

## 1979-11-22 THE APHORISMS OF PATAÑJALI as Taught by Baba Hari Dass, Pāda I, Sūtra 46 through 51 Review and then 44 and 45, at Mount Madonna

**Edit notes:** The following was typed from notes handwritten at the time of the darśana or from audio recordings.

**Q:** denotes a question from an unnamed participant in the darśana.

**B:** indicates what Babaji wrote on his chalkboard, as read by the reader, and then as heard and noted by someone present.

**R:** is comments likely of the chalkboard reader.

**BC:** read from Babaji's written commentary on the Sūtras.

**B:** read from remarks made by Babaji to supplement his commentary.

**HA:** read from Yoga Philosophy of Patañjali, by Swāmi Hariharānanda Āraṇya, English translation by P.N. Mukerji, University of Calcutta, 1977.

Comments in square brackets are generally those of the typist.

Comments in parentheses are likely that of the reader.

Names of individuals who are not public figures are changed and voices of individuals originally named are changed to V5, 2, ... to protect their privacy.

There was editing for format and IAST transliteration of Sanskrit terms.

V1: I was wondering if there is any relation between sat-cit-ānanda and Īśvara-puruṣa-prakṛti or if they relate to different categories altogether?

B: No.

**BC: Sūtra 46: Tā eva sabījaḥ samādhiḥ**

**Those (stages of samādhi explained before) are only samādhi with seed.**

tā	those
eva	only
sabījaḥ	with seed
samādhiḥ	samādhi

The object of meditation is bīja. (R: Now we're getting another term for the object of meditation that we've been using... calling the object of concentration. Now Babaji's referring to it also as a seed... the seed of your concentration, with object.)

It forms the basis of support for the consciousness. In the savitarka and nirvitarka, the seed is a gross object. In savicāra and nirvicāra, the seed is a subtle object. Sānanda and sāsmitā are the higher and highest stages of nirvicāra samādhi. In this way, six types of samādhi are in sabīja samādhi.

- The first, savitarka, in which the consciousness alternates between word, meaning, and sense perception of the gross object.

BC: [Continued]

- Second, nirvitarka, the state of consciousness in which the citta does not alternate between word, meaning, and sense perception of the gross object, rather only the real knowledge of the gross object remains.
- Third, savicāra, the state of citta in which the consciousness alternates in time, space, and causality of the subtle object. (In vicāra samādhi, the object is subtle.)
- Fourth, nirvicāra, the state of citta in which the consciousness doesn't alternate in time, space, and causality of the subtle object; consciousness remains fixed only on the essential nature of the subtle object.
- Fifth, sānanda: the higher stage of nirvicāra, which is a state of citta in which sattva predominates; ahaṁkāra is realized as aham, I-am. (R: I'll read that again.)

The higher stage of nirvicāra samādhi in which the citta is sattva [predominant]. And in this stage of sānanda, ahaṁkāra, the ego sense, is realized as aham = I am. In sāsmitā, the highest stage of nirvicāra samādhi, which only asmi, I, remains. In sānanda the distinction is 'I am' and that implies something else; because there's a blissful state, the 'I am' is the object of bliss. In sāsmitā, only the 'I' remains. Only the receiver remains. There's no receiving of bliss anymore in sāsmitā.

Vācaspati Mīśra in his commentary divides sānanda and sāsmitā also, and in this way, samprajñāta samādhi has eight divisions. Vyāsa and others count six divisions.

R: Babaji translates "Those stages of samādhi explained before are samādhi with seed." Āraṇya translates it "These are the only kinds of objective samādhi." So instead of saying these are only samādhi with seed, he's saying these are the only samādhi with seed. These samādhi with seed are the only objective concentrations. Further, Vyāsa and Āraṇya state "The four varieties of engrossment, or samādhi, as described before, have their objects in external objects, that is all knowable objects are the objects of samprajñāta samādhi." This includes cognizer, instruments of cognition, and the cognized. That's why in spite of their being samādhi they have to depend on something to develop. As Babaji said, they need support, a seed. Two of them, savitarka and nirvitarka, relate to gross objects, the other two, savicāra and nirvicāra relate to subtle things.  
Questions on 46?

V2: You said that in the higher forms of nirvicāra the citta was dominated with sattva, and in the lower forms of nirvicāra, what is the citta dominated by?

