

**CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)**

March 5a, 1982

ALCHEMY; BODHICITTA

with Appendix: 1982 0304-05-06 Partial Transcript.

TOPIC: Alchemy

SUBJECT: Bodhicitta

SUBSUBJECTS: Mentalism, Buddhism, Vedanta, Nous Atom, Mind-Continuum, Astrology, Quintessential Body, Body of Light

CONTENTS:

Knower as participator; the Intelligible World is within us; need to trace knowledge from its origin in the Intelligible to its transposition into the perceived world

Brief review: soul makes living images of the Ideas and uses them to fabricate bodies

Two questions: 1) where to locate the divine fragment radiated from soul in the Intellectual-Principle; 2) is the divine fragment a self-identical entity or a mind-continuum?

First model: Nous atom as self-identical entity; packet/fragment from the Divine inserted into the world; travels through kingdoms of nature; remains self-identical while accumulating experiences; retains continuity through multiple incarnations

Second model: mind-continuum (Buddhist perspective); continuity without substantial identity; like ephemeris showing planetary positions from birth to death; each moment distinct but causally connected to previous moments; consciousness as stream of successive moments; potential gap in Buddhist explanation of continuity between lives

Extended debate on Buddhist perspective and bodhicitta

Buddhist principles prevent positing a self-identical substance

How do Buddhists reconcile bodhicitta with denial of self-identity?; bodhicitta is thought of enlightenment, directing mind-continuum

Both Buddhist and Vedantic perspectives needed for complete understanding; Plotinian tradition incorporates both views; complementarity similar to wave-particle duality in physics

Outward-facing hypostasis: Ideas and their power reduplicated at sensible level as Nous atom and its mind-continuum (transits)

Reality manifests through paradoxical complementary principles; one essence, two persons

Intelligible World projected out through Nous atom becomes perceived world in constant transformation; this is the mind-continuum

Subject (Nous atom) experiences what it projects, extracts meaning from
 projections; no mind-continuum without a subject
 Projection and experience as necessary for self-knowledge
 Distinction between eternal vision and perpetual actualization; reality as both
 Chart as fixed moment indicating soul's evolutionary level; ego as causal body
 Soul's power manifested as nada (wave) and bindu (particle)
 Chart represents a specific Nous atom's projected world; Nous atom itself not
 visible in chart
 Different frameworks yield different understandings of the same reality; the need
 for frameworks to avoid schizophrenia in culture
 Nous atom in body; simultaneity of subtle and gross realms
 Wisdom gained through experiences builds quintessential body; quintessential body
 continues with Nous atom through incarnations
 Next evolutionary step: development of body of light; projection of extracted
 wisdom, mystical experience of lights
 Reference to Plotinus, III.8.6; Sage's use of wisdom body to express himself
 Further evolution beyond man of light
 Shift from Nous projecting through the individual to individual projecting own
 wisdom/quintessential body; becoming a conscious participant; having one's own
 erector set
 Experiences and their meaning must be seen in the context of building the
 quintessential body
 Chart as quintessential body (ether); no fifth element in chart
Appendix: 1982 0304-05-06 Partial Transcript

BOOKS / ARTICLES READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- D.T. Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*
- Raymond Panikkar, "The "Crisis" of Madhyamika and Indian Philosophy Today" in *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 16, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1966)
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)
- V.N. Mansfield, "Alexandria and Copenhagen: A Dialogue Between Plotinus and Werner Heisenberg"

PLOTINUS QUOTES READ OR REFERENCED: I.1.7, III.4.3, III.4.6, III.5, III.8.6, V.1.2, V.1.3, V.1.8

DIAGRAMS referred to (not with this transcript version) [Transcriber note: [diagram] means the speaker is referencing a diagram as he or she is speaking. If someone is drawing or writing, with audible sounds of chalk on a blackboard, I indicate this by [drawing.] or [writing].]

NOTES:

- This is **1982 03/05a, the Alchemy class, and the first entry associated with this date. 1982 03/05b = Soul**, for which we have no audio, just JF notes.

- We have two partial transcripts for this class with identical handwritten AD edits, Scan File 1982 0304 and 05-06 ALC 08R17.PDF and Scan File 1982 0304-05-06 alchemy 10p F10.PDF (both formerly misdated 1982 0305-06-07). Original transcript typed by CdA.
- Scan File 1982 0304-05-06 alchemy 10p F10.PDF has two extra pages at the end of it with student handwriting and diagrams that the other version doesn't have. Both the handwriting and the diagrams do not belong to this class and are not appended here.
- Since the partial is a summary of three days of classes (3/4, 3/5, 3/6), the AD edits don't fit neatly into the body of the verbatim transcripts and are not included there. Instead, I append the full partial with all AD edits to all three transcripts.

TRANSCRIBED Verbatim by IT 2021. In 2025, IT expands Subsubjects and Book List, completes TOC, adds new notes within transcript. **Archival verbatim transcript – V12a.**

AUDIO FILES: 1982 0305a, 1982 0305b. [Note: "Tape" and "Side" refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

1982 03/05a at Wisdom's Goldenrod Alchemy; Bodhicitta

[Audio File 1982 0305a Begins]

AD: --third.

S: [one word inaudible]

S: No.

S: No?

AD: I think that-- I think that if I was to goal direct you-- Is that improper? Goal direct you?

AS: Yeah, right.

S (very faint): Yeah.

AD: The problem would be something like this. [short pause] That if we conceive of the soul as like part of a pileup up of different layers, and then the last of the soul's powers, which is the organized body, and which acts as a medium through which the world becomes apparent and to which it becomes (apparent, then) the problem would be in physics. Because in physics they're becoming more and more convinced that the knower is a participator, not an observer. Observer still smacks of Newtonian (framework), right, whereas a participator says something to the effect, he's doing it. So-- go ahead. If that were so--

S (simultaneously): Could you speak a little louder please?

S: Missed the whole introduction.

LR (simultaneously): It's hard to hear from back here.

AD: Well why don't you *listen* louder?

S: I'm trying to.

AD: Ok. Well-- so if we start with that premise-- (laughter)

S: That's what we missed.

AD: Oh you want me to repeat it?

S (faint): That's what we missed.

RG: Repeat the premise. (bit of laughter)

AD: There's something in us which knows. And somehow it's involved in what it knows. And, what we're trying to do is start from pure cognitive-ness and work our way all the way through the actual act of perception. And, if we take the mentalist point of view that everything is coming from within us, alright, that our participation, or let's say our experience of the world, is primarily a world that we construct and then we participate, we not only participate in it but then we also experience it, then it would seem that we would have to trace the genesis of knowledge through these various layers of the soul

and get back to where it's all coming from. Now of course you remember from Plotinus he said that the Intelligible is within us. [Note: See Plotinus, III.4.3 (last para), III.4.6 (sixth para from end).] The Intelligible World, that is, is within us. Of course, we don't know this until we have mystical experiences where you do see that the whole of the world is within you. Of course within the "you" is to give up a lot of boundaries that you-- or, you know, we put around it. And so, if I wanted to direct-- to goal direct you I would say we've got to figure out how, if the Intelligible World is within us, and it-- and it includes the cognitive faculties even at the lowest level, that is, in the body, you know, senses (included), you have to try to trace one way or the other, either from the top to the bottom or from the bottom to the top, you have to trace that knowledge, see if we can go back to its origin or if we can conceive of the possibility how knowledge which is *within* the Intelligible gets translated or transposed into the perceived world that we have to deal with. I would say that that-- that would be how we have to orientate ourselves. [short pause] Do you follow the point now? [short pause] Well, I guess silence means something but I don't know what.

So-- We have to connect it with what we've been doing. And, what we've been doing is, well quite a-- quite a (mouthful). It's not together, you know. We've been saying that there's a higher soul and an embodied soul, that it has powers. These unem-- unembodied powers are-- get embodied in the second soul. [short pause] And yet there's a hiatus between the first and second soul. Seems to be a separation. [10¾ second pause] But what we did I think up to date, try-- try to review briefly. [short pause]

We conceived of the body of a human being down at the level of the earth element. It was the rupa. [short pause] What the Buddhists call the rupa. And we said that that seemed to be an instantiation of the gnostic functions. [short pause] The gnostic functions themselves seem to be deriving the idea of the forms from above themselves, that would be in the inerratic sphere. The combination or the totality of the living images which are to be found in the lo-- in the soul, these living images were reproductions of the Ideas which are permanent and immutable paradigms but the soul makes living images of these Ideas for itself and then it incorporates these Idea-- these living images. Or let's say, with the use of these living images, it fabricates the human body or any of the species down here below.

It seems that always in our discussion the problem to me-- problem to me is, where do we locate the-- where do we locate that fragment, that divine essence which is radiated from the soul in the Intellectual-Principle. And, the second question related to that is, is that second soul or that divine radiation which we've-- is referred to in various traditions, like in Buddhism bodhicitta, Plotinus refers to it as a light given off by the soul, the soul remains impassive. [Note: See Plotinus, I.1.7.] Is-- the second question would be, is that second-- is that self-identical-- [short pause] Is the germ, is that thought, that divine thought, that fragrant-- fragment from the Divine Mind, when that is radiated out and gets injected or immersed into manifestation, if you remember one of the quotes we said was that it travels through all the kingdoms of Nature until it s-- it succeeds in fashioning a double, a vehicle that the soul in the Intellectual-Principle can use as its reflection. Now the question was, does this remain self-identical with itself? Even if we include the fact that, let's say, the experiences that are left behind as traces in the Nous, let's call it this Nous atom, well alter it or enrich it. That was one way of looking at it and the second way was, if it's not of that kind of stuff, that is that it has some kind of identity, alright, remains self-identical with itself even though it can accumulate. And the other way of looking at it would be for instance the way the Prasangika and Madhyamikas would look at it, and that is to call it a mind-continuum.

AD/S(?) (faint): What's he use?

AD/S(?) (faint): Oh yeah.

AD: Mind-continuum or the word that they would use is bodhimind or thought of enlightenment. If we-- if we think of this here. [drawing] Here is the Sun, cosmic soul or any of the individual soul, and we set it at-- at in-- it had subor-- superordinate to it the Ideas, that these Ideas were-- [short pause while drawing] well, let's say we put the individual over here somewhere [diagram]. Now the other-- the other way of looking at it was something like this. [9¼ second pause while drawing] The other way of looking at it was, every time that the entity is born, alright, if we could think of this [diagram] as coming from this [diagram], the light coming from this, alright, if we imagine Plotinus' notion that the soul radiates from itself this light which combines with the organized body to produce the-- If we think that every time that there is a birth taking place, let's say the same individual, alright, his name is A here, the same soul, and let's say that this is his chart, he has birth and he-- and from the beginning to the end, that is, the-- the mind-continuum just keeps going on experiencing. In other words, what I'm saying is, if you looked at your-- if you looked at the ephemeris from the day you were born till the day you perish or-- and every day that would be like your mind-continuum. It's going on all the time, alright. Person perishes, then is reborn, alright, we'll alter the transits-- [drawing] well, change things around. But, the second birth, alright, will be again this mind-continuum still going around and [drawing] so on, ok. Now that would be another way of regarding this entity, this bodhicitta, in other words--

LC: Are you saying the-- those mind-continuums are all separate from ea-- they're all distinct from each other?

AD: No, there's a continuity going on, there's-- it's a con-- it's a continuous process, it never stops. But there are moments that, [LC simultaneously: There are breaks when you perish and then you're born that--] you know, you say the person-- yeah, that there seems to be breaks. [student assents, faint] There seems to be breaks. Person dies, reborn.

LC (simultaneously): But it's the same continuum.

AD: It's the same mind-continuum. According to this theory then it would be possible for instance to look up your previous incarnation, now go back to the ephemeris and try to figure out who you were before and see what your mind-continuum was like in the past and then go back before that. It's a theoretical possibility.

CDA: I don't see the difference between [LC simultaneously: Yeah that's right.] the two that you're saying. I don't.

LC (simultaneously): I don't see the difference between that and the one before [AD simultaneously: Ok.] which you said was another way of looking at the soul.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah. Now, the other way was, um, put-- The first way we said was, if we think of this light, it's like a one packet deal, alright, [AD hits board with chalk] is inserted into the world, ok. And this bodhicitta, let's imagine a tiny minute little germ, you know, Nous atom. Nous atom would mean that it's-- it belongs to the Nous. It comes from the Nous. So therefore it's imperishable. And then we could imagine it going through all the kingdoms of Nature, growing, evolving, alright. And that would be one way of looking at it. The other way I said was that, if we imagine this here as the mind-continuum

[diagram], alright, then you're not called upon to conceive of a bit of stuff from the Nous projected, thrown into the universe and it has a continuous-- an identical and continuous flow. This here is just a continuity without identity. In other words, as these aspects are going on, person perishes--

LC: It only continues with itself but it doesn't necessarily link it to-- the--

AD: Over here [diagram], the germ--

LC (simultaneously): The Nous atom is-- is a-- is from the Nous.

AD: Yeah. So the Nous atom let's say [drawing/writing] would be-- would have identity--

VM: Substantial identity.

AD: Substantial identity [VM: And the other's functional identity.] and continuity. Because it *will* be going through experiences and *will* be going through the entirety of the kingdoms of Nature.

LC: Right.

AD: Ok? But this one here [diagram], if we took the Buddhist position that there is this constant moment-by-moment continuity of the mind, so that they would refer to it as a mind-continuum, alright. But there is no substantial identity. There's only this flow, this light, alright, which every instant in time as these are making aspects, there's a continuum of mind, thoughts are being constantly-- both gnostic and fabricative, they're both creating and knowing.

LC: But they do-- it is identical with itself though, I mean--

AD: How could it be? The next moment this-- [LC: Because--] these have changed.

LC: Because you've been able to say life A, life B, life C, life D, and call that [student assents, faint] all [AD simultaneously: Yeah but you see, this would be--] part of the same continuum.

AD: Yeah. There's two [LC simultaneously: So--] ways of looking at this. This will be a continuity without self-identity [diagram].

LC: I don't even know what that means.

AD: Well A is not B, [LC simultaneously: Right.] [couple words inaudible] not C, ok.

LC (simultaneously): Right. But yet you're leaving them(--/.)

AD (simultaneously): On the other hand if we think of the Nous atom, alright, it would be like underlying all the time [drawing] all of these experiences, regardless of how we look at it. So in other words, the Nous atom in incarnation A would, let's say, extract certain experiences, alright, in incarnation B the same, C and D. But there will be this self-identical entity which would be extracting the experiences from-- from the various lives, alright, and assimilating them, bringing it into itself.

LC: Ok.

AD: The o-- [LC simultaneously: In other words, saying that you know.] now the other one-- the other one is different, in this way, that if we think of this life, alright, there's a continuity of thoughts, one after

the other follows. The thought before has some effect on the thought that follows insofar that it seems from our point of view to affect or to modify it, alright, so that you have this snowballing effect. But there there will be continuity, no identity [diagram]. Over here there will be identity *and* continuity [diagram], alright. But between these two, I would say the continuity seems to be broken. Between two lives, the continuity seems to be broken.

AH: In which case Anthony?

S: In the Buddhist.

AD: Where you have-- in the Buddhist situation where you have the-- you have a natal chart A in this life and then next life you have natal chart B. And between one life and another there is a break even if it's only for seven days. [AH simultaneously, faint: So--] According to the Buddhists, you know, you get seven days or 49 days and you gotta come back.

