking the eight precepts, which means you're left with the weight of responsibility for every single activity—which includes rejection of activity—that you take up, big or small, mental or bodily. That's the "right level" we often refer to.

The tick protection dilemma: Is effective protection killing or not?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Lemon_3675 2025-06-26 11:06:27

I found an attached tick on me again today which again brought up the topic of what should be done to prevent that.

Now I know how I would see this, but in case I am still wrong about this and since this is likely also still a question for others, I am posting this to bring up the topic again.

The normal repellent option (Icaridin, here sold by Autan) is unfortunately completely useless, at least for me. I also tested spraying the pants with Icaridin/Autan and found it just as likely to see ticks crawling on me later. It makes no difference whatsoever. First time I went out in shorts I immediately had a tick sting on my leg already.

So I already switched to only wearing long pants (running tights) and stuffing them in my socks, which means they will still get on me but usually I find them afterwards crawling around on my arms before they sting. Usually.

Now today I noticed a tick got attached on my upper back anyways, which is therefore the second one this year. So my tick prevention could still be improved. Since it was on my back it was difficult to remove. I tried the plastic hook things but as usual they didn't work to catch it. So I had to use forceps to remove it, which of course resulted in it being squished and killed and it's sting/mouthparts being left in the wound. I expected that to happen but I would say that since my intention was to remove it, not kill it, it didn't break the precept despite removing it... killing it? Is that correct? Otherwise realistically you could never remove ticks and would have to accept all of the (sometimes very serious) diseases.

So on this occasion I am once again thinking if I should treat my clothing (or at least pants) with permethrin (sold as 'no-bite for clothing'). This is the only thing, apart from trying to spot them quickly, that actually works reliably. It's also used by military who find it to be >99% effective if all clothing is treated. But the way it works that when the tick crawls on the clothes, depending on how long it stays, it will either be temporarily paralyzed or, probably more often, killed.

So this would be effective, but it would result in ticks dying. I don't want to kill them, I just want to protect myself and that happens to be the only reliable tool. So can I then say it's not intention of killing and doesn't break the precept, or it does?

Some context why I am taking that topic seriously: I already have enough health problems to deal with and getting lyme disease or worse would be even worse considering that I am a self-employed software developer and if I catch something and can't work (impaired cognition, fatigue or similar would be enough for that) for an extended period of time it could be a serious problem financially because I currently have neither unemployment protection nor particularly much in terms of savings. That is a risk in addition to the serious health risks themselves.

So the question is if permethrin can be used, because otherwise it basically boils down to being forced to choose one of multiple bad outcomes:

1. Keeping the precepts and being confined to living in a city without ticks only and never going in the forest etc. that would give more seclusion than my apartment
2. Keeping the precepts and not using permethrin and just taking a fatalistic gamble on whether or maybe rather when I will get tick born diseases that depending on my luck could leave me neurologically disabled etc. for life
3. Not keeping the precepts at least to that extent

If I think about this myself and tell you my honest thoughts, the only logically consistent

approach seems to be that even if I use some kind of method (usually poison for the parasite even if you call it something else) to cure or prevent a disease caused by a parasite that reliably results in the parasite's death would still not break the first precept.

Also if it would be considered killing, then that would mean that removing attached ticks would also be killing. Because in both cases (unless you unintentionally don't know or intentionally ignore this fact) the intention is to remove it from my body to minimize health risk but you know that it will often but not always result in the tick's death. And then we would come back to being left with the 3 options I just mentioned.

The first reasoning (regarding intention) being that I have no ill will regarding the parasite itself, I don't 'want' to kill it. I would much prefer to remove it without any harm to it. But I also want to protect my health at least to the extent that this is even possible. And it can simply be the case that the only way of accomplishing that results in the parasite's death.

The second (the issue of logical consistency) is that if removing attached ticks is allowable, permethrin should also be allowable. Because in both cases the intention is simply to remove the tick from the body or to protect health, and in both cases it often but not always results in the tick's (immediate or delayed, it does not matter) death. And of course it seems to be common practice to remove attached ticks.

Is my view above right or wrong? Thank you for reading and any feedback.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-28 07:43:24

So I had to use forceps to remove it, which of course resulted in it being squished and killed and it's sting/mouthparts being left in the wound. I expected that to happen but I would say that since my intention was to remove it, not kill it, it didn't break the precept despite removing it... killing it? Is that correct?

Yes, it doesn't break the precept in and of itself. The external outcome is not the determining factor; it's your intention. Therefore, if you were to do something with the intention of killing the tick (or any other being) and yet it *didn't* die, you would be equally blameworthy regardless.

So this would be effective, but it would result in ticks dying. I don't want to kill them, I just want to protect myself and that happens to be the only reliable tool. So can I then say it's not intention of killing and doesn't break the precept, or it does?

It doesn't break the precept either, provided your aim is genuinely not to get them to die but only to stop them from biting you.

It's functionally the same as walking on earth or driving a car—you know full well that insects will very likely die as a result, but it's not unwholesome because that's not your aim.

By the way, it *is* perfectly possible (and ideal for health reasons too) to remove a tick alive

if you're using proper tweezers. The trick is to grip it as far in front of the head as possible. Don't yank it because that will very likely split the body from the head. Instead, start very gently and apply steady, increasing pressure over several seconds. Be sure not to squeeze the tick with the tweezers because that can also kill it even if it comes out whole. If you do it right, the tick will let go, and you should see it start to move immediately afterwards.

You'll also want to do a full-body check after passing through a forested area, or at least twice a day. A large handheld mirror that you can also hang from a wall to check your back works well (plus a headlamp for better visibility).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-28 11:09:40 (in reply to a comment not included)

My point is that what OP described is not an external action of killing either. Burning a tick or squashing it to make sure that it won't bite you would be killing because you are consciously aiming at that outcome.

When we talk about the things that can never be done, it's to make clear that whenever those things occur *deliberately*, they will always involve an unwholesome intention. That's just to close the loophole where somebody might think they can "kill compassionately" or "engage in intercourse without lust." One could only believe that by misjudging the underlying intention.

Scratching Without the Itch

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** mentalw0rk 2025-06-26 03:02:22

Sensuality is fundamentally a project that is doomed to fail, as scratching the itch only appears to make the itch go away on the surface. While on a deeper level, it is making the problem worse, and it makes you more and more emotionally dependent on scratching, meaning it's actually tightening the noose around your neck, rather than freeing you. And it is **especially dangerous because of that deceptiveness**, it really does seem like it's giving you freedom from the itch, rather than binding you harder to it.

Now, my question is with the other part of the analogy. **If someone were to be cured from the itch, they would see that scratching was always painful.** It only appeared as pleasant in comparison to the greater pain of the itch. If someone had healthy skin, scratching that healthy skin would correctly be seen as pain.

In that case, for an arahant or anagami, would engaging with sights/sounds/etc. be felt as painful? Since they have cured their itch of desire. Would they feel more like "harassed" by sights/sounds/etc. even if they have an agreeable nature?

For example, even for someone who is not free from desire, there are times when a certain food (lets say french fries) is desired, and other times when it is not desired. With the presence of the pain of desire, eating the fries is felt as pleasant, as a relief. However, in

the absence of the desire (maybe you've had french fries too many days in a row), that very same food seems unappealing. And if you were forced to eat it, it would be kind of "meh", like a chore, or even slightly unpleasant. They would feel harassed or overstimulated by a stimulus of taste that they do not want. Is that how anagamis and arahants see sense objects and sense engagement? As more of a chore or bother than anything?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-27 07:32:36

The metaphor of "scratching" only makes sense on the mental level when there is craving. If one is free from craving, even the *possibility* of "scratching" is completely gone. Scratching is specifically the *seeking* of pleasing sense objects with passionate intent, which means that scratching itself is impossible if passionate intent is impossible. Encountering pleasing sense objects is not scratching in and of itself, so it's not like one would become "sensitive" and actively hide away from pleasing things.

That being said, certain things are harassing for one who's given up passion in the sense that they obstruct the pleasure of renunciation. That's not because those things are pleasing, but because they're noisy, messy, and too demanding of attention, such as crowds.

However, in the absence of the desire (maybe you've had french fries too many days in a row), that very same food seems unappealing. And if you were forced to eat it, it would be kind of "meh", like a chore, or even slightly unpleasant. They would feel harassed or overstimulated by a stimulus of taste that they do not want. Is that how anagamis and arahants see sense objects and sense engagement? As more of a chore or bother than anything?

No; that apathy and aversion are just the other side of the same coin where passion is. If you had truly uprooted passion, then you simply wouldn't care about sense objects, which is why you'd be incapable of any sensual acts. Feeling harassed or overstimulated is still a form of involvement.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-30 11:40:18 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Bhante, so this means that both the "itch" and the "scratch" are on the mental level right?

Not entirely. The hindrances originate purely from the mind, but they're inseparable from their bodily manifestation. In other words, the "itch" will be felt in the body even though the root disease is mental.

Initially it seemed to me that the "itch" was just the pressure from the senses.

No; the "itch" is how the senses manifest with ignorance.

But now it seems like there is a "second layer of pressure" on top of the first one.

You could say that in theory, but you have to keep in mind that it remains completely abstract for as long as the second layer is still there. When that second layer is gone, you can't even call what's left "pressure" because there is no compulsion or force whatsoever behind it. From the point of view of the second layer, what is left is not even annoying. It's irrelevant.

because even if you "scratch successfully", the real "itch", the second layer of pressure has been left completely intact. Because although the superficial sense of pressure has been temporarily reduced, the habit of compulsion to do something about the pressure whenever it presents itself has actually been increased. You have just ingrained that compulsive habit, that sense of obligation, even deeper. And whenever there is "obligation", that is the opposite of freedom.

Yes, that's quite correct. That's why sensuality *always* makes things worse in the final analysis, even if it "seems" to work for the time being. It's exactly as the Suttas describe it: a drink that factually satisfies a thirsty traveller in the moment but ends up causing him death or death-like suffering because it contains undetectable poison. Or the leper getting momentary relief from cauterizing his wounds but making the whole thing worse in the long term.

Whenever you give in to the offered scratch, the pain of not being able to scratch future itches—which will have to come sooner or later, since even infinite access to sensuality cannot guarantee satisfaction—skyrockets. That pain of abstaining in the face of intense desire is the closest to the pain of death you can get without actually dying.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-07 06:30:49 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

... And because of this, the bodily manifestation of pressure is also dropped, so the body is experienced as unburdening and pleasant in jhana, correct?

Yes. The body becomes unburdened, and *that* is pleasant: the fact that you *lost* what is burdensome and oppressive, not *gained* some special state or sensation that gratifies you. The latter is just sensual pleasure.

Did I understand you correctly?

Although the explanations might be correct in theory, you have to keep in mind that being able to provide them is not the point at all. The true problem is not in how well your explanations match somebody else's, but in what you are personally designating in your own experience (if anything) when you say "senses," "pressure," "mine," or "for me," and what you think somebody else is referring to when they use those words. The inaccuracies on that level are where the true ignorance is, and those can only be undone through the training.

Explanations can only take the existing internal inaccuracies for granted, even if they sound perfectly correct. That is why the Dhamma cannot be accessed through mere rea-

soning, and why it's a mistake to think that you're on the same page as somebody else just because you can produce words and phrases that closely match theirs. An AI can easily do that, yet it cannot possibly have an experiential perspective of what it writes about, and thus it can never have a *view*, right or wrong.

They no longer assume themselves to be the "the subject independent of the experiences, for whom experiences come and go while the subject remains the same", aka the "owner of the experience" or "the experiencer of the experience".

Same here. I can neither agree nor disagree, because the crux of the matter is how you personally interpret "subject independent of the experiences." If that interpretation is off, the whole statement is wrong (and if it were right, you would already be a sotāpanna).

And even if ownership of feelings is abandoned by a non-returner,

Ownership of feelings is only gone in an Arahant. But yes, the intensity of ownership decreases the closer one comes to it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-07-08 18:37:52 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

So practically, for any non-arahant, whenever the first layer of pressure is there, the second layer of pressure (compulsion to do something about the pressure) is simultaneously there to some degree. So to a non-arahant they appear as one inseparable thing; only an arahant has truly experienced the first layer without the second. But because compulsion is no longer there, the arahant's first layer ceases to be pressure, which is the meaning of "contact has ceased for an arahant"?

Practically, you will find the mind *already* wanting to do something, even just revolving around certain thoughts/images. Only once you have endured the discomfort of not welcoming those impulses sufficiently does the pressure as such become discernible. Before that, you can't see it for what it is even if you try.

That root of the pressure is assuming the sense bases, which you will at that point be able to discern concretely (but indirectly/peripherally) and contemplate rightly only because you've been guarding them well, not spilling out into sense objects (which includes mental ideas and intellectualizations) when there is a compulsion to do so. And that undoing of assumption and full understanding of the sense bases (as a dart, as a disease, as foreign, etc.) is how you eradicate even the possibility of pressure rather than just restraining certain responses *within* arisen pressures as before.

Different people have different faculties and a different amount of built up compulsion, so for some, that degree of necessary restraint will be more, for others less.

The amount of built-up compulsion is essentially the same for everyone. It's just that it

can manifest in different ways, some of those potentially being easier to overlook because they don't fit the classical notions of what a wild mind is like.

The problem seems to be that we don't do this thoroughly and consistently enough. We might see it with the obvious intense pressures, but we don't include the full extent of "my inclinations", therefore smaller inclinations/pressures are left out and implicitly taken as "mine".

Very true. And those smaller inclinations are not brought out by just looking for them harder. The only way to have a chance to see them is to be well established in restraint regarding everything coarser than them.

Pride in Asceticism

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Seekfinderin 2025-06-23 19:01:54

Simple question. How do you deal with some sort of pride in asceticism? Usually you would assume that giving up things is hard. And that it is a sort of sacrifice to not possess things, to only clad in the robe of a monk and all that. But what if almost the opposite is the case: Possessing things is a burden and you want to get rid of it. Having a comfortable bed feels like a burden and you are eager to get it out of the house. The buddhist robe seems beautiful to you and wearing it instead of other clothes is not hard for you but you rather find it much better and maybe even feel cool being a monk and so on. Stuff like that. Obviously there can be just as much pride involved in the few things one possesses as in a huge amount of things. What to do then?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-26 05:22:43

Obviously there can be just as much pride involved in the few things one possesses as in a huge amount of things.

Well, then that pride isn't pride in asceticism but rather pride in a specific kind of possession.

If someone is truly proud of their renunciation as such, their pride isn't going to pertain to anything that they still have but to everything they've given up. And that pride in actual renunciation isn't something to address directly, nor is it necessarily an obstacle as long as it doesn't lead one to become complacent and ignore that there are heaps of work still undone. It will fade quite significantly as a result of attaining Right View and disappear entirely only with the attainment of Arahantship.

Progress with the 5 hindrances: checking my understanding

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Formal_Breath_2026 2025-06-17 13:42:26

I am writing this in the hopes of clarifying that my practice is going in the right direction.

My understanding is that the 5 hindrances are all bodily, and they often coincide with bodily feelings that can be discerned more and more easily the more you withdraw from them. For example, ill-will might be felt as a hot sensation, or anxiety might be felt as a tightness or shortness of breath, or desire for taste might be accompanied by salivation. I am not sure if these bodily reactions are always there but they become more and more obvious. It also makes it clear that the body is basically just a biological machine that operates quite independently of 'you'. So it seems to me that progress with abandoning the 5 hindrances shouldn't, as I once thought, be measured by how often the bodily feelings and thoughts come up, as this will mostly depend on your body's own predispositions and your environment (I/my body seem particularly prone to anxiety, for example). The progress in withdrawing from the 5 hindrances should be measured by how much the citta is pressuring you to act out of the unpleasant bodily feeling via thoughts in the mano. For example, it seems that there are some things I can engage with now where I feel only the bodily feeling, but none of the accompanying pressure at all. Despite the fact that all of the 5 hindrances come together as one general phenomenon, by far the most primary one is sensuality, as it is fundamentally using your body for pleasure which makes your citta want to act out of all the other bodily hindrances as well. So your progress with the hindrances is primarily to do with how much you have abandoned the most coarse, which is sensuality (ill-will seeming to be a close second). Being more content to endure the pressure of the body without sensuality seems to do most of the work for the other hindrances on its own (not that you don't need to be careful about them as well, though).

So my understanding is essentially that the 1st Jhāna is the quantitative increase in this general principle of thoughts having less pressure, but with the qualitative difference being that sensual-perception has ceased completely, so there is not even a chance that the citta could pressure you no matter what comes up. This is how it can lead to total liberation, as your mind won't want to go back to the pressure after it's been in a state without it. I may be extrapolating too much here so consider this a bonus thought but my guess is that part of why the 2nd Jhāna is more refined than the 1st is because the thoughts that come up in the mano in 1st Jhāna, while having no pressure, are still accompanied by some of the minor disturbances in the body, and also that the sensual thoughts themselves are still slightly besetting even without any pressure.

I've made the same mistake a few times now which is that because the thoughts have less pressure, I watch over my mano less carefully, then end up dwelling on some sensual theme which brings the mind back towards pressure again. I think Bhante Anīgha mentioned in some talk that it's a common mistake to take a certain level of mindfulness for granted, be less careful as a result, and then lose that mindfulness. So my understanding is basically to be careful to not to keep making that mistake, maintain the mind in a state of relative mindfulness and pressure-less-ness, and (...eventually...) the citta will realise it's more pleasant to not have the pressure and that will be when kāma-sañña fully goes away?

Additional note: since so many contemporary Buddhist groups focus on managing the hindrances, they are completely missing the relationship between body, mano, and citta,

and that is why you can never have full liberation with those techniques. They are presuming a certain level of control over the three which isn't fully there. But if you abandon control then it doesn't matter at all what comes up, because there's no pressure and so it's not your problem.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-18 18:49:45

My understanding is that the 5 hindrances are all bodily, and they often coincide with bodily feelings that can be discerned more and more easily the more you withdraw from them.

They are completely inseparable from the body, yes. But the hindrances themselves are defilements of the citta (*cetaso upakkilesā*, as they're often called in the Suttas).

The progress in withdrawing from the 5 hindrances should be measured by how much the citta is pressuring you to act out of the unpleasant bodily feeling via thoughts in the mano.

Withstanding unpleasant bodily feelings by not allowing unbeneficial thoughts in mano is what the right striving is, but you've only overcome the five hindrances when there is no unpleasant bodily feeling in the first place (SN 48.38 defines the "faculty of pain" as bodily). The unpleasant bodily feelings are a symptom of the hindrances, which is why there's that ubiquitous passage describing that when the citta becomes unhindered, the body calms down and even becomes pleasant (as a burdenlessness rather than the orgasmic, lust-infected pleasure that people are usually after in modern meditative practices).

So my understanding is essentially that the 1st Jhāna is the quantitative increase in this general principle of thoughts having less pressure, but with the qualitative difference being that sensual-perception has ceased completely, so there is not even a chance that the citta could pressure you no matter what comes up.

Correct.

So my understanding is basically to be careful to not to keep making that mistake, maintain the mind in a state of relative mindfulness and pressurelessness, and (...eventually...) the citta will realise it's more pleasant to not have the pressure and that will be when *kāma-saṇṇā* fully goes away?

Precisely. But within that state of pressurelessness, you should also make an effort to reflect on the suffering inherent in sensuality and craving in general. The possibility of returning to that domain will not completely fade until that clarity fully sinks in. And that clarity is something you can cultivate only to the degree that the mind is beyond the pressure of sensuality—when the mind is "pliable." Understanding is what the hindrances obstruct, as is so often said in the Suttas. So you need to protect that pliable state as much as possible and not start taking it for granted so that the permanent, liberative understanding has as much time to work its way in as possible.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-24 02:19:48 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

So in this case, “not allowing” correctly, would mean to sit quietly and stop resisting the physically felt discomfort of mental inactivity?

No; the “not allowing” you’re describing is on the side of self-mortification.

But now, it seems like actually I am responsible for it, because I don’t want the pressure of “mental silence”, so I subtly give in to the pressure of mano to think or remember random things to “fill the silence”.

The pressure is not to “fill the silence”; it’s to engage with a pleasing sensual object (in the case of the song). So your responsibility is to not engage in that way, even by thought.

The unbeneficial thoughts that must not be allowed are those involving sensuality, aversion, and cruelty (or more broadly, those where the pressure of the five hindrances is involved), and you should certainly be thinking quite a lot about the danger in welcoming such thoughts and the benefit of their cessation. Otherwise their absence will just come from suppression, not because your citta has actually lost interest in them, and that suppression inevitably involves actual aversion/restlessness (in the citta’s attitude).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-26 05:59:36 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If things remain at this state, there are “no enemies on the horizon” aka the hindrances. But I still need to remain vigilant, and keep my eye on those thoughts in case they start showing inclinations of sensuality, ill will, or I am starting to get too absorbed in their content (even if its mundane content, the loss of awareness due to getting too absorbed is a problem right?).

Correct. Even if there is no overt sensuality or ill will, if there is a tendency to become absorbed in a thought, then one hindrance or another is involved. But if you try to stop *all* thoughts like you were describing, then you will overlook how that attempt is itself a thought that you are getting absorbed in. So the problem is not the presence of thoughts; it’s when those thoughts take hold of the mind and it becomes constricted.

The most productive work to do when the mind is clear like this, is to contemplate the danger of losing this (relatively) unburdened mind? As in, the danger of lust (or other hindrances) making me lose perspective, pressuring me painfully, and burdening me to do its bidding?

Yes. Thoughts laced with pressure will repeatedly try to bait you into letting them take center stage. You don’t try to stop them from trying; you just don’t accept the bait however many times it comes.

As in, the song will seemingly start playing automatically/effortlessly...and then it’s up to me whether to keep it going to get some pleasure from it. So

I can't really stop that initial engagement (mano offering up a memory) but I can reject further engagement with it? Even if it's offered a million times, it seems like I can't stop that initial spark, I can only refrain from letting the fire spread.

What happens there is that because the hindrances are still strong and perspective weak, you end up fully absorbed in certain thoughts without immediately realizing it. That's natural and inevitable in that scenario. So yes, your responsibility is to stop the intentional part as soon as you become self-aware.

The pressure from the animal to return to the memory or whatever will still be there, but that fades only as a result of persisting in this same task of un-welcoming what you caught yourself welcoming. You can't abruptly undo the mind's current slant, which is why you should always think twice before breaking your restraint and thereby worsening unwholesome slants in the first place.

What if the song/memory that mano is presenting you with is actually something that annoys you? Like the common example of an annoying pop song that is stuck in your head. In that scenario, it's not a pleasing sense object. Should you simply allow the displeasing mental object to remain without paying too much attention to it, until you learn to stop resisting the displeasure of it?

If it's a song, then it's almost certainly not annoying to the mind, so you should not allow it to continue whenever you catch it. *You* might want the song to stop during the brief moments that you're self-aware, but that's a separate matter.

If it's an actual aversion, like repeatedly picking on the faults of another person or similar, then yes, you should teach your mind to continue facing the displeasure of those faults without resisting it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-30 05:09:49 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

but I cannot see how I would ever possibly, if following the 8 precepts, not be constantly suppressing thoughts to the point of insanity.

Following the 8 precepts, at least to begin with, doesn't entail suppressing anything more than acts by body and speech. Once those have ceased for a while, it becomes possible to stop the unwholesome mental activities too. Initially those activities will still be there and feel almost "automatic" to the degree that the addiction took root. You just do your best to stop the mental singing whenever you notice it without expecting it to go away overnight.

I understand the thoughts to be concerned about are those "involving sensuality, aversion, and cruelty", but it seems to me I would always be questioning every thought and wondering if they might fall under one of those categories some how

Correct, there will be an unavoidable paranoia in the beginning. When you first go live in the jungle and are told to beware of snakes, it will feel like snakes are everywhere. But you can't just dismiss that as irrational anxiety and go around as if there were no snakes because *there are*, and you factually still don't know where they tend to be.

Double-clicking on delight

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Gcizzle 2025-06-15 15:11:27

An attempt to clarify patient endurance - I would appreciate if anyone can check my understanding.

We begin with acknowledging two levels of feeling/intention: one coming from the body/six senses, and one from the citta as a reaction to the former.

In both cases, these have arisen in my experience on their own - I am subject to them and do not create any arisings.

The citta level includes inclinations that might be defined here as mental delight or resistance towards sense objects, or a push/pull. In this case, I am indirectly responsible for their arising based on choices made in the past.

All "I" am able to do in the present, and where the work of endurance is entirely found, is direct attention to highlight (or "double-click") on certain arisen intentions over others.

Patient endurance is making sure that I never double-click on intentions, of either body, speech or mind, that are rooted in passion (that already-arisen peripheral delight) or aversion. This includes mental movements of resistance to that mental delight, or resistance to that resistance, and so on.

I fail if I take up, appropriate, go along with, succumb to, the mental delight/aversion. Otherwise, their existence is not a problem if I maintain context.

The point is not to remove currently arisen suffering, as this would imply double-clicking on intentions/views of subtle aversion. Instead, it is to reduce the frequency and intensity of future pressure from the citta. In other words, to tame it to be immovable when facing sense objects (aka samadhi).

This in itself does not directly lead to right view, but vastly increases the surface area for insight to land.

Is this correct? Missing anything important?

as an aside: something that still feels off is that this implies almost a chain of bait-taking. The citta is fooled by the pressure of the senses, and "I" am fooled by the pressure of the citta. Which means that understanding is at two levels: I need to fully understand the citta, and the citta needs to fully understand the harm in taking the bait of the senses - but is this overly personifying the citta? Is there just one understanding, at one level,

that takes place? Is it possible to not suffer in the face of pressure from the citta, or does freedom from suffering only come from a purified immovable citta?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-18 17:31:33

We begin with acknowledging two levels of feeling/intention: one coming from the body/six senses, and one from the citta as a reaction to the former.

Even if that's theoretically correct, it's not a practically useful way to see it from the starting point. To the degree that there is ignorance, body-pressure implies citta-pressure, and vice versa. If they weren't united, you wouldn't be suffering.

So the work of endurance is to not do, say, or think unbeneficial things out of that unified pressure that you feel. That endurance being sufficiently developed is in turn what "settles the dust" and allows the domains of body and citta to be delineated as they actually are and to free the latter from its wrong assumptions and attitudes regarding the six senses. No amount of pondering can on its own result in an accurate delineation of the two domains.

Is it possible to not suffer in the face of pressure from the citta, or does freedom from suffering only come from a purified immovable citta?

Pressure from the citta is already suffering. Understanding the citta does immeasurably reduce the intensity of one's suffering even if that citta is not pure (which is essentially what sotāpatti is), but fully purifying it from defilements is the only way to be completely free from dukkha (which is what Arahantship is).

Struggling with the precept of non-killing while doing yard work

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Global_Ad_7891 2025-06-14 23:32:42

I work in real estate and take care of several properties, which means a lot of yard maintenance. When it comes to weeding, I always try to hand-pull as much as possible. But realistically, there are just too many tiny weeds over large areas—it would take 10+ hours per property to do it manually. So, I sometimes use a weed spray that's marketed as safe for pets and wildlife (squirrels, birds, chipmunks, dogs, etc.).

But I've noticed that it definitely kills insects on contact. That's not my intention at all—I try to avoid spraying if I see bugs, but they often dart out from under the weeds right as I'm spraying and get hit. It leaves me feeling uneasy, especially in light of the first precept.

I'm wondering how others here relate to situations like this. Is the unintentional (or is it intentional in my case) killing of insects in cases like this still considered a breach of the precept? Or is it more about intention and heedfulness? I'd really appreciate any reflections or advice from others walking this path.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-16 05:24:44

But I've noticed that it definitely kills insects on contact. **That's not my intention at all**

For as long as that remains the case, it's not a full-blown breach of the first precept.

Nevertheless, the intent behind the action is still unwholesome to a lesser extent, because you are clearly aware of the insects dying despite that not being your intention, and yet you continue doing it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-17 19:38:47 (in reply to a comment not included)

In both cases, if we follow your line of thinking, we're aware that our actions—however ordinary—still result in harm to insects (and we continue doing it).

No, you're not “aware” of it to the same extent. You might *infer* that harm is being caused in such cases, but it's not a directly visible and undeniable fact (which is when continuing to do it cannot but be unwholesome).

You could of course decide to inspect every single patch of earth before setting your foot on it, but that would then be another choice born out of its own intention, which would almost always be unwholesome (obsessive compulsion). The goal for which you would be avoiding intentional killing—not acting out of craving so as to break free from it—would thus be obstructed as well.

Early Buddhist Teachings, other traditions and Sensuality.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Seekfinderin 2025-06-14 22:44:18

Hello. I am new here and just registered because of this place since I want to understand the early buddhist teachings better and there are several questions arising for me. English is not my first language, you may forgive me any suboptimal formulations or mistakes.

- (1) Firstly, I wonder in which sense really the buddhist teaching and way of life is different from e.g. the way of life of another sannyasin or brahmachari in other traditions. In order to show why that confuses me I will below describe how I live based off on other teachings.
- (2) Why exactly sensuality is necessarily suffering? In order to overcome sensuality, I feel that I must understand deeply why it is not good, if it is not. And I cannot understand it yet.

Regarding my first question, as to how I approached life so far: I am a “householder”. Which in my case means not being the owner of any house, but renting a small apartment, one room. In order to pay for this room and for some food, I have to do some job and it is basically the only reason I am doing that particular job (something in education). I have

and use some money but since I can think of it I would prefer not having anything to do with it. I do not drive a car either, but walk or use trains etc.

I am sleeping on the floor on a thin and hard mat since I was about 17. It may have started as a sort of appreciation of asceticism since that has been advised to do by christians as well as by vedantins. But in course of the years I also became very interested in training, exercise, physiology, movement in general and performance art. I know that sleeping like that, for example, is not simply “less comfortable”, in fact you can be very comfortable on the floor if the body is prepared and it has actual advantages for the health of your joints and so on, but I do not want to dive into that now.

Now, I do not think that I am training the particular artistic discipline to entertain anyone. I am training it because I consider this particular discipline and art that I train as something like my Sadhana. By training my body I am also training my mind. The physical training is very humbling, and it provides me with lots of opportunities to work on my own issues of impatience for instance. It is a very good teacher in not seeking immediate gratification and so on.

The precept regarding killing or not harming etc., that I am working on since 16, since I first came into contact with the idea of Ahimsa. I surely had a lot of times where I clearly broke this precept in course of the years. As a teenager I was very depressed and angry at the world and some people for the suffering they seemed to cause me. And due to that I was very critical and rebelled against the world (mostly intellectually). Then after that I was only really angry at myself, but that still broke out sometimes as anger towards others verbally. I am still perceiving some anger sometimes when being confronted with lots of violence, for example when I see a boy insulting a girl in a way that most people would describe as sadistic, I feel some ill-will against him, but here too it becomes easier to me to see behind it as his behaviour has its roots.

As for intoxicants. I have never been drunk, and swore as a child already that I will not smoke nor drink. So I don't do that and its not hard for me. As for “company”. I have company because I do that training with others, but I would not say that I really have friends. I never do any kind of “partying” and do not have any desire to do so. I do not meet with others just for the sake of enjoying company as I actually do not really enjoy such events where there is just spoken on political or economical or other such themes without substance.

But what has a meaning to me is when someone tells me about his deepest fears, sufferings or dreams, when a conversation seems to have true substance and moves something in myself or the other. When someone truly trusts me, seeks help or anything. But that happens very rarely.

As for possessions. Obviously I have a phone and a computer. I use them mostly to read stuff. Pure fiction/novels I don't read, but that is more in lack of interest than based on a conscious promise not to do so.

As for possessions. I may not have as little as a monk with his three robes. I have a bit more, about three pair of pants to cover my lower body (thicker cloth for the winter),

about five wide shirts to cover my upper body, about three thicker upper garments, like hoodies for the upper body when it's colder. Several pairs of socks, and a few underpants. All these clothes have one colour, no prints, non-bright, not skinny but wide, so not particularly showing off the body, are faded, often very torn and therefore regularly patched by me. A few blankets/rectangular clothes to sit on or use them as coats and that's it. Since I do not live of alms, I have to prepare food for myself, so I have some utensils for that too. Other than that I eat from a bowl too.

As for beautification of the body. I do not use any perfumes, I do not use any kind of adornments, have no tattoos, no piercings, no rings or whatever. So no beautification of the body, as far as I understand it. As for hair. I keep a beard. In Europe, for example the ancient cynics decided to let their beard grow for similar reasons for which buddhist monks shave. While a beard may have been like a sign of kings, a sign of culture and of majesty and pride, when we are looking at our current western civilisation we see that almost all the kings and wealthy of the world are shaved and that a beard is associated more with someone who does not care as much for his appearance. So to keep a beard can be done with very similar intentions.

I also would argue that letting a beard grow and just keeping it half-way decent, which can be done like once a week or all two weeks in less than a minute, is much less care invested in ones face than the time it takes to cleanly shave completely. Therefore I personally see this particular custom as more of a cultural rule and as not really essential, but maybe I am missing the point.

As for entertainment. I listen to music sometimes. And move to music in context of my training discipline. I wouldn't describe it as dancing in this context, as it has nothing to do with what the Buddha might have known as dancing from his time, of beautiful woman moving their bodies in alluring ways and so on or of people drinking and enjoying themselves and dancing to music on the street like on a party. No, it is training, like walking meditation just with different kinds of motions.

But all of this is not meant to justify any kind of "breaks". As I said, I am not a monk, but I am inspired by monks (in general, not only of the buddhist tradition) as long as I can think of it.

What I wanted to address with all of this, is that if the early buddhist teaching is primarily about keeping the precepts and that this is something very essential to the Dhamma, then I cannot really understand why other "spiritual" traditions or however we may want to describe them, seem here often to be criticised so much and seen in some kind of contrast (this is just what I perceived so far). I do not see this contrast? Many Hindu brahmacharis and Jainas, if practicing strictly, are doing all of that too. Ahimsa, Aparigraha, Asteya, sleeping on the floor, controlling their diet/eating, no intoxicants, celibacy, begging for food can also be found. The precepts in their content, as far as I understand it from my research, are not a unique buddhist contribution. So it seems to me that what actually and truly is in contrast to other teachings are not the rules of conduct, but rather some other metaphysical, more principal differences of the middle way. Now it cannot be about the middle path between some kind of extreme annihilationism on one hand and the opposite

extreme on the other hand, since both Jainism and Advaita Vedanta finds a path between of that too, when really grasping their teachings.

Now, as far as sensuality is concerned and awakening. The complete overcoming of the sensuality is not uniquely buddhist either. The Bhagavad Gita for instance puts lots of emphasis on it and what it teaches is, just as what the buddhist teaching seems to teach, not a Samadhi of Meditation that comes and goes, but it describes the man of eternal wisdom in very similar terms to how an arahant is described here. Here I often hear something like: As he has uprooted the roots of suffering, reached that particular point, he is now no longer bound or even able to suffer, but always content no matter what may happen whatsoever. The Gita describes this very goal just like that too and the commentators interpret it accordingly. It is not something that comes and goes, but that always stays if attained. It puts the utmost importance on getting rid of any desire whatsoever as the most important step on this path. I see no conflict to the buddhist teaching here, really. I would like to know why do you think that there is a difference between these two? Especially since Buddha, as far as I can say, never refused Advaita-Vedanta as that was not around as such at the time. He just refused specific teachings prevalent at his area at his time and as interpreted by him according to his understanding and his understanding of the doctrines of some of those other teachers may not necessarily have been always completely accurate either, isn't it?

But this, again, is not meant as a critique of buddhism or your particular teachings, in which I am very interested. I am here because I think that you are practicing the Buddhas teachings rather accurately and know what you're talking about and I want to learn and understand.

And so I come to my second question. What I personally struggle the most with is sexuality. I am not involved in sexual acts anymore, but thoughts keep appearing. I do not indulge in them anymore and I do not despise of them either. They are not causing aversion in me. But short moments of arousal and of very short moments of very deep desire for sure.

Now, both Buddha and the Gita advise that I have to overcome or uproot this desire. First by withdrawing the sense objects and so on. Now, my problem is, as I think I am honest to myself, that it is not really that I want this one particular sensual desire and the potential of some kind of sexuality to be away. I understood from your expositions that one would certainly stop longing for sensual objects if one would realise that even those desires or acts out of desire which are not even harmful to others or oneself in any visible way, are still full of pain. And the Buddha makes examples and uses metaphors and says things like: If sensual desire is like this or like that, then for sure you would like to overcome it and then it probably wouldn't be so hard either, due to the understanding. I am sure that if I would see clearly and understand fully that even such acts, that are apparently done just out of love for another with no obvious harm involved are still truly harmful, then I would have an actual motivation to get rid of them. But I do not see that. The Buddha says that this is the case and examples are made by metaphors, but I do not see any concrete explanation as for WHY this is the case, e.g. in the example of a deliberate and non-violent sexual act with another person.

Yes the urge is not going away for long, just for a short time, and then it is coming back. But so is hunger and thirst and the monk does not stop eating and drinking, he keeps eating and drinking to sustain the body and to get rid of the hunger every now and then. Where is the difference to getting rid of the ever-returning sexual urge every now and then?

Maybe one can explain to me why exactly this must be avoided necessarily?

Thank you and forgive me for the many words. I have great appreciation for your work. I apparently have been influenced more by other traditions but that does not mean that I have any hidden agenda and want to push my own ideas. On the contrary do I hope that the teachings and the experience of the monks here can deepen my understanding and may help me to overcome some misunderstandings.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-15 18:12:06

Firstly, I wonder in which sense really the buddhist teaching and way of life is different from e.g. the way of life of another sannyasin or brahmachari in other traditions. In order to show why that confuses me I will below describe how I live based off on other teachings.

In terms of external way of life, assuming celibacy as a common ground, followers of traditions would tend to allow themselves things that within (orthodox) Buddhism are considered unwholesome regardless of any supposed greater purpose behind them (e.g., any kind of music). At the same time, they may adopt prohibitions that, in the (orthodox) Buddhist view, are based on a mistaken understanding of moral purity (e.g., vegetarianism/veganism), as well as observances that would be considered wrong effort (e.g., fixed postures, prolonged fasting, sense denial instead of sense restraint, etc.).

What I wanted to address with all of this, is that if the early buddhist teaching is primarily about keeping the precepts and that this is something very essential to the Dhamma, then I cannot really understand why other “spiritual” traditions or however we may want to describe them, seem here often to be criticised so much and seen in some kind of contrast (this is just what I perceived so far). I do not see this contrast? **Many Hindu brahmacharis and Jainas, if practicing strictly, are doing all of that too.** Ahimsa, Aparigraha, Asteya, sleeping on the floor, controlling their diet/eating, no intoxicants, celibacy, begging for food can also be found.

Correct, and that is why our criticisms here are very rarely aimed at other spiritual traditions outside Buddhism. When it comes to restraint in conduct, which is the most foundational and least negotiable part of (orthodox) Buddhism, such practitioners can in important ways be closer to the Buddha’s teaching than a majority of self-proclaimed Buddhists today, who have twisted the Buddha’s teaching to mean exactly the opposite of what he actually taught. For example, taking the teaching of *anattā* to mean that one’s behavior and lifestyle choices are not ultimately important and that sensuality isn’t an inherent obstruction to insight (ignoring how you have far more Suttas talking about virtue and

sense restraint than about *anattā*, and discourses on such higher teachings were usually only given to celibate renunciates).

Those who we mainly criticize are self-proclaimed Buddhists who, despite claiming to be following the Noble Eightfold Path, do not see celibacy and withdrawal from sensuality as necessary, let alone strive towards it (i.e., regularly act with wrong intention and do not see any problem with it). That also extends to those who proclaim that harmful view even if they are themselves celibate by circumstance, which includes the majority of Buddhist monastics that are known in the West today. The second point we often challenge is the notion that the mental exercises promoted today as Buddhist meditation/satipaṭṭhāna have any connection with the Buddha's teaching (incidentally, those exercises seem to have seeped into contemporary Buddhism from yogic traditions).

The Buddha says that this is the case and examples are made by metaphors, but I do not see any concrete explanation as for WHY this is the case, e.g. in the example of a deliberate and non-violent sexual act with another person.

Yes. And here is no such concrete explanation that will in itself seal one's determination to give up sensuality, because purification of virtue is what comes first, not purification of understanding. Seeing it the other way around is another widespread misconception embedded in much of modern Buddhist thought—even among those who identify as “early Buddhists.”

In order to concretely understand all those metaphors the Buddha gave and actually *feel* the peril in sensuality, you first need to, out of a degree of faith and a degree of accurate reasoning, fully withdraw from it in your actions by body, speech, and mind (i.e., not welcome even thoughts rooted in sensual desire, no matter how “automatic” they seem to be). Similar to how an addict would only be in the position to accurately recognize the full extent of the pain that his addiction inflicts on him when he's stopped taking the drug.

Where is the difference to getting rid of the ever-returning sexual urge every now and then?

The difference is that giving in to the sexual urge cannot but be based on and further maintain an intense degree of craving and thus suffering (and there is no logical reason behind this; it's just the way the human experience happens to function). It will course of not feel intense to the person who regularly engages in sexual activity. Only one whose mind now on its own delights in and prefers celibacy and non-sensuality is in the position to see for themselves the extent of the torment of sexual desire, just as described in this simile. Exactly like how 30°C feels unpleasant when you've gotten used to much lower temperatures, even though in the past, you may have tolerated it well.

Because of the craving that is always involved—craving automatically implies ownership—it is impossible to have sexual intercourse without taking ownership of one's body, which is not the case with eating and drinking. Thus, it necessarily and very directly maintains the core problem that the Buddha's teaching is meant to uproot (ownership of the aggregates).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-17 19:04:52 (in reply to a comment not included)

Can we say, in simplified terms as I said, that the doctrine implies, that you will not be free from suffering, if you will not overcome sensuality fully

You will not be free from suffering to the degree that you're not free from craving, and sensual craving is the coarsest and most tangible of all the three. And without being free from that one, there is no possibility to be free from the other two (craving for being and for non-being).

which is also not, according to the Buddha, a mere internal practice of freedom of desire whereas you can still have sex, e.g. in the sense of some tantric practices, but it includes actual external abstinence from any sexual behaviour too as well as a complete absence of any even slightest wish to become intimate with another person. Is that correct? And the same we can say about all the other aspects of sensuality.

Correct. When it comes to sexuality, external engagement means internal desire. No exceptions.

If so, is then buddhism an anti-natalistic doctrine?

Certainly. The Buddha saw it as blameworthy to generate one's own existence, let alone to generate another's. Mind you, that's not the attitude that modern Buddhists would generally hold, but that is what the outlook that the Suttas unambiguously portray.

This doesn't mean that one should leave already-born children to die, of course. It just means that producing a child in the first place is a mistake from the Buddhist point of view.

If everyone would follow this path, humanity would be extinct in a very short amount of time.

There is no chance whatsoever that a sizeable portion of humanity, let alone the whole of it, would follow this path, and the Buddha had no hopes of that ever happening. In fact, he was convinced at first that *no one* would be able to follow in his footsteps. He then realized that a handful of beings had little dust in their eyes and then decided to teach what he discovered for their sake.

"Enough now with trying to teach What I found with so much hardship; This Dhamma is not easily understood By those oppressed by lust and hate.

"Those fired by lust, obscured by darkness, Will never see this abstruse Dhamma, Deep, hard to see, subtle, Going against the stream."

— SN 6.1.

As far as music is concerned, this is hard to grasp for me too. I wonder what the reasoning is. Sure hearing/listening to music is sensuality, but is it necessarily adding any craving?

Well, the answer is quite easy to find out. To whatever extent you still listen to music, stop doing it, and see if your mind rebels against that decision. If it does, that shows how it's rooted in craving.

Why is it much worse when I am instead listening to someone playing a drum in some contemplative way, that helps me to relax, for example?

Because the sounds of music are *made* to captivate the ear. Otherwise, the drumbeats would not have to follow any particular rhythm, and notes would not have to form a melody, just as the arrangement of the chirping of the birds is irrelevant to one's appreciation of it.

The enjoyment of music necessarily leads to intoxication and loss of perspective (regarding what is actually painful as pleasant and what is not yours—your own sense organs—as yours), while the sound of birds and similar doesn't necessarily do so.

but isn't it a logical reason that it is a form of bonding between people and giving birth to humans and mutual trust and so on, from which after all we all were born?

What I meant is that there is no rational explanation as to *why* sexual intercourse can never occur without a very intense degree of craving and—unrecognized by the participants, whose perception is completely distorted—suffering.

As for bonding between people, the purpose of the Buddha's teaching is precisely the wearing away of *all* bonds, let alone the very coarse physical ones.

You say not “welcome” any sensual thoughts, but what does it mean?

It means you don't intentionally engage and wallow in the sensual mental images for as long as they stay, even if it's for days.

But sometimes I cannot think of anything why a specific act of intimacy is wrong.

Intimacy and bonds are “wrong” (i.e., against your own welfare) because whatever and whoever you might bond with will be taken away completely without your consent sooner or later, and that's going to hurt precisely to the degree that there was a bond.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-22 04:38:20 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If someone is externally engaged because someone else is forcing himself on him and he does not actually want that but may not be able to stop the other, you would not say that there is internal desire involved, or would you?

There is internal desire to whatever degree there is consent. Consent isn't a binary even when there is force involved.

But what if in another case the person does not really gain any pleasure from it, what if he has no wish to be touched or to reach climax etc., but only does it for the other person which he enjoys seeing experiencing the pleasure in a sort of a selfless way of engaging in sexual behaviour?

This is just (convenient) poetry that doesn't reflect how the mind actually works. You cannot truly be selfless if you're emotionally invested in something or someone, because investment necessarily comes with bias and thus potential conflict. So it's not selflessness; at best it's just a tiny expansion to the range of things that gratify your sense of self.

Also, the person involved would always have certain minimum requirements regarding their physical characteristics, which proves that it's not a purely emotional interaction and actually does involve plain carnal desire. The act itself and the "enjoyment of witnessing the other's pleasure" would swiftly come to a halt if their body suddenly shapeshifted into something one finds very repelling—even if their mind remained intact and they were still the same individual internally.

"If you wish me not to be reborn, that is good. If you wish me to be reborn, this is equally good. If I fulfilled my purpose on this earth, I can go, but if I should be reborn a thousand more times to serve you on this earth in form of the poor or the sick or whoever, I accept it as well."

I wonder what Buddha would say to that and why.

That view involves the same mistake found in Mahāyāna of believing that rebirth can be a matter of choice. It can't. You can only exist if you crave, and you can only crave if you're ignorant. So you cannot possibly welcome another existence unless you are ignorant (especially of all existence's fundamentally unsatisfactory nature), just as you couldn't welcome being showered with one more bucket of feces unless your perception were severely distorted. Hence the Buddha said he did not praise existence even for a fingersnap, let alone a whole new lifespan.

Maybe it is on behalf of desire again, a sort of intellectual desire for meaning, or an emotional desire for purpose, that I am kinda attached to such ideas. But it seems reasonable to me. A teaching that has no purpose for any kinds of ACTING in the world seems to me to deny any kind of purpose.

Well, the Buddha's teaching does posit a very explicit purpose—to free oneself from all liability to suffering by purifying one's own conduct and mind from craving. So it's not saying that one should drop all action immediately; there are right actions that need to be cultivated and wrong actions that need to be abandoned until that purpose is achieved.

The reason why one would take on any other purpose than that is also that one wants to avoid suffering, so any purpose anyone might have is squarely within the purpose of the Buddha's teaching. But his is the only path that rightly achieves that purpose, by digging up the very root of all suffering.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-22 04:50:39 (in reply to a comment not included)

But if you do not need a person, if you are fully fine on your own and your own alone, if you can let any person go whenever they wish or “God wishes”, and this not inspite of your love for them but exactly because of your love for them, because true love wants their well-being and not yours, then I see no problem in company or a relationship.

It’s a contradiction in terms to not need a person and yet strive for their company or be in a relationship with them. At the very least, you want to see *that person* benefitting from whatever it is that you give them, and that is in itself an emotional involvement and a selfish desire.

When there are billions of beings in the world, many of them who probably could use your support a lot more than this one person, why would you devote your time to that one specifically and thereby neglect all others? And the only possible answer is that you’re biased towards them, i.e., *are* attached despite whatever poetic notions you might use to cover that up.

And that is why, if you cultivate an actual mind of mettā as the Buddha taught—which is not even part of his unique teaching yet—you become incapable of relationships. In order to maintain an equally friendly disposition towards everyone, you need to be friends with no one and have no investments in anything.

But may it not for the majority of people within the world be a more realistic goal than to leave everyone behind?

Certainly, which is why the Buddha’s teaching is far from intended for the majority, as I already made clear.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-24 02:07:44 (in reply to a comment not included)

Could you say that the correct practice of metta would result in an attitude towards others that more closely resembles the monastic rather than the layperson? In the sense that monastics can be friendly, still give advice, and help others with physical tasks when practical (including family and people that may externally be considered “friends”). For example, if someone in your family or former friends from your lay life were to visit you at the monastery, you could help them with advice or even help them physically if their car is stuck in the mud.

But you would not help them at the expense of others, nor would you go out of your way to travel somewhere else to help them with some mundane task. Because you would have to ask yourself, why am I going out of my way to help this particular family member or friend to this extent, instead of starving chil-

dren who definitely need the help more? Not saying that you should go travel to those children either, but the question would reveal that you are doing so out of a bias for one particular person over another (due to emotional ties, past memories together, etc.).

Also, if metta is practiced correctly, it wouldn't matter to you who it was that showed up at the monastery needing advice or help. Whether it was a complete stranger or someone you've known your whole life, your attitude would be the same in both cases.

Yes, that is exactly how it works. You wouldn't even need to think of the starving children, as being moved by that thought would imply a new bias. You would just need to unconstrict the mind from the particular person with whom a bond has arisen, and you're left with a mind that is boundless in every direction.

When you say incapable of relationships, do you mean that internally there is no bias or preference for their presence/lack, and that your mind would remain completely unmoved if you never see them/talk to them ever again? But externally it might still appear as a relationship, as in, your talk with them, are friendly to them, help them with mundane tasks if they are in your immediate vicinity. For example if laypeople regularly went to your monastery, externally it might appear that you have an ongoing friendship with them, even lasting years. But internally, there is no desire for their presence and your mind would remain unmoved if something were to happen to them?

In other words, true metta is completely incompatible with desire AND ill will, because desire breeds preference for one person over the other, which will lead to ill will when things don't go according to that preference, etc.

Precisely.

A really nice agama sutta.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** obobinde 2025-06-06 07:45:00

Somebody pointed me toward this beautiful sutta which is partly based on pali suttas. I thought some of you might enjoy it.

https://canon.dharmapearls.net/01_agama/madhyama/MA_080.html

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-06 16:33:51

I came across that one recently and was planning to share it at some point, especially because of this part where it very explicitly makes the same point we so often emphasize (that the precepts are not optional).

57. "Good men, suppose there's a monk who violates the precepts, breaks the precepts, is lacking in precepts, pierces the precepts, defiles the precepts,

and blackens the precepts. Wanting to base himself on the precepts and establish them, he considers the precepts to be stair steps, but there will never be a way for him to ascend to the unsurpassed wisdom hall of the right Dharma temple.

58. “Good men, it’s like going to a village not far away that has a lofty multi-story temple, and stairs are placed there that have ten or twelve steps. Suppose someone comes wanting to go up to that temple. If he doesn’t climb the stairs by going up the first step, then there’s no way for him to climb to the second step. If he doesn’t climb up to the second step, then there’s no way for him to climb to the third and fourth steps or on up to the temple.
59. “Good men, so it is if there’s a monk who violates the precepts, breaks the precepts, is lacking in the precepts, pierces the precepts, defiles the precepts, and blackens the precepts. Wanting to base himself on the precepts and establish them, he considers the precepts to be stair steps, but there will never be a way for him to ascend to the unsurpassed wisdom hall of the right Dharma temple.
60. “Good men, suppose there’s a monk who doesn’t violate the precepts, doesn’t break the precepts, isn’t lacking in precepts, doesn’t pierce the precepts, doesn’t defile the precepts, and doesn’t blacken the precepts. Wanting to base himself on the precepts and establish them, he considers the precepts to be stair steps. He’ll surely have a way to ascend to the unsurpassed wisdom hall of the right Dharma temple.
61. “Good men, it’s like going to a village not far away that has a lofty multi-story temple, and stairs are placed there that have ten or twelve steps. Suppose someone comes wanting to go up to that temple. If he climbs the stairs by going up to the first step, then he surely has a way to climb to the second step. If he climbs up to the second step, then there’s surely a way for him to climb to the third and fourth steps or on up to the temple.
62. “Good men, so it is if there’s a monk who doesn’t violate the precepts, doesn’t break the precepts, isn’t lacking in precepts, doesn’t pierce the precepts, doesn’t defile the precepts, and doesn’t blacken the precepts. Wanting to base himself on the precepts and establish them, he considers the precepts to be stair steps. He’ll surely have a way to ascend to the unsurpassed wisdom hall of the right Dharma temple.

If monks—whose very vocation is to realize the Dhamma and who can devote themselves wholly to that goal—cannot succeed with faulty conduct, what then can be said of laypeople practicing in the midst of other concerns? If going forth made liberation less instead of more accessible, the Buddha would not have established the Saṅgha to begin with (an institution that indirectly caused great sorrow to countless families).

Why kamacchanda feels like the worst hindrance to deal with?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** StriderLF 2025-06-05 16:15:03

I've been trying to practice for almost one year now, but something I noticed is that kamacchanda seems to be the strongest hindrance to restrain.

I heard from other Theravada Ajahns that certain people have a dominant defilement. Certain are more inclined towards hatred, some towards greed and other towards delusion. However, I have never found anything about that in the Suttas themselves.

Seeing this tendency towards greed and sensorial pleasures in myself, I wonder what's the reason behind it. Perhaps my Christian upbringing made the dangers of ill will and sloth more clear than those of sensuality? Or maybe I just became skilled in managing the results of engaging in sensuality rather than making any real progress in restraining the hindrances properly?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-06 16:10:08

Perhaps my Christian upbringing made the dangers of ill will and sloth more clear than those of sensuality? Or maybe I just became skilled in managing the results of engaging in sensuality rather than making any real progress in restraining the hindrances properly?

It's something much deeper than that. It's the reason why most Buddhist (and spiritual in general) practices these days focus mainly on addressing things that are on the side of anger and aversion, and greed often only to the extent that it leans on the side of cruelty and harming others. Those who regard sensual desire as inherently harmful *even if it doesn't harm anyone* and strive to uproot it with the same urgency as hatred seem to be a fringe minority (without even considering whether their approach is ultimately effective or not).

Almost everybody can viscerally perceive the harm of getting angry, and they would love to be able to handle every unpleasant situation calmly if they could. But the harm and suffering of desire and wanting are much harder to see because there is a degree of gratification that comes from sense pleasures. And that's all that most people see.

A person who still allows themselves to seek sensual pleasures is someone who *trains themselves* in ignoring the large suffering and seeing only the minimal and in fact worthless gratification, so for as long as they continue living that way, the danger in sensuality will seem intangible. The only way to un-train that habit of overlooking the (very real) pain of sensuality is to start saying no to it.

Levels of Yoniso Manasikara

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Little_Carrot6967 2025-05-31 16:04:59

I was kind of struggling to keep things ordered, so I thought I'd try to make a kind of map of what I see in terms of the levels. Anyway I thought it might be helpful to talk about it.

- 1) Conscious thought- Purification impossible, already arisen. Only containment or providing context is possible.
- 2) Awareness of mind at the handoff stage of thought to "self". Purification still possible but only if the mind (not "self") decides to on its own.
- 3) Awareness of mind acting out of suffering (Generation of thought before it's handed off to mind from subconscious domain (Processing.)(Squirming/agitation/movement) (Purification at this level is still possible.)
- 4) Awareness of intention towards experience (Purification possible by withdrawing intention toward experience.)
- 5) Awareness of the presence of craving/aversion (Purification possible) (Awareness of intent and awareness of craving/aversion is generally simultaneous.)
- 6) Awareness of subconscious suffering (Forms when pressure is ignored. Does not form when pressure is not ignored.) (Attending to this level means never acting out of it even in thought. However, you do experience the suffering unless constantly established at this level.)
- 7) Awareness of Pressure. (Attending to this level means the basis for suffering cannot form.)
- 8) ???

Note 1) At less developed levels of Yoniso, what appears to be pressure is actually the mind acting out of suffering at the early stage before unwholesome thought. If you follow that down, underneath it is suffering and underneath that is the actual pressures which caused the subconscious suffering.)

Note 2) Some people may see "Awareness of subconscious suffering" as discomfort, or process it this way, but honestly to me this seems to be what suffering actually is. All these other processes appear to just come from and/or feed back to this. The true dhukka. Accessing any specific suffering on this level though seems to require a line from higher processes.

Note 3) Even though the level of awareness of suffering is above the awareness of pressure, by attending to it all pressure disappears for some reason, even though it's not seen or attended to. Not sure why that is.

So, the furthest my Yoniso manasikara extends down is the awareness of subconscious suffering level. (Well, so far.) I'm aware there's stuff below that but I can't see it at all. It's

mainly inference. I'm pretty much always ignoring it unless I feel something happening at a higher level.

That's how I experience it so far but it doesn't seem very precise. Sometimes I feel like I can see the exact part of the mind where something is happening but that's kind of rare.

Anyway, what do you guys think? I'm probably missing or bypassing layers of it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-02 12:45:25

There are no such "levels" to *yoniso manasikāra*. At any given time, it's either *yoniso* or *ayoniso*.

Conceiving of such levels implies *ayoniso* in and of itself (imagining that you can analyze the way you're regarding your own experience as if you were an observer separate to your own observing).

What does happen is that your understanding of what *yoniso manasikāra* is becomes increasingly accurate and more impenetrable to any pressures that may be trying to get you off track, and that means you can establish it more firmly and reliably.

MN 13: Facing threatening environments on account of earning a living - a peril of sensuality

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** zdrsindvom 2025-05-31 05:21:59

I've been wondering about the following lines from MN 13 about one of the perils of sensuality:

And what is the peril of sensuality? It is when a son of a good family earns a living by means such as arithmetic, accounting, calculating, farming, trade, raising cattle, archery, government service, or some other profession. But he must face cold and heat, being hurt by the touch of flies, mosquitoes, wind, sun, and reptiles, and risking death from hunger and thirst. This, too, is a peril of sensuality that is presently evident, a mass of suffering with sensuality as its reason, source, and basis, purely caused by sensuality.

What exactly does it mean that this situation is 'purely caused by sensuality'? An *anāgāmi* is free from sensual desire but is not incapable of working to earn money. So, 'purely caused by sensuality' here cannot mean that, if not for sensuality, one would simply not be motivated to earn a living (and end up encountering uncomfortable and threatening environmental conditions in the process). Is it then rather the case that sensuality existing is the condition for the activity of working in exchange for money existing at all? But that once working in exchange for money already exists in the world, one can engage in it for non-sensual reasons?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-06-02 12:55:08

The purpose of the Sutta is to convey the danger in sensuality. So the message is that *because* somebody needs pleasure, they are also compelled to expose themselves to such displeasure. Someone who's given up sensuality could still end up facing cold, heat, insects, etc., but that's besides the point.

If someone weren't seeking pleasures, they would have no obligation to endure such things, and they could stop working their unpleasant job whenever they wanted. Either way, they would not suffer due to getting what they don't want simply because they don't crave what they don't have.

Pīti and Sukha in Modern Meditation Methods

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Formal_Breath_2026 2025-05-29 12:49:38

I'm not sure if this has already been discussed before, but I've recently been thinking about why modern meditation instructors tend to describe pīti as bodily pleasure and sukha as mental pleasure. E.g. > Pīti is a quality of distinctly joyous and rapturous interest in your meditation object. It can manifest in several forms: (1) as a feeling of shivers or goose bumps on the skin, (2) as a feeling like lightning streaking through the body, (3) as a surging wavelike sensation, (4) as an uplifting, buoyant experience reminiscent of floating, or (5) as an all-pervading rapture that suffuses consciousness. > Sukha is a feeling of deep contentment, joy, peace, or ease that occurs as a consequence of the simple observation of the meditation object. — Shaila Catherine, *Wisdom Wide and Deep*, p. 38

I do not have tonnes of other examples to hand but I'm fairly confident that this is quite a common description. 'Pīti' is often translated as rapture to support this description, despite the fact that a more straightforward translation of the word seems to be 'joy', but maybe there's another reason for this that I'm not aware of. This interpretation seems to contradict the Jhāna formulas in the Suttas quite plainly. For example, in the formula for the 3rd Jhāna it is said: 'with the fading away of *pīti* (joy) ... I experienced pleasure (*sukha*) with the body,' clearly listing *sukha* as a bodily attribute contrary to *pīti*. The reason why I find this interesting is because I have prior experience with the modern forms of ānāpānasati so I know the feelings of 'rapture' that are being described, and it seems to me that with this practice the bodily feelings of rapture come first, with the mind being gladdened on account of them after the fact, or that the mental pleasure experienced via the meditation is quite separate to the bodily pleasure. This contrasts with the Jhānas in the Suttas, where it is typically described that one's mind is gladdened on account of renunciation and freedom from sensuality beforehand, and the body is experienced pleasantly as a result of that. To me this seems to be a potential example of a completely distinct modern meditation method being pasted over the language of the Suttas in a way that doesn't quite fit.

It's possible that I could be splitting hairs with the interpretations of pīti and sukha, but the difference between these two kinds of experiences seems quite significant, since in

the modern form bodily pleasure appears to come as some kind of physiological (or psychological) reaction, and the mind becomes elated on account of that, whereas in the Suttas the mind is already joyful on account of being dispassionate towards the body, and since the body is within the whole domain of this joyful mind (citta), anything that is experienced by the body becomes pleasant. It seems quite obvious that the former is chaotic, stressful, and particularly subject to craving, whereas the latter more resembles what one would expect true freedom from the domain of the body to look like.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-31 05:54:03

This contrasts with the Jhānas in the Suttas, where it is typically described that one's mind is gladdened on account of renunciation and freedom from sensuality beforehand, and the body is experienced pleasantly as a result of that. To me this seems to be a potential example of a completely distinct modern meditation method being pasted over the language of the Suttas in a way that doesn't quite fit.

