

Bhikkhu Anālayo Daniel Ingram Email Exchange:

Email Exchanges between Bhikkhu Anālayo and Daniel Ingram, slightly redacted per Anālayo's wishes. Bracketed text my own:

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[Daniel's email address]>:

Dear Bhante,

Ok, well, that you wish to talk sooner rather than later is a lot better from my point of view, though I am sorry that coronavirus has disrupted your scholarly pursuits, at least in general terms. Given that it sounds like you treated my book about the same way I treated your article, I must admit that a delay does not cause me discomfort. Just like the round of rebirths, we find ourselves in a variety of rolls and relationships. I often wonder when I meet people how well they performed when they were in the role of Mara... ;)

I am happy to send you my reply, and so you will find it in text form below. Again, it has a bite, as does most of my writing, as you have probably noticed if you have read my MCTB2 all the way through, so no surprise really. I entirely get that this is not everyone's cup of tea.

Still, my reply at least has the virtue of emotional honesty and its tone maintains artistic continuity with that. It could also probably use a bit more editing, as it was written straight through without a lot of editing or further reflection, and definitely not in its final form, but pretty close. If you happen to catch any typos along the way, I am happy to learn of them, though no obligation for you to help the opposition, obviously.

As my reply is long, and on first reading might cause some reactivity, it might take you a bit to read and ponder it properly, and, as your time is likely more constrained than mine, when you feel you have had enough time, pick a Friday or Saturday, and I will make time then. I am on Central time, so 7pm your time/6pm mine are probably easier for me than 7am your time/6am mine, as I tend to rise around 7:30-8am most days, and, as I would prefer as much harmony benefit from the exchange as we can manage, probably best if I am not groggy. Let me know when you are ready and willing.

Also, if you want to converse about any other topics, the primary topics I like discussing these days are real personal practice and also meditation research, and happy to make some time for those topics if you care to, as there, at least for me, is where the spark is at the moment.

Best wishes, stay safe, and talk soon,

Daniel

[Daniel's contact information]

This is my point-by-point response to Bhikkhu Analayo's (forgive my lack of diacritics) article entitled "The Insight Knowledge of Fear and Adverse Effects of Mindfulness Practices", *Mindfulness* (2019) 10:2172–2185

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-019-01198-4>, Published online: 17 July 2019 Copyright Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2019

[The rest of my complete point-by-point redacted due to respect for copyright and the fact that it quoted the entire article line by line verbatim with replies interlaced, which, given that I just sent it to the BA, who wrote the article, should be ok.]

On May 1, 2020, at 7:11 PM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings

I read the first half of your writings and do not need any time to recover from that. I had expected something of the sort and have no problems with it. So if you are free we can meet tomorrow evening, Saturday 2nd of May, 7.00 pm my time (6 pm yours), by which time I will have read the other part of your writings. Please send a zoom link if convenient

with much metta

Analayo

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:

[\[Zoom link\]](#)

Just making sure you have this.

<PastedGraphic-1.png>

On May 2, 2020, at 6:04 PM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

this does not seem to work. I clicked the link you gave earlier and it says you have another meeting in progress

On May 2, 2020, at 6:05 PM, Daniel M. Ingram <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)> wrote:

Try this one:

Daniel M Ingram is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Analayo Daniel Zoom Meeting 1

Time: May 2, 2020 06:00 PM Central Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

[\[Zoom link\]](#)

On May 8, 2020, at 5:27 AM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings and thank you for the kind mail; I really appreciate you are allowing me to confirm or clarify the points that emerged for you from our interesting discussion. I reply below in italics

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[Daniel's email address](#)>:

Thanks so much for your time. It was good meeting you at last.

I wrote a brief summary of our conversation and wished to be certain this was representative of your views on our conversation, as I will include it in my response to your article in edited form.

"It should be noted that I had about a 90 minute discussion of my response to Bhikkhu Analayo with him over Zoom on May 2nd, 2020, during which he expressed the following major points:

- He truly believes in his heart of hearts that the stages of insight as he understands them never happen to people except rarely and then only on intensive Buddhist insight retreats and in no other contexts.

yes [These italicized replies after the bullet points are from BA].