AH (faint): Certainly don't want to deny that, Buddhist or otherwise, would we?

AD: Yeah.

AH: I mean would anyone deny it?

AD: I would deny it. [AH simultaneously, faint: You do?] I want two hundred years off.

AH: You would deny that there-- [VM simultaneously: Yeah.] that there is a break. (bit of laughter)

AD: Huh?

AH: You would deny that there's a break from one life to the next?

AD: I think the Buddhists-- I think the Buddhists would say that there *is* a break, and that is that death ends one life, another will begin.

AH: Who would say otherwise?

AD: Well, in this-- in this example here [diagram], the death-- there couldn't be a death to this Nous atom. [AH simultaneously: The Buddhists--] Whereas there-- whereas there is an actual break over here [diagram]. I'm--

AH (simultaneously, faint): Buddhists say there's a break but I don't think they speak of the death of the bodhicitta.

AD: I'm sorry?

AH: I don't want to get into the position of defending the Buddhists.

AD: Well alright, well we-- we're just having a pleasant conversation.

S (simultaneously, faint): See you later. (some laughter)

AH: You say there's a break. Certainly there's a break from one life to the next.

AD: Yeah.

AH: But there's continuity in that bodhicitta.

AD: Well, the point is, in the Mahayana tradition, what do they mean by bodhicitta?

AH: It's defined in very fluid and panoramic way. And it's spoken of in the-- in terms of the individual life in a specific sense, it's spoken of in a very universal sense. The definitions of it is a all-encompassing one.

[short pause]

AD: (Go ahead.)

S: Is it the soul?

S (faint): (No/Uh-hm).

AH: It is that, yeah. Among other things. Or it's certainly of an aspect of soul (now).

AD: The way I-- the way I understand it, basically the-- in the Buddhist tradition, there will just be this continuity of thoughts, one following upon another. And there may be varying intervals between, let's say, one set of thoughts and another. And they refer to that as a mind-continuum. And, if I remember right, the interpretation of bodhicitta is a little different, they say that you take the vows to become a Bodhisattva so that you could give a direction to this thought, this thought of enlightenment, and from then on, alright, you start piling up a certain amount of merit. In other words, you're starting to direct the mind stream towards a certain direction. I don't remember them speaking about a self-identical-- [short pause] self-identical entity.

AH: The bodhicitta forever remains itself--that aspect of its definition?

S (very faint): Yeah.

AD: Well, tell me what you're referring to, I mean, what quote though, from where?

AH (faint): I don't have a specific source, it's not--

AD: Well then, when someone says continuum, what does that suggest to you? Mind-continuum.

S (very faint): It seems--

AH (faint): Mind-continuum and the bodhicitta are two different things.

AD: Tell me the difference.

AH (faint): Mind-continuum is like we speak of existence I think in terms of eddies or currents of-- of energy, or last night we talked about will seeds. My--

AD: That's a Vedantic notion, (willing/will--) [AH/S(?): Well--] seeds of willing.

AH: It's like a-- a potential or a-- an eddy of energy.

AD (very faint): (Well/No) start again from--

AH (faint): It's like a certain momentum, (pick up) desire (thirst).

LC: What would be--

AH (faint): And then bodhicitta-- you got substance or bodhicitta (has/as) something different, is somehow *involved* in that. [student assents, very faint] But it's not it. It's that which [couple words inaudible] seems to be *extracted* from-- I mean that was the way I understood the general notion of bodhicitta.

AD: Then you're postulating or you say that they're talking about two things.

AH (very faint): Yeah.

AD: You're talking about bodhicitta which, let's say, is the self-identical fragment from the Dharmakaya.

AH: And it may take several--

AD: And then you're talking about mind-continuum.

AH: Yeah. And it may take many incarnations of that mind-continuum in order to generate the thought of enlightenment, which would be the bodhicitta as manifest in that continuum.

AD: Which would be--

AH: Bodhicitta as manifest in that mind-continuum would be that thought of enlightenment.

AD: How would you bring these two together, mind-continuum and the bodhicitta?

AH (faint): Mind.

[short pause]

AD (faint): Go ahead.

S (very faint): (No but, if) the Buddhists think--

AD: If [one/two words inaudible]

AH (simultaneously): You could also speak of that as the semen.

AD: And that I understand even less. [short pause] So, you're going to have to elaborate.

AH: But I'm not prepared to elaborate much beyond that.

AD: How about you Avery? Anyone know how they speak about it?

AS: Well, I just remember the claims of how they speak about it. I mean (even though/I don't know) what they actually-- And I think we just-- I heard several people claiming [one/two words inaudible] but can't back it up. Similar to the way Andrew speaks of the-- the bodhi-- it's just saying that the bodhicitta is placed in the Mahayana view or the Madhyamika view, I don't know, that the bodhicitta is something distinct from the mind stream, well, what we normally call the-- the mind-continuum. You know, you had the subject series and object series but that both of these are distinct from what you call this bodhicitta, which I thought we talked about as a fragment from-- but we-- in *our* terminology a fragment of the first soul but in their terminology would be-- they do speak about a subjective wisdom-consciousness,

Dharmakaya, and I thought in-- in the-- at least Madhyamika presentation of-- that's given, that they speak about this as distinct from the mind-continuum. I don't see what the problem is with distinguishing-- distinguishing mind-continuum *from* the bodhicitta.

AH: If you look at it as Avery suggested, that subjective wisdom-consciousness that would become that-- that-- [AS, faint: Or--] that cognitive principle in the mind stream.

S (very faint): Yeah.

AS: We had some quotes from the-- we did have a few quotes.

AD: Yeah, one of them was Suzuki. [Note: See D.T. Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*. See also WG Class 1982 0103.]

AH: The one from Suzuki was good, recently. I didn't remember the book.

AD: We still have a problem connecting bodhicitta and the mind-continuum.

AS: Well, Anthony, [AD simultaneously: If he--] actually though I thought that's what we were-- one of the things we've been working on all along. Like even in the alchemy, we distinguished carefully between these-- say the three levels of Mercurius or the body, soul, and then the intellect, which are all part of the manifested cosmos. We distinguish between that and the-- [AD, faint: Didn't you recite the--] and this-- the light of the soul. Now maybe-- are you saying the problem is in the Buddhist tradition distinguishing them?

AD: I'm sorry I-- you have to repeat.

AS: Ok. I mean, from other points of view it seems that-- if you're talking about this Nous atom or this light of the soul, we do somehow speak about it being associated with all these vehicles. And at least one of the Platonic views says that when the soul first enters the cosmos it's associated with this heavenly vehicle. And, it just provides the content-- that right there you have the continuum, the con-- the con-- continuity from life to life as it were in terms of these vehicles just provided by this first vehicle of the soul, whereas the permanent identity is more like the soul itself, the light of the soul itself.

CDA: Why was--

S (faint): Yeah.

LDS: So-- so that--

AD: Go ahead, (Lou/Louis).

LDS: So that, it seems that in the West there's no problem or in the Platonic tradition this Nous atom or this ontic self-identical individual or unit soul does get somehow associated with vehicles and so on. But in the Buddhist tradition I-- if I'm picking up on the problem that you're bringing up Anthony, it seems that they're bringing in something like this bodhicitta but then at the same time disclaiming any kind of self-identical substance or any true unit soul. So they have the problem of speaking of something in a way of a spiritual principle and yet denying its--

AD: Self-identity.

LDS: Self-identity in terms of substance.

AH: They deny it insofar as it's not to be involved in that mind stream, *by* the mind stream. It's like--

LDS: No. I follow that Andrew but the problem I think is, don't they deny any-- any soul, any-- any true or lasting individual?

DB: Well wouldn't this-- wouldn't this refer to that discussion that Dickie had up in Toronto where it was spoken of Buddhahood as the eternal possibility? And that-- that that eternal possibility would refer to this unit, [student assents, very faint] or this life?

LDS: Yeah I think what you're bringing up David is the fact that the Buddhists don't want to speak from an ontological perspective, that they want to speak in a-- in a phylogenetic fashion. So they are, by that-- by necessity they are forced to speak in terms of something coming to birth, something developing. But--

S: I think this can't wait.

AD (simultaneously): (Go ahead Avery.) Go ahead.

AS: I don't-- I don't quite follow the-- Well maybe I try and rephrase it some other way.

AD (simultaneously): Well he-- he's-- he's nailing it. According to Buddhist principles you cannot have a self-identical substance.

AS: Right, but I didn't think that was the problem that you were bringing up. [AD simultaneously: Well-- well--] Is it the problem just with the Buddhism or with the--

AD (simultaneously): Well, in terms of Buddhism [couple words inaudible]

AS (simultaneously): I understand the problem in terms of Buddhism. I'm sorry.

AD: If you can't have a self-identical substance which retains its identity, and it must be of an-- of the nature of incessant, you know, becoming, then it certainly can't be this germ or fragment from the divine Dharmakaya-- [AS: Right.] Dharmakaya.

AS: Yeah, I follow(ed) that.

AH (simultaneously): Well, we said the bodhicitta [AS simultaneously: But we--] is evolving [one/two words inaudible]

AD: I'm sorry?

AH (faint): No I don't think the Buddhists say that the principle is involved in becoming. Becoming is that--

AD: But their principles forbid them to have anything that's self-identical with itself! We may take that liberty when we're discussing them. But by definition, it's not possible.

LC/S(?): But why can't we just--

AH (simultaneously): Do you want-- do you want to get into that, Anthony?

AD: Sure.

AH/S(?): The reason--

AD: I'm not going sailing for a while. Sure get into it.

RG (simultaneously): Right (but--)

S: Sure.

AH: I was just asking, is that your intention or--

AD: No, that's not my intention but I like to get it out of the way one way or another. Either they say everything is an incessant becoming or it isn't.

AH: Well Louis was on the point when you were talking about the position that they take in terms of logic.

AD: I'm sorry?

AH: Louis's point is the-- is I think the explanation, they have a metaphysical or a logical scheme (that--)

AD (simultaneously): Well then, that's why, that's why I made the remark that the second point of view, this here [diagram], alright, would be the Buddhist position where there's this constant motion going on in the planetary spheres. There's no-- no-- there's no stopping, alright, the-- it's constantly going on. And you could imagine that you have $n+1$ number of transits and then your life is over, alright, and you start again, alright, and that would be mind-continuum. I see no self-identical substance there. I only [AD hitting board] see the waves of becoming.

AH: How-- how shall we see it, as a metaphysical abstraction? As part of a system of metaphysics, or shall we see it existentially in our-- in our experience? Like I think they're pointing toward an existential position, (so this/says) germ of enlightenment within the mind-stream. But they're not going to label it or-- or give us a way of speaking of it in terms of their logic. They don't deny the subjective wisdom-consciousness. But that's always spoken of experientially, from the context of being outside of that individual mind stream.

AD: Wait Andrew, I'm lost. Start again. (AD laughs a bit)

AH (faint): It seems--

AD: I'm saying here that all we had the right to consider as a Buddhist standpoint is the continuity of these thoughts, one following upon the other incessantly. And that if there *is*-- if there is this continuity, we would have to find within that continuity the bodhicitta. It would not be self-identical but it will be an ever-becoming. [students assent, faint] And the other pro-- the-- the other thing in opposition was this here, the Nous atom which is a fragrant-- fragment from the Divine, goes through the process. It is-- [AD indicating on board] it remains identical with itself, this Nous atom that belongs to A is never going to be these [diagram], alright.

AH: Let me just summarize what I was trying to say. The two stances, two positions are coming from a completely different perspective. So, the-- the conflict is one of a metaphysical view as opposed to an existential view. And, you know, insofar as that is true, I think both positions are correct.

AD: I don't know what position is correct. I'm not even interested in that, I'm only interested in understanding what they're saying. Right or wrong is the last and the furthest thing from my mind.

AH: Well they would go-- they would take you through the, you know--

AD (simultaneously): I'm just trying to symbolize it in my own understanding what do they mean when they speak about the bodhicitta. And in terms of the principles that they operate with, they're prevented from ins-- you know, having any self-identical thing.

AH: If you wanted to have-- if you want to have a principle that's self-identical, then (he/it) would take you through the analysis, you know, the Madhyamika analysis [one word inaudible]

AD: Yeah, which would prevent you from having such a thing.

AH: You can't find it, yes.

AD: You can't find it!

AH (faint): You can't find it.

AD: Not only you can't find it, you can't even talk about it. And they never speak about self-identity, they always speak about things as functional. They always speak about them as incessantly becoming.

AH: But they do speak about a path and the fruits of the path.

AD: Yeah, but it's always something going along, you know, moving on.

AH (faint): I see.

AD: I'm not saying this is wrong, I'm just-- This *is* a possible way of conceiving what they're talking about as the mind-continuum.

AH: See, their-- I think their intention or that general intention of that view was-- is to *stop* that mind's functioning.

AD: No, I thought that the general intent of their purpose was to give that mind functioning a direction. So that all the transits, alright, all the experiences in other words that a person goes through, are now organized and directed towards the goal of achieving Bodhisattvahood. This is not going to stop, it's going to go on. It can go on in terms of being a samsaric entity, you know, you-- you're involved in samsara. Or you're gonna-- you're going to direct your activities and your experiences and the understanding of your experiences to achieve Bodhisattvahood. So it's a perfectly legitimate way of looking at it. Like this light continual-- continuously, alright, from moment to moment, alright, is being inserted into this process, alright, into this world-process, and that this moment by moment, the light, you know, shooting out--light is quanta, light is granular in structure--so moment by moment it's shooting out, [AD tapping on board] and it is one entity, alright, in the sense that it's one mind stream and not another

mind stream. And the continuity, this continuity, is what we may refer to as what they are calling bodhicitta.

AH: Continuity of the mind stream.

AD: Of the mind stream. Like tomorrow I look, got Saturn Moon, I'm going to be depressed and the next day I'm going to have Mars on Jupiter I'm going to be inflated. So here's one thought after another, alright, and let's say we correlate them with these aspects, then this is the mind stream that I'm talking about. This is the mind-continuum.

AH: And you're-- I think you're asking, how is it possible to distinguish bodhicitta from that mind stream.

S: (No.)

AS: I see, this--

AD (simultaneously): No.

AS: He'd be saying that *is* the bodhicitta.

AD (simultaneously): That *is* the bodhicitta!

AS (faint): I get what he's saying.

AD: That *is* the bodhicitta!

AH (faint): And what did I [one word inaudible]

AS (simultaneously, faint): I see.

AD: Alright, you try Avery.

AS: No I-- it's actually-- [AH simultaneously, faint: It's the bodhicitta.] I-- I misunderstood before, you're not-- you're-- Yeah. That *is* the-- he's saying that *is* their view.

AD: Yeah, I'm saying [AS simultaneously: That's all.] that's their view, and in contrast to that [AS simultaneously: Is the other view.] we took the other view [AS simultaneously: Yeah.] where you have the Nous atom descend into [AS simultaneously: I see.] manifestation, go up through all the kingdoms of Nature, and in that process, alright, the Nous atom always remains the Nous atom. [AS: Right.] A Nous atom remains a Nous atom, alright. [AS: Right.] It will assimilate all the experiences. Let's say it's inserted in body after body, and the experiences that it gets from that body it assimilates and it becomes part of its content. But it always remains [AS simultaneously: Remains that, sure.] that Nous atom and not another.