Yes, that's exactly right. It's all upside down in the contemporary view. Bodily pleasure in the form of sensations are fabricated by whichever means, and then that pleasure simply overtakes the mind, making it "peaceful" to the extent that it is no longer interested in anything else because "this is just so good."

The process the Suttas describe is the exact opposite: the mind itself is calmed by turning it away from sensuality and the unwholesome in general, which is done by contemplating the peril once it has all been renounced well beforehand externally.

The body calms down and becomes lighter and more pleasant *as a byproduct* of the degree of mental renunciation, since it is the delight in the pleasures of the senses that the mind still carries which makes the body heavy and agitated.

in the modern form bodily pleasure appears to come as some kind of physiological (or psychological) reaction, and the mind becomes elated on account of that

Yes, it's sensuality 101. Mental elation due to pleasant physical sensations, the fifth cord of sensual pleasure.

It seems quite obvious that the former is chaotic, stressful, and particularly subject to craving, whereas the latter more resembles what one would expect true freedom from the domain of the body to look like.

In the former, you are still very much hungering after something. That something simply happens to be less far outside than before. But there is already no hunger in the actual first jhana, which is why it's actually peaceful, and why someone who develops that will not return to sensual pleasures (whereas the majority of those who practice the modern "jhānas" are not even celibate).

I am not sure if Ajahn Nyanamoli is correct when he says that mind gets used to pleasure or pain.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** BoringAroMonkish 2025-05-29 05:43:17

He said that desires are bad because our minds get used to it which is true but I think it has limits and you cannot just get rid of all desires and comforts to get rid of all pains.

If that is true then cancer patients should not feel bothered by their pains if they suffer long enough. Someone in prison should have improved mental health if they stay there longer. They surely don't get used to it enough to an extent that it doesn't bother them.

Are we sure that getting into discomfort gets used to it and all suffering vanish? Someone I saw a comment rejected the idea that in Christian hellfire one will be used to the pain. Because "getting used to" has certain limits. What do you think?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-29 11:48:23

If that is true then cancer patients should not feel bothered by their pains if they suffer long enough.

Virtually no cancer patient has actually given up desire. Same for prisoners. Such people would go back to their ordinary indulgent lifestyle the very next second if they were able to.

Because their intoxication with life, health, and sense pleasures remains the same internally regardless of what's happening to them on the outside, those painful situations make them suffer.

Confused of this book of Ajahn Nyanamoli. I am not well versed about his teachings.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** BoringAroMonkish 2025-05-28 07:35:38

So Ajahn Nyanamoli teaches that conventional meditation is not important and avoiding sensuality and enduring boredom is real meditation?

So I have to follow the 5 precepts, restrain from sensuality and avoid distractions and just sit doing nothing in free time?

If I don't get bored and overcome boredom I will become Anagami?

Is that enough or am I missing something?

And when enduring boredom is scratching an itch or moving body a little bit allowed or not? Do I have to sit like a stone?

I was reading “Only Way to Jhana” after someone recommended to me. Again I haven’t read it fully. And know nothing about HH.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-29 02:10:26

So Ajahn Nyanamoli teaches that conventional meditation is not important

Yes. The way it’s usually practiced—with the view that it’s part of the Buddhist path and not merely a psychotherapeutic technique with potential mundane benefits (and drawbacks too)—it’s not just unimportant but actively harmful.

avoiding sensuality and enduring boredom is real meditation?

In a way, yes. But you don’t simply go and do that like any other mechanical technique. It starts with overhauling your entire lifestyle by first of all committing to the precepts unconditionally. Then the right kind of boredom is revealed, which doesn’t have anything inherently to do with sitting motionless for X amount of time, but with *never* giving in to sensual desire, ill will, or unwholesome distractions (movies, music, videogames, etc.).

So I have to follow the 5 precepts, restrain from sensuality and avoid distractions and just sit doing nothing in free time?

You have to keep 7 precepts ideally. 5 with celibacy is the bare minimum basis for any significant development.

Do I have to sit like a stone?

Absolutely not. Aiming at that could only ever be rooted in a wrong view since neutral bodily movements are not where the problem comes from.

pornography

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** No-Spirit5082 2025-05-18 11:52:09

for years i keep trying and trying to practice celibacy yet i keep failing and going back to pornography and masturbation. usually i make it to few days or sometimes few weeks before going back. the craving that arises in me is insane, i begin to want it so badly and my mind gets drowned in that, or it starts lying to me and tricking me to just peek or whatever, its like i become intoxicated and i have no control over my mind and behaviour. then afterwards i feel horrible and either baselessly promise to myself somehow the next time will be different and i wont do it again or spiral into self hate and despair. im sick of it, i do not know what to do. i also used to be celibate from ages 13-15 but then i messed up and haven’t been celibate since (im 19 now) and its so annoying because i remember how much better i used to feel back then and it wasn’t nearly as hard as it is now, it makes me so frustrated what do i do

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-20 05:33:05

what do i do

First of all, give up porn altogether, no exceptions. It falls within the spirit of “misconduct with regard to sensuality.” If needed, install an app on your phone or computer that will block any websites with sexual content permanently.

Once you’re used to that, work on giving up porn-free masturbation.

“True” Sotapatti vs. “False” Sotapatti: How to Distinguish Between Them?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** tejveeer 2025-05-16 20:59:17

I’m still a puthujjana; this is not a question regarding me. But, this week, my views have changed quite significantly as a result of seeing with complete clarity, for the first time, the distinction between pressure in direct conjunction with the *option* to engage with that pressure. I remained vigilant to not enter the range of that pressure by *not* picking up that option (to approve, deny, distract myself from the pressure) and as a result, remained thoroughly untouched regardless of how pressuring the (particular) pressure was. I also saw many peripherally enduring pressures “convincing” me to engage with that option (or the arisen pressure), but they were instantly realized as such and thus “contained” within that “original” pressure that I had the option to engage with. As a result, even the peripheral pressures were not pressuring me.

This happened specifically in regards to sexuality as a result of taking up the determination to not approve of “inclinations” towards sexual sights (I put inclinations in quotes because, as a result of the above mentioned insight, my whole previous framework of the dhamma has collapsed including the usage of “inclinations” which I regard to now be completely inaccurate).

As a result of my framework collapsing - and now, being in the process of reconstructing it (and contemplating on what a rigorous construction of a framework even *entails*; I will specify the details in my reflection on Sunday in Discord) - I’m seeing that those who I previously regarded as ariyas may in fact not be ariyas. But, it appears they’re very confident they’re ariyas.

I went through their writings (or videos), and realized that all of them, on one level or another, regard *craving* as synonymous with *pressure* (details may vary about what *kind* of pressure they regard as craving). I’m very confident that this is precisely *not* the case as a result of my seeing. My idea of craving prior to this Tuesday still involved implicitly regarding pressure as the issue even though I’d explicitly determined a few months ago that it was not simply on account of reasoning (unlike now, through the direct seeing that occurred this week).

Now, I see craving as being in relationship with pressure in one way or another. Which

means, I cannot just “measure” the craving and “feel” its increase or decrease (the property of measurability pertains to my idea of pressure). My current understanding is that it’s a binary: it’s either there, or not there; one’s either in a relationship with pressure (of sights, sounds, smells, tastes, touches and thoughts) or not. I now also see the absolute necessity of thorough and complete withdrawal from picking up of any sensual intentions (indefinitely; not just for a few days, a few months, a few years, a few lifetimes) as a necessary condition for sotapatti. This is because picking those intentions up is *precisely* the craving (for me, right now), and if a sotapanna is one who sees craving as a dart, then entertaining that sensual intention (which is a mere subset of craving - but the largest part of it - as I understand it) has to also be seen as equally a dart.

A lot of those who I listened to and regarded as ariyas somehow allowed leeway for sensuality in their idea of the path leading to sotapatti, which in my view is a complete impossibility now. But they are very confident in being ariyas since that is implied in their tone.

Of course, I could be wrong in the above insight (though it would be hard to convince me otherwise right now). I don’t have that big of an issue in changing my views. My current views are not exactly the subject of this post, I was just mentioning them to provide context regarding how I arrived at the main questions for this post:

How does one ensure that one *is* indeed an ariya, and not a “fake” one? What are the chief characteristics of a “true” sotapanna as opposed to a “fake” sotapanna? What qualities can I develop - as a puthujana - such that I can ensure that I do not deceive myself in regards to my actual status?

Edit: changed a few sentences to be more precise.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 19:21:37

all of them, on one level or another, regard *craving* as synonymous with *pressure* (details may vary about what *kind* of pressure they regard as craving).

That is indeed the quintessential mistake that everyone is bound to make. All Buddhists “agree” with the four noble truths on paper, but the reason the vast majority are not sotāpannas is that what they *personally, in their own reflection* regard as the problem is ultimately the pressure/feeling (and fixing that is not a matter of just “agreeing” that the feeling is not the problem, because it’s much more deeply rooted than that).

If you’re practicing to overcome wrong view yourself, the conflation of feeling with craving will over time become clearer whenever someone who hasn’t understood those truths gives practical instructions—provided you try to read between the lines and are not swayed by buzzwords and the right phrasing like a lot of people are. The *implied purpose* of whatever they would prescribe, even if it came straight from the Suttas, would be to somehow wriggle out of the arisen feeling (e.g., “enduring it” or “reflecting on impermanence,” with the implied aim that what they think is the issue goes away).

Now, I see craving as being in relationship with pressure in one way or another.

Which means, I cannot just “measure” the craving and “feel” its increase or decrease (the property of measurability pertains to my idea of pressure). My current understanding is that it’s a binary: it’s either there, or not there; one’s either in a relationship with pressure (of sights, sounds, smells, tastes, touches and thoughts) or not.

Exactly.

A lot of those who I listened to and regarded as ariyas somehow allowed leeway for sensuality in their idea of the path leading to sotapatti, which in my view is a complete impossibility now.

It is indeed impossible. As MN 2 says, someone who still gives attention to sensual things and continues feeding that defilement will give rise to wrong view one way the other. Wrong view is not due to lack of information or of “powers of reflection,” but mainly due to the lingering assumption that the cause of your suffering is the circumstances, including internal ones. And, regardless of all that they may intellectually know and make a lot of sense of, that assumption is taken at face value and thus maintained each time a puthujjana acts in a sensual manner.

How does one ensure that one *is* indeed an ariya, and not a “fake” one?

Nothing except faith in the right external standard will totally prevent that mistake, as no universal criterion exists that couldn’t be bypassed.

Initially you won’t even know for certain which of the many available external standards is correct, nor who among those who claim to have adhered to it and fulfilled it actually did so. But, putting aside everything that blatantly contradicts the Suttas, you can take the safe route of choosing the highest and uncompromising standard, a choice that aligns with the immense gravity, difficulty, and significance that the Buddha ascribed to stream entry. Those similes aren’t just for dramatic effect. At the same time, there is nothing categorically stopping anyone from getting there except their own lack of diligence (or misapplied diligence that they don’t question).

What qualities can I develop - as a puthujjana - such that I can ensure that I do not deceive myself in regards to my actual status?

One thing is making a habit of inspecting whether there is anything at all that you are afraid of giving up or any loss that you foresee yourself not being able to handle if it were to happen unexpectedly. If there is, it’s a sign of still being liable to the second arrow, and your assumed freedom from it is being enabled by fortunate circumstances.

Only if you were already a sotāpanna yourself would you be able to understand how it’s possible to be in such a seemingly consummate state while still having plenty of work left until Arahantship. Someone who is still poor won’t be able to understand how a billion dollars can feel inadequate.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-23 02:45:15 (in reply to a comment not included)

then the right response to that is to further purify/sharpen/tighten virtue and sense restraint, rather than jump directly at abandoning that which was recognized as weaknesses?

The optimal and safest response will always be to give up those things altogether. Their effect is solely detrimental from the point of view of the practice, and thus not abandoning them will always involve some kind of weakness. If that is too daunting, then yes, the only other option with meaningful chances of success is to be maximally virtuous and restrained within the household setting.

The mind is moved by majorly unpleasant possibilities for the future because it regularly gets allowed to move regarding seemingly unrelated things (including pleasures above all) in the present.

Looking for reading tips regarding ancient India

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** craveminerals 2025-05-16 16:44:02

Hello dhamma friends,

I hope this type of post is okay here.

Some of this we can glean from the suttas. But I was thinking it'd be valuable to read about ancient India ~500 BC to get a more detailed picture of the context that the Buddha and his Sangha existed within, as well as the daily lives of the common people back then. It may for example give a picture of the obstacles/advantages they had then in attaining the Dhamma, compared to the ones we have now.

And so I was wondering if any of you have any good reading suggestions?

Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 13:37:41 (in reply to a comment not included)

who believes that people were much more virtuous in those days than they are now

A text that deals with monastic offenses and their origin stories will naturally be full of "wild" accounts. Drawing conclusions from that would be like assuming the average person in a country is violent just because that's what the news channels naturally revolve around. Nobody will report on a person who has never broken the law (or only to an insignificant extent) when that's the norm.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 14:58:33 (in reply to a comment not included)

Monks were only reprimanded by the Buddha for actions that would be considered outrageous by modern general standards, and which neither the monks nor laypeople of that time saw as problematic.

Could you give an example? Also, I recall the statement that those who were good monks criticized the deed after every such story, except perhaps in cases where as many permutations are being expounded as briefly as possible.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 18:11:13 (in reply to a comment not included)

Studies in Āgama & Vinaya Literature by Bhikkhu Anālayo, p. 19-20:

Vinaya narrative, however much taken as factual by tradition, does not function in a way comparable to a record of case-law precedents in modern judicial proceedings. Instead, Vinaya tales need to be understood in terms of their teaching function and as an integral part of the monastic project of inculcating moral values, such as celibacy. This explains why tales of the jātaka and avadāna type can be found in the different Vinayas, simply because these serve a similar purpose of edification in a teaching situation.¹⁸ This, in turn, circumscribes the uses to which such Vinaya narrative can be put by the modern scholar, in the sense that, although this material can certainly serve as a source of information about monastic ideas, attitudes, and fantasies,¹⁹ the chances that it offers an accurate reporting of actual events occurring on the ground in ancient India are limited. Confirmation of this impression can be found in the variations of sexual intercourse described in the part of the Pāli Vinaya that offers a commentary on the pārājika rule concerning a breach of celibacy. As part of its general mission to clarify the exact legal meaning of the terms involved in the rule, this section of the Pāli Vinaya moves through a range of different possible scenarios for sexual intercourse. One of these describes a case of self-sodomy, making it clear that such descriptions cannot be records of actual events.²⁰ Instead, this “case” story must be a product of fantasy, inspired by the attempt to cover all possible cases monastic lawyers could possibly conceive of.²¹ Although Vinaya narrative can certainly yield significant information on material culture and local customs as well as usages, a reading that takes Vinaya texts to be factual accounts of actual events would reflect a misunderstanding of their nature.

[...] the evident impact of imagination on Vinaya narratives also makes it clear that caution is required with particularly dramatic stories, often found only in one or a few Vinayas.

These stories appear to not only be absent from the Chinese versions. Even in Sanskrit,

the bhikkhuni pārājika rules contain no such stories (there seem to be no Sanskrit bhikkhu pārājikas available on SuttaCentral). I wasn't explicitly aware of this until now, but I was always suspicious of those accounts.

Apart from these questionable stories, even the interpretations of rules in the Theravāda Pātimokkha are sometimes absurd, and need to be rejected in order for the Vinaya to fulfill its intended purpose (of guarding against defilements and unsuitable situations).

For example, the Theravāda Vibhaṅga sees it as not an offense at all if a bhikkhu goes to a nuns' dwelling place to teach them Dhamma as long as they're not fully ordained bhikkhunis, regardless of there not being a suitable reason. As if that makes any difference to the obvious purpose of the rule.

It is also supposedly not an offense if a bhikkhu is alone in a private dwelling with a woman for as long as he's standing up, not sitting or lying down (which is of course ridiculous). These rulings can differ among parallel Vinayas, so they are clearly not canonical.

The Vinaya (especially the Pātimokkha section) was much more extensively modified and expanded than the Suttas, so some things within it should be taken with a pinch of salt. However, aside from the Sekhiyas, the basic rules—with their sometimes myopic, loophole-oriented Vibhaṅga commentary filtered out—are undebatable.

Edited: typos and clarification

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 19:29:12 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It is impossible according to ChatGPT.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-19 04:09:10 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

using the same logic, venerable Analayo should also conclude that any description of events that goes beyond what is generally accepted should be treated in the same way and rejected as 'a product of fantasy' and the later editions. This is essentially how he sends virtually the entire Kanon, including Buddha himself, into the category of fantasy.

There are descriptions of events that go beyond what is generally accepted *and* are universally present in the texts of all the early Buddhist sects, whereas these Vinaya stories are not. That is the main thrust of the argument that you shouldn't take them at face value. I was not necessarily advocating for anything else he might have written in that book, and I quite disagree with most of his views and his general outlook.

(Edit: Typo)

The hermit of Bundala

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Print-Remarkable 2025-05-13 20:53:12

Reading through the Hermit of Bundala and I didn't realize it mentions Venerable Katukurunde Nanananda of Concept and reality fame. Just now on that part so I may be wrong but I'm thinking they were close They meaning him and Ven Nanavira. I was wondering why I never hear him or his writings mentioned on the videos bc the book does mention his views were similar to Nanavira in some aspects

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-14 03:27:09

They shared a common ground of rejecting the Abhidhamma/commentary-based Theravāda views. The similarities pretty much end there.

What is “discernment”?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Kuznecoff 2025-05-13 19:41:43

A very large staple of the Hillside Hermitage nomenclature is the term “discernment.” When I first started out, I didn't have a clear understanding of what this meant. However, as time has passed, I believe I have a better grasp of how this word is used.

My impression is that discernment is not necessarily about identifying something that is immediately obvious and can be pointed to like an object in the world, but rather about using the principle of simultaneous presence (the structural interpretation of Dependent Origination) to infer the presence of other aspects of one's experience (the 5 Aggregates and necessary conditions for the experience to take place).

For instance, if an object appears in my experience, I can infer that I am conscious of a perception of it, based on the existence of my sense organs. And to have a perception, there must be some sort of configuration of matter that would create those perceptions. At the same time, the fact that I can understand what an object “is” implies that there is a layer of meaning that describes the significance of that object, and that there is the potential to act on any one of those significances (for instance, choosing to halt at a stop sign). Along with the presence of the object is a feeling which concurrently arises that is pleasant, unpleasant, or neutral. And of course, neither the feeling nor significance of the object would exist without the object, nor would an object be intelligible without those two characteristics.

Of course, none of these are things that can really be pointed at in a way where I could say “there is a stop sign”, yet are no less features of the present experience. It seems like the process of discernment is a means of breaking down and refining the understanding of one's present experience to reduce ambiguity, thereby seeing things clearly to develop dispassion.

I'd like to hear more about how you, as a practitioner, understand the term “discernment”. And if possible, perhaps an addition to the HH glossary may be useful to help newcomers understand better what is being communicated in speech and writing.

Also, congrats on 1k members! It's cool to see this community grow, yet still maintain its small niche. And thank you, venerables, for providing insightful interaction in the community.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-15 11:03:49

My impression is that discernment is not necessarily about identifying something that is immediately obvious and can be pointed to like an object in the world

Certainly; it would never be about objects in the world (e.g, clearly outlining various sensations or other “sensory data,” as some call it). But whether what is discerned is immediately obvious or not (what is “obvious” is in the end relative, as previously vague things will over time become obvious if one practices rightly), what matters is that it must directly free you from craving. If discernment is correct, its presence automatically makes the presence of craving impossible.

Therefore, if you think you've discerned something but you still crave (and suffer), that is not the right type of discernment even if ticks all the boxes in terms of depending origination, concurrency five aggregates, etc. Dispassion is not something developed separately on the basis of discernment; rather, if discernment is genuine, it *is* dispassion already.

Of course, none of these are things that can really be pointed at in a way where I could say “there is a stop sign”, yet are no less features of the present experience. I

Could you clarify what you mean by this? Do you mean to say that there *isn't* a stop sign?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-17 04:26:57 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

As I understand it, while it is very tempting to say that “there exists a stop sign”, at best there is only consciousness of the presence of perceptions linked with significances that would indicate a stop sign is present, but which does not imply certainty of the actual nature of the matter that would constitute what I understand as a “stop sign”.

This sounds like falling into the trap of mystifying rūpa.

The statement implies that there *is* a rūpa that you cannot cognize, yet somehow you can still talk about. It is a contradictory view that overlooks the extent of the five aggregates, thus enabling *sakkāyadiṭṭhi* (the view of being an entity with access to things outside of the phenomenal, cognized experience).

Rūpa is something you are conscious of, and to that extent, its presence is not subject to doubt. What you will not find is a sense object that actually represents rūpa, but that is not at all the same as saying that you can't know its existence. It exists *as* something that is definitionally “underneath” the foreground of sights, sounds, etc., and it can be directly known by *not* looking for it in the realm of sights, sounds, etc. Hence the Buddha compared the sense organs to “empty villages.” (SN 35.248). But being empty does not mean the village cannot be known as such.

“And how, bhikkhus, are there four phases? **I directly knew form, its origin, its cessation, and the way leading to its cessation.** I directly knew feeling ... perception ... activities ... consciousness, its origin, its cessation, and the way leading to its cessation.

—SN 22.56

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-19 04:01:19 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Instead, it would be that my perceptions are the only way that I can understand the existence of rūpa, which must necessarily exist in order for there to be a perception of something to be present. At the same time, the idea of a “true essence” would imply that there is rūpa that exists outside of this experience, which would be a contradiction based on the fact that something would have already had to have entered my experience in order for me to even consider the idea of there being rūpa outside of my experience.

So where is that rūpa, and how come we even know that it exists? Just as we don't bother positing the existence of a hypothetical matrix we are all enclosed within, why even bother positing the existence of rūpa instead of just saying that everything is a perception and stopping there?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-21 14:40:07 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

If a sense organ becomes damaged, our perceptions would change, which confirms that we have those organs in the first place, and that they have some sort of relation to perception.

True, but then it still sounds like that basis for our perceptions is a hidden entity that we have no immediate reason to call a “sense organ” except for the fact that that's how the Suttas call it. Hence there would be no intrinsic reason for that basis to be assumed as rūpa and not a matrix, or god, or whatever. It remains equally mystified and not any more discerned.

When experience is broken down into the 5-aggregate model, dispassion can be extended to every aspect of the experience more accurately, rather than

the more common subject-object view which leaves room for craving to exist.

Yes, in theory. But it will not be dispassion of the right kind for as long as the aggregates remain theoretical ideas.

The sense organs, hollow as they are, *can* and *must* be discerned as arisen phenomena to actually develop dispassion towards them. But phenomena—which are neither on the level of sensory objects nor of analytical ideas—will only become apparent if there is no lust towards sense objects, i.e., one's conduct has been purified.

Question Regarding the Fourth Precept

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** RunningForRotini 2025-05-11 19:28:41

Greetings,

Would the following scenario serve as a violation of the Fourth Precept?

Last week, while talking to my mom, I misunderstood something she said, and I followed up by stating that “I’m tired.” This conversation *did* take place about two hours before I went to bed, and I had been feeling depleted from the previous week’s work. However, I noticed the intention behind the utterance was to protect my image, i.e., to not be perceived as a dullard. I still had enough mental energy to function. Similarly, I could have listened more carefully to what my mom was saying.

I don’t know whether or not to regard this as a transgression due to the unwholesome intention which happened to have a convenient, partially-true excuse, based in external circumstances, no less.

Am I overanalyzing this? If so, how do I see the danger in the slightest fault without falling into recursive spirals of obsessive uncertainty (AN 7.11)?

Any feedback is appreciated.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-12 05:55:50

I don’t know whether or not to regard this as a transgression due to the unwholesome intention which happened to have a convenient, partially-true excuse, based in external circumstances, no less.

It’s not a transgression of the fourth precept. The fourth precept is to state something that is untrue, not something that can under some metric be regarded as an insufficient excuse for (not) doing something.

It is certain that when you take up the precepts, you will be swinging between the extremes of anxious concern with every little action and lax carelessness (where you might only keep the very strict letter of a precept but ignore the spirit). And you should regard falling for either of those extremes as a symptom of still not recognizing your own intentions clearly. Keeping the precepts externally without any compromises creates the

necessary basis for you to train that discernment. When it's trained, there will come a point where "not acting out of defilements" will for you automatically mean perfect precepts, without any room for doubts. And that's what "accomplishment in virtue" means.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-14 04:07:28 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

but it's not like one would have any intent of deception or expecting that anybody will believe it.

Exactly, so it doesn't break the fourth precept then.

Is chronic illness a rare opportunity to develop Right View?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Global_Ad_7891 2025-05-10 03:14:49

I've been reflecting a lot on the relationship between chronic illness and Dhamma practice. Specifically, I'm wondering if having a long-term health condition—one that doesn't immediately kill you, but gradually weighs you down and confronts you with mortality—is actually a powerful vehicle for cultivating Right View.

Of course, illness can give rise to urgency. But beyond that, I think the daily presence of sickness—especially the kind that lingers and shadows your life—can help keep your internal "context" aligned with reality: that life is fragile, impermanent, and headed inevitably toward death. For me, I have persistent lung issues. Nothing officially diagnosed as terminal, but it looms large in my mind. The thought of death is with me every day.

And honestly, if I never got sick, I don't think I would have ever started practicing seriously. I'm 25, and I probably would have just kept chasing jhanas or pleasant states, thinking I was doing something spiritual, when in reality I would have died one day having never truly understood anything. But this illness—because it hasn't yet incapacitated me—feels like a rare and oddly precious window. I can still think, walk, read, meditate. I can engage with the Dhamma deeply. Yet I'm constantly aware that this window won't be open forever.

Isn't that a gift, in a way? Not a pleasant one, but a gift nonetheless?

Would love to hear from anyone else who's experienced something similar or has thoughts on illness as a context for practice.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 05:30:09

Isn't that a gift, in a way? Not a pleasant one, but a gift nonetheless?

Yes. The context of "I could lose my life/my health could suddenly deteriorate sharply at any moment" would be a recognition of actual *anicca* that would be a lot less abstract than it is for most. One of the many reasons why *anicca* (and insight in general) is interpreted in

such myopic ways (e.g., observing the “flux” of experience, often of random sensations) is likely that people are on average a lot more disconnected—and in denial about—the unreliability of youth, health, and life due to the increase in safety nets that allow for covering it up almost totally for most of one’s life. Therefore, *anicca* gets interpreted as anything but that personal, jarring (for the undeveloped mind) recognition.

By the time a person who’s been intentionally ignoring their own mortality with the aid of modern comforts reaches a certain age, the assumptions of ownership are well cemented and are unlikely to be dislodged even if the divine messengers begin to make much more obvious physical appearances.

Wandering mind and non-activity

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Friendly_Distance119 2025-05-09 09:28:02

My computer-based job has me in a room alone all day. Some of the time I work, but most of the time I have nothing to do. I have always used this time to read and study the suttas. However, at some point reading and studying the suttas becomes just another distraction. So I am left with several hours a day with nothing to do but abide in non-activity. The process itself is not difficult for me as I don’t mind being alone in silence, and time moves along quickly while I pace back and forth in my room. However, after weeks of this I start to doubt its efficacy.

My mind simply provides all the entertainment it needs. It moves from one topic to the next without my control, whether analyzing a concept or going over a conversation from 20 years ago. The only way to make it stop is to adopt a meditation technique, which is forbidden. So I spend hours a day pacing while my mind entertains itself and time flies on by.

Is this really what I’m supposed to be doing? Spending hours a day helplessly pondering, whiling away the time as my mind wanders?

Thank you for your help.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 16:28:40 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Neither of these is correct. We dismiss meditation techniques in every possible context, and we’ve also made it clear that a layperson can get quite far if they’re celibate and well restrained in regard to sensuality in general.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 16:45:02 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I never got the impression it was designed for those who have already overcome the five hindrances and become fully established in the Eight Precepts.

It was:

People don't see boredom as an indicator and certainly don't see delusion as an attitude that they cultivate, *despite commitment to precepts, suttas, and meditation*. They always try to deal with boredom. Even when they are practising, their meditation technique becomes something they do on account of avoiding boredom.

Abiding in non-activity—the way he was describing it there and not what people would generally imagine it—means practicing jhāna, and thus the exact same requirement of impeccable precepts and sense restraint developed beforehand applies. Nothing one can do before that counts as practice.

The point of that talk was that a person who's established in the precepts might still be running away from the neutral feeling that initially manifests as boredom, using distractions that are technically within the precepts.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 17:20:10 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Just what the commenter above mentioned:

direct your attention to more useful contemplations—such as the dangers of sensuality, the burdens of ownership, the reasons for upholding the precepts, and the unwholesomeness of neglecting them.

If those contemplations feel abstract or mechanical, it's probably because there isn't a sufficient basis of precepts and restraint for those subjects to come to light experientially.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 04:04:13 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

In terms of Dhamma, contemplate the precepts and why they should be kept. Apart from that, it doesn't really matter as long as it's not against the precepts. Really homing in on the precepts while still engaging in various activities (excluding coarse entertainment like movies and games, of course) will be more accurate for such a person than trying to practice “non-activity,” which requires significant familiarity with one's own mind and would inevitably be done wrong.

Celibacy for sotapatti?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Substantial-Fuel-545 2025-05-08 12:47:23

Is celibacy mandatory in HH's view, in order for one to become a sotapanna?

In other words:

Is it possible for one to have become a sotapanna without having previously renounced sexual intercourses with his wife?

Of course I know that at least it's more likely or faster for one to achieve sotapanna with celibacy. That's why that is not my question.

I believe this question to be clear, and so I'd expect an answer to be as clear. A yes or no kind of answer would be optimal.

Thank you.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 19:02:43

Is it possible for one to have become a sotapanna without having previously renounced sexual intercourses with his wife?

No.

What's easy to overlook regarding the cited AN 10.75 is that Isidatta wasn't celibate *after* he got the Right View. There is no shortage of examples in the Suttas saying that in order to get there, the mind needs to be totally purified from passion towards sensuality.

After getting the Right View and a bit further (sakadāgāmi), Isidatta chose to be content with that attainment and wasn't celibate anymore—therefore not practicing anymore, or only on occasion—while Pūraṇa continued to make further effort even after he got to that point.

If Isidatta had remained celibate, his higher wisdom would've led him to non-return, while if Pūraṇa had practiced for longer and reached the same level of wisdom as Isidatta, he would've been a non-returner. But neither of them would've reached sotāpatti without cultivating the perception of sensuality as a charcoal pit (which *must* lead to not engaging in it with any degree of frequency; otherwise it's obviously not truly seen as a charcoal pit).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 06:34:03

What are the five shackles of mind he has not severed? Firstly, a bhikkhu is not without passion, desire, fondness, thirst, burning, and craving for sensuality. This being so, his mind does not incline to diligence, dedication, persistence, and striving. This is the first shackle of mind he has not severed.

Furthermore, a bhikkhu is not without passion for the body ... This is the second shackle of mind.

Furthermore, a bhikkhu is not without passion for form ... This is the third shackle of mind.

He eats as much as he likes until his stomach is full, then indulges in the pleasure of sleeping, lying down, and drowsing ... This is the fourth shackle of

mind.

He leads the renunciate life for the sake of a certain heavenly existence, thinking: ‘By this precept or observance or fervent austerity or renunciate life, may I become one of the gods!’ This being so, his mind does not incline to diligence, dedication, persistence, and striving. This is the fifth shackle of mind, he has not cut off. These are the five shackles of mind, he has not cut off.

When a bhikkhu has not abandoned these five obstinacies and cut off these five shackles of mind, it is not possible for him to achieve **growth, improvement, or maturity in this teaching-and-discipline.**

—MN 16

If one wishes to argue that this only applies to monks, MN 53, directed explicitly at a group of Sakyan laypeople, talks about the “practicing trainee”:

When a noble disciple is accomplished in virtue, guards the sense doors, is moderate in eating, and is dedicated to vigilance, has seven good qualities, and gets the four jhānas—easeful abidings in the present experience that involve an elevated mind—when they want, without trouble or difficulty, they are called a noble disciple who is a practicing trainee. Their eggs are unspoiled, and they are capable of breaking out of their shell, becoming awakened, and achieving the supreme safety from the yoke. Suppose there was a chicken with eight or ten or twelve eggs. And she properly sat on them to keep them warm and incubated. Even if that chicken doesn’t wish, ‘If only my chicks could break out of the eggshell with their claws and beak and hatch safely!’ Still they can break out and hatch safely.

In the same way, when a noble disciple is endowed with all these factors, **they are called a noble disciple who is a practicing trainee.** Their eggs are unspoiled, and they are capable of breaking out of their shell, becoming awakened, and achieving the supreme safety from the yoke.

The simile of the hen is the exact same one as in MN 16, and the meaning is the same: without these factors, the eggs will not hatch, i.e., one will not gain supramundane insight. Thus, this Sutta is saying the same thing but applied to an audience of laypeople: without complete withdrawal from sensuality—celibacy being included in “accomplishment in virtue” already, as Isidatta is called “lacking in virtue” in AN 10.75 due to not being celibate—they cannot consider themselves to be *practicing* even if they are already *sekhas*, i.e., are at least sotāpannas. Thus, as per MN 16, they are not capable of further growth in the Dhamma.

The same requirement for progress in the Dhamma would apply to a puthujjana aiming for sotāpatti—even more so today, without the Buddha’s direct instruction, and with more proximity to sensuality than people back then could even imagine.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 19:10:19 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

a little similar question but is it necessary to remain single too for sotapatti ?

A person who is currently single could only ever seek a romantic partner out of sensual desire, which is a categorical obstruction to stream entry.

And if one tries to argue that if one is celibate, then the relationship is not sensual, then that would only hold true if the other person's gender and bodily features do not matter at all—which would generally mean it's not actually a romantic relationship.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 19:36:50 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

There is no account of any layperson pondering on the Buddha's words they previously heard while practicing a breathing focusing technique and otherwise still going about their sensual householder business and then attaining stream-entry later.

True, but just to be clear (since some people try to argue otherwise), it's not like trying to implement what the Suttas actually teach instead of following modern approaches would somehow make up for not being celibate and potentially lead to the Right View after all.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 04:05:28 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Or is it that what matters is the present mindset—whether there's still craving or emotional attachment tied to it now, even if celibacy is being practiced?

Yes, that is what matters. Whether the relationship is still a basis for pleasure, physical or emotional.

But the fact that probably the majority of relationships today are founded primarily on pleasure does mean that many times the relationship itself wouldn't survive if one of them becomes very committed to the practice.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 04:22:53 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Those stories are not proof that celibacy isn't mandatory. They simply prove that a person's mind theoretically could become established in the attitude of celibacy and withdrawal very quickly by understanding the perils of sensuality.

But regardless of how quickly that attitude arises, it's not optional. And if a person has not yet decided to be celibate, they cannot at the same time pretend like they are cultivating that attitude.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 05:21:57 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It is mandatory in the sense that those people were not expecting to be celibate only for one afternoon. If you're seeing sensuality as a charcoal pit, which is the necessary basis for development to happen, you automatically intend to live a celibate lifestyle indefinitely.

One can fall from celibacy (as a non-anagāmi obviously) only once that perception weakens due to not cultivating it enough, as happened with the layman Isidatta. At that point, one is not practicing anymore.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 09:46:22 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

is it enough to be uninvolved in sex and sensuality at the moment of attainment?

It depends on what you mean by “uninvolved.” Simply not thinking about it for the time being is not enough, and many people can already do that. The mind has to actually not want to go back and prefer renunciation even when it remembers sensuality.

So his understanding of sensuality has become even worse after he has attained the right view than it was before he attained it?

No. He was simply not trying to cultivate that understanding further, and whatever level it had reached was not sufficient to bring about permanent disenchantment with sensuality (i.e., non-return).

What people often don't understand is that one can be *completely* disenchanted with sensuality and not want anything to do with it at all—not just “suppress” it through distraction as with contemporary techniques—and yet that doesn't mean that sensual desire will never return. It just means overcoming the five hindrances.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 03:48:46 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The former. One has to have been celibate (realistically speaking, for years) for the mind to be in the position to understand the four noble truths.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 11:22:40 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I doubt there is one that states it explicitly in those terms, but many strongly imply it (like MN 36, which I already cited). Likewise, there are none that explicitly say the five precepts are sufficient for sotāpatti. There are many things never explicitly stated in the Suttas that

people have no trouble believing because, apart from being self-evident, they don't have a personal stake in the alternative scenario.

And this is one such self-evident point. Nobody who looked at the issue without a costly stake in the race—an existing sexual relationship being the most common one—would have trouble accepting this point. No amount of convincing rational arguments will undo such a person's resistance to the idea.

The worst obstruction of all is the wrong view that is actively cultivated when a person purports to be practicing towards right view despite not being celibate. It means they will indefinitely avoid looking at where their suffering actually comes from and maintain the view that the problem is elsewhere than where the craving is (meditation techniques being just a very coarse example of this). Thus, they will never see the noble truths.

Continuing to engage in intercourse but accepting that one is not practicing as a result would do less harm in the long run, since it's wrong view that is the most malignant thing of all, as the Buddha said.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 12:39:57 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Actually, the point is explicitly stated in a number of places in the Chinese Āgamas, which in general tend to flesh out the importance of renunciation more than the Pāli, where it often stands out less due to extensive redaction over a longer period and adherence to stock formulas:

SĀ 1042:

If one wishes to cut off the three fetters and attain the fruit of stream-entry, once-return, or non-return, to have immeasurable supernormal powers, the heavenly ear, the knowledge of others' minds, the knowledge of past lives, the knowledge of death and rebirth (of beings), the knowledge of the exhaustion of the outflows (Arahantship), all will be attained.

Why is that so? Because of lawful and righteous conduct—maintaining precepts and **being detached from sensuality**—what is wished for will certainly be attained.

[For the rewards of sensual heavens stated earlier in the discourse, only “lawful and righteous conduct” (i.e., five precepts) is stated, not detachment from sensuality. From rebirth in the Brahma realm onwards, it lists detachment from sensuality as a requirement, and the part quoted above is further below. This nuance is clearly missing from the Pāli parallel, MN 41, as it essentially says that five precepts would be enough for Arahantship.]

Then there's T5, a Chinese versions of the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta:

“A person of highest wisdom obtains the path of arahantship. The second level of wisdom can attain non-return; the third level can attain once-return; the fourth can attain stream-entry; the fifth—**upāsakas who uphold the five**

precepts—can attain the heavenly realm; those who uphold three precepts can be reborn as humans.”

T6, another Mahāparinibbāna version:

The people of the world who, upon hearing the Buddha’s profound and subtle words of Dharma, understand the root causes of saṃsāra and **sever affections and cut off desires**, all attain release: those with the first diligence attaining arhatship; those with the second diligence attaining the state of non-returner; those with the third diligence attaining the state of once-returner; those with the fourth diligence attaining the state of stream-enterer; this is the fifth rare and spontaneous virtue.”

Even those ordinary people who, having a wavering mind towards the Buddha, perform a few good deeds will all gain great merit; none of it will be in vain.

Additionally, there’s T151, one of the very first Buddhist texts in Chinese, dated to 148-170 A.D.:

“Those with the foremost effort attain the path of arahantship. Those with the second level of effort attain the path of anāgāmi. Those with the third level of effort attain the path of sakadāgāmi. Those with the fourth level of effort attain the path of sotāpanna. **Even those unable to make great effort should uphold the five precepts.**”

Lastly, from the Pāli Canon, there is Snp 2.14:

Now I shall tell you the householder’s duty,
doing which one becomes a good disciple.
For one burdened with possessions does not get to realize
the whole of the bhikkhu’s practice.

They’d not kill any creature, nor have them killed,
nor grant permission for others to kill.
They’ve laid aside violence towards all creatures
frail or firm that there are in the world.

Next, a disciple would avoid knowingly
taking anything not given at all,
they’d not get others to do it,
nor grant them permission to steal;
they’d avoid all theft.

**A sensible person would avoid the incelbate life (abrahmacariya),
like a burning pit of coals.**

But if unable to remain celibate,
they’d not transgress with another’s partner.

There might be other examples in the Chinese canon that I haven’t discovered yet.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-10 18:16:35 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

But given how proliferated sensuality is today, with such a virtually endless array of options, I wonder if celibacy, while necessary, is even effective enough as it was in past eras.

That's a valid line of questioning. Celibacy alone is obviously not enough, but that naturally is what people get hung up on the most. Once a person comes to terms with that, the rest won't seem nearly as daunting.

The reason why all these restrictions are not optional is because the only way to get the right view is to completely close off all of the potential avenues for escaping suffering the wrong way (i.e., through something external, sense pleasures being the coarsest example).

“Asceticism” would be just as misguided and fruitless as trying to practice without celibacy and sense restraint, as one would then be expecting some magical revelation to “happen” to one as a result of a blind turning away from things, and that anticipated insight or revelation *would also be external* and mere management. Hence both extremes are much easier compared to the Middle Way, which boils down to the eight precepts, sense restraint, and saying no to things based on the intention behind them, without adding anything more.

Just a bridge that has never undergone significant load testing would collapse the first time it is fully loaded, if one hasn't been avoiding the two extremes and thereby exposed oneself to the fundamental dukkha, one's understanding of the Dhamma—even if pointing somewhere in the right direction—will remain abstract and become powerless when real suffering arises: suffering of confinement within indefinite and uncompromising celibacy and withdrawal from sense pleasures, and sickness, aging, death, and heavy loss.

So rather than waiting for the latter type of suffering to start building the bridge, at which point it will very likely be too late, uncompromising virtue and renunciation (of the right things) create a much safer basis for the same training.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 16:06:39 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

That's fine. I am not trying to change your or OP's mind in particular; that didn't seem like a realistic scenario from the outset.

All this, spiced with the non-answers to the direct and simple questions about your arguments

I don't see how you could regard any of my replies as “non-answers,” but alas.

OP's question was about the possibility of stream-entry without celibacy according to the HH view, and that is what I've expressed in categorical terms. Speaking solely from that angle, there is zero chance that someone will attain what *we* regard as stream-entry with-

out being celibate. If someone allegedly does so, they do not meet our standard for what constitutes stream entry, and I am confident that any such person's lingering wrong view will be obvious even without knowing that they haven't been celibate.

Nevertheless, I did not stop there and provided evidence that there is plenty of room for our interpretation in the Suttas. Meanwhile, it seems all others here have been able to do is lean on the assumption that absence of evidence means evidence of absence.

I could have done the same and stopped at citing the fact that there isn't a single Sutta where a householder meets the Buddha, takes on the five precepts, and through some practice or other based on that meager level of restraint attains the Right View later on. That is a possibility on which you (and the majority of practitioners today) seem to be willing to wager, despite no recorded instances of that happening in any early Buddhist text.

I am confident that any reasonably unbiased person reading this will be able to see that the latter conclusion rests on much feeble ground, and that's all I've been aiming for. And that's also as far as one can often go with "proving" things with Sutta quotes; a degree of interpretation is always required, and a person will have room to reject one's premises if they really want to. That's how even leading Pāli experts are sometimes able to wriggle out of the obvious meaning of explicit statements made in the Suttas to accommodate their existing worldview.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-12 03:49:22 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

There is **no difference** between "genuinely seeing all sensuality as akin to a charcoal pit" and permanently resolving upon a celibate and aloof lifestyle. If a person thinks withdrawing the mind from sensuality entails anything less than the latter, then the peril in sensuality is for them a partly abstract idea that has not sunk in on the right level, and therefore, that understanding of the peril will not be a sufficient basis for the Right View to arise.

So, it is a categorical statement: what somebody who currently indulges in sensual pleasures to any extent has to do in order to get the Right View (or further noble attainments up to anāgāmi) is get their citta to genuinely resolve upon permanent celibacy, without the slightest prospect of ever returning. There is no other way. And this is something that monastics of several decades' standing have not necessarily achieved yet and generally never do, even if they in the end pass away without ever disrobing. So, living physically disengaged for one's whole lifetime—even not thinking about sensuality much at all—is, in and of itself, *below* the level of withdrawal from sensuality that is required.

Now, whether that resolve for celibacy will actually last forever post sotāpatti is another matter—and one that indeed cannot be stated categorically. From the Suttas we can see that for many people, it didn't, because the *fetter* of sensuality had not been overcome yet, and they were satisfied with their current attainment.

Edit: Added link to MN 36.

Laypeople Who Don't Give Up Sensuality

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-05-08 05:22:11

I recently discovered two (so far unrecognized) Chinese parallels to the poem in Ther-agātha 2.34. They both provide a backstory that strongly bolsters the message present in the verses, conveying the central point that we frequently emphasize even more effectively: monastic or layperson, practicing the Dhamma entails giving up sensuality. Failure in the latter is failure in the former.

Thag 2.34

*I've seen lay disciples who have learned the Dhamma, who,
Though saying, "Sense pleasures are impermanent,"
are infatuated with gems and jewelry,
concerned for their partners and children.*

*They indeed don't know the purpose of this Dhamma.
Even though they say "Sense pleasures are impermanent",
They don't have the power to cut passion,
so they're bound to children, spouses, and wealth.*

SĀ 591

Thus I have heard:

At one time, the Buddha was dwelling at Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika's Park in Śrāvastī.

Then the Blessed One addressed the bhikṣus:

"In the past, on an island, an upāsaka went to the home of another upāsaka to attend a gathering. There, he harshly denounced sensuality, saying:

'These sense pleasures are worthless, insubstantial, and false—deceptive things, like illusions that deceive a child.'

Yet upon returning to his own home, he indulged freely in the five cords of sensuality.

Now, in that upāsaka's dwelling, there resided a deva.

The deva thought to himself:

'This upāsaka is mediocre and inconsistent. At the gathering in another upāsaka's home, he vehemently denounced sensuality, saying: "These sense pleasures are worthless, insubstantial, and false—deceptive things, like illusions that deceive a child." Yet back in his own home, he abandons himself to the five cords of sensuality. I shall now startle him into awareness.'

And he spoke this verse:

*'In the great assembly, you denounced sensuality as impermanent,
 Yet you yourself drown in craving—like an ox sunk in deep mud.
 I observe this gathering of upāsakas:
 Learned, wise in the Dharma, upholders of pure precepts.
 You see those who delight in the Dharma, and call sensuality impermanent—
 How then do you indulge in lust, never severing greed?
 Why delight in the world, keeping wives and family?'*

When that deva had awakened the upāsaka in this way, that upāsaka, thus stirred, shaved his hair and beard, donned the robes, and with sincere faith, left the household life to pursue the path. Striving diligently, he exhausted all defilements and attained Arahantship.'

The Buddha finished speaking this sūtra. The bhikṣus, having heard the Buddha's words, rejoiced and respectfully practiced accordingly.

SĀ-2.185

Thus I have heard:

At one time, the Buddha was staying in the Jetavana Grove of Anāthapiṇḍika's Park in Śrāvastī. At that time, the Buddha addressed the bhikṣus:

"In ancient times, in the city of Śūrpāraka, there was a gathering place for upāsakas (devoted laymen). The upāsakas assembled in their hall and spoke of the faults of sensuality:

Sensuality appears outwardly like exposed bones or like chunks of meat fought over by birds. Sensuality is like poisonous dung—both stinging and defiling. It is like a pit of fire or like a leper warming himself by flames, only to have his itching and pain worsen. It is like running against the wind while holding a torch—if one does not let go, they will surely be burned. Sensuality is like a dream, an illusion, a borrowed thing, or like fruit on a tree. It is like a spear or a halberd. Sensuality is impure, filled with filth. It is like undigested food—foul and repulsive.

Though they gathered and spoke extensively of the perils of sensuality, when they returned home, they each indulged in heedlessness.

At that time, the deity of the assembly hall thought to himself:

"These upāsakas gather in this hall to speak of the perils of sensuality, yet when they return home, their craving only grows. They are not pure, nor do they act in accordance with the Dharma. Now I shall disturb them to rouse them up.'

Having resolved thus, the deity, while the upāsakas were assembled, spoke this verse:

*'You upāsakas gather and discuss,
 Declaring sensuality to be impermanent,
 Yet when you return, you yourselves
 Are drowned in the torrent of sensuality.
 Like an old ox stuck in deep mire,
 Now I observe the many upāsakas—*

*Learned and disciplined,
They speak only of sensuality's faults,
Calling it impermanent.
Yet their words are empty,
For they have no true intention to abandon sensuality,
still greedy for and attached to the forms of men and women.*

*Craving and attachment are said to be non-Dharma—
You ought to forsake them!
In the Buddha's teaching,
you ought to conduct yourself righteously.'*

When the deity had spoken this verse, the upāsakas, upon hearing it, were roused up. Disgusted with sensuality, they shaved their heads and beards, left their households, and took up the monastic life. Diligently practicing, cultivating virtue, composure, and understanding, they all attained the fruit of Arahantship.”

The Buddha finished speaking, and the bhikṣus, having heard his words, rejoiced and faithfully practiced accordingly.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-12 05:01:04 (in reply to a comment not included)

As is very common, your comment rests on a critical confusion between abandoning the fetter of sensual desire and purifying the mind from sensual desire.

Moreover, in Saṃyutta Nikāya 55.26 (SN 55.26, Anāthapiṇḍikovāda Sutta), the Buddha declares the householder Anāthapiṇḍika a stream-enterer — a man who remained fully engaged in lay life, with wife, wealth, and sensory contact.

Nobody is denying that some stream-enterers could continue to engage in sensual pleasures *after* their attainment. That position is untenable in light of the Suttas. What we insist on is that one cannot *attain* stream-entry (or any noble attainment) without abandoning passion for sensuality beforehand, and this is not only stated prior to every recorded attainment of sotāpatti in the early texts but also in more generalized fashion in Suttas like MN 16 and MN 36, which I've cited in another thread.

AN 8.53:

“Gotamī, the things that you would know lead to passion, not dispassion; to attachment, not to detachment; to accumulation, not diminution; to abundance of desires, not fewness of desires; to discontent, not contentment; to socializing, not seclusion; to laziness, not effort; to being burdensome, not being unburdensome: **Categorically, you should remember them as not the teaching, not the training, and not the Teacher's instructions.**

SN 45.24, a Sutta which I hadn't cited yet, is even more direct:

At Savatthī. “Bhikkhus, whether for a layperson or one gone forth, I do not praise the wrong course. Whether it is a layperson or one gone forth who is practising wrongly, because of undertaking the wrong course, **he does not attain the way, the Dhamma that is wholesome.** And what, bhikkhus, is the wrong course? It is: wrong view ... wrong composure. This is called the wrong course. Whether it is a layperson or one gone forth who is practising wrongly, because of undertaking the wrong course he does not attain the way, the Dhamma that is wholesome.

“Bhikkhus, whether for a layperson or one gone forth, I praise the right course. Whether it is a layperson or one gone forth who is practising rightly, because of undertaking the right course, he attains the way, the Dhamma that is wholesome. And what, bhikkhus, is the right course? It is: right view ... right composure. This is called the right course. Whether it is a layperson or one gone forth who is practising rightly, because of undertaking the right course of practice he attains the way, the Dhamma that is wholesome.”

The second factor of the “wrong course” is wrong intention (*micchāsāṅkappa*), i.e., intention of sensuality.

So, yes, plenty of laypeople in the Suttas remained within sensuality after their stream entry. But they were *ipso facto* not practicing the Dhamma anymore, even though they had understood it. They were engaging in wrong intention and in that which is against the teaching and the training.

This is why a group of laypeople who were probably already all noble ones—our point is highlighted even more if one takes it otherwise—had to be reminded in MN 53 that, in order to be considered “a practicing trainee” (*sekho pāṭipado*) they must follow the exact same training that is prescribed to monastics. That training *starts* with “seeing the danger in the slightest fault” and “sense restraint,” both of which automatically rule out any sensual (and especially sexual) activity. Never did the Buddha prescribe a “milder” course of training based on five precepts; rather, the consensus in the texts is that such a person is simply *not training* towards the cessation of existence but towards a good rebirth at best.

People tend to severely underestimate what the essential requirement for stream entry—purifying the mind from sensual desire—entails, thinking that it’s enough to simply not desire any particular sense pleasures for the moment while internally being in a mind state that *would* delight and lean towards a very compelling sensual prospect if it were to suddenly become available. This is in line with the contemporary (mis)understanding of the five hindrances, where the momentary absence of very specific sensual thoughts on account of focusing one’s attention on something else is regarded as the absence of the hindrance of sensuality.

This ignores the fact that, under such an interpretation, even a very indulgent person’s mind can be “purified from sensuality” at many points during the day, and yet they would certainly not enter the stream if they were to reflect on the four noble truths during such times.

If you wish, you can read this comment for more on the topic.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-16 05:18:23 (in reply to a comment not included)

First, the Buddha's Middle Way was defined precisely by the refusal to fall into extremes - neither indulgence nor ascetic suppression.

The Middle Way is defined as the abandonment of sensual pleasure without going as far as seeking extra pain (which is unnecessary). If by "ascetic suppression" you mean an uncompromising effort to not tolerate and abandon wrong intention (intention of sensuality), then that's precisely the Middle Way you find in the Suttas.

While the suttas clearly emphasize the dangers of sensuality, they also describe a path that unfolds gradually.

Not "gradually" in the sense that you seem to be implying. Nowhere in the Suttas do we find the common modern view that a person ought to "take their time," as if they were sure to have many years left to live, indefinitely procrastinating the relinquishment of that which goes against the Dhamma (i.e., everything connected with passion, attachment, etc., as per AN 8.53). Far from it, the emphasis was on the transient nature of life and of suitable conditions for making the right effort, and thus the need to be maximally diligent (e.g., SN 3.25, MN 82, AN 5.57).

The word often translated as "gradual" is *anupubba*, and it means "step-by-step." Either way, the very first step of the "gradual" training is establishment in virtue, seeing the danger in the slightest fault, which in itself already encompasses celibacy.

to a kind of purity test that could easily blur into spiritual perfectionism.

Arguably, "spiritual perfection"—a state of complete mental purity—was precisely the necessary condition for even householders to understand the noble truths:

And when he knew that Upāli's mind was ready, pliable, rid of hindrances, elated, and confident, he explained the special teaching of the Buddhas: suffering, its origin, its cessation, and the path. **Just as a clean cloth rid of stains would properly absorb dye**, in that very seat the stainless, immaculate eye of the Dhamma arose in Upāli...

.

Lay followers like Anāthapiṇḍika or Citta were praised not because they had already renounced all sensuality, but because they practiced with sincerity within their conditions.

From memory, Anāthapiṇḍika and other sensually-engaged householders were never personally praised in the Suttas on account of any supramundane qualities. They were praised due to things like generosity. The householders the Buddha selected as models for the laity were all anāgāmis, including Citta (SN 17.23-24). Hatthaka and Nandamāta

were also non-returners, and thus it is reasonable to assume that Khujjuttarā was too, although there are no canonical stories about her.

The Buddha would not have praised disciples like Anāthapiṇḍika and established them as exemplary due to a crucial point implicitly made in AN 10.75: someone who is not celibate is deficient in virtue (*dussīla*). The internal liberation that would separate somebody like Anāthapiṇḍika from an ordinary person would be, to an ordinary person, quite intangible.

“Householders, if wanderers of other sects ask you: ‘Householders, what sort of monks and divines should not be honoured, respected, revered and venerated?’ you, being asked thus, can answer those wanderers of other sects thus: ‘Those monks and divines who are not rid of lust, hate and delusion regarding forms cognizable by the eye, whose minds are unquiet in themselves, whose bodily, verbal and mental behaviour is now righteous and now unrighteous—such monks and divines as these need not be honoured, respected, revered and venerated. Why is that? Because we too are not rid of lust, hate and delusion regarding forms cognizable by the eye, our minds are unquiet in ourselves, our bodily, verbal and mental behaviour is now righteous and now unrighteous. **So since we see no greater righteous behaviour in these good monks and divines, they need not therefore be honoured, respected, revered, and venerated.**’

—MN 150

but because they practiced with sincerity within their conditions.

Again, one cannot say that they were “practicing with sincerity” if they were engaging in wrong intention and “going with the stream”. For one with wrong intention, the other factors of the eightfold path cannot be present. The disciples who were praised on account of things directly related to practice were those who were established in renunciation, since the Dhamma is at its core the relinquishment of passion. Just as in a weightlifting context, only people who lift heavy weights receive praise.

If we say that anyone who has not yet uprooted sensuality is “not practicing the Dhamma,” we risk erasing the very terrain the Buddha walked with people - meeting them where they were, not where they “should” already be.

I never said nobody who “has not yet *uprooted* sensuality.” That would indeed be confusing the path with the goal. Nobody who is not trying to uproot sensuality, i.e., the coarsest form of craving, and continues to give in to it, is practicing the way to the cessation of craving. They might aspire to, but they are not doing so at that time.

Of course, it is true that most people will not be able to take large steps towards renunciation all at once. But it is seriously misguided (and unfortunately quite common) to conflate that with an allowance for contentment with their current lifestyle.

Someone gradually giving up smoking must also be relentlessly aware of the habit’s harmful nature. The moment they lose that visceral sense of its harm, the addiction wins. On

a concrete level, they will remain bound to the habit. At best they will have only a remote, theoretical recognition that a smoke-free existence is supposedly better but will lack the gut-level motivation required to break free.

Stream-entry is not the end of passion - it is the end of confusion about where the path leads.

It is also the end of confusion about what the path *is*, which means that a stream enterer would know full well that any sensual resolves they might still carry are incompatible with the path.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-16 05:28:04 (in reply to a comment not included)

This reinforces the distinction between full sensual renunciation and the irreversible insight of stream-entry.

It does not. The precepts include celibacy. Sense restraint is an even further layer of development where one would avoid *anything* that becomes tainted with greed or aversion, even if it's not against a precept.

You overlooked the part right before the one you quoted (starting 40:40), where he talks about the need to not only keep the precepts but also give up sensuality unconditionally, saying also that the bare minimum of virtue is "five precepts with celibacy."

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-16 17:04:54 (in reply to a comment not included)

seems to allow the possibility that laypeople who are restrained in the five precepts may become a stream-enterer.

That is not what the Sutta says. It says one can *identify* someone who is *already a stream-enterer* by the fact that they are (at the very least) restrained in the five precepts and possess all those other qualities. But they would have never acquired profound and unshakable confidence in the Triple Gem if they had not plunged into the abyss and found the escape *there*.

The reason for celibacy being a prerequisite is quite simple. For as long as someone still has the door to sensuality "open," they will not be forced to find the actual escape from dukkha. Whatever escape they may discover will be superficial and of the nature of management, not even reaching the level of jhāna, precisely because they still allow themselves to go with the path of least resistance when their mind pressures them.

Furthermore, a monastic is said to have to perfect their conduct, purify their mind from delight not just in sensuality, their own body, form, and future lives, but also in company and association with others in order to get the Right View. So, purely in terms of textual analysis, there are three options:

- (1) The stories about lay sotāpannas keeping only five precepts are a fabrication.
- (2) Monastics obtain a different kind of sotāpatti than laypeople do, with a higher threshold for entry.
- (3) Those laypeople who at the time kept only five precepts also had to cultivate the same level of disenchantment and withdrawal from sensuality at least until they understood the Dhamma.

Option #2 is obviously absurd (going forth would be a burden rather than an aid), while option #1 would require considerable evidence to back it up. And I'm quite sure there isn't any.

Hillside Hermitage Schism?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** No-Spirit5082 2025-05-07 13:56:58

I was reading an essay by Sridhar Rana Rinpoche a while back and he said : >“As I have already mentioned, Chittanusmriti, i.e., mindfulness of the mind, is the form of Vipassyana most common in Vajrayana. Visualizing of various Mandala, like forms and spontaneous appearance of Devas in meditation, is found not only in Vajrayana but also in the Theravad Buddhist traditions existing in the mountains of Laos. So these Theravadin “Vajracharyas” who have tried to make fun of the Mandalas of Vajrayana are also criticising their own Theravad traditions as practiced in the mountains of Laos. I believe this is breaking the Theravada tradition (creating disturbance in the Sangha).”

Firstly, i know the words of x rinpoche mean basically nothing to no one in this subreddit, but it does to me, at least to an extent to consider an issue of this magnitude.

Schism is one of the anantarya karmmas, and it makes me wonder, given how unnaccepting HH is of basically every other Theravadin tradition (and definetly of the esoteric laos mountain monks) if there is a Schism between HH and general Theravada.

p.s im writing this not as an attack, but out of concern for my own welfare, as i have had great results with practicing Ajahn Nyanamoli's teachings, and i want to practice further and ordain, but I don't want to join a schismatic group for obvious karmic reasons.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-07 16:05:29

Firstly, it would be a mistake to think that there is any fundamental cohesion even within so-called “Theravāda.” Take any pair of senior Theravāda monks who are renowned teachers, sometimes even within the same overarching tradition, and they probably won't be able to live together for very long without falling out on account of their differing views. All that binds them together, if anything, is their interpretation of (most) Vinaya rules, and a superficial respect for the Suttas that is undermined by having very different interpretations of them.

Secondly, the ānantariya kamma is to create a group that secedes from the Noble Saṅgha, and this already happened very long ago, X amount of decades or centuries after the Buddha's passing.

The Theravāda is most certainly not the Noble Saṅgha. In its original form, which is arguably very different from what we see today, it was only one of over a dozen (all sectarian and schismatic) schools that existed in ancient India, and at least the outer shell of it happened to survive mainly because they became established in Sri Lanka.

Without even getting into what technically is the official Theravāda view and whether it's what the Buddha taught, the simplest reason for it not being the noble Saṅgha is the first point above: modern Theravādins are themselves split among each other, and there is significant strife between traditions and lineages to this day. It's at best swept under the rug to save face, especially with laypeople.

If two groups regard themselves as separate, they cannot both consist of noble ones. That's a corollary of the inherent immutability and uniformity of the Right View.

