

Monday Dharma talk, week 3

Gil Fronsdal

September 14, 2026

Keywords: *rūpa, vedanā, saññā, viññāṇa, khandha, satipaṭṭhāna, Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, Sutta on the Lump of Foam*, five aggregates, clinging

So, one of the characteristics of this retreat is that I'm referring a lot to metaphors—the metaphor retreat. And so there's another one that Buddha gives, and I'll describe the items first and then what they stand for.

So, the first is foam. That's floating on a river, so maybe there's been a soapy plant upstream or something, and somehow something comes together to form a thick wet of foam on top. You can pick it up and hold it in your hand. It's maybe somewhat substantial enough for that, but, you know, you poke at it and it gives away. You can maybe push it into water and it dissolves. Maybe you could even very, very approximately make it into some kind of shape. Maybe you can make it into a little mustache to put under your nose.

But it's insubstantial. It's kind of hollow. There's no real solid substance in it. But it still has some—it's something, barely.

The next item is the same river. There's some underwater gas that bubbles up, and it just forms a little bubble, reaches the surface, and almost immediately pops. And that is mostly this—this bubble that kind of bubbles, clearly insubstantial, clearly empty on the inside, and then very brief. We call it a bubble.

And because of my joy of words, it turns out the English word “bubble” has an amazing connection to the Buddha in a certain way. The Pāli word for bubble is *bubbuḷa*, and, you know, some words in the Indo-European languages are related. They come from the same Indo-European source. So the fact that, you know, if you said “bubble” to the Buddha, he might understand you.

Another very important word that doesn't seem to change much in Pāli is the word “soup,” which is our word soup. Italian, it's soup. These very important words don't change. Anyway, there's a kind of linguistic connection to the Buddha that's kind of fun.

So first there's foam, and then there's the bubble that pops right away. Then, on some bodies of water and some deserts, there are mirages. I remember I drove through northern Nevada a few years ago, and there were long stretches of kind of flat desert. It just looked like, "It's a lake there. There is a lake." But there's no lake.

It just somehow shimmered, or the way the light came off the kind of material, the sand, or something that was there, shone in a way that I would expect off a surface of water. So, a mirage. And that's even more insubstantial, maybe, than a bubble. I mean, a bubble, at least you can kind of believe you're seeing the bubble as a bubble. But a mirage—what are you seeing when it's a mirage? What do you see when you see a rainbow?

So they're calling for something that's not so substantial, to something that's even less substantial. So: the foam, the popping bubble, and now a mirage.

And then the next metaphor is for the core of a banana plant, banana tree. So you might not know this, but a banana tree—the stalk, the trunk of a tree—is really tightly wound leaves, and the center of it is hollow. So the core of a banana tree, there's nothing there. That's insubstantial. So that's even more insubstantial than the mirage. Somehow, there's nothing.

And then, if this is really a progressive movement of less and less substantial, the last, fifth of these metaphors is a magician's illusion, a magic trick. The magician makes something appear that wasn't there and conjures something up. They trick the eyes into seeing something that's not even there.

So the idea is that these five things are metaphors for something that is equally insubstantial, equally hollow, empty. If you take it as substantial, if you take it as having a core, if you take it as something to grab onto that you can rely on, you will come up frustrated. It won't really work. There's nothing there to hold on to. Nothing there to build upon, to make stories and ideas on.

And so the idea is to see that a lot of what we cling to is that way: insubstantial, unreliable for the purpose of clinging. And now, with a particular teaching where the Buddha gives this, the *Sutta on the Lump of Foam*, it ends with a kind of a call to practice. It's one of the few places in the suttas they use the expression, "Practice as if your head's on fire." I guess if someone lights your hair on fire, you're going to be motivated to put it out quickly. So it's a powerful metaphor which has been carried down through the ages.

And my first encounter at a Zen center—there's some Zen, sometimes they have a kind of a sign where it says that: "Practice as if your head's on fire." But as an encouragement to

practice, it goes along with this explanation of the teaching: “Make yourself a refuge.” If you remember, that was something we talked about earlier in a different sutta.

But here again, the Buddha is calling upon us to make ourselves a refuge. Nowhere in the suttas, can I see, does the Buddha suggest or encourage people to take refuge in the Buddha, *Dhamma*, and the *Saṅgha*. That’s quite a remarkable thing. But he does say, “Make a refuge of yourself.” And again, the way to do that is to practice, to practice diligently, as if your head’s on fire.