AS: I-- [AH simultaneously, faint: So you speak of--] I thought the-- I thought you were asking the question of how to put them together 'cause they seem to be ver-- e-- maybe not easy, but they seem to go together very well as complementary viewpoints. In fact it seems you would have to take both of these viewpoints together. But I-- that wasn't your question, you were just asking I think [AD simultaneously: I--] how would the Buddhists speak of it.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, I-- I-- I would agree with you, [AS simultaneously: I see, I misunderstood what you were saying.] alright, and I would say-- I would say it seems that these two points have to be taken together [AS: Yeah.] in order to come up with a consistent [AS simultaneously: A total--] doctrine, yeah. And in that paper that nobody, you know, really wanted to get into, you remember “The “Crisis” of Madhyamika and Philosophy”? [Note: “The “Crisis” of Madhyamika and Indian Philosophy Today” by Raymond Panikkar in *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 16, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1966), pp. 117-131, University of Hawai’i Press.]

AS (simultaneously): Yeah. Oh I-- he brought--

AD (simultaneously): Well he makes the [AS simultaneously: Exactly.] point, *exactly* that [AS simultaneously: No I thought that was a good point.] point, that the Buddhists and the Vedantists better get their heads together, because you either take one side of the fence or the other and they don’t want to see that it’s both!

AS: Right, that was exactly his point too, he was making the point in philosophy that I think is the same one as Vic was bringing out in the modern physics. You have to take this complementarity point of view in the philosophy as well. So in fact I-- that’s probably a good analogy of wave and the particle.

AD: Follow the argument here? Wait a minute, wait a minute Andrew, let’s get some of the others involved.

RC (faint): I have a problem with seeing that, in the example you gave, that-- what the continuity is between those two, why it isn’t broken.

AS: See--

AD (simultaneously): It’s not broken because you would exist in the subtle realm being-- having a-- having [AS assents] experiences without a body, alright. They refer to it as the gandharva entity, the subtle entity that goes on until it reincarnates again, and the experiences are con-- continuing. But in the case of-- in the case of the-- you know, when the person passes on and perishes, he’s not plugged into let’s say that world-system. He’s-- he’s living more in his own subjectivity. Whereas when he’s in a body, alright, then he’s plugged into that world-system and he has to receive-- the input is coming from that world-system. And all the time, remember in the back of my mind, in the back of your mind should be the fact that all this could be internal. [students assent, faint] I mean I’m speaking of it in this objective [AS simultaneously: Right.] way so you can follow me. [AS simultaneously: But internal’s a lot.] But this whole thing is internal to the soul.

AS: Oh but wait.

AD: If I would have told you-- if I were to tell you the zodiac and the inerratic sphere and the planetary is all within you, alright, this-- [AS: But--] this thing [diagram] would be useless.

AS: But-- but then-- if you do that then-- then there’s a problem though. I can’t re-- If you say this is all within you, in the Buddhist point of view even, it’s within--

AD (simultaneously): No.

AS: See then I can-- in-- within *who*?

AD (simultaneously): No, it's only from the mentalistic point of view, [AS simultaneously: Yeah.] which would not be the Madhyamika point of view.

AS: Yeah because then you have to posit that there *is* a self-identical subject within which it is.

AD (simultaneously): That's why I'm not doing it, Avery, that's why I'm not doing it.

AS: Yeah. But there's one other--

AD (simultaneously): I can only hold with the Yogacara school.

AS: There's only-- there's one other problem though I have with the Buddhist point of view which is ali-- in line with what Dickie had asked at that time. How do you speak about something which *is* a continuity and is ins-- even if it's con-- continuous, it's still instantaneous as it were. It's-- it's not a self-identity. How do you speak about something which is this continuum becoming this permanent principle of Buddhahood? I mean is it-- how do they speak of the goal then?

AH: They say that this thought of enlightenment that has to be generated--

AS (simultaneously): Does it become--

AH: Do you want me to answer that?

AS (simultaneously): Yeah. (Focus on--)

AH: (You want me to answer) the question or what? The thought of enlightenment is-- is a s--

AD (simultaneously): The way to look at that Avery will be a-- [one/two inaudible student words] that would be the [AS simultaneously: Well actually--] ultimate outcome of directing-- of directing the mind-continuum to achieve that possibility of Buddhahood. But Buddhahood, in their terminology, you know, wouldn't necessarily have to be a self-identical thing. It won't-- it won't-- in other words, Buddhahood would be-- would be a stage where the entire world-process is comprised within that mind-continuum.

AH: Anthony?

AD: So I don't have to-- they don't have to give up their point of view.

AS: No. I was wondering what they would conceive it.

S: (That's true.)

AH (simultaneously): They speak of that thought of enlightenment also as the thought, in the Madhyamika tradition, is leave cyclic existence. That's a thought that's different than all other thoughts.

AD: I'm sorry?

AH: See, this mind stream is cyclic existence. Somehow the bodhicitta is immersed in it. It says-- in the Madhyamika tradition that necessity of generating the thought to *leave* cyclic existence--that's the thought of enlightenment. The thought of enlightenment and the thought to leave cyclic existence are the same. And that thought is different than all other thoughts in the individual mind stream.

AD: Yeah but that's not disagreeing with what I'm saying. That thought, alright, it's an ongoing process. It's not something that is self-identical with itself. The thoughts that you have for instance on becoming a Bodhisattva today will not be what you have tomorrow. So the bodhicitta directed or goal-orientated towards achieving Buddhahood is not a static self-identical thing, it-- it is an ongoing process. When they say you-- you have to think of the bodhicitta as the vow or the thought or the germ of enlightenment, you have to understand by the very nature of what they're saying, germ of enlightenment, that means it's going to fulfill itself. That means it's an ongoing process. There's no *finis* to it.

AH: But isn't that thought, that thought of enlightenment or the thought to leave cyclic existence, different than all other thoughts? Like it represents a--

AD: Every thought is different from every other thought.

AH: No, let's say-- thoughts are similar insofar as they're thoughts. [AD: Uh-hm.] But there's a particular thought that has to be generated in order-- in order to begin this process where that-- there's a conscious discipline. They say I have-- you have to have two things, correct view of emptiness and to generate the thought to leave cyclic existence. I mean that (would) be their definition of the path.

AD: Yes, but that doesn't-- that doesn't deny what I just said.

AH: Well then all--

AD: It's still-- it's still not a static thing, it's an ongoing process which has-- has a goal and an ongoing process. It isn't that you reach a goal and you become corporealized in-- into this-- into a stone-like Buddha. It's an ongoing process. The thought of enlightenment never ends. So it's part of the mind-continuum. It is in a sense one way of taking a hold of the mind and saying, well instead of being preoccupied with samsaric existence, you're going to be preoccupied with nirvanic existence.

AH: But doesn't that represent kind of a turnabout for that life?

AD: That doesn't matter. You see, that's not the point I'm discussing.

AH: Well insofar as it is a turning--

AD: It's like here's water coming down here, ok. It's rolling down, a river is rolling down, and I change the banks and I say I want it to go over there into the ocean. That's-- that's the thought of enlightenment. This here, it just goes into this pool over here, this swamp.

AH: I was trying to speak of that thought, that particular thought, as being a manifestation in the mind stream of a principle that *is* self-inherent.

AD: Can't. Can't allow it. Not in Buddhism. You're trying to say that there is a self-identical element in-- in the thought of-- you know, or the germ of enlightenment which is always self-identical with itself.

AH: 'Cause this mind stream is change, defined as change, perpetual ongoing change(s). And it's going to have this notion of nirodha or stopping. That's the meaning of cyclic existence.

AD: Yes.

AH: And, isn't that a way of speaking about something other than change?

[17¾ second pause]

AD: I don't think so. I don't think so. Because then what you're telling me is that the process comes to an end.

AH: Has no beginning but it has an end.

AD: No end. There's no end to this. Unless you-- unless you're going to say that a final absorption takes place or a final annihilation takes place. Which I wouldn't accept.

AH: But if it does [one/two words inaudible]

AD: Their own premises.

AH: What is Buddhahood?

[short pause]

AD: What *is* Buddhahood? I just mentioned to you. The Buddha, or Buddhahood, is the possibility of including or incorporating the entirety of knowledge that's in that circle, in those circles [diagram], in the whole of the planetary spheres.

AH (faint): Yeah.

AD: That's the way *I* conceive Buddhahood.

DB: Could it-- could it be spoken of in-- like in a sense that we speak of this fragment of-- of life which goes through these various stages, and until it's reached a level of-- until it's reached a level where it can mirror perfectly the contents of the soul (that) remains in the Nous, it's not-- it's not a self-- it's not self-identical--

AD (simultaneously): It's not self-directed.

DB: Well-- no, it's-- well it's not self-directed but it's also involved in a series of fluctuating thoughts.

AD: Look, again, the same problem, huh?

DB: (Well--/Alright.)

AD: We say that from the beginning of time, alright, this x entity goes through a certain development. It reaches a certain point when it could consciously direct and goal-orientate itself towards a state of Buddhahood rather than continuing in the ways of Nature.

DB: Yes.

AD: Alright. Now, the problem here would be again the same thing.

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1982 0305a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

AD: --exit, alright. There in the Plotinian tradition, both views are combined. Now down here at this level, we could say-- now I'm just speculating, we could say there *is* something called a bodhicitta, a germ, a fragment from-- of the divine substance which comes from the Nous and is inserted into the

world, and then what it experiences, let's say insofar that it gets embodied in bodies, it experiencing-- it is experiencing the transits as a mi-- its mind-continuum. And again, the combination of the two not only brings about interesting results but seems to be a workable thesis, whereas the other one, it's either one or the other and I-- if it's either one or the other, I can't move. If that's just the mind, alright, then there's no one there having any experience, there's no subject. Go ahead.

AH: Could I see if I understand what you're saying by pursuing Linda's point a little. Ok. In the Vedantic argument, in-- they will find this self-identical substance in experience, they say it's capable of immediate perceptual use but can't be objectified.

VM: So it's not findable.

AH: No they say--

RG: That doesn't mean it isn't in experience, Andrew.

AH: No, I'm saying the Vedantists say it *is* there. And they have a logic to prove that. The Buddhists are going to come to quite different conclusion. They do an analysis of experience, they can't find that. They can't find that self-identical substance in the Buddhist analysis. So there's the disparity between Vedantism and Buddhism.

S: See Andrew just--

AH: Now, you're suggesting that the view that you're presenting somehow combines those two positions in a unified view.

AD: Uh-hm. I'm going even further than that. I'm saying that in the empirical sensible world, there is that process which is in the Intellectual-Principle being reduplicated here in a sensible way.

VM (faint): Can you expand on-on that?

AD: In the same-- I just told you before Vic, if we think of the Intellectual-Principle, we know that the Intelligibles there have an eternally authentic existent. Does that mean they're motionless like stones sitting in a corner? No. They're eternally and authentically existent, but they are also, because of the very power that they embody, radiating out from themselves, alright, a kind of activity, and he referred to that as an eternal or as an ex--

VM (faint): Outward-facing hypostasis.

AD: An outward-facing hypostasis. Ok. And I'm saying that that process is going to be pictured down here.

VM (faint): That's right.

TS (faint): So you were saying that the soul has an outward-facing hypostasis of itself which would be that-- that light of the soul. And, [AD: That--] that light is unfolding something from within the soul through a series of-- of lives, which lives are independently representative of this mind-continuum.

AD: Yeah. And that will be the outward-facing hypostasis of the Nous atom down here.

TS (faint): So then the question becomes how do you see that-- that outward-facing hypostasis integrated into or indicated in a life.

AD: That's a problem all by itself. And I don't think we can do it in five minutes. Maybe after five seminars.

CDA: Would you mind repeating that, Tim, so we get it?

AD: The mind-continuum of the Nous atom is those transits that are going on all the time.

CDA (simultaneously): And this is the outward-facing hypostasis of the bodhicitta.

AD (simultaneously): That's its outward-facing hypostasis, yeah.

AD/S(?) (faint): Andrew?

LDS: Yeah, and that--

RC (simultaneously, faint): PB said it was the bodhicitta.

AS (faint): No but he said.

CDA: (Right.)

TS/AD(?) (faint): (Will remain.)

AD: Sure. That's the track I'm following to hope-- to come to some kind of understanding of the chart all the ways down to the empirical level.

LDS: But wouldn't you say like that's pretty much the Buddhist emphasis is that image, or that outward-facing hypostasis of the soul is what they want to restrict themselves to when they speak of this bodhicitta. And, in that sense they're not--

AD: Yes.

LDS: See--

AD: But the Vedantists do the same things, they want to restrict themselves, as far as the subject is concerned, to the Nous atom.

LDS: Yeah, to the Nous atom but not the image of the Nous atom.

AD (faint): I don't know what you mean.

LDS (simultaneously): No. Let me say it again. It seems that the Buddhists are speaking more of the image of the soul or the outward-facing hypostasis of the soul and not regarding the soul in itself. And it seems that the Vedantists want to emphasize the true Atman, the true unit soul in the Intellectual-Principle. Does that make sense? So that in this-- the image of the soul *can* be spoken of as going through some kind of development because a true-- it isn't truly a self-identical principle as an image.

AD: Try again Louis, we're lost.

LDS: Um-- Well I try to make sense of the-- the last (weekend) of this discussion and that is, that if we speak of a-- of the soul as a truly existent principle, then it must have an outward-facing hypostasis.

AD (faint): Uh-hm.

LDS: And it seems that the Buddhists are emphasizing and regarding that aspect of this spiritual principle as what they're going to talk about as the bodhicitta, you know, the truly spiritual principle that the individual has to come-- come in contact with or bring up. In that sense, it doesn't have to have a self-identical nature because it is an image of-- of the soul. And yet it does have some spiritual significance or nature because it is-- even though they're not going to speak of it as an image of this unit soul.

AD: Well you-- what you're saying is that the mind-continuum which is presented by the planetary grid is the outward-facing hypostasis of what they might call their wisdom-consciousness.

LDS: Yeah.

AD (faint): Yeah.

LDS: Yeah.

AH (faint): (What's the goal?)

RG: But you know, again, again, [S simultaneously, faint: So this--] that kind of-- that kind of thinking about it--

S (simultaneously): Doesn't make sense.

RG: Well I think so, because you've again taken-- taken the Vedantic side there, and it seems that-- and if you go to the ontology of it, that within the Intellectual-Principle we have-- there are both positions on an equal level, I mean the categories of Being include both the identity of the Vedantist and the motion of the Buddhist, this-- the-- the sameness and the-- and the difference of the rest and the motion. And therefore within the soul itself we should be able to analyze both positions, not-- not from a manifestation of one but from a-- a penetration of the soul itself. And to see one as an emanation of the other doesn't--

VM (faint): Do justice.

RG: Seem-- do justice to-- to one-- to the one side or the other.

AD: Well, yes, especially then, and especially that to me it's been axiomatic that reality reveals itself through these paradoxical complementaries. And that if I were to take one side I would be, you know, blinding-- blinding myself.

RG: But the-- but the phra-- but the-- the conceptualization of the-- of this discussion in terms of the soul and emanation of soul, to say soul is the Vedantic and emanation of is the Buddhist seems to be, again, the analysis of the positions at different levels rather than at the same level, trying to use the categories of Being say that-- that would justify each position at the same ontological level, whether it be at soul or at Nous.