R: In sānanda, the citta becomes predominately sattvic. When nirvicāra first dawns, before sānanda, but after savicāra, between savicāra and sānanda, what guṇa predominates? What's the mixture of rajas with sattva at that point?

B: Rajas and sattva are in nirvicāra. The activity is subtler; the action of rajas is getting subtler, but it's still identifying 'I' with something else. 'I am experiencing the subtle

nature of this object'. In savitarka and nirvitarka tamas and rajas are mixed. These are purer forms of tamas and rajas.

V3 You said you distinguished s̄ananda and s̄asmitā into two stages?

R: No I don't. Vācaspati Miśra , he said that he divides s̄ananda and s̄asmitā instead of into two categories, into four categories. So it's s̄ananda and nirānanda: with bliss and without bliss and then s̄asmitā and....

B: Then it goes from s̄asmitā to asmitā. No one else says this.

V3 Then he's probably, just trying to fit it into the other, the lower....

Q: Does Hariharānanda [Āraṇya] have any categories for samādhi without seed? You indicated that he spoke of "these are the only samādhi and all of those were with seed?"

R: We haven't gotten into the description yet of what the seedless samādhi are. We'll get into that later; I think in Kaivalya Pāda, where we'll talk about dharma megha and kaivalya... the next sūtra?

Q: He said there's some difference?

R: No, only in translation of the... you have, "the stages of samādhi explained before are only samādhi with seed." implying that there's higher samādhi. He translates it "these are the only kinds of..." yeah, so its essentially the same thing.

Q: He's saying these are only objective kinds, didn't he?

R: Right. So that still implies the non-objective concentration, objectless concentration, seedless, nirbīja, which we'll get to now, unless there's any more questions on 46.

BC: **Sūtra 47: Nirvicāra-vaiśāradye adhyātma-prasādaḥ.**

**After becoming absolutely expert in nirvicāra samādhi, there's clarity of prajñā (knowledge).**

nirvicāra	the seedless, excuse me, is the higher vicāra samādhi
vaiśāradye	absolutely expert
adhyātma	spiritual
prasādaḥ	clarity

In nirvicāra samādhi, the impurities of rajas and tamas and the veils of ignorance are reduced, and by the predominance of sattva, the light of buddhi glows continuously. That is called absolutely expert. The bliss and purity which shine in the mind, in buddhi, is called prajñā-prasādaḥ, or adhyātma prasādaḥ, by which an aspirant can attain realization up to prakṛti. This sūtra points out that spiritual illumination begins to flood the mind when the yogi has reached the highest stage of nirvicāra samādhi.

R: A slightly different translation meaning the same:

HA: **On gaining proficiency in nirvicāra, purity in the inner instruments of cognition is developed.**

[Paraphrased Vyāsa's comments]

Proficiency is attained when the impurities of rajas and tamas, which have shaded buddhi, are removed; then buddhi shines, due to the predominance of sattva. This proficiency purifies the inner instruments of perception and gives the power of knowing things as they are, in all their aspects, without any sequence of time. (R: You recall back to our definition of Nirvicāra Samādhi. This is what is being referred to.) The clear light of knowledge dawns through the power of realization.

[Paraphrased Āraṇya's comments]

Adhyātma prasādaḥ is purity of the inner instruments of cognition or purity of the energies of the senses, the state of sattva predominating buddhi. Sattva is predominating buddhi, the discriminative faculty. Buddhi is the highest instrument of cognition that we have. So when it is illumined, it illumines all other centers. And whatever is known at that time is complete truth. All knowledge about any object, that's the object of concentration, appears simultaneously. It is the highest development of direct perception. The ancient sages, all sages, have their knowledge this way, and the scriptures were derived from this knowledge.

R: Questions on 47?

Q: What does the phrase, 'up to prakṛti' mean?

R: It means everything from mūla prakṛti downward can be known as a result of this proficiency in nirvicāra. All knowable objects can be known in their completeness, in their fullness, by attaining proficiency in nirvicāra.

V4: How is this different from seedless... uhm, I mean....

R: Because there's no pratyaya, there's no mental content in the seedless samādhi. Samprajñāta means 'with complete knowledge' its filled with knowledge.

V4: But if it goes up to mūla, isn't that...?

R: Mūla prakṛti... that....

V4: That's not this one here. I mean, I thought that between here and here you were getting into seedless samādhi.

R: From śrī to mūla is the seedless area.

V4: From śrī to mūla, but this is saying that to 'mūla', you can go up to mūla in....