So that’s the context for this whole teaching, for these five insubstantial metaphors. And the first, then, that of foam, is a word in Pāli again. That word is *rūpa*, and *rūpa* is usually translated into English as “form.” And form is a little bit of an odd word. It kind of means shape. It’s the shape of something, and so it isn’t exactly a thing, but the shape of a thing.

But what it refers to, one of the core physiological or perceptual meanings of it, is what your eye sees. So the eye sees shape and other things, but shape is one thing. And so, by extension, it stands for anything that the eye can see. Then, by extension, sometimes it’s used to mean anything that is an object of the senses.

But the odd thing about the word “form,” the way it’s presented in the suttas, is that it’s not the thing itself that you’re looking at, but how the thing itself has been constructed in our minds. How, you know, we’ve kind of focused on certain things as being important. We identify something by its shape, perhaps, or by its color, or by its texture, or by something. And different people might identify it in different ways.

I still, maybe once a year, see a little stick or root on the ground when I hike in the mountains and, for a moment, think it’s a snake. So I’ve taken a shape and constructed it in my mind as a snake. Once in Thailand, I did the opposite. It was a very long branch across the dirt road, like maybe it was wide enough for a car or something. But it was really—it was just a branch. So I stepped on it, and then I realized I’d stepped on a big snake. That was exciting.

So we have this way of, you know, looking at things. You might see someone, even someone you’ve never met before, and somehow they have the physical characteristics that you’re really concerned about. Because one of the big challenging experiences was having a high school bully who really picked on you, anybody who has those characteristics really jumps out. So that’s the appearance you’re looking for. That’s, you know, what you’re almost subconsciously doing.

So you’re constructing, you’re pulling that out, you’re selecting that out. You’re not innocently just watching and looking, seeing things as they are. We’re often selecting, often see-

ing what's important, what we think is, you know. And, you know, I was once told by a friend that there are some people—I was kind of flummoxed by this idea—there are some people who are very interested in, like, one of the primary characteristics of a person that's important is the shoes they wear. Like, what? What do shoes have to do with anything from my universe?

But that's something that some people get oriented toward, the shoes, and so they make some meaning or something out of it. And some of this, of course, is tragic. How we construct racism is a form of constructing: taking certain appearances and assigning meaning to them, making value, highlighting it, holding on to it. And in a way, that's in the eye of the beholder. The eyes of the beholder are constructing all this and focusing on this as being central, while overlooking all kinds of other characteristics.

Like with the person who looks like the high school bully, a person could be phenomenally kind and friendly, but that's not the reaction we have because of the association that we make. We might act that way toward them based on our association and have mistrust right away. And so we do that with ourselves. We have a certain kind of way we look at ourselves, and we see appearance. We create appearance. We have this idea of what's important about appearance.

And some of us probably could write an autobiography of our life all centered on our hair. I've gone through many different hairstyles in my lifetime. Then I could tell a whole story about all that, including my concerns about having split hair and how I tried to deal with it when my hair was halfway down my torso. Split ends, I guess it's called.

And so, you know, we do this to ourselves. Sometimes it's the great joys. Sometimes it has certain meaning that is empowering and all kinds of things for us. Sometimes it expresses something deep inside that's important for us. But still, it belongs to a world of kind of human creation, human construction.

And that's what the Buddha emphasizes: that there is a way we are what we are, which the Buddha defines in a technical way by calling it, "We're such." On top of that, just being such as we are, there's a selection process of being concerned with appearances—others' appearances, our own—and there can be a lot of investment into that. Financial investment, for some people. It's a huge industry, people who are adjusting their appearances.

And there's a lot of suffering around it. It's very sad, the way that cultures and groups and people treat others differently because of their appearance. And we do it to ourselves. A lot of attachment there.

The second one is *vedanā*, feeling tones, and they're less substantial than the appearances. They appear briefly. They have a very brief life. A particular sensation arises and passes. It might seem like it lingers, but that's because the mind kind of pieces together everything as if it's continuous, like a sixteen-millimeter movie.

There are just all these still shots, still frames on the screen, but the mind constructs them into motion. There's no motion actually in any of the pictures. But the mind makes it. And so sensations can give—we can construct a sense of continuity.