AD: Well, again, we could even go and elaborate it this way. One could take the position, when they're speaking about the Ideas, that they're self-identical. But to speak about the Ideas as being

paradigmatically an Intellectual and self-identical and immutable and not to speak about the power that they emanate is to not understand the Ideas. To speak about the Ideas as just power which is emanated and not understand the Intellectual paradigm again is to abuse the understanding and say that it's only the power of the Ideas that's operative and the Idea is meaningless.

RG (faint): Uh-hm.

AD: And I don't think we can get away from the fact that every time we're confronting with reality it always has this paradoxical nature acting in terms of complementarism, whether we think of substance and function, whether we think of passive and active perfection. Any time we're confronted, there's always the-- a pair confronting us.

RG: Uh-hm.

AD: And, I think, I think to-- you know, in terms of what we're talking about now, I think it's wise that we make these things very clear so that, if by implication that-- if-- if let's say the Buddhists are speaking about this a mind-continuum, alright, and they refuse to s-- to bring about this notion of a Nous atom, alright--

VM (faint): [couple words inaudible] later.

AD: Or vice versa, if the Buddhists-- the Vedantists speak about the true subject, this is, you know, the prajna consciousness [diagram] which has to reach to the substratum of the object-consciousness to know that object, if you take this point of view, I think you'll see sooner or later it's just like trying to walk on one leg, you can't walk very far. The inner inconsistencies and contradictions just tear it down. And this is-- this is why that article I thought was quite good when they spoke about this crisis in Eastern philosophy. And it is a crisis because they've been doing-- they've been carrying on this for two thousand years. And I don't think there's any peace treaty in sight.

JC: Anthony, what would be the contradiction in saying that the-- what you're calling the bodhicitta is something that is momentary as a outward-facing hypostasis of the soul whose function is temporal? That the soul does function to establish the temporal order in its very moment-by-moment activity. What would be wrong with saying the bodhicitta *is* that outflow *of* the soul in this momentary fashion? The soul is what is the substance. The continuum of the *identical* substance belongs to the soul. But, its outflow *is* momentary and that's what--

AD (simultaneously): Listen. But now--

JC: I mean-- one more thing. On the level of ontology I could see motion and rest have equal status. But I don't see that that-- that necessarily holds in-- in terms of manifestation, that substance and function-- well-- you know, that ge-- there could be an identity of substance in terms of manifestation may not be so. That's what I have trouble seeing too.

AD: Well, let me pick up one question at a time, huh?

JC (faint): Ok.

AD: You want to make this the substance [diagram] and you want to make this the function [diagram].

JC (faint): (Yeah/Yes).

AD: You want to make this the substantial reality, the soul, alright, and its outward-facing hypostasis the [JC: That's its function.] planetary grid, ok?

JC (faint): (And) that would be its function [couple words inaudible]

AD: Um--

[9½ second pause]

JC (faint): (Let me) repeat.

AD: You're right, and in-- yet it won't be adequate.

VM: You still have the same complementary pair there, I mean-- It seems that you don't have to pit the Buddhists against the Vedantists to see, let's say, a certain conflict. It seems right within the-- the Platonic tradition if you like, if you speak of the soul as an eternal self-identical principle, then you speak about a hypostasis as some kind of activity or outflow from that principle, some sort of power that has the ability to generate or manifest, it seems right there you again run up against this complementary pair--the hypostasis versus the pure principle.

JC: And I think to speak of a Nous atom as identical in substance only has meaning so-- so long as we're caught up *in* the mind-continuum. I mean when-- when that Nous atom has recognized its distinction from the-- the substance of the soul, then-- you know, it may be then it-- like we say when buddhi distinguishes itself from the purusha, I wouldn't say buddhi lapses here but the pur-- the-- the true-- true subject is seen.

AD (simultaneously): Let me-- let-- let-- let me see [AS/S(?) simultaneously: Oh yeah.] if I could-- Does this [diagram] have experiences?

S (faint): Yeah but, I think there's a problem.

S (faint): [one/two words inaudible]

JC: I think-- I mean I-- I've never been able to understand this two persons, one substance. I'd say if there's anything that we know, [AD drawing] it's that Sun in Aquarius [diagram].

AD: Again, let me ask you, does this [diagram] have experience of the [VM simultaneously, very faint: No.] sensible world?

VM (very faint): No.

JC: Via that light I would say yes.

S (faint): Do you--

AD: Then the question is [drawing] what is this light [diagram].

JC: Some sort of-- some sort of power of knowledge, I don't know exactly--

AD: Well it's an emanation *from* that soul.

JC: Yes.

AD: And it's going to have experience of this here [diagram]? In order to have experience of this here, doesn't it have to be [drawing] something here [diagram]?

S (faint): Uh-hm.

RG (faint): Uh-hm.

JC: It has [TS simultaneously: Yeah.] to be in a body. And that--

AD (simultaneously): I mean because what-- what you said amounted to the-- or a denial *of* the soul's [VM: Unibility.] reincarnation, metamorphosis, the individual's experiences, the growth of that until it-- it can come into contact with itself again.

JC: (Pound it) again. I mean there's a continuity of the-- of the processes in Nature. I mean you can speak of the growth of this mind-continuum.

AS: But, I think-- I think the distinction is we're speaking here of three different principles, not different but three distinct things, and you're speaking of two, right?

JC (faint): Well maybe [couple words inaudible]

AS: I mean, I think here we're bringing in the fact there's the soul in the Intellectual-Principle, the pure soul, and there's this light which it gives off which I think we're in this view they're calling the bodhicitta or the spark of the soul. And there's also this whole mind-continuum, let's say that spark is going to get embodied lifetime after lifetime in all of these various vehicles.

JC: Ok, no I buy that. I'm just trying to speak that way.

AS: But then-- oh but-- but then I thought you were saying that well, that (comes--)

JC (simultaneously): The bodhicitta is constantly *involved* in the mind-continuum.

AS: You're saying-- you seem to be saying that mind-continuum *is* the-- *is* the emanation of that first soul and you don't have to speak about a--

JC: Well I could even see it as separate.

AS: Yeah, a separate principle of-- of light or emanation.

AD: Well, if this here [diagram]-- if this is an emanation of that life principle, ok, I mean that soul principle, then there would be no need or even necessity to talk about achieving Buddhahood.

AS/S(?) (faint): Yeah.

AS: 'Cause it's already done.

JC: Right, I would rather say that's the objective order. The bodhicitta's inserted in it. [AS simultaneously: Oh but then that's the same.] And it's that through the bodhicitta is the way that that soul can contact that aware-- and-- and has to develop a vehicle by which it can express itself via that

bodhicitta. And that's the process of evolution that's going on to develop a vehicle by which the bodhicitta can carry something of the soul into the world.

AD: Alright so then if we pick up from there we're saying this is the soul [diagram]. A radiation from the soul or an emanation from the soul takes place. This light which is given off, alright, is the germ or the Nous atom. It's caught up in matter. It will evolve through all the kingdoms of Nature. While it is evolving through-- throughout all the kingdoms of Nature, it is experiencing in a very partial way and according to the individuality of that body these-- the transiting function-- transiting knowledge here that's taking place. And as it does so, it goes (in) evolving and there's a-- an ontogenetic and a phylogenetic [drawing] development taking place until this person becomes a man of light and then goes to Sagehood and then becomes a perfect vehicle or reflection for the soul here [diagram]. So, if-- if I speak about *this* here [diagram] as an essence, alright, this is the essence, soul, which is (emanating), and we say that this Nous atom is a fragment from that divine essence, alright, so we would-- we could say this is one essence but two persons. You can't say *two* essences because the essence of the Nous atom *is* this essence. So the essence is identical, alright, but you have two persons. You have-- this is [drawing/writing] the first person or the first soul [diagram], alright, and this is the second soul [diagram].

AS (faint): That's the twins, the twins.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, that's the-- that's the story of the twins, ok. Now, with that as a *background*, I can start trying to understand this entity's experiences as it goes through-- [drawing] let's say the-- the journey through-- through Nature, all the-- all the kingdoms of Nature. We could imagine it going through until it reaches the level of human consciousness, and it is there, it is there where a vow could be taken, you know, to direct the bodhicitta, alright, towards Buddhahood, to leave cyclic existence. That means that you goal-orientate the whole of your mind-continuum towards that end. And that end does not mean it stops there. It's just figurative expression. Ok? Go ahead.

AS: Yeah, this is-- along these lines there's this question that I thought we were getting at before. When you say the second soul, you're speaking of this-- this emanation from the first soul which is identical in essence. But also in-- it's conjoined with or embodied in all these vehicles, the planetary vehicles.

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

AD: Uh-hm.

AS: Now, I thought one-- where I thought there was a question is now (this/the) question of, in going through this development life after life, something of the essence of that experience is retained. Let's say we could talk about this bodhicitta or this light developing somehow. And here's where it seems that there's some very fine distinctions [student assents, faint] as to first of all where those experiences are retained. [AD: Yeah.] Say in this view, do you speak about the life in the soul as conjoined with some kind of causal vehicle through the whole of its-- for the whole of its journey through cyclic existence, say the subtle-- the mind-body complex each life drops off but something is retained from that life. Some kind of wisdom is retained.

AD: Yeah.

AS: Now it seems that that wisdom that's retained doesn't go all the way back, isn't retained all the way back in that first soul [AD simultaneously: Uh-hm.] but is retained in something of this-- in the second soul, and that-- Well for example some would posit that's why you would need a-- this identical essence. The Buddhists would say no, it's enough to have it contained in this continuity. In other words, now we-- if we *do* take a complementary point of view, you have both of these going along, you have an identity of them-- a continuity of a mind stream. You also have this identical Nous atom. [student assents, faint] And you have these experiences that they're both as it were going through. There's some--

AD: I'm sorry, that they're both going through?

AS: What I mean by that-- Yeah, that they're both-- that-- that in a sense they're both going through. The Nous--

AD (simultaneously): No, you have to tell me *both*?

AS: In different ways.

AD: What do you mean by both?

AS (simultaneously): To both. The Nous [S simultaneously, faint: Both (one word inaudible)] atom or the bodh-- the light of the soul is *having* the experience. It's the experiencer. And, this vehicle, this mind-continuum--

AD: No.

AS: --is going-- is getting--

AD (simultaneously): That's not a subject to me.

AS: No, no, I didn't finish.

S (faint): Well--

AD: Oh, ok.

AS: That this mind-continuity is what's being trans-- is-- is taking on the forms in this experience. The mind-continuum is like the object for that bodhicitta, for the light of the soul. And the bodhicitta, the-- or the light of the soul is the subject, the knower, and the mind-continuum is going-- what I am saying by going through the experience, it's going through these various modifications. They speak about the modified (mind/light).

AD (simultaneously): Alright. Let-- let me try this way. Now, if I take a mentalist point of view, alright, I'm loc-- I'm locating myself here [diagram], ok, then all of this here [diagram], all of this here, is within-- within me. The whole of the Intelligible World is within me. What takes place is a projection, an outward projection, alright. You could [AS/S(?) simultaneously: (Well/So)--] think of it as the seed-thoughts in the heart and they get projected out. [AS assents, faint] Now, what I'm calling the mind-continuum is an efflux from my own inner being. [AS simultaneously: Right, and it's-- yeah.] So in itself, in itself it is *not* the subject, it is what-- what the true subject projects forth, [AS: That's what I'm saying.] alright, and there could be the interaction either way.

AS (faint): Yeah. [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): I would think that the experience is coming from the outside or I think of the experience coming from within and projected out there.

AS: Ok, but my question is, in-- in this experience of-- take a mentalist-- a subjective point of view, then-- that this mind-continuum is-- into this mind-continuum or the mind-continuum is projected out and it's-- in this mind-continuum is the form of all my experience.

AD: Ok.

AS: And I'm going to know that. Now, out of this continual interaction something is distilled, some kind of wisdom.

AD: Uh-hm.

AS: For example, I think you would have to say in this view that this-- even though this Nous atom *is* self-identical there is *something* going on with it, otherwise there'd be no point.

AD: Alright, let's say that the Intelligible World is projected out of the Nous atom, alright, and that from that experience or that-- the form of the experience it's going to extract and take back from that projection what it needs for its own [AS assents] development.

AS: Now in this view we could say that the-- the distilled knowledge or essence [AD simultaneously: Uh-hm.] that it gains is stored in that heart atom, [AD: Yeah.] the Nous atom. But-- ok, but from the complementary point of view, the Buddhist point of view, they would say well, there's always this mind-continuum as it were *accompanying* this Nous atom, [AD, faint: Uh-hm.] and something is stored there too, that too is going through a process.

AD (simultaneously): No, because-- nothing could be stored there because this is always in a state of constant transformation.

AS: Yeah, everyone has these [one word inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): And if you want to say that [AD indicating on board] B is the cause [AS simultaneously, faint: Right, yeah.] of A, alright, and C is caused by B and A, and D is caused by everything that precedes it, if you want to say in that way that it stores something, yes, but that it can be in any way stored or meaningful for the subject, I can't follow.

AS: I'm not talking about [RG simultaneously: But--] for the subject though, I'm talking about the point of view that there is some view, and maybe it's impossible to take that point of view but they do talk about a point of view of a mind continuity.

AD: Yeah, they could. [student assents] But, a thing could be continuous.

AS (faint): Right.

RG: But what is-- what is that continuity though?

AS (simultaneously): And not being directed?

RG: I don't understand that.

AD: To me, the way I understand it, the continuum of mind that they speak about is the outward effulgence or the outward-- the spreading out of the Intelligible contents that are within the Nous atom. They're spread out there and there's this constant-- there's this constant activity, this constant projection taking place. The-- the continuity of those projections is what they refer to in my understanding as the mind-continuum.

RG: Ok. Now what is that mind, what is it? What principle is it?

AD: I thought I just told you.

RG: No, no, I di-- well, no, you said it was the mind-continuum but I didn't get the-- to the--

S (simultaneously): To (the) continuity.

RG (simultaneously): [couple words inaudible] though.

S (simultaneously): The (ejection).

S (faint): Yeah, uh-hm.

AS (simultaneously): Would that be what we called--

AD: No, no.

RG: I didn't get it.

AD: No. You didn't get it.

RG: I didn't get what the continuum part was, I got the-- I got the efflux part.

AD (simultaneously): The continuity-- the continuity of the projections coming from the Intelligible, [RG assents] alright, this continuum-- I mean this continuity of these projections is the mind-continuum.

RG: Well all you-- yeah, all you just told me was the contin-- the continuity was the continuum but what-- what is the source (for--)

AD (simultaneously): No, no, I-- very specifically, *the projection of the Intelligible* [RG: Right.] *is the mind-continuum.*

RG: The projection.

AD: *Of the Intelligible is the mind-continuum.*

S: Well--

RG: Now-- ok.

AD (intensely): Now, you have to stop just for a moment and give it thought, alright. If everything is within the Nous atom, if the whole of the Intelligible World is within the Nous atom, but it must be projected out of the atom and it becomes your perceived world, that perceived world which is constantly transforming itself, you call that a world of thoughts, one thought following upon another. They're

referring to that as the mind-continuum! [student assents, faint] But that is not the subject! And it has no self-identity!

AS: Uh-hm.

RG: But, there's more to the continuum.