- He believes me to be a highly deluded, self-promoting, dangerous author without realization or any personal understanding of the stages of insight or jhanas whose book and work are not only categorically wrong when it comes to insight stages, but actively harmful to practitioners.

yes, although I would not have used the word "dangerous"

- He says he wrote the article critiquing my book and its ideas about insight stages because he was begged by essentially all the senior insight teachers in the Goenka, Mahasi, and Pa Auk, as well as Western Vipassana tradition, to address the gross flaws in my absurd logic and conceptual understandings.

no. I was asked by one single teacher to read and criticize your book.

- He did say that his impression of me wasn't quite as negative after we talked, but still was utterly certain of his core diagnostic impressions.

yes

- He categorically denies that it was in any way his intention to deceive anywhere in this article, and was utterly unacknowledging of the possibility that there might possibly be flaws in his logic.

yes about my intention, no about the rest. I am not infallible and have made mistakes in the past, which I have been quick to acknowledge, once pointed out. Only so far in our exchange you have not pointed out a real flaw, as far as I can see.

- He didn't address the clinical implications of his points, as he said he is a scholar and that was not what he was trying to do, but instead was trying to illustrate textual points about early Theravada Buddhism.

Not quite, I was throughout trying to make the point that the insight knowledges are about insight meditation, not about other experiences.

- He was certain that I wasn't a Buddhist scholar and was utterly convinced that I hadn't read many of the books that I claim to have read, such as *The Dark Night of the Soul*, a title he said was a mistranslation and erroneous.

*Yes about you not being a Buddhist scholar. About the *Dark Night of the Soul*, please see the attached article.*

- He was certain that he was not in any way using rhetoric for propagandic purposes in this article.

yes

- He said that the *Visuddhimagga* is the definitive and final guide to the stages of insight, and anything that falls outside of that, such as contemporary phenomenology and observations of what happens in real practitioners today, being intrinsically non-canonical, can't possibly apply to the stages of insight.

*No. Here and elsewhere, my point is that in order to apply the notion of the "insight knowledges" to someone's subjective experience, one has to stay within the framework within which these evolved. This is Theravada insight meditation, for which the *Visuddhimagga* is the central point of reference. Your childhood experiences, for example, are not fit to be considered insight knowledges. Taking this position does not mean that I reject actual experiences for the sake of a theoretical model. I am only saying that this particular theoretical model should be used for the type of actual experiences for which it was designed, not for others.*

- He dismissed entirely the notion that traditional Buddhist insight stages could apply to traditions such as Christian contemplatives, rejecting perennialism and the notion that Buddhist insight stages were describing something universal in attentional development.

yes

- He laughed when I mentioned the point he made in his Harvard YouTube Wisdom video about Rebirth, that of confirmation bias, that being two individuals who read the same data and come to utterly different and even diametrically opposed views on the topic, as, from my point of view, appears to be happening here. <https://youtu.be/YLT63llyQgI> start at around 29:02 or so.

yes

- He does acknowledge that there are situations where people on intensive retreats can get into difficult mind states and that teachers in those traditions are not always well-trained to handle these, so, at least on this we agree.

yes

I did find him a pleasant person to speak with, so that's something, and we agreed to have further dialogue while acknowledging that it was likely impossible that either of us would convince the other of our points of view."

yes.

Any further thoughts welcome.

There were a few other things that we discussed which you did not include in the above (such as your claim to be an authorized insight meditation teacher), but that is fine. [Redacted by BA's request]. As soon as I have the final version [Of the article from Springer], I will send that to you and this is then a version that you could share with others, in case you wish, but not post on the web, as it is copyrighted material. Once you have read and digested the article, we might see if we can find another occasion for an online exchange.

with lots of metta

Analayo

Best wishes!

Daniel

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:
Dear Analayo,

Thanks for your responses and clarifications. They are much appreciated. If it is ok with you, may I pass on our written exchange in those last two emails to those who have been following along at home? Our interactions have garnered considerable interest.