But if we're really not constructing, not making, not putting things together, sensations arise and pass very quickly, just like a bubble: here and not here. The sensations of pleasure, pain, and pleasantness also belong to this sparking world, dancing world of sensations coming and going.

I first realized this when I sat my first silent retreat at Tassajara. They had this kind of grueling rite of passage to show that you're really serious about being in the monastery, and you had to sit—I think back then it was five to ten days—in the meditation hall for three to four hours at a time throughout the day, and not move. Not move. I mean, you could move, but if you did, someone was watching, kind of. And they could choose whether you stayed there for five days or ten days. So if you were moving around a lot, guess what? Longer.

And so it was kind of painful, very painful. But I found out that if I put my attention in my knees, where most of the pain was, it was remarkable to see this amazing dance of tiny little sensations in a little square inch or square centimeter or something. Fire and stabbing and poking and pulling and searing, and you know—it was kind of—but it was a whole different thing to experience this sparkle of sensations. The mind, again, is a constructing apparatus. It takes data in, sense data in, and constructs the world for us.

The mind constructed solidity there, continuity there. It took all those little sparks of sensations and lumped them together to be a more solid, substantial thing. It appears substantial, but if you really get into it, it's just little bubbles that are popping, kind of.

And so, how do we relate to the pain, and hopefully wisely, so we don't get injured? But how do we relate to pain? How do we relate to the construct the mind has made, or do we relate to the raw sensations themselves? And that requires quieting the constructing mind and dropping down, and being able to really sense without the mind doing anything to it. But the mind does things to it, constructs a certain thing.

And then the third is the mirage, and the mirage is *saññā*, usually translated into English as perception. I prefer to call it recognition. I was sitting there just now thinking about this talk,

and in the living room over there where I am, there's a big kind of painting of a Buddha on a screen. It's kind of a screen and a kind of bamboo roll. Anyway, I was looking at the painting of the Buddha's hand. One hand is up, and one hand is down, like this.

And then I looked at it, and I see a hand, but it's just some paint on a surface. I think if I took a little cutout, you know, the part with just the hand, the down hand, and showed it to you out of context of the rest of it, you'd just see some smudges on a surface. Your mind would not construct "hand." But in the context of the whole painting, the mind will construct a hand on a Buddha. Is there really a Buddha there? What is it? It's kind of a mirage. It's really not there, what you think is there.

But it is, you know. What is it? So, perception. And we think our perceptions are recognizing—what we recognize is 100 percent what's there—but we don't realize the degree to which we are constructing it.

So there we have in front of me here these round brown things. It looks like it has a handle on it. The top is kind of flat. The side is kind of folded. You know, what is that?

Some of us know, but maybe if I—there's sometimes I've used a thing like that as a pillow to sleep with at night. So I guess for some reason we have all these brown pillows here. But we don't call them pillows. We think that they are sometimes called *zafus*, sitting cushions. Is that what they are? They are functionally that here, but they could be used for something else.

I've used some of those things as a footrest. Pile them up, sit in a chair, and put my foot on top. Is it a footrest? What is it? Who gets to say? Who has the right to say exactly what that thing is?

So it's an object, and we recognize it in a particular way. And the recognition is a little bit arbitrary for some things. Sometimes we identify it by its function. And this bowl, this thing we have up here, it's a round object made out of metal, with no top and hollow on the inside. It turns out it works very well as a bell. It works really well as a pen holder. It works really well as a way to measure how much flour I need whenever I make bread. So I just pour my flour, and I know I have enough. And then it's a kind of measuring container.

My teacher in Burma had something that looked very much like this next to him for the *Dhamma* talks. There was a spittoon. I don't think you want me to use spittoons in the middle of a *Dhamma* talk. We construct *Dhamma* talks and what they mean and how they're supposed to be conducted and how they're supposed to appear, so that I'm not really allowed to have a spittoon. I think it would be kind of unusual.

So objects can be recognized as different things. We can be recognized differently depending on who sees us. My children see me, recognize me, as a father. My father recognized me as a son. My sister sees me as a brother. My wife as a husband. My friends as a friend. Students as a teacher.

So, you know, to see people in their role is not exactly a substantial, real thing. So we keep looking at this: not really substantial. Any of these things—they're constructs. They're ideas, and so much of the recognition belongs to that world. And we walk around. Generally, it works pretty well. We can use things functionally as they're supposed to be used, they're intended to be used, or we can be creative and use them in interesting ways and not be beholden to the standard way.