AS (simultaneously): I think Richard was just asking what the-- why is it called a continuity. It's clear that it's a projection. But what's continuous about it? I mean suppose we took a Buddhist-- what's continuous about it?

RG (simultaneously): Right, what is-- why call it continuous at all? I mean if you really took [LR/S(?) simultaneously: Is this about (couple words inaudible)] a strictly-- a strictly motion point of view and a-- and a strictly energetic point of view, I don't-- I don't get the continuous portion. You-- we say it's the proje-- then you're saying the Nous atom is the source of a continuum.

AS (simultaneously): Of its continuity.

RG: Of its continuity.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah.

AS: Yeah.

RG: (Now/And) how is that different [AS simultaneously: That's the--] than saying the Nous atom is-- is evolving through its planetary wandering?

AD: No, no, no, you're missing the point. The Nous atom is not evolving through its planetary wanderings. First you have to think of it this way, that the Intelligible World is coming through and manifesting *through* the Nous atom.

RG (simultaneously): Ok. Granted.

AD (simultaneously): Ok?

RG: Yes.

AD: It projects that world out because if you-- if you introvert and you go in-- inwardly, alright, there will be *your* zodiac.

RG: Uh-hm.

AD: *Your* inerratic sphere.

RG: Ok. But--

AD: Alright, so that means if it's all within you, you've got to project it out there to be able to say there's the inerratic sphere out there.

S (simultaneously, faint): Uh-hm.

RG: Yeah.

AD: But, the inerratic sphere or the-- whatever the scene is that's out there, alright, is a constant succession of thought after thought.

RG: Uh-hm.

AS: But-- but [RG simultaneously: Well--] from its point of view, [RG: Yeah.] it's-- there's [AD simultaneously: From--] some development for the Nous atom.

AD (simultaneously): From who's point of view?

AS: From the point of view of the Nous atom.

AD (simultaneously): From the Nous-- again, to continue, to follow up, from the Nous'-- the Nous atom point of view, now that it's project the world, it also is inserted *in* the world and is experiencing that which it projects [RG simultaneously: Right.] and extracts from it what is meaningful to it or superimposes on it.

RG: And must go through some transformation in the process.

S (simultaneously): Yeah.

AD: *What* goes through transformation?

RG (simultaneously): The atom or the--

AS (simultaneously): It's getting actualized.

AD: Well, what-- what is it--

RG (simultaneously): If it didn't, then it didn't need to be embodied in the first [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): No, but what is it that it's doing!?

RG: I don't know. Whatever it--

AS (simultaneously): It's actualizing its own potential world.

LDS (simultaneously): Becoming self-conscious.

AD: Exactly!

RG: Fine!

AS: Yeah, that's fine, that's not-- yeah.

AH (simultaneously, faint): What did he say?

AD: Exactly.

RG (simultaneously): [couple words inaudible]

RC (faint): What did you say now?

AS: He agrees with it, I think the whole-- the only--

RG (simultaneously): But I don't-- alright.

AS: The only question again gets back to, [RG simultaneously: How is that really--] and it's really just an artificial view, it's like the Buddhist view says-- it's an artificial view, you say if you-- if you cut off the connection to that Nous atom, what kind of a continuity-- Take a Buddhist view where there *is* no self-identical Nous atom. What kind of continuity could this mind stream have cut off from the identity of the Nous atom.

RG: Right.

AS: What kind of a continuity would-- would it give it but--

AD (simultaneously): But you see that's-- that-- from my point of view would be an absolutely theoretical [AS simultaneously: An artificial--] [student assents, faint] abstraction because if you have a subject you're going to have the emanation from the subject, you're going to have a projection out from the subject. If you could-- if you think that there could be a continuum out there without a subject that is [RG simultaneously: No.] projecting it, I can't follow you.

RG (simultaneously): [couple words inaudible] That's the point.

AS (simultaneously): No, that's his point.

AD: Alright, that [couple/three words inaudible]

RG (simultaneously): And if you follow the whole (I--) But that's why I don't understand why--

AS (simultaneously): That's why he doesn't understand the Buddhist view.

LDS: Yeah that's--

RG: Or, if we-- if we try to understand the Buddhist view in that sense, what is the-- then the distinction between the mind-continuum, the continuum of the mind and the Nous atom, that distinction then starts to get (hazy).

AD (simultaneously): But you see, that was-- that's why I brought the problem up immediately, although I wasn't up to it. The problem I brought up was, do we conceive of the bodhicitta in this way, this light emanating, the planetary aspects that are taking place moment-by-moment, if we think of that as the mind-continuum, or if we think of this light here [diagram] coming from the soul projects a part of itself, a fragment, alright. And, you remember, Plotinus says the soul is an authentic eternally existent. [Note: See Plotinus, V.1.2, V.1.3, V.1.8.] And if it's of that nature, an emanation from it will carry and bear the same attributes and characteristics. [RG/S(?), faint: Right.] So this Nous atom will have an eternal immutability, alright, [RG assents] but at the same time that's not going to prevent it from assimilating the experiences that it projects out from within itself.

RG: Right, in the-- and in the sense that it assimilates and projects the pro-- the-- and itself is-- seems to be evolving in this process once it projects its world, then isn't a-- isn't that very close to being a mind-continuum?

AD: Isn't that very close--

RG: To also calling it a-- the continuum of the mind.

AD: No because there you would have to contract the mind, alright. In other words, I can think of-- I can think of the entire of the mind-continuum being protracted or contracted back into the Nous atom. But I can't think of spreading the Nous atom, alright, and saying it's the equivalent of the totality of all these mental processes.

RG: Not the equivalent but it's certainly the source of them. I mean--

AD (simultaneously): Because-- that this-- that the Nous atom is the source of-- oh yes.

RG: And in that sense--

AD: But not the reverse!

RG: Right, right, but in that [AD simultaneously: Ok.] sense it *is* the continuity of them also.

AD: It is the continuity of these here [diagram].

RG: Right.

AD: Yeah but the point I was trying to make it more important is that this [diagram] is what is self-identical *in* that continuous stream.

RG: Granted. That's-- ok, granted, but if we try to intelligize the Buddhist position in that sense, and try to understand it from that point of-- I'm saying is there a way to understand the Buddhist position from within the Nous atom also and not see it only on an-- on a-- on an objective level but on a subje-- subjective level as well.

AD: Well--

AH (simultaneously, faint): Yeah but-- but the Madhyamika doesn't conjecture--

AD: If I could find-- if I could find some quotations I'd be glad to, you know, but I can't think of any quotations where, let's say, the mind-continuum would imply some kind of self-identical subject. There may be, I'm--

RG: But if we just take their logic, I mean if we take the logic of it and take the logic of the idea of continuity at all, it doesn't seem to-- I mean it would seem to break down if you don't tie it, as we said, back to a subjective source of that continuity.

AD: So you feel that there's a kind of impa-- impelling logic that we approach it in these two ways.

RG: Yeah. I mean-- But I would also want to see that, not only are they so distinct but that you could apply the logic of the energetic point of view also to the subjective angle as well. Not only see it as the objective process but tie the con-- continuity portion to the subjective side and sh-- and then-- and tie it together some way.

AD: Well, I certainly see it like that because the totality of all these mental states *is* a projection from out of the subject so to me there *is* no discontinuity and there *is* no hiatus, because, when we take a chart then and we look at a chart and we-- and this is the outward [diagram]-- you know, what's inward, and we see

certain aspects we-- are going on, alright, we would say that it is the Nous atom which is assimilating the experiences or the meaning that these experiences are providing for it.

LR: But it already projected [RG simultaneously, faint: Right.] out all those experiences you're saying.

AD: Yes.

LR: So I'm-- I-- I'm missing the point of it all.

AD: Well don't you have to project certain aspects of your psychology in order to [couple inaudible student words simultaneous with AD] get to know it?

S: Yeah.

AD: And that if they remain inwardly and ou-- in a potential state you'd never get to know them.

AS: Yeah, have to get crystallized.

S (simultaneously, faint): No, it's not what I--

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

LR: But what does that *mean* for the Nous atom? My psychology certainly [AS simultaneously: But--] isn't on a par.

AS: Yeah but--

AD: Your what?

LR: I mean, what does-- there's still this-- this one point in even [couple words inaudible] [AS simultaneously: Yeah, why did it have to go--] that doesn't speak to it.

AS: Yeah but--

LR: If you're saying that the totality of that mind-continuum is projected from the Nous atom--

AD: There-- there's no answer to the question you've reached.

LR: Come on Anthony.

VM (faint): (Yeah), come on Anthony.

AD: No that's what you're asking. There is no answer.

RC: Well there's also the problem that we assume finality (all the time).

LR (simultaneously): Well-- well but can we at least get a little specific about it?

AD (simultaneously): Huh?

RC: There's also the problem that-- that most [few inaudible student words simultaneous with RC] of us here seem to assume some sort of finality, and because we assume that doesn't mean it's so. I mean--

S (faint): Right.

AS: Well--

AD: I think the question she was asking was why does this have to get projected if it's already contained [AS simultaneously: Yeah.] within.

S (very faint): Yeah.

RG (simultaneously): Yeah.

AS: That's what she said.

RC: But even [RG simultaneously: Yes but--] if it's contained within--

AD: And I asked her psychologically, why do you have to go through the experience of projecting your anima to get to know it? And [student assents] she says well there's-- that this is no analogy.

S: [three words inaudible]

RC (simultaneously): But if it is contained within the sys--

AD (simultaneously): Huh?

S: This isn't.

AD: No?

S: Is it?

AD: How else would you get to know yourself?

RG: But-- but that-- but we *don't* know our--

AD (simultaneously): When you-- when you-- when you study a chart and a man is getting rid of something, how does he get rid of it except by manifesting it?

S (simultaneously): [few words inaudible] right now.

AD (simultaneously): Huh? What [RG simultaneously: Yeah.] does he do, step on it and bury it deeper?

LR: But in the Intelligible Realm--

RG: No, but that-- but yours-- but that's 'cause we are not conscious of the-- of what's in us but the-- how could you say that about the Nous [AS simultaneously: Neither is the soul.] atom, [LR simultaneously: (couple words inaudible) knows.] that it isn't conscious of what's in it.

S: [three/few words inaudible]

AS (simultaneously): Neither is the soul to begin with though, Richard.

DB: Why should--- why should the Nous atom be conscious of what's in it? If it was, why would it-- why would it be--

AD (simultaneously): Well-- Yeah, what purpose would there be in the soul emanating this fragment?

LR: But in--

RG (simultaneously): So the soul is unconscious of the content.

AD (simultaneously, intensely): If it's already perfect, why emanate it?

AS (simultaneously): Right.

VM: That was the question [three words inaudible]

AS (simultaneously): He does say that, [S simultaneously: Right.] Plotinus, in the one on Love. [Note: See Plotinus, III.5.]

LDS (simultaneously): Yeah, Plotinus says that all along.

AS: In fact he-- in fact, it seems that that's the-- one of the big distinction between Nous and soul, that the Nous *is* totally conscious of its content but that the soul isn't.

S (faint): Yeah.

LR: But, we did say at one point that--

S: [three/few words inaudible] (laughter, student words)

LR: See I could understand it a little better when you were saying that the soul's joining through the (feeling) it-- through this whole thing.

AS: Speak up. (We're/Right) here. When they say that the soul's journey through this whole thing--

LR (simultaneously): We did have a different-- a little bit of a different explanation at one point--

AS (simultaneously): No it was to get crystallized out.

LR (simultaneously): --which meant-- Wait Avery.

AS: Sorry.

LR: Which was that the-- that the projection of the soul was actually in order to pick up or assimilate meanings from those 360 degrees or whatever you want to call them originally from the Intelligible World. And that it actually came into contact with them there, the contact that it didn't--

AD: Well, why do you feel [one/two inaudible LR words simultaneous with AD] that that's disagrees with what we just said?

LR: Because--

AD: As a matter of fact that's-- that's *exactly* what I'm saying. [LR simultaneously: Somehow--] That unless, [few inaudible student words simultaneous with AD] unless the-- the Intelligible World within is projected out, alright, and the Nous atom experiences in terms of a subject-object duality under the intensity of wakeful consciousness, it will never become fully aware of itself.

LR: Ok. Here's the difference I see. When you say that it projects it out, contact-- that it's projecting out contents which were already within itself--

AD: Including the 360.

LR: What do you mean by within itself? Don't--

AD (more quietly): I can't tell you that.

LR: Come on, what do you mean?

AD (intensely): Within you!! You will not believe in the mystical experience that the whole universe is within you! You just won't *believe* it!

LR (simultaneously): I know.

S (faint whisper): Yeah.

S (very faint): Can't help you.

AD (intensely): There's no way I could make you believe something like that.

LR: What I'm saying is, in the view that this soul-- this soul's only--

[short pause]

AD: Getting tongue-tied?

RG: But-- but he al-- but-- but--

AD (simultaneously): You got a chart just like Kant, you should be able to continue all day.

S (very faint): Yeah.

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

RG: But-- I mean but Plotinus also says that the soul by contemplation of the Nous then envisions its product. And how could that vision not include the knowl-- I mean that vision has to include [S simultaneously: (Yes/That's) (one word inaudible)] the knowledge of what [one/two inaudible student words simultaneous with RG] it's projecting.

LR: That's-- that's (ok).

DB (simultaneously): Yeah it does but [one/two words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously, intensely): Yes but that would be fine for the *unembodied* soul it has knowledge of that. [student assents] And it includes the entirety of the development that that germ of the-- of the Intellectual-Principle is going to go through, that's already included in the soul's vision.

RG: Right.

AD: But that is not actualized until it *goes* through that.

LR: But wait--

RG: What do you mean by actualized?

S: What do you mean?

AD: In other words, its vision [AS simultaneously: Goes through it.] may be an eternal contemplation. The actualization is in the perpetuity of time.

LR: Is it merely a repetition?

AS: In fact--

AD: Oh--

AS: Oh but Linda, wait, if it looks at the Nous [LR simultaneously, faint: (one/two words inaudible) is it?] and one of the things it sees is its whole development through this-- [LR simultaneously: But it-- no it--] it sees its actualization, the actu-- you're taking the actualization as something apart [LR simultaneously: After.] from its vision. Whereas actually that actualization [LR simultaneously, faint: (Ok/I see).] is part of that vision and it's not something extrinsic to the vision.

LR (simultaneously): Or that happens after.

AS: The actualization is part of its whole vision.

AD: You have the same complementarism here, the polarity between the eternal vision of the soul and the perpetual actualization of that eternal vision. And the reality manifests itself through both. And if you insist on saying it's only the soul's eternal vision of the Idea of Man as the reality and not that actualization, again you're taking only one leg to walk with.

LR: No, no, I wasn't trying to say that. But--

AD (simultaneously): Well, you got a little bit of background now.

AS: I s-- Li-- I'm sorry, we-- can I-- It's a related question, I-- I wasn't clear on that-- that one point I was trying to ask, maybe it's gotten clarified somewhat. This-- when-- when the Nous a-- when the-- this light of the soul, fragment of the soul is projecting out the world, it-- in doing that it's objectifying or crystallizing something that's only potentially within it. And that's I think what you're speaking about the wisdom gained from each life. Like in each life it projects this whole life experience from one end to the other. But out of that, there was some essence of it that it will retain.