[Redacted by Anālayo's request]

Thanks yet again for the offer of another exchange once appropriate digestion has occurred. I realize that at some point you will be going on a three month retreat, so do let me know if and when that time period will happen, if you care to, so that I can see if I can work around it properly.

Our interactions highlight a key issue I have been pondering and discussing since last Summer, that curious mix of proprietary linguistics, orthodoxy, and the battle for the control of professional and

academic lexicons that may sometimes obscure the underlying truths and useful points they were originally created to illuminate, miring them in politics and ignoring the real clinical needs they might represent.

They also highlight the historical and political tensions that those who innovate based on more traditional material, such as myself and my academic colleagues, face when they attempt to bring the resulting innovations into some more contemporary, secular, clinical context. They (in this case we) can face resistance both from those who look back to religious history with a quality of reverence and also from those who look at their current, contemporary, in this case secular clinical tradition with a comfortable sense of solid certainty and so similarly change.

I will give you an example of the sorts of thoughts that can arise when trying to respectfully navigate these choppy waters. Last Summer, while staying at Wolfson College in Cambridge in the UK, I had a long conversation with a distinguished professor of medical linguistics about these thorny issues, as well as numerous other academics at various times before and after, including numerous conversations with the Department of Psychiatry professor that had invited me there for the Summer.

In a half-joking, half-serious fashion, one idea we pondered was renaming the predictable patterns that I see clinically and associate with the descriptions of the progress of insight (against your noted objections) as a “Wolfson Cycle”. In this “Wolfson Cycle” might be the following:

- What I typically call the Three Characteristics stage (against your noted objections) is renamed a “Wolfson Prodrome”
- The A&P (again against your noted objections) as a “Wolfson Event”.
- The difficult stages that follow (again noting your objections) as something like the “Wolfson Minimum” and some other possibilities, as in, “His sudden unexplained depression and paranoia after his Wolfson Event may be at least partially explained by his entering a Wolfson Minimum.”
- The phase of Equanimity (again, noting your objections) as “Wolfson Integration” and possibly other variants.

We played around with variants on these terms, even considering terms from Greek Mythology for them, which is often, curiously, considered acceptable in clinical contexts, probably due to it being a dead religion and thus not a threat. At various times we pondering their clinical rings to the ear in contemporary contexts. Everything that follows is merely a whimsical exploration of the possible consequences of these possible linguistic gambits.

Curiously, I think you would have largely approved of our conversations, as they address numerous key issues you also care about and raise.

The professor and I realized that this sort of strategy solved various problems but created others.

It fixes instantly the objections that traditionalists such as yourself raise, bypassing in one step the entire swamp of issues. However, it does cut the roots (however erroneous from your point of view)

to the core, historical material that did actually historically lead to the development of the clearly recognized clinical pattern and nomenclature.

Science generally likes to give credit where credit is due, even if, as you point out in your arguments, there is the possibility that credit is wildly off in some key way. The mistakes and missteps of science are often as interesting as the great and accurate leaps, and we obviously would disagree on which is happening here, but the key point remains in the abstract.

It also fixes numerous other religious objections, such as by powerful fundamentalist Christian, Islamic, and Hindu groups, for example, that would likely similarly loathe having terms that originated in Buddhism being used to diagnose them in a medical context.

Furthermore, it similarly dodges the objections of staunch scientific materialist atheists who might just as zealously loathe terms that originated in any religious or spiritual context being allowed into the Respectable and Rational Canon of Medicine.

A “Wolfson Cycle” just sounds respectable. You can imagine some old British colonel saying, “Old Bigsby just entered a Wolfson Cycle last Tuesday,” and his British major friend replying, “Ah! Jolly good show! God save the Queen!”

I am obviously slightly joking when I write this stereotyped dialogue, but the point remains.