And so, again, there can be a lot of suffering based on recognition. We can have a lot of prejudice based on the particular way that we recognize someone. We can have a lot of desire for people. We can have a lot of complicated kinds of opinions about people, depending on how they're recognized.

I remember when I—I've told this story a lot—but when I was 19, I traveled with my friends through Morocco. It was the first time I'd been in a non-Western country as an adult, kind of an adult. And I remember feeling strange being there. Something in my mind was lighter, more open, kind of more spacious, or something. And I thought it was really strange. What is this strange feeling in my mind, being here? What's happened, being here?

And eventually, I saw where it was. Most of the men in Morocco back then wore *jellabas*. These are gowns, these robes. I think they were striped mostly. And I had no idea how to interpret that, how to recognize that.

And I realized back in the United States, I recognized all these things about people based on their clothes, their appearance. That person is a, you know—and I had very strong opinions. That's a businessman. That's a jock. That's something else. That's something else. And my mind was actually making these judgments of people all the time based on how I recognized them.

But I was clueless how to read these Moroccan men wearing these robes. And so that part of my mind let up, and there was enough of that that I felt this ease or this lightness. So wow, I had no idea that I was doing this, and the cost of it, the tension of it. I didn't know it was going on, unknown to me that I was doing it, until that experience.

So, is it insubstantial, these acts of recognition? I think that's what the Buddha is saying. Do we relate to them as insubstantial? Some sufferings we have come because we don't. We

see them as substantial, as being real. They have weight, they have importance, they have meaning, and we cling around it.

The fourth, then, is the empty, the hollow banana plant. And these have to do with our constructs, what the mind makes up. We can make things up, but they don't exist at all. We can make up Bambi, and, you know, that's nice. It inspired a lot of kids, but there's no Bambi. It's just a made-up thing. It's empty. It has no core.

We can invent and make up a lot of different things, stories. I've lived in stories that turned out not to be true. I thought they were true, and so I thought they were substantial. But it turned out it was just a made-up thing that was not true. And I've had stories about people that I made up.

I remember once—I've told the story of my three-month romance, a *vipassanā* romance at IMS, for a three-month retreat. And three months is a long time, you know, for the romance to develop. It wasn't like I was obsessing with it exactly, but it came through in kind of a nice rhythm. And so we met, we talked, we started to date, you know, got together, we got married. It was fantastic.

And then at the end of the retreat, we had a kind of a breaking-silence time. I think we sat in a circle, a group of people, and introduced ourselves, talked a little bit. And so this woman who was the subject of this fantasy spoke, and she had a very thick French accent. And as soon as I heard the accent, I said, "Gil, what have you done?" Because in the fantasy, she was all American. I had no idea that she was from France.

So I realized at that moment, wow, Gil, you just made up a complete fantasy, a whole story. So at that moment, I saw it as empty, as hollow. And in that fantasy, you know, I mean, I had joys and I had sorrow, suffering. So the mind is quite capable of all kinds of stories, ideas, interpretations, constructs.

In fact, it's this constructing part of the mind that makes constructs that the Buddha says constructs the first three. It constructs the appearance that we focus on or make. It constructs, in some ways, the *vedanā*, the feeling tones, especially it may construct them as being substantial. It constructs the recognitions we live with. And there's a lot of suffering in our stories.

And then the fifth one, the magic show, is *viññāṇa*, usually translated as consciousness. And sometimes I prefer cognition. There too, there's a way in which we take in the data from the world, and maybe we don't recognize it as some kind of object, but we're still receiving it and putting it together. And we start to think that consciousness itself is solid.

Consciousness is not just a single moment of cognition, but it's like we construct that into

a solid field, an essence, an unchanging core thing that we always have and always will be, and is timeless. Maybe it's the true, truly who we are. We're not consciousness, but that's the truest thing. And there's a lot of attachment to being conscious. It's close to being "I am." It's very close to being.

For some people, everything else doesn't count as the self, but consciousness is the ultimate true self. And then there's attachment to it. Often that attachment takes the form of people having strong religious ideas about consciousness and annoying other people with those ideas.