AD (simultaneously): Now, and-- and this retained or this extracted wisdom, like the problem we would-- that would get cancelled out would be well wh-- where is the locus of this extracted or distilled wisdom from our experience.

AS: Well, it's obviously in the Nous atom.

AD (simultaneously): The Nous atom obviously would be the receptacle of that.

AS (simultaneously): Right. But how would you-- see, is-- that's-- that may be s-- but let's suppose now the next life comes and you have a new chart as it were. Wouldn't that chart itself be a pictorialization of the accumulated wisdom, or wouldn't showing up in that chart be a--

AD (simultaneously): Well isn't that what you mean when you say that those planets signify the powers of the soul.

AS: Yes, that's what I'm saying, so in a sense that projected continuum, that new life, *is* the outward manifestation *of* the accumulated wisdom that the soul has. And is that-- is that what you meant by saying that the ego itself *is* the causal body?

AD: Yeah.

AS: That's what I wanted to ask.

TS: 'Cause it seems like if you take that-- the-- the natal chart, in the presupposition of taking the natal chart you're taking something as fixed within that cont-- within the moment-to-moment continuity of the planetary motion. And it seems that that's the mark of the Nous atom on that continuity. The-- in other words, if you just take the planetary motions as never-- never being stopped, why choose one moment over any other moment and refer things to that one moment?

AD: Because at that moment, the position, the angular relationships of the planets, precisely describe the level of the [student assents] soul's evolution.

TS (simultaneously): Yeah. Because what-- in other words what I'm saying-- I was trying to say-- speak to that, that it would be that kind of infiltration of the accumulated wisdom of the Nous atom that it would-- it would-- it would fix one moment as representative-- representative of its--

AD: Yes because at that moment that it fixes that, right, all the parts, all the degrees that you have to assimilate are being fixed. Those are the ones you have to get to know.

TS: Well that would be the continuum part, the-- whereas the transits and the progressions would be the-- (yeah/you have) the-- the mind-- that would be the mind-continuum would be the transits and the progressions, that changes from moment-to-moment, and as-- has the-- the quality of being not individual. Mars is in Virgo for everybody in the month of September or whatever. But, it may be s--

AD (simultaneously): No, it's in Libra.

TS: Ok, (whatever/go ahead).

S (faint): Thank you.

AD: Forever. (bit of laughter)

TS: I'm not saying it well but kind of--

RG: Yeah but--

DB (simultaneously): See, you're saying like--

RG (simultaneously): But through the-- through the manifestation of the particular moment [one/two words inaudible] through the space-time configuration of the houses, for example, and the parts which are defined by the houses, that defines the fixity of the Nous atom involved with it.

TS (simultaneously): Yeah. Yeah.

AD: Now the reason I-- the reason I'm taking this approach is because in the problems that Vic is faced with, you know, he started out in Alexandria and he's trying to get to Copenhagen, and I don't know if he's somewhere out in the orbit of Mars. [Note: Reference is to WG Paper, "Alexandria and Copenhagen: A Dialogue Between Plotinus and Werner Heisenberg," by V.N. Mansfield, September 1981.]

TS: Yes.

AD: The scientists have come to the conclusion despite-- despite their prejudisms, they're coming to the conclusion that you are a participator, you are a-- a reality structurer. You are structuring reality. Now if *you* are the one that is structuring reality, it must be coming from within you. So if we pick it up from this way here, we'll not only get along with trying to understand what we're heading into but also maybe get to the problem that he's working with.

S (faint): What do you mean?

[short pause]

AD: Instead of saying intelligence-- I mean instead of saying consciousness, if you say that you are the pure intelligence, and that the world is a projection from out of your pure intelligence, within the pure intelligence you have all the elements necessary to project a world. Not only the-- let's say, the Ideas, but also the power that the Ideas have to employ in order to instantiate themselves in a sensorial way. But then, if we say that that power has to be included, that power may be manifested, let's say, in two possible ways, which I don't want to go into right now. One of them is nada and the other is bindu. Nada represents the wavelike formation, bindu the point or gran-- the granular, alright. And these two powers are part of the soul's process of manifesting or instantiating sensorially the world that it's going to, let's say, project and receive back. Alright, so if we take this way I think we'll-- we'll have an open door to a few-- if we use this kind of hypothesis, in other words, that there is a-- that there is a germ from the-- from the Intellectual-Principle, and if it is-- if it is the radiation of a person's soul, this germ has an eternal-- well, we-- we should say a *perpetual* becoming. And, again if we think of the remark that PB made, to think of this here [diagram] again--

[Audio File 1982 0305a Ends]

[Audio File 1982 0305b Begins]

[someone drawing]

TS: --what we mean by the-- the planetary spheres.

AD: This is the projection-- the projection is the entirety of the sensible manifested universe.

TS: Is that different than the planetary spheres?

AD: Well that *includes* the planetary spheres!

TS: And when we speak of the mea-- well, ok now let me back up. When we speak of the planetary spheres in themselves, then we're making a hiatus between them [couple/three words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): I'm not, maybe you are.

TS: Well, let me-- can I finish it? If you speak of the planetary spheres as a projection [someone drawing] of the Intelligible universe, an ongoing and perpetual projection of soul-- soul's containment-- containment of the Intelligible universe, in that way the planetary spheres and the organization of them are indicative of something (is empirical) to that soul. If they're spoken of as extrinsic to that soul--

AD: I don't know what you mean.

TS: If the planetary spheres are taken as somehow outside of this-- the soul or its projection, then the problem-- well, there is a problem of connection. But if you s-- if they're spoken of as being only as being that soul's projection, then you have-- then-- then the [one word inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): There's no hiatus.

TS: So then, to ask the question, would you-- I wanted to see if I can say this [couple words inaudible] is talking. To ask the question where in the horoscope is the Nous atom is to ask the question wrongly because the horoscope *is* the Nous atom. Or is emblematic of the Nous atom with respect to the quadrant. It couldn't be a part of it.

AD: Well, you got to the point, Tim, yes. In other words, the question we were asking last night, where are we going to locate the Nous atom. And when you look at a chart, a simple naïve chart, you know, which has 360 degrees, the planets, the houses and all that, alright--

VM: That's it.

TS: Go ahead.

AD: That's exactly what you're saying.

AS (simultaneously): That's it.

TS: Yeah, that's it.

AD (simultaneously): That is representative of your whole sensible world.

TS: Yeah. [AD/S(?) simultaneously, faint: Uh-hm.] And that's-- and as representative what you mean there is that it's-- it's this projection of the Intelligible universe for the soul.

AD (simultaneously): (Right.) From within you, yeah.

TS: And it is the experience of that projection.

AD (faint): [one word inaudible] yeah.

RG: But when you say representative--

AD: Representative would be wrong because then you'd-- it introduce something like a hiatus, you know.

RG: Or-- well, what do you mean em-- or emanation, however-- whatever-- however you want to-- I mean what's the word you want?

AD (simultaneously): Alright, go ahead.

S (faint): Say it again.

TS/S(?) (simultaneously): She is.

AD: No, I ju-- I just mean-- [RG simultaneously: No, no, the big difference is that--] I just wanted to understand, he wasn't using it that way, that's all, you know.

RG (simultaneously): There's a big difference to say "is" or "emanation". Because if it *is* the Nous atom, I don't quite understand how you talk about it as self-identical and as-- and as getting transformed in the process.

TS: [couple words inaudible]

DB (simultaneously): If it wasn't self-identical it couldn't get transformed.

AD: I think you answered your own question when you said it is representative. [S, faint: Yeah.] I think that's what Tim means, that when you look at the-- the chart, it is symbolical-- a symbolical representation of your Nous atom.

RG: Which is *not* in the chart.

AD: Which is not in the chart.

RG (simultaneously): Right.

TS: But insofar as the chart means anything it is the meaning of this (Nous atom).

AD (simultaneously): Well it has to apply to a certain Nous atom. Otherwise [RG simultaneously: Yes.] it's no-- it's a meaningless chart.

RG: And you could say the chart is what is accruing the wisdom [couple/three words inaudible] what the Nous atom is [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Ultimately it'd have to-- yeah. But, in terms of existential and experientially you have to put yourself in the native's (all the time).

RG (simultaneously): Yeah.

AD: Yeah.

LR: I--

RG: (When you--) wait. But when you say the native you mean something else than the entire chart?

AD: Yeah.

RG: You mean the Nous atom.

AD: Yeah, the subject.

RG (simultaneously): But-- which is not in the chart.

AD: No.

TS: But is represented by the chart [one/two words inaudible]

S (simultaneously): The chart is like an organ, right?

TS: So you get--

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, this sounds like an organ, that's right.

S: I mean it isn't--

AD (simultaneously): On and on, you know. (bit of laughter) Let's go on!

AS: I got a little organ.

AD: Ok. (AD laughs a bit)

BS: Then the Nous atom have to-- Nous atom, you say it projects intelligibility to a s-- It's not like you're suggesting that it projects intelligibility through a sensible world or--

AD: The sensible world *is* part of that projection of the Nous atom. Yes, don't you see what I'm doing? I'm just coming from pure mentalism.

BS: You're saying it's already Intelligible, the whole System of Nature is present as Intelligible?

AD: That projection of all these forces, all these powers, the activity of the entire Intelligible World is represented to you externally in that system that you're looking at. And that's why, that's why for instance I refuse to recognize Vic's position. Not that he's wrong. When he speaks about a multiplicity of worlds and universes, he's correct. I'm not arguing that. But, let me remind you of the little story I told you a long time ago. You remember this story? I take charcoal, powdered charcoal, and I take powdered salt, ok, and mix them thoroughly, and I look at them and I say there's grey there. Ok? Now I diminish myself to the size of a tiny little amoeba, [S: Uh-hm.] protozoa, anything real small, there *is* no grey. [short pause] Now, what have I done? [S: Uh-hm.] In other words, [couple inaudible student words] as soon as I change my framework, as soon as I change the scale of observation or perception, I've denied myself the very thing I'm-- I claim that I can perceive.

Now in order for me to make sense out of this whole vast blooming confusion, I take the solar universe, our solar system as a nit-- an-- a unit which has an integrity that can't be violated and I work with it in that framework. If Einstein says, "But that's not enough," I tell Einstein, "You worry about the other worlds, I'll worry about this one because this is the only one I'm living in *now*." I've got to understand this one, I've got to understand the framework I'm living in and operating with, then I'll worry about the other ones.

Now, you can see that there would be a certain amount of harm for a naïve or a simple person, a peasant, to introduce him to the immensities of the relativity of universal manifestation. It will introduce schizophrenia into your culture. Because you deprive him of a framework. And no one can live and work without a framework. In other words, the sensible manifested universe would be meaningless. So unless he has this for a background then goes on to, you know, let's say examine the inerratic sphere, because that will happen, if a person does achieve some kind of Atmic consciousness he *will* experience other realms of existence. But, until then, (they/there) will be just concepts, mental constructs, and he's going to

think he's found the truth in those mental constructs, in other words in Brother Ass. (bit of laughter) Shall we continue now?

CDA: Yes, my question.

AD: Your question. Avery? You take over.

CDA: Well, my [AS simultaneously, faint: Yes but--] question is, is in reference to--

AS (simultaneously): And here's the answer.

S (very faint): Uh-huh.

CDA: Sorry but, no more.

S (simultaneously, very faint): [couple words inaudible]

AS: Didn't work though.

S: Didn't work.

AD: Well, this is another [CDA simultaneously: Go ahead.] version of the circles [diagram], right?

CDA: Yeah.

AD: I'm going to place that little germ down here [diagram], [CDA: Yeah.] alright. [LC/S(?) simultaneously: The Nous atoms?] The little germ, the-- that fragment, the Nous atom. And he's going to be a mineral. [CDA simultaneously: In the chart, oh ok.] And then he's going to become [CDA simultaneously: A vegetable.] vegetable. (CDA laughs) Most of us never leave that state. (laughter)

S: Turnips.

AD: Turnip. Then they become an animal. Then they become human, alright. So it traverse these kingdoms of Nature. It reaches the human level. Now there-- there is as far as I look around me no higher species on this planet. So that means that the evolution-- the evolution over here has reached its limit. But, assuming that it reaches a human condition, he is introduced not only to the greatest perplexity of all but a source of constant frustration, annoyance, etc, you know, [CDA simultaneously: Weariness.] it goes on. And he knows there has to be something better. And it turns out that there *is* a further evolution but it's now *mental* evolution that has to take place. So he's got to build-- start building up or evolving something mental, mental higher body. Please.

S (very faint): That's it.

AS: What are you--

AD: Continue from mental evolution.

AS: Mental evolution. (AS laughs) Well I'd like to continue from some mental evolution. (AS laughs) [S: So--] So-- well, you're really going up this way [diagram] now.

AD: Yeah.

AS: I mean, [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] even though you were going across really.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah, we can go across and we can go up, we can do both but--

AS (simultaneously): But I mean when you were doing the cross you're really talking about now going to this realm [diagram]. Oh that's why-- that's why you put this up as answering to Carol's question about-- [someone drawing] talking about this quintess-- quintessence here?

AD: Quintessence.

AS: He was talking about evolving up-- when you talk about a mental evolution I think you're now [someone drawing] talking about some kind of evolution within this realm of the quintessence.

CDA: Ok, but I would-- I would [AS simultaneously: I mean, is that--] very much like to like equate and make some equation between what were you just doing in terms of the Nous atom and the projection out of its-- of the Intelligible Cosmos within it and then this ex-- then the extraction of the wisdom again that we just said when this-- when this wisdom was extracted that it resided in the Nous atom. Now when we've been doing alchemy we've talked about this quintessential body and that if it was in the-- this-- this body where these drops of wisdom resided. [someone drawing] Now, to me that sounds like two different stories.

S (faint): Well that's right, uh-hm.

CDA: And I wonder how they go together.

S (faint): (Yeah.)

AD: You get her question? I don't think I do.

LR: I do. She's asking where is the-- that the distilled wisdom which we've spoken of as the etheric body or the quintessential body, how does that relate to saying--

AD: How does that relate to--

S: Yeah.

LR: Where-- where does the quintessential body fit into the--

AS: Just by I--

LR (simultaneously): We-- to the retention of wisdom.

AS: I thought we're saying it was. Wasn't we? Or one point of view [someone drawing] was that that was-- that acquired wisdom went to build up that quintessential body, and then when you speak about a mental development, we spoke also about projecting, you know, this light experiences, I (don't--) projecting out this wisdom which now has accumulated there.

CDA: So is that the Nous atom there?

VM (faint): Wouldn't you say [couple words inaudible]

AD (simultaneously): Well, where's-- if you look down here [diagram], where is the Nous atom?

CDA: It's not there.

AD: What do you mean it's not there?

VM: All the higher levels are in the lower.

AD: No but the point [CDA simultaneously: Well--] is, is it-- the Nous atom is in your body.

CDA: I-- but-- I'm quite confused because, you just said that--

AD (simultaneously): Well-- [AS simultaneously: The whole chart is within-- because the whole chart is within (one/two words inaudible)] no, no, answer this question first. It has to [AD knocking on board] [CDA simultaneously: It has to be in my body.] be in your body, it has to be in your body.

CDA: Well it has to be in the experience of life that I have. Yeah.

AD: It has to be in your body, I want to be very specific.

CDA: Ok I-- I--

AD: I think somebody called it the heart atom. Everybody calls it a different name. But it has to be in the body. And it is from the body that it's going to extract the meanings and experiences that are worthwhile.