R: To prakṛti....

V4: I mean to prakṛti....

R: To un-manifest prakṛti.

V4: To un-manifest prakṛti, so that is with knowledge, which means there's still a mental action....

- R: There's still an object of concentration, a seed of concentration.
- V4: But actually the area into which you're getting is also the area in which seedless concentration also takes you. I mean, I'm probably mixing things up, but I'm trying to understand the area that the phrase 'up to prakṛti' means. She says, "... not the place of mūla in the head."
- R: When we speak of mūla prakṛti, it means everything in, all the phenomena of creation, every knowable object is knowable through proficiency in nirvicāra.
- V4: I understand that, at least I think I do.
- R: Don't bring in the subtle body structures in the skull. Mūla is the center.
- B: The skull mūla, this point at the back of the skull is called mūla, the origin. Its prakṛti is the whole of sahasrāra. We can't explain it that way. The four aspects of the mind, manas, buddhi, citta, ahaṁkāra. Manas he equates with savitarka. Buddhi, savicāra; citta, sānanda; and ahaṁkāra is sāsmitā. Buddhi is savicāra and nirvicāra. Vītarka samādhi are in manas. Vicāra samādhi are in buddhi. Sānanda samādhi are in citta. Sāsmitā is in ahaṁkāra. The four minds are instruments of vijñāna cakra with its center, śrī. Vijñāna is with seed.
- V4: So then without seed is as it's moving up towards mūla?
- B: That is within prakṛti.
- V4: So the 'without seed' that is not in prakṛti, in prakṛti, or it still is in prakṛti, then... without seed?
- B: That goes up to puruṣa.
- V4: And when it goes up to puruṣa, when you approach the realization of puruṣa, and the separation between puruṣa and prakṛti....
- B: That's already happened.
- V4: That's already happened....
- R: The highest attainment in viveka khyāti is discrimination between the puruṣa and prakṛti.
- V4: That happened at the end of 'with seed' concentration?
- R: That's before nirbīja.
- V4: Yes, before nirbīja. But then as you attain to puruṣa, you're getting beyond śrī cakra, is that correct?
- V5: I have a question about citta: the sānanda being in citta and sāsmitā being in ahaṁkāra. I think someplace Vyāsa says that sānanda is ahaṁkāra and sāsmitā is buddhi, which we equate with citta. Sāsmitā is mahat.
- B: What is ahaṁkāra?
- V5: Ahaṁkāra is identification with the feeling of bliss in this case.
- B: In asmitā, the ahaṁkāra is identified in its real form.
- V5: Put it's a higher state than sānanda and I thought that ahaṁkāra was a lower state than citta.
- R: The normal ahaṁkāra is, but not the pure ahaṁkāra.
- B: Ahaṁkāra is the cause of all four minds. Mahat separates in the three guṇa.
- V3 And that separation is caused by ahaṁkāra?
- R: When he was making this list, he included nirvicāra samādhi in buddhi, so that by extension that would also, at one level, include sānanda and sāsmitā. But just the level, the subtlety changes, I think.

- V5: It changes level in buddhi, because mahat is called buddhi, that's universal buddhi.
- R: Right.
- B: So the s̄ananda would be more associated with the grosser ahamkāra and s̄asmitā with the subtlest ahamkāra. Mahat is also called citta.
- V5: That's why this list confused me.
- V3 In this sūtra, Babaji's saying that nirvicāra is used in its general sense including s̄ananda and s̄asmitā, right?
- R: When they say in this that "after becoming absolutely expert in nirvicāra", this also includes s̄ananda and s̄asmitā.
- V3 So what I'm wondering is....
- R: He's experiencing nirodha.
- Q: Would it also be called prakṛti?
- R: Would mahat also be called prakṛti?
- B: It's a form of prakṛti in the second state. Third stage is ego. It steps down. So energy is already stepped down in mahat.
- R: Mahat is the state of equilibrium of the guṇa, but because of that equilibrium, because it's in prakṛti, it's considered a sattvic state so sattva is [predominant] even though the guṇa are in equilibrium.
- B: Prakṛti breaks down to the gross elements.
- R: From subtlest to grossest to all this.
- V3 So in perfected nirvicāra, you mentioned the terms adhyātma, purification of the instruments of cognition....
- R: Of the ātman....
- V3 And I'm wondering if that is a preparation to viveka khyāti or is that just another phrase for it?
- R: Is adhyātma prasāda the same as viveka khyāti?
- B: It's a state of mind.
- V3 Which is necessary for viveka khyāti?
- B: It's a state of mind which is completely pure and full of bliss. Sattva predominates and the mind is fixed in purity in that state.
- V3 Is that before viveka khyāti?
- B: That brings that perfection.
- V6: Could you say that it is a state of no thought?
- R: What is?
- V6: This state of utmost purity, that is a state of no thought. Before there was a state where only emptiness pervaded, but still there was a thought, but now in this stage is of no thought?
- R: She's saying that the commentator she has there is saying that adhyātma prasāda is a state of 'no thought'.
- B: Vicāra equals thought and nirvicāra is no thought. But the mind is still there in the form of flowing towards sattva.
- R: So the mind hasn't been arrested; it hasn't been stopped.