This respectable sounding ring to it, divorced utterly from squabbles among traditionalists of both the secular and religious varieties, having that delightful sound of old school eponymous medical terms, frees it instantly from the objections of both, and might allow this clear clinical pattern into places that, hobbled by linguistic objections, it might not be able to enter.

It also might just be able respectable sounding enough to slip into the ICD-10 codes and DSM, which are among my core targets for this clear phenomenological, clinical pattern, however named. Truly, a rose by any other name...

I appreciate your willingness, however reluctant and tinged with obvious disappointment and disapproval, if not to say hints of revulsion, to participate in this dialogue, and any thoughts are welcome. There may yet be a way forward we are all happy with. Our storm clouds may have the possibility of a silver lining, if we have the skill, that is.

Just so we are clear, my core concerns that drive me daily to pour countless hours into this project are that patients get cared for properly, and I actually do not care at all what words are used to do that so long as the care is good and the words and concepts that facilitate that care are useful to that purpose and adopted.

You clearly care profoundly about the objections you raise, as was evident in your face and tone, and I respect that and hear you.

Any thoughts truly welcome, as, if our solutions going forward please you, they would likely please many others, and I am happy to eliminate any needless landmines that could impede this

clinically-focused, pragmatic, non-dogmatic project. It is not that everyone can be pleased in this, including me, but we can all at least try. You have the opportunity, however reluctantly, to do good here, so I welcome your participation if you will offer it.

Best wishes and hopefully talk soon,

Daniel

On May 9, 2020, at 5:24 AM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings and thank you

Please feel free to share the replies in my last email with whoever might be interested. [Redacted by request of BA].

I would be happy to meet online again on a Friday or Saturday, my two online days, at the time we used last time, i.e. 7.00 pm Eastern time, which I believe was one hour earlier yours. I have one appointment pending for one of the next Fridays and Saturdays, not yet confirmed, hence it would be good if you could provide me with two alternative dates that would work for you, if possible.

If you were to stop using the insight knowledges for describing what you consider to be clearly recognizable standard clinical patterns, I would no longer have any objection. I am a scholar of Buddhist Studies and a teacher of Buddhist meditation, and it is from these two perspectives that I object. My objection is not against caring for the clinical needs of people; I only object to how this is done.

with much metta

Analayo

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:

Dear Analayo,

Thanks for the clarifications and suggested changes to the email. I will respect your wishes in this.

I can meet Friday or Saturday at 7pm Eastern, 6pm Central, so let me know which works best for you, and, given that I find our dialogue important, let me know other times if neither of those works and I can likely be flexible.

I appreciate your respect for my deeply clinical focus and interests, and I appreciate your deeply scholastic and orthodox one.

That your objection was so carefully circumscribed and essentially purely linguistic, doctrinal, and denominational was not apparent to me in your article, but now that this has been definitively clarified, the situation feels far more workable, and the origins and paradigmatic underpinnings of your arguments make more sense to me than they did before.

May I share publicly your concise and definite summary statement of the linguistic criteria under which you would drop all objections to the description of the apparent clinical patterns?

I hopefully will have written my whole reply to your article about me and my work before we talk again, but realize it will probably take 20+ hours or so to really get it done properly, even in a first complete draft form, and I can't be entirely sure that I can do it by next weekend, and there is some possibility that you may just see a partial response, which might have to do, given time constraints. It is an imperfect world after all.

Best wishes and stay safe,

Daniel

On May 15, 2020, at 5:37 AM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:
Dear Daniel

warm greetings

thank you for checking and no problem with sharing my last reply with others

The article has in the meantime come out; I append the online version which can now be shared with whomever you like to share it with.

I would be available tonight at 7.00 pm my time (6.00 pm yours), but we could also wait another week and then meet the Friday or the Saturday (I would be able to confirm on next Friday morning which works better for me). It is up to you what you prefer.

There is no need to show me your criticism ahead of our discussion or ahead of publishing it in whatever way you intend to publish it, unless there is something specific that is unclear and which you like me to clarify. Only it would be nice to let me know once it is out; I will do the same with whatever reply I might offer to that, which, if at all, will only be after my 3 months retreat.