Also, what one might loosely refer to as "Theravāda meditation" and practice (the interpretations of samatha and vipassanā) is an invention under 200 years old that now everybody takes for granted and colors their reading of the Suttas with without even realizing it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-07 17:26:38 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

This is a common (and convenient) interpretation, but the Buddha said the exact opposite: the fundamental disagreements leading to the harm of many are those about Dhamma—which certainly abound today, no less within Theravāda than other traditions.

A schism in Vinaya can only be a symptom of at least one of the two groups holding on to what is not Dhamma.

Question about seeing the mind

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Accurate_Pineapple89 2025-05-07 02:47:19

Whenever I try to think of the mind, various images will arise. Generally, these images follow a similar pattern of a clear sphere.

These images themselves are not the mind, but they can only arise because the mind is present. Similar to how eye consciousness (vision) is present, but whenever I think about eye consciousness, those are just thoughts, not eye consciousness itself. In essence, eye consciousness is unreachable by thought. These mental images of trying to see the mind come from intentions sustained by craving. If that craving to directly see the mind through mental images is abandoned, then what should be left is the mind - not directly describable, but present.

Is this an accurate way to see the mind, or have I misunderstood?

If all craving is abandoned, then all mental images about anything are abandoned. So what's left is the mind without images (note that when thinking 'the mind without images', this is another image. It's cessation is closer to the accurate experience of the mind than the image itself).

Is this imageless mind nibbana, or at least the mind in the state of nibbana?

Edit:

I may be falling under a wrong view of an eternal mind-consciousness. As I can't help but take 'imageless mind' as a self, due to my thinking being constrained by Avija.

Would it be more accurate to say that whatever intellectual idea I can come up with will be constrained by Avija, and therefore fall under the category of wrong views?

Therefore the only way out of these wrong views is to abandon craving through the noble eightfold path, which will result in the cessation of Avija.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-07 15:42:28

Is this imageless mind nibbana, or at least the mind in the state of nibbana?

No; that's just mystification. Nibbāna is a *dhmma*, i.e., also an image. And that image is in its core purely negative, i.e., an *absence* (of the three defilements) rather than a presence of some special/higher image (including that of an "imageless mind," which cannot itself *not* be an image).

Would it be more accurate to say that whatever intellectual idea I can come up with will be constrained by Avija, and therefore fall under the category of wrong views?

Yes. Nibbāna is when there is no passion. So, you are *factually* much closer to Nibbāna by adopting the precepts and thoroughly abandoning sensuality, and no amount of speculation about what Nibbāna might be will compensate for deficiencies on that level. Just as clapping your hands and making silly noises will not help in the slightest to extinguish a raging fire—especially when you keep fueling it to boot.

Having seen a form with mindfulness muddled, Attending to the pleasing sign,
One experiences it with infatuated mind And remains fixated on it.

“Many feelings flourish within, Originating from the visible form, Covetousness and annoyance as well By which one's mind becomes disturbed. For one who accumulates suffering thus Nibbāna is said to be far away.

...

“When, firmly mindful, one sees a form, One is not inflamed by lust for forms;
One experiences it with dispassionate mind And does not remain holding it tightly.

“One fares mindfully in such a way That even as one sees the form, And while one undergoes a feeling, Suffering is exhausted, not built up. For one dismantling suffering thus, Nibbāna is said to be close by.

—SN 35.95

Advice On My Practice Attitude

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** still_tracks 2025-05-04 09:33:27

I hope it is not inappropriate to share the evolution and problems of my practice over the last ~8 months in order to seek some advice.

From the beginning, HH’s teachings felt very close to the Suttas and, more importantly, addressed aspects of my life that had always been sources of dissatisfaction and dullness in my day-to-day experience. Things like sexuality (especially in its proliferated form in the West), indulging in emotional music or movies, and being addicted to video games never brought real happiness. Then, suddenly, inspired by HH’s teachings, I was able to restrain myself from engaging in precisely these things. I assume I don’t need to elaborate further, as a lot in this sub will likely relate to this experience.

This inspiration and perceived progress also led to romanticized ideas about ordaining or living a restrained life. However, whenever things start to get serious in that direction, I find myself completely overwhelmed.

For example, a few months ago (after having taken up HH practice for about 3 months), I visited Samanadipa with the intention of staying there for a couple of nights. I was hoping for some seclusion and wanted to observe what monastic life looked like, as my inspiration had convinced me that my path would lead me toward it. However, I quickly realized I wasn’t even able to stay longer than a single night. Sitting in a cold room in a foreign country with nothing to do, contemplating that this might someday be my daily life—my inspiration rapidly faded, and I became completely overwhelmed by the idea I have to give up every source of happiness I know (mainly the safety of my home and family). The only way I could calm myself was by resolving to leave the next day. Since then, I have not watched a Samanadipa video because I feel ashamed of my weakness.

Nevertheless, over the past few months, I have been gradually integrating the practice of adhering more closely to the eight precepts. After Bhante Anigha’s comment highlighting the value of confession, I arranged something in that direction with another member of this sub and decided to focus on the seven precepts. Again, my satisfaction with practice and inspiration grew and I thought things were going really well.

However, after declaring the same precepts on the confession server on Monday, my mind started to panic again—similar to my experience at Samanadipa. The first day was relatively calm, but on the second day, things quickly began to unravel. After rereading the seven precepts wiki, I grew increasingly anxious, fearing that I had not signed up with the right attitude. However, contemplating a more earnest approach (that I will now

definitely keep them for the rest of my life unconditionally) led to full-blown anxiety.

In my panic I left a comment for Bhante Anigha, doubling down on my desire not to distract myself for the rest of my life and asking for clarification on some technical aspects of the entertainment precept. However, this only made things worse, as I then began to fear that I had unwittingly made a religious vow. I then re-edited the comment probably 20 times to remove the committing tone from it, in the end I chose to leave it essentially how it was.

It seems that I cannot hold the 7 precepts with an attitude of unconditionality, as this brings way to much fear. I kind of need the mental loophole that I can abandon them at any time or at least bend them to my will (especially the entertainment precept, as I am still struggling with distractions).

I am currently in a state of cognitive dissonance of wanting to cultivate renunciation based on reason and not wanting to cultivate it based on fear and complacency.

All the restraint seem to have failed to bring me closer to adopting a truly earnest attitude toward practice. It appears that it requires an attitude that I find utterly terrifying and impossible to uphold.

I want to be open about my weakness and ask for advice. Based on what I have shared, does anyone recognize any major flaws in my attitude I have not yet stated? Is it simply that, for some people, practice is slow, or am I overlooking something significant?

EDIT: I removed a little bit of the dramatic tone as it isn't useful for anyone.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-06 05:06:17

Ultimately, you must not forget that the real problem lies in the fact that your mind is susceptible to spinning out of control in the first place. The resolution of that fundamental issue is not on the level of a simple shift of attitude. The animal has to actually stop being feral, not just that you learn some way of skillfully navigating around and not triggering its ferality.

That said, it sounds like you might be trying to add in too much too quickly for your particular animal, so it's resisting a bit too aggressively. So my advice would be to stop trying to look for more things to renounce and to stabilize yourself within your current standard of conduct (which should be challenging but not totally overwhelming) until there is no longer a strong pressure to go back to old habits. Take it in smaller—but equally uncompromising—steps.

Am I understanding correctly the purpose of developing perceptions?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** serculis 2025-05-03 17:02:52

I shall only attempt this with the perception of ‘emptiness’.

From the very little I understand, the buddha is using skillful conventional words to help already well-established monks developed in virtue/restraint progress along the path and develop experiential insight regarding the ultimate nature of things.

So of course, the most difficult assumption to undo is that of being the owner of this body. I believe I’m an agent occupying the body, a subject “behind” or “beyond” experience and using this body to get what I want. The body appears as a sense object within experience so you just assume yourself to be the owner of it. There is virtually no awareness of the body being a foundational process that gives rise to this standing sack of flesh in the world. There’s just the assumption of “the body, the world, and me”.

But for a monk who has been sense-restrained and properly established in virtue, I would imagine that if one were to start perceiving/imagining this walking bag of skin as being “empty” of a self, as in, it’s there, but it’s empty of an actual owner, then that would help monks see the body peripherally as the container or underlying process that gives rise to this sight, sound, smell, taste, touch and thought of this perceived bag of skin. So this body being “empty” of a self means that yes, there *is* seeing, there *is* hearing, there *is* smelling, there *is* tasting... etc. but *nobody* is seeing, hearing, smelling and so on. This seems to be much better language to accurately point to there being the image of the body, but the image of the body *belonging* to that body. Or in other words, you stop saying “the self doesn’t exist” but rather recognise the feeling of being a self as *belonging* to that body, and that anything that is designated as self (literally anything in experience) is actually not-self.

So when this bag of skin is fully understood to be empty of a self, there’s simply the experience of this body standing in the world on its own terms, heart beating, lungs breathing, “you” completely out of the picture now. These invisible sense faculties are finally seen as being the necessary counterpart for any sense objects occurring within experience.

Lastly, if this bag of skin is seen as empty of a self, whatever arises is whatever it ineffably is. “chair”, “table”, “people”, “world” are understood as constructs by the mind, not the factual state of sense objects labelled by “you”, and designations fade away over time through dispassion and non-identification. The concept of “emptiness” is a perception itself that leads to its own cessation when seen correctly. A final conventional label that points to the ultimate reality.

Sorry if this is an unstructured ramble, but am I on the right track here? Is this why the buddha specifically used the word emptiness and instructed monks to develop the perception of emptiness?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-06 04:18:30

This seems to be much better language to accurately point to there being the image of the body, but the image of the body belonging to that body. Or in other words, you stop saying “the self doesn’t exist” but rather recognise the

feeling of being a self as belonging to that body, and that anything that is designated as self (literally anything in experience) is actually not-self.

Yes, that sounds right. Stating that “there is no self” makes no difference; there *is* self for as long as the right order (the body coming first) is not recognized. When it is, even that which you may call “me” will not be tainted by assumptions of ownership anymore, as the necessary basis for such assumptions is gone (rather than trying to tackle them individually).

Lastly, if this bag of skin is seen as empty of a self, whatever arises is whatever it ineffably is. “chair”, “table”, “people”, “world” are understood as constructs by the mind, not the factual state of sense objects labelled by “you”, and designations fade away over time through dispassion and non-identification. The concept of “emptiness” is a perception itself that leads to its own cessation when seen correctly. A final conventional label that points to the ultimate reality.

This part I would disagree with. “Chair, table, people” are not any more “constructs” than whatever you may regard as “the mind” that supposedly makes them. And that’s when the perception of “emptiness” is developed: when there is nothing whatsoever, no matter how lofty or rarefied, that you even tacitly regard as greater or more significant than everything else (in this case, “the mind” that constructs the world). It’s the absence of any refuge, which is the true safety.

Denying the reality of some things in favor of a more “ultimate” reality (which inevitably raises the question of why you didn’t question *that*—ad infinitum) is the opposite of emptiness. It’s conceiving substance, and tacitly leaving room for passion towards *something*.

Making such contrasts between the “conventional” and the “ultimate” only serves to maintain *attavāda* under the pretext of removing it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-08 02:19:52 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

and none of the words themselves are more significantly more real than the other?

Of course, but more importantly, the *phenomena themselves* that the word “ultimate” may be pointing to are not more significant or real than all the others. The absence of regarding anything as “ultimate,” including itself, is what Nibbāna, i.e., the extinguishment of passion, is.

the role of designations and how they “point beyond themselves”

The Dhamma (or even just phenomenology) lies in the opposite direction. A thing can only exist to the extent that it is designated, and seeing this is what brings dispassion and eradicates conceit. If that isn’t seen, there will inevitably be an underlying hope for some

refuge external to “all this,” and there isn’t. As the Suttas say, no matter where one goes, one will only be revolving around the five aggregates one way or another.

But for the mind not trained in *yoniso manasikāra*, things that are endowed with some sort of special or more elusive designation or significance can be ignorantly taken as “beyond designation” (or even “beyond the five aggregates”), and that “swelling up” is, ironically, the very reason they suffer. So no matter how closely in contact they come with that which is “ultimate” or “beyond designation,” *that very assumption* is the root of the problem, so they will never be free.

or any passion to still be present in regards to a view, even if that view is correct, there has to be ‘me’ and has to be that thing, which subtly maintains the *attavāda*

Yes, but that would be more on the level of the subtler conceit (*asmimāna*) than *attavāda*. *attavāda* is when the view itself is irreparably wrong (i.e., inherently incompatible with dispassion) on top of one being passionate about it, which would be the case here.

Anonymity, privacy and taking things personally

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** like_a_raft 2025-05-03 14:33:18

Over the past two weeks, I have been considering some options related to my Reddit profile and presence in this community. Bhante Anīgha’s recent post about the confession server heightened the relevance of the topic.

The initial question was: why don’t I create a new account with my name, surname, and picture of me?

The obvious reply to that is: “because privacy”. Nowadays, it’s a given that one must protect his privacy; it’s something that every reasonable person should do.

But upon pondering on why it is so, I couldn’t come up with a satisfying answer. It’s not difficult to conceive scenarios in which ill-intentioned people could use the data to threaten or attack me. Or other scenarios where a neutral or friendly person could form an undesirable or biased impression of me, looking at my profile(s).

Both scenarios, though, seem to me to share two characteristics: 1) they are very unlikely to happen, and 2) the potential outcome is not *that* disastrous.

Risk assessment is a notoriously complex domain, ask any insurance company. What probability corresponds to “very unlikely”? What outcome is “not that disastrous”? Calculations are tentative at best, and the emotional stakes are high considering how averse to loss a human being is by nature. More specifically, I would say, how acutely averse we are to the unknown upper bound of the worst possible scenario.

On the other side of the scales, what is the full cost of anonymity? At first sight, it seems so low, basically zero. Hence, it’s easy to quickly dismiss the topic. But is the almost automatic choice of anonymity as inconsequential as it seems? Which opportunities are precluded or stifled by it?

Maybe I’m naïve or poorly informed, and the risks are serious, tangible and only bound to

increase as time passes. Maybe there is a good reason why being cautious and distrustful when it comes to protecting your privacy is recommended and advocated by basically 100% of the internet population. I can't recall a single statement from anyone going against the grain in this sense.

But this in itself means nothing in terms of Dhamma or practice. On the contrary, the fact that there is such a homogeneous "grain" of things suggests the hypothesis that this might be about the universal human desire for safety and comfort and aversion toward anything that could threaten that. If the situation is as such, it *could* be valuable to go against it, even if just in part.

I want to shape a view on the matter (and on every matter) that is based on Dhamma principles and not on the impressions and judgements of society.

At the same time, it's crucial to keep in mind that something being against the grain doesn't automatically make it aligned with the Dhamma. The whole domain of self-mortification is the best example. Drawing general rules that apply to a generic individual or group of individuals is possible only with the precepts.

So, what would be the reasoning behind considering such a course of action? It should be quite intuitive in broad terms, but I would add some explicit thoughts on the matter.

The more matters are taken {personally}, the more discomfort and unease come to the surface rather than being covered up.

{It's interesting how the expression "taking matters personally" can lend itself to two interpretations that are oriented in polar opposite directions. Egocentric narratives vs phenomenological attitude}

Wherever there is the desire to hide something, there is at some level the view that that something is valuable and that has to be protected. Now, there are things that are indeed valuable and need to be protected, at least at some level. Things connected with preserving this human life, chiefly the four requisites and a minimum necessary network of trusted people. Is privacy at this level of preciousness? Currently, I don't see that.

Every piece of clothing used to cover the existential nakedness is, fundamentally, non-essential and hindering.

Every piece of armour and every shield, physical and metaphorical, asserts the existence of vulnerability to the external world. At the same time, it is picked up and worn to banish the unpleasant recognition of that very vulnerability.

Safety is pleasant to the extent that it allows one to drop concern over the threat. But once the threat is seemingly forgotten, safety becomes the new baseline, and from that baseline, new threats are even more likely to be identified than before.

A first and simple counterpoint that came up in reaction to these reflections is: don't I have bigger fish to fry at the moment? Is this a priority?

A second counterpoint could be: what if the level of discomfort and attrition that arises when facing non-anonymity simply leads to abstaining from interacting? I could make myself more accessible to the public eye, yet standing on the corner of the room or trying to camouflage myself in the crowd.

Further adding to the hazy and uneasy nature of the matter are the considerations coming from the fact that I have two children, still little. Using common sense, I am free to do as I please with my privacy, but I should be respectful of the privacy of others. Even more so when the subjects involved can't be adequately informed about it, nor can they form educated opinions. One could say that there's no need to talk explicitly about them, to expose them. But details about my life are or could be, in some cases and some ways, details about their life. And here we go back to the unpredictability of the vast plane that is The Internet and the extremely diverse features and goals of its inhabitants.

As briefly mentioned at the beginning, the subject saw a further spike of interest on my side with the recent initiative from Bhante Anīgha related to the confession server. I feel reverent and in admiration toward an offer that is both generous and brilliant in its concept. In the thread, Bhante explicitly touches the topic of accounts and identity, and it made immediate sense to me. How can a confession be authentic if the confessor is willing to render opaque his identity even when it's tied to a nickname? The bigger the chasm between the individual doing the infraction and the individual reporting the infraction, the more fertile ground for bad faith and inauthenticity to breed.

This topic was, in its specific technological aspects, obviously absent during Buddha's time. It's interesting to me how in the Suttas names or surnames, and ties with the family, are used without concerns. On the contrary, it seems to be considered relevant to identify the exact person. I don't recall many instances of an episode concerning a generic monk or householder. The Internet doesn't forget, and neither does Ananda :)

One last thought: Ananda himself said that relying on craving, one should give up craving and that relying on conceit, one should give up conceit. Perhaps, in a sense, relying on identification, one should give up identification?

If such-and-such man, from such-and-such clan, is acting out of greed, aversion and delusion, and that individual is not me, then it's not on me to reflect on the fruits of the action and to rectify the conduct.

Conversely, if the burden is taken up, and it's considered as "assigned" to me, specifically and unequivocally me, then I can work with that burden and try to understand it. Once the work is done, the burden can then be put down, and the name becomes just a convention, empty of identification.

I might be pushing it with this last reflection, there might be wrong views creeping in, so I'll stay open to amendment.

Moving at last to the practical considerations, I have considered the following options for a possible new account and new nickname, in increasing order of anonymity:

- 1) My full name; 2) "Householder (or other epithet to identify someone that is not a monastic yet is a practitioner) (or)" 3) a combination of Pali word and my name
- 4) "householder" followed by a significant Pali word (with similar considerations to point 2)

By seeing these options spelled out, a question arises: is the subject worth this level of

analysis? Imagining choosing each of these options, I feel a different sense of involvement with “things”. “Things” being the risks discussed above, but also the impression that I can give to others, how their behaviour could be affected, the positive example (??) that I can give to others, a heightened sense of shame, and its impact on the fear of wrongdoing. These reactions seem to point to something worth taking a decision about, even if tentative or temporary.

I’ve already found it quite useful to write my thoughts with the concrete idea of sharing them in the community. In a meta sense, this post is already an exercise in scraping off some of the protective layer against the scrutiny of others.

Perspectives and counterpoints are welcome. I’m particularly interested in the views of the monastics, also for their experience of receiving a second given name and dealing with two identities, so to speak. Thank you _

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 10:51:22

In and of itself, a wish for anonymity would be at best a secondary symptom of the more fundamental unresolved defilements and mistaken assumptions of ownership. And like any other symptom—such as a strong aversion to physical nakedness or an inability to bear acute physical discomfort—singling it out as something to deal with is likely to distract one from the actual illness. The tendency to single out such symptoms as worth dealing with is itself born out of the illness (lack of clarity about “the right level” where craving manifests).

Whenever you decide to focus on something of that nature, you immediately beg the question of why you would not choose to go “against the grain” in regard to a whole host of other things. The decision could only ever be arbitrary. And that’s exactly how you end up going down the rabbit whole of self-mortification.

Granted, anonymity can be used for nefarious purposes such as intentional deception, but that’s a feature with almost anything, including physical clothing.

With confessions it’s of course different. But even then it’s not that the anonymity is itself unwholesome, but that it will render the confession ineffective due to the ability to create endless new accounts. I settled upon using Reddit usernames instead under the impression that the real name of someone who you are very unlikely to ever meet in real life means very little, as it usually adds no context whatsoever to who the person is and no inherent accountability. But knowing someone’s Reddit username in this community does add some context. It *would* induce a sense of shame and a reconsideration of what progress and development actually are if a user, regardless of their real name, had built up a good reputation through their posts here, but then everyone finds out that they can’t even keep the precepts unbroken.

Danger in sensuality

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Fickle_Singer_9877 2025-05-03 05:09:59

How can I start seeing the dangers in sensuality? I want to rennunciate but sometimes I don't know why I'm doing it or moreso the full benefit of giving up sensual pleasures.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-03 15:59:15

The danger can only really be seen on the basis of practicing renunciation first. Anything you might understand before that is necessarily just a theoretical idea and will not hold up when significant pressure arises. That's why a degree of faith is necessary, and that faith is made possible by feeling sufficiently dissatisfied with your current situation.

You won't know for yourself in the beginning that the doctor's diagnosis is correct and that your illness is that serious, but because you are sufficiently fed up with the painful symptoms and the doctor's prescriptions make a lot of sense, you start diligently applying his advice

Eventually, you see for yourself that, indeed, you do have that illness, it is *that* bad, and it is being caused by precisely what he says it is. And then you will not have to theoreize about what the benefit of not fostering the cause of the illness is. You would have the same apprehension as you would for drinking poison.

Mindstream kleshas question

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Little_Carrot6967 2025-05-02 09:36:00

Can the defilements of the mindstream be distinguished in any way from the defilements of the mind? Or observed as part of the internal relationship?

If not, is there any conceptualization of what does come from it available that can be reliably pointed to as an example?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-03 15:07:01 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Thinking in terms of a "mindstream"—a wrong view that arose with later non-canonical texts and contradicts basic principles of phenomenology—will destroy any chances of seeing that relationship.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-04 04:06:11 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

That's interesting because Ajahn Nyanamoli Thero has used that term as a reference for instruction in at least one of his videos. Are you saying he has

wrong view?

I don't recall that. Still, he certainly wouldn't have used it with the usual connotations.

The problem with the idea of a "mindstream" is the underlying assumption that you can observe mental phenomena objectively. That automatically leads to a form of self-view, since that which observes "the mindstream" is overlooked and left out and thereby implicitly assumed to be outside of the five aggregates. And that will happen whenever there is any sort of "object-ification" of mental phenomena, regardless of how one labels it.

then there should be some kind of klesha interaction going on that affects the self to animal relationship.

The sustenance for defilements is that one does not sufficiently understand the animal, the danger in going along with some of its wishes, and the extent of one's responsibility in regard to those wishes. The latter meaning that one either goes along with its desires or impatiently tries to destroy them, and both of those perpetuate the animal's wildness. Having to deal with a wild animal in turn muddles the waters for oneself even more.

So the "interaction" is not an objective thing that you can observe and analyze quasi-scientifically but is something that involves every nook and cranny of your being and intentions. It cannot be "paused" and analyzed from the outside.

(Also, just to be clear, "self" in the sense of *sakkāya*, is also a result of the animal not only being untamed but also not understood. Self—an *assumption* based on craving—is not the same as agency, however).

HH Confession Server on Discord

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-04-28 11:04:10

(Invite link updated on 15/05/2025)

I've created a Discord server for people who want to commit to the very valuable practice of confessing whenever they break a precept. It is inspired by the core principles of the regular, compulsory confession that the Buddha established for all monastics.

Upon joining, please read the rules.

In brief, the way it works is that each new member must declare their precepts in the "precept-undertaking" channel. It is possible to undertake either the standard five precepts or five or more of the standard ten precepts (meaning that, at minimum, the third precept becomes full celibacy).^{*} Something within the second option is highly encouraged but is not compulsory. Only members who have undertaken precepts themselves and are thereby obliged to confess their offenses will be able to see the confession channels. They will be hidden for everybody else.

Every Sunday, users who have undertaken precepts must confirm that they have kept them all in the "purity-confirmation" channel. Otherwise, they must confess their trans-

gressions in the “confession” channel. If by Sunday midnight in their time zone a user has not done one of these two, they will lose access to both of the special channels, and they will have to undertake their precepts once more in the “precept-declaration” channel to regain access, like someone who newly joined the server. This is to ensure consistency.

To create some degree of identifiability, every member must also provide their Reddit username, thereby agreeing to use no other accounts to engage on this subreddit. Doing so with other accounts would be considered a violation of the fourth precept. A completely anonymous confession carries no weight.

The central rule that cannot be externally enforced and must rely on each user’s authenticity and conscience is that undertaking a precept binds one to confess any and all transgressions of it, without exception. Even if one confesses some transgressions while omitting others, it is still a deliberate lie.

- Monastics who wish to join should instead write “I am a X” (bhikkhu, bhikkhunī, etc.) in the “precept-undertaking” channel to be assigned to separate channels.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-28 15:14:07 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I follow a weekly Uposatha where I undertake full 8 precepts. Can I include this into the setup somehow.

I’ll make a channel for Uposatha confessions.

Is it better for me to declare full celibacy, and confess the times I transgress; or is it better to state ‘sexual misconduct’ and ‘over-achieve’ on the precept

Certainly the latter. One is not actually keeping a precept if there is any intention to break it at any point, no matter how rarely.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-28 16:16:56 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Should breaches on the mental level also be confessed? It is difficult for me to discern intentionality at the mental level, and occasionally I find myself already in thoughts about breaking a precept. Does this already count as a breach, or does it only become one if I choose to dwell further on these thoughts?

No. Yes, mental misconduct most certainly must be avoided, but confession of it cannot be made compulsory because, as you said, one starts out not seeing mental intentions clearly. There will come a point where one can accurately and reliably recognize certain lines of thinking as wrong, but when that time comes will depend on the person (assuming their bodily and verbal behavior is on point; otherwise it will never come).

If we break a precept, should we write it down to ensure we don't forget it by Sunday?

Sure, anything that helps one not to forget.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 04:59:04 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

What are we talking about here? Something like a Japanese Tatami mat? A blanket on the floor?

There is no official definition of allowable bedding, and it's not a given that every modern mattress violates the precept.

As seen from stories in the Vinaya, the precept is about the ornateness and extravagance of furnishings. But yes, on another level of training, you shouldn't use overly comfortable bedding that, for you, is inducing obvious delight and wallowing in the pleasure of sleeping.

If you see that you presently sleep excessively and there is that indulgent mental attitude behind it, then using a thinner mattress (or none at all) will address that.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:15:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I see people in the discord taking up the precept not to lie, but no mention of idle chatter (which is hard as a lay person).

Not sure what you mean. Idle chatter and lying are two completely separate things, and an Arahant is only incapable of one of them (though of course one can do both).

Also, I would not steal some physical good from anyone ever, but I occasionally download series online. If that counts as stealing, then I guess I couldn't take up that precept either.

That's not stealing. The concern would be with entertainment.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:30:38 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

What if sexuality has truly **lost any appeal to you and you really just rarely maintain it on rare occasions** out of the feeling of duty to your partner and fear of deteriorating the relationship?

That's a contradiction in terms. You can't engage in a sexual act unless the body is aroused, and the body can't get aroused unless the mind is delighting in the purely sensual aspect. An abstract feeling of duty towards your partner would be unable to prime the body for the act.

Any sexual activity whatsoever, regardless of intention, requires the perversion of perception of seeing the ugly as beautiful and is inevitably perpetuating it. That is why it cannot coexist with right understanding.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:39:10 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Are there any error messages?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 05:57:49 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

What's your username?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 06:17:37 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

That's why then. You need to create a Discord account first.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 06:40:00 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Breaking the law is not necessarily the same as breaking virtue.

Now, if you were to, let's say, go and break into a server where files are stored and then download them, that *would* be stealing.

Downloading a pirated torrent or similar is like accepting a free giveaway of a clay pot made from a stolen design—the creator's unique clay pot design that they never wanted anyone else to distribute. If anyone is at fault it's the one who copied the design, and even for them it may not reach the level of stealing (though it would very likely be unwholesome in some other way).

So in this case, it's much more important to ask yourself *why* you're downloading something—whether you paid for it or not.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 06:55:31 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

There is absolutely no arousal needed for women to engage in sexual activity.

Sure, not to the full-blown level, but consenting to the act regardless of one's sex automatically implies some level of arousal/passion, and ignorance and the perversion of perception are necessarily there.

Bhante, there are many variations of pills, etc on the market which act on a pure physical level enhancing and impacting on the male sex organs and which regardless of the desire and arousal of the mind enable the man to perform the task even if they are inwardly disgusted and do not desire it at all.

Of course, nobody can stop the effect of such pills, and erections can happen for various reasons unrelated to lust as even the Vinaya describes. Still, the choice to engage in/consent to sexual activity always implies lust on some level.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 11:42:30 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

That would hold for all those people who are forced, coerced and manipulated into it ,or who do it solely for the material benefit of it.

In the first two cases, they might not be consenting to it (e.g., rape). In the last two, they definitely are, and there is a wrong perception associated with that to an extent.

There is a reason why a monastic is permanently expelled—the harshest punishment—the moment they consent to a sexual act with no regard whatsoever for the motivation behind it. The origin of that rule was not even a monk who desired intercourse for its own sake. He did it because his parents coerced him into it, as he was an only son, and if he didn't have children, the lineage would be lost.

i just can't see that engaging in sexual acts for those people is rooted in the intentions to satisfy their sexual cravings.

I didn't put it that way on purpose. What I wrote is that wrong perception and ignorance are necessarily involved, and that is why there are no excuses for it for one who is earnestly striving for liberation. One can only step into a charcoal pit by not seeing nor making any effort to see it as such. That doesn't mean actively holding a coarse view that the charcoal pit is a nice swimming pool—not truly seeing it as a charcoal pit on the right level is enough to remotely consider jumping into it *for whatever reason*.

Of course, you can always second-guess the Buddha's words or cherry-pick the ones you trust, but needless to say, it's wise to be extremely wary of that when the context behind it is clearly to justify maintaining things that you emotionally don't want to give up.

That very impulse towards justifying it through whichever means that inevitably arises is an example of how the act, and any relationships that rely on it, itself obstructs one's perspective.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 11:48:00 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, all of these would constitute “misconduct in regard to sensual pleasures,” i.e., excessive scratching of the itch to the point that the skin is ripped. Even by mundane standards

of morality, the average person is ashamed of saying that they do these things (and of promiscuity in general).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 16:03:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I don't doubt that there must inevitably be perverted perception involved in whoever engages in the sexual act.

My point is that that perverted perception is nothing but kāmarāga. They're not two separate things. And that is why there is no mitigating factor in the Vinaya for someone who engages in intercourse of any kind.

All the others can even if their intentions behind it might not be related to kama raga.

Just to be clear, this explicitly contradicts what the Buddha said.

I only don't see sexual arousal being there necessarily as a motive and intention behind it.

You are free to hold that opinion, but if you ever feel like reconsidering it, my two cents is that your criterion for what constitutes "sexual arousal" is set way too high, expecting overly coarse manifestations of it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-29 16:25:53 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I see what you mean now. Well, that is not the standard formulation of the five precepts in the Suttas, and it's for a reason. It doesn't mean all that much if a person who is not celibate abstains from idle chatter. It's kind of like a smoker worrying about wearing a mask in urban areas to protect his lungs.

Still, it's not like you have to rudely cut people off whenever they start gossiping. As long as you make sure that *you* don't add any extra momentum to the conversation and are aiming to let it die out, you're not gossiping yourself.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-30 20:43:03 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

And I think there is a place in the suttas? where it talks about how a brahmin 'toes the line' if he has intercourse for procreation, but he 'steps over the line' if he does it for pleasure.

This may not be it, but in AN 5.191, the Buddha pretty much says that Brahmins of the time had become worse than dogs because they would now have intercourse with their wives outside their fertile period.

This is clearly not a Buddhist invention, since the Apastamba Dharmasūtra (a Sanskrit text dated to 600 BCE - 300 BCE; during or even after the Buddha's lifetime) is even more specific:

A man who ejaculates his semen in any place other than the vagina becomes equal to a thief, equal to a murderer of a Brahmin.

The same text goes on to say that such a man must undergo rituals of penance to purify himself, involving celibacy for up to a year. A similar view was present in early Christianity. The ideal was complete celibacy, and marriage with intercourse only for procreation was a compromise. Sex for pleasure was seen as a sin.

Obviously, these people were ultimately coming from a place of wrong view—with all the arbitrary ritual nonsense and the utterly misguided hope that some external force will save them—but it highlights how stricter the standards of conduct for qualifying as an average “upright” person were, which explains why stream entry was within reach for many householders (assuming it was indeed all that common; ultimately there's always “survivor bias,” i.e., you don't hear about all those who *didn't* make it).

The view that “there is no harm in sensual pleasures,” held and acted out today more than ever before—likely more in the West than the East but overall still a lot more—is vastly more obstructive and antithetical to the Dhamma than believing in God or believing in a self (both of which fewer people do today than ever before).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 03:03:40 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

But even from a work standpoint—if I'm expected to be working during that time—doesn't this border on being deceptive?

If there is an intention to hide what you're really doing, it's already a form of deception and involves an unwholesome mental state, whether or not you verbally lie. To be asked and then lie would be a step further.

But it's not that the only admissible option is to become a perfect drone who does nothing but work. What matters is that you keep an eye on your intention. Whenever an intention to conceal arises, don't give in to it; instead, choose between doing what is expected of you or accepting that you might get caught.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 03:44:50 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Can I rightly claim having undertaken the precept (I have already done that in the Discord server) by being open to such theoretical circumstances?

Yes. Such instances would not count as entertainment. It's only when the entertaining content is the focus of your intention, regardless of what the reason for that intention is.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 04:00:29 (in reply to a comment not included)

It sounds like it wouldn't be an issue. But if you were to start enjoying the show and looking forward to it, it definitely would be (since that's when it would absolutely start to produce unwholesome states).

It would nevertheless be good to confess it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-02 04:04:57 (in reply to a comment not included)

So while there may not be that true typical sex-based desire, wanting not to hurt other people or to cause divorce or drift in the family is still based on passion ...and fear.

Yes, that would count as passion too, but consenting to a sexual act because of it is a further step—one that will hinder you far more from ever overcoming passion than anything else not covered by the five precepts.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 09:34:56 (in reply to a comment not included)

Just to clarify, I do not intend to be incelibate with any degree of planning or periodicity. It is just that I feel that I am not as iron-clad about it, and hence am not certain that I will never ever breach it.

Right, but it doesn't need to go as far as "planning." It's enough to not be iron-clad about it. I'm pretty sure many people don't plan these things in advance; it's often a sudden decision when the pressure gets too strong or an unforeseen opportunity arises.

With the other precepts (alcohol for instance), I feel that certainty, of my non-compromise in regard to that commitment (barring I imagine, a virtual 'gun to head' scenario). With celibacy, I don't feel the same level of confidence.

How it "feels" is a separate matter, and in such cases you might feel confident because there isn't any acute pressure to do those specific things, which isn't by itself an achievement.

Perhaps there is a concealed failure avoidance motive there; that I don't want to be in a situation where I have to confess it. So rather than use the confession as a 'challenge' to strengthen myself, I might be opting to punch below my weight, with an easier opponent so to speak.

There might be. But the whole point of the precepts is to tie down the wild elephant to a strong post precisely so that it can't run away when it wants to. It's not just for when it wants to sit by the post anyway.

Since I do want to push myself, and set the bar higher than what I know I am already capable of; I had the question if I should post full celibacy as my precept.

If by doing so you are setting the intention to say no to any and all future prospects of sexual activity that may come up, then of course. But it sounded like you already knew it wouldn't be that way.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 09:41:43 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Would it be breaking the precept to not lie if one were to “play” into the social situation and give the “expected” response like “it’s good” even though it doesn’t necessarily taste or look good?

You would just need to ask yourself honestly what your intention is. You always know at the back of your mind what you’re trying to convey to the person. If it’s clear to you that all you’re giving is that superficial reassurance and that there is no intention to hide the full story if they were to prompt you further, then you’re not intending to deceive them.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-05 12:43:11 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Bhante, in this case, making up funny stories to my daughters doesn’t really count as lying

It does, because you’re making a statement that is not factual in its content even if you know that the listener will not take it seriously. Hence one should not lie even as a joke..

When someone vaguely asks if you think something is “okay” or “good” and you say “Yes,” even though you have some grievances about it, you are not stating an untruth. You are not stating that you *love* that thing when you don’t—which *would* be a lie even if the intention is just to emotionally reassure them. You are conveying the message that whatever grievances you may have (and even the person will know there are some, as nothing in the world can be 100% flawless) are minor and not worth getting into. And that’s what the person is most of the time asking as well, unless they start pressing you for a more elaborate answer.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-06 02:28:53 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

With sarcasm, the meaning you are conveying is intentionally the opposite of the specific words you say. You are deliberately conveying the message “this is not so” by saying “this is so” in a specific way/tone. So there is no intentional deception involved (whether others misinterpret you or not is secondary).

But when you make up a false story to entertain others, you yourself have to intentionally muddle the context of “this is not so,” at least until you get the desired reaction. The story wouldn’t be amusing otherwise.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-09 09:57:46 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Taking on such precepts is very likely to perpetuate a person’s misunderstandings of what those defilements are (which will be there if they’re not sotāpannas).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-11 06:07:59 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I later realized that this is the sort of thinking that could eventually lead one to put a net over one’s mouth like a Jain, and lead one towards looking past one’s actual intentions- (‘ayoniso manasikara’) and fuel more craving- so I endured these pressuring thoughts and let them pass by, and reassured myself that I hadn’t actually done anything wrong.

Exactly. The offense is to deliberately kill a living being.

What can happen though is that one does something without the express intention of killing, but out of over-investment in the desired outcome of the task, one intentionally ignores signs that one is unintentionally killing and proceeds anyway. But that is then not an offense of intentional killing. It’s mental pressure that one should not be giving in to and allowing to overtake one’s perspective.

For some context, see Udāna 6.9 where the Buddha was watching moths falling into oil lamps and dying without immediately jumping to save them.

Therefore, as always, “the line” is in the intention, and not much can be said in the way of fixed external guidelines.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-23 14:54:15 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

No; the link somehow expired even though I had set it not to. The current link is still working as of now.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-24 08:53:08 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Taking it on would still be more beneficial than allowing board games *and* other forms of entertainment as well. If you continue doing so, just don’t cover up the fact that you’re

playing board games out of weakness, not because it's not ultimately a hindrance. Regard it as a transgression still.

Questions about Lying, Confessing, and Fixing Mistakes

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** hopefulls00n 2025-04-28 04:14:59

Several years ago I told an awful lie about someone to some other people. Some of the people I lied to know the person I lied about, others that I lied to have never met the person and are no longer in my life. Years ago, I told some people that what I said wasn't true, but I lied again by suggesting that my lie was a result of me misinterpreting events rather than that I just told this awful lie in full awareness. I now plan to tell the full truth to the group of people that I still talk to and that know the person I lied about. The questions in this post are mainly about what to do about the other group of people- random people from my past that I don't talk to anymore and that either never met the person I lied about or met them only a few times many years ago.

I want to emphasize that the main thing I'm trying to leave behind here is not the behavior of saying awful, false things about people (this has been abandoned for years) but the internal (and external) coverup of my full responsibility for these actions (which could eventually lead to me lying again in future lifetimes).

I'm wondering if I should just endure the guilt and shame I feel over this without trying to rectify the situation, or if I should try to rectify the situation (by telling the truth to everyone I lied to) and endure the guilt and shame of that. I feel internally prepared to do either thing, I just don't know what would be best for my practice/most in line with what the Buddha taught. I don't know if I'm seeing this situation clearly and I don't want to be "missing the mark" with my efforts/emphasizing the wrong things by trying to tell everyone.

Could it be said that even if I think I'm totally prepared and open to telling everyone the truth, until/unless I actually do it, there's no way to know if the full weight of this action has been completely uncovered internally?

Is there some added benefit for my virtue (in the sense of reduced risk of doing this again) in coming clean to everyone I lied to vs just confessing the specifics of this situation to someone with whom I would feel a sense of shame?

Even though I haven't told these awful lies in a long time, would it be correct to consider them to still be "active" or current because I have never cleared them up? I'm trying to understand how to see my current virtue in light of this situation.

Is this situation better viewed as two separate issues - Confession/Dhamma practice and trying to do what I can to fix a mistake? Is doing something to "right a wrong" automatically in line with the Dhamma, or does it depend what this effort is motivated by? It seems like there are some cases where something may be motivated by pressure but is still the right thing to do.

One of my friends suggested that perhaps confessing these lies to the people I currently know/have some reputation with (the other female practitioners I talk to) might be more beneficial than trying to find/come clean to all the people I lied to that I don't even talk to anymore. Would this be true, or would this be something I should just add on to my efforts to clear things up with the people I lied to?

Is confession necessary for actions you did years ago or before you were even practicing the Dhamma? Does it depend on whether you're still doing those things (or slighter faults along the same lines) or not?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-28 18:07:29

Is confession necessary for actions you did years ago or before you were even practicing the Dhamma?

No. Confession is not for cleansing oneself of all accumulated evil, let alone rectify it externally, but for making sure that *now* that you've taken on the training, you won't be able to cover up or downplay your own deviations from it (which would make it quite likely that they will repeat themselves).

With lying specifically, it's not even necessary to inform the specific people you lied to, though that's certainly better than totally keeping the lie to yourself. On top of that, since this happened before you started practicing, at least as far as the training is concerned, it's not necessary to confess it to anyone at all. If there are worldly motivations to inform the people you lied to—e.g., you have to discuss the topic you lied about anew for some practical reason, or the lie is still having an effect to this day—then by all means.

But don't do it out of a hope that it will somehow resolve any mental pressure that you might be experiencing. That's impossible, and acting out of that hope would be the unwholesome kind of caving in to pressure that will only perpetuate itself (and wrong views about what the escape from suffering is as well).

Pressure/suffering can only be truly resolved through right understanding (which requires a firm basis of restraint), not through further actions.

Either way, you should certainly be mentally prepared that if the topic ever comes up on its own, you won't go along with people's wrong impression of the facts that you deliberately created however long ago. If you do go along even tacitly, then you know that you have still not accepted the weight and blameworthiness of the action, and this tacit affirmation of the old lie would be a new lie that you *would* have to confess.

Subject Object

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Future_Plastic_9910 2025-04-24 18:17:01

Is the distinction between subject and object or subjective and objective something that has an analog in the suttas or early Buddhist Sangha? It seems to be based on attavada but

I'm not sure. Some people, like Ippen (time school of Pure Land) say that enlightenment is about overcoming the subject object distinction. That doesn't sound like it has anything to do with the early texts. I don't think that the subject object distinction has anything to do with Yoniso mansasikara either. In fact the idea of simultaneous co dependence seems to be the opposite. The background is not a subject but its not an object to that you look at, while the foreground is not an object exactly. It isn't seen by a subject.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 06:36:46

Is the distinction between subject and object or subjective and objective something that has an analog in the suttas or early Buddhist Sangha?

In a way yes, but not how one would initially think. You never actually “dissolve” the subject in the sense of becoming unaware of the gap between you and other people. That's impossible, and it can only ever be make-believe.

Rather, you fully understand that that which appears as subject—which doesn't need to be denied or changed—is a phenomenon too. It is not a non-phenomenon that experiences phenomena and makes choices in regard to them, which is how the puthujjhana implicitly regards their sense of self.

When the subject is seen as a phenomenon instead of denied, its impermanence is revealed, and from that it becomes clear that that phenomenon cannot be owned, i.e., is anattā. Then, whether you still choose to call that phenomenon “subject” or not is a matter of semantics. Like how the Buddha often used the word “I” and “mine,” yet at the same time often spoke of giving up “I-making” and “mine-making.” Fundamentally, the problem is the implication of ownership and control.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-26 08:51:35 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

In this case, how is it possible to see impermanence of something which exists for so long?

Seeing impermanence doesn't mean seeing the moment things come to an end. Otherwise you wouldn't be able to fully understand the impermanence of life and become an Arahant without first dying.

It means seeing that they are *able* to come to an end.

How does meditation fit into the path?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** None 2025-04-24 13:16:47

[deleted]

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-24 16:26:38

So, how is it defined by HH and how is it used with the other parts of the path to attain awakening?

We define “meditation” as the purification of the mind from unbeneficial states—the five hindrances, fundamentally—and that is how it is defined in the Suttas as well.

The connection with virtue is that through simply keeping the precepts, the coarsest manifestations of the hindrances are already gone. Only when one’s actions in the world are free from coarse hindrances—by keeping the seven precepts at least—is it possible to purify oneself from them on the internal level. The connection with wisdom is that the five hindrances are what obstruct discernment, so discernment will naturally arise to the extent that one’s mind is free from unbeneficial states.

The crucial difference with other approaches is in how the five hindrances are interpreted. For most, it means momentary thoughts that one can brush away simply by shifting attention onto a meditation object. And that is why the mainstream approaches can be divorced from their Buddhist context. For us, they are something much deeper that cannot possibly be separated from one’s behavior and lifestyle choices and is fundamentally *impossible*, not just difficult, to overcome without firm virtue. It would be like trying to lift 100 pounds before you can even lift 50.

And that is why in the Suttas, meditation was only taught to people who were already virtuous—usually monastics—and not to complete beginners like the modern techniques are.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 06:02:48 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Because the purpose of the post was to present the bare minimum basis of virtue that a person would need to make significant progress. The adverse effects of sleeping on a comfortable mattress are small compared to those of not being celibate, for example. Some people may not necessarily see that and think that it has to be either all eight or only the five, and others might give up their mattress and sleep on the floor, yet still not be celibate.

It was never discouraged, so whoever is willing will take on that precept as well provided they have adopted the other seven.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 14:27:02 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

There are many intermediate steps between the precepts and satipaṭṭhāna practice in the gradual training.

Besides, what I presume you mean with Anapanasati (some kind of mechanical, breath-sensation observation exercise that can in any way be stripped from its Buddhist context of dispassion for all existence) is not what the Anapanasati Sutta describes. That is a very specific—and in our view absurd and unjustifiable—interpretation of those instructions.

My advice for a beginner would be to simply recognize that the Anapanasati Sutta is very vague and that the contemporary interpretation(s) of it have nothing to do with the essence of the Dhamma and simply don't add up to scrutiny—and to put Anapanasati aside for the time being. There are only a handful of Suttas that talk about it, so it's not like it was or should be an essential practice by any stretch.

Later on, after seeing for oneself how and why everything else the Buddha taught leads to freedom from suffering, one will be able to take on Anapanasati through that same context. Its actual purpose will be much clearer, and there will be no room left for seeing any value in observing sensations in general—of breathing or otherwise—nor in yogic breathing exercises with a Buddhist facade.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-26 08:20:07 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Are you basically saying that modern meditation is not what the Buddha meant or taught as meditation in the Noble Eight Fold Path?

Yes. Whether one defines it as such or not, the fact is that it will not free one from suffering, and people who are self-honest realize that and simply shift the goalpost. Therefore, it cannot be what the Buddha meant if we accept that he *did* teach the way out of suffering.

What were the monks and lay followers doing with their minds when they were sitting cross legged at the root of a tree or in an empty hut? That's what I'm essentially asking.

Precisely what I wrote above and what is described in the Suttas repeatedly. Purifying the mind from the five hindrances. That cannot be done through a “technique,” but only through knowledge of the nature of the hindrances and how they come to be and are starved. And that knowledge cannot be developed overnight, let alone immediately transmitted to a beginner. That is why, again, that practice comes much later in the gradual training.

If it is merely keeping virtue and sense restraint, why did he separate *sīla* and *samādhi* into separate categories?

Nobody is saying that *sīla* and *samādhi* are 100% the same thing. But they are not nearly as distinct as is nowadays thought, *plus* what is nowadays taught as *samādhi* is certainly not what the Buddha taught. Same with *sīla*, for that matter. *Sīla* is not merely keeping precepts externally so that then you can move on to your “meditation.” *Sīla* means behavior purified from unwholesome motivations.

According to the modern view somebody could *in theory* have *samādhi* without *sīla*—their

path would merely be said to be “incomplete.” Which means that’s not really samādhi.

A small reflection on sexual desire

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-04-24 13:13:40

I started noticing this a while ago, but right now especially.

When sexual desire comes and rises to a big extent I feel “I must do something about it”, but even in the past when I wasn’t restraining it sometimes I would notice that when I get to do something about it the desire already faded and I don’t feel it nearly as much. This is the obvious “revelation” about it, I don’t have to do anything about it, just let it rise and go away without intervention. **My intervention is actually redundant**

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-25 06:45:05

The more acute point is that even if it doesn’t go away, your intervention is still redundant. The same amount of suffering, in fact worse, will be there if you give in. The suffering just gets overlooked because it doesn’t fit your preconceived idea of suffering.

At best the pain of desire gets replaced by sloth and laziness, which are also suffering.

On the other hand, if you don’t give in, there is at least a chance of ending up in an objectively better state.

Why is this sub tending towards intellectual proliferation?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** craveminerals 2025-04-21 10:55:18

Hi Dhamma friends,

My question in the title may sound a bit redundant in itself but I have some reasons why I’m asking about it, which I will describe below. And then I’ll ironically share my proliferated thoughts about it.

A couple days ago I came across another sub in which a user commented that “it’s like they are (this sub) trying to think themselves to enlightenment”. It’s missing the point obviously, but I can see how it looks like that from the outside, considering that there are quite a bit of labyrinthine discussions going on.

I’ve myself benefited a great deal from the talks from HH, Samanadipa Hermitage, and the discussions on this sub. At the same time a couple of questions sprung up in my mind lately, about the abundant intellectual proliferation that takes place, in varying degrees, especially in the discussions on this forum (discussions which often fly over my head).

Questions such as- Why? Is it necessary?

My thoughts on why this is so;

The language of the suttas themselves are quite compact, complex and deep and takes

a lot of ‘unpacking’ and contextualization in order to begin to understand them. So the proliferation is partly an attempt to make them a bit more digestible. It’s better to have a wide knowledge of the suttas and their intricacies, in order to transmit the Buddha’s true message to others, for example.

Though it seems to me that bordering towards over-intellectualization also is a cultural tendency, a quite “head-oriented” one, one which historically valued systems of thought, and philosophy. We may also just, simply, enjoy proliferating and clarifying things.

It also seems to be the result of (especially the Venerables) countering, in many various ways, the massive tidal wave of Wrong Views- which we inevitably carry with us, maybe especially in this age.

This expansive proliferation based on the suttas may serve as ‘guardrails’ against one’s strong tendency to get off of the road of Dhamma- if one day you start being curious about exploring other “side roads”. We have plenty of desires pulling us in all possible directions these days, so more ‘guardrails’ against them can be helpful. There are many examples of such guardrails, the most obvious being the precepts. Subtler ones guard against finer errors, such as some taken-for-granted-assumptions like- “this is consciousness.”, or “this is body in the body”. HH may then come and say- “Don’t be so sure”.

(Another example. If I understand correctly, in short, some Zen traditions moved away from doctrinal study and traditional practices, in favor of *direct understanding* instead- believing that the former is superfluous. This may sound attractive, surely more attractive and sensible than the Abhidhamma, but it’s more often than not bound to go off-track from the subtle path which the Buddha described.)

Is a lot of intellectual proliferation necessary though? ;

At the same time, all of this isn’t really a necessity for gaining stream entry, or even full enlightenment. After all, did the accomplished people in Buddha’s time need to discuss and proliferate in these ways in order to gain the ‘Dhamma Eye’, 2500 years ago?

Maybe they met at parks, or at the well, and discussed super intricate details of dhamma together for hours, what do I know?

But that didn’t really seem to be the case - somehow even a humble farmer or a householder could understand it back then, immediately, from hearing a single discourse by the Buddha. Supposedly thanks to the fact that they had less ‘dust in their eyes’, less desire and hindrances overwhelming their minds, as well as more awareness of the basic truths of life- particularly of suffering, danger, and death. All of which enabled them to be granted a seemingly simple but groundbreaking insight; “Whatever has the nature of arising, has the nature of ceasing.” & “If this exists, that exists; if this ceases to exist, that also ceases to exist.”

So it seems to me one doesn’t necessarily need to proliferate much at all, just do the work, live simply, keep the precepts, study a few suttas, investigate your experience, and you’ll get to where you want to go. And while it can be helpful in certain ways, it’s easy to see how too much talking and thinking about these things can lead one to become like a spider caught in its own web of ideas and intricate systems of thought.

IS THERE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN YONISO MANASIKARA AND SATI? IF IT QUACKS LIKE A DUCK AND

What do you think? Do you have any thoughts on this matter?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-23 08:42:27

Is a lot of intellectual proliferation necessary though?

It depends. For someone who doesn't understand what's being discussed, the most accurate and pointed discussions of the practice, even when relatively brief, can seem like "intellectual proliferation." That's because the expressions being used don't point to anything in their own experience and therefore appear like empty words, and that's usually due to a lack of development in the basics (virtue, sense restraint).

There's also of course the possibility that there is no practical value behind the complex net of ideas someone puts forth, and that is probably more often than not the case. But then the problem is not the complexity of the ideas; it's the fact that they have nothing relevant to say regardless of how many words they use. Someone could proclaim the most rudimentary ideas still with an emphasis on poetic rather than liberative value. Another person could be using more complex concepts to actually and accurately convey the escape from suffering that they have themselves realized. And more often than not, due to the sheer prevalence of wrong views nowadays, it's necessary to go into more detail.

So it seems to me one doesn't necessarily need to proliferate much at all, just do the work, live simply, keep the precepts, study a few suttas, investigate your experience, and you'll get to where you want to go.

The problem with this attitude is that "just do the work" can mean essentially anything for anyone, and if you're not a sotāpanna, that expression will not mean for you what it should. And if you have pretty much any past experience with modern Buddhism, you will on average be even farther off the mark, since the mainstream views are what you will default to when there is confusion (they are not mainstream by accident). So it's always necessary to re-clarify what the work even is, because remembering information is not at all the same as recalling the right *meaning* of that information.

The middle way is to seek intellectual clarity when the practice is unclear or when you've been doing it and it's not working out. That means you won't be seeking clarification past the point where it's actually necessary, but at the same time you won't dismiss the need for it altogether.

**Is there a difference between Yoniso Manasikara and Sati?
If it quacks like a duck and walks like a duck, it must be a duck, right?**

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ActualBrazilian 2025-04-18 09:41:32

Am I missing something or is Yoniso Manasikara essentially the same as attending while

established in recollectedness, without making the base of one's recollectedness the object of attention?

Suppose I have kept the eight precepts close to perfection for a little over a month including actions by mind, and even before that imperfectly for a couple of months beforehand, and that I have been practicing in the way described, established mainly in recollectedness of the body to the extent that allows me to discern my posture and of the breath to the extent that allows me to discern its length and depth, and suppose that I have this peculiar mental sensation which, not without bias, I would describe as a brightness, a gladness, an ease, and that it is localized mainly at the fore, that is with me throughout the day, even as I walk, and that breaking out into speech causes it to cease at that instant...

I suppose that is what I should 'suffuse, fill, and pervade' my body with, is it not? Except its not entirely clear how. Should I now go to the root of a tree and practice absorption with this as the object? Do I just ignore it and keep going about my days in just this way, protecting this context, and it'll just happen naturally eventually?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-19 05:42:38

I suppose that is what I should 'suffuse, fill, and pervade' my body with, is it not?

No. Even though it happens to have arisen after you started keeping the precepts, the pleasure you're describing clearly comes from something other than renunciation (which automatically means that it's still within the sensual domain).

and that breaking out into speech causes it to cease at that instant...

That's a telltale sign that it's not worth cultivating. When the mind on its own is disinterested in sensuality and inclines towards renunciation, and the pleasure of relief from the burden of desire is felt as a result, that pleasure is essentially indestructible for as long as the inclination towards renunciation remains. And that inclination cannot be undone in an instant; it takes a long period of carelessness (just like the inclination towards sensuality cannot be erased in an instant).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-24 11:38:05 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It's not just renunciation in the sense of externally doing away with as many things as possible (which would result in self-mortification), but rather training the citta to prefer and enjoy being withdrawn from sensuality specifically. And that is done by reflecting on its peril..

When the peril is clearly seen by the citta on the right level, your choice of not engaging with sensuality that has been enduring for a long time—by keeping the precepts and guarding the sense doors—now brings satisfaction and relief in and of itself, and any effort apart from continuing to be restrained and mindful of the danger is completely redun-

dant. Just as the Suttas put it, you are joyful *simply* because you know that the hindrances are a debt, illness, imprisonment, etc., and you are not under their power anymore.

You also know that those tribulations cannot possibly return accidentally, so unlike sensual pleasure (which includes the pleasure of contemporary meditation), it's a pleasure that cannot be threatened by anything outside of your control, which is why it's not to be feared.

Thus, it actually is the pleasure of renunciation and not something else that you do on the side of keeping the precepts (if even that).

Spanish translations

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** adriyansavaka 2025-04-18 03:37:53

Please have these spanish translations as an offering out of my deepest gratitude. Feel free to share them with anyone who may benefit from them. Thank you.

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/102EfNMeSMWsbhbsDSrUa2jmysrztrHk4?usp=s_haring

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-18 15:51:20

Aún no he leído todo, pero lo que he visto parece estar muy bien. Tenía planeado algún día traducir Dhamma Within Reach, pero parece que me has ahorrado el trabajo :)

Trataré de leerlo todo y hacer sugerencias si surgen.

Asking advice for going forth

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** baubleballs 2025-04-17 16:36:16

Hi all, I realize these are personal details. If this sort of question is better asked privately, please let me know. I'll take down my post.

I'm planning on moving to a monastery and going forth in July/August, but I don't know where.

Ordaining. After reading u/kellerdellinger's monasticism thread, I was planning to ordain at SBS in Malaysia. I've followed climate science closely since then, however, and I'm afraid that if I lived anywhere in Southeast Asia I would die a lot sooner than I would if I lived in the United States. I just don't know how long it's going to take me to break the first 3 fetters, and I'd like to have the best chance possible.

I'm both an EU and American citizen. I was wondering what my criteria should be as I research my options. I've been to and like the conditions at Forest Dhamma in Virginia

(Dhammayut, Thai Forest), but monks there aren't allowed Wi-Fi. I've considered downloading all of the HH info I can onto my phone, but I don't know if that's enough. People say friendship with noble ones is important. There's no way of knowing that I'll have that, and my best shot, as I currently understand, is by talking to members of the HH community. To be honest, I vaguely consider communication with HH practitioners as a lifeline—so I think not having Wi-Fi would be problematic.

I have another relatively minor question: how does travel work? Forest Dhamma is in rural Virginia. Would I just stay there my whole life I ordained there? I assume plane tickets would have to be donated, and I obviously want to limit my use of charity. I'm asking because I can't really just get up and leave when I want to, which is fine, I guess, but my understanding of the monastic ideal is that travel is a permissible and even desirable pleasure—not staying in one place for *too* long—and I wonder what it'll be like to stay in one place for decades.

Before Ordaining. I currently live with my partner. They're aware of my decisions. My plan is to separate and go back to my parents' home this June, (our lease will be up). Last week, though, my parents told me that, push comes to shove, I can live there, but they don't like the idea of it—i.e, I'd be burdensome—due to already having a full, chaotic house and my taking the 8 precepts being stressful to others. They suggests I stay where I am.

Given I take the 8 precepts in either circumstance, I assume that the common advice would be that the comfort of a romantic relationship would be worse than the difficulties of living with family. I think I'd be less pressured in my relationship than with my family, because my partner is understanding of my practice. However, if I'm being honest, the ambient feeling of false security would probably be stronger there. Is there a clearly better decision, or is it up to me to decide?

TL;DR. - Internet access seems important. Should I consider it a dealbreaker? - How does travel work? Will I go stir crazy, or no big deal? - Please recommend me (either here or privately) any good locations in the US, Canada, or in Europe. - Does it matter where I live if I take the 8 precepts?

Thank you

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-18 06:49:20

Would I just stay there my whole life I ordained there?

No. There is a traditional expectation to stay at the place one ordains at least for the first five years after Upasampadā (the nissaya period), but it's not like leaving breaks a rule (some places would want to scare new monks into thinking that though). Still, it's good practice to stay put for the first five years, and some places might ask you to promise that you will before ordaining you.

Internet access seems important. Should I consider it a dealbreaker?

Constant, daily internet access is certainly not essential. I reckon in all monasteries ex-

cept the most heavy-handed, there would be at least a communal computer with internet access that you can use occasionally. That should be good enough.

Does it matter where I live if I take the 8 precepts?

You should live wherever you anticipate the likelihood (and severity) of breaking the precepts sooner or later to be the lowest on average. I find it unlikely that would be with your partner, but it's up to you to assess the situation honestly.

There's also the fact that you don't know for sure if you will ordain as soon as you think you will, or at all. You may aspire to do so, but it's very common for people to postpone it longer than they anticipated or give up on the prospect altogether, for various reasons. So you should choose the option that has the most long-term potential of being a suitable environment or that at least opens up the most suitable possibilities.

If you can't find anything suitable in North America or Europe (which might be unlikely), I would strongly recommend reconsidering Asia. From what I know, it's uncommon for Western places to provide the space one needs for actual practice.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-19 05:49:41 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

which I've heard you previously refer to as just seclusion and not too many chores

Just for the record, it also means not having particular views (or worse, techniques) being actively pushed on you.

Question about Right Livelihood

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** None 2025-04-16 23:59:04

[deleted]

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-17 15:32:57

u/Realistic_Caramel768's answer is correct. Serving alcohol is what would be an issue.

Anigha why deleting my posts ... bro!!?? :)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** adivader 2025-04-12 15:51:14

[removed]

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-12 16:02:57 (in reply to a comment not included)

Save yourself the time. Both of us know that this won't get us anywhere.

Wrong speech, regret, the weight of consequences and Right endurance

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** LotusOfUpekkha 2025-04-12 14:31:53

I recently spoke harshly to my father. The content of what I said touched on the practice - on sensual desire, on the danger of indulgence and distractions, precepts, on how it can be beneficial to practice - but it came from a place of ill-will: resentment, irritation, and the desire to assert myself. It was entirely misguided and I shouldn't even have talked about the practice, let alone Buddhist concepts in the first place. I wanted to prove myself right and his perception of me wrong. I didn't take the possible harm of my speech into account.