- V6: He says that the Zen master comes and says, “How you’re doing in your meditations?” And he says, “Only the thought of no thought is there... only emptiness.” And then the Zen master says, “Go and drop the emptiness.” And then dropping that emptiness... Would that be viveka khyāti?
- R: She’s giving an example of a master who asked his student, "How’s your meditation?" and he said, “There’s only the thought of no thought.” And his teacher said “Drop that, and then you’ll get seedless.”
- V6: Drop the emptiness.
- R: Well see, that’s still a thought, still a conception, the thought of no thought, that’s a contradiction in terms.
- V6: That’s a big statement, dropping emptiness.
- B: We can’t drop emptiness if we’re really empty. Who will drop, and what?
- R: The point is that it’s not real emptiness; it’s still a mental modification; it’s a trick of the mind. If you think you’re empty, there’s still something to drop. There’s nothing to drop if you’re empty.
- Q: Well it’s a concept. It’s a trick of the mind; the thing is to drop that concept.
- R: I understand that. What I’m saying is that the concept is false. That emptiness isn’t true. The example that she gave is a false example.
- V3 But that’s why his teacher told him to drop that. In other words, we’re getting so subtle that we can’t even express it in words.
- B: The thought of no thought can’t be explained.
- V3 It’s impossible to really explain nirbīja samādhi in language.
- B: You can explain it, but you can’t experience it or make anybody else experience it. It’s a state of sattva.
- V6: Before it was mirror mirroring. Now there is only a mirror left.
- R: Before there was a mirror mirroring. Now left is only the mirror.
- V6: On that state, in this sūtra.
- B: The mirror is the receiver. Saying mirror is the same as saying receiver. Cognizer, the one who sees, the seer.
- V6: Is there a reason why at first there are four samādhi explained, and later on, two, nirvicāra and nirvitarka are added. Why wouldn’t all six be explained at once?
- R: Why are the six samādhi not all explained at once?
- B: The four are stages. He explained the thought process in four stages. Then he explained two more which are different in thought process.
- R: Remember also it was said in various sūtra that there were three main objects that you could concentrate on. That is, the knower, or the seer, and the act of seeing, and the seen. There are four categories within those three. In seen, in objects, are... all objects are in that... everything that has an object for concentration is within that and that’s the savitarka and savicāra samādhi are within that, even subtle objects. And the next stage relates to seeing, the act of perception. that’s the subtle instruments of cognition. And the third, the subtlest stage, is the seer itself, when pure ‘I’ is realized. So that’s six samādhi. Some commentators classify only four. They say sānanda and sāsmitā are savicāra and nirvicāra. sānanda would be savicāra and sāsmitā would be nirvicāra.