CDA (faint): Ok.

S (very faint): Right, uh-hm, but--

AD (simultaneously): So, if we locate the Nous atom *in* the body, alright, then that body is the *field* in which it is gaining experience and bringing that understanding into itself.

CDA: Didn't you just say-- and I've heard you say this many times and I-- and I understand that. That's why I'm (taking--)

AD (simultaneously): Well, don't ask me to swear on a Bible, just say it. (bit of laughter)

S: Yeah Dickie.

RG: Didn't you just say [CDA simultaneously: Didn't you--] that the-- that the-- that the Nous atom was *not* in the-- in the chart?

CDA (simultaneously): Yeah. You said that it's not in the--

AD (simultaneously): It was what?

RG: Not in one's [S simultaneously: Not--] chart. And your--

CDA: The native is not in the chart.

AD (simultaneously): Well how could you see that in a chart?

RG: Then how could you-- Wait a minute.

S (faint): It's in the body, not the chart.

RG: If it's in the body--

S (faint): Right.

AD: Yeah, how do you see it?

S (faint): It's true.

CDA: Oh, ok.

VM: It's astrologically not symbolized.

CDA (simultaneously): Ok.

AD: There's no way of symbolizing it but there-- I take a certain degree and say that's the Nous atom?

RG: No.

AD: Do I take all the planetary aspects?

RG: You--

S (faint): (Yeah) [one word inaudible]

AD: If-- if you-- if you want to say, Dickie, that [RG simultaneously: Yeah.] there's a *body* there and within that body there'll be a Nous atom and to that extent it's symbolized, I'd agree with that.

RG: No but-- There's a big difference, I don't get it, I mean--

AD: You're not going to see it with your eyes.

RG: You're not going to see *any* of the astrology of it with your eyes.

AD: Alright, so then-- Wait a minute. You can see these things. [chalk on board sounds] (laughter) I see your body.

VM (faint): That's the one thing I *can* see.

RG: No, no, but the part of it-- the part of it that you *can't* see, you can-- you can't-- you don't see the-- the Nous atom but you also don't see all the other-- the mental levels either that are in there with your eyes, I mean-- So to claim that it's in the body and not in the horoscope [S simultaneously: Was the body in (couple words inaudible)] is strange.

S (very faint): Doubt it.

S: If it wasn't in the body you wouldn't have a horoscope.

AS: Well, it's [CDA simultaneously: So can I--] just a strange-- it's a strange config-- sequence of containments, you're saying well, the whole sen-- the whole of the sensible world is projected out from the Nous atom, [AD: Uh-hm.] ok. But on the other hand, you're saying well now but [drawing] we can say this Nous atom is within-- has to be right present within the body.

S: Yeah.

AS: Now if you follow that--

CDA: Ok, so in that--

AD (simultaneously): It-- it is [S simultaneously, faint: (Who is it?)] again the same problem, Dickie, once before, of the simultaneity of the subtle and the gross realm. You can't speak of one without the other being present simultaneously [VM assents] now. If the-- if we think of the Nous atom or the heart atom as a very subtle kind of entity and it's located in the heart, I mean, there if we said physical heart we would be wrong, although, when you have an experience like that, just like if you have an experience of kundalini and you see this flame shoot up a spin-- a trunk, you know, like a straight up and spread out, now, the immediate inference, you know, and it's almost intuitive, is that this is taking place right in the body, although there's no correlation between the dimensions, you know, of the body and the experience of that column. But yet we unconsciously make that correlation, say "Wait, they fit together. This is my spinal column and it's going up there." But if-- once you get out of that, there are no-- there is no geographical topography. So the correlation is usually just an inference, you're saying "It's my spinal column." [RG assents] Ok. So that we have the same problem, if we try to locate the heart atom, you know, in the heart and we say well where in the heart, alright, if it's in the subtle realm, you're only going to say "Well somewhere around here I feel it."

RG: Ok.

AD (faint): Yeah.

RG: But is that any different than saying that the-- the mental bodies of the planets constitute our psy-- our psychic being and can't be seen--

AD: I'm sorry, I don't-- You got to go very slow. The mental body of the planets?

RG: Well, yeah. I mean insofar that the physical aspects of the planets is symbolized in our chart, are only symbolizing the psychic aspects of the planets which are constituting our psychic nature--

AD: But I-- I think we come to a conclusion that the planets could indicate three different realms. In other words, they can indicate the gross, they can indicate the psychical, [RG: Right.] and they can indicate the ideational, [RG: Uh-huh.] you know, the degree meanings.

RG (simultaneously): Right. Now is the heart-- is the Nous atom different from those three?

AD: Oh yes.

RG: But yet you called it subtle, and so--

AD: Uh-hm.

RG: I don't know. I mean it's--

AD: The Nous atom is *more* than these. Because the Nous atom, like I said, contains the whole of the Intelligible World. Don't restrict the Intelligible World to this sensible manifestation or to that *portion* of the sensible world that you perceive. I know you're-- I know that you got to use your marbles now and

you got to use the understanding that you got of Vedanta and Buddhism and whatever, put it to work. But if you left it at that stage you would be-- you would-- you know, it wouldn't be of any value.

AS: Are you like making an analogy here say to the dream analogy saying on the one hand, the whole of this manifestation is within that Nous atom, but on the other hand you're locating it then within that manifestation, [CDA simultaneously: Within the dream.] [someone drawing] you're locating it at a particular point.

AD (simultaneously): Yeah. Insofar that the world gets projected from the Nous atom and then you're located *in* that [AS assents] world, alright, the Nous atom has to be in that body. [students assent, faint] In the same way like when you locate-- like when you have a dream and you're one of the dream subjects, you locate or you seem to be imminent in that body that represents your subjectivity.

AS: Yeah.

AD: Go ahead.

CDA: Can I-- I would like to just try this. So from the point of view of-- of the N-- the Nous atom being inserted in say the dream subject--

AD: Well there there's no Nous atom.

CDA: Ok. In the body--

AD (simultaneously): There's no Nous atom there.

CDA: No, in the body. I'm just making the analogy--

AD: Oh ok, yeah, you-- yeah.

CDA (simultaneously): --the body like the dream subject. And, in that sense when-- when there is this gradual evolution of the-- of the meanings or, you know, a-- a purification, and-- and subtilization of the bodies, that that's how we would speak of this in this chart as the meanings get extracted and-- in the quintessential body from the point of view of the Nous atom in the body. And that this-- if--

AD (simultaneously): Let's see. The analogy you're using, like if we take the dream analogy, we could imagine the dream subject building up a sufficient understanding to a point where he realizes, alright, that there's something more than that sensible manifestation.

CDA (simultaneously): Yes. Yes, and he would have a-- these vehicles in which the-- the-- this understanding would be deposited. This--

AD (simultaneously): In which this--

CDA: In which this understanding would be--

AD (simultaneously): Well, before we do-- before we do that, can you see that the Nous atom would be resident *in* that understanding?

CDA: The Nous atom *in the body* would be resident in that understanding.

AD (simultaneously): Alright, now imagine yourself as a mental being. Would that Nous atom be resident *in that mental being*?

CDA: Yes. And, I-- Now I want to just ask, if this distinction that we make in-- between the wisdom being deposited in the quintessential body *is* the wisdom being deposited in this particular life of this Nous atom being inserted in this-- in this projection of its Intelligible Cosmos. Got that?

AD: No.

RG: Quite a sentence.

CDA (simultaneously): Ok. Ok. In this [AS simultaneously: Maybe.] life of mine, that this-- this sense of I-ness that I have is this-- this part of the Nous atom that's been inserted into this body, ok, and I extract the wisdom of my experience which goes to form this quintessential body in this lifetime. Now when I die, this wisdom that's in the quintessential body is in the Nous atom per se.

AD: This wisdom which *is* the quintessential body--

CDA: Ok. When I die, this wi-- but this wisdom, this Nous atom here goes back to its source of the Nous atom. I'm making this distinction--

AD (simultaneously): It doesn't go back, doesn't go back to anywhere. It continues. Goes on to a next incarnation.

AS: Yeah, and it ca-- carries along this accumulated wisdom which is the quintessential body.

CDA (simultaneously): Ok, but it's no longer in this body then, it's no longer [AD simultaneously: Yeah, yeah.] as divided.

AD: Ok.

CDA: Ok. Now, this wisdom is just-- [S, faint: It's right there.] ok.

AS: It still has that.

CDA (simultaneously): But it-- but it's not in a-- is it still in the--

AD: As a matter of fact, you're-- the ego you have in the next incarnation will be the result of this wisdom that you've picked up previously, [CDA simultaneously: Ok.] and all the other besides.

CDA (simultaneously): Ok, now does a new quintessential body have to be developed in the next life?

AS: No, I-- wouldn't that one continue? That would be the--

CDA: That continues.

AS: (That was--)

AD (simultaneously): That continues? Yeah.

AS (simultaneously): That's [CDA simultaneously: Ok.] what the-- that's what you mean to say that (possibly another student: ego, yeah.)

CDA (simultaneously): Now is that-- but is that different than the Nous atom.

S (very faint): Uh-hm.

AD: The quintessential body?

CDA: Yes.

AD: Yeah.

AS: Yeah.

S: That would be different.

CDA (simultaneously): It is. So that [S simultaneously, faint: (It is/Yeah).] quintessential body continues along with the Nous atom life after life.

AD: Uh-hm.

AS: That was (the point).

AD: Now, if you take that quintessential body, alright, and you build it up all the way. You remember the way we pointed out?

CDA: Yeah.

AD: And then mysticism is triggered off.

CDA: Yes.

AD: The man of light, the bo-- with a body of light.

CDA (faint): Yeah.

AD: That means that this quintessential body contains all the reason-principles that it experienced.

CDA: Yes.

AD: Ok? You remember that passage from Plotinus when he speaks about the Sage plies the reason-principles?

RC (faint): When he [S simultaneously, faint: Uh-hm.] expounds it [couple words inaudible]

S (faint): Yes.

AD: III.7 something? [Note: Plotinus, III.8.6. "The Sage, then, has gone through a process of reasoning when he expounds his act to others; but in relation to himself he is Vision: such a man is already set, not merely in regard to exterior things but also within himself, towards what is one and at rest: all his faculty and life are inward-bent."]

AS: Yeah, when he ex-- the one Randy just said.

AD: What was it?

AS (simultaneously): When he's within himself he's Nous, he's all Vision, but he has to express it in terms of reason.

AD: Yeah. And he-- when he has to express it, he'll be using that wisdom body.

CDA: Ok, so it's like--

AD: Now-- wait.

CDA (simultaneously): Go ahead.

AD: So then this wisdom body we said would be the extraction of all the meanings that the reason-principles that you've experienced, alright, get distilled as this wisdom body. And then we said that out of that grows the man of light. Now the man of light, insofar that he projects from within himself his contents, the contents that he projects will be these reason-principles. So that the man of light experiences *the quintessential body of wisdom that he has built up through the eons of time*. And it will *not* have-- it won't be mythological or anything like that, it'd be-- it's-- it's-- and what could we say, the glorious experiences that makes a person really think he is divine, ok, because that's all that body of light is.

RG/S(?): [few words inaudible]

AS (simultaneously): Yeah but, there's only one question there, that's-- that why I'm-- I don't see why you use the mentalistic framework before that point. That seems to be a confu-- I mean, at the point of-- you say now he has this quintessential body--

AD: What does mentalistic mean to you?

AS: I-- in the sense that, I don't see why we can't up to that point as it were ha-- keep this dual-- It's not-- I'm not [couple words inaudible]

AD: I didn't realize it was 10 o'clock. Class is over! (AD laughs, clapping, laughter)

AS: Ok. No I wanted to-- See just--

AD: Go ahead, go ahead.

AS (simultaneously): --you say-- you say now--

AD: But first [AS simultaneously: I follow that.] answer my question if you want to get a lead. What do we mean by mentalism?

AS: Ok. You mean in the case that you were u-- that everything is within the soul. That everything is projected from within the soul.

AD: Yeah, what-- do you think-- do you think it would have been better if PB's-- if we translated PB's terminology in our terminology, when we say mental, what will we mean?

AS (simultaneously): Soul.

AD: Wouldn't we mean-- wouldn't we mean Nous?

S (faint): Uh-hm.

S (very faint): [couple words inaudible]

AS: Ok, [student assents, faint] I follow(ed) that point. If everything's within the Nous--

AD: Everything's within the Nous.

S (very faint): Yeah.

AS: Ok, I-- then I-- in that case I follow. It's just that's-- there's-- I think that was part of Carol's confusion because it's at this--

AD (simultaneously): Carol's always confused, I don't pay attention to her.

AS: Ok, well then my confusion. (bit of laughter) My confusion. The-- at the-- at this point that you actually speak about the proje-- this light experience, this body of light, now it's-- he's a-- now he's projecting or experiencing all of the essences that he has accumulated [AD, faint: Uh-hm.] in this quintessential body. Before that, it may be that the experience is coming from within him. But it seems in a different way than it's coming from within him now that he's experiencing the quintessential body.

S (faint): Of course.

CDA: Uh-hm. Yeah.

AS: I mean-- and that's why-- To speak about them both-- um--

S (faint): [couple words inaudible]

RG (simultaneously): But doesn't at that point you start-- he would start consciously realizing the contents of the Nous atom as well and that the distinction becomes less and less as the quintessential body gets more and more wisdom?

AS: Yeah. But I--

AD: Yeah I-- I don't think I understand your-- I don't understand you yet, you have to try again.

AS: (Well--) um-- At this point you say well, now he's developed this quintessential body. All these lifetimes, all these essences he's accumulated he now begins projecting them as this light experience and this is what he's experiencing, this content of essences that's within himself, actually within this quintessential body.

AD (simultaneously): By the way, that's not the end of the process.

RC/S(?) (very faint): Yeah right.

AS: The next stage you-- you're going to have to be up at the [AD: Yeah.] inerratic as it were. But, in-- in the view-- in the epistemological view--

AD: Could I ask you, [AS: Yeah.] if he wanted to get up to the inerratic what would he have to develop?

AS: What would he have to develop? Well, instead of a body of reason he'd need a-- what's it called-- he'd have to get into conjunction with the unus mundus, the archetypal realm. What would he have to develop?

AD: If he-- if the-- in the ether he has to develop an-- the etheric body, quintessential body, and so let's say he can become a denizen or a resident of that sphere, suppose now he wants to--

AS: Well he'd need a body of-- you'd call this epiphany, the-- he would have to have all the Gods as it were within him. I mean, something like that. But, I think I follow so far, no problem. [short pause] You would say--

AD (simultaneously): Alright, we'll let it go because all of this is just to get us to the point where you get a rationale-- Well, it's-- it's pretty speculative as you can see but I am trying to bring them together as much material and correlated as many sides as we can. And maybe tomorrow we can show you the way Atwood is coming at it, alright, besides Jung. And, you know, like the-- it's the same thing like the last thing now. I'm not going to tell anyone to be a Vedantist or a Buddhist or anything else. He's going to decide-- he's going to decide that for himself sooner or later.