As with the other article, your reply would need to some extent to summarize what I say; the interlinear style you used earlier would not work due to copyright restrictions.

all the best and with much metta

Analayo

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:
Dear Analayo,

Thanks for your email.

Yes, I have seen the article in Mindfulness and the team and I are working on various responses to the many intricate points it raises on so many fronts.

Given the newness of this, let's wait a week, if that is ok with you. I have spent probably 50 yours so far in my response, and it turns out that isn't nearly enough time to do it all justice, so the added week will allow for something vastly more refined.

Yes, the intraliner style is more for article production purposes, to make sure that all points of relevance are addressed. The final version would do its best to fairly summarize your points so they might be addressed. That intralinear style also doesn't work due to issues of length.

I have two questions for you in the meantime, if you would be so kind:

1) Do you have a coherent piece somewhere that really lays out in detail your preferred relationship between your understanding of the orthodoxy of your denomination of Theravada Buddhism and the functional world of clinical Mindfulness, mental health therapy, neurophenomenology, and the science that underpins clinical medicine? I am getting it in hints and pieces, but it would be nice to see something that was comprehensive and definite for clarity and understanding your point of view, as ambiguities around this clearly have caused some confusion.

2) How do you view authors such as Jack Kornfield and Joseph Goldstein, both vastly more popular and influential than me, who routinely use language and concepts in their writings and talks which are quite similar to many of those you criticize in mine? Given that they were key influences on me as I came up in this meditation world, and many of the ideas and terms that I use actually came straight from them, as I presume you know, this would help me understand how you see your relationship to the looser, more Universalist, more Perennialist, more inclusive, progressive denomination of Buddhism that they have clearly helped create vs the more ancient and orthodox one you clearly prefer. Said another way, are you sure you have picked the correct target for your writings, namely me and those who share my views, or am I really something of a mechanism to launch broader critiques at targets that are actually farther up the chain of causality from me but too popular to take on directly without paying too high a political price? I don't mean this in an accusatory way, necessarily, just trying to understand you and how you conceive of all of this. If you haven't read Jack or Joseph's works, I think you should, as it is hard to imagine you not having a lot to say about them.

Best wishes,

Daniel

On May 15, 2020, at 17:15, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings

perfectly fine to wait another week (even two if you like).

1) I am not writing from an orthodox Theravadin perspective. I am ordained in that tradition, but ordination does not come with any imposed need to uphold certain orthodoxies. My work in this article (and others) is intended to provide an early Buddhist perspective, in the way this can be reconstructed through comparative study of the early discourses, on matters of relevance to the mindfulness community in general.

2) None of the two teachers you mention has come out with claims anything close to what you have done. There is thus no need for me to target them indirectly. My concerns are seriously misleading descriptions of the insight knowledges, combined with false claims to high attainments, and mistaken allegations of the supposed dangers of mindfulness that are based on the two items just mentioned. This matches your case, not the others.

with much metta

Analayo

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[Daniel's email address](#)>:
Interesting replies.

To be able to address these issues more concretely and precisely in a clinical and research context, would you do me and the discussion the favor of detailing the complete, definitive list of clinical criteria by which a clinician with unlimited currently-available diagnostic capabilities at their disposal might recognize an arahant and exclude non-arahants according to the dictates of your tradition such that an appropriate study of the situation might reasonable be designed that would definitively settle the issue for both sides in both theory and practice of how arahats manifest in your specific sect? I have highly competent researchers that might be interested in attempting a validation of your claims and so end arguments.

However, it should also reasonably be noted that, while MCTB has the word Buddha on it, even a cursory reading of the first few pages identifies it clearly and in detail as a contemporary fusion tradition and thus categorically different from your denomination and your precise creeds. Are you sure your attentions are warranted and that your criticisms apply as you feel they do? You allow the Vajrayana, for example, yet their definitions of arhat are quite different from those you prefer. Mine differs from the one you prefer and the one they prefer.