This all happened because I couldn't bear the pressure of hearing my father repeatedly insinuate that I spend my days hiding in my room scrolling social media and distracting myself - which, for months now, hasn't been the case. I wanted him to *see* that I've changed, that I've been trying to live differently. But instead of patiently enduring the discomfort, I reacted. I forced the issue, and started oversharing about dhamma practice - not in clarity, but in ill-will.

Now, in retrospect, I see that even though I may have sounded calm, composed and sincere on the surface, the intention behind my speech was tainted. There was no wisdom, no restraint - just the need to be seen a certain way, to avoid the painful feeling of being misjudged or disrespected. That's what makes it all the more painful now: I've not only failed in speech, but I've likely made Buddhism appear hypocritical or alien to my father. All pointing to a lack of mindfulness on my part.

And the consequences feel... heavy. This might be the most intense regret I've felt in my life. It's hard not to see this as a permanent fracture in our relationship. I've likely turned him against the very path that I value most. I've likely turned him against me as well since my words must have felt like a personal attack on his way of life and existence. He likely sees me, and this path I'm trying to follow as a rejection of *him*. It feels like I've betrayed him, betrayed myself, and brought disrepute to the Dhamma. I worry that I've also taken away any slight chance my father might have had in someday developing interest in the Dhamma himself in this life.

So my question is this:

What does *Right endurance* look like in a situation like this? How does one live with the consequences of a wrong act, especially when those consequences affect how the Dhamma itself is perceived by others?

Not restraining the tongue, not guarding the mind - this leads to one's own detriment. My foolish behavior has caused a lot of doubt and somewhat irrational thoughts to arise, like: *Have I now compromised my Dhamma practice entirely?*

I'm still young and living at home, which makes the situation even more difficult to endure. It now feels as if my father watches my every move - silently judging, silently rejecting - interpreting each of my choices through the lens of that one outburst of ill-will. For example, my decision not to join in watching TV with the family (something I had already quietly stepped away from) is now likely seen as part of that same "rant" I gave him. Everything I do may now be framed in his eyes as a rejection of *him* and my parents upbringing, not a pursuit of clarity and restraint. That perception, too, is painful.

I don't want to act out of guilt or try to patch things up just to feel better. But I also don't want to fall into despair or self-pity and call that "practice." So how can I endure this rightly?

At some point, my parents may bring up my practice again for some reason (I won't do it myself anymore after this foolish act). When that happens, I hope I'll be in a better position to speak with at least some wisdom guided by Right Speech, rather than by emotion or the need to defend myself or to make a big deal out of it.

Any reflections from the HH perspective would be deeply appreciated.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-17 15:29:48

What does *Right endurance* look like in a situation like this? How does one live with the consequences of a wrong act, especially when those consequences affect how the Dhamma itself is perceived by others?

You first of all need to restrain any impulse to get rid of the displeasure of the situation. It is precisely due to justifying resistance to displeasure in light of some mundane goal that you gave in, and so even if it seems like acting out of craving once again will resolve the situation, doing so will only maintain the same underlying tendencies and suffering (i.e., the actual problematic situation) for the future.

My foolish behavior has caused a lot of doubt and somewhat irrational thoughts to arise, like: *Have I now compromised my Dhamma practice entirely?*

Yes, and now that too is included within the overall displeasure that you need to train in regard to. There will be a pressure to put the blame on those unsettling thoughts, but the truth is that they are a problem only because they move you, not in themselves.

At some point, my parents may bring up my practice again for some reason (I won't do it myself anymore after this foolish act). When that happens, I hope I'll be in a better position to speak with at least some wisdom guided by Right Speech, rather than by emotion or the need to defend myself or to make a big deal out of it.

The only way to genuinely be in a better position is training yourself *now* to not be moved by mental displeasure, regardless of whether it arose due to your past actions or something else. Then even if in the future you end up having a similar conversation with your parents, you will be less likely to lose your composure. The gateway that you need to guard is at the same spot regardless of what the current feeling has arisen on account of (purely internal turmoils like doubt and regret, or a difficult conversation).

Making mistakes. Acting out of aversion, seeing through doubt

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Makeoutstill666 2025-04-11 18:29:00

I am a young person working the trades, and in this particular trade there are straightforward aspects such as drilling and cutting, and technical aspects such as interpreting blueprints and engineering directives. While I believe myself intelligent, the technical understanding needed for compliance under strict guidelines seems to allude me. Ive made many mistakes, requiring myself or someone else to fix or redo my work. This bothers me deeply. I have put forth the effort to understand what Im doing. Patiently taking one step at a time until a task's completion. It seems no matter what I work on, no matter the time I spend or focusing I do, I make mistakes. This frustrates not only me, but my supervisor and coworkers. I feel unreliable, and incapable of decent work. I doubt that Ill last much longer if I continue on like I have. Does anyone have a perspective on developing composure in the face of my mistakes? Or better yet, how to avoid these mistakes entirely. Thank you.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-13 06:28:26

If it's composure that you're after, then the only way is to tame your mind in the broadest sense, which means not acting with lust, aversion, or carelessness/distraction in all areas of life. You can't develop composure in regard to only one specific unpleasant situation, because the trigger for the frustration and pain is the displeasure that is felt, not the external situation. Thus, any situation that arouses displeasure with similar intensity will cause the same amount of suffering for as long as the mind's susceptibility to crave against displeasure is kept alive, primarily by chasing pleasure.

All you can do on a specific level is make the situation less unpleasant (i.e., management). Not that management is inherently sinful or something, but it must not be confused with composure.

Hey everyone, I've recently started meditating using Ajahn Nyanamoli's instructions and wanted to check if I'm on the right track.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ComprehensiveCamp486 2025-04-07 02:58:35

From what I understand, the practice is about observing the intentions behind actions and recognizing whether they're wholesome or unwholesome. But when I sit in seclusion—even for hours—nothing really arises. No craving, no ill will, no strong emotions. I just sit in silence, fully attentive, often in a neutral but subtly blissful state.

I live completely celibate, eat once a day (usually just ground beef), and rarely engage in entertainment—and when I do, I stay mindful of the intention behind it. I work a simple, mostly solitary job (cleaning, driving, shopping), rarely speak to anyone, and don't have friends. I've followed the five precepts for most of my life (about 80%), and I recently FORMALLY took up the Eight Precepts, except for the one about avoiding a high or luxurious bed—though I don't oversleep or take pleasure in it per se.

Sometimes I reflect on past instances of anger or reflect on life in general, but I never feel the urge to distract myself. No desire to check my phone or laptop, no urge to socialize, no sexual thoughts—just stillness.

I've tried adding some Mahasi-style noting, but it tends to disturb the peaceful state I'm in. I mostly learn from Dhamma talks—channels like *Hillside Hermitage* and *The Dhamma Hub*—and forums like this one. I'm not deeply read in the suttas, though I'm familiar with many concepts from hearing them referenced.

Would it be helpful to start reading the suttas more deeply at this point? Or should I just keep going as I am?

Any feedback or guidance would be appreciated.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-07 14:29:58

From what I understand, the practice is about observing the intentions behind actions and recognizing whether they're wholesome or unwholesome.

Correct, and it's also crucial to remember that one's notion of what constitutes an action is initially limited, and that too needs to evolve and become more refined (and this happens on its own as a result of the gradual training; not volitionally as a result of "figuring it out").

But when I sit in seclusion—even for hours—nothing really arises. No craving, no ill will, no strong emotions. I just sit in silence, fully attentive, often in a neutral but subtly blissful state.

This doesn't sound right. Plenty of things are supposed to arise in right samādhi. What gets "calmed" is the unwholesome states of mind that ordinarily underlie things. And that is why right samādhi cannot simply "occur" as a matter of luck; one needs to be very familiar with the unwholesome tendencies of the mind (which are sly and slippery by nature) and know how to tame them in the right way.

So I would warn against taking this as a sign of progress and instead see it as a subtly muddled state even though it may feel peaceful.

Would it be helpful to start reading the suttas more deeply at this point? Or should I just keep going as I am?

I would advise focusing on developing more correct views about what the practice and the goal are, and moving away from the notion that stillness is intrinsically good and that it means "nothing coming up" (which is precisely one of the main misconceptions of modern views about meditation).

Question about right livelihood. (Talaputta sutta).

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** No-Nature8928 2025-04-06 20:18:41

' And for a third time Tālapiṭṭha said to the Buddha:

"Sir, I have heard that the dancers of the past who were tutors of tutors said: 'Suppose a dancer entertains and amuses people on a stage or at a festival with truth and lies. When their body breaks up, after death, they're reborn in the company of laughing gods.' What does the Buddha say about this?"

"Clearly, chief, I'm not getting through to you when I say: 'Enough, chief, let it be. Don't ask me that.' Nevertheless, I will answer you.

When sentient beings are still not free of greed, and are still bound by greed, a dancer in a stage or festival presents them with even more arousing things. When sentient beings are still not free of hate, and are still bound by hate, a dancer in a stage or festival presents them with even more hateful things. When sentient beings are still not free of delusion, and are still bound by delusion, a dancer in a stage or festival presents them with even more delusory things. And so, being heedless and negligent themselves, they've encouraged others to be heedless and negligent. When their body breaks up, after death, they're reborn in the hell called 'Laughter'.

But if you have such a view: 'Suppose a dancer entertains and amuses people on a stage or at a festival with truth and lies. When their body breaks up, after death, they're reborn in the company of laughing gods.' This is your wrong view. An individual with wrong view is reborn in one of two places, I say: hell or the animal realm."

,

Naturally, I was surprised at such a perspective, given that the only other guarantees come attached with heinous actions such as killing one's parents or injuring a Buddha.

Additionally, the standard admonitions against wrong livelihood make no mention of acting or entertainment, unless one were to apply a more expansive lens to the admonition against trading in human beings.

It seems that this sutta can be interpreted to encompass a vast majority of the livelihoods and idle actions of people today. For instance, creating appealing products, or engaging in idle chatter, and so on.

I've thought about this for a day, and I've come across varying interpretations from other people online.

1: there is a matter of translation, where the English version doesn't adequately emphasize the "false" or "misleading" aspects of the actors performance.

2: The word "actor" comes with negative connotations, as it perhaps does in the modern day.

Given this, I wanted to ask how this sutta is to be best interpreted.

Are all arts categorically wrong livelihood, or can things such as fantasy stories, written with good intentions and conveying positive messages about the five precepts be admissible?

Granted, I'm tempted to say the question is trivial, considering the Buddha made use of parables, but it could perhaps be the case that only someone with the right view ought to attempt such things, which itself leads to rather constraining conclusions about the use of parables in everyday speech.

Link:

<https://suttacentral.net/sn42.2/en/sujato?lang=en&layout=plain&reference=none¬es=asterisk&highlight=actor>

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-07 14:52:23

Additionally, the standard admonitions against wrong livelihood make no mention of acting or entertainment, unless one were to apply a more expansive lens to the admonition against trading in human beings.

Probably because the word used there is "vāṇijja," which refers specifically to mercantile activity and not livelihood in general.

It seems that this sutta can be interpreted to encompass a vast majority of the livelihoods and idle actions of people today. For instance, creating appealing products, or engaging in idle chatter, and so on.

No, that would be quite a stretch. Yes, such other things would be against the Dhamma to various degrees, but there is still a wide gap between being a performer and simply engaging in distracting and unwholesome actions in a normal context. In the former, among many other things, you actively induce unwholesome mindstates in yourself in order to perform well and entertain others (i.e., induce similarly unwholesome mindstates in them). Without such mindstates in yourself at least, one cannot perform.

Are all arts categorically wrong livelihood, or can things such as fantasy stories, written with good intentions and conveying positive messages about the five precepts be admissible?

Not all arts would be on the same level. It would depend on the type of art and the mindstate with which it is done. I can imagine sculpting, painting, or writing about non-sensual and non-fantastical topics (say, making sculptures of real animals) not necessarily being an obstruction since the mind can remain in a relatively sober state even while doing it. But once you get into the realm of creating fantasy, it will inevitably tend to involve loss of clarity and self-awareness and intoxication with imaginary scenarios.

On a smaller scale than a performer, one's success in creating fantastical art would hinge on one's ability to suspend right mindfulness of the present, factual context of one's situation (the state of one's body, feelings, mind, and mental phenomena). What responses one's work might induce in others is secondary, and there is no situation where helping others is more important than maintaining the right frame of mind. In fact it is only through the right frame of mind that things you do could actually be beneficial (instead of merely making people feel good and superficially inspired).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-09 05:15:35 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

For someone trying to develop a context of living a good worldly life and perhaps aim for a heavenly rebirth, is learning an instrument consistent with such a life? My main fear and goal is to do my best to avoid a low rebirth.

No, there would be no problem with it if that's the goal.

Surely there is a big difference between someone (such as myself) who learns an instrument for, say, an hour a day after work for enjoyment vs someone who relies on such a skill for their vocation?

Yes.

- 2) Can it be skillful to learn an instrument as a means to get over more coarse vices? For example, pornography.

Yes—if one's goal is not liberation. If it is, then the replacement will most likely not make much of a difference and will not make actual renunciation any easier. The extent of *dependence as such* remains the same, even if the object of dependence becomes less harmful in a mundane sense.

- 3) Is stream entry impossible whilst learning to play an instrument?

It is impossible while holding a view that sensuality is compatible with the Dhamma. Since a person who aims for stream entry and at the same time learns an instrument will almost certainly be holding and reinforcing that view, yes, realistically speaking, it's impossible.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-10 02:42:44 (in reply to a comment not included)

Not quite, because that would imply that a sotāpanna somehow feels trapped within their remaining sensuality. The recognition that it's impossible to be helplessly subjected to defilements—that one is *entirely* responsible for their maintenance or cessation—is a core aspect of right view. That doesn't mean they understand the way to cessation fully (for then they would be an Arahant), but that they cannot forget that there *is* a way and that nothing stops them from following it.

As for the external profession, it would be the same principle. Their authenticity would make it apparent that it's impossible to actually “need” to do something. There is always an alternative. The fact that it may be undesirable or even dangerous is a different matter. They may not always choose the alternative, but they can never deceive themselves into thinking that they *can't*.

It is because they are no longer able to cover up their responsibility for whatever they engage in, internally or externally, that they sooner or later will give up everything unwholesome. For the puthujjana, remaining defilements are not just much stronger; they are also doubtful as to how to overcome them and sometimes might even feel like it's impossible. That is by far the most acutely aggravating factor.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-11 03:13:51 (in reply to a comment not included)

Is it simply that this is a necessary but not sufficient condition? And/or is it that a puthujjana can only adopt such an attitude mentally (repeating or committing it to themselves, but sometimes inevitably forgetting), while the sotapanna automatically cannot be caught up in any other attitude even when maximally afflicted by remaining kleshas, since self-view itself has totally dissolved?

The puthujjana can take responsibility and should do so if they want to become a sotāpanna, but the sotāpanna has gotten to the point where they are unable to *not* take responsibility. And yes, that's because they are free from self-view. Pure resolve won't free one from ignorant tendencies permanently.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-12 04:40:15 (in reply to a comment not included)

do you then say that a Sotapanna would always make a choice to get shot, rather than the kammically suboptimal choice presented? I think you might not mean that?

Right, that's not what I meant.

So if the Sotapanna does choose to then save themselves from the gunshot, by way of breaking a core precept - would they not experience the suffering of those options (the ones presented) and the choice they made - in the here and now (not to say of the ensuing kammic consequences) ?

The problem is that such hypotheticals assume that the number of options is limited, which is an impossibility (similar to how there is always the middle way as an alternative). When actually faced with such a situation, it would be obvious even as a puthujjana that there *are* other options apart from breaking a precept or getting shot. Hence there is no right answer to such questions; the premise as a whole must be rejected. One would get closer to the right view by understanding the inherent impossibility of those black-and-white hypothetical scenarios rather than arriving at a satisfactory answer to questions about them.

but also acknowledging their mental inability to commit to that choice, on account of incomplete development of their mind ?

There's a contradiction here. The person is supposedly "authentically knowing their responsibility" yet simultaneously thinks that there is an intrinsic mental inability (as opposed to what, a physical inability?) to commit to a choice. This is a denial of responsibility at the fundamental level while pretending to acknowledge it. And self-view is what would make one ultimately *liable* to that even when one does take responsibility. For as long as there is implicit conceiving of a chooser distinct from the aggregate of saṅkhāras, one will be able to think that this chooser is "unable" to commit to a choice, whatever the rationalization might be.

Just as liability to suffering is present all the time, freedom from it is not limited to when extreme scenarios are encountered. So a sotāpanna's freedom would not begin the moment they make the final choice; even when merely being presented with the choice (and throughout the whole expanse of time preceding that scenario as well), they would not be liable to suffering to anywhere near the same extent.* Hence it's misleading to boil down the difference to any specific scenario.

* And precisely because of that, they would be able to see and accurately assess options that a puthujjana wouldn't.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-12 15:25:15 (in reply to a comment not included)

the state of development of mind has not yet reached the point where sensuality has been abandoned, to the extent necessary for going forth at least (if not an Anāgāmi).

This still would not imply a mental inability to commit to the choice to go forth. The lack of development of mind simply means that that commitment will be more unpleasant.

It may sound like a purely semantic distinction, but it's not. If there are any "buts" whatsoever, one is not actually taking responsibility even if one says one is. And the assumption

of *something* outside of the manifested experience where choice and responsibility apply (whether one calls it “self,” “state of development of mind,” or “inability to commit to a choice”) still lurks there. The assumption of such a “something” is *attavāda*, even if on paper one soundly rejects the term “self” (and similar variations like “chooser”) due to one’s learning.

If the mind’s inclination toward greed, aversion, and delusion—*however strong*—had any bearing on one’s freedom to choose otherwise, then these inclinations would either be impossible to fully abandon, or they would have to be resolved through some tangential practice while nevertheless continuing to indulge in them at the end of the day—which is, in fact, the usual expectation.

In this case, Mahānāma did not choose to fully go against the grain of his mind’s unwholesome inclinations. But unlike a puthujjana, at no point could he have believed that there is a “reason” for that. He would know that that failure is completely gratuitous (inasmuch as no amount of feeling can inherently obstruct the making of a choice; those are two separate aggregates).

This correct outlook is what guarantees a noble disciple will have a sense of shame in regard to any remaining unwholesome qualities and thus eventually subdue them all, whereas a puthujjana will tend to cover up the sense of shame by coming up with justifications (even if those sound right from a Dhamma point of view).

Uneasiness as Indicator for Right Ideas

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** still_tracks 2025-04-06 10:44:00

I was wondering if arisen uneasiness is actually a valid indicator for a contemplation hitting the right spot. For example, if I contemplate the inaccessibility and impermanence of the senses (or the impermanence of my dear ones, possessions, etc.), would a level of anxiety be a sign that the contemplation is earnest, or can Mara trick one by “inducing” that unpleasantness, while one’s assumption of ownership hides untouched in an obscured spot? If so, how would one be able to discern if one is tricked? Can this even be done while contemplating, or only inferred by honestly questioning oneself in day-to-day life if the overall level of pressure due to attachments is decreasing?

I would also like to expand that question to the broader scope of the practice as a whole. I am currently under the assumption that a subtle level of uneasiness is the natural emotional state for a puthujjana finding out about his situation and even useful for being more alert and authentic. So the same question applies here: are such emotions a valid measure for being on the right path? Or would it be better to refrain from any idea of “measuring” one’s practice and instead acknowledge the uncertainty regarding one’s notions about practice—which in turn would give rise to new uneasiness and, of course, could thus again be taken for granted as being a correct idea.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-07 14:16:50

Or would it be better to refrain from any idea of “measuring” one’s practice and instead acknowledge the uncertainty regarding one’s notions about practice—which in turn would give rise to new uneasiness and, of course, could thus again be taken for granted as being a correct idea.

In this case, this would be the way to go.

For the vast majority of people—because of their lack of restraint and tendencies built up on account of that—the right contemplations will often be unpleasant, and it’s important to come to terms with that because there is a tendency to think that the Dhamma is supposed to free you from suffering very quickly (and *on your own terms* to boot). That gives rise to all the management-oriented practices that abound today.

But even when it arises, you don’t want to be finding safety in that unpleasantness, telling yourself that it “means” you are practicing correctly. Unpleasantness that is bound with certainty and safety is unpleasantness that is on your own terms, and that means it’s still affected with craving. And, ironically enough, the uneasiness of the right kind would return when the uneasiness you expect and find safety in is not there, which shows that you would’ve just moved the same problem elsewhere. You would’ve covered up the uneasiness on the level that matters and turned what’s on the surface “right practice” into self-mortification—which is gratifying in its own way and wrong precisely for that reason.

Instead, recognize the uneasiness of not knowing whether you are practicing correctly or not, and train yourself to remain unmoved in regard to it while it is there. If the mind expects uneasiness and it’s not there, see the uneasiness of *that*. That would be much closer to the right practice.

Getting fed up

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-04-04 17:36:37

I am not very proud of it, but I indulged heavily in lots and lots of sugar and fast food, also pornography and a ton of videogames and so at some point I got fed up somehow and now I want to keep the precepts. I deleted videogames, but not to avoid playing them but because I cannot handle playing videogames, it’s painful. Also porn just seems disgusting and there is less and less pleasure in it, sugar makes me feel sick and so my conclusion is that this method is valid and it works.

The only downside to getting fed up is if person uses heroin, because then they might die. Otherwise it works

So it is an easy path of less resistance, because I’m so fed up I can’t even do it anymore. I woke up and started doing something “hard” with interest, because as soon as I think “maybe play videogame?” I feel “agh, please don’t do it”

Also I feel the need to do something, but the options are suddenly much more limited, feels very dull and boring.

“I TOLD YOU SO!” yes

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-05 03:42:38

Otherwise it works

Not for long.

Question about Right Livelihood and investments

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Pallantinus 2025-04-04 17:20:08

Hello,

I would greatly appreciate any help in better understanding the idea of Right Livelihood, especially this part of the wiki on virtue:

https://www.reddit.com/r/HillsideHermitage/wiki/virtue/#wiki_right_livelihood

Laypeople should not obtain their income from certain avenues, and this extends to any form of financial profit directly derived from these avenues even without physical participation (e.g., investing in stocks of weapons or alcohol producers, or animal farming companies).

It seems clear that if I buy shares in a company that sells weapons or alcohol, that would go against the precept.

Also, if I invest in an index fund that includes such companies, even if it's not direct, it would probably still go against it.

But what if I invest in a fund that only buys shares of banks, and those banks then support or finance weapons companies? I'm not sure, but it's very likely. Would that also break the precept?

In short, does Right Livelihood mean that I must avoid any form of financial support for those industries, even if it's very indirect? Or is it only about direct investment?

Thanks in advance.

edit: another example that I have thought of and about which I have doubts is that of investing in a textile company, which does not slaughter animals, but buys leather to make clothes.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-06 06:20:24

But what if I invest in a fund that only buys shares of banks, and those banks then support or finance weapons companies? I'm not sure, but it's very likely.

Would that also break the precept?

If the banks are making their own decisions, which sometimes happen to include financing weapons manufacturers, then no.

another example that I have thought of and about which I have doubts is that of investing in a textile company, which does not slaughter animals, but buys leather to make clothes.

It's not an issue if the animals are not slaughtered for that particular company and they simply buy existing leather (which apparently is usually the case).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-06 10:08:17 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The problem is specifically when your choices, regardless of how many intermediaries there are in between, are *predictably* supporting or financing the operations of improper industries.

For contrast, the Buddha didn't forbid laypeople to buy meat even directly from a butcher (unless the animal was killed on their personal request, in which case it would break the first precept quite obviously through speech). For the same reason, it would not be an issue if you bought a weapon directly from the manufacturer without intending to use it for killing or harming—even in self-defense—but for some completely unrelated purpose (assuming one arose).

But say you regularly buy a whole fish from a very small-scale fishmonger who, with only a handful of regular clients, slaughters one fish for each order they expect in advance. Then you would certainly be complicit, though not as directly as when you go and order a fish knowing that it's still alive and will be killed for you.

The bottom line being: purchasing an existing product that would still be supplied to the same extent regardless of your individual purchases is not the same as financing a company that produces the product, asking them to make it for you in particular, or making the product yourself.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-05-19 19:31:26 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

after having also looked at a part of the resources linked by Ven. Subhara below.

Even if the conclusions there are sound, whether you buy meat from a supermarket or not is still too intangible from the point of view of your present mental state and intentions to fall within the precepts. Of course, you could be seeking meat out of lust for tastes, but that has now nothing to do with the first precept.

Regarding the first precept, all that matters is whether you are intentionally aiming at the death of other beings, no matter how indirectly the result comes and what the excuse for it is. Getting somebody to kill an animal for you would certainly fulfill that factor, and you should not do that even if it means starving to death. But that is not what your intention is when you buy meat from a store simply for the sake of nourishment, even if theoretically that decision did lead to more animals dying.

For the record, the relationship between buying meat and indirectly causing animals to be slaughtered was no doubt a lot more direct in the Buddha's time. There is a story in the Khandhakas where somebody was looking for meat and there was none available, because no killing has taken place that day.

That this was even possible suggests that if the Buddha had at least forbidden monks from accepting any meat, let alone laypeople from buying it, it would realistically have had a huge and very direct impact on meat production in those days. And yet he did not. He even made meat and fish two of the five "staple foods" in the Vinaya, and nowhere in the Suttas did he encourage laypeople to abstain from meat.

Someone could argue that, by failing to make veganism a rule for Buddhists when he easily could have, the Buddha is "responsible" for the deaths of hundreds of billions of animals over the last 2500 years. He was surely not unaware that he could've prevented that, and in others areas he didn't have a problem with nudging people against the grain for the sake of the Dhamma.

would this monk - who, say, suspects that the layperson killed the cow for him
- be at fault for accepting the meal because it might induce the layperson to
kill another cow for him in the future?

Yes, that's a bit of a gray area, and thus the Buddha said it should be avoided. But it's not that the layperson killing another cow automatically follows from accepting the offering. Hypothetically, the monk could just as well reprimand the layperson for killing, and if they chose to do the same thing again it no longer be on him.

It's because it's an impure offering, similar to something that was obtained through stealing or cheating.

am I right in thinking "approving of killing living creatures" means having a
view that killing is at least sometimes permissible?

Correct. It is on the basis of that view that you would approve of somebody else's killing. Most people would entertain the idea of killing (and approve of others doing so) past a certain level of duress, but what that Sutta is saying is that there should not be such a point.

Training yourself to become *unable* to entertain the prospect of killing even to save what's dearest to you is immeasurably more fruitful than a blanket abstinence from meat.

Practical implications of the fifth recollection

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** tejveer 2025-04-04 00:23:04

Of the five daily recollections, the fifth is the following:

I am the owner of my kamma, the heir of my kamma; I have kamma as my origin, kamma as my relative, kamma as my resort; I will be the heir of whatever kamma, good or bad, that I do.
Bhikkhu Bodhi

But I find it to be fairly abstract now; at least for me. In the past, my daily reflection of this would involve contemplating what “owner of kamma” meant and so for rest of the phrases, never really attending to the day-to-day implications of it.

What are the practical implications of the above recollection? What attitude should it induce?

My current “translation” of that in practical and tangible terms would be as follows:

My mind learns from my actions. I and I alone teach it what it values; whether it is good (not valuing what is unstable) or bad (valuing what is unstable) for it. I experience the results of what I have taught it, whether good or bad. If I have taught it to value what is unstable, then when that instability presents itself to the mind and infuriates it, I am subject to it. At any point in the day, my actions can be either good or bad and there is no one besides me preventing me from acting in what is good for it apart from myself.

The above almost instantly induces a sense of responsibility and vigilance for whatever I will be doing throughout the day. Could such a reflection be regarded as being along the right lines of what the Buddha expects us to reflect on for this recollection? If not, how can I improve it?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-04 06:27:20

The implication is that nothing you do is inherently justified. Even if someone puts a gun to your head, coercing you to do something, the choice to comply can never be made for you. That doesn’t mean that compliance is automatically wrong, but rather that you cannot escape the fruits of the choice to comply (whether good or bad) just because a gun was pointed at your head.

In practice, this attitude is crucial because only with it will you be able to develop virtue. The natural tendency is that, when there is enough pressure towards doing something—i.e., when the gun is pointed at your head—you find some sort of justification or excuse for the action rather than taking responsibility and saying, “I did it because I acted out of the pressure, and I could have not done so.”

And the same goes for wholesome choices. If you don’t take responsibility for them and do them only when there is inspiration towards them or other people are doing them with

WHAT DEFILEMENT(S) ARE CAUSING ME TO FEEL AWKWARD IN THE STAFF BREAK ROOM AT WORK?2

you, then you will not see that you can continue to make them indefinitely and nothing can force you to stop.

What defilement(s) are causing me to feel awkward in the staff break room at work?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** senserestraint 2025-04-02 02:55:48

Whenever I try to sit distraction-free during my breaks at work, it feels so awkward sitting there while everyone else is either on their phones or chatting idly. It is particularly difficult not to pull out my phone when someone sits in my line of sight. Would love to get to the point in my practice where I am completely at ease in these situations.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-03 03:00:29

Pulling out your phone is not necessarily a distraction in that particular context. There is nothing you can do in such a setting that would bring the same level of clarity and composure that you could have while alone (that's why seclusion is always a prerequisite for actual satipaṭṭhāna). It's arguably better to pull out your phone and even get some headphones in that setting, since that decreases the possibility of being spoken to, and with that, the capacity for self-awareness naturally increases.

In that situation I would just focus on avoiding unsuitable content (breaking the entertainment precept) and listen to a Dhamma talk, read Suttas, do some practical task on the phone, etc.

What environment is actually necessary for liberation?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Solip123 2025-03-31 23:29:54

At this point I am not certain what is actually needed in terms of the environment and mindset one must have. I am reading Polak's book, "Nikaya Buddhism and Early Chan: a New Meditative Paradigm" - he suggests that radical renunciation (of even self-preservation instincts) may be necessary for liberation. The problem is, I am not sure how to integrate this into my own life. I live with my family and renouncing everything is not really tenable or even possible in this day and age. The conditions in 5th century BCE India differed considerably.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-02 02:09:42

It's not about "renouncing everything." That's the view the Buddha initially had and which he overcame when he found the middle way. It's about renouncing passion, aversion, distraction.

Giving up one's family is very helpful for that goal (and is the only way to achieve it completely), but if keeping the seven precepts, it can be done to a great degree even at home (non-return) as seen in the Suttas.

It's actually much easier to adopt a view that external austerity is automatically beneficial and keep pushing it on that external level instead of developing understanding of what craving actually is. External comfort isn't automatically rooted in craving—it is definitely so only when it violates a precept, especially celibacy.

Self-preservation mechanisms cannot be overcome through willpower and observances, and the Buddha even encouraged maintaining some of them for a trainee. What needs to be abandoned is specifically the prospect of breaking a precept, even if it means not being able to save your life. That's an example of the middle way, which *does* lean a lot more on the direction of asceticism than people often like to think. But not all the way to what you're describing, and with the right context (right view) behind it rather than sheer white-knuckling.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-02 05:20:36 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, the former is optimal. But it still doesn't mean "renouncing everything" the way you seemed to be implying (by saying that it's not possible in this day and age). Even the lifestyle of the most austere monks was still quite comfortable and easy compared to what other ascetics with wrong views were doing, and not hard to follow today. They sometimes accused even the most austere monks of being "indulgent" because they didn't renounce enough in their eyes (still going on alms round daily and eating good food if offered instead of eating only a mouthful of leaves every few days).

When asked to make them compulsory, the Buddha declined and insisted in making even those comparatively very moderate austere practices optional, knowing that they are not automatically beneficial.

Confessing breaches of virtue- why and when?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** craveminerals 2025-03-29 19:10:24

Hi Dhamma friends,

In the pursuit of Dhamma, what would be the purpose of confession of bad deeds to another vs. admitting them to oneself, and resolving not to act unwholesomely again?

Considering that in the latter case, one does still take virtue and the training seriously, it doesn't seem like confessing every mistake is essential- except if it's a grave offense- am I wrong? Is this more important for an monastic environment perhaps?

My reasoning is that if it's a minor mistake, I'd be fueling excessive guilt by obsessing and making a big deal out of it. But if it's a big mistake, a breach of precepts for example,

there may be a legitimate need and benefit to confessing it to somebody, and thereby helping you ‘process’ it- because if you don’t it could dominate your mind and warp your perspective, and in turn endanger your spiritual practice.

•

Speaking for myself, lately I’ve occasionally been indulging in wrong speech fueled by ill will, in regards to talking about politics— worldly things, bad idea I know— as well as in a strange and difficult coworker situation a little while ago. Out of fear, weakness and defensiveness.

Nothing too extreme lately, although some past memories of especially shameful immoral behaviors have resurfaced. I’m currently letting them “weigh down on me” and basically just acknowledging, and enduring, the guilt. But since I’m not obsessing about them 24/7, and they don’t seem to be warping my perspective, I’m thinking of sparing my local priest a visit by me.

I’d be interested to hear if you have any thoughts! Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 09:56:18

Considering that in the latter case, one does still take virtue and the training seriously, it doesn’t seem like confessing every mistake is essential- except if it’s a grave offense- am I wrong?

Confessing *everything* that you sense was a transgression, no matter how small, means that you won’t be able to cover things up precisely in those scenarios where you are inclined to downplay the significance of them (which is usually a sign that it is very much a problem; denial is the primary recourse of an addict). The natural sense of shame that one would have for anything that was factually unwholesome will come to the surface, simply on account of having to reveal it to someone else. If the action truly didn’t come out of any defilements, then there would be no reason to feel ashamed of revealing it.

Is this more important for an monastic environment perhaps?

As I wrote in the recent post, apart from arbitrary things like looking a certain way, the things the Vinaya enjoins a monastic to do are not accidental; they are meant to prevent them from straying from the path as much as possible. Confession might be somewhat more difficult for laypeople because many may not know people who share the value of restraint and would encourage them in their efforts towards pure conduct instead of trying to dissuade them. But it’s still a net loss to one’s practice if one doesn’t find a way to do it. Years, even a whole lifetime, of progress can be lost simply because one never fully acknowledged something as a mistake, continued to do it, and repeatedly found excuses to cover up regret and doubt whenever they arose. All the while continuing to believe that one is “taking the training seriously.”

My reasoning is that if it’s a minor mistake, I’d be fueling excessive guilt by obsessing and making a big deal out of it. But if it’s a big mistake, a breach of

precepts for example, there may be a legitimate need and benefit to confessing it to somebody, and thereby helping you ‘process’ it- because if you don’t it could dominate your mind and warp your perspective, and in turn endanger your spiritual practice.

When the mind really wants you to continue a certain bad habit, it will try to gaslight you into believing that seeing it as a fault constitutes “excessive guilt.” Guilt is an issue only when it gets to the point of self-hatred and self-contempt, since that won’t help you to prevent the mistake. It might even convince you to make it again because “who cares, I’m worthless anyway.”

The right sense of shame comes out of a sense of dignity and having high aspirations, and it’s not concerned with revolving around the past but with doing better starting right now. If there is a compulsion to turn the acknowledgement of a fault into self-hatred, that’s a time to practice the same not giving in to unbeneficial pressures as usual, without covering up that which is true and factual (that you made a mistake and better not repeat it). That would be an example of the middle way.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-01 12:22:42 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

But I suppose it’s preferable if it’s in person and maybe even someone who can hold you accountable?

Yes, but something is definitely better than nothing. Merely revealing things to someone with whom you’d feel a sense of shame regarding the transgression will show you the extent to which it’s possible to cover things up *from yourself*. Keeping it to yourself, you will likely not realize it, regardless of how sincere and heedful you think you are. Even though you might still acknowledge it as a fault, it can still be a rather abstract, arms-length recognition (and you can be sure of that if the fault happens again).

And how about on the days when I keep the 8 precepts, like on Uposatha day, if I for example eat more than needed and indulge in some form of entertainment, should I confess that to somebody as well?

If you’re clear that you ate past a certain point out of indulgence in tastes and not hunger, then yes. But in itself, there’s no fixed amount of food you should have on an Uposatha day as long as it’s within the allowable time. You stop as soon as you’re no longer physically hungry, enduring and seeing through whatever doubts might come up (in either direction: tempting you to eat more or to irrationally find fault with eating a perfectly reasonable amount just for dispelling hunger).

As for entertainment, yes, that’s worth confessing because it’s categorically breaking a precept you’ve undertaken even if only that one day (and, as I wrote, that heightened restraint should naturally bleed into your whole week if you did it right).

Private vs public precepts

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** tejveer 2025-03-29 15:13:49

I've been trying to keep the precepts in private for all this time, and never really declaring to others that I'm keeping what I'm keeping. I realized a few months ago, that my justification for not announcing them publicly was fear and disapproval of others.

It was only a few weeks ago that I realized that my compulsive search for the 'perfect proof' for the validity of the Dhamma was a symptom of this fear of disapproval of others. In my mind, if I'd found a justification for the teachings which was as indubitable as mathematical proofs, then I could confront others about what I'm doing without having to fear any criticism. Or even if I were in fact criticized, the idea was that if I had a proof of such degree of indubitability regarding the efficacy of the path, then the criticism wouldn't make a difference to me either way since they would be undoubtedly wrong in it. It was a sort of protective measure that I could fall back on to, that I hadn't been explicitly realizing as such until just now.

Now that I've been restraining the compulsive tendency to seek justification for everything, the fact that I fear and shy away from disclosing my intentions is becoming more and more apparent.

I'm celibate and intend to remain celibate for the rest of my entire life, and have no issue in that. But, I haven't disclosed this to my family even though we're Indian and the idea of celibacy isn't something they aren't familiar with. In announcing my celibacy publicly to my family, I would implicitly be distancing myself from the religion I'm born into (Sikhism) because it's doctrinally the opposite from everything taught in it. This isn't too much of an issue for my closest relationships (mom, sister) since they've assimilated well into Western society where none of the religious doctrines are really relevant (but there are of course other concerns like my mom expecting me to have kids in the future). I'd personally abandoned the religion doctrinally many years ago, but it acts as a kind of social glue between my family and relatives. Announcing celibacy, and for example, not eating and socializing for the sake of pleasure, would most certainly boot me out of that cohesive social structure held together by the religious doctrines I'd be implicitly rejecting.

I don't fear being booted out of the social group, but rather the disapproval that precedes it.

The same is the case for jobs. When I last had a job, during lunch times when I wouldn't be able to go out for a walk alone, I would have to sit with others and they would inquire into my interests. At that time, I was still not keeping the entertainment precepts in the manner I am now, so I would talk to them about the music I liked and so on. But there were other subjects they would talk about like clothing, restaurants, relationships, etc., that I had no concern with, and I would get weird looks and jokes made of me since I was so 'inexperienced' in that area.

It's very odd because in my entire life I've never really cared significantly about doing what the group did, or what was 'trendy', and was always, from others' perspective, the

oddball doing my own things. Nonetheless, in nearly all the social situations I've been in, I had quite a great reputation and a lot of friends, and I made sure it would stay that way.

But acting in line with the Dhamma is destroying any possible basis that could exist for maintaining such a reputation. I'm now at a point where I can officially say I have no friends, and I'm content with that. Previously, I would still have people I'd occasionally talk to, but now as I've given up even music and the last bits of entertainment like youtube and so on, there's no basis for any relation with any people. The only thing I can imagine left connecting me to the world is my mind's enjoyment of my family's safety and comfort, but that too is something that I intend on reversing.

But now I imagine in social situations, my reputation will dampen even more as any social currency (other highly reputed friends, hobbies others would like, being inquisitive of others, etc.) I previously had is in the process of destruction. And it is very scary.

My question is, how do I train myself in regards to overcoming this fear of losing reputation? The fear of having to disclose my private intentions?

Currently, I don't go to university since the lecturers are subpar, so I'm home alone most of the time just studying or contemplating. Should I try to join social groups to expose myself to potential disapproval? I can stay alone like this all the time, but then I won't really be able to discern the mind's inclination towards reputation, and as such, not really have any opportunity to train amidst that.

I could also just 'expose' myself to my family by mentioning the fact that I'm keeping the precepts, but that would be such an immense pressure all of a sudden that I don't think I will be able to handle it. Is there an equivalent 'gradual' manner of working towards that point?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 05:06:58

My question is, how do I train myself in regards to overcoming this fear of losing reputation? The fear of having to disclose my private intentions?

By first of all not acting out of the fear if and when it comes up.

Should I try to join social groups to expose myself to potential disapproval? I can stay alone like this all the time, but then I won't really be able to discern the mind's inclination towards reputation, and as such, not really have any opportunity to train amidst that.

This sounds precisely like your mind trying to bait you into acting out of the fear. Even if going out leads to learning how to successfully defend yourself against criticisms for the rest of your life, since that was an action rooted in the fear, you will remain emotionally invested in what people think about you, and the *liability* to the fear will remain unchanged.

You "prove" that you can handle it by seeing that fear and concern about reputation have already arisen *here and now*, before you've even met anyone, and not allowing them to

be your motivation for doing anything. If that means that you will not be able to prepare yourself for people's future criticisms, so be it. That would not be a problem at all if not for the fear, which would eventually disappear if you stopped giving in to it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-01 11:40:18 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

This is a good example of why it's necessary to question one's intentions.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-02 02:33:35 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The character of the action is not determined by a combination of the intentions lying behind it but by which of those intentions you emphasize at the end of the day. So if you bought the books truly just because you wanted to access their contents, that would be fine, but it would mean relinquishing the possibility of deliberately revealing them—unless a different reason for making them known arrives that is unrelated to getting recognition.

Often times, the elation towards an action dissipates when you actually do it with a right intention and put aside all wrong ones. Just as a child might not be enthusiastic about the very same trip anymore after learning that there won't be a treat at any point.

New Wiki Page: Virtue and the Seven Precepts

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-03-28 16:37:04

<https://www.reddit.com/r/HillsideHermitage/wiki/index/>

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 02:38:36

For some reason, the Sutta quotes had been cut short. References (searchable on the page): T 54, MĀ 133, AN 10.62, SN 3.25, MN 78, AN 7.67, AN 9.41, MN 61, MN 9.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 04:29:55 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

For incelibacy precept you say "Thinking sexual thoughts", as I understand here it should be "delighting in..."

That was deliberate. Unlike the others, sexual thoughts in particular cannot be had without automatic delight.

- For some of the precepts you add "Deliberate" in front and others don't have this, maybe good to add this in front of all of them for consistency.

It was also deliberate for the ones that don't have it.

I've implemented the other suggestions. Thanks.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 07:01:21 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Surely you have practical things to take care of in daily life?

The point is not that you should try to keep yourself occupied. You should resolve to be without engaging activities some of the time (basically anything apart from walking and sitting) because that's when your internal states can become clearer. But unless you're pretty close to Arahantship, it will be hard to do nothing at all for more than a couple of hours a day without losing perspective and falling into wrong views/attitudes. It means you'll be forcing yourself to avoid neutral activities, thinking they must be rooted in craving somehow. By assuming you already see where craving is and that you just need to stick to that denial mechanically, you won't be looking for where it actually is.

Instead, look at the inclinations of mind enduring behind whatever you're doing and make that your guide. If an activity is unwholesome, you'll see that it's directly inclining the mind towards sensual desire, ill will, and eventually breaking precepts. It's pretty obvious when that's happening, but you look the other way and allow those pressures to gain momentum.

As I wrote, you will make mistakes and misjudge your intentions sometimes, but that's fine. That's the only way you will concretely learn the distinction between wholesome and unwholesome. It's not fine when the mistake entails breaking a precept, since that's full-blown carelessness that doesn't come out of a simple lack of clarity about your intentions.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 12:12:04 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Would occasionally delivering those products as a truck driver or working in a restaurant or supermarket that sells those products qualify?

It depends. When it comes to intoxicants, live animals, poisons, and weapons, being responsible for personally handing them to customers or directly or indirectly encouraging them to buy them (marketing) would in itself be an issue. Delivering or promoting the purchase of meat from animals slaughtered by the company you work for would also be problematic. If the meat comes from elsewhere and is not commissioned specifically for your employer, then it's fine.

Such livelihood would hinder your Dhamma practice—not because of external ethical considerations but because it implicates your intention. The Dhamma is concerned solely with the state of your own mind. You would be implicitly condoning the harmful actions of others, and that is bound to be rooted in delusion (not acknowledging what's factual) at the very least.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-01 18:15:36 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I wouldn't see it as an issue. You do want to be careful about what books you personally read if you want to tame your mind, but working at a library is on a different level than being a musician, actor, or someone in "showbiz" in general (as promoter, producer, director, etc.)

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-06 12:59:44 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

this sound right?

It does.

With the sort of activities in bucket 3, apart from ensuring that they don't constitute entertainment in their content, you'll want to regularly inspect your intention to see whether you're doing them as a way of running away from pressure and unwholesome mental states (where "running away" really just means letting them fester somewhere in the background, since you can never truly escape them through distraction).

Instead, you need to have the attitude that you can never "take a break" from the four right strivings and make that your unwavering priority. That means that regardless of what you do, you're always maintaining perspective over your mind-state and motivations and trying to keep them on the wholesome side, and are ready to drop whatever you're doing if you realize that the motive behind it has become corrupted even though it initially wasn't.

With that attitude, such activities will not be a problem: you will be mindful (in the right sense) while doing them, and thus you will start to get a sense for when you should stop. And that will absolutely train you in discerning wholesome and unwholesome internally, whereas maintaining a fixed routine would keep you outwardly very restrained for however long it lasts—but once it ends (as sooner or later it will), you'll be walking through the same old minefield of actions without any idea where the mines are, because all you did was avoid the field entirely.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-08-29 17:43:15 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It's just a heuristic. In an ideal case scenario, yes, you would devote all your time to cultivation. But also, if you were fully clear about what the right cultivation is and were able to stick to that uninterruptedly, a day and night of that cultivation (or a few) would be enough to fully discern the noble truths and become an Arahant.

Since it's just a fact that one's practice will usually be directed by a miscalibrated understanding, there will be less wasted effort if one does not overcommit to what appears to be right on any given day (which realistically goes hand in hand with spending more than a couple of hours doing it) and makes sure to not let oneself backslide into the hindrances

even more during neutral activities. That also counts as practice, since activities within the precepts cannot induce further wildness in the citta without the help of one's own careless attention.

The section on purifying the mind from obstructions day and night takes for granted that one clearly sees what the mind and the obstructions are, and that's already beyond sotāpatti.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-01 15:44:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

So does that mean that if after a couple more years of full time work I can reduce my work and increase that available time to let's say a solid 3h per day and but keep working and doing chores for 5-6h per day, it would be equally good or even better than if I can figure out a way to make it 7-8h in seclusion and not work anymore except chores etc.?

No, it wouldn't be better.

There is a big difference between being by yourself with nothing that you necessarily "have" to do for the rest of the day and then doing things within that and, on the other hand, having externally enforced duties that you can't avoid. It's helpful to try to have less of the latter as long as it doesn't reach the point of aversion towards tasks in themselves.

But what makes it eventually not miscalibrated if not spending time in seclusion trying to get the right understanding? If more time in seclusion would be wasted effort, doesn't that imply that the time doing "neutral activities" but "merely" trying be careful not to backslide / (fuel?) the hindrances would actually be the productive effort?

Well, both should ideally happen in seclusion; I don't think I ever said otherwise. But what you need to understand is how and to what extent craving underlies your actions and how action without that craving is possible, and you don't get that solely by thinking about it until it all clicks on the intellectual level.

Quite often, a person's incessant "thinking about it" will be the thing stopping them from seeing that they're acting out of craving and overlooking their citta right at that moment. So by allowing some room for doing something other than just "think about Dhamma" or "cultivate this or that," you will at least be putting the brakes on that momentum of wrong effort from time to time and creating an opening to return to the "right level." But both of them very much count towards understanding the Dhamma, because even when you, say, go for a walk (ideally alone where there are no people), you're still trying to keep an eye on your mind and making sure that it's not pushing you in unwholesome directions. Likewise, sometimes you *should* keep actively pondering and reflecting because you're in fact clarifying things at the right level at that time.

Since you can't reliably know when it's which, the best policy is just to keep the door open for either. Overly fixating on either course of action would waste more time.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-09-02 15:46:49 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The confusion might be in part because for many people this is not even something they need to think about. They will naturally realize that what matters is to not delight in company and be on their own as much as possible, but that at the same time it's not about active, forceful effort all the time. That is not just unsustainable but will also take one in a wrong direction that overlooks the current state of mind. As the four right efforts describe, there are times when it's just about protecting what you already have. If it never seems like that to someone despite being virtuous and restrained to the best of their understanding, then they're most probably not seeing their citta.

So then it's not really that one goes out of one's way to find things to do (or to try to be around others more), but that one realizes that the mind is already not infected with passion, aversion, etc., for the time being, and thus there is no need to keep pushing with that intensity for the time being. Then whatever is offered as an option for activity within that (even on the mental level) has to be done with the clarity that it will not introduce unarisen unwholesome states like delight in work or in company (or restlessness regarding the Dhamma, for that matter).

If one is able to spend one's days and nights in that state without falling from it, then there is already nothing significantly unwholesome there. No coarse states of sensuality or aversion would be coming up. Only when that basis is firm is one able to strive more "decisively" regarding lesser impurities (as per the formula describing the wakefulness practice) without being driven almost inevitably by restlessness and wrong expectations of what freedom even is. You could say that at that point, the person has understood and become established in the precepts and sense restraint. And to get to that point, they certainly need to have frequented empty dwellings and not delighted in company.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-11-30 10:38:01 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It means anything that you feel compelled to do out of the pressure of lust, aversion, or desire for distraction. Actions based on those pressures are not "innocent" even when they seem so to others.

Importantly, those motivations are not inherent to any specific actions (apart from breaking the precepts). At one point you might want to do a certain activity out of those unwholesome motivations, and at another those motivations would be absent.

Is this a correct way of practicing?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** No-Spirit5082 2025-03-28 14:04:23

Ever since i started living by the 8 precepts (not to the letter but mostly) and practicing abandoning the attitude of sensuality, i find that i very naturally, or with little effort can be

mindful in this sort of way - when im walking in the forest, im aware of my body moving, aware of sounds around me, wind blowing on my face, i feel present and my mind is naturally quiet with little thought.

Should i intentionally cultivate this way of practice?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-29 03:25:19

Sounds like precisely the wrong direction to go in. That quietude is probably based on the novelty of living a simpler life externally and will not last long. The pressure of the hindrances will become apparent again at some point (more likely than not, it's already there; it's just overlooked), and that's where the work lies.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-30 03:27:07 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Because it's not like you have a choice. The hindrances never go into limbo. If you just practice something because you find it calming or enjoyable, not examining what the attitude behind it is, you will be under the thumb of one hindrance or the other. That means nothing of fundamental value will be developed and right understanding will not arise (since the hindrances are what block it).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-10 03:22:03 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

whenever anyone experiences any kind of relief or otherwise productive feeling as a result of keeping the precepts and renouncing bad habits, they're told that's proof they're doing everything all wrong.

The feeling described here does not actually come from keeping the precepts and renouncing bad habits. Anyone could, without renouncing anything, go for a walk in a quiet forest and have a moment of peace and release from being extra "present." It's a contrived kind of joy still underlain by passion, which, sure, is less harmful than rabid sensual pleasure but is far from the actual joy of renunciation that the Buddha praised. It's still well within sensuality, clearly still relying on the five senses.

How would anyone know they're on a productive trajectory

When joy arises *purely* because they have abandoned unwholesome states, whether they attend to their sensations or do anything else. Even when they try to become lustful or angry, those states simply cannot ignite as strongly as before, and *that's* pleasant.

That's very different from such states (seemingly) not arising because the pleasant sensations are keeping one occupied for the time being.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-04-10 11:25:31 (in reply to a comment not included)

When pleasure truly arises from renunciation and freedom from unwholesome states, you cannot fail to recognize its source because you've been consciously doing the right work. Once you succeed, it simply wouldn't occur to you to attribute it to anything else—unlike any other type of pleasure of an unbeneficial kind, which can arise spontaneously.

But isn't that a characteristic of someone who experienced enlightenment?

It's a characteristic of someone who has lessened the five hindrances by unbroken persistence in not acting out of them (rather than merely finding an enjoyable spot within them by attending to pleasant experiences). It's not a permanent state though, and one can and will fall back eventually if one becomes heedless.

What does a raw beginner have to go on to know they're on the path?

A beginner, i.e., someone without right view, is strictly speaking never on the path. Their task is first and foremost to understand what the path is. But everyone inevitably starts with *some* understanding; the question is only whether it's right or wrong (i.e., leads to freedom from liability to suffering, or not).

One can know their view is getting closer to the right view when they are less moved by pleasure and pain purely because of their understanding, not on account of a practice or activity they engage in.

I'm trying to reach the point of keeping 8 precepts all the time.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** 4NTN8FP 2025-03-27 00:28:15

The precepts which I currently do not adhere to every day are the 6th and 7th. I've taken the approach of making small steps towards an eventual 100% adherence to these particular precepts. For example, I am intermittent fasting, but still eating after noon because I can't / don't eat breakfast. I am working on cutting out snacking and only eating at two meal times/day.

As for the 7th precept, it's the entertainment part that I'm still not 100% untangled from. I've gotten to where I will not engage with entertainment during the work week, and I don't ever listen to music. Watching shows is now almost always something I do with family but not on my own.

Not to overthink or be too impatient, but part of me is wondering if this approach might lead to a perpetual state of making small allowances here and there to break some of the precepts. Am I better off just going all in and not working gradually at it?

Another thing, seeing that I am not a monastic, have a young child who enjoys watching movies and shows with me occasionally, and we eat dinner together... should I be more

realistic and wait until her dependency on me is over and she is living out on her own before taking some of these renunciation precepts on more full time?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-28 04:34:33

My advice would be to first of all cease to watch shows out of your own interest. In such cases it's worse, and there isn't even an excuse for it.

More broadly, it's important to have the right context towards the precepts. It's not about fulfilling an imposed duty but about abstaining from things that run counter to what you hope to develop. Thus, when it comes to the core of the training—not acting out of lust, ill will, or desire for distraction—your aspirations should not be guided by whether you're a monastic or not but by how high liberation is on your priority list. It's not about who you are now but about what you want to achieve.

So, work on developing a perception of danger in regard to breaking the precepts so that your reasons for keeping them become more accurate and solid. Aim to see for yourself *why* the very performance of those actions is *inescapably* unbeneficial* for your own mind until that recognition is so concrete that it overshadows anything others might say or do. That's when you're established in the precepts (and that clarity can only be developed on the basis of already keeping them).

* As discussed here, the food and sleep precepts are not on the same level as the others, but if all the others are in place then it's well worth adding them.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-28 04:45:31 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

True, but the often overlooked caveat is that both in the male and female* cases, the lay disciples to emulate were anāgāmis.

So, in an attempt to emulate the conduct of those exemplary disciples, one would at the very least be celibate and abstinent from sensual pursuits in general.

* There are no details on Khujjuttarā in the early texts, but since the other three disciples were all anāgāmis, she likely was too.

Seven Grains of Sand (The Suffering of a Sotāpanna)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-03-25 16:43:55

This is a translation of **SĀ 1178** and **SĀ-2:92**, two parallel discourses from the *Samyukta Āgama*—a collection of early Buddhist scriptures closely related to the Pali *Samyutta Nikāya*. Today, the *Samyukta Āgama* survives in three distinct Classical Chinese translations made by different groups at different times based on lost Indian originals. One (SĀ) is complete, while the other two (SĀ-2 and SĀ-3) are partial translations.

Their content serves to illustrate a point often made in our teachings that I've attempted to clarify a number of times here. Namely, that the suffering a *sotāpanna* is liable to is minuscule compared to the *puthujjana*.

In the same vein, further below I added a translation of SĀ 891, which unlike the Pali version SN 13.10, makes no mention of “at most seven [lives],” nor depicts the Buddha with “seven grains” on his hand, instead using a different comparison altogether. As we shall see below, this appears to be an addition to the Pali rather than an omission from the Chinese.

SN 15.10 is a Pali text that discusses stream-entry undeniably in the context of *saṃsāra*, and we can see that though the message might appear the same as SN 13.10 at first glance, there are subtle and important differences. Firstly, SN 15.10 (and its Chinese parallels) does not say anything about *suffering* proper; it focuses on the fact that, for a *puthujjana*, there is no end in sight to birth and death, while for a *sotāpanna* there is.

On the other hand, both SN 13.10 and SĀ 891 agree in explicitly speaking not only in terms of *dukkha* but also quantitatively, with SN 13.10 referring to “the mass of suffering that was exhausted and worn away”, and SĀ 891 mentioning “various vast and immeasurable sufferings cut off at their root, unable to arise again” (adding the simile of a palm tree with its head severed that appears in several Pali Suttas, emphasizing that it's not merely an ability to overcome arisen suffering). Both compare this large quantity with a miniscule amount representing the suffering that remains for a *sotāpanna*.

We can thus see that the distinction between ordinary person and stream-enterer is being presented from two angles that are not strictly equivalent: although the amount of births explicitly mentioned in SN 15.10 will in practice likely correlate with more net suffering, in theory one being could suffer the same “amount” over very many lifetimes in a higher realm than another being over a single lifetime in a lower realm. If a *sotāpanna* continued to suffer as much—or sometimes even more than—a *puthujjana* but had only seven existences remaining, this would of course still be an extremely significant achievement worth striving for. But through the lens of SĀ 891, the *sotāpanna* is no longer liable to anywhere near the same amount of suffering *at any given time*, even when encountering unfortunate circumstances (and this aligns with the Arrow Sutta). This also would by itself—without any fixed limit on future rebirths—be an extremely significant achievement worth striving for. In both cases, the deal presented in SN 56.35 seems perfectly sensible. In reality of course, *both* of these are defining characteristics of a stream-enterer, and they both originate from one and the same cause: having understood the four noble truths.

Given that the language in SN 13.10 more closely reflects the latter aspect of stream-entry than the former, it seems that its original focus was on liability to suffering—similar to its closest equivalent, SĀ 891. However, at some point, there appears to have been an effort to shoehorn in the theme of rebirth found in SN 15.10 and other canonical texts that emphasize the seven lives aspect. This likely occurred because, as later interpretations—chiefly those of the Pali commentaries, whose spirit and underlying assumptions shape virtually all modern Theravādin traditions—became the norm, it may have even been sin-

cerely viewed as a textual error for the original SN 13.10 to suggest that a stream-enterer's suffering had been reduced to *one* sesame seed compared to the Himalayas.

After all, the only reasons for thinking that SN 13.10 is about rebirth are **(1)** the phrase “that is to say, the fact of having seven lives at most (*yadidaṃ sattakkhattuparamatā*),” which appears at the very end of a passage that in itself does not refer to or hint at rebirth, meaning the phrase could easily be an insertion, and **(2)** the mention of specifically *seven* mustard-sized pebbles (*satta sāsapamattiyo pāsāṇasakkharā*) rather than *one*—like the *one* drop of water on the tip of a hair depicted in SĀ 891—which could also have been inserted later to align with the other mention of the number seven. If we remove these two arguably unnatural references to the number seven, the text becomes identical in essence to SĀ 891.

What's more, since the comparison with the Himalayas was never substituted, SN 13.10 ends up containing a technical flaw uncharacteristic of the Pali canon: equating suffering with time in *saṃsāra* and then comparing the puthujjana's suffering to the Himalāyas implies their time in *saṃsāra*, although very large, *has an eventual end*. But this is precisely not the case. In early Buddhism, for as long as beings are ignorant and fettered by craving, there will not be an end of suffering for them. The idea that all beings are inevitably destined for Nibbāna is a later development, made possible by very different notions of what Nibbāna and the path to it are.

This is one of a sizeable number of instances where the Chinese version of a text appears to be more authentic than the Pali version, and this might be because the Āgamas, translated into Chinese around the time of Buddhaghosa (4th-5th century), were never as widely engaged with—and thus modified, intentionally or otherwise—as the Pali texts, which have been used by a living tradition for two millenia. This is because Mahāyāna dominated China for most of its history, apparently already since the 5th century, and thus these texts were likely scorned and labeled “Hīnayāna,” yet they were still preserved.

It is also noteworthy that the bulk of the manuscripts used to compile the modern Pali canon apparently date back to no earlier than the 17th century. The congruency between the Chinese and Pali collections suggests that any changes made to the latter by the Theravāda tradition over the last millenium and a half were not so drastic so as to be glaringly obvious. However, as this example illustrates, there can be subtle yet impactful differences in meaning between the two versions of a discourse created by the presence or absence of just a couple of words. # Saṃyukta Āgama 1178

Thus have I heard:

At one time, the Buddha was residing in the Ambara Garden in the country of Mithilā.

There was a Brahmin woman named Vasitthi, who had lost six sons in succession. Grieving for her children, she lost her mind, wandering naked with disheveled hair along the roads, until she arrived at the Ambara Garden in Mithilā.

The World-Honored One was surrounded by a great assembly, delivering a discourse. When Vasitthi saw the Buddha from afar, she regained her senses, felt shame and embarrassment, and sat down modestly with her body drawn in.

The World-Honored One said to Venerable Ānanda, “Take your outer robe and give it to the Brahmin woman Vasitthi so she may wear it and listen to the Dharma.” Venerable Ānanda, following the Buddha’s instruction, took the robe and gave it to her to wear.

After the Brahmin woman put on the robe, she approached the Buddha, paid homage with her head at his feet, and sat to one side.

The World-Honored One taught her, showing, instructing, illuminating, and gladdening her. Following the Buddha’s usual method of teaching—progressing step by step—she developed pure faith, took the Three Refuges, and, hearing the Buddha’s words, rejoiced and expressed delight. She then paid homage and departed.