- Q: When you cease the thought in the mind you feel emptiness. I don't see how that state equals attaining of our fundamental Self as in the first sūtra?
- R: She's going back to [her (V6's)] example of dropping the idea of emptiness. She's arguing about the words that we use, it's a semantical argument.
- Q: Its not semantic at all.
- R: Well, I'm not understanding you then.
- V5: She said that as she understands nirodha, you feel emptiness. And she doesn't understand how that emptiness equates to your true fundamental Self. (No) Oh, I'm sorry.
- Q: She's saying that she doesn't....
- R: Wait, wait a minute... [laughter]... now everybody say what they think she means... Say it again and try to make out a little more concise, and maybe we'll be able to follow you.
- Q: You said that the experience of nothingness was a false stage....
- R: No, no, no, no. I was saying that only in the example that she gave that the person that thinks he's feeling nothingness, and still has something to drop, hasn't really been in the state of nothingness and still has something to drop, hasn't really been in the state of nothingness, that's all I was saying. That's what his teacher told him, it's the same thing. But the state he was in when he thought he was in emptiness wasn't nirodha, because in that state the mind ceases functioning.
- Q: I'm still not clear about the six and four. Why did they use the same word for all the sabīja samādhi as they used for one of the parts of the stages. It seems like... well, if they used nirvicāra also be equated to all the sabīja samādhi.
- R: It's not....
- V3 No, nirvicāra in some includes sānanda and sāsmitā. What Babaji's saying is that when they distinguish it in four, then sānanda goes with savicāra and sāsmitā goes with nirvicāra.
- Q: O.K., but if you are using the six-fold division, and sometimes they say that on attaining the most purity of the nirvicāra stage that you've realized all of the prakṛti.
- R: Everything up to prakṛti.
- Q: Then it's no longer being used as a stage of one of the stages anymore, including all of them.
- V3 Right. Nirvicāra in that sense means without thought and includes sānanda and sāsmitā.
- Q: That's what I'm saying. Sometimes it does and sometimes it doesn't. Yeah, why do we use the same words for the general sense and the small sense, because that makes for confusion.
- V3 It's just the limitation of our language because you can't just relate nirvicāra with one English word, because it's used in different ways.
- B: These are in sūtras. This is written in sūtras, so he made it as short as it can be made.
- R: Also realize that in sānanda and sāsmitā, the definition put them in the nirvicāra category. They are nirvicāra samādhi, but there are subtle distinctions within that state. That's why they're grouped in nirvicāra. They're not put in savitarka or nirvitarka.
- Q: Will you try to explain that again so that... I don't see how... it sometimes seems like it's one of the stages in the six stages. You go, savitarka, nirvitarka, savicāra, nirvicāra, sānanda, sāsmitā.

- R: Right. When nirvicāra changes, when only bliss is being felt, when only the bliss of the knowledge you've received from the lower samādhi is being experienced, then nirvicāra gets to the subtler state of sānanda. The first nirvicāra isn't sānanda.
- Q: So there's different stages of nirvicāra, too?
- R: That's the whole point that we're making, that's being made.
- V3 Some commentators differentiate those stages and others don't. They just go from nirvicāra to the nirbīja samādhi.
- R: But if the sūtra says that upon complete mastery of that state, upon perfection, that implies that once you're in that state, there's... it implies there's something more to gain in that state, just by virtue of the sūtra. It says "one who has attained perfection in it." Well that means 'you can get it and not be perfected in it yet.' So there's got to be levels to it, which are sānanda and sāsmitā.
- B: Instead of writing sānanda sāsmitā vaiśāradye, he just says nirvicāra.
- Q: That just seems like not a very good reason to word it.
- R: But what he's saying is "on becoming absolutely expert in nirvicāra," what difference does it make how many levels are in nirvicāra? When you're absolutely expert, you're at the highest level.
- B: It made it short.
- R: These were passed on word of mouth and the student had to memorize them. So they were kept as short and concise as possible and then the student was supposed to bring, on coughing up the memorization, then it was thought he would also bring up the commentary of his teacher.

[Audio tape change]

- V7: ... nirvicāra in this case.
- B: Because sabīja includes savitarka, nirvitarka, savicāra.
- R: He's saying that only when perfection in nirvicāra, the highest of the sabīja, is attained, then the clarity of the mind is there.
- V7: Doesn't nirvicāra already include those two?
- R: Include what?
- V7: Savitarka and...
- R: Yeah but he's saying on absolute perfection, when you become absolutely expert in nirvicāra. He doesn't say just when you get it that you have adhyātma prasāda. Only when you become absolutely expert in nirvicāra, which implies the stages, which means sāsmitā samādhi is perfected.
- B: When you attain nirvicāra after perfecting lower samādhi, then you perfect nirvicāra. And then you get seedless samādhi. And then you perfect seedless samādhi, and get kaivalya. There's still stages in the seedless samādhi.
- Q: But on attaining of this nirvicāra, then the yogi can no longer fall from that state.
- R: Yes, you can; sure you can.
- Q: Even if he perfects nirvicāra?