And so these are these five that go on part and parcel with the constructing mind and how we gather data and sense data in and work it. And the Buddha, in this *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*, presents these in a very simple way. They're just presented as themselves. They are not presented as aggregates. Usually, they're called the five aggregates in English. But there's no reference to this.

That's a stepping away and creating a new recognition. That's doing the very constructing work, making it into something. Here, the Buddha is not doing it. It's the editors of the text who added it in later. He just talks about each of these five areas.

And what he says is that—but first, you know, the assumption we can read into this is that by now, doing *satipaṭṭhāna*, the mind is quiet, mindfulness is strong. Maybe there's a great stillness, stability of mind, steadiness. When we see things, we're not bringing with us the busy mind, the constructing mind, the story-making mind. We're not bringing with us the overlay that we place on our experience. That's kind of what we're doing all the time, like I did with especially men when I was a young teenager, and didn't do in Morocco.

So, this overlay. When we sit here quiet enough, we stop this overlay, allowing things to be just as they are. And at some point, we see that an appearance appears: a sound, maybe a sight, maybe a bell. Maybe salad at the supper table. So, just appearance, salad, you know, just—or the color or the shape—just appearance, very simple.

And we see that the appearance is quite brief, in and of itself. It appears and disappears, comes and goes. And we see that the *vedanā*, like the bubble, pops, comes and goes quite quickly. The sensations come and they go. Recognitions—the recognition in and of itself.

The thing we recognize can seem like the bell is just unchanging. It's not going to change, go anywhere. It's pretty solid, unless we melt it. But the act of recognizing it as a bell is momentary. And then I'm off to recognize the next thing—the clock and the time, and then the iPad with all the people online. And so the recognitions, you see, are fleeting. They come

and they go.

At some point, when the mind is quiet, when the mind is no longer pulling it, pulling them into the mind to construct, to make, to do, each of these five areas—the stories, the constructing mind—is seen as just fleeting, empty, hollow. Even consciousness is starting to seem not just a magic show that should be solid and continuous. Consciousness, awareness, also is insubstantial, hollow, fleeting, coming and going. There are different moments of cognition.

And so at some point in the *satipaṭṭhāna*, the hindrances have been quiet enough. And remember, it's a process of simplification. The mind is not simple with hindrances. But at some point, by accident, the mind gets quiet, still enough. And now we start seeing something at a deeper, more fundamental level.

That is, we're no longer keeping on constructing and building. And so we just see things beginning to come and go. One sees—the way it's worded in the text—one sees clearly. There's an appearance. One sees an appearance. One sees it arising, coming into existence, coming into experience, and sees it ceasing.

And when recognizing the ceasing of it, the stopping of it, right there, there's freedom from it. Right there, we're no longer playing the game of constructing and building. Right there, in the absence of it, the mind is not making anything, doing anything with it, and there is freedom. That's the path to freedom: to appreciate that area of not doing, not constructing, not grabbing on, not clinging.

And so it's kind of settling back at some point in practice and no longer being too actively involved with knowing, not so much sensing anymore exactly, but more that it feels like the mind now is just watching. And the watching is, in the process of simplification, simpler than knowing, simpler than sensing. The mind is just settling back and just allowing perceptions to arise and seeing. It doesn't get involved. The mind's eye doesn't involve itself in stuff, but just sees it appear. The magic show appears. It just comes and goes.

And the advantage of this, why this is emphasized by the Buddha, is that this is one of the most useful ways of perceiving our experience that helps us to relax the grip of attachment, the grip of clinging. Because we realize that clinging doesn't work. You grab at an appearance, you grab at a recognition, you grab at a feeling tone, you grab at a story, you grab at some idea of solid consciousness, and it's kind of like trying to grab air. When you close your hand around the air and you come up, "Look at all the air I have."

Or water—you can't really hold much water in your hand. It kind of oozes out. But it's kind of more like air. And so it's kind of an amazing thing, at some point, to really have a clear

sense that you've been a good clinger most of your life. It seemed to have worked really well. You've suffered a lot, so you have suffering to prove it.

But it turns out that that itself is a mirage. You are clinging to something imaginary, something the mind had constructed. You thought it was real, but you—you know—I mean, if I cling to this bell, the bell is real. But really, what I'm clinging to is not the bell. It's the idea of the bell, the meaning of the bell, the associations of possessing the bell. And when you really look, those are just insubstantial, hollow, empty. This won't work. You can't grab them.