Later, when her seventh son suddenly passed away, the laywoman Vasitthi did not weep, grieve, or suffer in anguish. Her husband, the Brahmin, spoke a verse to her:

*When your earlier sons died,
Grief for them brought you suffering;
Day and night without food or drink,
Even to the point of madness.
Now, with the seventh son’s death,
Why do you feel no sorrow?*

Vasitthi, the laywoman, replied with a verse to her husband:

*Children and grandchildren number in the thousands,
Born from the union of causes and conditions;
Through the long night of time, they pass away,
And so it is with you and me.
Descendants and kin are countless,
Born in various places,
Where they devour one another in turn.
Knowing the nature of birth,
Why should one grieve?
I have understood liberation,
The nature of birth and death,
And no longer feel sorrow,
Thanks to entering the Buddha’s true teaching.*

Her husband, the Brahmin, praised her with a verse:

Never before have I heard such a teaching,

Yet now I hear it from you.

Where did you hear the Dharma,

That you no longer grieve for your son?

Vasitthi replied with a verse:

Today, the Perfectly Enlightened One

Resides in the country of Mithilā,

In the Ambara Garden,

Forever free from all suffering.

He expounds all suffering,

The cause of suffering, its cessation,

And the Noble Eightfold Path,

Leading peacefully to Nirvana!

He is my great teacher,

And I deeply rejoice in his true teaching.

Having understood the true Dharma,

which can dispel your sorrows.

Her husband, the Brahmin, responded with a verse:

I too shall go

To the Ambara Garden in Mithilā,

Where the World-Honored One

Will dispel my grief for my son.

The laywoman replied with a verse:

Behold the Perfectly Enlightened One,

His body radiant like soft gold;

He tames the untamed,

Guiding countless beings across the sea of existence.

The Brahmin prepared a horse-drawn chariot and set out for the Ambara Garden in Mithilā. Seeing the World-Honored One from afar, his faith and joy increased, and he approached the Great Teacher.

The Great Teacher spoke verses, opening his Dharma eye, revealing the Four Noble Truths—suffering, its cause, its cessation, and the path—directing him toward Nirvana. He immediately saw the Dharma and attained the non-return state. Having understood the Dharma, he requested ordination.

The Brahmin was then ordained. He dwelt alone in seclusion, contemplating diligently, and eventually attained Arhantship. The World-Honored One declared: “On the third night, he attained the Three Knowledges.”

After attaining the Three Knowledges, the Buddha instructed him: “Send the charioteer back with the chariot to inform Vasitthi, the laywoman, to rejoice. Say to her: ‘The Brahmin went to see the World-Honored One, gained pure faith, and devoted himself to the Great Teacher. The Buddha taught him, opened his Dharma eye, revealed the Noble Truths of suffering, its cause, its cessation, and the Noble Eightfold Path, leading to Nirvana, and he attained the non-return state. Having understood the Dharma, he sought ordination. The World-Honored One declared: “On the third night, he fully attained the Three Knowledges.”’”

The charioteer, following the instruction, returned swiftly. When Vasitthi, the laywoman, saw the charioteer returning with an empty chariot from afar, she called out and asked: “Did the Brahmin see the Buddha? Did the Buddha teach the Dharma, open his Dharma eye, and reveal the Noble Truths?”

The charioteer replied: “The Brahmin saw the World-Honored One, gained pure faith, and devoted himself to the Great Teacher. The Buddha opened his Dharma eye, taught the Four Noble Truths, and he attained the non-return state. Having understood the Dharma, he sought ordination and now contemplates diligently. The World-Honored One declared: ‘On the third night, he fully attained the Three Knowledges.’”

The laywoman rejoiced in her heart and said to the charioteer: “The chariot and horses are yours, and I grant you an additional thousand coins for delivering this good news: ‘The Brahmin has become a monk and attained the Three Knowledges,’ which brings me great joy.”

The charioteer replied: “What use do I have for chariots, horses, or money? Return the chariot, horses, and money to the laywoman. I will now return to the Brahmin and follow him in ordination.”

The laywoman said: “If that is your intention, go quickly. Soon you too will attain what he has—the Three Knowledges—and follow him in ordination.”

The charioteer said: “So it shall be, laywoman! Just as he ordained, so shall I.”

The laywoman said: “Your father has ordained, and you will follow him. Soon I too will go after you. Like a great dragon soaring freely in the open sky, with other dragons, dragon sons, and dragon daughters following, so too will I, taking up the robe and bowl, living simply and easily satisfied.” The charioteer responded: “Laywoman! If it is so, your aspiration will surely be fulfilled. Soon I will see you with few desires, content, carrying robe and bowl, eating almsfood discarded by others, with shaven head and dyed robes, having

cut off attachment to form, feeling, perception, and consciousness, free from greed and bondage, and extinguished all outflows.”

The Brahmin, his charioteer, Vasitthi the laywoman, and her granddaughter Sundarī, all ordained and reached the end of suffering.

SĀ-2.92

Thus have I heard:

At one time, the Buddha was staying in the Amrapālī Grove in the kingdom of Mithilā.

At that time, a Brahmin woman named Vāsithī had recently lost her sixth child. Overwhelmed by grief for her lost child, her mind became disordered, and she ran about naked and frantic, eventually arriving at the Amrapālī Grove in Mithilā.

At that moment, the Blessed One was surrounded by a vast assembly, teaching the Dharma.

Then, Vāsithī, the Brahmin woman, saw the Blessed One from a distance and regained her composure, squatting on the ground in shame.

The Buddha said to Ānanda:

“Give her a nun’s robe, and bring it here; I will teach her the Dharma.”

Ānanda received the command and provided the nun’s robe.

Vāsithī, the Brahmin woman, quickly put on the robe and approached the Buddha, bowing her head to his feet.

At that time, the Blessed One taught her various aspects of the Dharma, showing, instructing, and delighting her, as the Buddhas of old had done—speaking of generosity, morality, and the heavens, explaining that desire is the root of impurity, suffering, and affliction, while liberation is true joy.

Then, the Blessed One expounded the Dharma broadly, knowing her sincere wish to free herself from the fetters of hindrance, and taught her the Four Noble Truths: suffering, its origin, its cessation, and the path.

This Vāsithī was intelligent and insightful, able to grasp the teachings upon hearing them, like a clean white cloth easily taking dye.

In that very moment, seated there, she perceived the Four Noble Truths, saw the Dharma, attained the Dharma, understood it, and crossed beyond doubt to the other shore. She realized the Dharma herself, no longer relying on others’ teachings, her faith unshaken, fearless in the Buddha’s doctrine. Rising from her seat, she joined her palms, bowed to the Buddha, and said:

“Blessed One! I have now crossed beyond the three evil realms. For the rest of my life, I take refuge in the Three Jewels as a lay follower, vowing never to kill, maintaining pure faith, refraining from theft, sexual misconduct, false speech, and intoxicants—such is my commitment.”

Then, having heard the Dharma, the woman rejoiced, bowed to the Buddha, and departed.

At a later time, Vāsithī lost her seventh child, yet she felt neither sorrow nor distress, nor did she dwell on it or run about naked and frantic as before.

At that time, her husband, the Brahmin Bharadvāja, spoke in verse, asking:

*“When you lost your children before,
You mourned with unbearable anguish,
Your heart entangled in sorrowful memories,
For a long time you neither ate nor drank.
Now, with your seventh child fallen ill and passed away,
You, a devoted mother,
Why do you not grieve or dwell on it?”*

Then Vāsithī replied to her husband in verse:

*“Through countless eons,
I have taken bodies without end,
Due to attachment and love,
My children and descendants are beyond count.
In every place I took birth,
Losses were never few,
In the vast wilderness of birth and death,
I have endured endless suffering.
I have understood birth and death,
The destinations of coming and going,
Thus, today,
I harbor no grief or attachment.”*

Her Brahmin husband responded in verse:

*“What you have said,
I have never heard before.
From whom did you gain this insight,
that you are able to cast aside your sorrows?”*

Then Vāsithī answered in verse:

*“Brahmin, know this:
In days past, the three Buddhas,
In Mithilā, in the Amrapālī Grove,
Taught the cessation of all suffering,
And the path to end it,
Cultivating the Eightfold Noble Path,
Leading to peace and Nirvana.”*

The Brahmin then spoke in verse:

*“I, too, now wish to go
To the Amrapālī Grove,
To ask the Blessed One
To relieve my pain of longing for my child.”*

Vāsītthī replied in verse:

*“The Buddha’s body shines like pure gold,
His halo radiates a fathom around,
He has forever severed all afflictions,
Ferrying beings across the stream of birth and death.
Such a great guide,
Able to tame all,
Transforms all sentient beings,
Thus he is called the True Deliverer.
You should hasten now
To the presence of that Blessed One.”*

Hearing his wife’s words, the Brahmin rejoiced and leapt with joy. He immediately prepared his chariot and went to the grove. Seeing the Blessed One’s majestic radiance from afar, his reverence doubled. Upon arriving, he bowed and sat to one side.

At that time, the Blessed One, with his mind-reading ability, observed the man’s earnest heart and immediately taught him the Four Noble Truths—suffering, its origin, its cessation, and the path—along with the Eightfold Path and other teachings leading to Nirvana.

Hearing this Dharma, the Brahmin awakened to the Four Noble Truths, attained insight into the Dharma, and sought to become a monk. The Buddha permitted it.

After becoming a monk, he practiced diligently without negligence, and within three nights, he attained the three higher knowledges. The Buddha declared him an Arhat, thus renaming him “Well-Born.”

Having attained the three knowledges, he instructed his charioteer, Bharati, saying:

*“Take the jeweled chariot you drove and return home. Tell Vāsītthī:
‘You should rejoice for me. Why? Because the Buddha has taught me the Four Truths, allowed me to become a monk, and I have gained the three knowledges. Therefore, you should have pure faith in me.’”*

The charioteer, Bharati, returned home with the chariot. Seeing it return, Vāsītthī asked the charioteer:

“Did the Brahmin meet the Buddha?”

The charioteer replied:

“The Brahmin, while seated, perceived the Four Noble Truths. Having seen them, he sought to become a monk, and the Buddha allowed it. After becoming a monk, within three nights, he attained Arhatship.”

Then the woman said to the charioteer:

“You have brought this good news. I shall reward you with a horse and a thousand gold coins.”

The charioteer replied:

“I do not need a horse or gold coins. I wish to go to the Buddha and hear the wondrous Dharma.”

Vāsithī said:

“If that is so, it is truly excellent. If you become a monk, you will quickly attain the path to Arhatship.”

Vāsithī then spoke to her daughter:

“You should manage the household well and enjoy the five sense pleasures. I wish to become a nun.”

Her daughter, Sundarī, replied to her mother:

“My father has abandoned the five sense pleasures to seek the path as a monk. I, too, shall follow and become a nun, letting go of attachment to my brothers and kin. Just as a great elephant departs and the young elephant follows, so I will follow, becoming a nun, holding an alms bowl and begging for food. I can practice the easy-to-sustain way, not the difficult one.”

Vāsithī said:

“What you desire is truly good and auspicious. Your wish will surely be fulfilled. I see that soon you will exhaust all desires and be free from all fetters.”

Thus, the Brahmin Bharadvāja, Vāsithī, and Sundarī all followed one another, becoming monks and nuns together, each attaining the end of all suffering.

SĀ 891

Thus have I heard:

At one time, the Buddha was staying in Śrāvastī, in the Jeta Grove, in Anāthapiṇḍada’s park.

At that time, the Blessed One said to the monks:

“Suppose there is a lake, vast and long, fifty yojanas wide and equally deep. If a man were to dip the tip of a single hair into that lake water, what do you think, monks? Is the water in the lake greater, or is the drop of water on the tip of the man’s hair greater?”

The monks said to the Buddha:

“Blessed One! The drop on the tip of the man’s hair is exceedingly small, while the lake

water is immeasurable, thousands, millions, billions of times greater—there is no comparison.”

The Buddha said to the monks:

“For one who fully sees the truth, with perfect right view, the disciples of the Blessed One who realize the fruit of truth, with unwavering certainty, have at that moment already severed and understood, cutting off the root—like chopping off the head of a palm tree—so it will not grow again. The manifold sufferings they have severed are vast and immeasurable, like the water of that great lake, while the suffering that remains is like the drop of water on the tip of a hair.”

Having spoken this sutra, the monks, hearing what the Buddha taught, rejoiced and put it into practice.

Just as with the drop of water on the tip of a hair, so it is with the drop on the tip of a blade of grass or a twig.

Just as with the water of the lake, so it is with the Sarodattagā, the Ganges, the Yamunā, the Sarabhū, the Irāvati, the Mahī, and the great ocean—likewise it is said.

Having spoken this sutra, the monks, hearing what the Buddha taught, rejoiced and put it into practice.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-26 05:20:40 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Does this perhaps imply that number of 7 is more of an approximation, similar in the sense to how we say people in our current era are expected to live between 70-80 years (with of course some people dying prior or longer to this estimate)?

That’s not unlikely. The number seven is everywhere in the Suttas, often in oddly specific ways. So in this context too, it could just be a way of saying “several.” And of course, it’s not that a sotāpanna *will* have seven existences. That’s just if they are maximally negligent and probably of slow understanding too.

But if that perception of seeing the conditions for practice doesn’t change, then wouldn’t it be possible for a sotāpanna to be stuck at their stage of ignorance through indefinite lifetimes until they finally make the decision to pursue the path?

No, because they would at times have to get weary of the little suffering they’re still subject to (which compared to an Arahant or even anāgāmi is not insignificant). Especially in the human realm that weariness would arise rather frequently, and so they would do the work at least intermittently. So even if they’re very heedless, it’s not like it would be possible to put the Dhamma aside indefinitely. Otherwise, there would indeed be no reason for a guaranteed end.

On the other hand, with the mind inclining towards renunciation (the stream), it is said that they will be carried by it even if they want to resist at certain points. So I suppose this culminates into my other question: what would prevent the sotapanna from swimming indefinitely against the stream? Evidently they are not directionless (samsara), but at the same time, it seems possible that they could resist the idea of pursuing renunciation indefinitely. What would eventually make them “tire out” and stop trying to swim against the stream?

Only a puthujjana can deliberately reject Nibbāna, since that requires holding a wrong view.

If a sotāpanna is knowingly negligent, they simply lack the motivation to make further effort—they don’t ever actually *want* to postpone Arahantship. You can lack the motivation to stop eating junk food even though you categorically don’t want to be overweight and would shed all the fat immediately if you could.

And that’s what would, even in the most negligent of all cases, prevent an indefinite stalling—right view. Being unable to hold the view that being overweight is fine (that craving and existence are worth maintaining), which the average puthujjana still has. A learned puthujjana can abandon that view, but without understanding for themselves what craving and existence are (which comes from seeing the signs of the mind), they won’t be carried by the stream and are liable to ruin still—even to going back to the old view at some point.

Question about the 8 Precepts & Hunger from Asthma Medication

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** SevereJury8 2025-03-25 03:04:45

Hello,

I’ve recently started practicing the 8 precepts, and I’ve run into a bit of a dilemma I was hoping to get some guidance on.

I have asthma and need to take a steroid medication regularly. One of the side effects is a noticeable amplification of hunger — it’s not constant, but when it comes on, it feels quite sharp and intense. I’ve been doing my best to stick to the one-meal-a-day rule, but this side effect sometimes makes that challenging.

My question is: how should I work with this in a way that stays in line with the spirit of the precepts and sense restraint?

On one hand, it feels like I’m genuinely hungry at times, and eating a second small meal (late morning or early afternoon) seems like it would relieve a physical need rather than indulge a craving. On the other hand, I don’t want to start bending the rules and convincing myself of exceptions every time something gets uncomfortable — especially if that

discomfort is workable with patient endurance.

Is there a way to distinguish between eating to relieve a medication-induced hunger and eating out of desire? Can one eat twice a day without falling into craving, or is that considered a violation of the precept in formal practice regardless of the reason?

Appreciate any guidance or reflections on how to skillfully navigate this.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-25 04:26:35

If the hunger is medication-induced, then it doesn't signify that your body actually requires calories, so you could just see it as harmless discomfort to learn how not to resist.

But I wouldn't try to be perfectly strict with this precept yet, especially if you don't see yourself being fully established in all the other, much more essential ones. There's also nothing about dawn and noon that directly relates to virtue; the time in between was most likely just the most easily recognizable, reasonably-sized period back when there were no clocks. And even for monastics, any amount of meals is technically allowable within that period.

On top of that, monks initially ate all throughout the day, and a higher percentage of them were Arahants compared to later times (which is precisely why rules had to be introduced). That doesn't mean you shouldn't strive to keep the food precept, but it just goes to show that there's nothing inherently unwholesome about eating at any time of the day. It's just more likely to lead to wholesome states to not do so.

Why ever eat sweets?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok-Addition-7759 2025-03-24 16:20:59

One ought to be eating for the sake of this body, not for pleasure, just to keep this lump of matter healthy and comfortable. The pleasant contacts only last so long.

Wouldn't choosing to eat sweets, desserts, unhealthy stuff while healthier options are present categorically be acting out of sensual desire? Do all the Hillside monks eat in this manner? Probably not. I wouldn't fault them for however they eat, though, because I'm probably just missing something. I cannot imagine one who is properly eating in moderation according to my understanding of the way the Buddha spelled it out and the way Hillside teaches it reaching for an unhealthy option over a healthy one. And moderation (in the usual sense) isn't the middle way, so that's not the answer here, right?

But then again, I've heard Ven. Nyanamoli disparage the practice of not eating sugar. Probably because it's done for the wrong reasons and means you don't have to think about your intentions. The good intentions to reach for the sugar seem very limited.

For all my issues with food I've come to the conclusion that one meal a day is best and I can get all the calories I need for my lifestyle. That being the case nothing more is needed, and to eat more than that one meal would almost always be craving. I want sweets more

than anything else, and will restrain myself even with fruit if I think the mind is craving them too much. This craving towards sweetness is probably stronger in me than most people. I might just have to give up sweets altogether and maybe even fruit for some time to help things normalize. I know abstaining from certain foods for periods of time can permanently alter your cravings and relationship with them. As things stand, my mind is untrustworthy regarding eating sweet things and that needs to be fixed, and at this point I don't want to eat the stuff if there's any doubt at all. It's certainly not always acting out of craving to eat fruit, and the tonics, while unnecessary for most individuals, do have their place if you're sick or truly famished or do hard work.

I've struggled with the triad of caffeine, chocolate, and sugar for a long time. I could go without two at a time, but always needed one. When I tried to abstain from all three I always fell back. I'm beyond caffeine and chocolate cravings now, but sugar remains and is more complicated. This really does seem the point for me where if I abstain from all three I suffer properly, without it being adulterated by management.

No topping up the body with what the 21st century thinks is normal to consume, or in amounts it thinks is normal.

Edit: Eating them as part of the one meal is definitely the optimal way to go. Eating sweets as part of a meal is always better for your teeth too. Venerable Subhara brings up some legitimate points about the food situation in monasteries in Asia(although I don't think curd being available justifies adding jaggery to it). And having been able to previously fully give up sugar, I can say that there is a huge difference with the way "the animal" behaves if you're eating even a little sugar and your mind is able to expect it each day(and get "topped up") and not eating any. The mind expecting something sweet at the end of it all is the main problem with Samsara after all, but it's just suffering arising and ceasing. I will say that this has been a point of pride for me, not eating sugar-until I fell from that one day a few months ago and over-indulged and have been struggling with it like an addiction since then. It was a good point of learning at least, seeing that I basically didn't train the mind at all in regard to it before, I just kept it pinned down until it gave up. As a former drug addict, I can see that the mindset of looking or hoping for a high has remained and its just shifted its object. A few times now when I've had shifts in my attitudes towards food and its purpose, those nights I would dream about drugs.

Edit 2: My thoughts about healthy and unhealthy could use some recalibration. All these veggies are so unnecessary spiced anyway and I often genuinely go for sweeter things because they're generally easier to digest. It needs to be approached with discernment each time. I can also trust my gut when it doesn't want something. If my stomach is telling me a bad feeling when I look at and consider certain foods I shouldn't eat them because my stomach is always right and I will feel uncomfortable or get sick from them. It doesn't necessarily follow everything it says "yes" to is good for me to eat, though.

A temporary break is also probably a good idea.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-25 04:03:41

If you feel that for you personally the mind cannot remain stable when eating sugary foods (or engage in any particular action that isn't against the precepts), then sure, avoid that *for the time being*. But that's not a justification to develop the view that those things have to be rooted in craving. By holding such views, you obstruct yourself from concretely understanding what craving is and realizing that, for example, craving for sweets can come and go and is not a fixed phenomenon. Seeing craving as something that will always be there in regard to certain things implies thinking about it in near complete abstraction, a common mistake that is the main underpinning of self-mortification, i.e., the same problem in a new costume.

Apart from the precepts, progress is not measured by how many things you never do but by how little your mind cares about doing anything in particular. That doesn't mean you will never do anything, but that whatever you do will never be rooted in obsession internally and *thus* always be moderate and dispassionate.

So consumption of sweets (or of anything) would be fine if and only if your mind is internally uninvested and not by externally having a "justification" like being sick or famished (obsession can still be there regardless of that justification, and one would then feel absolved from restraining it). And people make mistakes on both accounts: they assume their mind can remain internally uninvested *always* and thus stop actually inspecting whether that's the case on every occasion, or they assume that the external reasons are the measure, and equally stop inspecting their minds internally.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-26 03:39:16 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I've also heard the instruction from HH to avoid unsuitable food.

Never literally, as far as I recall. Surely it was in some figurative sense.

These aren't the signs of the mind, right?

Certainly not.

Is there a way to purify these images?

Yes, these two recent talks go into it (1) (2). In general, make sure you're not trying to forcefully make them go away, as they're clearly not your direct doing. All you have to do is let your attention rest everywhere else but *there* for as long as such images are forcing themselves on you. And it doesn't matter how much they're forcing themselves on you; what matters is that *you* don't welcome them (and thereby implicitly ask them to stay).

Would results like sexual or wet dreams from consuming those foods be grounds to consider them unsuitable, as I have in the past?

No, because food cannot ultimately be the issue. Whatever sexual desire those foods can "trigger" wouldn't be there if you sufficiently and comprehensively practice restraint in

regard to unwholesome images. It's like a fire that needs to be kept alive in some way; otherwise it would already have gone out.

It's hard enough as it is trying not to interpret them, or to not think of them as relating to some sort underlying mental structure, like being the appearance of a "real and existing but outside of experience" subconscious thing.

Such directions would also count as "opening the door" for the images and thus need to be restrained as well.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-27 02:54:40 (in reply to a comment not included)

At some point you have to upgrade your notion of unwholesome images to anything that is coming from the pressure of a hindrance, not just things rooted in blatant lust or ill will. And in order to be right, the non-engagement would have to be directed towards the hindrance aspect and not just be a blanket preference for less activity, since that preference itself could well be rooted in a hindrance.

When you take it far enough, that's basically how you end up practicing absorption rather than overcoming the hindrances: valuing less activity in and of itself with little to no discernment of what the unwholesome activities are.

Different levels of understanding of the aggregates. Evolution of your understanding through time.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Silatigi1 2025-03-23 15:20:50

Hello everyone,

I found this comments on another forum and would be interested to get your reaction to it, and your first person understanding of your own aggregates too, how this understanding has evolved throughout your years of practice, and how the teaching of Hillside Hermitage has changed your view on these and continue to do so. I'm especially interested in what happens to your first person phenomenological experience once sense restraint has been established for years and years compared to before it was so established.

"Re: A Review of Ven. Ñānavīra's"Notes on Dhamma"

Post by chownah » Wed Jun 10, 2015 3:19 am

The totally uninstructed one just assumes a self....does not see aggregates etc. The suttas address this ignorance.

The barely instructed one knows of the aggregates and so denies the self....but fabricates an "ongoing being" by assembling the aggregates into a cohesive uber-aggregate which

persists through time and calls it a “being”. Basically the barely instructed fabricates another kind of self with the main constituent being the aggregates....still it is a “self”. The suttas address this ignorance.

The bit more than barely instructed one denies the self called “ongoing being” (and the “self” without recourse to the aggregates) and fabricates ideas of a bunch of “ongoing aggregates” which each persist individually and act together over time....basically a bunch of little selves working together. The suttas address this ignorance.....

And the bit more than a bit more than barely instructed one sees the fabricated and lacking of self quality of the foregoing things but fabricates the six sense bases and their objects as persisting through time and basically thinks of them as persisting through time and each being even smaller selves than aggregates and fabricates them as objects and thus as selves....and here it is often the intellect which is latched onto and when this happens it is not uncommon for the bit of more than a bit of barely instructed one to slip on that slippery slope and come to rest right where they started with the deluded “discovery” that the intellect is “me”.....(note: when at the aggregate stage they often grasp onto consciousness and slide down the same slippery slope to arrive at “me”.)

As I see it these are some of the perils of our fabricated existences and the suttas address all of them because there are different people at various places and they all need instruction so there is instruction there which will better fit those various people. The suttas we are discussing address the second delusion of my list.”

Chownah”

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-25 03:34:38 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

yes yes and yes. This is a great motivation to keep them. In a way my curiosity will be helpful to make me keep the precepts (seeing the danger in the slightest fault),

That’s not quite how it works. Maybe reflecting on things like sickness, aging, and death would “help” you keep the precepts better by giving you a sense of urgency, but reflecting on concepts that will at this stage inevitably remain abstract like the five aggregates and dependent origination will not. Hence the Buddha recommended everyone regardless of their status to practice the former kind of contemplation, while the latter he generally only taught to monastics.

Can someone please explain the purpose of sleeping on the floor and the purpose of eating one meal a day?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** No-Spirit5082 2025-03-22 21:51:37

I have taken up eating once a day (in the afternoon/evening) and sleeping on a yoga mat on the floor, but i dont yet understand the purpose of this. Can someone please explain? Or refer to a video where this is explained?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 07:40:10

The purpose of eating one meal a day is that it will concretely highlight the difference between eating for pleasure, which goes almost unnoticed when you allow yourself to eat whenever you want, and eating for the sake of staying alive and able to practice..

You can think about it abstractly as much as you wish, but as long as you're eating at leisure, it's much harder to see that difference. Also, more pragmatically, someone striving for the cessation of craving should have no problem with the very mild discomfort of not eating for a measly 24 hours; otherwise the effects of their practice are highly questionable to say the least. Many people would see they're not nearly as advanced as they think if they realized that progress in the practice entails *actually* not being affected by unpleasant feelings.

It also won't inherently lead to weight loss. It's only hard to eat enough the very first few days. Most monks are overweight.

As for sleeping on the floor, a comfortable mattress generally induces you to sleep more than is actually necessary, and takes the experience of sleeping more in a sensual direction than it needs to be.

None of this means you should avoid all comfort; that attitude quickly becomes self-mortification. But these two ways of relinquishing comfort are too mild to take one in that direction by themselves. They are thus generally in line with the middle way. Still, the other six precepts are vastly more important; eating one meal a day and sleeping on the floor while not keeping the others (including celibacy) would be like giving up vaping but not cigarettes.

Question about attachment

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-03-20 14:36:56

In one of the talks Ajah mentions "can you suffer if you don't want anything and don't have anything?" naturally I imagine anyone would answer "no", that sounds like freedom. So I thought "can I not want anything and not be attached to what I have?" since that's what's causing me pain. Acquire only what is necessary as means for something else that is necessary. Like working, buying food or transport to be able to survive and not to delight in acquisition.

I assume monks also have plenty of things in a monastery, but they don't delight in those things, don't think about acquiring more even if the level of engagement could be the same as a layman has in the world. Like for example a person could acquire books for the

pleasure of acquisition or someone else could have what is strictly necessary to support their goal. The level of engagement is the same.

I feel like my post partially answers the question then it becomes why do anything?, why try to change anything? So far it worked without changing anything and just doing things and experiencing the results.

Why change anything externally if that is not where the freedom is?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 08:43:32

Why change anything externally if that is not where the freedom is?

Because certain external conditions are not as conducive to achieving internal freedom, and at a certain point (anāgāmi) they would become a categorical obstacle.

Nevertheless, working and having possessions is not too big of an issue, and ordination is not strictly necessary to make significant progress on the path. What is necessary is not to engage in actions of lust, aversion, and distraction—*that* is now one's internal non-freedom that they keep cultivating, and, indeed, the external circumstances do not intrinsically force you to not be free (i.e., do such things).

If we're trying to remove the ownership of the sense of self, who or what is doing the removing? What or who is owning the sense of self? Is it the puggala/individual?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** obobinde 2025-03-19 18:50:51

I'm a bit unclear on those... As I understand it the puggala is what remains when sakkaya ditthi has been removed. But it feels a bit circular since I feel **I'm** doing the decisions to practice sense restraint to remove **my** ownership of sense of self... So the sense of self is doing the undermining of the clinging to the sense of self??

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-20 05:53:20

So the sense of self is doing the undermining of the clinging to the sense of self??

In a way yes. The Buddha even said that “conceit is to be abandoned through conceit.” A puthujjana can't step outside of the self-view even for an instant, nor abstractly imagine what it would be like to not have it. All they can do is make the right choices that will weaken that assumption *from within* (such as sense restraint). Thus, it's not a matter of “choosing the right term.” Only by actually not having self-view anymore can you begin to make sense of the distinction between “individual” and “self.”

For a puthujjana, any term or description whatsoever that they might use to refer to “this here” will for them still tacitly imply the same assumption of self that they haven’t understood and abandoned. For a sekha or Arahant, that assumption cannot arise even with the word “attā,” hence the Buddha saw no issue with telling monks that they should hold “themselves” as island and refuge (*attadīpa attasaraṇa*), and he and other Arahants would often say “I” and “mine,” even when referring to past lives.

Consciousness = point of view?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** fe_feron 2025-03-15 07:44:21

Practically, in general terms, would you say that consciousness means the presence of a point of view?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-15 17:15:56

No; for one thing, that would mean you have 6 points of view all at once.

Whichever such “point of view” you find, no matter how seemingly fundamental or “deep” in its content, will be something already cognized/manifested to the very extent you’re aware of it, and thus there is no “inner side/point” behind the rest of experience that is not itself another cognized experience. Everything without exception is “on quicksand” (impermanent) for that very reason, and that’s why Sāti’s view in the above Sutta was so wrong.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-17 05:25:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I think I understand that you’re saying that there isn’t a point of view behind manifested experience which would be the center to which things arise. Basically there isn’t an independent consciousness to which things manifest. Is that correct?

Yes, there is nothing that can rightly be regarded as being outside the domain of ordinary appearances. And it’s important to know that this assumption has essentially infinite ways of manifesting; it doesn’t have to explicitly sound like an assertion of “my self is X” in order to be a form of self-view.

For example, thinking you’re developing views in line with the Dhamma, you could easily start to have ideas about the “structure” of experience that underlies the rest of experience (the physical matter of the body that itself is not a perception, the point of view that is not itself viewed, the nature of things which is not itself a thing, etc.), not realizing that you’re thereby falling into one of the 20 forms of attavāda (form as self, self as possessing form, etc.).

And whenever someone asserts the existence of something outside the aggregates, they are also asserting a view of self through that. By believing that something *could* be outside, you automatically maintain the view that the self is outside. Just by holding the view, for example, that there is a more fundamental “purpose” to life that lies outside of our individual experiences and must guide them (or also that there is a more fundamental *lack* of purpose and meaninglessness) means holding the view that self is within, say, intention or perception. Not seeing purpose or lack of it as an arisen intention or perception within this experience, one gives it gratuitous primacy over all other intentions or perceptions.

And these views are undone not by intensive philosophizing, but by abandoning the five hindrances. They are what cause one, out of passion, to put certain phenomena on a pedestal.

Discerning unwholesome intentions behind seemingly wholesome thoughts

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** meshinthesky 2025-03-13 16:49:15

The context of the post is within the stage of developing virtue and the specifics of sieving thoughts according to whether they spring from a mind with wholesome or unwholesome intention.

There are thoughts which their contents are wholesome in themselves. Yet, they are clearly rooted in a mind wanting some change regarding the current experience. They are refined ways for the mind to complain: I want this, I do not want that - sometimes even dressed in dhamma language. When such apparent wholesome thoughts are rooted in a mind with greed or aversion, such unwholesome intentions seem discernible to me.

On the other hand, it is not clear to me when some wholesome-content thoughts may be rooted in delusion or not: when the intention of the mind is wanting to distract itself for avoiding enduring the present situation. I am not referring to such thoughts that call for a coarse action to be started changing fully the context (i.e.: let's go and read some teachings), but those whose purpose seems to be avoiding or coping with boredom... merely for the sake of filling the void and chaining further thoughts.

At the mentioned stage, are those delusional intentions coarser enough to be dealt with (specially when one's trying to abide in non activity) or are they subtle enough to be seen as a finer peg that removes a coarser one (i.e.: thoughts with unwholesome content, or born from greed and aversion)? If it is the former, how to approach and learn to tell apart delusional intentions from wholesome intentions of the mind.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-15 07:10:58

On the other hand, it is not clear to me when some wholesome-content thoughts may be rooted in delusion or not: when the intention of the mind is wanting to distract itself for avoiding enduring the present situation.

I would not even go as far as saying that there is such a thing as “wholesome-content thoughts.” What there certainly is is content that is always unwholesome, such as content about the five cords of sensuality (i.e., lustful things, not just things perceived through the five senses in general), and thoughts of ill will (not just aversion or resistance, which can be much subtler and is not an immediate concern). But no thought-content is automatically wholesome.

You need to start looking at the current state of mind behind a certain thought in order to see when it’s rooted in delusion/distraction, and not assume that thoughts about the past or about the future, or about things that are elsewhere instead of “here,” can be delusional in themselves. Those can never be anything but present thoughts in the present situation, and are to an extent inevitable.

So don’t worry about the content of the thoughts, and instead worry about whether a thought about anything becomes so captivating and absorbing that you lose the peripheral awareness that “this is a present thought in the present situation.” Such a thought is a delusional thought (because the state of mind is clearly one of obsession with it, i.e., one or another hindrance, and thus clarity is automatically obstructed and there is a loss of perspective).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-17 07:12:43 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It seems like you’re overthinking it and trying to systematize different teachings that use different paradigms (to explain the same thing).

The first thing to do would be not to take for granted the pressure to figure out what you need to do, since what you need to do is not act out of pressure. Remind yourself of the danger and suffering in acting out of a hindrance (in this case doubt), and don’t continue attending to the thoughts that it pressures you towards.

Then you let the mind off the hook while still staying watchful. You have to let it go because, for now, there is no problem. It doesn’t make sense to forcefully pin down an animal when it’s not misbehaving at the moment.

At some unknown point in time later—it doesn’t matter how long; it could be a few minutes, or more, or less—you will realize that you fell under the grip of a hindrance again. Maybe the same one, maybe another; what matters is that the same background pressure is back, not the content of the thoughts. Then you remind yourself of the danger and suffering in acting out of a hindrance again, and put aside those thoughts (even though their content was not the problem, they were rooted in the pressure).

As you keep doing that, that pressure will begin to return less and less, until eventually there is not even a possibility for pressure or suffering underlying your thinking, regardless of what you think about. Not because you’re being careful. And that’s when the hindrances are gone for the time being. And then “peripheral awareness” will be effortless,

and whatever context or phenomenon you try to discern will be seen rightly without distortion or abstract theorizing.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-20 03:58:32 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Twice a month, I review my practice, reexamine the teachings, and question myself trying to be honest. Then, I actively engage with the underlying doubts about the practice, including “to figure out what you need to do”.

That sounds like a good strategy.

Nibbana Is The Ultimate Uncertainty

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** No_Squirrel4617 2025-03-13 00:06:37

I am a bit unclear about how exactly the practice progresses. For example, I am accomplished in virtue, and because of that, I have learned what it truly means to restrain the senses and what samadhi is about. Two questions arise for me now: Should I just continue pushing my sense restraint with the idea that its significance will somehow become more apparent, or should I also introduce practices like noticing and acknowledging that my life and everything I hold dear depend on the breath?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-15 06:47:29

should I also introduce practices like noticing and acknowledging that my life and everything I hold dear depend on the breath?

Such contemplations would only be fruitful to the extent that you’ve overcome the five hindrances. So if indeed your virtue and sense restraint are as cemented as you say, purifying the mind from hindrances (for which you will need to learn to see the signs of the mind more clearly, for which you will in turn need stricter seclusion) would be the next step.

This talk, and this newer one too, might help.

When trying to spot the hindrances, don’t just assume that specific thoughts are a problem (apart from the obvious unwholesome ones with lustful or hateful content). Instead, look in the direction of *why* (emotionally) you’re thinking whatever it is that you’re thinking, and you are more likely to find a hindrance there (i.e., the signs of the mind). If there’s a compulsion behind that thinking, it’s a hindrance. If not—if the mind is pursuing certain thoughts without being obsessive about them—everything is fine for now, but you still remain watchful.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-17 05:41:22 (in reply to a comment not included)

I think this is the right direction.

It might be. The catch is that you will have to remain watchful of whether your attempt not to let things take center stage is not the thing that you've put in the center stage, which would mean still acting out of a hindrance. That can easily end up happening if you develop a "rinse and repeat" sort of attitude towards the practice, as you'd begin to overlook your own intentions.

There needs to be a balanced degree of effort. If you let your mind think freely without any prodding, it's too loose. If you're prodding it constantly, it's very likely too tight unless you were about to physically do something unwholesome.

The way to achieve that balance is to keep an eye on why you're engaging in a certain line of thinking/effort, never assuming that it's admissible in and of itself. And that would also prevent things from taking center stage; they can do so only if you become oblivious of your motivation for paying attention to them.

HH stand on meditation

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-03-11 10:59:08

I have watched many talks on HH channel, many times but can only remember one about meditation and many about the misconceptions about meditation.

The talk I mean is where Ajahn Nyanamoli describes how to recognize "am I breathing?" and that's it

And all the countless videos about how intention behind it matters, how it will not make me enlightened, etc.

So it makes me wonder how important is it to meditate?

I personally don't like meditating and prefer upping the precepts and learning the dhamma. Being mindful of the body is the closest to meditation I ever get, so I wonder is it necessary? Is samadhi in "sila, samadhi, panna" meditation or is it composure?

I imagine that in a monastery there isn't that much to do and monks generally are supposed to meditate countless hours, no?

Adding to this, if the practice is simply "don't act on craving" why is there such a big emphasis on meditation?

<https://youtu.be/GgoRGxbR6y8?si=X3DmnsT2n2x21LrP> - this talk answers the question, I missed it among all others. Makes a lot of sense connecting it all together

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-12 15:24:14

Probably around half of the videos on the HH channel describe what you would do when you sit down to purify your mind from hindrances and unwholesome states and develop clarity—once you’ve accomplished the precepts, virtue, sense restraint, etc. It’s not a different practice at all; it’s the same thing you were already supposed to be doing but in a more precise way.

We see “meditation” in the way taught in modern Buddhism as useless for the development of *sīla*, *samādhi*, or *paññā*. The kind of “*samādhi*” you get from that is of a kind that suppresses the domain where understanding takes place, leaving you only with visions and sense objects. The mind is not actually “unified” (*ekaggatā*); the senses are just mostly shut down in favor of a particular experience, and the two are not the same.

As for *sīla*, contemporary meditation rarely takes people beyond the five precepts they’ve been keeping from the very start, even after decades of practice. In our view, the only things such practices lead to are mundane calm and stress reduction (which you could also get without any practice by addressing the root of the mundane problem and changing your job, life situation, etc.), sensual euphoria without a need for people or external things, and transient revelations unrelated to the four noble truths.

Right *samādhi* and calming of the mind are developed by abandoning the five hindrances, which is impossible to achieve by focusing on physical sensations or visualizing things. One does these things either for sensual reasons or out of other hindrances, but that’s overlooked because the contemporary, watered-down, widespread notion (illustrated quite well here) is that a hindrance is simply a distracting thought that takes you away from the meditation object. That would lead to the conclusion that an Arahant can never emerge from meditation again.

Adding to this, if the practice is simply “don’t act on craving” why is there such a big emphasis on meditation?

Because it’s a quick fix that reduces suffering and provides pleasure, which is plenty for most people. Contemporary Buddhism is mostly an echo chamber that caters to the majority, who often only want quick fixes (or at least fixes that don’t require changing their habits too significantly).

I imagine that in a monastery there isn’t that much to do and monks generally are supposed to meditate countless hours, no?

One is supposed to be alone in seclusion most of the day because that’s where the five hindrances can be recognized clearly and abandoned, whether while walking or sitting.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-13 04:34:31 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

wouldn’t focusing on something help to not give into habitual unwholesome thinking patterns that would then have no choice but to die out?

Not by itself.

Unwholesome thoughts wear away for the long term only when the mind wants to go in a direction and you don't let it, but you also make the effort to understand the harmfulness of that direction rather than blindfolding the mind so that it forgets about the whole thing. That's not training it at all.

People who meditate in the modern sense and whose unwholesome thinking patterns have truly been reduced didn't achieve that result because of the time they spent successfully focusing—which they would usually consider a “good meditation” but which is no more beneficial for the training than sleep. The reduction came from adopting the value of restraint across the board, not just during their focusing sessions. Try restraining the unwholesome thinking patterns *only* during meditation, and you'll see that it won't work at all.

But that small benefit is overshadowed by a greater problem: they didn't stop at recognizing thoughts of sensuality, ill will, etc., as unwholesome. They instead went to the other extreme and developed the view that focusing itself is wholesome and is the state free from hindrances. That's a seriously wrong view that their own past experiences would disprove if they took the time to consider them carefully.

(And then, of course, there's the inevitable expectation that insight is something that will just pop up while you're focusing, which flies in the face of what insight really is.)

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-14 04:01:24 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The Therāgatha might contain later additions according to scholars. This is a good example.

There are no Suttas in the four Nikāyas where fixating one's attention on an external object is presented as a viable way to develop samādhi. That absurd concept certainly came later and is taken seriously only in commentarial texts like the Visuddhimagga (which advises staring at clay disks, candle flames, etc.)

Advice on how to deal with a persistent trigger for unwholesome behavior

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Akalika_Username 2025-03-11 00:06:01

For more than a year, I have been trying to patiently endure the pressure to act out of a persistently triggering situation in my daily life. The hostile and cruel thoughts that arise when the trigger is present are intense. I try not to give them the center of my attention when they inevitably arise throughout the day.

I have attempted to tailor my environment to reduce the frequency and intensity of my

exposure, though there is only so much I can realistically do. There is also no reason to believe the situation will become less challenging in the foreseeable future.

Until this last weekend, I have been pleased with my verbal and physical restraint regarding the situation, including with subtler, indirect actions. Now I have begun following the pressure to engage in things that could eventually lead to verbal and physical behavior of a hostile nature. I am also afraid that the presence of the trigger will become more prominent in the coming months, as it had this last weekend. My fears are likely to be accurate, if I'm being honest.

It seems that I presently have three options for dealing with the increased likelihood that I might act verbally or physically in response to the situation: 1. more aggressively tailor my environment; 2. redouble my efforts at restraint when inevitably exposed; and, of course, 3. do both.

My impression from what I've read from HH and in the Suttas is that the third option is the safest bet given that acting physically could be seriously detrimental for my welfare and the welfare of others. But the prominence of the trigger could easily become so significant that the effort to reduce exposure might ultimately exacerbate rather than reduce the pressure to act unskillfully. I wonder if there isn't some justification for maintaining or even slightly increasing exposure in a situation like this, where avoidance is unrealistic and could make the problem a greater source of resentment.

Does anyone have any advice on a scenario of this kind? [Edit: the type of hindrance doesn't matter, just the persistence of the pressure in relation to something unavoidable that is a potential obstacle to progressing in virtue and restraint.] I'm particularly interested to learn if anyone has had past success with similar difficulties.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-12 04:51:16 (in reply to a comment not included)

I have locked this comment as it does not comply with rule #3. Without outlining the discrepancy, it casually gives advice based on widespread underlying assumptions about the practice of meditation that contradict fundamental HH teachings.

Upakkilesa Sutta MN 128

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Formal_Breath_2025 2025-03-09 16:36:07

I have a few questions about this sutta. The whole section on samādhi seems to be referring to the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Jhānas, but the Buddha mentions *obhāsa* (light, shine, splendour, effulgence?) and *dassanam rūpām* (vision of forms), which I have not seen before in the usual Jhāna formula. Is this relevant to Jhāna in general or is the Buddha talking more specifically about something like developing the Divine Eye?

The other thing in this sutta I haven't seen before is that the Buddha mentions developing both samādhi with vitakka and vicāra but also *without* vitakka and *with* vicāra. Bhante

Ñānamoli tends to talk about vitakka and vicāra in the context of 1st Jhāna as near-similes, so I'm not quite sure what this indicates. If vicāra is a more passive kind of thinking, I suppose it could suggest that he's stopped active thought but there are still dhammas appearing?

The Buddha also talks about “perception of diversity” and “excessive meditation on forms” as hindrances, but the formula makes it unclear if this is relevant to all the forms of samādhi the Buddha developed, or just some of them. It sounds more relevant to formless attainments but I could be wrong.

Thanks.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-10 15:34:49

MN 128 is about developing the divine eye. The Pāli is ambiguous, but the Chinese parallel (pg. 20 here) says that the light and vision of forms disappeared because “the eye ceased.” Also supported by how Anuruddha eventually became foremost in the divine eye.

Jhāna is not about light and visions but about intentionally cultivating the pleasure that arises from renunciation, and it's a form of recollectedness of the body specifically. That shows how there are different directions of samādhi you can take, all of which depend on abandoning the five hindrances. Whereas the commentarial (and often contemporary) belief is that because jhāna is “absorption”, samādhi and jhāna are basically synonymous except for the supposed “momentary” and “access” concentration.

As for vitakka and vicāra, etc., AN 8.63 shows that those permutations would occur within various forms of samādhi. The case of “without vitakka and with vicāra” occurs there too.

If vicāra is a more passive kind of thinking, I suppose it could suggest that he's stopped active thought but there are still dhammas appearing?

There can't be a state where dhammas do not appear except Parinibbāna. If there is consciousness, there *has* to be some form of activity or “movement” (*saṅkhāra*) underlying it. With samādhi, what you do is shed coarser activities in favor of subtler ones, and at no point in the nine progressive stages does the mind become completely still and “frozen,” as many might genuinely believe due to not seeing the signs of their minds and only objects instead.

Both vitakka and vicāra are activities (*saṅkhāra*) and are thus pacifiable, though vicāra is subtler, i.e., less active than vitakka, not quicker and harder to “catch” momentarily. But they are both simultaneous aspects of the same thing. They are structurally and not sequentially bound together.

For example, you can have an overall Dhamma of “being seated in a cold room looking through the window feeling joyful,” and vitakka would be the more active mental movements within that: “picking up” the specific things you are joyful about (the absence of sensual and unwholesome inclinations). If there is still vitakka, vicāra would be the overall “being seated in a cold room looking through the window feeling joyful” that endures

as a background to the specific thoughts throughout.

If vitakka has subsided, you would see that the dhamma of “being seated in a cold room looking through the window feeling joyful” can be made even less active, and by establishing the mind in that you would be left with *purely* “being seated in a cold room looking through the window feeling joyful,” without the activity of vicāra, which was still a subtle movement on top of that (and this is second jhāna).

But you can’t even abstractly imagine how to calm vicāra or what the absence of it is like until vitakka is gone—until then the “passive” thing is vicāra. You can’t turn milk straight into butter. And you certainly can’t discern any of this until you have freed yourself from hindrances through the gradual training.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-12 14:11:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Yes, I see what you’re saying, but the thing is that when MN 44 says *vitakkavicāra* is *vacīsaṅkhāra* or “verbal activity,” that doesn’t mean *vitakkavicāra* can only ever be verbal. If it were, every person would often have instants without at least vitakka when they briefly do something like focus on a sight or physical sensation. This is how a lot of people truly believe they can “stop thinking” by attending to their breath and similar; they believe thinking begins and ends at the verbalization part. The contemporary “jhānas” are *vitakkavicāra* (mainly vitakka due to the emphasis on focus and observation), with hindrances (which have their root at the level of vicāra) and with pleasure/peace and some unusual perceptions within it. Sights, sounds, etc., and even physical actions all manifest through vitakka. Thus, even vitakka is far broader than specific verbal formulations.

So you could say that once *vitakkavicāra* is purified from hindrances and understood rightly, it is no longer *vacīsaṅkhāra*, i.e., it no longer *implies* the possibility of speech. Whether it involves specific words is then totally secondary, since those are also just perceptions that are wrongly assumed to be more than that whenever they imply the possibility of speaking. In other words, even if you didn’t have a mouth and couldn’t even conceive of speaking yourself, you would still be able to play words in your mind, but they wouldn’t imply *you* speaking and would thus not be *vacīsaṅkhāra*.

Practically, you need to approach the whole thing as a totality, i.e., being fully enclosed within *vitakkavicāra* from top to bottom. This means any phenomenon you can possibly experience will up until the second jhāna be at most a form of vicāra.

People who are virtuous, well restrained, don’t delight in company, etc., can start to rightly grasp the hints of vicāra; otherwise everything will be vitakka for them. Some vicāra is always inevitably there, but for the unrestrained person, vicāra (e.g. their underlying attitude for vitakka-of-something) can change completely and become sensual or averse, and they will not have a clue. This is one way of describing the ignorance of the signs of the mind.

Edit: I remembered there's this Sutta where the *leader* of the Jains is absolutely convinced that the cessation of vitakkavicāra is impossible. That goes to show how the range of vitakkavicāra is a lot broader (and its genuine surmounting lot more subtle) than generally assumed.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-13 07:31:41 (in reply to a comment not included)

i did not “do” questioning thinking it was vicara; but the function of questioning in the context of what i was doing seemed to be quite aligned with what i was understanding as the function of vitakka-vicara – and i continued with the assumption that this questioning movement of the mind is vicara, and looked at the suttas. there is a lot of questioning there – very similar to the questioning attitude i was cultivating, inspired, at that time, both by Toni Packer and by HH.

I would put it this way: in the experience of questioning yourself in this way (which can indeed be beneficial), there is a deliberate placement of attention in a certain thought/perception, with or without verbalization involved. *At the same time*, regardless of whether you realize it or not, there is a broader image there of “I am questioning myself” (never explicitly expressed in words though), and within that overall image or phenomenon, things like the way you're feeling, why you're questioning yourself, the state of your physical form, what you expect to come out of the questioning, etc., are *implicit*. That is the level of vicāra, and those are things you are inevitably *conscious of* (i.e., they are *manifest* in experience) even if you're not aware of them (which would correspond to *sampajañña*).

But the catch is that if you now try to *place the mind into* that overall image or phenomenon in the background, it becomes another vitakka, and there is now *another* background image of “I am trying to figure out what vicāra is” with its own implications, and all of that is now unseen. So one has to recognize the extent of vitakka clearly and, at the same time, without making another vitakka, *know* vicāra where it already is. This is all precisely what I was referring to here recently, and it's the principle of “peripheral awareness”, yoniso manasikāra, etc.

You can think of it as two identical sheets of glass stuck together perfectly. Vitakka inevitably carries vicāra, which you will be able to discern only by seeing *through* vitakka. And yes, you start by intentionally directing vitakka in certain ways, as described in MN 19, because if the content of vitakka is already unwholesome, there is no way vicāra can be discerned. Once vitakka was sufficiently pure and well directed (which indirectly purifies vicāra to some extent) the Buddha realized that he could simply stay with the recognition that “these dhammas are there” and not try to have any specific content in vitakka nor in vicāra.

The kind of questioning you describe could serve to *reveal* vicāra if one already knows where to look for it (e.g. questioning your motivation behind something but letting that

question *point to* the background, already-arisen motivation in your present experience rather than jumping into vitakka-answers and vitakka-explanations). But the questioning in and of itself would still be vitakka (again, even if it's just a "movement" of looking at something within experience without any verbalization).

There are absolutely no constraints as to the *contents* of the thought/image that attention can be placed onto with vitakka (hence the Sutta I quoted saying that the entire world functions through vitakka). It can be the most ordinary thought about what you're going to do in 5 minutes or the most extraordinary spiritual experience. The fact that you *place the mind (mano) into it**—or, even more coarsely, focus* on it—with or without any mental chatter, is what makes it vitakka.

*The translation of vitakka as "placing the mind" is in theory quite accurate, but in practice, with the way those translations are explained and interpreted, the range of vitakka is severely underestimated.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-13 17:57:18 (in reply to a comment not included)

To be clear, I am fully certain that we don't merely disagree about terminology. In what I've been attempting to convey, there is at best some overlap between manasikāra and saññā, and vitakka and vicāra. They can by no means be equated, for the simple reason that vitakka and vicāra would be completely gone in the second jhāna, whereas saññā and manasikāra (and cittasaṅkhāra) would continue in all the further jhānas and even immaterial attainments.

if vitakka-vicara do not correspond to the verbal thinking and questioning described explicitly in the suttas, the presence of verbal thinking and questioning and their role in the training remains in the air / unaccounted for somehow

I don't quite see why. I didn't deny the usefulness of such thinking and questioning; in fact, I made sure to point out its necessity when citing MN 19 above. But following the narrative of that same Sutta, there comes a point where one needs to realize that active thinking and questioning are no longer necessary. This is done by recognizing the full range of vitakkavicāra, which *contains but is not limited to* the questioning you describe. Without that shift of emphasis, it will be impossible to "compose the mind internally," and one will remain in active cultivation of skillful thoughts indefinitely, which still leaves one liable to subtle hindrances.

You brought up AN 8.30 a few times, and there's actually a big hint there about precisely what I'm describing. The Buddha told Anuruddha that he would be able to enter the jhānas at will if he cultivated the seven thoughts he came up with *plus* the eighth that he added and that Anuruddha did not initially consider. The eighth is about "non-proliferation," and there's a very good reason why, without that "final touch," Anuruddha wouldn't have entered the jhānas. It's the very same principle as MN 19: first you direct the mind towards wholesome themes, but there comes a point where you actually need to "step back" further and start looking at the whole picture more broadly ("these phenomena are there"),

which is how *papañca* is overcome. In other words, one needs to shift the emphasis away from vitakka:

Eye-consciousness arises dependent on the eye and forms. The meeting of the three is pressure. With pressure as basis, feeling. What one feels, one perceives. ***What one perceives, one thinks (vitakka) about. What one thinks about, one proliferates.*** What one proliferates is the cause for perceptions and considerations born of proliferation besetting one in regard to sights cognizable by the eye pertaining to the past, present, and future.

—MN 18

This doesn't mean vitakka *disappears*; it of course remains a defining factor of the first jhāna. But because it no longer sits alone in the limelight, it is unable to proliferate as much without any need whatsoever to actively hold it back by emphasizing wholesome vitakkas. That is the only way that one can be truly "separated" from *all* unwholesome states. There is a (effortlessly) limited "depth" of engagement that the mind can have with any given direction of vitakka because it has become established in the full picture of vitakka and vicāra occurring simultaneously, and it is because of this that speech (and sensual perception, which is proliferation of what the Suttas call "the sign of beauty") can no longer occur even if there is still mental chatter. Speech necessitates not seeing the (in itself non-verbal) choice to take up of the physical mouth as just another thought, i.e., overlooking the extent of vitakkavicāra.

Which brings me to your point about vacīsaṅkhāra: there is no contradiction between this and the MN 44 description of "having vitakka-ed and vicāra-ed, one breaks into speech." If this statement were asserting that vitakka or vicāra were intrinsically verbal, it would imply we must first play out in our minds the specific words we intend to say before physically uttering them, and that's quite clearly not the actual dynamic. As we speak, our minds internally "move about" various non-verbal thoughts and images, and that "moving about" is vitakka (with vicāra as the broader background as I've described).

And, again, vicāra is also *active* and pacifiable very early on, *long* before saññā, but its activeness is not discernible until the coarser and more active vitakka subsides.

and words with an obvious everyday meaning become increasingly technical
/ divorced from their direct meaning.

All this is why I disagree with the conclusion that "verbal thinking and questioning" can be fully equated with vitakkavicāra. It doesn't automatically follow from anything in the Suttas.

Furthermore, given that anyone can simply stop speaking at any moment, how would the interpretation you propose account for the fact that speech is what ceases in the first jhāna? It does seem to leave that crucial point unaccounted for.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-21 11:47:36 (in reply to a comment not included)

No, because consciousness has also ceased for an Arahant in this very life.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 07:20:25 (in reply to a comment not included)

Does this answer the question?

A question on the background of experience/peripheral awareness

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** ActualBrazilian 2025-03-06 05:58:04

I have kept the 5 precepts for about two months and have just started efforts in keeping the 8, I can sustain what I believe is remembrance of the body and of the breath as I attend to activities. For some activities it is harder to sustain both. The body and posture are too subtle for me to sustain while working as a programmer, but I can manage the breath, though even of the breath I'll still lose occasionally (I'd say I can keep it about 60-70% of the day). I try to catch any pressure towards distraction (as someone with ADHD I'd say aversion to focusing on studying and working are my most severe hindrances) and analyze the justifications and reasons the mind comes up with for them, finding that they are just about every time ad hoc.

From Bhikkhu Analayo's *Satipatthana: The Direct Path to Realization*, I have taken the view that my goal should be to sustain remembrance of the breath and to exert myself to expanding it to the whole body and the other 3 foundations of mindfulness as I maintain analyzing pressures in that way (which is what I currently understand 'doing away with the unwholesome' to be).

Is this a productive path of practice, how grossly am I missing the mark on these views and 'methods'?

Edit: To add some context I have been using remembrance of the breath mostly as an aid to noticing arisen pressures before I act out of them and for enduring them. When I keep this remembrance and noticing-and-endurance well, I do also feel a cooling sensation in my head physically, mostly the top of the head and the forehead, which I did attend to sometimes but have started trying not to.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 06:38:03

It's not like one should never make any effort to think about how to practice satipaṭṭhāna, but it should not be one's main practice up until the Right View. The reason is that nothing you do can "do away with the unwholesome" by itself without you understanding exactly

what the unwholesome actually is, because the unwholesome is in your very *intention* (e.g., with which you would be practicing satipaṭṭhāna the whole time) and not in the particular mental objects that you can replace by attending to something else.

Instead, apart from strengthening your virtue—there is almost always going to be plenty of room for improvement there as a layperson—the main practice should be discerning the intention behind *whatever* you do, not taking for granted that, for example, practicing satipaṭṭhāna is in and of itself a wholesome thing to do. Nothing is ever automatically wholesome; it depends on why you’re doing it at the time.

That’s how you would become skilled in recognizing your own mind, which is necessary for satipaṭṭhāna to be done rightly. Unless you see that, you don’t actually know what pressure is, so no amount of satipaṭṭhāna practice will allow you to “catch” it.

Lastly, discerning your intentions does not mean psychologizing the logical reasons why you do something; it means seeing whether there is greed, aversion, or delusion driving the action you want to do or are already doing. Nothing more elaborate than that. You need to learn to recognize a vague, ambiguous mind of greed *as such* without resorting to secondary explanations of any kind.

jhana and jhana or jhana

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-03-06 04:16:13

I thought I should ask this question, even though it may seem provocative. I was wondering “how can I confirm this?” and realised it’s impossible, but maybe someone has a clearer understanding and view and so on

Basically the “lay jhana teacher” said that he experiences the eight jhanas while having a wife and he just “returns” to the world when needed. Naturally I started contemplating this for a while, because this contradicts what ajahn here said, why not have both jhana and a partner too without making it the goal of my life?

Ajahn Nyanamoli said that whoever teaches jhana different from Buddhist jhana just couldn’t get the Buddhist one, which sounds a bit like an assumption to be fair considering we don’t know all the people who didn’t become monks and their motives, but what is that “buddhist jhana”? Are there different types of jhanas beyond the eight jhanas, like eight Buddhist jhanas and eight lay jhanas?

I realise there is some level of justifying staying in the world here, but the topic is valid anyway, I think

For people who just read, downvote and move on I want to say that every question is valid if approached correctly, it’s not me who should to stay silent, its you who should keep your hands and judgements to yourself

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 07:18:53

but what is that “buddhist jhana”?

As defined in the Suttas (from which the term “jhāna” originates to begin with), it’s the pleasure of renunciation, the ease of being free from any trace of sensual and unwholesome urges that comes from not engaging with those urges long enough, and understanding them rightly as perilous. To people who enjoy sensuality, renouncing their sensual urges by definition won’t be pleasurable at all.

Hence, whatever “jhāna” people who still enjoy sensuality can obtain is not what was originally meant with the word “jhāna.” Jhāna was not widely taught to householders in the Buddha’s time precisely for that reason.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 17:16:38 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

That’s not a problem as long as you don’t forget that that isn’t what the Buddha taught as jhāna, nor does it lead to what jhāna is supposed to when made much of (not returning to sensual pleasures again, and disinterest in the world in general).

And even if it’s difficult to fully follow, you can still see value in the *direction* of renunciation and try to gradually go towards it more. You would then partake in at least a bit of Buddhist peace, and maybe you would one day notice the difference for yourself and decide to pursue that direction further.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-07 18:10:21 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

the jhanas taught in contemporary Buddhism lead to unbinding and nibbana.

Same as with jhāna, these are just buzzwords that people nowadays ascribe their own meanings to, which usually are not what the Buddha meant.

For one thing, full Nibbāna in the Buddha’s outlook would make you unable to seek or relish sensuality and even platonic relationships. All of that is ultimately dukkha, but is not seen as such when the mind is clouded by passion and ignorance, i.e., not in Nibbāna.

So if that’s not the end result (on top of coming from a very different kind of practice), it’s not the Buddhist Nibbāna. “Nibbāna” was not supposed to mean any peaceful state whatsoever, but specifically the extinguishment of craving, which has a very specific (and incomparable) kind of peace as its *byproduct*.

Now, people are totally free to regard the Buddhist unbinding as undesirable and not pursue it. But instead of doing that, they often instead redefine what the Buddhist unbinding is. Probably because it looks and feels much better when you can assimilate the weight and authority that Buddhism has accumulated, and also because few people read the early texts widely or with enough openness to reconsider their established beliefs about the practice and the goal.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-08 06:34:21 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Stream-enteres glimpse nibanna

Yes, a stream-enter has an accurate glimpse of how craving is suffering and the destruction of craving is the ultimate and only worthwhile peace. Therefore, that's exactly what his practice would be aimed at, and that's how he eventually achieves full Nibbāna. "Glimpsing Nibbāna" and working towards it means something very different in their redefinition.