- R: Until you pierce śrī.
- Q: On the highest perfection of nirvicāra, you're still....
- R: What's it in? It's in sabīja samādhi, still. Not nirbīja.
- Q: But the buddhi is supposedly shining with pure knowledge.
- B: After nirbīja, then no fall.
- R: Its harder to fall at that point, but you still can.
- Q: I just have that thing, that if there is pure knowledge coming through there and you're attaining perfection in right knowledge, how can you fall if you're getting the right knowledge?
- B: You're still within buddhi, your mental content and saṃskāra are still there.
- Q: So the saṃskāra would pull you back into the....
- R: The next sūtra will tell how those saṃskāra get buried and how it gets less likely that you'll fall, but the fact remains that you still can.
- Q: If you're in a car accident and you had to be reborn because of the seed desires, then you'd have to go through adolescence and who knows what saṃskāra would come out, is that right? That's how you would fall, if you died.
- R: No, you could fall in this life.
- Q: Oh, in this life too.
- Q: What does it mean when you fall? Does it mean you can't attain that stage again and you have to work until you....
- B: The mind gets attached to the world.
- R: Nothing new. It's the same old problem that pulls you back.
- B: The result of samādhi is dispassion.
- R: Thus you're breaking the pull of the world by your samādhi. But until you get seedless samādhi, there's still a pull due to your saṃskāra. Any other questions on 47?
- Q: If through dispassion the pull becomes more... the pull of the world becomes more distasteful to you, then it seems that one would have to work on that, work on wanting the world again, if it becomes distasteful to you through dispassion.
- R: He's saying if a person gets a certain amount of dispassion, then will he have to try to be in the world in order to function.
- V3 Dispassion and distasteful don't mean the same thing though.
- R: Distaste is the first stage of dispassion.
- B: You still work in the world as long as complete dispassion is not attained.
- R: It's complete dispassion when you don't even care to draw the next breath.
- B: Paravairāgya.
- R: At that point you might die or you might live. It doesn't matter. Its all a reflex. If no one feeds you, you'll die.
- V4: That's paravairāgya?
- R: Let's go on to 48.

**BC: Sūtra 48: Ṛtambharā tatra prajñā**

**There, after attaining the highest state of nirvicāra samādhi, the consciousness is truth bearing.**

ṛtambharā	truth bearing.
tatra	there
prajñā	higher state of consciousness.

Ṛtambharā is made by two words. Ṛtam means ‘truth’, and bhara means ‘to bear’. Ṛtam is a truth beyond matter and energy which is perceptual fact. The knowledge attained by testimony and inference is conceptual fact. After attaining the highest stage of nirvicāra samādhi, the superconsciousness of the spiritual aspirant becomes full of ṛtam, truth, or absolute knowledge. Ṛtambharā prajñā should be considered equivalent to viveka khyāti. After perfection of nirvicāra samādhi, first is attained adhyātma prasāda, clarity of knowledge. And then is attained ṛtambharā prajñā, truth-bearing consciousness. He’s equating that now with viveka khyāti. Upon the clarity of knowledge, the truth-bearing consciousness with discriminative wisdom dawns.

**HA: The knowledge gained in that state is ṛtambharā prajñā (filled with truth).**

[Vyāsa’s comment paraphrased]

When adhyātma prasāda is attained, the knowledge that appears is called ṛtambharā and justifies the name given. There is truth only, with no misconception. (R: So its truth-bearing. That’s what Vyāsa says. That’s why it justifies the name given.)

[Selected from Āraṇya’s comments]

There can’t be any better knowledge of an object than that which is acquired through the highest nirvicāra samādhi. That’s why it’s a complete truth.

R: Any questions on 48?

V2: What I hear is that two different kinds of truth are being equated and I don’t understand... the truth of any object coming from direct perception, but... the truth that’s been arrived at through these various samādhi, so we directly perceive an object. But that’s limiting inasmuch as it’s specific to that object, right, and viveka khyāti is more a universal truth as I understood it from the past sūtras, being a discrimination between the real and the unreal.

R: That only dawns when we have complete knowledge of everything that can be known. Once we have that fullness of knowledge, then we can discriminate because of our former knowledge, we can discriminate between those things that are knowable and that which is in it’s essence, unknowable, puruṣa.