Regardless of name, my experience performs as I say it does, and redefining arahatship is neither new nor unique. In fact, you should consider paying attention to my definition, as it can, in fact be accomplished, as others have noted. It is based on reasonable assumptions, compatible with

contemporary sensibilities, and straightforward in practice. Further, it is actually quite nice and satisfying. I recommend it.

Best wishes,

Daniel

Sent from my iPad

Dear Daniel

warm greetings

In my article I describe the criteria for determining if someone fails to live up to the claim of being an arahant. This is not the position of some specific sect or personal creed, but of early Buddhist thought as reconstructed with the academic methodology of comparative study.

with much metta

Analayo

On May 16, 2020, at 9:25 AM, Daniel M. Ingram <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)> wrote:
Alright, said another way, do you accept each and every criteria in the Pali Canon as definitive? There are a number you don't seem to address.

Would you be interested in helping to coordinate and spec out a clinical trial to determine if some of those currently claiming arahatship in the Theravada monastic tradition meet all of those criteria when rigorously studied in controlled conditions, if they were agreeable? It could be a great opportunity to leverage the impressive capabilities of science to boost the veracity of Buddhism.

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:
Further, how do you see the relationship between the Dhamma of the Buddha and Mindfulness? In particular, if Mindfulness is close enough to the Dhamma to be informed by your work, is it then still ok to charge so much for it?

I am pretty sure the Buddha thought the Dhamma should be freely given, having boundless value as it does?

If Mindfulness is ok as it is, meaning they can charge large amounts of money for it, up to hundreds per hour for some therapists, what do you think the early Buddhist literature has to say about that? Is this Right Morality?

Thanks,

Daniel

On May 16, 2020, at 11:07 AM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings. I do not accept each and every criteria in the Pali canon. In fact, this canon has a range of different texts of different time periods. What I refer to is "early Buddhism". This emerges out of a comparison of Pali discourses (mainly the four Nikayas) with their parallels in other transmission lineages (mostly in Chinese, but some in Gandhari, Sanskrit, and Tibetan.

"some of those currently claiming arahatship in the Theravada monastic tradition". I am not sure who you have in mind.

As for MBIs and charging money, please read the attached article. It shows that already the Buddha taught mindfulness for health purposes and had no qualms about the instruction being delivered on his behalf by a paid instructor.

with much metta

Analyo

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:

Interesting.

So, in your view, only the earliest Buddhist texts are accurate in this regard? Can you list some of the canonical criteria you reject so I get a sense of it more definitely?

Also, do you have a definitive list of which suttas are and aren't "early" according to your scholarship?

Also, you frequently site the commentaries, which are clearly not very "early", and, at least as I understand it, generally later than even the latest Pali Canon texts? I am sure you can correct my errors if I have made them here.

Do you ever feel a sense of tension between the scientific, clinical paradigm, which is generally, "The latest and greatest is likely best, as it has been studied and refined the most," and the religious paradigm, which is often, "The closer to the source [in this case the Buddha], the more authentic and thus the best regardless of historical refinement."? If so, how do you personally resolve that tension? If not, what do you believe allows you to not have it whereas others might?

Said another way, how can you tell which old things are simply too old to make sense today and which old things are clearly highly applicable to a contemporary clinical setting?

Thanks for continuing the dialogue,

Daniel

On May 22, 2020, at 04:35, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings, hoping this mail finds you well. Here the summer has just arrived

I did not understand your first question. There is no definite list of suttas that are early. This has to be decided case by case. The commentaries are clearly much later than the suttas. About my vision on how early Buddhism could related to cognitive psychology, please see end of attached article.