What's the difference between true nibanna and the redefinition of nibanna that you claim they're making?

True Nibbāna comes if you work on severing your attachments and wearing away your liability to craving by first of all not acting out of it. It can't come from a meditative experience, which would be like an alcoholic who, instead of focusing on giving up alcohol to reach sobriety, looks for something so extraordinary that it captivates and enthralls him to the point where the urge to drink fades (if even that). While this might work for a time, the novelty will inevitably wear off, and the underlying addictions that were never truly addressed will resurface.

And that's why more often than not there is little to no talk about permanent and final Arahantship (unless it's been redefined not to signify complete renunciation and destruction of craving), since it's about perpetually chasing after greater and deeper experiences and insights, hoping for the ultimate thing that will fill the ever-lingering void perfectly instead of destroying the void itself once and for all.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-09 03:36:57 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Not quite. According to the the Suttas, insight arose because he reflected on the four noble truths on the basis of the fourth jhāna. That description is extremely common and is agreed to be the "standard" path to awakening in the early texts.

That's not a "meditative experience," but something that you could contemplate at any time, and that indeed many people managed to do to a degree just from talking to the Buddha and without jhāna, which is how they entered the stream. Doing it with the mind of the fourth jhāna—which arises from giving up sensuality and then taking the same principle further, not from a meditation technique—simply makes the contemplation much more powerful and penetrative.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-09 20:34:31 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Well, when we talk about "bad kamma," it's important to remember that it's not some sort of judgment cast upon you by an external force. It's about what you're doing to your own

mind, in this case through something that's very harmful to others too.

If someone knowingly misrepresents the Dhamma with fully conscious, malicious intention for the sake of gain, renown, and the like, then that's on another level where one is breaking the fourth precept in the worst possible way. But I'm optimistic that this is very uncommon, and misrepresentation is generally not deliberate.

Still, unintentional misrepresentation it's still quite bad because both in oneself and others, one reinforces wrong views and makes them even harder to remove later on. It's worse if a teacher confidently tries to give the impression that what they teach is the same as what's in the Suttas without having sincerely investigated whether that's the case (most would start noticing glaring discrepancies if they did). The only reason one would do such a thing is valuing gain and renown over the truth.

Even worse than the misguided emphases you listed is actively discouraging students from taking on faith anything they don't yet see for themselves, feeling ashamed and regretful (*hiriottappā*) of their unwholesome actions, studying the Suttas, and tenaciously going against the grain of their defilements even if it's unpleasant (not to mention forms of *sati* and *paññā* that would be much closer to the right ones). The rejection of at least some of these basic wholesome qualities is very common in Western Buddhism.

It's an unwholesome principle already to baselessly display certainty about anything, and the fact that it's about Dhamma and one is profoundly influencing people's lives and choices, sometimes actively taking them away from what's actually the Buddhist path while making them believe the opposite, makes it a lot worse.

Knowing Background Phenomena

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** still_tracks 2025-03-01 17:49:24

I was wondering why we *feel* feelings but know/discern/see other peripheral phenomena and what these verbs even refer to. When I actively try to feel a feeling, all I find is that I want to make the feeling palpable by searching for sensations in my chest or head. However, even before such a search, I already know that I am feeling well or bad, and this knowledge clearly refers to something in my experience. Now, isn't the same true for the overall mood? I can't find the mood when I search for it, and I don't even have to do it because it is simply something I know. This knowing is not based on some fantasy, but a bad mood is easily recognizable in one's experience, even for the most unrestrained person in the world. The same goes for intentions. It isn't too hard to be aware of the most obvious pressures/pulls to do, say, or think about various things throughout the day, while withstanding a pull is, of course, a different matter. I also tend to associate these pulls with sensations in my chest, but these association attempts can only occur because the pull has already appeared as a background phenomenon.

So, is this the basic principle for every kind of peripheral phenomenon? That there is knowledge of something which is clearly or even vaguely there in experience, and every attempt to catch it by sensing it in the body (another example would be weak legs when

feeling anxious) or trying to find it as a mental image or thought is futile and unnecessary. When I am angry, I know it; I can only know it because it is present; I don't act out based on it and that's enough.

Hence, the reason we say that we are *feeling* feelings or even emotions is just because these are very obvious background phenomena, and we have a word for it in society, while phenomena like the internal body are on a more subtle layer in experience. However, as the same principles apply to all background phenomena, feeling a feeling and knowing/discerning/seeing the internal body is basically the same kind of "act," just pointing toward different things in experience.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-02 14:50:09

So, is this the basic principle for every kind of peripheral phenomenon?

Yes, that's how you discern all of the aggregates, in fact. They are all "peripheral."

there is knowledge of something which is clearly or even vaguely there in experience, and every attempt to catch it by sensing it in the body (another example would be weak legs when feeling anxious) or trying to find it as a mental image or thought is futile and unnecessary.

Indeed, and you get to recognize the aggregates clearer the more you contain those habitual attempts to make phenomena "more palpable" by pinning them down into specifics. That automatically distracts you from their actual manifestation, which is always general and non-specific by nature.

You also start to see the very concrete and inseparable relationship between restraint and understanding. Lack of restraint, sensuality, etc., is that "coarsing up" of things that would've otherwise remained as non-specific phenomena (that are nevertheless *real as such*). That then makes it even harder to recognize and stay with the actual manifestation of things (which is always peripheral to any particular details). Then even when you try to practice and see the Dhamma, you end up watching sensations and things of that nature, to the point of imagining that you can "observe" your five aggregates coming and going like things popping in and out of a screen.

It's not at all an exaggeration to say that modern Buddhist tradition and practices move in the complete opposite of the right direction—towards *concealing* phenomena rather than revealing them—often invoking the buzzword "phenomenology" without understanding what it means. It's also not an accident that virtue has become an afterthought at best.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-20 05:30:56 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It seems there are always countless perceptions in the background—for instance, the sound of chirping birds as I write this or the sensations of my body touching various surfaces.

Such things are not in “the background” at all; at least not the one we refer to when we use that term. You could say they’re just an inconspicuous part of the foreground.

For me, it seems like the foreground cannot be anything other than a perception—whether it’s one of sight, sound, smell, taste, touch, or imagination. Whenever I try to make one of the other aggregates the focus of my attention, I inevitably end up with a perception, usually in the form of a thought like, “there is pleasant feeling.” This perception then acts as a stand-in for something that is elusive and enables me to think about it in meaningful ways.

This is accurate in a sense. But the fact that anything in the foreground tends to be a perception does not mean that all perception is in the foreground.

I would say that, while my thought about a current feeling isn’t the feeling itself, that the “real” feeling is nevertheless experienced—there is no doubt that I am feeling fine at this moment.

For example, here the overall recognition of there being no doubt that you are feeling fine at this moment is also a perception. What you refer to as “my thought about a current feeling” is just an extremely coarse kind of perception (i.e., very much at the foreground) that’s unnecessary to know how you’re feeling.

On the other hand, since rūpa cannot be intended, felt, or perceived, I can never be as certain about it as I am about a perception, feeling, or intention. The necessary existence of rūpa seems to be something I only can infer; for me it isn’t an undoubtable phenomenon like a feeling and the perception which stands for it (which in turn comes with its own feeling and determinations) is everything I am able to know.

This is a common misunderstanding that leaves room for personality-view, as I explained here.

Rūpa is not any more “concealed” or fundamental than feelings or perceptions. If anything, rūpa is *less* fundamental (hence the formless states).

The right way to see it is that whatever you *refer to* or *designate* as rūpa is necessarily a perception-of-rūpa. But that’s in no way different from any of the other four aggregates, including perception itself.

If we only regard perception as foreground sense input that we can “observe” and “focus on” (e.g., sensations of touch), then yes, rūpa is certainly “behind” that kind of perception (the kind most people emphasize but is quite irrelevant). But perception seen on the right level—as [the knowing of] the characteristics of a thing of any subtlety at all—is more fundamental than rūpa, which is why it ceases much later in the series of samādhi attainments.

Self-view is gone when you’ve become unable to doubt whether there can be things apart from the perception of those things. Any notion of a “more real” rūpa (or any other phenomenon, including a soul or self) supposedly beyond your perception of it is itself just

another perception. The alleged “more real” phenomenon is knowable to the very extent that its characteristics (such as its ambiguity and inaccessibility) are perceived, just as, on a coarse level, a blue towel is perceived as a blue towel. But one starts with a way too narrow preconceived notion of what “perceiving” is.

And this doesn’t mean everything we experience is some sort of secondary fabricated reality, and the ultimate reality beyond perception is hidden from us. “The reality beyond perception (or other aggregates),” which many might think is Nibbāna, is perceived. *Structurally*, it cannot be otherwise, and not seeing that means not knowing Nibbāna, because there is ignorance and misconceiving of the aggregates.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-21 10:45:33 (in reply to a comment not included)

Certainly not. Rather, whatever is *described* and *recognized* as the aggregate of rūpa is a perception of the aggregate of rūpa.

It may sound the same, but it very much isn’t. Stating “rūpa is *perceived by* perception” involves a phenomenological contradiction: experientially, you thereby tacitly and vaguely imagine (*perceive*) a “pure” aggregate of rūpa that is supposedly not yet perceived.

Of course, you wouldn’t have perceptions without rūpa (e.g., your physical eyes there in the world structurally preceding the visual perceptions on account of them). But any recognition, image, description, characterization, concept, notion, idea, belief, impression, etc., of that rūpa because of which there is perception will be a perception.

The result of recognizing this is full dispassion towards form *and* perception. Not recognizing the extent of perception means leaving an unoccupied space outside of both form and perception (or perception and any other aggregate), and that space is where the self is.

“Beings perceive the describable
and are established upon the describable.
Not comprehending the describable,
they fall under the yoke of Death.

But having comprehended the describable,
he does not conceive one who describes,
for he has nothing by which one could define him.”

—SN 1.20

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-23 07:15:18 (in reply to a comment not included)

The thing is that the aggregates that you have now are *in themselves* the opposite of Nibbāna (the five aggregates of assumption or *pañcupādānakkhandā*), so any effort to figure

out how Nibbāna might “fit” within the aggregates you have now would be based on a wrong premise.

As you said, the whole world is within the aggregates (of upādāna for puthujjana), so even the most careful and precise thoughts about anything, including Nibbāna and Arhantship, are also within them. So it is by purifying thoughts and mental images regardless of their content (past, present, or future, coarse or subtle, mundane or about Dhamma, etc.), from craving and assumption that you would achieve Nibbāna. Hence it all boils down to freeing this very mind from the five hindrances through the gradual training, not to figuring things out in abstraction. That’s genuinely the only way that these things can be grasped *even intellectually*.

Only if you abandoned the five hindrances to a good extent would you have a basis to see for yourself what the difference is between the presence and absence of upādāna, and thus what the way to fully abandoning it is. That’s why it’s a prerequisite for any noble attainment.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-26 03:11:41 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

What if hindrances are abandoned only for short periods? Return back because the mind have strong habit to seek the satisfaction or safety outwardly. Distraction is more interesting than calmness for an animal - how to train it, what to show it?

To the extent you abandoned the hindrances, the mind should be more pliable and obedient. So even though desire for distraction arises, you would be able to easily direct the mind away from it. But it might take time until you can reach such a degree of pliability, so for the time being, what you’re describing is natural. The initial sense of urgency and diligence is driven by the amount of suffering there is, so when the hindrances diminish, that diminishes too.

What you want to ensure for now is that the “returning back” never gets to the point of unwholesome activities, i.e., things that are blatantly rooted in greed, ill will, or sensual distraction. Then you’ll never stray too far into the hindrances and will be able to continue more or less where you left off.

Without the necessary training in seeing the signs of your mind, if you tried to force it to stay put in seclusion then practically speaking you would likely end up acting out of a hindrance of restlessness and falling away from the calm you reached anyway.

Looking for a practical model.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** tejveer 2025-02-27 02:08:58

I’ve been having some sobering reflections for the past few weeks asking myself the following repeatedly: what have I got to show for all my study of HH and the suttas for around

3 years?

The answer is mostly complete silence with respect to what actually matters: uprooting the liability to suffering. I can justify it by stating that in the process of familiarizing myself with HH content, I've picked up subsidiary insights about the "structure" of experience, technicalities of various phenomena (desire, the peripheral body, *namarupa-vinnana*), etc. But that justification is ultimately redundant since what fundamentally matters is again, the uprooting of the liability, which has remained unaffected.

So I asked myself: why is that? Is that in whom I am learning from, or myself?

And the answer is almost entirely myself. When HH said 8 precepts and sense restraint are a prerequisite for understanding the Dhamma, the first thing that came to my mind was attempting to rationalize it: why is that, what is their grounds for claiming that?

I've just now noticed, a few weeks ago, that I've had this idea that I must have a *perfectly clear model* of all the components related to the practice, how they relate to the other components, and why it is that those components must exist in the context of the practice: "What *precisely* is the citta? How does it operate? What is the relationship between *yoniso manasikara* and the citta's inclination towards this or that? How can I know *for sure* that this is the only way of taming it? What is my justification for this being the "only" way?" And it goes on.

Noticing this, I came to the realization that that view that my intellectual model of the practice must *first* be perfect for me to begin the *actual* practice is itself completely unjustified.

The only reason it has been justified thus far has been in part because of my like for complete systematization, as well as a need to justify to others, in case I'm asked about my practice, what I'm doing and why I'm doing that, and ensure that I have a perfectly defensible answer in which no fault can be found.

I've also come to realize that on the one hand, there's an individual who puts no effort into a rational re-evaluation of their currently existing model, and the other, an individual who neurotically puts effort into rational re-evaluation of their currently existing model. I most certainly fall into the latter category.

In one of the recent videos, Ajahn said along the following lines: the Dhamma is not irrational; you just need precepts and sense restraint because otherwise the field of phenomena that it is concerned with will not be present, and no amount of reason will be applicable (recalled from memory; very likely not verbatim).

And so it seems the assumption that a perfectly existing model is possible *prior* to being well-established in the precepts and sense restraint is already a contradiction; an impossibility. Thus, I've given up that assumption.

My concern now is in simply anchoring myself in a practical model that is able to provide a value for the precepts and sense restraint, which I can hold on to till I gain mastery in them. Then, once the "field of phenomena" that the Dhamma is concerned with becomes

apparent, and reason is applicable, I can let go of that initial model in favor for a more accurate model, which can then be updated and refined, until eventually the most accurate model is obtained: that of a sotapanna.

I would like to know what such a practical model would look like.

The most practical model I'm able to come up with which justifies the precepts and sense restraint is the following:

Incline the mind towards the enjoyment of only that which is worth enjoying; not what is not worth enjoying. What is not worth enjoying? The world. What is worth enjoying? That which is not based on the world.

Why is the world not worth enjoying? Because it is subject to change, and the mind does not understand that; if it were to, *it* would not want to go there (proof via personal experience). Why should I want the mind to not enjoy the world? Because the mind which enjoys the world desires; and desire is not wanted; desire being not wanted, there is all my engagement with the world *which never solves the problem of the mind enjoying the world*. Teaching the mind *to not* enjoy what is *not* worth enjoying: this will actually solve the problem that giving into desire is meant to solve.

How should I teach the mind to not enjoy what is not worth enjoying? I establish myself in the precepts first, which are coarse forms of enjoying the world. Then, when I've gained a "distance" from the senses as a result of establishing the mind within the precepts, I *see* directly thus: "these choices will lead to the mind enjoying this, whereas these choices will lead the mind to *not* enjoying this". Seeing this, I choose the choices which will *not* lead to it enjoying that.

When I've dwelled sufficiently thus, and see the mind largely inclining towards keeping the precepts, I go further and see more subtler phenomena still pertaining to the world that it values and practice similarly.

For an example of how I train my mind consider the following:

I establish myself in the non-enjoying of women; the sight, sound, smell, taste, touch and thought of them. Why is that? Because all form is subject to change, and that which is subject to change is not worth enjoying; and the form that my mind enjoys the most is that of a woman. When I've "kept" up this motivation sufficiently enough, I start to *see* actions and their relation to the mind enjoying women; I *see* that at this moment, if I do this, the mind will incline here. So I don't do that. I then reflect continually and try to "review" the mind even further: is there any hints that the mind will still incline towards that? If so, on account of what actions is it that it still has the possibility of valuing that? Reflecting on this, those subtler actions become apparent, and I sufficiently *not* do those until any hints of it valuing that has been completely cleared, without a doubt.

Reflecting on this current model I have gives me confidence. Is it decent?

Perhaps me asking "is it decent" is itself a sign that there's still residue of that overtly rationalization-seeking behavior that I'd just initially pointed out. But in any case, I will leave it out in case anything of use can come out of it.

EDIT:

I've been seeing some misconceptions in the comments so I thought I'd clarify. It seems people do not understand what I mean by a model/system; by that, I simply mean something which is able to explain what I have to do (in this particular case, keep precepts and sense restraint), why I have to do it, and why it works (practically speaking).

Reason I say this is because in some comments I see the mention that gradual training is a model; which, the manner in which I'm using the word here, it is not; it is rather a set of trainings as the compound implies. And there also seems to be the common perception that I'm trying to rationalize away "sexual attraction" and "dispel the discomfort of not making any progress"; I'm not trying to do that. The purpose of the example above regarding women was to show my current idea of how I should be practicing; I'm unsure how it's being seen as some manner of justification for anything.

I also see the assertion that I'm currently trying to systematize knowledge again; however, I should mention, I do not see a problem in systematization, and that is precisely what I had come to look here for: a practical system/model. What I had an issue was with the kind of neurotic intellectual reconstruction of my present system/model of the Dhamma in hopes that I could get a perfect picture *prior* to being thoroughly sense restrained.

Again, what I find a problem here with is the (now previous) **neurotic** intellectual reconstruction and re-evaluation of the system. I still greatly value a clear system, of which, I'm able to see the relevance of every component and relationship, and justify it rationally. Except, I'm not able to do that to the best degree possible unless I'm first thoroughly restrained.

Now, I should perhaps also give further context for where I currently am in the gradual training. I keep the five precepts and am celibate; I do not listen to music (the inclination towards that has been largely dropped), I do not engage in coarse entertainment (shows, movies, shopping, etc.) and only have subtle entertainment left (getting derailed while on the internet trying to study). I do not eat for the sake of pleasure, however, I haven't put a maximum on how many times I can eat yet because I currently need to eat to gain more physical strength; I do not have adequate enough physical strength to do a lot of things. Once I've stabilized my weight to where I have enough energy to do the day-to-day things, I will start fasting on Saturday/Sundays by eating once a day and hopefully, from there, expand if the body allows. I do not sleep on the floor yet, but I intend on doing that once I have enough strength.

I do not have a lot of friends now because I'm fairly content being by myself and don't need to look for others.

I'm fairly well-established in what I've mentioned above.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 05:47:18

My concern now is in simply anchoring myself in a practical model that is able to provide a value for the precepts and sense restraint, which I can hold on to

till I gain mastery in them.

The problem here is the assumption that you have a say in what practical model will provide a value for the precepts and sense restraint. You don't. Different "models" will inspire the mind to do the work at different times and for different people. The Suttas are full of such "models," and you can take up whichever feels more relatable and clear at the time.

If there's resistance towards that lack of control, that's a remnant of the same neuroticism you described and ultimately an expression of the view of self (assuming control over your experience from the outside). So you would need to include *that* as something to give up and not act out of within whichever model you're using at the time.

Renouncing the renunciation, question for HH and a possible critique

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-02-26 21:16:00

Since I for long have conflicting views about the path and didn't realise that "stilling of all activities, relinquishment of acquisitions" is rather self-explanatory and I feel like at this moment in time I prefer to stay a layman and put value in certain things that a monk would not be able to value I wonder where will my path lead me if I practice a certain degree of incremental restraint, watchfulness of my intentions, trying to maintain the right perspective and so on, while clearly not giving up everything . What Ajahn Nyanamoli said in his recent talks makes sense to me, yet I am not exactly "not doing it" and waiting for results to happen. I am doing certain things and see certain results, but am very confused in regard to what my expectations should be as a layman. Some inserts from the suttas:

1. **Anathapindika:** The Buddha's chief male lay disciple and a stream-enterer, was a wealthy householder with a family. The texts mention his role as a father and a husband, suggesting he likely maintained a typical lay life.
2. **Visakha:** One of the foremost female lay disciples and a stream-enterer, was married with many children and grandchildren. Her family life implies that sexual relations were part of her lay experience.
3. **Citta the Householder:** He was a sotapanna who remained a layperson, continued his household duties, and engaged in business. There is no mention of him practicing celibacy.
4. In the Anana Sutta (AN 4.62), the Buddha explains that a sotapanna may still enjoy sensual pleasures but will not break the five precepts, including avoiding sexual misconduct. However, this does not imply total abstinence from sex, only adherence to ethical behaviour regarding it.
5. In the **Sigalovada Sutta** (DN 31), which addresses householders, the Buddha provides guidance on how to conduct relationships ethically, indicating that sexual conduct within a marriage is considered acceptable for laypeople.

So this gives me a picture that “yes I can still be a sotapanna and it doesn’t matter what anyone says”, but if on the other hand I am wrong and don’t see it I’d rather know

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-27 13:22:47

Thinking in terms of how many precepts to follow depending on what type of person you are externally means remaining bound to silabbataparamasa, rather than your actions being guided by direct insight of kusala and akusala, which is what defines a sotapanna.

The fact that the Suttas mention the five precepts for laypeople doesn’t mean that they went about their lives doing whatever they wanted except those five things, while somehow practicing the Dhamma nevertheless. It means that was the lowest common denominator that they would not go below even in their most heedless moments. When they made efforts in the practice, they would have to have developed the exact same right intention (of renunciation, non-aversion, and non-cruelty) as monks.

It’s one thing to not be able to fulfill renunciation all at once, and entirely another to redefine what the goal is so that renunciation becomes optional. Even if you then call it “Dhamma” and “noble eightfold path,” it’s something else now.

I’ve seen lay disciples who have learned the Dhamma. Though saying, “Sensuality is impermanent”, they’re infatuated with gems and jewelry, concerned for their partners and children.

They indeed don’t know the purpose of this Dhamma. Even though they say “Sensuality is impermanent”, They don’t have the power to cut passion, so they’re bound to children, spouses, and wealth.

—Theragāthā 2.34

Furthermore, what if, hypothetically, all those stories of householders attaining sotapatti were actually made up to make Buddhism more appealing to the common layperson? You can’t know for sure.

But you can see for yourself here and now (if you’re authentic) that liberation and sensuality are two opposite directions. So if you want to take the safe route and not just conform to a pre-defined role in the Buddhist community that may or may not lead to what you hope it will, you need to put that discernment first. And most likely, that’s exactly what those laypeople who did become sotapannas did. Their remaining household ties were not because they thought those things were “fine” in light of their lofty aim; they were seen as fetters they were still too weak to cut.

(Edit: Note also that the lay disciples the Buddha established as role models were anāgamis, i.e. had abandoned sensuality).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 05:26:21 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

setting people up for failure because the only goal must be nibbana, even though its not the only goal a person can have, while some degree of awakening is good for everyone and benefits the world and reduces suffering

The true “failure” is to develop wrong views about the Dhamma, such as that renunciation is optional and the Dhamma can be practiced apart from it. Right intention in the eight-fold path includes renunciation. It’s far better to fail at the right thing than to succeed at the wrong thing.

It means exactly that they went about their lives doing whatever they wanted within the 5 precepts

My point is, they *could* and may often have done so. But that does not mean that they were *making progress* on that account (towards non-return, which would be their aim).

That’s exactly why the Uposatha observance exists. It was a regular opportunity for a layperson to re-align themselves with the behavior of an Arahant. And the more someone wanted to be an Arahant, the more they would try to maintain that all the time, not just slip back to five precepts mindlessly as soon as the Uposatha is finished. And the Uposatha used to be weekly, not bi-weekly as it often is today.

Attachment and non-attachment are two opposite directions, but people define what is what differently and this is the crucial point.

Yes, and some definitions will be adequate, others not.

It’s like saying, “people define what is an addiction differently.” Sure, but does the person still consume the drug at all? If the answer is yes, then compared to someone who is completely free from that, they are still addicted, no matter what mental gymnastics they engage in to convince themselves otherwise.

There’s no shame in admitting that actually giving up craving is difficult and you don’t feel like doing it. Almost nobody does. But twisting the Dhamma so that you can reconcile sensuality with it is not a good move, and there’s no justification for it. Nobody’s forcing you to practice the Dhamma.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-04 07:08:49 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Sure, it’s not like every monastic was an Arahant or even an ariya. Even the Suttas don’t claim otherwise. And the reason would have been the same as for laypeople who failed to attain anything despite hearing the Dhamma many times: a mind still obstructed by passion.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-04 13:12:48 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

The point is everywhere in the Suttas, not just there. The stock description of people seeing the Dhamma always involves their minds turning away from sensuality first, upon recognizing its peril.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-05 06:06:50 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

would you please explain why you made this statement that appears, to me, to not be in accordance with the two characteristics of the buddha's dhamma that i've included below?

The two characteristics you mention apply to the Dhamma as an experiential principle, not to historical knowledge—such as whether laypeople mentioned in the Suttas as having attained stream entry truly did so. And as I think I made clear, the statement was mainly rhetorical.

if so, how do you reconcile that view with the following characteristic of the buddha's dhamma that i've included below?

The Dhamma itself is independent of time, but the *realization* of the Dhamma is gradual and requires time.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-05 10:00:20 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Why make this rhetorical statement if that's indeed what you were doing? I really want to understand where you're coming from

The original post references Suttas that in an attempt to support the view that renunciation is not necessary for attaining stream entry. I presented a hypothetical to highlight that the safe bet is to prioritize one's own honest recognition that sensuality and liberation are two opposing directions (something that one can eventually know beyond all doubt) rather than conclusions reached from a liberal interpretation of stories whose accuracy will always be subject to doubt.

I guess what I'm getting at is I fail to see where the six characteristics of Buddha-Dhamma aren't applicable...

ehipassiko, etc., doesn't mean one will know whether a certain account of something that took place 2500 years ago is fully accurate or not. What one "comes and sees", is presently evident, etc., is the four noble truths.

Does this historical knowledge bring immediate results with regards to dissatisfaction and the end of dissatisfaction?

No, and I never claimed otherwise. I do agree that the end of dissatisfaction comes from a fundamentally different kind of knowledge, and that knowledge and the path to attaining it are the subject of many of the discussions on this forum. On the other hand, I strongly disagree that the “immediate result” produced by the practice you propose is the true ending of dissatisfaction. That said, you seem quite convinced—so to each their own.

How should we interpret AN 5:161, “The Subduing of Hatred”, which recommends developing goodwill for someone if you’ve given birth to hatred for them?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** AlexCoventry 2025-02-26 02:57:51

The Subduing of Hatred (1): Āghatāvinaya Sutta (AN 5:161)

“There are these five ways of subduing hatred by which, when hatred arises in a monk, he should wipe it out completely. Which five?

“When you give birth to hatred for an individual, you should develop goodwill for that individual. Thus the hatred for that individual should be subdued.

“When you give birth to hatred for an individual, you should develop compassion for that individual. Thus the hatred for that individual should be subdued.

“When you give birth to hatred for an individual, you should develop equanimity toward that individual. Thus the hatred for that individual should be subdued.

“When you give birth to hatred for an individual, you should pay him no mind & pay him no attention. Thus the hatred for that individual should be subdued.

“When you give birth to hatred for an individual, you should direct your thoughts to the fact of his being the product of his actions: ‘This venerable one is the doer of his actions, heir of his actions, born of his actions, related by his actions, and has his actions as his arbitrator. Whatever action he does, for good or for evil, to that will he fall heir.’ Thus the hatred for that individual should be subdued.

“These are five ways of subduing hatred by which, when hatred arises in a monk, he should wipe it out completely.”

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-27 09:25:39

There’s no problem with the idea of “dispelling” or “wiping out” hatred or any other unwholesome state through these cultivations.

The problem is that for most people, because of not being developed in regard to the pressure of their minds on account of lack of virtue and so on, their recognition of the mind state of hatred is limited to the superficial negative thoughts that are a byproduct of it, and thus they believe merely replacing those with good thoughts is enough.

But one has to recognize that the state of anger is something much more fundamental than those thoughts. It's more along the lines of the “mood” you're in, and you can't get rid of your mood instantaneously. Thus, you need to *first* come to terms with that fact (AKA “endure” the arisen mood, which means not giving in to the thoughts it proposes, nor distracting yourself from it).

On the basis of that, without at any point getting impatient and trying to fight with the mind directly (thereby acting out of the same aversion), you can develop these five themes. As a result, you eventually “wipe out” the actual liability to angry thoughts altogether (the angry mood) rather than merely managing it and sweeping it under the rug with contrived positive thoughts. And then the mind would incline towards good will and so on by itself, without you “doing” it.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 05:37:29 (in reply to a comment not included)

cultivating metta in order to provoke the processes of clinging to that hostile mood, for the sake of better understanding those processes?

I'm not sure what you mean by “provoking the processes of clinging.”

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-28 15:40:29 (in reply to a comment not included)

Cultivating mettā cannot trigger resistance. This sounds like what I referred to above: an attempt to replace the bad thoughts arising from an angry mind with good thoughts, overlooking the angry mind or leaving it to somehow sort itself out. That attempt might trigger a secondary resistance whose disappearance can be confused with successful cultivation of mettā (especially when the root resistance already feels normal due to an insufficiently restrained lifestyle; *brahmavihāra* and *brahmacariya* go together).

That's the popular approach, but it's just a way of covering up the resistant mind, which still lingers to some extent. And that's why the full-blown resistance sooner or later returns, whereas proper cultivation of mettā would uproot any tendency to ill will, even without actively practicing mettā ever again.

To be able to cultivate mettā, you first need to familiarize yourself with what a hateful or resistant mind actually is: an ambiguous “cloud” that looms overhead despite whatever you might do. That's the third satipaṭṭhāna, and it's not the same as allowing hateful *thoughts* to persist (which should not be done, as the Buddha said). You'll only be able to see that hateful mind for what it is if you don't jump into action in response to it, which includes what you seem to be describing as “cultivating mettā.”

Mettā is about completely dispelling that cloud on the basis of seeing it clearly, not just maneuvering around it or compensating for it on a superficial level.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-03-02 13:47:53 (in reply to a comment not included)

And then you try to get rid of the mood, by replacing it with another mood, which requires thinking thoughts of goodwill?

No, that's the point. Thinking thoughts of goodwill won't lead you to a mind of mettā, because the mind (citta) and thoughts constitute two separate domains without a direct connection. The stock brahmavihāra description quite clearly says that one pervades the whole world with a *mind* (citta) of mettā, karuṇa, etc.

Practically, the distinction is that with a mind of mettā, you wouldn't wish harm on another even if they were to harm or kill you and everyone close to you, while being fully aware of what that person did. Someone whose practice consists of thinking thoughts of goodwill must cover up and ignore the negative while focusing on the positive. That only works up to a certain point and is doomed to fail long before it comes to such extreme scenarios.

But also "seeing it clearly" what does that mean?

It means you've been keeping the precepts consistently, not engaging or delighting in sensuality, and not delighting in company, and the phenomenon of the mind has become apparent as a result. You're able to see pressure *as such*, and you see that you have a clear choice in following that pressure (including by thought) or not. Whereas before your only two options were acting out of the pressure or ignoring it through distraction.

You can't develop mettā or any other form of mental cultivation unless you go through that training that reveals the mind, since all you will see and be able to work with is your thoughts and the secondary feelings that they arouse, i.e., distractions that leave the underlying aversion unchanged.

How do you ensure you aren't just ignoring angry thoughts out of aversion? Is it possible to try to get rid of the angry mood for aversive reasons?

Such mistakes can only happen if you haven't fulfilled the necessary training and therefore don't see the mind clearly. Otherwise, you would be aware of the aversion as such.

7 'Existences' vs. 7 'Lifetimes' - for a Sotāpanna

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** upasakatraine 2025-02-25 07:53:34

Hello Bhante,

In common usage, it is often said that a Sotāpanna will make an end to Saṃsāra within 7 lifetimes. This is usually taken to mean 7 more rebirths at most.

However, is it to be understood differently as 7 'existences' (bhava) instead, which need not correspond specifically to 7 'rebirths'?

In DN18, we see that King Bimbisāra appears to the Buddha as a Yakkha, and mentions that he is indeed Bimbisāra, who recollects his 14 rebirths to the Buddha. And he mentions that he has for long known himself to be a Sotāpanna, and now aspires to become a Sakadāgāmi.

Could you shed some light on how this is to be understood ?

Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-27 05:40:31

AN 3.80 says:

Udāyī, if Ānanda were to die without being free of lust, then because of his confidence he would exercise celestial kingship among the devas seven times and great kingship in this Jambudīpa seven times. However, in this very life Ānanda will attain final nibbāna.

...which adds up to 14 births (note that the translation on SuttaCentral deviates from the Pāli in order to preserve the traditional view. The above is Bhikkhu Bodhi's rendering).

AN 9.12 has:

sattakkhattuparamaṃ deve ca manusse ca saṃdhāvitvā saṃsaritvā moves between gods and humans seven times.

sattakkhattuparamaṃ has been traditionally (perhaps due to the Commentaries) interpreted as 7 births, but it is never actually specified as such in the Suttas.

And if the passage in DN 18 is accurate, it also means 7 existences is not automatically 14 births.

Introducing new rules to r/HillsideHermitage

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Bhikkhu_Anigha 2025-02-24 07:28:55

So far, this subreddit has operated smoothly with no active moderation or rules. However, it is now approaching 1,000 subscribers—more than four times the number from a year and a half ago when I joined. In recent months, the quality and usefulness of posts have noticeably declined compared to a year ago, an inevitable consequence of increased traffic. While the situation could be much worse—reflecting the generally good character of users here compared to most subreddits—it will not improve or stabilize on its own.

In response, I drafted a list of guidelines and reviewed them with the other mods to ensure this continues to be a reliable, high-quality resource for learning about and discussing HH teachings, which was and should remain its intended purpose.

The guidelines should now be visible in the sidebar. I will leave this thread open for a week to make room for clarification and discussion of the new rules.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-24 09:57:13 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Thanks for the feedback. I edited the rules, and now they should be visible on old Reddit as well.

Seeking Guidance: Stay Close to Family or Embrace Solitude in a Monastery?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Global_Ad_7891 2025-02-22 16:51:29

Hey everyone,

I'm a 25-year-old currently grappling with lung problems, so the reality of my mortality is always on my mind. I've been practicing sense restraint for a few weeks now—my days mostly consist of going to work, reading suttas and browsing Reddit, and spending quiet hours in my room just staring at the wall. Surprisingly, doing nothing isn't too difficult for me.

I have some financial flexibility and could move to a secluded place, but I'm torn. On one hand, living in solitude or even joining a monastery (like the Bhavana Society in West Virginia, which is the closest option) has its appeal for deepening my practice. On the other hand, given my health condition, staying close to family—specifically, living with my mom who can take care of me if things take a turn—seems like the safer bet.

Here are my main questions:

- Should I quit my job and continue living with my mom to be near support, focusing on achieving sotapanna while staying as secluded as possible? We have a pretty relaxed lifestyle with not much social interaction.
- Would it be better to move and live alone in a secluded area despite the distance from my family?
- Or is joining a monastery the right path, even though it might not be the ideal environment if my health worsens?

I'm relatively new to the practice, so any advice or shared experiences would be incredibly valuable. Thanks for reading, and I look forward to your thoughts!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-24 06:43:34

I would advise making sure you are already fully committed to the practice (keeping the eight precepts, being withdrawn from and not delighting in sensuality and worldly pleasures) before you commit to ordaining. Being committed to that unconditionally is what matters; “staring at the wall” is not necessarily useful.

If you can't do that, it would show that you're not taking enough responsibility for your practice and are expecting the monastery environment to motivate you to do it. The

monastery is not supposed to make you do what you otherwise wouldn't do; it's supposed to support you in doing what you would be doing anyway.

Navigating the Balance Between Practice and Health Risks

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** SacredStomach 2025-02-22 03:53:33

I'm about to visit Southeast Asia to ordain and I've been trying to figure out what my best move is. Here are the things I'm considering:

1. Southeast Asia appears to have the best monasteries for practice and ordination (and visa stuff, as a foreigner)
2. Soil Transmitted Helminths are really common in these places (hookworms, roundworms that can enter your bloodstream through your (bare) feet and wind up in your intestines)
3. I'm actually not grossed out by this, my main concern is that there can be serious health consequences, including premature death
4. **Basically, I'm trying to figure out how important it is to go to a place that I think is better for practice but where I may be more likely to die sooner (hard to really know), or whether I should go to a less ideal monastery that appears safer (but where I could still definitely die) and try to achieve right view there first?**
5. Is there a chance that being in an environment that really reveals the unownability of the body in this way might expedite the process of getting right view?
6. How much can I emotionally relinquish the body while still taking measures to protect it?

If anyone has any thoughts on this, I would appreciate hearing them. Also, if anyone who has been in SEA (especially as a monastic) has any suggestions on **how to prevent or treat helminth infections that don't break the precepts or monastic rules**, please let me know.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-24 05:51:12

It's common for people who take for granted their very safe urban environment to have such concerns, but it's not as big of a deal as it initially appears. The mind is just irrationally afraid of the unknown because it's so used to its current level of apparent safety.

You're close to 100 times more likely to die from a car accident, and yet you're probably not too worried about it. On top of this, living in a city makes you more likely to be in a bad mental state at the time of death when it comes.

It's also not like you'll never get proper medical care again after you ordain. You would have to either be very obtuse and ignore the symptoms, or refuse to be taken to the hospital in order to die or suffer any major complications from a worm infection even in Asia.

Is there a chance that being in an environment that really reveals the unownability of the body in this way might expedite the process of getting right view?

It's only revealing of that unownability when compared to the rather exorbitant Western standard. You'd probably have to look hard to find a place that exposes that unownability to an extent that takes more just a few weeks to get used to even as a Westerner. And that's usually not the type of place that would ordain you. Even forest monks in Asia often live in better conditions and with more luxuries than people in the nearby villages, and probably most of the world as well. But yes, it would still be easier to contemplate and recognize those things compared to wherever you probably are now.

How much can I emotionally relinquish the body while still taking measures to protect it?

By making sure that the measures you take are not rooted in emotional attachment but in buying yourself time to practice. If that's your context, it will automatically keep in check potential irrational obsessions with preventing as many threats to your health as you can, blowing the risks out of proportion. That still doesn't mean you will have emotionally relinquished the body, as that comes through wisdom. But at least you won't be actively strengthening your sense of ownership of it.

Haven't been in SEA myself, but in Sri Lanka I never had any issues with worms despite eating alms from poor village homes daily. I imagine monks there will have tried and true methods to deal with worms if they indeed tend to cause significant issues. You can be sure that they're not equanimously putting up with illness or death left and right.

Wakefulness, and the watches of the night

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** meshinthesky 2025-02-19 08:01:50

In MN39

What more is there to do? You should train yourselves like this: 'We will be dedicated to wakefulness. When practicing walking and sitting meditation by day, we will purify our mind from obstacles. In the first watch of the night, we will continue to practice walking and sitting meditation. In the middle watch, we will lie down in the lion's posture—on the right side, placing one foot on top of the other—mindful and aware, and focused on the time of getting up. In the last watch, we will get up and continue to practice walking and sitting meditation, purifying our mind from obstacles.'

In dhammapada

If a man really regards himself as dear, let him well and truly protect himself. During one or another of the three watches the spiritually mature person should keep wide awake.

Thus, Buddha is saying that at least in one of the three watches one should keep awake practicing accordingly.

- 1) I assume the day is equally divided into morning, noon, and night... is that right?
- 2) I assume the night is equally divided into three watches... is that right?
- 3) when one is said to be accomplished in being wakeful? (in the calculations I've done, it seems one needs to be wakeful sleeping around 5 hours)
- 4) the lion's posture is something repeated again and again. Yet, I have not seen almost any discussion on it. I assume the goal is to keep protecting our own body posture and to not get loose even in sleep.

Is this proper lion's posture? <https://www.vineobstacleszen.com/content/images/2023/07/EPSON582-2.jpg>

Is this what a perfect lion's posture looks like? <https://scdd.sfo2.cdn.digitaloceanspaces.com/uploads/original/3X/6/0/606de3046905bea12aca968eeacc02a2127185b7.jpeg>

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-19 18:05:40

Apart from what u/no_thingness replied, it's also useful to remember that being fully established in the precepts with the right attitude, and being able to recognize—in regard to oneself, not in abstraction—which things are beneficial and which are not already constitutes stream entry.

The “right attitude” means any sense of duty in regard to the precepts has completely disappeared, and yet one does not break them no matter what, because there is a direct and absolutely immovable discernment of those actions being *in themselves* categorically harmful the instant one intends to perform them, irrespective of any subsequent consequences and effects on other people.

A simple question to ask oneself is: “if I were to receive an indisputable guarantee that I can attain Nibbāna without keeping any precepts at all and doing whatever I want, would I feel even the slightest elation at that prospect, and would I stop keeping *any* of them?” Until one can answer “no” to that question with perfect confidence, one's main task is to perfect not only one's external virtue (which anyone can do while remaining equally ignorant) but also the attitude and views behind it. Any practices the Buddha gave subsequent to the aggregate of noble virtue should not be taken on in a fixed manner until then, because one is very likely to undertake them wrongly (i.e., still with a sense of duty behind it rather than direct recognition of wholesome and unwholesome).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-20 09:48:37 (in reply to a comment not included)

There is a noticeable pattern: the more I sleep; the more I dream; the more the mind creates its dream movies, the more the mind, as a sense, gets loose, and

pasture in unwholesome fields. So, I kinda think that starting with the next step “dedicate to wakefulness” right now would help me with the “restraining the sense doors”...

This is a good example of what I meant. This is not the right motivation for trying to limit your sleep, and the fact that you think sleep causes a tendency towards unwholesome thoughts means you have not sufficiently understood what unwholesome thoughts are and how they actually come about. Sleep cannot create unwholesome thoughts on its own; it's through you not being sufficiently clear enough about where the “gateway” lies in regard to your own intentions that your mind proliferates in unwholesome directions (assuming that is what's actually happening, and you're not overreaching by seeing thinking itself as unwholesome).

So if you were to commit to the practice of restricting your sleep, you would do so on the basis of that already wrong assumption about where the problem lies, and that would make that practice wrong even if you were practicing the external form of wakefulness perfectly. You wouldn't actually be wakeful even if you never slept, because as the description goes, it's about clearing the mind from obstructive states, which means one needs to be very clear about what those states are already. Not just stick to an external prescription. Notice that the instruction regarding the watches of the night and so on *follows* the instruction to clear one's mind of obstructive states. In other words, those specific habits are the *result* of the right attitude. And you can't arrive at the right attitude without understanding it, merely emulating the external form instead.

Since Buddha laid down a specific and physical set of instructions on how to sleep and how much to sleep, why a trainee should not do his best to follow them?

He didn't lay that down in a categorical manner for everyone. It's even absent from the list of 5 things new monks should train in. It is quite clearly stated that it is undertaken after the practice of sense restraint has been completed, and as I noted before, if you had the right understanding of what virtue is, let alone sense restraint, you would already be at least a sotāpanna. So the task is to keep going back to that understanding, revising it and upgrading it for as long as it takes, and not to start building a structure of more advanced practices on a still shaky foundation.

Sleeping is also not a sensual enjoyment in itself, and the way you are expressing your perspective sounds to me like you might be drifting in the direction of self-mortification, because it would then follow that only by never sleeping would you be free from sensuality. Māra even tried to convince the Buddha that his sleeping was indulgent, and he failed.

Just like eating, sleeping is sensual enjoyment *when* it is done with sensual motivations, and that's not intrinsically connected even with how long you sleep. One person could theoretically sleep 9 hours one day without any craving, another one not sleep at all but with a mind affected with craving and ignorance top to bottom, all the while thinking themselves to be pure because of how little they sleep.

So I would put it this way: disregarding sleep duration altogether, if you catch yourself sleeping in when you're not really tired at all, and it's clear that it's rooted in laziness and nothing else, that's something you should try to restrain. But it would be a problem because of acting out of craving there and then, not because it would later create unwholesome tendencies through some unknown mechanism. Beyond refraining from that, which you could consider to be on the level of virtue, I wouldn't advise trying to pre-determine a sleep schedule/procedure yet because it simply won't be coming from the right place, and it would mean acting as if you already completed the much more foundational work when you in fact did not.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-20 15:47:52 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

... or that I should go back to focus on external virtue until that habit gets strong enough to bring a chance for itself?

Virtue is not external. Otherwise, a newborn baby would be virtuous already because they don't break the precepts. "Virtue" refers to acting with a mind free from greed, aversion, and delusion (see MN 78). Hence, as I mentioned, only a sotāpanna has developed virtue properly speaking; that's when one is trained enough to see the defilements clearly.

Even in the case when one is focused purely in virtue: one should do effort in restraining the delusional habits of the mind and senses, right?

It depends on what you mean by "delusional habits." If you mean thoughts of unwholesome nature—of sensual desire and irritation; thoughts and fantasies of breaking the precepts—then yes, that needs to stop because that would fall within virtue. But if what you are referring to as "delusional habits" is mental chatter about this or that, then no, and trying to stop that would be overstepping the mark and falling into the same wrong view that underlies meditation techniques.

If the latter is the perspective you've been working with, I'd recommend even stopping what you have so far been considering as sense restraint altogether, and going back to simply training in virtue without trying to curb your mind any further than that.

See this recent discussion for an idea of what that would look like.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-21 10:01:46 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

- (a) one is virtuous when one acts, speaks, and thinks virtuously in a natural and effortless way - the senses, including the mind, may want this or avoid that, but one does not need to fight with them to keep the virtue in body, speech, and thought.

Yes, and practically speaking, that also means being free from doubt about the nature wholesome and unwholesome in the most general sense, because it's not about externals,

but about seeing one's own mind and intentions clearly. And it's essential to be able to make the distinction between something being wanted (a pressure arising), and you acting even by thought in regard to it. Those are two separate things, but people tend to overshoot and try to get rid of the mental pressure as well, not just the intentional "picking up" of images *on account of* the pressure, which is what they are directly responsible for.

- (b) one is sense restrained when on their own accord the senses do not anymore want this or avoid that - thus they are said to be pacified.

Not necessarily. The senses being "pacified" (i.e., still perfectly functional and aware of the same objects but free from defiled intentions towards them) means being in samādhi. Practicing sense restraint properly simply means not attending to things out of greed, aversion, and delusion, even if those pressures are still there.

But it's important to remember the presence of defilements or craving is determined by the mental state at the time, *not* by the specific objects. So at one point, *because* you're in an angry mood, thinking about someone's faults or about something you dislike can be unwholesome because it will make that state worse. On another occasion, if the mind is more neutral or even content, and you're able to keep it so, those same thoughts would not be a problem at all. Hence what matters is the the state of mind, as you quoted. And if you adhered to that principle, you would be unable to break any of the fundamental precepts, since that would have to come out of a defiled mind. That's how the early Saṅgha lived without any rules for a good while.

If one stops practicing sense restraint does dukkha return or is some dukkha permanently removed given enough time?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** NibannaGhost 2025-02-17 15:33:12

If a monk practicing correctly disrobed would they be less liable to suffering permanently even when engaging with sensuality? What does a layperson's life look like if they're practicing correctly?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 17:50:34

It's impossible for a monk practicing rightly to disrobe (in the sense of actually returning to a lay lifestyle), let alone to engage in sensuality, precisely *because* he would be free from suffering. Engaging in sensuality is rooted in suffering, and the Suttas always refer to disrobing as "returning to what is inferior" (*hīnāya-āvattati*).

What does a layperson's life look like if they're practicing correctly?

Being free from virtually all suffering and experiencing near perfect peace (anāgāmi), and therefore not engaging nor even being interested in sensuality, relationships, or worldly

pleasures of any kind, even if they still have a job and practical affairs to take care of. But there would have to be a good reason for them not to give everything up and go forth, such as supporting aging parents or children that were born before they freed themselves, for they would have no personal interest in anything that lay life has to offer beyond fulfilling a lingering sense of duty towards family, rooted in the five higher fetters they would still have.

See AN 8.21, MN 81, and SN 55.6 for examples.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 07:09:28 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Monk is a profession/vocation.

Nowadays and most of the time, yes, because of the deterioration of the practice at large and the introduction of arbitrary rituals and responsibilities akin to what priests in other religions do, which were not part of the original lifestyle of monks, and which need to be put aside in order to actually meet the standard of a bhikkhu. So it's disingenuous to suggest that that's what a monk is *supposed* to be. A monk is someone whose sole focus in life is to practice and realize the Dhamma. Not being a monk (or a recluse/renunciate, more accurately speaking) means having other priorities that subtract from that.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 09:01:26 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Sramana is not a social role or position. It doesn't require social recognition, a uniform, or a membership of a group. Sramana is a state of mind.

Of course, that's exactly what I mean. That's why I clarified with "recluse/renunciate" to distinguish from the external situation of formal ordination, which in itself means next to nothing.

But being a samana definitionally does also involve not wasting any effort and time with things that have nothing to do with the Dhamma and even act as a distraction from it, such as all lay affairs. All attachments are ultimately "evil."

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 15:46:25 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It does take dedication towards developing the mental skills necessary to study 'attachment' rather than be obsessed with presence or absence of apples, or jobs, or money ... etc

It seems you're making a strawman here. Nobody's saying that the absence of any amount of external things amounts to successful practice in itself.

An extremely smart sramana engages and disengages with apples in order to study the attachment to apples in both conditions juxtaposed against each other.

The example of apples is moot and blurs the lines between things that can be done without attachment and those that can't. If you were to deepen your understanding of what attachment is, you would see that certain things, namely the things that define household life, cannot be partaken in without it.

Besides, pausing engagement for x amount of time and committing oneself to not engaging **ever** again are earth and sky. You see that even with drug addicts; they can go for a good while without actually consuming their substance if they know they'll be going back to it eventually and they still have it available just in case.

So someone who thinks they are "engaging without attachment" should test themselves by giving up the engagements completely and forever. Even just half a decade might suffice for a real test. For extra challenge, add living alone in a remote forest like an "external" samana, exposed to the elements constantly, and with nothing but their mental skills to rely on for comfort and happiness.

If they are truly free from craving, there will not be the slightest dissatisfaction arising at any point. And they will gain tons of extra time and energy to do whatever their practice is, continuously experiencing even deeper states of peace as a result.

As with anything that's difficult to do, feeling like they would be fine in that scenario while sitting comfortably at home does not count.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 16:49:29 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I have not downvoted you.

Rise and Fall of the Five Aggregates

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Omaree9 2025-02-16 13:56:45

I think there is a common misunderstanding when it comes to this statement of the Buddha. What current practitioners think the Buddha meant is to see the inconstant nature of the Aggregates, how they are always changing. What I think the Buddha meant was to see how they arise and fall based on Dependent Origination. How they come to be through the causal process, which is independent of the idea of I. It is an impersonal process that works independent of an autonomous entity. So seeing the rise and fall of the aggregates would be understanding how form comes to be: through birth, through craving, through rebirth, through eating of food, all the things that cause form, ie this body, to exist and persist and all the things that cause it to disappear, to no longer exist.

Does this make sense?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 05:59:33

What I think the Buddha meant was to see how they arise and fall based on Dependent Origination. How they come to be through the causal process, which is independent of the idea of I. It is an impersonal process that works independent of an autonomous entity.

This too is a common misunderstanding of modern practitioners. Aside from Arahants, there isn't even one "process" in anyone's experience that is actually "impersonal," because all experience, no matter how refined, consists of the five assumed aggregates or one among them (with upādāna varying in degrees). And the five assumed aggregates are precisely what personality (sakkāya) is.

Dependent origination in particular is the very opposite of an impersonal process; it is *the* origination of personality. The destruction of the entire thing is the goal, rather than seeing it as an "impersonal process" in some sort of psychoanalysis. When one is no longer ignorant and actually understands paticcasamuppāda, i.e., avijjā is gone, none of the other "factors" come to be either, and there is no dependent origination to analyze anymore.

Both of the notions you describe are popular, or at least follow the very same spirit as those that are. They conflate the Dhamma—which nobody starts out being able to see, and needs to be "realized by the wise for themselves" through practice and gradual training—with pleasing psychologizations that anyone who's learnt some Buddhist jargon can understand and "agree" with, and even formulate themselves.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-23 07:05:13 (in reply to a comment not included)

Didn't the Buddha advise his disciples to view the aggregates as not me, myself, or my own?

Yes, but those were teachings for monks, who would've been established in the practice and lifestyle that makes all of those teachings not be abstract anymore. If you're someone who is properly "exposed" to the aggregates as they are by never acting out of greed, aversion, and delusion and living in solitude, you just can't fall into this type of elaborate theoretical explanation because it's clear that it just doesn't apply, and you're overlooking the actual aggregates by engaging in it.

And yes, the Buddha talked about viewing the aggregates as *anattā*, but there's a good reason why there's no mention of things like "impersonal process that works independent of an autonomous entity." When you see the aggregates for what they are, you realize that such elaborate notions inevitably distract you from the direct seeing of them as simply "not mine", because they're not in your direct control, that's it. And that's all the Buddha said in his second discourse; he didn't forget to mention elaborate details of some larger theoretical framework.

Question about the Heart of the Trap (upadana and gratification)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Silatigi1 2025-02-16 13:23:49

Hello everyone,

from 40min until 45min of “Why did the Buddha say”Sensuality” to be an Assumption? | Hillside Hermitage”

I got intrigued by the appearant power of sensuality to divert, to cover up the actual pressure. We know it doesn't always work (+we know that from past experiences for which we had all the “green lights” of sensuality ON how quickly sense pleasure gets saturated and “doesn't work anymore”, sometimes for days so called “rest of the warrior”) but still I have an inkling that the trap would be easier to see if it never worked (not giving us the insidious idea of control see Bihhku Anigha : “*the ignorant mind continues to put an emphasis on the little control that it has and overlooks the more fundamental non-control. The enlightened mind does the opposite.*”), but then maybe this existence is all based on that trap, or rather this existence of us in this kamma loka IS the trap ? That without the trap this existence would not (“need” to) be ?

My question is very very basic : why is that that by engaging in sense pleasure we (are somewhat able to) stop resisting the pressure that the unpleasant feeling exerted on ourselves ? Is there a way to continuously feel the feeling while engaging ? Or rather the idea would be to see the danger in engaging (NN calls it the danger of wanting change, when change was the thing that caused the pressure in the first place in another discussion), and so stop engaging. Also in general curious about how a feeling feels without upadana ? What is that experience like phenonenologically ? Like seeing the feeling as feeling not affected by upadanna ? How was it before your development on the path and how is it now in comparison ?

Thank you for any pointer and help in understanding these.

Sil

Why did the Buddha say “Sensuality” to be an Assumption? | Hillside Hermitage

https://youtu.be/WNotZXYWV-0?si=_3EOAVfxep3JpIuy&t=2437

Ven Nyanamoli :

Because that whole assumption that “I have a desire, then engage and like satisfy the desire then the desire runs away?” No! You just you, you get tied basically from running away from the pain, then you accept it, and it cease to hurt.

So what if you were to accept the pain right away, and removing the middleman of sensual pursuits that cannot possibly even pertain to the domain of pain? Then you realize you will be above the pain even before the pain.

You can't satisfy your desires. But nobody denies **that after a degree of engagement**, with your sensuality projected goals of your desires, **you don't feel painful anymore. Why is**

that?

So this sense object remain unchanged, in a way, like you haven't truly consumed it and destroyed it. It's still there things you've been touching even the food in a way it's still there just now in the stomach as opposed to the table.

So nothing has come out of the material domain into your gut consumed by the all powerful sense of self. Yet there is no pain now. Why is that?

Ven. Akincano : We just covered it over?

NN : How can you cover it over ?

AkO : By... By...

How can it cover the order in the domain of census cannot possibly pertain to the domain of feelings? , what has changed?

Bhikku : You stop pursuing,

NN : you're not perceiving the pain anyway. You're feeling it. What has changed?

Bku + AkO: pursuing

NN : Yeah, but you stopped pursuing it, because it doesn't hurt anymore. The pressure is gone. **Why is that?** Why is it that it doesn't hurt anymore ? Why did he hurt in the first place?

AkO :Because you were just subjected to painful feeling?

NN : No, that's not suffering. Painful feeling is not Dukkha. Craving to be free from painful feelings, what Dukka is. So that's the only thing that changed. **After a certain amount of engagement** with sensual object pursuit of it, in particular, **you stopped resisting the unpleasant feeling in itself**. And that's why you don't suffer.

NN : But pursuit of sense object had nothing to do with you stop resisting it. It was basically a diversion. And that's why exactly, sometimes **if you keep engaging** with the pursuit of the sense objects, it becomes apparent that **it cannot do anything to the pain you're feeling**. So what you do then ? You double down! you triple down! And that's how perception of sensuality proliferate. Because it has nothing to do with the domain that you're actually acting from.

NN : And then yeah, you go to the extremes. Just to hoping that **some of it will allow your mind to take it as a successful project of diversion**, basically. So you don't know how to stop craving the feeling, you're just doing these random things, **hoping that it will result in you at least temporarily forgetting about resisting the pain**.

NN: And that's why you have to stop engaging, etc. has to be first, even if you're completely ignorant, you have to start practicing sense restraint first. Because it's basically it's on the level of a magical belief or diversion, that you know, deep down.....

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 07:48:28

The resistance does not stop *because* of engaging in sense pleasure. Rather, when resistance stops, it is because one has given up hope that the unpleasant pressure exerted by the senses will go away. The key point of the discussion is that one must learn to abandon that resistance directly, without resorting to sensual pleasures at all, which is like chanting a prayer hoping it will make you stop doing an activity that you yourself are actively performing.

Moreover, the situation is not static: the more one indulges in sensuality, the less effective it becomes, even in its already very limited and superficial effectiveness. Eventually, it reaches a point where no amount of engagement can suppress the resistance, leading to burnout, where nothing can satisfy the mind anymore. At that point, the only remaining options are either to dwell with aversion and apathy, or to seek escape through sleep, intoxication, or other forms of distraction. And this happens both on a “micro” and “macro” level, with the latter type of burnout often becoming clinical depression.

As for whether one can “continuously feeling while engaging in sensuality”—not the feeling that matters. Thus, there is no benefit or justification for indulging. Sensual engagement is always rooted in ignoring the unpleasant feeling that drives it, and in avoiding responsibility for one’s own suffering. It’s inherently a failure to recognize that dukkha arises not from lacking the desired object, but from one’s own internal craving. Engagement can thus only be rooted in ignorance of the four noble truths, and it will only grow and perpetuate that ignorance further.

It is also crucial to understand that one cannot wait for the dangers of sensuality to become clear in order to abandon engagement in it. The danger only becomes evident, and the mind only realizes the escape, **after** one has already refrained from engagement and one’s conduct has been purified for a long time. The very act of indulging in sensuality prevents one from seeing its danger, so it’s a vicious cycle that can only be broken by renouncing it first—regardless of how unpleasant that may feel initially.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-18 07:33:02 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Do you think someone who went as far with sensuality as experiencing what you described in that quote hasn’t gone too far, isn’t too broken to see the Dhamma?

They might be. But that’s not something you can know in advance because the practice is bound to appear quite daunting for everyone initially.

Yes, someone who has experienced severe dukkha from their own indulgence could be less likely to fall for the false promise of meditation methods, but it all depends on their authenticity and faculties. They could also just feel so overwhelmed that they are not willing to do anything but look for a quick fix. But either way, yes, their practice would certainly be unpleasant, as the determining factor for that is how much greed, aversion

IF JHANA IS A NATURAL CONSEQUENCE OF SILA, HOW COME ARAHANTS ARE NOT ALWAYS IN JHANA?

and delusion one has accumulated, not the “approach” of practice that one chooses.

So ultimately, it's not the fact of having indulged too much that would increase the chances of success. It's authenticity and diligence, even without having experienced any adverse circumstances of any kind.

If jhana is a natural consequence of sila, how come arahants are not always in jhana?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** aaimnr 2025-02-15 14:17:14

Despite initial resistance I'm finding the interpretation of jhana as a natural stage of gradual training more and more beautiful, appealing, consistent with Buddha's words and to an extent corroborated by my experience (at least regarding some initial levels of samadhi).

There's one thing though that doesn't compute for me however, which is - if jhana is developed by understanding the danger of sensuality (as discussed eg in Samatha vs Vipassana video), and likewise second jhana is developed by seeing a “problem” in the preceding stage, how could Arahant remain in the First Jhana at all (and not in higher ones)? Moreover, how could they ‘enter’ jhana at will (which was mentioned in the suttas), how could they NOT be in the jhanas?

One potential explanation could be that the gradual training is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for jhana, meaning that there IS a distinct ‘samatha’ step in somehow triggering the jhana as a specific state of mind. Which leads to a question of what is that additional/separate step or a dimension, because I don't remember it being discussed.

Thank you!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 06:13:46

and likewise second jhana is developed by seeing a “problem” in the preceding stage, how could Arahant remain in the First Jhana at all (and not in higher ones)?

Seeing the danger and escape in regard to the five aggregates as a whole is what characterizes the Arahant. That is a much broader and fundamental knowledge than knowing a further (still conditioned) escape from each jhana, and it does not automatically translate to the latter. But of course they would have no issue developing it and mastering all the jhanas if they wanted to.

Moreover, how could they ‘enter’ jhana at will (which was mentioned in the suttas), how could they NOT be in the jhanas?

They would not be in any of the jhanas if they lost their seclusion and aloofness from the world for whatever practical reason. First jhāna is the cessation of speech, so merely

having to talk already categorically prevents it during that time. Talking doesn't prevent being free from hindrances though.

The conditions for the first jhāna are (1) physical seclusion and lack of activity (2) a mind free from hindrances, which an Arahant always has anyway and (3) very clearly seeing the danger in sensuality, since that's precisely the "theme" of the first jhāna, the theme that is reflected upon (the literal meaning of jhāna). And an Arahant of course has that clarity perpetually accessible.