- V2: But one's a universal and one's a specific. But the truth of any specific object that's focussed on... it can be the truth of every specific object, but you see it's specific to whatever the object's focussed on. The second is kind of a universal truth... this is all unreal....
- R: Which? You mean viveka khyāti?
- V2: Yeah
- B: Ṛtam is real truth.
- R: Is it specific to an object?
- B: It can be specific.
- R: Nirvicāra will give the ṛtam of the object concentrated upon, under all conditions of the object. By inference, you understand how all objects are made in the universe because you go to the level of the energy, the tanmātrika level, and subtler, and you see that all objects are made the same way. And then, because of that knowledge, discrimination comes.
- B: There are two words for truth, ṛtam and satyam. Ṛtam being perceptual truth which is perceived directly, and satyam being conceptual truth, the idea of truth.
- V2: Satyam being inference and testimony?
- B: Satyam includes testimony and inference. The word ṛtam can't be used in that stage.
- V2: In the stage of conceptualization.
- V3: Another way to explain it might be that in... the object you find the true essence of that specific object but then in the perfection of nirvicāra, sānanda and sāsmitā have to come, which is more of a universal than a specific. Like you were saying, [speaking to the reader], that somehow through the specific knowledge, you get into universality of the energy.
- R: Generalized, the microcosm becomes the macrocosm. You see the truth of the universe by knowing your own innermost essence.
- V2: And that's when you, when the equation between ṛtam and....
- R: Viveka khyāti. Because you have perfect, absolute knowledge of any object in creation, you also have the ability to separate all of those objects from the truth, from the higher truth, from God, because you see that they're all knowable things because you've known them. When that perfection of knowledge dawns, that gives viveka khyāti, discriminative wisdom. It means discriminating between puruṣa and prakṛti, in creation.
- V7: I'm thinking that maybe the word perception is misleading because I think it connotes in some way through the senses, so maybe a better word would be direct knowledge for ṛtam.
- R: How is it not perception?
- V7: In it's highest form, it doesn't involve the senses.
- B: Higher consciousness perceives.
- V7: It's a perception without the senses.
- B: Still higher consciousness is perceiving.
- R: It's not conceptualizing, it's perceiving.

V7: If I understand it right, you're saying satyam would include knowledge that comes through the senses, but sometimes the word tends to mean - sometimes perception means through the senses so I just thought there could be a better word for that.

B: Through the senses or through the mind.

R: Perception doesn't just... anything taken in by the mind.

R: [Reading from note passed up to Babaji] She says we say 'extra sensory perception.' Our word perception can mean without senses.

R: It means a percept is taken in, in perception, and that means that something is taken into the consciousness, a percept, a unit of perception.

V7: It's right on the edge whether we can use that word when we're talking about higher consciousness.

Q: Perhaps for you.

Q2: In response to [the previous question] about the differentiation between the individual and the general, in reference... does that mean then that in order to reach the general, you have to go through a specific object or whatever?

R: In order to reach the fullness of universal knowledge, does one have to concentrate to the fullness on a specific, minute object, is that necessary, or could the object start with the vastness?

B: It's the method of savitarka to sāsmitā.

R: Concentrating on an object.

V3 You have to concentrate on something in order to concentrate.

R: The object of concentration can be anything in prakṛti.

Q: But by the nature of concentration itself, there has to be that at the beginning.

R: Yeah, as long as it's concentration with seed. It means it has a support.

Q: [Inaudible question]

R: It's not the object that's discovered, so much as the way the mind is working and the way that the subtle faculties are working that gets revealed. It doesn't really matter about the object; that's why it's said that any object will do. Because you get to see the workings of the object and your own self in the process. And then discriminative wisdom comes.

Q: Do these two stages of truth relate to the perceiver?

V3: You mean ṛtam and satyam?

R: It seems like the word ṛtam is being used very specifically. Satyam refers, is a general sense of truth. Your idea of truth, all of our ideas of truth are satyam. The things which are true. Our concept of truth is satyam, however that manifests. But ṛtam comes from perception, from direct perception. It's not a concept; it's directly perceived and realized. It's a concept until it's realized.

Q: In experience.

R: Yes, realization in experience.

B: If we see a rope as a snake, it's satyam because we believe it's truth. But it is not ṛtam.