It's very humbling. It's kind of remarkable to get quiet enough to see and watch how clinging, how pointless it is to cling. To watch and see, and begin to relax the grip. Just, okay, let go, let go.

Elsewhere in the suttas, the Buddha takes these five—form, feelings, perceptions, usually translated mental formations, mental constructs, and consciousness—and calls them the five. In English, when the Buddha is speaking English, he calls them the five aggregates. But that's in his particular English dialect. My dialect calls it bundles.

The word *khandha* means a heap or a collection. It also refers to, like, a bunch of wood that's tied together in a bundle. So I like calling it bundles because we take each of these constructs that we make, all each of these five. And we can get attached to one of them, but then while we're still attached to one of them, we grab the next one and the next one. We start gathering them together, and we start having bundles of things that we're attached to.

Probably a few of you can probably go through, if you are honest, and come up with 12 things that you kind of qualify as an attachment, having to do with how you appear. You know, it's important enough for you that you suffer around it if something's not quite right. And there's probably all kinds of attachments around pleasure, comfort, discomfort. Some people—that's their primary place of attachment—is around pleasure and pain, comfort and discomfort.

Some of you have very strong opinions about what's what, the recognition of things, and you can probably come up with 10 things that you're attached to around the things that you recognize as such. This is how it should be. So we start gathering these bundles we carry with us. And so the Buddha called these—not these individual moments of appearance and sensation and recognition, but when we start gathering together and make them into bundles—he calls it a burden.

Because then not only do we have the bundle, but then our attachment holds onto the whole bundle. And one way we hold on to the whole bundle, we take all these bundles of attach-

ment and we build a self out of them. This is who I am. And one of the primary areas of suffering around self has to do with the self that's built up by our clinging, these bundles we carry.

And the Buddha called it a burden to do this. Just like it was kind of a burden for me to have opinions about all these men in America when I was 19, based on their clothes and who they were and who was right and who was wrong. And so the Buddha called this a burden, held in place for carrying it because of our craving. And he said it's possible to put the burden down, to drop it.

So as *satipaṭṭhāna* practice moves along, we're not supposed to now construct, make our experience fit into what I just talked about. But rather, as we keep settling in, doing the basic practice of mindfulness, developing some stability, steadiness, continuity, the clarity grows. The mind expands. The mind becomes freer, more steadied. We're deeply kind of connected to the deep mind, the deep sensations. We're at home in them. We're resting.

The surface mind, the constructing mind, begins to quiet down. Because the constructions all belong to the surface mind, and that gets quieter. Then, at some point, when mindfulness is strong, we really connect closely, we really feel and recognize, know well. At some point, it seems like it shifts to just being very, very simple and watching the arising and passing of phenomena.

And what we watch, partly, is the arising and passing of appearances, sensations, feeling tones, moments of recognition, maybe moments of construction, maybe moments of cognition. And we just see the coming and going, the river of how our experience changes all the time. The river of perception, the river of life going through us, at this raw level, free of a lot of the constructions we do, a lot of the overlays we put on top.

And for some people, when this happens, it's very compelling. Wow, it just seems so nice. There can be a wonderful concentration, wonderful joy, at kind of cruising, riding on this flow of changing phenomena. It's like this wonderful—like being in the river, flowing with it, or being in the rain, and just being in a hot day, maybe, and just being saturated by all these drops coming and filling us.

But if you are wedded, if you are strongly committed to your stories, committed to your opinions about what's what, committed to the importance of appearance over the deep mind, deep part, it's very hard to see at this kind of basic flowing level. And so, a lot of the movement toward this stage of *satipaṭṭhāna* is a movement of relaxing, quieting, stilling the active, busy surface mind, trusting the deep mind, where this deep seeing, deep knowing can do its

work to help us let go.

So if this talk disposes you to now see, as you go through your days here practicing, the overlay of constructions, interpretations that we put on our experience, that's really good to see. And the idea is to be inspired by that, not to do it better, come up with better interpretations, better stories. But to realize, oh, just the other side of those, there's freedom, there's simplicity, there's more space.

And it's quite significant to see an interpretation as an interpretation, to see an overlay, to see a construct, to see a projection we have on things as a projection. Because then maybe you can settle back and not be caught by those projections, those beliefs, those stories, and allow something deep inside to relax further and further. To allow yourself to become simpler and simpler, just here, just now. Thank you.