So that's the "trigger": bringing up and making explicit the knowledge of the danger in sensuality. But it's not a "samatha step"; if anything it's a vipassanā one. The samatha step, if anything, would be the virtue, sense restraint, etc. that were already developed long beforehand, and which free the mind from hindrances. And you can't do any of that mindlessly and without insight. Even for basic virtue, you need to have insight into wholesome and unwholesome, when there is craving and when there isn't, etc. It's not just keeping precepts like a robot. Hence vipassanā is needed for samatha. Conversely, you won't see the danger in sensuality clearly and enter jhāna before the mind has lost its blinding infatuation with it, so samatha is needed for vipassanā.

Thus, the neat separation falls apart: even though you can outline them as distinct aspects, there is no samatha without vipassanā, and no vipassanā without samatha.

yoniso manasikara

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** BakeFinancial4087 2025-02-15 03:08:51

How does having knowledge about the 'origin' prevent one from further acting out towards sensuality? Assuming that's what yoniso manasikara is. Or if i keep this knowledge long enough, will it automatically prevent me from acting out? I just don't understand the relation between the two. As I have understood from Ajahn Nyanmol's teachings it will help me not act out, or as he says knowledge of yoniso manasikara will make you unable to make unwholesome choices, now of course i understand i have to put in the work, but i just wanted to clarify exactly what it means and how proper yoniso manasikara will help.

I have been keeping the 8 precepts strictly, however there is still mental unwholesomeness, which obviously i try not to act out of, but sometimes it's hard to discern the middle way. I think I have the 'prerequisites' for discerning the origin.

thanks

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 07:05:03

Or if i keep this knowledge long enough, will it automatically prevent me from acting out?

No, it's the other way around. In order for the right knowledge to even be accessible, you need to have completely stopped acting out already. Developing knowledge only serves to

make you dispassionate on top of merely being restrained, which basically means there's no need for restraint anymore. The mind simply does not want to go there because non-craving is *recognized* and seen as perfect safety, and craving as danger.

So yes, it will make you unable to make unwholesome choices. But you need to have completely stopped actually making those choices long beforehand.

When it comes to the mental unwholesomeness that can remain even within the 8 precepts, you just have to follow the same principle. You don't have to suppress your every thought; just restrain any thoughts that partake *in the direction* of breaking precepts. Thoughts rooted in lust or longing, hatred or resentment, and so on. That doesn't mean you destroy the *pressure* to think those thoughts, which is not your responsibility. It just means you don't think those specific thoughts on account of it, and thus you won't be further feeding it as a result.

Just as you wouldn't need to destroy a bottle of wine no matter how forcefully it's offered to you in order to keep the 5th precept. You just wouldn't go and drink it. Eventually whoever is offering it to you would forever stop trying. And then you'll be truly relieved from the problem at its root, instead of ignoring the fact that the bottle is still being offered to you and sending your mind elsewhere for a superficial and temporary relief, which is what meditation is most often about for people.

And this is all *yoniso manasikāra* as practically as one can describe it. It's not about trying to figure out various technicalities of your attention, the "peripheral," etc., but about giving up greed, aversion, and delusion right here and now.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 09:27:26 (in reply to a comment not included)

even if i dont specifically go along with it it keeps pressuring me and i dont know what needs to be done. Its like a recorder being played and im there just watching it.

"Not knowing what needs to be done" is something that is pressuring you too, and if you don't restrain yourself in regard to that pressure as well and feel justified in acting out of it, you will be feeding the same craving that makes you liable to sensuality to begin with.

So don't indulge in the sensual pressures by body or by speech, no exceptions. Mentally, don't intentionally listen and tune in to the "recording" even if it's playing in the background—because that can't happen by accident. But *also*, don't indulge in the urge to get rid of those pressures, and see that too as a recording playing in the background.

That's basically the middle way, and if you understand it and sustain it long enough, not just particular instances but the overall liability to any type of pressure will diminish and ultimately be destroyed.

but other days its just a lot of pressure and longing and is hard to keep steady when this happens

You need to start recognizing why it is that this happens, because it's not an accident. If the mind gets wild, it can only be because you've been giving attention to things you shouldn't have, often because in the moment it doesn't feel like a big deal, and the danger is not immediately obvious. Only afterward when you're already drowning in pressure you realize you made a mistake, but then it's too late.

However I have only just come to the monastery in the last 10 days so I assume I should be a lot more patient....

Yes, that's for sure.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 13:44:55 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

This explanation seems a bit limited when exceptional circumstances occur (mostly connected to loss, sickness and death). If, for example, my child dies suddenly and I'm devastated because of it, it doesn't seem realistic to attribute the wildness of my mind to what I did in the past days.

Why not? How could the death of your child trigger craving in your mind if craving hadn't been kept alive by your own actions that are rooted in it? Craving subsists and grows based on fuel that is not provided to it by accident. Hence you're responsible for every bit of it that you have, subtle or coarse.

What is "exceptional" and what isn't is also quite circumstantial. There have been (and probably still are) places and periods where children dying was not unusual. Craving is the one and only root of suffering; tragic and unexpected events have nothing to do with it.

Being free from craving doesn't make me feel relief or bliss

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** senserestraint 2025-02-14 15:35:27

For example, I used to be addicted to facebook but deleted it three years ago. When I think about how I now have zero craving for facebook, it's just an 'um, ok' neutral feeling. No relief or bliss from no longer being bound to something I was once bound too. Am I missing something?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 06:38:49

You have most likely not freed yourself from many other cravings. Giving up craving as a whole is what leads to peace automatically. And that requires understanding the nature of craving (the right view); it can't just "happen" the way people naturally lose interest and get bored of this or that specific thing (nor the way things just stop coming up as a result of a focusing practice). Otherwise every 90 year old would be an anāgāmi at the very least.

Understanding Craving: Personal Reflections

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** still_tracks 2025-02-14 14:34:30

I would like to share my current understanding of craving in the hope that someone may relate or identify any issues and be generous enough to point them out. This will be a lengthy post with mainly personal reflections.

For me, it seems that there are different “shades” of craving that manifest in experience in different ways. Firstly, there appears to be a type of craving that Ajahn Nyanamoli usually refers to as “wanting the wanting.” For me, this means that there is something in the experience that actively wants to go along with the pressure of the senses, mainly via justifying it. It also seems that this wanting of the wanting has its own force and just waits for the moment when the wholesome context (e.g., the danger of sensuality, non-ill-will) becomes weaker (by actions I have taken contradicting it). For example, if I am irritated by a person, initially I can know that the person isn’t the problem. However, there isn’t just a pull to get back at the person but also a pull to justify going along with the pull — something that wants to override the context of “others are not the problem” into “others are the problem.” If the context of “others are not the problem” is already weak, the justification of the pull easily succeeds and results in me being pulled into unwholesome engagement, especially on the mental level. The “me” that has tried to withstand that pull has transformed into a “me” that is now relishing thoughts of ill-will. This can happen within seconds, which is quite astounding. Once the relishing part has started, the craving isn’t occupied with wanting the wanting anymore (because it has succeeded); instead, it is occupied with keeping the relishing going. Attempts to withdraw oneself from that mental absorption will be met with very high pressure to dive back in. This whole dynamic and how it “feels” is also the phenomenon that comes closest to what I understand as dukkha. Being absorbed in the unwholesome and fighting with the pull really “sucks”, while being properly established in a wholesome context and not questioning this context feels quite peaceful, even amidst unpleasant pressures.

There also seems to be craving in the sense of “never being satisfied with the current experience.” Even when the mind is calm and not occupied with coarse hindrances, there seems to be some dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs. When I am feeling a pleasant feeling, there is subtle nervousness to “never lose it again.” When there is displeasure, there is a subtle attitude of “when will this go away?” One can, of course, be theoretically aware that feelings come and go by themselves, but even these thoughts seem to be aimed at getting rid of the current not-sufficiently-pleasant feeling. For me, it seems most important to be aware of the non-ownability of feelings when pleasant feelings are present because, in the face of unpleasant feelings, it seems hard to contemplate it authentically. Hence, in general experience, there seems to be a continuous pressure “to do *something* about this situation.” However, in contrast to a pull based on coarse hindrances, it doesn’t really have a clear direction. The pull seems to be superfluous and blind, nonetheless, it seems quite unimaginable how there could be experience without it. In some moments, it seems that I can “see through” it and been free from it for a moment. But in the same moment, it seems to be there again (or still?).

I am not saying that these examples represent what actual craving is for someone who truly understands craving (i.e., to be free from being overpowered by it). Still, this understanding gives me a direction for practice, which doesn't seem too far off. Foremost is to protect the proper context, i.e., to not forget the value of not wanting the wanting (i.e. seeing the danger in it, seeing the benefit of harmlessness) and to unabsorb oneself from being occupied with agreeable thoughts and images, without denying them. The agreeable doesn't have to be something "beautiful" (like women, success in career, having insights into dhamma, getting positive feedback for this post, etc.). It can also refer to the "perverse" agreeability of dwelling on the faults of others and imagining how one would get back at them (i.e., ill-will and cruelty).

Any feedback is very appreciated.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 09:41:40

Are you already established in unbroken precepts and withdrawal from sensual engagements? If not, you are probably overthinking things. Up until that point, craving is nothing more complicated than the fact that you break the precepts or give in to sensuality even occasionally, and trying to see anything more subtle than that will distract you from the actual and rather obvious problem—the actions you still engage in. Even if you were to then develop perfectly accurate ideas about the practice, all you will be doing with them is managing the byproducts of that root problem that is still welcomed and tolerated.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 06:56:53 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Until recently, my "meditation" practice mainly consisted of "sitting in a room doing nothing", often for hours, resisting the pull to distract myself from boredom. Outside of these "meditation sessions", it can still happen that I give in to distraction and subtle entertainment (like reading an interesting article on Wikipedia, scrolling through Buddhist subreddits), though it never escalates to completely losing perspective and starting to watch a movie or something like that. As it now feels normal to spend my weekends and after-work hours this way, I felt it would

I would advise focusing more on learning to discern when something is internally rooted in distraction and avoiding it only then, instead of rejecting everything and trying to sit in perfect quietude (an activity which might very well become your distraction from what's actually happening internally when you still don't see your mind clearly). Full non-activity comes later in the training, and it will almost certainly be done wrongly before that.

Reading Wikipedia articles or Buddhist subreddits is not a distraction in itself; it doesn't *need* to destroy your self-awareness like watching a movie would. It will do so when the motivation *at that time* is some sort of craving or pressure already, and your reading is *at that time* your way of acting in accordance with that craving. Then you're making it worse, and trying yourself to dukkha tighter and tighter by virtue of doing that action. It's

like how you don't let a brat have do he wants *because* he's throwing a tantrum about it. If there's no tantrum and he doesn't care if you say no, it's fine. But you still keep an eye on him because he could start getting overly engaged and emotionally invested, and then he'd angrily refuse to stop when you tell him to.

So learn to discern your motivations more clearly, and then you'll be able to know beyond doubt when something is fine and when it isn't. If you just stick to a blanket avoidance like you're describing, you might well be depriving yourself of the opportunity to develop understanding of your own mind, which is what defines wholesome and unwholesome.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-16 12:52:11 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Would it be more conducive to wisdom to read the article, observe if I could stop in the middle of it and continue if no pressure (on the level of throwing a tantrum) is felt?

With this sort of thing, yes. You basically have to allow yourself some room for trial and error in regard to everything that isn't against the precepts in order to come to discern what actually makes something wholesome or unwholesome (your own mental state in relation to that activity at the time). It's not the activity itself; it's the craving behind it.

If you just "stay on the safe side" by default, you can end up giving up everything without coming any closer to seeing where the problem actually was, and the willpower for that blanket restraint will *have* to run out eventually. And then you'll be right back where you started because you never learned where the "bait" really is. Like the second herd of deer in MN 25.

But even within that trial and error, what is never up for debate is that you must not break the precepts. That cannot be conducive in any shape or form. If you never do that, you will never stray too far off.

You might one day spend a whole afternoon obsessively researching flowers, and some pressure will build up as a result. But if that's *really* all you did, and you never went on TikTok or something (thereby actually breaking a precept), it's not going to leave you with a mind infected with lust for days on end and lead you to do something coarsely unwholesome. You might also learn something about how craving works because obviously the flowers were not the problem. Consuming actual entertainment is a very different story, and there can't ever be a good reason for doing it. Nor will going that far ever teach you any relevant lessons that you didn't already know.

I am quite aware that there are things that utterly destroy self-awareness (like listening to very emotional music)

All music, actually. Some types are even worse than others, but all of them are unwholesome. That's why abstaining from music of any kind is part of the eight precepts.

However, it still feels safer to even avoid these things when I experience even a

tiny push towards them and if they are not really necessary for my well-being. That's how "doing nothing," going for walks, hiking, and reading the Dhamma have basically become my only hobbies left.

"A tiny push" is also the only thing that can get you to go for a walk or read Dhamma, and you could also say that most of the time neither are strictly necessary for your well-being. So from that point of view, it doesn't make sense to think that *those* tiny pushes are fine and the others aren't. If you took this view to its culmination, then the only truly pure coarse of action would be to stop breathing and wither away, since breathing too is rooted in a tiny push that goes unnoticed.

The things that have to be categorically avoided are not the "tiny pushes." They are the big pushes that usurp your perspective, and preventing that is what the precepts are for (even some "hobbies" are not a problem if they don't contradict the precepts and are done in solitude). So learn to stay within the tiny pushes and to recognize when a push starts to grow past a certain point. And you'll need to learn for yourself what that "point" is through repeated practice; it's not something you can recognize through mere reasoning.

And the principle never really changes. What constitutes a big push just becomes subtler as you progress, and as the old big pushes fall away and become impossible. Thus, at no point will it feel like you have to avoid everything if you're practicing rightly.

This is how you achieve automatic and natural moderation in all matters. Not by preemptively defining how long you should do each individual thing.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-17 17:36:03 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I guess the same is true for mental actions at my current practice stage? Instead of worrying about being unmindful, wondering "where the craving exactly is" and trying to jump to conclusions, it would be better to observe which mental engagement ends in my mind being wild (like dwelling on the annoying behavior of a person) and which engagement doesn't effect me very much (like daydreaming about the household work i have planned for the day). So reestablishing the context is important when one has been lost in his thoughts and daydreams

You need to worry about the "daydreaming" and thinking that is clearly driven by longing and hatred, because that's the one that destroys your perspective. And it's not about some ultra subtle "reading between the lines" of your thoughts; it's a very obvious, feverish attitude where the mind refuses to let go of those thoughts and memories even though you don't want them and you see that they're painful. Hence all the similes in the talks about the "wild animal" that disobeys your commands.

The view that daydreaming and thining are inherently a problem is deeply embedded in a lot of people's minds today because of the popular focusing techniques with which almost everybody starts, but in the Suttas you don't find that idea. The natural function

of the mind (mano) is to go past the immediacy the five senses, and that's not a problem in itself. It becomes a problem when there is passion behind the thinking, which again is what makes you lose perspective and mindfulness.

but being mindful and not becoming absorbed into mental images 24/7 isn't a concern

Yes, and right there is the reason for the sequential nature of the training. If you try to skip ahead, inevitably you'll be trying to uproot defilements that you can't even see yet. Because the problem is as of yet too unclear and ambiguous, it feels like you have to stab in every direction "just to be safe," since it could be anywhere as far as you can tell.

Can I deal with craving this way?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** GachiOnFire 2025-02-13 19:42:07

For context I'm still actively tightening my virtue within the boundaries of the 8 precepts, and can still lapse on the level of body or speech on a weekly basis. But still I see that my mind already got tamed to a degree because of it since before the practice.

Within this basis, and particularly in regard to upset, I get some insights of what is happening "behind the scene" of these actions, and I would appreciate opinions on whether I should continue in this way or not.

It happens that I recognize that trouble arose because of a perception/feeling, I don't see citta-pressure as such but I'm aware that this specific perception is forced into the center stage of attention, and if I investigate what's happening there I find a mental activity of resistance towards a certain aspect of this perception; the term "proliferation" takes on its full meaning because it is as if it automatically started happening and would just continue on and on.

I know that this mental action is of my doing as Bhante Anigha repeated many times, but I'm inclined to think it seems like it automatically started happening on its own because that's the natural way I've been inclining until now in dealing with these pressures. Mind goes one way, I follow wholeheartedly instantly.

So there's this perception/feeling forced into the center stage of attention and this mental activity of resistance towards aspects of it; at this point, having recognized this mental activity I'm sometimes able to just stop it "Why am I resisting this, causing all this tension? Why don't I just not do that?" and so I do. (I cannot help but think about MN 20: 'Why am I walking quickly? Why don't I slow down? ...')

It's particularly easy with upset because calm comes back very quickly on account of the thoughts subsiding [I may be wrong here, it doesn't always subside without remainder]. With the other hindrances it can demand more might to abandon it without remainder, it's usually rather a state of "non-crystallized possibility" [at best, sometimes] that I should not give in, but doesn't subside altogether.

All of this to ask:

Is this a right form of renunciation, and should I continue do that whenever trouble arise?
Or is this management?

If this is right, does that mean I'm more developed towards irritation than the other hindrances, and the others will eventually come to subside as quickly?

And please, let me know if something is off in what I'm describing, in regard to the Dhamma that is.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-15 05:51:52

You only need to worry about never going beyond the “non-crystalized possibilities.” Contemplate the danger if the mind starts to move in those directions again, just to get back to the possibilities and enduring them at that level. If you were to “stay” there long enough, a subtler engagement with the possibilities *as such*—prior to any particular giving in and proliferating—will become apparent, and with that you automatically realize that you can stop that engagement too. And only then can you truly go beyond the hindrances, not just keep them in check.

Don't fall into the trap of expecting the hindrances to disappear quickly even if they sometimes do. Your responsibility is only to stop engaging with them, not to destroy them. They are destroyed only when the fuel for them has completely drained away on account of your heedfulness in not crystallizing them regardless of their pressure. And that's important because when trying to “manually” destroy a hindrance, you will be acting upon another hindrance inevitably (thus maintaining craving as a whole). As long as you maintain craving as a whole, you maintain the possibility for every hindrance, so even the one you want to get rid of the most will be ready to come back when you get tired of pushing it away.

Also, ill will is the quickest one to fade and the easiest one to overcome. It's not a coincidence that almost all traditions unanimously praise the giving up of ill will (or rather the last-minute management of it), but it's much rarer to find someone who encourages, let alone attempts, to give up sensuality equally and *across the board*, even through superficial management. But you need to be just as apprehensive of it because it will keep you liable to ill will no matter how quickly you can get rid of the latter. The true safety from ill will is in destroying the liability permanently, not in a perfect management of particular instances. And for that sensuality needs to completely go as well.

Lastly, it's always worth emphasizing that one cannot even begin to give up the hindrances unless one is fully restrained on a physical and verbal level. Acting out by body and speech “crystallizes” the hindrances to the greatest possible degree. And it's not enough to abstain from unwholesome things most of the time: even the most undeveloped person already doesn't engage in sensuality and hatred most of the time. In order to be actually virtuous, you need to have knowingly rejected any *possibility* of acting unwholesomely from the very beginning. You might then still fail from time to time, but out of carelessness and

being overwhelmed by pressure. Not because you had allowed yourself that possibility in advance, i.e., never actually took on the precepts.

mindfulness of external situations.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** PrestigiousStreet930 2025-02-10 22:48:18

I am friends with a monk who tends to include mindfulness as being related with situational awareness. For example if someone is clumsy that means they are not being mindful, if someone doesn't see something in their external environment like a stump on the ground or something and trips on it that means they are not being mindful. Are there any suttas that support this way of thinking about mindfulness, because for me mindfulness and things of that nature that I just listed are completely different.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-11 06:53:59

Not being aware of what's actually going on around you would be a symptom of unmindfulness, a sign that became overly preoccupied with something specific and lost sight of your overall situation. So in a way yes, "situational awareness" would be an accurate description of mindfulness as long as we qualify that you don't develop that by trying to focus and become hyperaware of the stumps on the ground, the movements of your feet, sensations in your body, and so on, which is the direction people tend to go when trying to develop mindfulness. That's just becoming unmindful on the basis of a different sense door. You would thereby start ignoring a whole range of things, including your intention behind engaging in that practice in the first place.

So indeed, one should not be immersed in mental proliferation and daydreaming, but being immersed in physical sensations is not an improvement at all. Right mindfulness is when the mind is unfocused and unabsorbed in regard to everything, no exceptions. That's the only way to be aware of your entire situation instead of prioritizing some specific aspect of it gratuitously.

Dhamma as Inspiration (or Management?)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** still_tracks 2025-02-07 14:33:38

I would like to ask when one should stop seeking inspiration from reading Suttas and listening to Dhamma talks. I've noticed that reading inspiring Dhamma material can quickly set up the proper context, such as the certainty of death and the danger of sensuality. For instance, yesterday I read a transcript of Ajahn Nanamoli's talk titled Appointment with Death and the slight unease of being liable to death stayed with me for the entire day. This led to me being mentally very restrained at work. Often, I find myself in situations with already proliferated stress, but on that day, I was able to see my mind moving in that direction before becoming totally absorbed in it. When meditating on Dhamma topics

“on my own” for relatively short periods (like in the morning before a working day), the context usually isn’t established as firmly.

On the one hand, it seems to me that seeking inspiration from Dhamma material can help establish the proper context. It can lead to long periods of awareness and clarity. On the other hand, I don’t like the idea of being dependent on this ritual. I understand that I’m using it as a form of management because, with a firm context, daily pressures feel less intense and don’t overpower me as easily.

Am I correct in thinking it might be better to read Dhamma material only when not “preparing” for a day of work and potential challenging situations, and instead face such a day with a “shakier” context? I am relatively restrained in my bodily and verbal behavior with the “shaky” context (keeping 7 precepts, though with occasional laps on the verbal level), but mentally it is much more challenging to keep the Dhamma as the most important thing without this kind of inspiration.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-08 09:48:08

What you’re describing is something that is mentioned in the Suttas several times, and it’s not bad in and of itself. The problem arises when you expect inspiration to carry your practice, especially because the mind will only get inspired from hearing the Dhamma if it is already not too immersed in hindrances due to careless conduct.

The inspiration comes from understanding the meaning of what is said, and a mind clouded by hindrances won’t gain such perspective no matter how much you want it to—until you bring it back in line. Hence, even the inspiration depends on you having already been diligent to a degree beforehand.

Even if you are outwardly virtuous, if your listening is rooted in an irrational craving for content rather than a genuine wish for clarification, that very hindrance will prevent the meaning from becoming clear. The mind will not gain inspiration. So you must also be watchful of what exactly is internally driving you to seek Dhamma talks (which doesn’t mean you should avoid them altogether). As with everything that isn’t covered by the precepts, it’s about discerning the right and wrong time.

Furthermore, it won’t turn into a “ritual” or “management” if you ensure that you actually *use* that inspiration to give up and restrain things that you now see as unwholesome through newfound clarity—no matter how justified you feel they are or how integral to your life they have become. Even if it’s not a fully fledged focusing technique or similar, virtually anything you practice will be a form of management and distraction when your fundamental intention is to try to have your cake and eat it too: when you want to sidestep the suffering bit, while at the same time being unwilling to evict all the habits and behaviors based on craving that you still have, and which create the fertile ground for suffering to arise in the first place.

On the other hand, if you do have that kind of resolve, then even if something uplifts your mind, it’s not necessarily a problem because you made sure to remove everything

unwholesome beforehand, and you have nothing to deceive yourself about.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-09 11:50:59 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Do you mean adopting an attitude where you only stick to the practice when feeling inspired and neglect it when inspiration runs out?

The intention to keep the precepts and not act upon sense desire or aversion has to be rooted deeper than the inspiration so that it stays even when inspiration goes.

Here, “understanding the meaning” would refer to relating the ideas one is reading about to one’s own experience — not just liking the idea of impermanence, but actually trying to see the things one likes as impermanent? So a mind under full sway of the hindrances would only like the ideas on an intellectual level, while the hindrances can’t be in full control if one is able to relate to the meaning on a personal level

Yes. A tangible recognition that the things that you personally take pleasure in and rely on are impermanent, and that this delight thus makes you *liable* to suffering at any moment—regardless of whether the things themselves are good or bad—will naturally inspire you to give them up. But you have to then actually go through with abandoning them and not just remain with the inspiration to do so. Inspiration also won’t fully nor permanently remove the pain of withdrawal from the addictions, and at some point you will have to simply put up with it, with or without inspiration. Just like when giving up a physiological addiction.

So would it be a genuine wish if the aim is to expose oneself to ideas that one already knows intellectually but covers up in day-to-day life? Is this what is meant in Ud 4.1:

You can tell if the wish is genuine by what you do after you get the clarification. Do you keep living as before, or do you align all your subsequent actions with the context that was rekindled? It’s well and good if an addict is reminded of why he should stop taking his drug, but his search for such reminders is not genuine if he continues giving in as usual.

I guess an attendant of the Buddha already knows about the benefits of ethics, seclusion, etc. but still needs talks and exposure to those ideas to not cover that information up again?

“Covering up” does not happen accidentally, but only when you go and act against your better judgment, and someone who’s diligent wouldn’t do that. So it’s more like being exposed to those ideas would help them recognize more refined ways that they might still be giving in to craving, where it’s not anymore due to heedlessness but due to a lack of clarity.

How to get over this attitude towards sensuality

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** 4NTN8FP 2025-02-07 13:14:56

I've been noticing that I have a long standing attitude that sensuality is a reward. So when I've had a long or challenging day, or am tired from doing a lot of activity/work I search for some type of reward in sensuality so I can relax and settle into a dull state for a while. Then when that gets old I'm motivated to practice again, and usually with some regret for recently not abstaining from sensuality. Clearly this is a cycle I'm in, but I don't quite know how to break it so that it stops happening altogether. Any advice?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-08 10:28:43

You need to realize that it's not like the moment you get back from work your mind suddenly shifts into a sensual mode. It would have to have been in that state for a while prior, probably the whole day. It's just that this is when it becomes obvious to you. And at that point, you can only rely on mere willpower, which will inevitably fail you sooner or later.

So the only real solution, and what wisdom and mindfulness are really about, is that from the very beginning of the day you are careful to see the danger even in the *slightest* fault, i.e., not just in breaking the precepts outright, but even in the slightest action rooted in sensual craving or aversion, no matter how weak the pressure is. When the pressure is still weak, it's easy to say no, so you don't need nearly as much willpower. On the other hand, it's also very easy to say "yes" because it feels like it's not a big deal. But every wildfire starts out small, so it's foolish to see a small fire and not put it out right away.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-09 13:49:41 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I've been contemplating giving up my smart phone because it's the only device I have that can give me endless hours of internet use. The other option is to put a time limit on it and have someone else set the pin so I can't change the time. Do you think this is avoiding the problem or a skillful means to get myself out of this habit for a while?

Both of those are certainly viable options. Try them out and see what happens.

It's impossible for the mind to suddenly shift from a wholesome mode into a sensual and careless one on account of a single thought (and vice versa), so that's not the level where you need to deal with things. The mind inclines towards the general directions you've been cultivating (sensuality, aversion, and carelessness), even if the things you end up doing within said directions are not always the same. Hence what I wrote about needing to be equally diligent in avoiding the unwholesome at all times, not just at the last moment when the mind is out of control.

In the afternoon it may not feel like a coarse feverish state of mind relative to your usual baseline, but if as you say you just can't help yourself, it's already in a frenzy, and that

cannot happen by accident.

What is Sense Restraint?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Devotedlyindeed 2025-02-07 00:27:26

And how does it differ from *sīla* (which is, as I understand it, always choosing to follow wholesome and not follow unwholesome intentions)? My understanding of sense restraint is missing something important. Thank you in advance.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-07 07:18:53

Sense restraint doesn't actually "differ" from virtue in the sense of being something separate. Sense restraint is just an evolved version of virtue as you rightly defined it (not following unwholesome intentions and following wholesome ones, rather than mechanical keeping of rules). In turn, virtue is a less refined form of sense restraint. The same can be said for any of the further "stages" of the Gradual Training, including *jhāna*. They are all increasingly farther milestones along the exact same path.

Thus, ultimately, it's not even that virtue (and sense restraint, etc.) are a "support" or "aid" for *jhāna*, which still implies that they are different things. By developing further the same principle by which virtue is established, you inevitably arrive at (actual) *jhāna*, without needing to add anything else at all ("meditation" in the modern sense) into the mix.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-08 06:37:37 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

That sounds accurate. Though it's worth clarifying what the right "sweetness" is derived from because of the many widespread misunderstandings. As the Suttas say, wholesome joy comes from recognizing that one is no longer liable to unwholesome states, and that's on account of cultivating renunciation in every facet of one's conduct—abandoning engagement with the five hindrances not just in body and speech, but down to the level of the most personal thoughts, those no one else would be privy to (that doesn't mean one needs to deny every thought; a thought is a hindrance only to the degree that there is emotional pressure and impulsivity behind it). And not for an hour or two, but as an uninterrupted lifestyle.

What arises from that is, as you put it, a state which isn't just the suppression of particular emotions, but where the *condition* for the arising of those emotions is no longer there. Hence, there is an ease born from internal safety, a kind of effortless "immunity"—though that immunity is of course temporary and conditional, as explained below. It's also not black and white; there can be an only partial immunity, which would not quite constitute *jhāna* yet. Hence the Suttas speak of experiencing "blameless ease" already at the stage of virtue, even though the hindrances haven't been fully overcome.

And that's precisely why it is truly peaceful, unlike the type of meditation commonly taught today. Such meditation revolves around a special practice or activity that must be constantly maintained. A stressful situation that is generally not recognized as such because of its superficial pleasure, much like sensuality.

Having cultivated renunciation rightly, even you actively try to usher the hindrances back in, they remain "distant" (hence the "separation" from unwholesome states). This is because the hindrances have nothing whatsoever to do with the content of your thoughts, but with the attitude of the mind (citta) towards that content (hence efforts to focus the mind on specific objects are heavily misguided). Just as you couldn't immediately control your mind to stop delighting in sensuality, you won't be able to immediately destroy the joy of renunciation even if you want to either. What the mind inclines toward is the delayed result of what has been previously cultivated; that inclination—whether toward sensuality or renunciation—is something you "build up" over time.

Hence, even though the mind may currently have no interest in sensuality, it can return to it and lose its "immunity" and its safe ground eventually if you start cultivating sensual thoughts (or simply due to too much engagement with people and worldly matters). But that will take time—hours or even days—depending on how firmly the mind was established in renunciation. Conversely, it takes time (though usually much more) to establish the mind in the joy of renunciation, depending on how deeply entrenched it was in sensuality.

What about tears from sadness or joy ?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** obobinde 2025-02-04 07:22:36

The right attitude towards instances of aversion or craving as enduring the pressure without either giving in or managing it and with no hope for it to disappear seems pretty straightforward. Still, concerning tearing up out of joy or grief or just because a fleeting moment of sadness swells up unexpectedly I wonder what would be the right attitude.

Indeed, I can't really pinpoint where the resistance is and so not resisting more or less ends up meaning letting it out and letting the tears flow. Also, a corner of my mind won't let go of the common knowledge that at least in the grief process, tearing up is in fact considered part of a healing process. It is often cathartic for people who repressed it and finally let it out and end up feeling a weight has been lifted from them. FYI, I'm not grieving at the moment.

What do you think would be the right attitude ?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 10:06:44

The right attitude towards instances of aversion or craving as enduring the pressure without either giving in or managing it and with no hope for it to disappear seems pretty straightforward.

One needs to do this when the mind is still calm, long before intense feelings arise. Otherwise even the attempt to “endure” things will be just last-minute damage control, conveniently employed only when things go south and put aside once they go back to normal.

The right course of action is not finding the “right way” to counter arisen unbeneficial states (managing them), but reminding oneself of why one is liable to them in the first place, and putting an end to that root cause. Any state of mind that overpowers you, be it overly positive or overly negative, is a necessary byproduct of previously cultivated craving.

Also, a corner of my mind won't let go of the common knowledge that at least in the grief process, tearing up is in fact considered part of a healing process.

Perhaps. But the Dhamma is not about “healing”; it's about never getting hurt in the first place.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 13:36:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

recollect that this body brings all of those reactions (tears) and feelings without my say into it ?

Even if in theory you don't have a say in it at that time, it's because you yourself set the ball rolling already and now it's too late to immediately stop it. So don't try to gain relief from the pain in the moment by acknowledging and recollecting something or the other—which is looking for safety in management. Instead, now that you've been forcefully reminded of the undesirable consequences that doing so brings, use that to strengthen your resolve not to act out of craving from now onwards, regardless of whether things are going well or not. Recollect what will happen when you notice yourself getting heedless again.

Question About Hindrances and Mental States

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** AlwaysOneLove 2025-02-02 11:20:34

Context:

I am a complete beginner. I stumbled across the HH understanding of Dhamma 3 months ago; it has completely changed the course of my practice, for which I can't thank the Venerables enough. I have been keeping the five precepts for 3 months and have been celibate for 3 months. I have also been experimenting with the 7th precept and discerning why exactly it is dangerous to give in to that pressure for entertainment/distraction. Previous habits of scrolling on social media, watching football games on TV, etc., have largely been given up. I have only read the first 43 suttas of the Mahjima Nikāya (I have only recently started reading the suttas).

Question 1:

While contemplating in the manner explained in the video “The Ultimate Method for Overcoming Hindrances,” when, for example, restlessness and anxiety are present in one’s experience, is it then skillful to take that restlessness itself as the background (or *yoni*) of experience? Or should one recollect the state of mind with regard to that hindrance—or switch between both perspectives—so that, for example, one first discerns the hindrance itself as the background in relation to any bodily, verbal, or mental activity, and then switches to attend to the hindrance as the foreground while simultaneously recollecting the state of mind with regard to the anxiety, and vice versa? It seems that the latter is more effective and deeper than the former, but I’m not sure.

While writing this last sentence (with bodily activity as the foreground), I notice that the hindrance of doubt is present in the background. When switching perspective, I experience a state of mind of “mind with aversion.” It is quite subtle, but there is a craving in the mind for a clear answer to that question; therefore, asking this question is acting out of that state of mind and is unwholesome.

I could have never discerned the aversion toward the hindrance if I had stayed with the hindrance itself as the background. Or is this not important at all, and is it only important *not to act out* of the hindrance rather than to discern the state of mind in regard to that hindrance itself?

Question 2:

How does one pick any of the “wombs,” and when is it skillful to switch from one womb to the other? Are the things that one is attending to of importance in this choice of recollection?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 13:26:11

The are hindrances first and foremost abandoned through the development of steadfast virtue (i.e., conduct free from greed, aversion, and delusion/carelessness). What you are asking about pertains to a much subtler level of refinement that only becomes applicable once the hindrances have been abandoned at that coarser level.

Or is this not important at all, and is it only important not to act out of the hindrance rather than to discern the state of mind in regard to that hindrance itself?

So it’s the former; what matters is not to act out of the hindrance. But you don’t do that through some intricate mental exercises like what you’re describing, but by keeping an eye on your conduct, because that’s where the hindrances are. Usually people see virtue as as something that they hastily set up (if at all) so that they can then move on to what they think is the “real” practice, failing to see that virtue itself *is* the real practice, *is* the abandonment of hindrances already.

You mentioned that you’ve only been experimenting with keeping the 7th precept. The hindrances are precisely what seeking entertainment is rooted in, so you need to do away with that completely first—and anything else you might do during the day that partakes

in similar or even coarser forms of greed, aversion, and delusion—to be in a position to rightly deal with the more refined, purely mental aspect of the hindrances that is described in that video.

A father's perspective

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** knwp7 2025-02-02 05:24:13

“The liability for suffering to arise” exists as long as I am around my children. For me they are the strongest attachment to this world and also the strongest influence on my karmic actions. I have experienced **sudden** rage - when a “possibility of harm” to my child arises. Similar upset or anger is less frequent if I find myself suddenly in adverse circumstances. “Sudden” is the keyword here. Upon reflection, the rational mind calms down; an ongoing adverse situation - mental or physical - is thus not a cause of suffering (i.e. in retrospective view). But this reflexive calming-down is “management” in HH-speak, as I understand. And so now I understand a little better, the non-arising of the 2nd arrow, or being free from the liability to suffer.

So what are my options?

For a long time now I have understood my kids to be my strongest attachment to the sansara; they make the path of renunciation more difficult for me. But I came across Dharma when they were already in their growing years. Having understood what I have, I am not inclined to take-up any more karmic obligations - in the form of new relationships (breaking precept #3), more children (incelibacy), pets (precept #7), etc. If this realization stays with me into my next birth - then I can hope to progress more swiftly on the path, staying single.

What about this lifetime?

I am responsible for providing direct care to my kids. That means I have to participate in their life in an ongoing, daily basis - in-person, not thru proxies. The alternative to being present for them is to hand them over to social-media/internet. I hold a strong obligation towards bringing-up my kids in the right manner. This includes them being upright, compassionate, kind; besides doing well at school and having a balanced life with social-engagements, gaming and sports. I also sow the seeds of Dharma as everyday experiences present the possibilities. I know the outcomes, what they grow up to be, are not in my hands - but I nevertheless feel a strong duty to give them my best effort.

Since growing faith in Dharma and trying to “practice” it, I have experienced major shifts in my way of living. Dharma and kids are my only two priorities. Whatever worldly engagements arise, arise mostly on account of kids; a lot of my daily life revolves around them.

Downside of parenting?

Not only do I have to be present for them, I have to work, to make a living, to provide for them. I need to run a household, pay the bills. If I were to talk of conventional Dharma-

practice, this would mean that the focus is not as sharp, and the time devoted is not as much - as they could have been - due to the worldly pursuits in the name of raising children; also giving me a pretext to not be rigorous in the HH-manner. However, I have the conviction that HH is the right interpretation of Dharma. So I continue, keeping the faith, despite occasional setbacks (getting indulgent) and conceit (my last post hastily titled in present-perfect).

Another downside is that I have very few opportunities for solitude - eg. school summer-break! A good side-effect of solitude is a naturally calm-mind that allows one to evaluate one's experience against the teachings (true "meditation"). For me, the only time for contemplation is had in a sitting "meditation" where, if/when the mind settles down, I use that (self-hypnotized?) state for self reflection. (Are there any better suggestions in absence of solitude?) I understand that "doing" meditation is not what the path is.

Future plan of action?

u/kellerdellinger was not wrong in asking to emotionally abandon family. Doing so to one's growing children is not feasible, though. Unless one is rich/fortunate to delegate their child-raising responsibility to another responsible human, the child is going to suffer thru the parent's negligence.

I have noticed that this liability I mentioned earlier reduces when I am not around my kids. If the perceived harm is not in the present-moment then it does not affect me because I know, thru a near-traumatic experience I had with them, that I can't intervene in their karma.

So sometimes I think I need to leave my family once the kids are mature. If I am not entangled in their everyday lives then I do not see the liability to suffer on their account arising. But isn't leaving them a form of deprivation/denial/self-mortification? Clearly I am trying to avoid the possibility of unpleasantness arising from their company. Giving up family seems "management".

But then what does giving up family, friends and relationships mean? Maybe it is about not engaging in worldly actions on account of them. If one is not obligated then one does not have to take up worldly matters - otherwise, abandoning company is an escape, as in abandoning responsibility towards them. My motive is clear to me only. So whatever I choose, only I know whether it is right or not.

Thoughts and questions are welcome

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-04 06:07:42

Dharma and kids are my only two priorities. Whatever worldly engagements arise, arise mostly on account of kids; a lot of my daily life revolves around them.

This is where the heart of the matter lies. If you want to stand a chance to make any significant progress, then it's the Dhamma that must be the highest priority. Whenever there is

a conflict between the Dhamma and the affairs of household life, which will often be the case, the Dhamma needs to take precedence. And it will naturally take precedence for someone who has realized it already, which is part of what it means to have “unshakable confidence” in the Dhamma. The inability to think that anything else, even your children, could be more important. And that’s not true only for laypeople; even monks would not necessarily feel that dealing with mundane affairs at the expense of their practice is never justified. That view makes stream entry impossible.

But then what does giving up family, friends and relationships mean? Maybe it is about not engaging in worldly actions on account of them.

For example, if there is a situation where doing something you think is beneficial for your kids would entail breaking a precept, you don’t do it. Someone with unshakable confidence in the Dhamma will not kill even if it seems necessary for saving their kids’ lives, let alone break a precept in a situation that’s less urgent than that. And this should not be regarded as an “extreme” case: the Buddha said Nandamātā should be the example for all female lay disciples, and he also said that a layperson should be exhorted to give up concern for their family to the same extent as a monk.

Again, Pahārāda, just as the ocean’s tide is never out of time, similarly, Pahārāda, in my true teaching and discipline, the monks, nun, laymen, and laywomen will never, until the end of their lives, break the precepts, which I have established for these clansmen. Pahārāda, that in my true teaching and discipline, the monks, nuns, laymen, and laywomen will never, until the end of their lives, break the precepts, which I have established for these clansmen—this is said to be the second extraordinary quality of my true teaching and discipline, having seen which the monks delight in it.

—MĀ 35

It’s of course much harder to develop that dispassionate attitude when living at home, but it’s not impossible if one doesn’t move the goalpost and forget that that’s what realizing the four noble truths entails (making the Dhamma into some sort of metaphysical truth that one can partake in while one’s actual cravings and emotional dependencies remain unchanged and unquestioned).

I have experienced sudden rage - when a “possibility of harm” to my child arises.

It’s actually impossible for the mind to become suddenly defiled. When this happens, it’s because you have been going beyond merely fulfilling your duty, and have been actively fostering emotional attachment towards your children. So when you notice that, instead of calming yourself down by secondary means that leave the root of the problem unchanged, you need to contemplate how attachment that you keep cultivating is what makes you liable to rage, and reflect on why no amount of it is beneficial even in the case of loved ones. You won’t be able to fully give up that attachment for as long as you still live at home, but by giving precedence to the practice and leaving only the “leftovers” for everything else, you can contain the attachment enough to make the necessary amount

of room for the Dhamma to be understood (passion is what obstructs understanding, as the Buddha said right after his awakening).

When your precepts are firmly in place, you can contain attachment further on the mental level by ensuring that whatever you do for your children is done with the recognition that they, or you, could die at any time and that you may not be able to prevent it. That context does not prevent you from fulfilling your duties as a parent; it only prevents you from overstepping beyond that. If the mind recoils from that context, it is recoiling from the Dhamma and seeking to ignore it.

The extent of sense restraint

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** GachiOnFire 2025-01-30 14:54:54

EDIT: Actually, after further reflecting on it this is probably Bhikkhu Bodhi's translation, which suggests that one doesn't grasp at any sign and feature, that made come to this conclusion, while the HH one rather suggests that this is only the signs and features connected to delight and upset.

Until now I thought that sense restraint needed to be performed only towards things that I know by experience can result in delight or upset, or as soon as I notice the mind going in the direction of delight and upset, by enduring the pressure without letting the thoughts crystalize any more than they already did. (this is from the point of view of someone with a wild mind, that can still overlook citta and run with it without thinking twice, if not constantly careful)

But reading the occurrences in the suttas about sense restraint, I tend to understand that it is something much broader, needed to be performed in regard to anything. (and it kind of makes sense considering that if I restrain myself in regard to what I know by experience can result in delight or upset, craving can still manifest in regard to things that weren't causing delight or upset until now)

Is this the case? And when well developed is it resulting in not grasping at any significance more than another one in regard to anything in my experience?

Along with these questions, I was wondering if sense restraint would have an effect in this MN18 passage:

Mental-faculty-consciousness arises dependent on the mental faculty and phenomena. The meeting of the three is pressure. With pressure as basis, feeling. What one feels, one perceives. What one perceives, one thinks about. What one thinks about, one proliferates. What one proliferates is the cause for perceptions and considerations born of proliferation besetting one in regard to sights cognizable by the eye pertaining to the past, present, and future. – MN 18

I tend to understand that being accomplished in sense restraint would **only** remove that last step of proliferation, would it be correct?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-31 07:10:41

Is this the case? And when well developed is it resulting in not grasping at any significance more than another one in regard to anything in my experience?

In a way yes, but you shouldn't be trying to perfect your sense restraint unless your precepts have been perfected. Getting used to never breaking the precepts no matter what *is* your sense restraint in the beginning (and your wakefulness, your mindfulness, your abandonment of hindrances, etc.). If you start trying to do more when that foundation is still shaky, you will only reap frustration because you will be trying to deal with impurities that are still too subtle to recognize reliably from where you currently stand. And that's when you inevitably fall from the middle way, and end up practicing either indulgence or a degree "absorption" (i.e., forceful denial of all objects in favor of a specific one). Sense restraint usually becomes the latter for people who are not sufficiently established in the precepts, and that's generally a very tiring and unpleasant endeavor.

Intense anxiety enduring while contemplating

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** AlwaysOneLove 2025-01-30 00:01:54

So when I'm contemplating in seclusion or when I'm listening to a dhamma talk there is an intense anxiety and restlessness of the body that endures in the peripheral of that contemplation/listening to dhamma talk.

My heart goes wild beating in my chest and initially I'll let this endure in the background for as long as it lasts, but when I have been contemplating/listening to a talk for an hour or longer and the anxiety/restlessness of the body and heavy heart pumping doesn't seem to stop, I'll have to bring this to the forefront of attention and try and manage it/ease into that unpleasant general feeling/restlessness and anxiety that endures in the background. But even while attempting to modify that anxiety and displeasure of that bodily state/general feeling, I can see that my attempts are not per se successful.

Maybe I need to improve my emotional regulation first or learn how to manage this anxiety with some technique before I delve deep into territory that will inevitably stir up a lot of anxiety?

It has been said in the talks that this anxiety is very intense in the beginning and that it could be a good indicator of how well or deep the contemplation sinks in. To calm the aversion seems to be the best course of action. Is this the right way to go about this?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-30 05:41:31

Maybe I need to improve my emotional regulation first or learn how to manage this anxiety with some technique before I delve deep into territory that will inevitably stir up a lot of anxiety?

That won't help. Employing a management technique would mean staying right where you are, if not altogether regressing (in your ability to be undisturbed by unpleasant feelings when they *do* arise, which is the only thing that counts as progress).

What you probably have to do is improve your virtue. The reason why contemplating the Dhamma would evoke anxiety is not because the contemplation itself is wrong or because one hasn't developed some other skill, but because the way one lives is still in opposition to the Dhamma and in line with craving, so there is an inherent discrepancy. While continuing to welcome craving, you contemplate the peril in craving, which will of course feel very unpleasant. If contemplating/practicing the Dhamma is pleasant for someone who still welcomes their defilements in their daily conduct, they can be sure that what they're practicing is not the Dhamma.

When you have been *living* renunciation and become fully established in it, then thinking about the dangers of sensuality and attachment, as well as the inevitable cessation of everything you once held dear, will be the most refined joy—the joy of seeing that you have freed yourself from endless amounts of pain that would have otherwise befallen you. That, in turn, motivates you to give up even more, and this is precisely what jhāna is if you read the Suttas.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-31 04:45:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

This and this are good examples.

Virtue can only take place within the precepts, but someone who doesn't break the precepts isn't intrinsically virtuous. Think of a child, for example. It only counts as virtue when it's done with a willful commitment to giving up greed, aversion, or entertainment/distraction. And that means you would be actively looking for those faults and working to remove them regardless of what "allowances" the rules supposedly give you, because it's about purifying your own mind and not about meeting some external expectation.

Day in the life of Samanadipa / HH residents

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** upasakatraine 2025-01-28 05:45:26

Might there be a short video made, showing what a typical day looks like at Samanadipa and/or Hillside Hermitage looks like. It would be of benefit to me to try and incorporate a similar regimen in my practice.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-28 13:47:39 (in reply to a comment not included)

We wouldn't make such a video because it would only give the wrong impression. We don't have a daily routine, nor do we place any importance on having one. What matters is the permanent abstinence from acts rooted in greed, aversion, and delusion. No routine can fundamentally capture that principle because those qualities exist in each individual's mind and can only be known internally. Apart from the breaking of precepts, they aren't measured by outward activities.

Someone who spends a whole day in diligent "practice" might be completely consumed by hindrances while thinking they're practicing well (which is not uncommon). Meanwhile, someone who spends the same amount of time doing nothing but menial work—perhaps considered by the other person a "distraction"—may do so with an internally composed mind free of underlying defilements. In another case, the person who occupies themselves with external activities could be doing so for the wrong internal motivation, out of an "itch" of distraction, and they should actually restrain that. You can't tell when it's which just by looking at someone.

Thoughts on Unwelcoming Sexuality

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Formal_Breath_2025 2025-01-26 19:07:18

I've been practicing not welcoming thoughts of desire, not attending to their pleasant features, not giving them the centre stage etc., but I noticed that sometimes when too much lust arises, that becomes quite difficult (not necessarily impossible) to do with lustful thoughts that arise. So when that happened I moved to contemplating the body and feelings as well, and I noticed 'pleasant' feelings that are present in the body, not just in the thoughts. I thought "why is my mind relishing as pleasant those arisen bodily sensations which are, beyond the pleasant feeling, mostly just uncomfortable?" (bodily sensations that endure well before you *act* on them, just so we're clear). I felt that it was a perversion of things to feel this situation as pleasant, so I kept attending to those pleasant feelings through-the-origin and unwelcoming them until my mind started to turn away from the lust. I found this useful because even though I wasn't directly unwelcoming lustful thoughts or contemplating asubha, once I had practiced this, those thoughts started to have much less appeal, because you realise that people who wilfully engage in sexuality mostly just can't exert restraint over their bodies in this way, and they take sexuality up as their 'own' choice as a kind of existential wilful ignorance towards this fact. From this perspective, lustful images actually start to become quite unappealing without any traditional asubha contemplation at all. I think this might be part of what the Buddha meant in the Samyogasutta (AN 7.51) when he mentions "A man focuses on his own masculinity... he's stimulated by this and takes pleasure in this" *before* the man goes to seek 'union'. It's not just that he finds his own body, clothes, etc. attractive, but that he already must experience some level of pleasure with regard to his masculine body part *in order to seek union*, i.e. the pleasant feeling is enduring even before seeking union, and some-

one couldn't possibly desire to seek union if they don't take pleasure in that body part. Once you've uprooted the delight in that bodily sensation, lustful images naturally start to become unappealing. These are just suggestions so any feedback is welcome. I think it would be quite hard to practice this for anyone who hasn't already been practicing sense restraint for a while, but I'm mainly suggesting it for those who have.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-28 13:25:32

Yes, sensuality is after all nothing but delight in one's own body. You can't purely experience the body of another. You can only experience your body experiencing the body of another, and that's where lust arises.

The "traditional" asubha contemplation is not just not necessary; it's misguided. It's a rote repetition of visualizations that's relies on another set of equally visceral reactions of your senses: using aversion of the senses to override lust of the senses. It's on the same level as someone w a pile of who keeps a pile of excrement ready so they can revisit it whenever they get hungry and thereby suppress their appetite. At some point you will get either so hungry that it will make no difference, or you will just get desensitized over time.

But if having long since stopped engaging with sensual objects you come to discern the "framework" of your own body—through which not only other people's bodies but all sensory experiences are encountered—and the fact that it is composed of these disgusting organs, then any delight, not just in human bodies, will inevitably fade. You realize that there isn't a single nook or cranny in your experience that isn't enveloped by that repulsiveness.

Then it's no longer a volitional exercise of "pasting" asubha images over whatever is beautiful in a short-term management/antidoting fashion. You cease to be concerned with whether this or that is beautiful because you have seen that the sole "gateway" through which any extent of beauty can possibly come is utterly revolting, and there is nothing you can ever do about it. And that's good, because that dispassion will then be rooted in the way things are and always will be, and not in your volition.

Questions about internal sense bases and citta.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** obobinde 2025-01-25 07:55:02

If the internal sense bases are a negative space that can't be felt but only discerned, would it be right to say they are in the same domain as 'that body because of which' ?

If yes : the sixth sense base being mano, can we say that the external part of it is composed, among other things, of the active thinking *and* of the felt sense of I since the I is a thought ?

What about citta then, is it also pertaining to the inaccessible domain of 'that body because of which' ?

In which case, can we say that all of the internal sense bases, even though being an empty negative space, are under the influences of the citta and that is the reason why our senses are pulling us in whichever direction without us having anything to say about it (since we have no control whatsoever on either the citta or the internal sense base) ?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-27 07:25:06

What's "internal" and what's "external" is not determined by a universally present "structure", but by one's individual mental situation. For the puthujjana for example,

the felt sense of I since the I is a thought ?

this would not be correct. Their sense of self is always "internal," which is precisely why they're still a puthujjana. Hence whenever they contemplate self, it's inevitably an external thing that they're contemplating "through" their still internal sense of self. That's what is meant with "seeing not self with self."

What about citta then, is it also pertaining to the inaccessible domain of 'that body because of which' ?

For a puthujjana, yes. But seeing the signs of the mind means precisely that the citta is not "inaccessible" anymore. One is able to recognize it as a phenomenon, and it's not anymore "internal" (i.e., overlooked) as it used to be. But that of course doesn't mean that it becomes a quasi-sensory object as in the popular understanding of "nimitta." It's still just on the level of a recognition, similar to how you know you are human without that knowledge being represented by any particular sensory object.

In which case, can we say that all of the internal sense bases, even though being an empty negative space, are under the influences of the citta and that is the reason why our senses are pulling us in whichever direction without us having anything to say about it

Yes, for someone who is not free from sensuality this would be the case. So the say that you *do* have, which would eventually take your senses out of the influence of the citta and establish the right order of things, is to not act on the pull of your senses even if it's there. And that's why virtue is indispensable.

Comfort zone of solitude

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** craveminerals 2025-01-24 17:52:01

Hello dhamma friends,

The other day I read Sister Medhini's interesting essay titled "Homelessness is Nibbana" where she talks about comfort zones, and how they reveal underlying attachments, and assumptions of safety.

In a footnote she states; “Company is a comfort zone for those who fear loneliness, but solitude can be a comfort zone for those who are insecure and anxious around others.”

What would be the right course of action for one who takes solitude as a ‘comfort zone’? I’m currently delighting more in solitude and non-activity than in company. I’ve seen great benefit in learning to enjoy solitude and cutting down on distractions.

But honestly I’m afraid of people, and am uncomfortable and filled with shame in almost all social situations, whether I’m with friends, family, at work- and this has been the case for my whole life- with some exceptions here and there. Even now, when I’m living more virtuously, keeping 5 precepts (and 8 as much as I’m able) and am not burdened by any serious wrong deeds (that would explain the feeling of being at blame)

So I’m wondering, what would be good ways of breaking out of this “comfort zone” of solitude, while keeping in line with the dhamma?

Is it simply a matter of actively confronting these fears- by putting oneself in social situations, while enduring unpleasant feelings whenever they arise, and not fuel further negative thoughts and actions? (Which I thought I had done “enough” of already, throughout my life)

A more indirect approach would be, I suppose, starving the root of these fears by severing the attachment to sensuality..

Any advice or comments would be appreciated ☸

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-24 19:52:48

Is it simply a matter of actively confronting these fears- by putting oneself in social situations, while enduring unpleasant feelings whenever they arise, and not fuel further negative thoughts and actions?

Definitely not. That would not solve the problem but only move it elsewhere.

Unless you’re an anāgāmi, solitude would almost surely cease to be comfortable if you stopped making choices that you, through self-honesty, realize are rooted in simple desire for sense pleasure or distraction—temporarily taking your eyes off of the problem that your mind still is rather than “taming” it.

In order to truly abandon concern with what others think about you, you need to first give up not only physical acts but also thoughts of delight in sensuality. Those are coarser impurities.

Clarification regarding Ven. Ñāṇavīrā’s note on Paṭi-casamuppāda

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** upasakatraine 2025-01-24 13:39:37

Dear Bhante, u/Bhikkhu_Anigha

A question came up in my mind, in pondering over Ven. Ñāṇavīrā's note on Paṭiccasamuppāda, in particular Para23 and Para24

He tells us that :

“It should be borne in mind that *paticcasamuppāda anulomam* (‘with the grain’—the *samudaya sacca*) always refers to the puthujjana, and *paṭilomam* (‘against the grain’—the *nirodha sacca*) to the arahat.”

This indeed seems an accurate conclusion to me, but the question then is: what about the *ariyasāvaka*? Is it somewhere in-between? Is it *anulomam* most of the time, and *paṭilomam* some of the time (only when they are abiding in jhāna)?

Furthermore: He says that the principle of conditionality (i.e. *hetuppabhavā*) is a general principle, that is ‘exemplified’ in the *paṭiccasamuppāda* formulation (of the 12 *nidānas*) of an individual's experience. I.e. *paṭiccasamuppāda anulomam*, is a formulation that also adheres, to this same general principle, and is an ‘exemplification’ of it.

That is to say, that as long as there are conditions (*hetū*, plural), there will be the ‘playing out’ of the *paticcasamuppāda* formulation in experience.

But the fact that conditions are (i.e. *hetū* are), is dependent (*paccaya*) on *Avijjā*. This is how we arrive at “*Avijjā paccaya sankhārā*” (*hetū* and *sankhārā* being synonymous in this usage)

Which is just another way of saying “*Ye dhammam hetuppabhavā, tesam hetum avijjā*” (Ven. Assaji's words to Ven. Sāriputta)

He quotes:

“*Avijjāpaccayā sankhārā*” will thus mean ‘*paṭiccasamuppāda* depends upon non-seeing of *paṭiccasamuppāda*’. Conversely, seeing of *paticcasamuppāda* is cessation of *avijjā*, and when *paticcasamuppāda* is seen it loses its condition (‘non-seeing of *paticcasamuppāda*’) and ceases. And this is cessation of all *hetuppabhavā dhammā*. Thus *tesam yo nirodho* is cessation of *avijjā*”

Seeing the Dhamma, is synonymous with seeing *paṭiccasamuppāda*. And seeing *paṭiccasamuppāda*, is cessation (*nirodha*) of *avijjā*.

Therefore this also prompts the question of why Ven. Sāriputta, who upon hearing Ven. Assaji's words ‘saw the Dhamma’ (i.e. the general principle of *hetuppabhavā*, and consequently his particular exemplification of *paṭiccasamuppāda*), but was at that point a *Sotapanna*.

If as per Ven. Ñāṇavīrā, the seeing of the principle of *hetuppabhavā* marks *Avijjā nirodha*, shouldn't that mean that Ven. Sāriputta attained to Arahantship? Why then did he need a couple weeks or so, *after that* realization?

I hope the question is sensible, and isn't worded too clumsily.

Thank you for your explanations !

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-28 12:38:15

Is it somewhere in-between? Is it *anulomam* most of the time, and *paṭilomam* some of the time (only when they are abiding in jhāna)?

From the puthujjana's perspective, it's not "anuloma" at all. The "grain" that you experience is the coarsest fetters that you still have. The higher ones are for all intents and purposes not present for as long as the coarser ones exist. So the puthujjana's ignorance and craving do not exist in a sotapanna anymore, and neither does a sotapanna's ignorance and craving exist in an Arahant.

Curd is not a bit of milk and a bit of something else. Accurately speaking, curd contains 0 milk. By processing *all* of the milk, you get curd.

Brahmaviharas from the perspective of a lay person not seeking enlightenment.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** DaNiEl880099 2025-01-22 13:35:59

What exactly are brahmaviharas(I have general views on this topic, but I'm curious about people's opinions here)? As someone who does not plan to pursue enlightenment and develop restraint, can I pursue brahmaviharas?

You could say that I have developed a daily practice of contemplating what I have done throughout the day in the context of compliance with the brahmaviharas. I have noticed that this practice makes me less nervous about various things and I look for opportunities during the day to act on them.

As for this practice. In short, at the end of the day I ask myself "What was the course of this day and what did I do?", "Were my actions in accordance with the brahmaviharas?", "If I did wrong, why did I do it?". I ask these questions and evaluate my behavior. I praise myself for good behavior or breaking the pattern and I reprimand for negative behavior.

What do you think, is this a valuable practice for someone who simply wants to continue living a normal secular life, but also wants to partially introduce the dhamma into their life?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-23 06:19:01

As for this practice. In short, at the end of the day I ask myself "What was the course of this day and what did I do?", "Were my actions in accordance with the brahmaviharas?", "If I did wrong, why did I do it?". I ask these questions and evaluate my behavior. I praise myself for good behavior or breaking the pattern and I reprimand for negative behavior.

That's good, but fundamentally you need to realize that you can't become established in Brahmaviharas unless you give up desires and attachments too. Attachment is what cre-

ates the basis for anger and discontent, since whatever you are attached too will eventually have to deteriorate or be destroyed, and that's precisely when anger will arise. You can might skilled at suppressing the arisen anger by fabricating nice thoughts and so on, and that can indeed help you manage your suffering just like anything your average psychologist without any Buddhist background would tell you. But it would be a disservice to call that "brahmavihāra," since that requires giving up desires too. Hence the word for celibate/ascetic life in Pāli is "brahmacariya," or "Brahma conduct," alluding to the idea that sense pleasures do not exist in the Brahma realm.

but also wants to partially introduce the dhamma into their life?

This may not be altogether impossible, but "the Dhamma" proper exists to the extent that you give up *all* manifestations of a certain "layer" or "degree" of craving. If you try to go very far with giving up only one type of craving, letting other instances of craving go unchecked, then even though it may be helpful in a worldly sense, it's not the Dhamma anymore. The right view, the recognition that all craving is equally bad regardless of its type, has been put aside.

Think of someone so deeply engrossed in the "hustle" of their emerging business that they no longer even care about coarse sensual pleasures like food and sexual intercourse, but who shamelessly acts out of ill will when annoyed at their subordinates' mistakes. Or ascetics in the Buddha's time who were often even more austere and separated from agreeable things than the Buddha, but would often become bitter and spiteful as soon as their views were questioned. Someone who tries to develop Brahmaviharas without giving up sense desire is the same—just inverted.

