



"buddhist" forums
or
(*"The Voice of Mara(s)"* :)

.... the good Dhamma will last only five hundred years.

Buddha

AN 8.51/ MA 116/T60

It sounds like the "Good Dhamma" does not generally please the moderators, owners and collaborators of these forums.

As far as the habitual bunch populating them is concerned, they are always ready to embark you on their pseudo-"*buddhist*" merry-go-round nonsense - when it is not about telling you cunningly, the exact opposite of what the Buddha said.

These people are usually posting the same questions, on a regular basis - (that is to say, around every four months) - and their "friends" are just there to flood anything that does not fit their vitiated views, with unceasing red herring and fraudulent considerations.

Might you go on telling them that this is just mere fallaciousness; then the moderators are quickly telling you that you are violating the Terms Of Service (TOS). And you see your posts filtered by the moderators, until you come back to a "more appropriate" behavior.

How a **fraud** can be called otherwise?

When you pass along this kind of touchy information, with accurate references in the Suttas (with parallels), you might just be plainly & simply banned.

One should care about these "**validated**" forums with a critical eye, to say the least.

Grammar (vyākaraṇa) is considered as an ancillary discipline (aṅga) in Indian philosophy. It is second to the direct experience (anubhava) of the Śrutis (authoritative texts).

Yet, some grammarians on these forums, are elevating it to the pinnacle of understanding. Grammar must be taken very seriously; as long as it is not to be interpreted to the desires of their users. And most too often, these grammarians retrench themselves behind their indecipherable jargon, to convey their own philosophy. And some people are so impressed,

that they don't even look at the fraud behind.

Might one of them, for instance, be a Hume or a Locke empiricist enthusiast; then the Pali grammar is twisted and interpreted to make the philosophy of Buddha, a mere philosophy that is derived from the sole experience of the senses.

Which obviously, is not the case; because you have to transcend the kama (sensory), then the rūpa, then the arūpa lokā. Something that does not make Buddhism a mere empiricist philosophy based on sensory experiences only.

The liberation of the citta is the liberation from the mano's influence upon it (see the note on [paṭigha](#); to see how etymology is paramount, to really understand Buddhism). And citta does not have to operate solely in the kama loka (sensory world); in which it is defiled as ceto.

Etymology (nirukta), is another anga - and it should be used to unveil some unclear meaning into words.

However, it is absolutely proscribed in these "forums". And most too often, interpreted grammar overrules the real meaning.

Lexicography is elevated to the lowest form of research. And words, it seems, have to remain in their most cryptic interpretations.

This intolerance among certain pundits on these forums, resemble the parasitic position of those who dread to see their fraudulent advantages and benefits, put on the line and jeopardized.

Sometimes, a rather knowledgeable person in the Pali grammar, will even enter the arena of lexicography - with such a poor knowledge of it - that even the most eminent scholars in their field, will question their biased and unlearned views.

This hysteria towards looking for meaning in pre-Buddhist Vedic/"Sanskrit" texts, has come to such a extent, that some fairly good grammarians - self proclaimed pundits in linguistics - can advise you (with much contempt,) to read some pundit work on Pali roots - telling you that Pali has nothing to do with Vedic "Sanskrit" - and that you should drop the case of finding meaning in these pre-Buddhist Vedic/"Sanskrit" texts.

Meanwhile, in the introduction of the said pundit's work, it is noted that most of the Pali roots are derived from the Vedic/"Sanskrit".

How more ludicrous can that be?

Even more farcical, when you know that these angas (vedangas,) were used to explain the unclear meaning of the old Vedic/"Sanskrit" words themselves. Words that had not changed for millenia; as far as they were orally transmitted.

So, how can some self proclaimed "pundit in linguistic", can tell you day after day, that Sanskrit is a post Buddhist language; and that you should not touch these Vedic/"Sanskrit" texts, even with a ten foot pole.

Particularly when some eminent scholar, on another eminent forum, tells him, day after day, that he is wrong.

This hysteria has something buried under, that is not so innocent.

Lexicography is paramount to understand the real meaning of these too often cryptic words in the suttas.

Looking for meaning in the Vedic texts - and particularly across close Buddha's time texts - like, for instance, a same meaning, that appears in the early Upaniṣads, and conjointly in the Mahabharata; and the corresponding Pali word (same root) - is a judicious endeavor. And an enlightening thing.

Also, their insistence at keeping things to the mere basics, through an overwhelming use of digressions and trivialities, has the level of their conversations crawling in an unending painful shallow depth.

Strangely enough, you usually just cannot go beyond the kama loka (the world of senses). Everything indeed, is done to keep you there, and exacerbate the shackling - and prevent the release.

Do you often hear them talking about getting released from the kama loka? - I doubt so - They are always talking to you about making it better, and enjoying it to the full extent.

Strangely enough.

Is that echt Buddhism?

Just leading you astray.

*

Created: 09/08/2017

Views: 37 (as of 2017-10-27)