AS: Guess-- I guess I see what I-- I wanted to say. Before this quintessential body, you say it's all coming-- it's projected from within his own [AD simultaneously: Uh-hm.] soul, ok, I buy that. But what's projected isn't really his. The world he's projecting isn't really his. The World-Mind as it were, the Nous is presenting it [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] to him from within. But *now* what he's projecting really *is* his [students assent] in the experience [AD simultaneously: Yeah.] of these [CDA assents] lights, I mean it actually *is* his. So this-- there *is* [CDA assents] a distinction. There's a big-- there's quite a big difference.

AD (simultaneously): Oh sure, there's--

AS: I just was trying--

AD (simultaneously): There's the Intelligible World which is projected, then your role in that Intelligible World requires that you become a participant thereof.

AS: But I'm s-- but that's-- that seems to be the impor-- an important point in this step, in fact a very important point because if the purpose is somewhat to actualize his own individual nature, to become a self-conscious soul, (then/and) this seems to be--

AD (simultaneously): But-- but what did-- what did it mean to you, what did it mean to you when he-- when the remark was made that each person, you know-- that there's a possibility that you can get your own erector set and build your own [S simultaneously, faint: Right, uh-hm.] world system?

S (very faint): Didn't like that.

AD: You didn't like that?

AS: Yeah I [one word inaudible]

S: (Yeah right.)

AD (simultaneously): Well, if we do this now, alright, if you have something of, you know, a background in this here now, now when we start pointing out, I think like for instance you look at a natal chart and you try to see what experiences you're going through and what they mean to you, they have to be in the context of the building up the quintessential body. If they're only in terms of this particular lifetime with this, you know, short-- short end of, you know, then it won't be enough. In other words, to experience the

reason-principles in this life without this for a background, it's like a dead-end. But why should I bother experiencing reason-principles if I'm going to-- if this is all going to vanish?

AS: It seems then that-- along the lines of what Tim and Dickie were doing, talking-- you know, the way they were expressing it, it seems that what you're saying is the chart is-- well, Dickie said well it isn't-- this isn't the Nous atom, and Tim said well it expresses it. If you're saying that that quintessential body ex-- *is* that accumulated wisdom, the chart seems to be more direct, it *is* the quintessential body, (and/I mean) if you put it that way. [couple inaudible student words simultaneous with AS] It *is* his accumulated wisdom.

AD (simultaneously): The ether, that's right.

AS (simultaneously): See. But it's-- and it does rep-- it is that and it does represent his Nous atom, I mean--

AD (simultaneously): It *is* the ether, that's [AS simultaneously: It is the ether, yeah.] why you don't see it on the page.

AS (simultaneously): Yeah. That's why there's no fifth element.

AD (simultaneously): You don't see one of the elements as the ether.

AS: So more precisely it would-- it *would* be that, [RG: Yeah.] and it *does* repress--

RG (simultaneously): The more self-conscious it [AS assents] becomes, the closer it realizes its alignment with the Nous atom.

AS (simultaneously): With the Nous atom.

AD: Alright, go home, hurry up back. (laughter) Turn the (tape off).

S (simultaneously): [couple words inaudible]

TS (faint): Yeah, Parsifal.

[Audio File 1982 0305b Ends]

APPENDIX: 1982 0304-06 ALCHEMY PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT

[File 1982 0304-05-06 alchemy 10p F10.PDF Begins]

Atwood p. 98-9, 455, 94, 188-90

Macrocosmically, Proteus is the ‘power of Pan’, the medium of the World Soul’s manifestation of forms. Microcosmically, it is the imaginal essence, the astral light, the imagination needing to be purified, stripped so that the mind can conform to things as they are. The imaginal essence of a Sage is virginal and is like a magnet attracting [Partial transcript: AD replaces ‘attracting’ with ‘sensitive to’] whatever is around it. But ours is full of superfluous images from the past which we constantly project out. Thus the multiplicity of images we experience are intrinsic to the [Partial transcript: AD replaces ‘the’ with ‘our’] imaginal essence. The lower astral, the ‘Brazen Wall’ refers to that psychic belt which is around the individual as well as the world. The zodiacal degrees are outside of the imaginal essence, but manifest through it. As the planets continually return and aspect the natal degrees, the activities become more and more efficient. The imagery is reduced and interferes less and less with the planetary functions. So it is the planets, the faculties of the soul that will be subjected to the discipline, the purifying process which is ultimately to be free of images. [Partial transcript: AD adds “& efficient functioning without self-cons.”]

The purification entails returning the images into the very substance of the astral realm; a proper method being the Hua T’ou exercise: before the image or thought gets the opportunity to manifest, you cut them off at the point [Partial transcript: AD adds “just prior to”] where they arise. We have to conceive that all the images in the imagination are being cleansed so that what gets fixed is the imaginal essence in its purity. [Partial transcript: AD changes last part of sentence to “so that the imaginal essence gets fixed in its purity.”] You begin to see it more and more as a ‘thing’ to deal with. Before you can understand the powers [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘& ideas’] that are manifesting themselves in this flow of sensory imagery (the presentation) the images have to be made fluid, flexible [Partial transcript: AD adds “deprived of our preferences”]. You have to restore the world you perceive back into a matrix of possibilities before there can be a communication and an identity between the inner reason and what nature is trying to manifest. [Partial transcript: AD adds “to your inner sense”] The instantiation of the sensible world is a concretization of the Intelligible World within, and if kept flexible one can understand the reason principles manifesting as the sensible object. So the beginning of the work is to make the energies dominant in your mind absolutely flexible and to fix the imaginal essence [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘in transparency’].

This is not the Bodhicitta or Nous Atom per se, but that which is emanated or projected out, the causal light or vital principle -- Mercurius. P.B. speaks of the heart atom as being the origin of Being, Consciousness and Activity. The vital principle has its origin or genesis from that atom. This vitality which has developed over eons of time both phylogenetically and ontogenetically will always tend to go back and recapitulate past ways of operating until it is consciously directed by the will. The Alchemists said that this energy has to be captured and bottled, and the container or bottle is the will. Mercurius escaping from the vessel is like a renegade monk, fleeing from the discipline of the will back to the old ways, among the most noticeable is the tendency towards sexuality and emotionality.

The imagination is very volatile; influences continually flow through it and it wanders everywhere with them; it has to be continually brought back, over and over again through an effort of will. Generally the will would let it go off where it wants, so in this [Partial transcript: AD adds

‘disciplinary’] process the will is being purged. It is not a repression but a suppression of this energy; it will take all the conscious understanding you have to do it. Every vital impulse is Mercurius personified. It is such an intimate thing that is going on all the time, you can hardly distinguish yourself from that operation. So the ultimate task is the purgation of the will.

In the Alchemical scheme, Mercurius is not only the projection of the vital principle from the heart atom, but also the introjection of reason principles from without. An image is presented to you and it seems that a meaning goes right into you. We would call that image the presentation or your astral soul. So it seems that the meanings are coming from without to within. On the other hand it can be reversed; there is something out there and you project something from within on to it. Whether you call it introjection or projection, in both cases it is Mercurius. Psychologically this is what Jung calls the anima function -- that which is projected out onto circumstances as well as being the rapport one has with the circumstances in order to assimilate the meaning. This mysterious quality is associated with the mysterious quality of our attention. What is the meaning of attention?

The angular relationship of the planets in the natal chart represents the unadorned powers of the soul (as a set of numerical combinations), the causal light that is being fixed. [Partial transcript: AD adds “or the initial identification of the Nous atom with a specific quality of energy of the moment”] The houses represent the body, the signs represent the mind, i.e. together the body-mind complex. The causal light is thus here embodied and immediately there will arise the process of projection and introjection of [Partial transcript: AD replaces ‘what’ with ‘the task’] the soul powers have to accomplish. They go through the double process of getting refined and manifesting the reason principles buried in the matter [Partial transcript: AD puts single quotes around ‘matter’]. The body is the medium for the manifestation of the reason principles which are not to be conceived as static, but as functional. Your body is part of, is included in the world body, and is a very specific organized destiny. The soul has to learn certain lessons according to the body it is inserted in. Or, if we use a mentalistic framework we would say the Nous Atom contains the whole Intelligible Cosmos and projects that out (including the body) and then identifies itself with that body; then that material body is the product of the soul’s faculties, which means that the level of development of the soul’s faculties determine the kind of body it is going to have.

Upon perishing, the gross and subtle bodies return to the elements, and the residue -- the bits of wisdom extracted, remains in the causal body. So the causal body is not a tabula rasa, it carries with it all the development of prior soul functions. [Partial transcript: AD writes in left margin: “here it seems causal body is = to quint. Body...?”] This is what KCB refers to as the Vijnanamaya Kosa -- a body of will-seeds -- where the entity remains between lives. We can call the causal body the abstract ego, and say this ego is the result of all previous egos. In other words, it is not a static conception.

If we think of the individual soul not only as the moment of the first breath, but as the whole ongoing process from birth to death, all the transits and progressions, we see it as a constant radiation of light associated with the planetary configurations. This is what the Buddhists refer to as the mind continuum; at each incarnation the process is continued. Are we to think of this mind continuum as that incessant operation of the projection of the causal light [Partial transcript: Student adds “from the Bodhicitta,”] or are we to think of the Bodhicitta as a substantial entity which is inserted into manifestation, remains and never leaves?

The Buddhist view of the mind continuum is one of continuity without [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘excluding’] identity. There is a continuous stream, yet thought A is not thought B. They deny the possibility of a self identical substance, their position is the constant motion of the planetary spheres.

Their mind continuum is quanta, granular in structure; moment by moment it is ‘shooting out’ but is one entity in the sense that it is one mind stream and not another.

For them the Bodhicitta, the Thought of Enlightenment, is part of the mind continuum and is therefore in ever becoming. Their intent is to give the mind continuum a direction so that all the experiences are organized toward the goal of achieving Bodhisattvahood. Buddhahood would be the ultimate outcome of this where the entire world process is comprised within the mind continuum. So there is for them a continuity of thought, the prior thought has some effect or modification on the thought which follows. But the person perishes and is reborn, and they claim it is the same mind continuum, but there seems to be breaks between incarnations. This strictly functional view doesn’t explain this. And, if it is just a mind, where is the subject? [Partial transcript: AD writes in margin to the right of the last two sentences: ?]

We have described the Bodhicitta as the spark from the Soul in the Intellectual Principle, which is radiated out and gets immersed in manifestation, [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘or’] “inserted into” an organized body. Does this Bodhicitta remain self identical with itself? As we have just stated, the Prasangika-Madhyamikas say no, and refer to it as continuity [Partial transcript: AD or student crosses out ‘without identity’]. From the mentalistic point of view the entire cosmos is internal to the soul, as Plotinus speaks of each soul containing an intellectual cosmos. [Note: See Plotinus, III.4.3 (last para), III.4.6 (sixth para from end).] This spark then has an eternal immutability, it always remains self identical with itself. The continuity of the projection of the Intelligible content is the mind continuum; it becomes the perceived world which is in constant flux, i.e. the transits and progressions.

Both views have to be combined for a workable thesis. In the sensible world there is reduplicated [Partial transcript: AD puts single quotes around ‘reduplicated’] that which is in the Intelligible World. In the Intellectual Principle the Intelligibles are eternal authentic existences and because of the power they embody they radiate out an outward facing hypostasis. Reality must reveal itself in this paradoxical complementarism. On the level of the soul this polarity exists between its eternal contemplation of the Idea of Man and the actualization of that eternal vision in the perpetuity of time. If you say the soul’s vision of the Idea of Man is the reality and don’t include the actualization, only half the truth is revealed. So unless the Intelligible within is projected out, and the Nous Atom experiences in terms of a subject-object duality under the intensity of waking consciousness, it will not become actualized, fully aware of itself. Thus this pure intelligence has all the elements necessary to project the world, the ideas and the power necessary to instantiate the ideas in a sensorial way. This power can be manifested in two ways – nada or the wave formation and bindu or the particle. [Partial transcript: AD puts the last sentence in parentheses.]

Where is this Nous Atom located in the chart? The chart is a symbolical representation of your entire sensible world. The chart therefore has to apply to a certain Nous Atom otherwise it would be meaningless. But the Nous Atom itself can not be seen in the chart, there is no way to symbolize it. [Partial transcript: AD adds “except that it refers to one –”]

The Nous Atom contains the whole of the Intelligible World, which is not to be restricted to this sensible manifestation or that portion which you perceive. Insofar that the world gets projected from the Nous Atom and then you are located in that world, then the Nous Atom has to be in that body, and that body is the field in which it gains experience.

It is the problem of the simultaneity of the subtle and gross realms. You cannot speak of the one without the other being present. The Nous Atom is a very subtle entity located in the heart, but if we say

the physical heart we would be wrong, although, when you experience it, you infer that it is within the heart. As with the experience of kundalini, there is no correlation between the dimensions of the body and the experience of that pillar of [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘fire &’] light. There is no geographical topology in the subtle realm [Partial transcript: AD adds “that we could point to”].

The Alchemists used the chemical processes in order to make contact with and fix the volatile subtle forces. When the subtle processes are projected onto a substance (the body) there is an amalgamation of the subtle and the physical; this is the chemical wedding and results in what we experience in our outer consciousness as thoughts and feelings. In the chemical process, for example a metal getting oxidized, there is a combination of two things -- iron and oxygen -- and something new is produced. In the same way, when the subtle combines with the physical body from within [Partial transcript: AD or student adds a comma] a third thing is produced, [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘ultimately’] the quintessential body. Eventually there comes a recognition of this process and you begin to play a conscious role in [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘directing it’]. So it may be that the Alchemists were using those processes the same way we use the chart. For on the one hand, we have a subtle understanding working its way out, and on the other hand, we have to fix it, so we turn it into a diagram or symbolical representation resulting in a fixity of conceptual understanding; it becomes more and more a body of content with structure and organization.

The ego of the next incarnation will be the result of all understanding previously acquired. The quintessential body thus continues with the Nous Atom life after life. When we say the planets signify the powers of the soul it means this wisdom is accumulated life after life, [Partial transcript: AD or student crosses out ‘and each incarnation,’] each chart would be a moment fixed as representative of this accumulated knowledge of the soul. And this is what is meant that the ego itself is the causal body. In this way the angular relationship of the planets precisely describes the level of the soul’s evolution. At this moment, all the degrees and parts that the soul will have to assimilate are also fixed. So when you look at a natal chart and you try to see what experiences you are going through and what they mean, they have to be in the context of the quintessential body. It [Partial transcript: AD adds ‘represent’] the ether, [Partial transcript: AD adds “which is not included in the symbolism”] that is why you do not see it on the chart.

When the quintessential body has been fully developed, the next step is the development of the body of light. Through the mystical experience of the lights the wisdom previously extracted is projected out and becomes the body of light. The man of light projects from within himself his contents, which are reason principles. So he experiences the quintessential body of wisdom that he has built up through eons of time. Plotinus is referring to this level when in III-8-6 he says:

The Sage, then, has gone through a process of reasoning when he expounds his act to others, but in relation to himself he is Vision: such a man is already set, not merely in regard to exterior things but also within himself, towards what is one and at rest: all his faculty and life are inward bent.

Before this evolution, what is projected as the world is not really his. The Nous projects it from within him. But now what he projects is his own wisdom or quintessential body. The Intelligible World is projected and your role in that requires that you become a self-conscious participant thereof. This is what it means to have your own erector set. [Partial transcript: AD changes last sentence to: “Is this what it means to have your own erector set?”]

[File 1982 0304-05-06 alchemy 10p F10.PDF Ends]