In other words, it would be better to find a level of withdrawal from unwholesome things that is "even" all around, even if it's less than complete, than to try to go all the way with renouncing only one type of unwholesome state. The former carries at least an approximation of the right view, whereas the latter is necessarily rooted in a wrong one.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-23 15:32:16 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It certainly is possible, and I'm sure many people interpret the practice that way. But you wouldn't strive for the richness of something if you truly saw impermanence and what it actually entails. You would go the opposite direction, because you would realize that involvement + impermanence = suffering. But it's a suffering that one readily justifies because it feels like the path of least resistance in the moment.

So it's not so much about whether such compromises are "possible" or not, but about whether what is being developed through them actually is the Dhamma. It's fine not to want to practice the Dhamma, i.e., the comprehensive cessation of craving. But it's dangerous to forget that that's the motivation for the compromise. The person then ends up in a gray area where they are neither pursuing their ambitions to the extent that they could, nor actually practicing the Dhamma (because they don't want to give up craving but only "manage" it in their own admission).

On the other hand, if you view the Dhamma as the literal abandonment of craving, internally and externally, as opposed to a clever strategy for somehow maneuvering around it, then however little you do in accordance with that accurate view will be a step or two mostly in the right direction. You won't have muddled the waters regarding what the right direction is even if you hardly went for it.

Insisting in calling one's practice of management "Dhamma" can only be rooted in dishonesty and wishful thinking. If the positive outcomes of the management practice were truly all that one cared about, one wouldn't mind whether it can rightly be reckoned as Dhamma or not because how one labels it won't change its results. There would be no issue with acknowledging that the Dhamma is much more than that. Just as a self-honest Kia owner wouldn't struggle to acknowledge that their Kia isn't a sportscar, and that they *could* buy a true sportscar if they saved enough money.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-24 19:13:54 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

It seems to me that one could make a certain division here into two groups.

Yes, that division will inevitably exist. The point is that people who know they belong to the second group cannot develop the practices that require the lifestyle, mindset, and outlook of the first group, such as the brahmavihāras. Likewise, to the extent the first group attempts to fulfill worldly aspirations, they lose their original direction. It's like any other situation in life where you can't do two opposing things at once to the same extent. As long as one realizes that and acknowledges the inherent limitation, there is no problem with trying to go as far it allows.

Not acknowledging the limitation is a problem because then the refined aspects of the Dhamma, such as the jhānas, brahmavihāras, and meditation in general, get shoehorned into a space where they can't fit, inevitably deforming them and "dumbing them down" in the process. And out of that arise all sorts of delusions about achievements and attainments that don't measure up to the standard of true, unshakable freedom from suffering.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-27 07:11:52 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Is the only advice in such a situation to then keep the 5 precepts or are there reflections which are suitable to such a person in order to keep the mind inclined towards morals behaviour? (Making sure to be faithful, not developing jealousy etc).

Yes, reflection is always beneficial no matter what one's situation is. It's just that the benefits of those reflections will be limited to the basis of virtue that you have. Reflection cannot undo defilements that you still act out of by body and speech, just as a toothbrush would never be able to scrape off hardened cement. Reflection can only keep your mind

in check so that you are able to *maintain* your current level of virtue, in this case 5 precepts.

Also, how should one reflect on feelings of guilt for choosing this path rather than following the Dhamma?

If realizing the Dhamma is valued as a goal, then one should foster that guilt (*hiri-ottappa* as it's called in the Suttas), and not label it as bad. If you don't feel guilty about something that your mind craves for, there's little chance you'll ever give it up.

Should such a lay person still seek out solitude on occasion?

Yes, but that time should be devoted mainly to increasing their baseline of virtue for that period, not to doing more advanced practices that they might think will “make up” for what they do the rest of the time, which is not how *kamma* works. Eventually, after periodically establishing higher virtue many times, they may come to see the benefits of it for themselves and end up making that their default. That's the point of the Uposatha observance. But for that to work, one needs to actively *want* that increase to happen (i.e., actually value the cessation of craving *over* the continuation of one's present lifestyle) and not feeling justified and content with keeping 5 precepts indefinitely, which is most laypeople's mindset.

Homelessness is Nibbana (by Sister Medhini)

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** GachiOnFire 2025-01-22 09:37:47

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-24 11:49:17 (in reply to a comment not included)

I know myself enough to know that at short-mid term ordaining as a monk will lead to more proliferation, not less, to more socialization, not less... therefore it is likely that it will lead to more agitation, not less, and probably to accumulating more doubts.

It very well might, but those pitfalls can only manifest as a result of one's own choices. Monastic institutions are nowadays certainly far from the ideal, but you can still find a place that isn't too bad if you look further than the popular ones that are made to cater to the superficial needs of the majority. The views will almost inevitably revolve around wishful thinking, mysticism and magical experiences, and management techniques, but a good number of places would offer you an external environment that's still better than lay life in almost every way. In lay life you will for the most part be surrounded not just by wrong views but by wrong behaviors and values as well.

Going off to live in the wilderness as a layperson would probably be better than staying in the city, but it's still important to examine oneself as to why going to a monastery seems unpalatable provided one with reasonable seclusion and independence can be found. It

may happen that it's because one still clings to the worldly type of freedom and safety of being able to do things according to one's desires. As long as they're not coercing you to break precepts, or to forsake your seclusion and sit in a room full of people for the whole day, then even the most inane expectations and tasks you might get from a senior monk cannot prevent you from developing your own mind.

Rebirth

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-01-21 14:14:16

When do we get reborn? From my understanding when we go to sleep we leave the body(in sleep body is not there) and in the morning come back into the body for our next cycle of birth. This could create an infinite amount of lifetimes that create the separate experience in the present that we believe to be real. By this logic we are constantly getting reborn inside the body until clearly seeing the noble truths and putting an end to craving and attachment from which we narrate this story of coming from the past and going into the future. I think this is why seeing the dependent origination ends rebirth.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-21 16:37:52

From my understanding when we go to sleep we leave the body(in sleep body is not there)

This isn't really true. If you truly "left" your body, you wouldn't be woken up by loud noises, and things you're experiencing physically through any sense organ except the eyes wouldn't influence your dreams, as can happens sometimes.

Studies have demonstrated that auditory stimuli presented during sleep can influence dream content. This technique, known as Targeted Memory Reactivation (TMR), involves delivering specific sounds during sleep to cue associated memories, thereby modifying dream content. For instance, research has shown that pairing neutral words with positive imagery, and then re-exposing individuals to these words during non-REM sleep, can lead to the incorporation of positive elements into dreams.

putting an end to craving and attachment from which we narrate this story of coming from the past and going into the future

Whether there is a story or not, one will suffer for as long as there is craving. So the "stories" and the sense of continuity connecting past and future are quite irrelevant, neutral phenomena, and would not be abolished upon abandoning ignorance and craving. The Buddha himself would say things like "I was such and such a king at that time, and now I am the fully awakened Buddha" when referring to his past lives. The sense of self (*bhava*) is generated by *upādāna*, which is in turn bound up with craving, and not by a "story" or a sense of continuity.

'Significance' of mother and father.

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** upasakatraine 2025-01-19 08:29:11

Dear Bhante u/Bhikkhu_Anigha,

I was revisiting the talk on Right View, and the point made that while one might 'rationalize' that mother and father are just a heap of atoms or just perceptions and such; they are actively ignoring the phenomenological 'significance' of those (heaps of atoms), in their present lived experience. It is this 'significance', that lends the 'motherhood' or 'fatherhood' to the persons referred to.

A question arose then, that since the entirety of a persons experience is encompassed by the 5 aggregates (and nothing beyond the 5 aggregates); where would this 'significance' then fit in, into the aggregates model. Would not the significance, most accurately be falling under the aggregate of Sañña ?

Also, per my understanding, it is the 'overriding' of this very strong significance, that renders the act of killing one's mother or father, such a heinous act of Ānantarika Kamma. Therefore it stands to reason that the mother and father need not be biological. As long as an individual bears that significance towards any person(s) (e.g. one is adopted and isn't aware of that fact), the act of intentionally violating that significance, through killing, would bear the same consequences.

So a person raised by adoptive parents, but grows up unaware of that fact (i.e. with the notion/significance of them being his birth parents), would still be committing an Ānantarika Kamma, should he take their life.

Thank you for your responses as always !

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-20 05:10:32

Would not the significance, most accurately be falling under the aggregate of Sañña ?

It would be all of them. Particularly feeling and intention.

Also, per my understanding, it is the 'overriding' of this very strong significance, that renders the act of killing one's mother or father, such a heinous act of Ānantarika Kamma. Therefore it stands to reason that the mother and father need not be biological. As long as an individual bears that significance towards any person(s) (e.g. one is adopted and isn't aware of that fact), the act of intentionally violating that significance, through killing, would bear the same consequences.

Certainly. The "overriding" of that significance requires such a strong degree of greed or aversion that the mind is irreparably "broken" as a result (any lesser passions or aversions also "damage" it and obstruct it from seeing the Dhamma, but such damage is reversible

in this life). It has nothing really to do with the biological connection, which at the end of the day is something you can only take on trust.

Whatever has the nature of arising has the nature of ceasing; Freedom from suffering too?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Belozersky 2025-01-18 22:59:45

Whatever has the nature of arising has the nature of ceasing.

Freedom from suffering has the nature of arising.

Hence, Freedom from suffering has the nature of ceasing.

This argument would mean that liberation can't be unconditional. The very fact that you've achieved liberation means that you will lose it at some point. What do you think about this argument?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-19 05:34:48

Freedom from suffering has the nature of arising.

Technically it does not. That's one reason why the widespread conception of awakening/freedom from suffering as an "experience" is very misguided. Such a thing, having not been there before and then all of a sudden appearing, will inevitably be impermanent *in its nature* (i.e., its facticity of having arisen), no matter how extraordinary—even "unconditioned"—its *content* is.

"Bhikkhus, there are these three characteristics that define the conditioned. What three? An arising is seen, a vanishing is seen, and its alteration while it persists is seen. These are the three characteristics that define the conditioned.

"Bhikkhus, there are these three characteristics that define the unconditioned. What three? No arising is seen, no vanishing is seen, and no alteration while it persists is seen. These are the three characteristics that define the unconditioned."

—AN 3.47

For an explanation of what it means for Nibbāna not to be liable to arising, which also makes it clear that it's not a miraculous event that happens to you but something that you *understand*, see this comment.

Sutta accounts of jhāna while listening to/contemplating teachings

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Devotedlyindeed 2025-01-17 04:58:55

I was recently discussing with a monk (whose views on jhāna do not align with HH) the importance of contemplation in practice, and I mentioned that there were people who entered jhāna while listening to the Buddha teach. But it suddenly occurred to me that I actually don't know any explicit accounts of that happening. Maybe I just recalling this based on implications of people gaining Noble attainments while listening, figuring that must mean they had to go into jhāna to fulfill the N8P; it makes way more sense than assuming everyone who became enlightened while listening to the Buddha had already been practicing jhāna. But are there unequivocal accounts that it was like this?

Additionally, are there unequivocal accounts in the suttas that people enter jhāna while actively contemplating, or is this something I've also inferred while reframing my views of meditation into something more contemplation-forward? (I know of modern accounts of such written pretty straightforwardly, such as Bhante Ñaṇadīpa's, but can't recall any so clearly stated in the suttas.)

I am seeking cut-and-dry examples, if there are any so clear. Thanks in advance~

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-17 07:00:30

You may have gotten that from SN 46.38, which doesn't describe jhāna per se, only giving up the five hindrances. It's also often mentioned how the Buddha would first teach about generosity and the danger in sensuality in order to make a person's mind free from hindrances (*vinīvaraṇa*), and only then teach them the Four Noble Truths.

It does show that abandoning the hindrances involves something very different from what people tend to think. It's fundamentally about *clarity of understanding*, chiefly regarding the harmful nature of sensuality, and the benefit and peace of giving it up. Hence it is said that understanding the former as it is, not just in theory but "as it really is with right understanding," is an indispensable prerequisite for entering the first jhāna. After all, jhāna literally means nothing more obscure than "contemplation; reflection; consideration, etc." Hence the Suttas say one can "do jhāna" either wrongly or rightly, i.e. with or without hindrances.

If an ordinary person's mind can be freed from hindrances and get to develop understanding in this way, then it's no wonder that a noble disciple listening to further expositions of the Four Noble Truths—who sees *the right meaning* of those teachings in his own experience directly and beyond doubt—would be free from the hindrances and fulfill the awakening factors at that time.

Additionally, are there unequivocal accounts in the suttas that people enter jhāna while actively contemplating, or is this something I've also inferred

while reframing my views of meditation into something more contemplation-forward

Every description of someone entering jhāna in the Suttas describes them contemplating the drawbacks of the five hindrances beforehand (e.g., DN 2, MN 39). There's also MN 19 and SN 35.246, which put it in a slightly different way.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-17 12:21:05 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

These seem to contradict each other, unless jhāna in general is a more broad term than “The First Jhāna”?

Yes, that was essentially my point. “jhāna” simply means “contemplation/reflection,” and by itself in no way implies one is reflecting, contemplating *properly* (i.e., in such a way that the hindrances are overcome and the mind is tamed). The verb “pajjhāyati,” from the same root as jhāna, means thinking in a distressed/dejected way, and “nījjhāna” is used to refer to considering/pondering a view, as a result of which one (rightly or wrongly) comes to agree with it.

And then would it be right to say (proper noun:) Jhānas are simply when someone does jhāna, along with right view and absence of the 5H?

Correct. So when the Buddha spoke about “the four jhānas,” those are the four contemplations that are always right because they lead squarely to right knowledge, dispassion and relinquishment. Hence they are defined as *sammāsamādhi*.

And that since the Buddha describes going off to enter into and practice jhāna, he would therefore still experience the 5H. Is there somewhere you have explained this matter?

Not sure what you mean by this. If you mean that the Buddha still had the five hindrances and therefore had to go and practice jhāna, that would not be correct. As he said, an Arahant's hindrances are “cut off at the root, not liable to future arising.”

Thus, First Jhāna at the very least implies freedom from the five hindrances, but freedom from the five hindrances does not imply jhāna (as seen also in the Suttas I cited above). If Arahants were perpetually in at least the first jhāna, they would not be able to speak.

Thank you for elaborating; I'm not very good at logic with these things.

Sure, no problem.

Two ways of thinking about Jhāna?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Formal_Breath_2025 2025-01-16 13:50:26

I have recently been listening to Ven. Nyanamoli's talks about Jhāna and I feel like there are two different themes that tend to come up. One is that Jhāna is developed naturally

when one has abandoned the 5 hindrances and develops the pleasure of seclusion and renunciation, and the other is that Jhāna is developed by reflecting on subtle themes within experience: in the 1st Jhāna it's that speech is determined by thinking and pondering, and understanding that these are two separate domains with cessation of speech, all the way to the 4th Jhāna where it's that breathing itself has a prior life-determination which exists independently of it (but this is well beyond my understanding). I don't fully understand how these are linked - is it that someone who develops the pleasure of wholesomeness and seclusion will naturally come to perceive the dependent arising of e.g. thoughts and speech while dwelling in that pleasure? Or is that someone has wholesomeness and seclusion as the *prerequisite* for examining the relationship between thoughts and speech? If it's the latter then it seems like Jhāna would be quite hard to develop without instruction, but maybe it's something that seems much more natural after the 5 hindrances are already abandoned.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 14:38:56

That would be the difference between someone who develops jhāna outside of the Buddha's teaching and someone who does so as a noble disciple. The distinction is never explicitly made in the Suttas, but it's implicit in many ways.

There are accounts of ascetics before the Buddha who were free of passion for sensual pleasures, and that can be taken as a sign that they had developed renunciation and made their minds value it and be joyful and peaceful on account of it (which is what jhāna is). MN 102 describes such a scenario in more detail.

The second "type" of jhāna that is bound with clarity about the nature of experience is the type that requires Right View, and that is the jhāna that is only accessible to noble disciples, that develops the seven factors of awakening, and that can truly be said to be *sammāsamādhi* (right composure), since it is born out of *sammā sati* (right recollection). Both of which, of course, necessitate the right view. And only that second type of jhāna involves *complete* abandonment of the five hindrances, since the ability to give them up fully is a characteristic of a noble disciple. Giving up the hindrances requires understanding their nature and is not something that just "happens" on the basis of a method or technique.

You could argue that developing the first "type" of jhāna could serve as a basis for someone to get the right view, since, as we often see from the Suttas, whenever people would understand the four noble truths, it was because their minds were relatively free from hindrances, though most likely not fully in the first jhāna since they were not in seclusion.

Still, just to emphasize: as said in the Suttas dozens of times, that freedom would have to come from reflecting on the hindrances rightly based upon a lifestyle where one is well restrained in regard to them already (which is what you end up with by following the Gradual Training). What people nowadays regard as "meditation" would play no role at all, which is why you never see *that* mentioned prior to someone entering the jhānas, but instead the completion of the earlier parts of the Gradual Training. The states arising out

of those two things are worlds apart from each other.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 15:59:41 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

someone who is already proficient in establishing the right order of things would immediately understand the 1st Jhāna as indicating the relationship between thought and speech, even if they had not been given that specific teaching already?

They may not think of it in terms of “relationship between thought and speech” explicitly, but they will certainly be able to see the full scope of thinking, without overlooking anything, due to the strength of their yoniso manasikāra. And “not overlooking anything” is the only way to uproot the hindrances, for otherwise something or other will remain “underlying” you, keeping you subservient to it in some subtle way through its unnoticed pressure.

Seeing that full scope clearly, and not some specific contemplation, is what automatically makes one unable to speak, as well as freeing one from any assumptions of pleasures (or anything, really) “outside” this experience. All those pleasures are seen as simply vitakkavicāra *about* a sight, smell, etc., and one is unable to conceive even of the possibility of an “actual” sight outside vitakkavicāra that one needs to go and “get.” Hence some other Suttas speak of cessation of “sensual perception” (*kāmasaññā*) rather than of speech in the first jhāna. Both have exactly the same root and cannot exist without the other.

And, of course, seeing that “full scope” is only possible if one’s bodily and verbal actions of sensual or averse nature have been well restrained beforehand. Entertaining delight not only in thought but also to the extent of acting physically and verbally can only stem from the assumption that what you acted towards exists outside vitakkavicāra, which means the assumption will “ossify” even more and become harder to uproot.

What do I have to renounce?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** benedictus-s 2025-01-16 12:38:29

I am not yet following the eight precepts, even though I’m gradually going in that direction, and am full of doubt. I (believe I) understand that much of the practice revolves around not feeding taṇha. The precepts forbid activities that necessarily do, and sense restraint is about dealing with the other subtler unskillful things we do. I’ve heard in dhamma talks that one not supposed to really be able to discern skillful from unskillful before having been restrained for a while.

I obviously do not know how much I would have to abandon, since I haven’t even reached dhamma practice, and it is filling me with doubt. I think I could follow the eight precepts, but I’m not sure how much farther I could go. I know I don’t have to renounce everything that brings me joy, but only what feeds the craving. I however don’t really know what that

entails? Is there a way to make that distinction in my present experience? For example, I like reading about non buddhist philosophy, but I don't know whether I crave it. I also enjoy reading fiction from time to time and the same question applies...

I'm aware my question does not reflect the existential terror that my situation should inspire. I would be very grateful if you could give me your informed opinion on the matter.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 16:20:02

I know I don't have to renounce everything that brings me joy, but only what feeds the craving. I however don't really know what that entails? Is there a way to make that distinction in my present experience? For example, I like reading about non buddhist philosophy, but I don't know whether I crave it. I also enjoy reading fiction from time to time and the same question applies...

It's impossible to stop feeding craving completely from the very beginning no matter how hard you try. No particular "protocol" of living will do that in itself; that requires first-hand discernment of what craving is and its cessation, i.e., stream-entry. As the Buddha said, craving perpetually "moves," so it's not like by restraining one or even all of the specific things that arouse craving for you *now*, you won't see it come up anymore.

This is why it's a training that builds up progressively. In this case, your only concern should be to begin keeping the precepts and get used to that. Don't worry about anything else for now. Once you get used to the precepts and more "space" starts to open up as a result, you will naturally start to see subtler impurities in your own mind, and only with that first-hand discernment will you be able to abandon them rightly.

(If one has a severely wrong view of what practice and purification are, a view that places the emphasis on something completely unrelated to the precepts and one's behavior, then it's of course very unlikely that any further impurities at the level of conduct will be noticed—even after keeping the precepts perfectly for decades—simply because one won't be looking to find them. The precepts become simply boxes to tick mindlessly before moving on to the main act ASAP.)

Musings on right intention

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** TheDailyOculus 2025-01-15 23:08:07

It's not until recently that I truly began to notice/view/understand how the word intention applies. Below is my current understanding as I practice it:

Intention seems to me to be the closest you can get to the origin of any action. Even thoughts/images/pressure have a sense of being offered up by the mind, but you have to "take them up" (assuming you are the owner and that they are yours) by intending in the direction of what was already offered, for those thoughts to further escalate in that direction.

Only by being ignorant of their nature as independently arisen phenomena, not created by you, can you assume ownership and intend to act out. And as such, you don't see the intention, only the action. You don't "see" the thought/image/feeling/pressure, you only see that you act as you please in this world.

So when you see a pleasant sight or a pleasant image arise in your mind - "you" are in the presence of a mental image of that sight, a pleasant feeling, and a potential line of thinking.

But if you do not slip into that trap of image/feeling/thoughts, if you do not intend in line with the pressure to go in that direction, there is no fuel for them to burn brighter so to speak. With your intention present (to me it seems that the words "delighting in" and "being averse to" applies as well), the mind will be encouraged to offer up these independently enduring phenomena.

And to the degree you commit to non-delight and non-aversion (or non-intention) in regard to presently enduring phenomena, the mind will calm down more and more and offer up such suggestions less and less.

I've been applying the concept of studying intention in regard to the breath, while recollecting that the breath exists on its own with no overlap with one's intention. So the intention to breath and the actual breath are not the same. Aversion and delight comes from assuming that there is a cohesive "you" that bridges the gap between intention and body, or intention and mental phenomena. In intending to breath deeply, you intend in a direction that already exists in the mind in the form of a mental image.

But even the closest things to you, thoughts, mental images, feelings.. They are the mind's territory, and the mind pressures you to go in its wanted direction.

And so the only real training, is to practice non-intention in regard to anything unskillful presented to you by the mind and the senses. That is, patiently enduring not acting out of greed, aversion and delusion.

I'm at a place now where I still act out unskillfully from time to time, but there is an overlap with me also knowing and seeing beforehand what I've described above, and so I act out knowing it is unskillful. But it seems to me, that I now know what abandoning sensuality truly means. All I have to do is to train this in a less disturbed environment until I've grown enduring enough to non-intend instead of intending in the face of greed, aversion and delusion.

Edit: I should also mention that it is that very intention affected with greed, aversion and delusion that is the reason one still acts out in the presence of pleasant or unpleasant phenomenon. By knowing what phenomena that are skillful or unskillful, and by seeing that choice/intention, and by having enough strength to endure non-action in their presence, one's failure to non-intend becomes purified.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-16 15:23:22

This sounds mostly like the right direction, but do make sure not to forget that you won't be able to recognize subtle things like the relationship between intention and breathing with any significant degree of accuracy until this

I'm at a place now where I still act out unskillfully from time to time, but there is an overlap with me also knowing and seeing beforehand what I've described above, and so I act out knowing it is unskillful.

...is no longer the case. If that's still happening, it suggests that your clarity of those acts as unskillful is insufficient and somewhat shallow, so I would focus on addressing that first. Otherwise you'll be trying to build the roof of the house before there is even a foundation. Proper knowledge of *kusala* and *akusala* would alone make you a sotāpanna.

“The More You Scratch an Itch..” Further explanation, Please?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** StrikingRegular1150 2025-01-12 00:24:11

First, let me say I absolutely love the Hillside Hermitage Youtube Channel. I'm so grateful for it! Discourse that I've been exposed to through it has really helped connect a lot of dots for me. So thank you, thank you, thank you on account of that.

I have a question I'd very deeply appreciate any responses on from either Hillside Hermitage or anyone in the community, here.

For years I've been trying to gain better insight into the dynamic of how the more one pushes away something not wanted it paradoxically not only does it not lessen the effects of what's desired to be pushed away, but only makes it worse. (When I say “push away something not wanted”, examples: anxious avoidance of a trigger, angry defensive pushing-away a trigger, or indulging in sensory escapism to forget a trigger.)

I've felt for years that better understanding this (paradoxical at face value) dynamic of what happens you react to internal pressure by giving in, or don't, is one of the most important lessons in human life there is.

I say that, not only for better navigating in real time what caving into pressures means for one's self, but also for eliciting feelings of compassion for others when seeing them cave into these pressures.

Hillside Hermitage video reference this dynamic within responding to pressures or not, and will sometimes make the analogy of:

“The more you scratch an itch the worse it gets.”

I was wondering if anyone could flesh this out much more deeply though?

Thank you very much in advance!

Love,
Mark

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 16:21:08

As with everything that has to do with the Dhamma, this isn't really something you can figure out in an abstract sense. The very act of trying to figure it out can often be underlain by the same dynamic of "scratching" an arisen "itch," and you would be overlooking the actual dynamic right in front of your nose and contemplating abstract ideas instead. It can only be understood on the basis of practical, lived virtue and restraint. That's how you begin to see—on a first-person level, which is the where the Dhamma is found—how your choices and the attitudes they stem from impact the directions that your mind inclines to.

It can't really be described in any more detail than saying that your mind's inclinations are something you only have indirect, "delayed" control over, exactly like a dog. No matter how tight you have it on the leash, you can't force a dog to *want to* behave as you'd like it to. But when you see it getting excited having smelled something attractive, you do have a choice to either let it run towards it, or not. If you let it go where it wants, it will only get more agitated and defiant to your commands (the "itch" intensifies). If you stop it from running towards its target when the excitement is still only nascent, despite probably having to put up with a bit of whimpering initially, you cut off the possibility for an entire array of problems at its very root, and the "itch" will diminish too.

The same principle applies to aversion, just that the "itch" is of course different in its content (pushing back at a perceived threat).

[Edit: It's also important to remember that letting "the dog" get worked up over one thing means letting it get worked up over *everything*. So if a person struggles with a specific defilement, they should always consider not just that one, but all the other defilements they might be giving in to, not seeing them as a problem].

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-27 06:52:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Seems like the "jump over" part, the separation of sense door pressures, is some kind of illusion, perhaps?

No, it's not an "illusion." The whole concept of "illusions" is something one should avoid, as it is almost always rooted in denying the factual state of affairs for the sake of managing one's feelings in regard to it.

The pressure "jumps over" from one sense door to another simply because it's not the sense doors that are infected with craving themselves, but rather the mind (citta), which is tied to all the sense doors, including the sixth. And there's no "why" to this, it's just the way existence works.

What is the appropriate attitude/view to have towards one's parents?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok-Addition-7759 2025-01-10 20:06:07

As I prepare to go forth it's becoming much more real the fact that I'm leaving my family behind. When I leave, I don't know when or if I might see them again. It feels easier to see the body as not mine than it is to see my mom or dad as not my mine. I don't want to say they're "not mine" in the wrong way. Nothing can belong to anyone, but it's too easy to take that in the wrong way, in a way that avoids responsibility or isn't taken personally enough or is dissonant with the actual underlying emotions and attachments(denial, repression, etc).

The Buddha makes it clear that we owe our parents a lot, that it's a debt that is hard to repay. They are our first teachers and we aren't entitled to any of the food, protection, care, etc that they provide.

I used to have a very entitled mindset. I thought I was a victim. I've come to see how much of a lie that is, that I'm not owed these things, and that I am deeply, deeply cherished, loved and accepted by those around me. As I prepare to go forth it's becoming so much more real how much I owe my mom. How much she did for me. How much she sacrificed. I have a hard time not being ashamed for consuming resources like food and healthcare and accepting things without guilt. That part of being a monk will be difficult to get used to. I would like to be able to accept things without shame or guilt. I think the entitlement is a compensation strategy by the mind to cover that up.

I didn't have any relationship with my father before I found Buddhism, but my introduction to the dhamma was so profound and for whatever reason drove me to call my dad. We talked for the first time in 15 years. 2 years later, we have a wonderful relationship. He is a good man, a kind man, and I'm so blessed to have gotten to have this relationship with him. At first I was really apprehensive about the idea of reconnecting with him or building it into a relationship, but I kept coming back to the Buddha's teaching that there is mother and there is father.

I've practiced hard at home to earn merit for my mom, it's been a big motivator. She isn't really able to receive Buddhism much, I can't teach her or establish her in mindfulness, the things the Buddha says are best for parents and loved ones. When she asked what I wanted for Christmas I saw an opportunity for her to make merit and told her I wanted a donation to Hillside Hermitage. I'm really glad I was able to help her make merit with that. I don't see much more I can do except be a good son and practice well.

How does one view parents and relationships with them? How does one properly say they're not mine? I'm not trying to get out of the pain of separation. I'll have to work through that and I plan on crying in the forest a lot when I get to Sri Lanka, for grief and joy.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 13:27:08

How does one view parents and relationships with them? How does one properly say they're not mine?

You don't "say" they're not yours.

As usual, you first need to be established in the precepts and withdrawal from sensuality, especially because those defilements are much coarser than the attachment to loved ones. Then within that, don't try to deny all the good that your parents have done for you. Acknowledge how helpful they've been, but at the same time don't try to cover up the fact that you could lose them or be separated from them forever the very next moment. That's just to hammer in the same point that *any* attachment to anything in the world is unjustified and unbeneficial because it puts you in a vulnerable position due to impermanence.

Attachment doesn't help you the tiniest bit in being grateful for what somebody has done for you nor even in repaying them. Quite the opposite; all attachment is bound up with selfishness by necessity. It's based on your own attitude towards your own feelings, and has nothing to do with the other person. It will blind you and make you overlook ways in which you may even be harming the other person given that your tacit priority is getting what you want out of them.

Signs of the Mind/Practice Check

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** None 2025-01-10 17:02:28

[deleted]

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 16:40:12

This sounds like an attempt to find an escape from suffering through psychologizations, and is certainly not what we mean with "seeing the sign of the mind."

Seeing the sign of the mind would be taking a step back from this whole complex net of ideas and asking yourself why you feel compelled to engage with them in the first place. Most likely, through radical honesty, you would see that it helps you cope with challenging emotional states and situations better one way or another. But that's not how you arrive at freedom from suffering. It's the mind still trying to exert control over experience and have things go according to its preferences at the level of feeling at least, just in a way that's less obvious.

You can only arrive at true freedom from suffering by abandoning craving in regard to whatever feeling is present, not by trying to manipulate it by rehearsing various ideas, whether accurate or not.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 17:49:59 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Effort isn't necessarily always conscious, especially when something has become habitual. *Sanikhāras* exist due to ignorance as the Buddha said, not because one explicitly wants to have them.

it's seen as a sentence without meaning. Then the sentence falls apart.

Even if it feels like it's not "you" making that happen, the fact remains that the freedom came from a change that occurred, and not from you being completely unmoved by both very meaningful and very meaningless sentences equally, or by whatever else happens to manifest regardless of its pressuring or non-pressuring qualities.

Such freedom cannot be unconditioned because the occurrence of a change is its condition.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 04:31:24 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Change occurs on its own.

It does, but you seemed to imply that the occurrence of the change is the reason for the freedom, i.e., that if the sentences continued having the same heaviness of meaning indefinitely, the suffering would also continue.

What I'm trying to share is the seeing that resulted from the cessation of craving.

And my point is that what you described seems like a change in feeling (regardless of whether you deliberately caused it or not), not the cessation of craving. Seeing the sign of the mind and Right View boil down to seeing that these two could not be further apart.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 05:09:04 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Simply put: when I see a mirage, no thirst for water arises. Why? Because the knowledge that a mirage is empty of water is already present.

My point is that the actual cessation of craving is such that even when the water is perfectly real and not a "mirage," you *still* don't crave for it. Understanding the four noble truths leads to direct cessation of craving without any intermediary, rather than indirectly by altering the way you perceive things first, and *thus* not craving. The latter is adding a middleman, and it's what we tend to call "management." It's not what the Buddha taught.

The *direct* reason for your suffering is not that you see things as real and not a mirage, which is what your view seems to imply. It's that you cannot feel "real" pleasure without craving for it or feel "real" pain without craving against it. So that's where the wisdom

needs to be developed. The “mirage”-type feelings and phenomena don’t need to be understood because anybody will naturally be equanimous towards them.

That was all just to clarify what I said. Could you expand on this?:

“Seeing the sign of the mind and Right View boil down to seeing that these two could not be further apart.”

Seeing the sign of the mind means becoming aware of its attitude of craving when things *aren’t* easy to endure, i.e., when they’re not a “mirage”. That’s how you develop Right View. And that could not be further apart from a practice based on things being a mirage always, which will only obscure the fact that if things were not so, your mind *would* crave. The latter practice involves a subtle assumption that feelings, not craving, are the root of suffering, and thus it’s the polar opposite of Right View.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 05:36:34 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

and now I understand where you’re coming from

It doesn’t seem like it, I’m afraid. The way you speak about your understanding quite clearly implies to me that you think feelings are the cause of suffering, despite not wanting to phrase it that way presumably because it sounds wrong according to what you’ve learned intellectually. I would’ve said the same even if you had never used any metaphors. I’ve only been using your metaphor to try to convey the message.

Thus, everything remains real as it is, but no longer as it once appeared to be.

This is the mistake I’m referring to. Everything *should* be exactly as it once appeared to be. *Avijjā* has nothing to do with things *appearing* otherwise than they truly are. The Buddha was no mystic. It has to do with not understanding that 100% real water is not worth craving for, for reasons completely unrelated to the ultimate truth/validity of its appearance.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 06:32:45 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Simply put, you are on the surface using the same words and expressions of “giving up craving” and “seeing impermanence” to describe a very different practice from what I’m describing. For you, those expressions mean the phenomenon’s appearance changes. On the other hand, what I’m saying is that knowing the nature of a phenomenon and abandoning craving in regard to it does not change the way it appeared when there was ignorance, and that is perfectly fine because appearances are not the root of suffering. If one needs to change appearances to not suffer, one is not addressing the core issue but simply sidestepping it.

This is how the presence of craving, in any form, fabricates experience so that things appear to be good and bad, me and mine.

I can't see how things would appear in any way similar to how they did when craving deluded perception, making everything appear as permanent, satisfying, and ownable.

It's the other way around entirely. Things appear the way they've always done (feelings of "good" and "bad") > craving is present due to ignorance of *anicca*, *dukkha*, *anattā* in regard to feelings and the aggregates in general > one suffers. This is quite clear from the Suttas.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-12 16:48:25 (in reply to a comment not included)

Yes, that analogy might work on a crude level. But in the end it's subtler than that, since only the most misled people would genuinely think that insight leads to a transformation of sensory perceptions themselves. Ultimately, you need to stop expecting any change to occur even at the level of feeling, since that's also part of "appearance."

Over time, of course, the mind becomes more equanimous, and things that used to pressure it won't do so as much. But that is a secondary side effect of the right practice, and it is absolutely paramount not to be hoping for that effect and trying to bring it about when it's not there, for otherwise you won't actually be abandoning craving here and now, and any calm that comes out of craving will be feeble, limited, and require constant management.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-14 04:26:54 (in reply to a comment not included)

It is NOT sensory perceptions that change. It is ignorance (perceptual and conceptual fallacies) in regard to sensory perceptions that disappear completely.

I've no doubt that that's not what you're saying, and I never thought so. I wasn't referring to you when I wrote "the most misled people..."

As I made clear, the problem is not with the phrasing. The phrasing of what you wrote here to describe insight is not necessarily wrong because it's what the Suttas say. But what that content *means for you* seems to be something rather different. It involves still putting the blame for suffering on the way experience manifests.

This Sutta may help get my point across. The Arahant is completely free from suffering *in spite* of the potentially infinite magnitude of the tides (arising from the senses), whereas what you're describing sounds to me like "there is freedom *because* there is no tide" (the "tide" having been removed by the contemplation of impermanence, letting go, etc., which would not be the correct use for those contemplations).

Even if the content of the sense perceptions remains the same, their "weight" is gone. But

that “weight” is in itself not craving and thus not suffering, yet your descriptions sound to me very much like you think it is.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-14 12:14:28 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

No need to stand apart from the tides of change, of conditions, of pain, because without craving it is impossible to suffer

Indeed, and it's essential to check whether one's practice revolves around removing that actual craving or whether it simply diminishes the tides.

having had experience altered in such a way that seeing phenomena as anicca, dukkha, anatta, has created a refuge within where nothing seems to reach.

And this sounds to me like diminishing the tides. It might still be “the same mass of water” as before and not have entirely turned into something else, but that freedom is still dependent on *an alteration of some kind*, in this case the magnitude of the tides.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-02-02 08:33:36 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I don't see why you would interpret this Sutta as support for the view that the cessation of craving involves alteration of perception. It is talking about what MN 1 describes, which is much subtler and very different from simply altering perceptions (which again, is inevitably “management”, a much easier temporary fix that should not be assumed to be a true escape from dukkha even if it works in the present).

Having to search far and wide to find a single Sutta that lends support to what one thinks the cessation of craving is about is also a red flag, as you would expect the Buddha to talk about something frequently and explicitly if it were that important. Instead, probably hundreds if not thousands of times in the Suttas, the practice is said to be giving up passion and delight in arisen perceptions and other aggregates, not altering them.

Isn't everyone in this community just blindly assuming that free will exists?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** senserestraint 2025-01-10 05:18:46

Ajahn Nyanamoli talks a lot about taking personal responsibility for giving into the pressure of desire. I don't understand - doesn't this imply that free will isn't an illusion?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-10 13:40:56

I don't understand - doesn't this imply that free will isn't an illusion?

Why would it be? The Buddha certainly never said that. At least not if we define free will simply as the ability to exert intentions or refrain from doing so, and differentiate that from the ability to achieve desired results.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-10 17:12:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

A determinist would say that all your intentions and refraining are caused by prior conditions which you didn't have control over i.e., any of your actions can be traced back to the state of the world prior to your birth.

Indeed, but without a concrete basis or evidence for that belief (there isn't any), but only other beliefs/assumptions that they take on faith, often simply because not feeling the weight of responsibility is more pleasing to them. Quite the opposite, experiential evidence—which is apodictic and cannot be “proven” through secondary means—shows you that your choices make a difference. The person would choose to deny that evidence and settle for a belief instead.

Asserting that there are actions which are ultimately caused by you would imply that you are some kind of primordial unconditioned entity

That's quite a leap. You wouldn't feel like you're a “primordial unconditioned entity” if someone locked you into a cell even if they let you move freely within it, would you? That's what the power of choice is: the ability to put one of the options given to you above the others, never to actually create new things from nothing. Even on the mental plane, you can't think a thought that wasn't already available before you thought it. Otherwise you would never forget things.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 06:32:59 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Your choices making a difference isn't evidence for them not being pre-determined.

Nor will you be able to provide conclusive evidence that they *are* pre-determined. So my point is that it's a belief that isn't even supported by any more evidence than the opposite. It's not somehow a more rigorous or rational take.

that doesn't mean they have some free will independent of the flow of conditions, it just means that the current flow of conditions INCLUDES their wisdom from choosing the donut in the past and INCLUDES their current degree of ability to restrain.

In the overall picture, it's still a path of less resistance that will be used to avoid responsibility for indulgence, because the person will inevitably at some point *choose* to regard their supposed lack of free will as their reason for eating the donut, rather than making the perfectly possible, even if “illusory,” choice to blame it on nothing but their own

weakness—assuming eating the donut actually *was* an indulgent intention, which isn't a given—thus opening up the possibility for growth, even if an “illusory” one.

The Buddha's teaching is ultimately about the way things manifest to you and your suffering on account of those manifestations, not about hidden metaphysical truths. Even if actually and in truth your choices and your development in restraint were “not real”, that will make no difference to your ability to practice the Dhamma and free yourself within the supposed “illusion”. Whether it's an illusion or not, you suffer, and experience shows you that there are “illusory” choices that either go with the grain of craving, or not. That's all that matters.

A point about meditation and question about sensuality

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok_Watercress_4596 2025-01-07 10:32:11

Hi, I wanted to share a little bit about my own “path” here to illustrate a point and to ask a question, maybe someone can help

1. I used to not be able to keep the 5 precepts and was really upset about it almost all the time, so having no other options I started meditating and eventually was able to start keeping the 5 precepts. Now I want to aim to increase the threshold further as I did in the past, starting with the most obvious things and to me it seems like sitting mindfully, aware of the body, with a quiet mind really helps me to overcome rising greed, aversion and grief, etc. To me it seems obvious that even though meditation may not be sufficient on its own as a technique to attain Nibbana, it is quite important and a crucial element of fulfilling the gradual training, in my experience. The thoughts are filled with sensuality as well, so sitting calmly helps me to undo the thinking habits that are unbeneficial and to me it seems like this cannot be avoided, a person must become aware of their thoughts and calm them down and try to give them up, otherwise these thoughts are the same as the sensuality I want to give up
2. I've been trying to contemplate drawbacks of sensuality, but it doesn't seem to work. I've given up various things, but at the same time value some other things and really struggle to give them up. I'm wondering if there is some trick or way or technique to clearly see the peril, danger, drawback, the problem with pleasure and make the thoughts of renunciation more appealing as a way out
3. Can I still enjoy some hobbies I like? Like 3D modelling, videogames and bodybuilding, are those also dangerous?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-07 15:19:51

The thoughts are filled with sensuality as well, so sitting calmly helps me to undo the thinking habits that are unbeneficial and to me it seems like this cannot be avoided, a person must become aware of their thoughts and calm them down and try to give them up, otherwise these thoughts are the same as the sensuality I want to give up

It *can* be avoided by training yourself in virtue, restraint, and renunciation in the overall context of your life, since those actions create the momentum that keeps pushing you in the same direction mentally even when you're not doing anything in particular. Once you abandon those things on the bodily and verbal level, you need to learn how to abandon *only* the unwholesome thoughts whenever they arise as the Buddha described in MN 19, not shut down your thinking altogether, which is a form of cheating.

If you try to jump right into calming yourself down before all of this is done, it will be an act of suppression rooted in ignoring the work you need to do. It might make you more peaceful quicker, but it will be the peace of taking a nap in a dirty room, shirking your duty to clean it.

I've been trying to contemplate drawbacks of sensuality, but it doesn't seem to work. I've given up various things, but at the same time value some other things and really struggle to give them up. I'm wondering if there is some trick or way or technique to clearly see the peril, danger, drawback, the problem with pleasure and make the thoughts of renunciation more appealing as a way out

It might be that you're expecting a special contemplation to do the work of abandoning for you, but that's not how it works. Right contemplation internally becomes possible on the basis of renunciation externally, since what you're contemplating is not the peril in the specific objects (which would be an endless task) but the peril in feeding further the craving that becomes revealed when you're restrained, by giving in to it once more. Undermining your own wish to attain lasting peace for the sake of instant gratification.

Can I still enjoy some hobbies I like? Like 3D modelling, videogames and bodybuilding, are those also dangerous?.

Playing video games will always be rooted in a craving for distraction, which will in turn feed sensual tendencies too and make it harder to restrain them. And that cannot be beneficial. The others depend on the intention behind doing them at the time. It could be craving for distraction too, or vanity in the case of something like bodybuilding, or some practical purpose. Nothing apart from the five precepts, celibacy, and giving up entertainment is set in stone.

That said, you probably want to stop the coarser, most craving-driven things like sexual activity and entertainment before you try to closely examine your intentions behind subtler things that aren't covered by the precepts. You won't have a clear perspective to do so otherwise.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-07 15:29:48 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

You will have imperturbable peace to whatever degree you do that work, whereas the work of "meditation" as conceived of nowadays is just putting a bandage over a festering wound and doing next to nothing about it in the end.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-07 19:02:15 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

Any action rooted in craving inevitably makes you liable to suffer more when you don't get what you want or get what you don't want. Even if the misfortune has nothing to do with the original action. That's because it's "one" craving that is fed by everything and spreads onto everything, so to speak.

Each time you give in to craving, you basically bind yourself down tighter with your head beneath a guillotine that could drop at any moment. Because nothing fundamentally guarantees that you won't lose everything you cling to the very next moment.

If by not fueling it further you give up craving and thus break loose before the guillotine drops, it won't be a problem no matter how hard it falls.

Practice for right view

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Wild-Brush1554 2025-01-04 06:06:09

I have been practicing sense restraint(for a few weeks) and non activity for a few days. I am restrained when it comes to my bodily and verbal actions because I'm only fulfilling my basic needs (eating, bathroom, sleeping, chores and other necessities) since any other activity would be done out of unwholesome intentions because its unnecessary.

While abiding in non activity, i just walk/sit(while sitting i try not to move and stare at one area)and let the feelings and cravings come up without changing them. Throughout the day mind is very active, it keeps bringing up thoughts rooted in craving, longing for company, past experiences and anxiety about the future/doubt. I endure craving and try to discern my intentions. I can clearly see that most of my thoughts are rooted in craving which would make them unwholesome(I could be wrong since I dont have right view). I dont try to think of unwholesome thoughts, however they come anyways and my mind jumps to them, but not all the time. I try to let the mind do its own thing without trying to change much.

Am I supposed to just keep doing the same thing and wait for the mind to settle(I assume it will since im not agitating it).

My current understanding of the practice is that I should:

1. Avoid acting out of unwholesome intentions.
2. See the danger in the slightest fault
3. Contemplate the danger of sense pleasures.

By contemplating i mean whenever a thought of craving comes up I reflect on how its impermanent, can never satisfy me and will be future suffering.

The time in non activity is not easy, although im not restless(which is a good sign) I still feel uneasy and suffer my minds craving

Is my practice of non activity and endurance happening rightly? Will this be enough(if done consistently and over long enough) to make me naturally devalue sense pleasures and get the right view?

Any help would be appreciated!

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-05 06:17:55

More important than trying to “get it right” in this particular period would be to make sure that you establish yourself in sense restraint permanently (which you say you’ve done only for a few weeks). Otherwise, you will be trying extra hard now but sooner or later your motivation will run out, and since you tried to take on the whole thing all at once, you might just as quickly drop it all and default back to non-restraint.

And *that*, not the lack of intellectual clarity you’re trying to resolve, would compromise your training and undo any beneficial work you may have done.

So sure, do your best to contemplate and discern and so on, but don’t aim for perfection on that level. Aim for perfection only in regard to sense restraint for now (or even just the eight precepts, in case you aren’t 100% confident with them either).

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-06 07:04:00 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

How do we know if we are 100% confident in the precepts?

One way would be to review yourself at the end of each day to see not only whether you broke any of them, but whether you were at any point even *close* to doing so.

You should also, of course, ask yourself honestly whether your resolve is to keep them forever and you feel perfectly comfortable with that prospect, or whether the resolve is only temporary or only applies to when it’s relatively easy to say “no.”

Ultimately, if you doubt it, it’s because you’re not confident.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-06 11:43:55 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

In order to permanently establish myself in sense restraint, I would have to find a substitute for sense pleasures right?

This is a common wrong view. The right kind of joy, which is the joy of renunciation, will come only when you give up any hopes of getting what you currently regard as joy, which most likely is still within the sensual/unwholesome realm. And that relinquishment that is peaceful won’t happen for as long as you are restraining your senses *for the sake of* some kind of joy. In fact, that’s exactly what would make the sense restraint painful, since you would just be feeding your craving through it.

The joy of renunciation will arise when you fully see the danger in sensuality and the value of renunciation, and keep your sense restraint with that alone as motivation. Not when you do something entirely separate from that, for otherwise it wouldn't be called "joy of renunciation" anymore.

Even if I don't give in, I would still be touched by the pressure which would make it very hard and a constant "doing" to not give in.

That's not a problem per se. You need to keep "doing" it for a long time until the mind calms down for no other reason than having gotten used to it. If you've been feeding these habits for years or even longer, like basically everyone, it's silly to expect them to subside quickly. Hence what I wrote about not expecting to undo it all at once.

Will this habit subside on its own through longer duration of practice

It will. The mind's over-activity is a result of the lingering momentum created by one's previous lack of bodily and verbal restraint.

A desire/thought arises about something pleasant, while the desire is there if I remind myself how it is painful etc, wouldn't that be done out of aversion to?

Yes, but that's a more subtle problem than what would happen if you didn't contemplate the danger, so you don't have to worry about that until the danger has become fully clear, and definitely not until sense restraint has become your natural mode of being.

What is the "you" that chooses what to allow the wild animal to engage with?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** MaggOtBrainz 2025-01-02 13:46:29

What is the "you" that chooses what sense objects to engage with or present to the wild animal?

Do you have control over that "you" and the choices it makes? Or is that also determined by further factors down the chain?

If you do have control, then what is the you that has control? Isn't that antithetical to the teaching of the Buddha? You would be some kind of separate acausal entity. You could've chosen not to be in ignorance in the first place. Whether or not you are pressured by the world would be completely up to you. But we know that we are ALREADY pressured - that's the starting point.

If you don't have control, what is the basis for that "you" that chooses what to engage with? And therefore, what is the basis of an ignorant mind, and what is the basis of an enlightened mind?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-04 05:44:37

What is the “you” that chooses what sense objects to engage with or present to the wild animal?

In simple terms, you could say it’s the faculty of attention.

Do you have control over that “you” and the choices it makes? Or is that also determined by further factors down the chain?

You can only attend to something because it is there as possible-to-be-attended-to already, cognized by your sense bases, without you having any ultimate say in what’s available and what isn’t.

You could’ve chosen not to be in ignorance in the first place. Whether or not you are pressured by the world would be completely up to you.

From the above, you can see that this doesn’t really follow. In your own experience, is moving your attention to something else a fundamentally reliable method of avoiding suffering? If so, how come many people fall into depression anyways?

what is the basis of an ignorant mind, and what is the basis of an enlightened mind?

Not sure what you mean by this. Assuming you’re asking what is the cause of each, a simple way to put it is that the ignorant mind continues to put an emphasis on the little control that it has and overlooks the more fundamental non-control. The enlightened mind does the opposite.

It bears mentioning that “not allowing the wild animal to engage with things” is not what leads to enlightenment alone. That’s what anyone who attains samadhi even with wrong view would have to do. A tamed animal (assuming the taming came from the gradual training and not a meditation technique) is but a *suitable basis* for enlightenment.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-05 12:47:34 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

What causes the mind to go down these paths? I think that’s what I’m trying to get at. What are the conditions for you to make choices that are in alignment with enlightenment or samsara?

Restraint in conduct and of the senses (or lack of it) is the condition. Things like sensuality and ill will are driven precisely by an emphasis on the very limited control one has and overlooking the bigger picture of non-control. If you saw that you have so little control over your own life that you could even die the very next moment, any value in sensuality or hatred would be gone at least for the duration of that recognition. But if you keep giving in to such acts, you can’t even stop to consider the aspect of non-control because you’re already fully bent on asserting your control.

What else is required?

The insight of non-control (which should not be confused with **denial** of control). The mind tamed by restraint has less of a pressure to assert its control, but that doesn't mean there is the understanding of how little control can be exerted regardless of how hard you try.

And to be clear, understanding non-control would not turn one into some sort of automaton. It just means one doesn't find any refuge in the power of choice that is factually there, so when things go bad, there will be no suffering if one fails miserably at improving them, as will inevitably happen sometimes.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-08 06:49:29 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I think I'm mindful of the possibility of death at any moment, (I accept it, and I'm ok with it, it doesn't worry me), and yet cravings for sense pleasures still arise.

That might be because you're thinking of death in an abstract sense. It's impossible for a non-Arahant to be at ease with death unless they misconceiving what death is. A courageous soldier on a battlefield is not afraid of death because his notion of death does not apply to whatever his sense of self and of safety has become established upon. Most people who feel that way would get closer to what death is by considering the possibility of losing everything they find the slightest bit of joy and reassurance in, forever.

This discussion might be helpful.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-11 13:15:14 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

I will cease to exist, all suffering will stop for me, from my perspective something completely new will be reborn.

I'm missing something, if I die then my sense of self will cease to exist.

These views are where the problem lies. That's not how it works, and it's not how the Buddha spoke about "rebirth." Think of it as things happening to you tomorrow without having any memories of today. You would still most certainly be concerned about what position today's actions will put you in even if you won't remember them. *anattā* is the result of seeing dukkha in regard to the entirety of existence, not an intellectual standpoint you simply adopt.

Do I have to be seriously into 8 precept territory for years to be able to see what you are talking about here? Can a regular person with decent sense restraint understand this contemplation, or am I spinning my wheels at this point?

To be able to see it in a way that liberates unconditionally, yes. 8 precept territory is the least that qualifies as "decent sense restraint," especially in modern times in a lay setting.

Less than that would seem “decent” because of one’s habituated baseline and lack of a reference point for the sheer “size” of one’s craving in absolute terms. Even a lay sotāpanna would know that they’re mostly just “cruising” on 5 precepts, not *practicing*.

Sure, strictly speaking it may be possible to understand the Dhamma with slightly less, but why would you justify continuing to smoke any amount of cigarettes if you genuinely wanted to cure yourself of lung cancer, unless you had the very pernicious view that there is no connection between the two?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-15 05:01:20 (in reply to a comment not included)

There are at least two things that may be missing which would constitute that “middle step.” The first would be that in order to start learning how to recollect death (or anything else) rightly, you need to have undertaken restraint and precepts first, rather than relying on the contemplation of death to do the restraint for you. It can only undo delight at the level of thought. If things have been proliferated past that point into bodily and verbal acts, there’s not much any contemplation can really do. We probably give that “disclaimer” quite often, though perhaps it wasn’t explicitly mentioned in this specific case.

The second thing, which comes within the first, is that you have to recognize the liability to death *rightly* (which means concretely, in a way that doesn’t leave out your point of view). Thinking about it as some sort of external fact will certainly not undo your passion for sensuality. Many people do already recognize that “we’re all going to die one day” and so on, but because they’re not relating to that possibility of death rightly, they can even use it as an excuse *for* sensuality, ironically.

It should also be qualified that undoing passion for sensuality does not necessarily mean exterminating the *pressure* of sensuality on the spot. If you’ve been cultivating delight mentally, you can’t instantaneously stop that train. But what recollecting death rightly *would* do is put things back into perspective so that you are unable to keep fueling the pressure that has been accumulated, at least for as long as the recollection remains properly established.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-31 16:28:57 (in reply to a comment not included)

It’s not that the memories *need* to be absent. Complete forgetfulness is just how it would generally pan out, but whether you remember or not does not matter.

Assuming this is the reasoning behind your question, the fact that someone may remember even everything from a previous life does not validate that person’s wrong assumption of self and appropriation any more than remembering what happened 10 years or 10 seconds ago would.

Rather than being some sort of universal law that we can “observe” objectively, *anattā*

is something that needs to be *realized* by understanding *dukkha* and becoming fully disenchanted with all existence, and memories from previous lives would allow for exactly that.

People are intoxicated and enamored with this life because they naively but genuinely believe that things will somehow be alright in the end. If they were able to look back at how they thought the same every single time and they *always* ended up being ultimately disappointed and remorseful of all the effort they put into pursuing impermanent things one way or another, with no consolation whatsoever in the end, they would abandon all passion for existence. And that's why in the Suttas, the knowledge of previous lives is a precursor to the final destruction of craving and termination of saṃsāra.

Even in this life, if you reflect carefully you will see that good memories are actually *painful*. It's just that if you have the means to experience the same sense objects again, the momentary pleasure can distract you from the pain of nostalgia, which can never be fully removed.

In other words, by understanding that both remembering and not remembering will inevitably be painful, and that both will make all the pleasures you acquire in this life either useless or direct sources of pain (nostalgia), you would realize that nothing is worth delighting in, and that is closer to *anattā* than any intellectual ideas about the self not remaining the same from life to life that one may have.

Is jhana necessary for enlightenment?

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** None 2025-01-02 04:38:15

I don't even fully understand what jhana is, mostly because of the many contradictory teachings from many different people who all say they know what it is and how to get it. I've sort of decided for a while to just not bother with the whole matter and do my practice. But is jhana a necessary part of the Buddha's instructions for awakening? If I don't know what it is, will whatever it is be cultivated if I'm practicing everything else correctly?

My basic point is - do I need to have this term clearly defined in the correct way, and is jhana a state I need to work towards intentionally, or is it something that will arise naturally by doing other things that support it?

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-02 05:15:50

My basic point is - do I need to have this term clearly defined in the correct way, and is jhana a state I need to work towards intentionally, or is it something that will arise naturally by doing other things that support it?

Unless you've already been leading a lifestyle of virtue (avoiding any verbal or bodily action driven by defilements and not just keeping rules), celibacy, restraining your senses, not tolerating the slightest unskillful thought, and seclusion for a good while and somehow you still haven't attained jhāna, then the answer is the latter. The Buddha always

began his instructions on how to enter jhana not with a special technique for focusing on sensations, but by listing all these things, starting all the way down from virtue.

The contradictory teachings you mention are due to an underemphasis or altogether dismissal of those prerequisites. For someone who does fulfill them, and doesn't get distracted by any of the various views about what jhāna is, withdrawal from unwholesome states will take place regardless of their wishes. And that withdrawal is pleasant and joyful on its own because the hindrances are a burden that is now gone, because they were not acted out of and fueled for long enough. Not because some contrived method of fabricating joy is involved. Each teacher coming up with their own such method and justifications for it and putting that first, giving the prerequisites an honorary mention, if any, is the reason for all the discrepancies.

And yes, jhāna (read: successful abandoning of sensuality and all forms of aversion) is indispensable for enlightenment.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-03 05:03:50 (*in reply to a comment not included*)

And am I correct that you are saying jhana is not a state to be arrived at by putting yourself in a trance through a series of steps in accordance with a technique? Rather jhana is the pleasure that arises when one is sufficiently withdrawn from sensuality because of the intentional act of abandoning it throughout their life, not just temporarily during meditation, while being asleep, or for a period of time on retreat?

Correct.

Does this mean there are non-Buddhist jhanas that Hindu yogis can attain through trance states, but this is something different from what the Buddha called jhana?

Yes. They're such a different thing that arises out of such a different mode of practice (which the Buddha happens to never have talked about) that it's a bit of a stretch to call them jhānas, really. The fact that the people who practice that way are often still engaged in sensuality outside of their meditation points to the fact that it's not the state the Buddha described, on account of which even a puthujjana would go beyond such pleasures.

Does this imply that jhana is a sensual experience too, but just a highly refined sensual experience because it is free from unwholesomeness?

"Sensual experience" and "free from unwholesomeness" going together is a contradiction in terms. One enters jhāna by being completely withdrawn from sensuality, as the Suttas always say.

How would one go about "letting go" of jhana?

By applying the same attitude to it as one did to sensuality and the world in order to enter jhāna.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-03 05:14:55 (in reply to a comment not included)

Then what you are saying is that jhana will not arise for anyone until anagami stage?

Certainly not. Often people struggle to see the middle line we are trying to convey between “jhāna can be attained by anyone and their mother by doing a meditation technique” on one extreme and “jhāna cannot be attained by anyone but an anāgāmi”.

Jhāna is the culmination of building up a momentum of renunciation and disinterest in the world through one’s lifestyle. But that doesn’t mean that the opposite momentum towards sensuality can never return. It will sooner or later, even if only in a next life, unless one develops the insight that destroys the fetters regardless of jhāna.

People who have been well withdrawn from sensuality, company, distractions, and worldly activity for a good while would be able to see that their minds have greater perspective, and are in general less disturbed by things. A lot of people would report that after staying at a monastery for a while. That’s at least a few steps in the direction of jhāna.

But this would soon fade once they return to the world and start breaking precepts again, etc. One would also ironically be prevented from getting to that modicum of proper samādhi even if the external conditions are right when engaging in a meditation technique, since that’s often yet another activity of pursuing pleasure and avoiding pain that takes the place of the external activities that were abandoned. What comes out of that isn’t a truly calm state, but another ecstatic pleasure that tires you out eventually.

Getting up early and napping during the day

Subreddit: r/HillsideHermitage | **Posted by:** Ok-Addition-7759 2025-01-01 21:12:40

So, I get up pretty early and after I eat my meal for the day at 8:00 I’m often useless for the next several hours and struggle to meditate or be mindful. I eat in moderation so that’s not the issue. I have to fiercely fight to stay awake after eating and often can’t sit down for a couple hours after eating or I’ll just go into oblivion. I’m tempted to take naps all the time but it’s really hit or miss if they actually make me function better.

Is it better to just power through and not nap until my mind stops steering to that as an option and gets used to it? (like it does steering to eat more after my meal but before noon since it’s “allowable”)

This sleep stuff really sucks because it feel like my body wants to get up this early, and I’d probably feel gross going back to more sleep at this point. Sometimes it’s like the only time my mind relaxes and the pain in my neck goes away is when it’s time for bed. It’s really frustrating that calm might only come at that time and I have to meditate and live with anxiety and neck pain otherwise. I feel like I’m over determining things but I don’t

know how to stop.

Edit: A few of you mentioned food intolerance and I think that must be it. I think it's my whey protein. I had an inkling that might be an issue for a while but didn't test it out properly. It's that subtle inner feminine voice that I seem to often miss or ignore, and then stumble around this way and that before I finally listen to them to see that once again, they were right. It's a very male thing to prioritize thinking, logic, and prior determinations over intuition.

Comment by Bhikkhu_Anigha on 2025-01-02 05:43:22

If you know you're not tired due to some specific physical reason like recent strenuous activity or some food intolerance, then the problem might be that you're expecting the dull state after the meal not to be there, with the wrong view that "only then" can you practice. That aversion would in turn make the sleepiness worse.

The hindrance of sloth and torpor is not due to the drowsiness after the meal in and of itself, but due to your *ayoniso manasikāra* towards it:

"And what, bhikkhus, is the nutriment for the arising of unarisen sloth and torpor and for the increase and expansion of arisen sloth and torpor? There are, bhikkhus, discontent, lethargy, lazy stretching, drowsiness after meals, sluggishness of mind: frequent *ayoniso manasikāra* to them is the nutriment for the arising of unarisen sloth and torpor and for the increase and expansion of arisen sloth and torpor.

—SN 46.51