A friend wanted to know if you still considered yourself an arahant, as he had heard you had withdrawn from that claim. I would like to share the following part of your previous email, which to me gives the impression that you still make this claim, and also wonder if you have anything to add to that:

"Regardless of name, my experience performs as I say it does, and redefining arahatship is neither new nor unique. In fact, you should consider paying attention to my definition, as it can, in fact be accomplished, as others have noted. It is based on reasonable assumptions, compatible with contemporary sensibilities, and straightforward in practice. Further, it is actually quite nice and satisfying. I recommend it."

with much metta

Analayo

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:

Dear Analayo,

I have sent you links to two Google Docs, the first is a mostly cathartic, point-by-point response, a work whose ultimate destination is unknown, and the second, derived from it, extracted, coming from a much larger point of view, more of that of the field of Mindfulness and meditation science rather than our limited conflicts. You will have the ability to add any comments you like on them, and, while I might not agree, will definitely carefully consider your point of view and see what can be done to resolve conflict where it reasonably can be. Hopefully, by highlighting these questions, which I believe are important, our dialogue will have helped further a more functional conversation.

If you are up for meeting either tonight or Saturday, do let me know. I could make either night at 6pm my time, 7pm yours work, and possibly other times as well.

Thanks for your continued interest in dialogue about these topics so dear to both of our hearts,

Best wishes,

Daniel

Sent from my iPad

On May 22, 2020, at 2:15 PM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings

I had a short look, but even the shorter document is too much for me to read now. I have proofs for my next book with Wisdom, just received copy edits for a translation with BDK, am teaching an online course, and have an article to complete. With all that, my time until I go on retreat is very limited.

We could meet tonight at 7.00 pm my time for maybe 45 minutes, if that works for you. If there is anything specific you like me to read before that, please send, but it would only work for something that does not exceed 2 to 3 pages. Thank you for your kind understanding.

with much metta

Analayo

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:
Daniel M Ingram is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Analayo and Daniel Meeting

Time: May 22, 2020 06:00 PM Central Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

[\[Zoom link\]](#)

[Zoom details redacted]

On May 22, 2020, at 6:55 PM, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings, it has been very nice talking to you.

Here is my article studying the insight knowledges (Dynamics of Insight), and then my satipatthana practice guide (this is the third of my books on satipatthana, the first was my phd in which I survey the Satipatthanasutta, the second brings in the Chinese parallels, and this one is just about actual practice)

Enjoy whenever your long reading list allows.

And I will keep thinking about the fire kasina

with much metta

Analayo

On May 22, 2020, at 7:17 PM, Daniel M. Ingram <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)> wrote:

Thanks! Will definitely check them out as time permits.

Retreat well!

Seriously, fire kasina! So amazing! Give it a minimum of 100 hours over 7-10 days before really judging it: my best advice. If you do this, remember that black and grey are colors that can be attended to, and that it really doesn't matter what you are seeing but that you simply see it and stay attentive and interested in it. Don't forget Neko's Triad: Patience, faith, and curiosity. Mixes well with simple mantras, as the old books say. Yay!

www.firekasina.org

Best wishes,

Daniel

Quoting "Daniel M. Ingram" <[\[Daniel's email address\]](#)>:

Dear Analayo,

If you haven't started your retreat yet, a Theravada monk friend was asking about the reference for the sutta where the Buddha said it was ok to charge money to teach the Dhamma.

If you have started your retreat, I hope it goes very well.

Best wishes,

Daniel

On May 29, 2020, at 18:27, [\[Anālayo's email address\]](#) wrote:

Dear Daniel

warm greetings

the formulation your friend uses is a bit in need of change, it is worded incorrectly. The discourse in question shows the Buddha giving an instruction on mindful eating to an overweight king. In front of the Buddha, the king asks someone in the audience to memorize the instruction and recite it to him daily, promising a regular payment for that. This then happens (with no record of any objection from the Buddha) and the king eventually loses weight.

The discourse is found in the Kosalasamyutta, SN 3.13, in Bhikkhu Bodhi's translation of the Samyutta nikaya this is on page 176.

So this is not so much about "teaching the Dharma" in general, but more about providing a precedent for Mindfulness-Based Interventions more specifically, as the instructions are clearly aimed at health benefits (rather than Nirvana) and involve a delivery on a regular basis by a paid mindfulness-instructor of sorts

with much metta

Analayo

Thanks! I will pass that on.

Retreat well!

Daniel

Sent from my iPad