- V8: What if it jumped? Would that be ṛtam? The living truth, wouldn't that be the reaction of a misconception?
- R: No. She says if we were scared by that rope, thinking it was a snake, and jumped, would our reaction be ṛtam?
- V6: He calls it the Tao, ṛtam. He says it is closer to the Tao.
- R: Well, he's mixing his metaphor and that's always a dangerous proposition, mixing metaphors like that, mixing two systems. If you start trying to define one system with terms from another system, then you're gonna create confusion.
- V6: That's right, He said that too.
- V2: I'm still confused on the difference between satyam and ṛtam because it says here in the [Iqbal Kishen] Taimni book, satyam constitutes the truth or very essence of all things and ṛtam is the ordered course of things in both the material and moral aspect. And moral, just by definition, would imply concept. Maybe he's working on a different thing, but that seems to be the opposite of what we've been talking about
- V5: Why don't you read Hariharānanda page 116?
- R: Ṛtam is without any wrong knowledge.
- B: There's no truth if a rope is seen as a snake.
- V2: So if we suppose that the rope is a snake and said that that was true then that would be within satyam. There can be true and false....
- R: But then once you identify the rope as a rope, it's ṛtam at one level, but that ṛtam changes to satyam because that becomes your conceptual truth. But to get to the ṛtam, you've got to have that as your object of meditation and go to the tanmātrika level and beyond and nirvicāra state in your concentration to get to the ṛtam, the real ṛtam.
- V2: And one more question. The truth of a deductive statement, of a logical statement like 'If A, then B,' you know, and you could say this statement is true. You know, 'if Johnny has two legs and so forth, then he is a boy.' Oh, that's true, right, in a deductive state. What kind of truth is that?
- B: It's satyam. Because all men are born....
- R: He said all men are born female.
- B: In the beginning, all are female.
- V5: ... change out of the female....
- V8: The seen and the seer are one. Would that be the ṛtam? And then as soon as that becomes conceptual, would that become a satyam? Like the interface between the seer and the seen, is that....
- R: Interface doesn't mean a thing.
- V8: Well, it's the medium of unity between the seer and the seen.
- R: OK, then say that.
- V8: It's five words compared to one. Would that be the same though? Would the initial experience be the ṛtam? of the unity of the seer and seen and then....

- R: When the seer and seen are united in nirvicāra samādhi, would that be ṛtam, and then once you're out of the state of nirvicāra samādhi and you think about the object again, or you think about your knowledge, would that be satyam then? In other words, is ṛtam only in the state of samādhi, or is it also after?
- V8: In the state of unity.
- R: I think it's in the interface... [laughter] that's the next thing, the state of interface is coming right up. He explains.
- B: After nirvicāra, expertness.
- R: The thing is, we can't really know what ṛtam is until we achieve that nirvicāra expertness. Until that time we have only concepts of ṛtam, we have only satyam of ṛtam.
- B: The truth that is gained after expertness in nirvicāra is ṛtam.
- R: So it's not anything else that we might liken it to, try as we will. So try to grasp the concept, the idea that it's a non-conceptual fact. What is its English word? There is none!
- Q: Reality.
- V6: Truth plus love.
- R: Truth plus love equals ṛtam?
- V3: It seems that another way to describe it is that ṛtam is the result of a concentrated process which requires a certain amount of perfection. And the problem is that we're talking about satyam, one as a process which is relativistic, and also a satyam which is the absolute truth that comes after samādhi. So we're mixing those two things up.
- R: That's one of the problems about the Sanskrit terms is that they apply at different levels in different ways.
- V7: That was kind of what I wanted to bring up about perception, too, because it's hard to not bring in our model of perception based on the senses....
- V3: That's our limitation, of the language.
- R: I you look up the word perception, you'll see that even by definition, it doesn't relate only to what's taken with the senses.
- V7: Yes, but the metaphysics on the model of it is like you say a discreet package of something that goes from out there to in here, process that we want to talk about something where that's not the process taking place. The highest form of nirvicāra samādhi is when you no longer have that division between something out there that's going to come through this process and reach you. In truth, it's a unified field, more or less.
- R: But still, as Babaji said, perception is happening. Only perception is going on, at that time.
- V7: OK, but you see what I mean. Our word perception, as [a prior voice] was saying... it's hard for us not to bring along a model that we know from the senses, so it would be the same if we used the word experience I guess, but it's just that perception does have a lot of other thing.
- Q: Experience is the same thing.
- R: Yeah, right.
- V7: Yeah, experience would be the same thing, I know, but that's why it's difficult and like [he] said, it's good to see that it's another whole process that we're talking about. But perception does... it's true that it's my word... but perception.

V5: Try to drop your attachment to it. [Laughter]

V7: I think I can drop my attachment to the word, but....

R: Babaji wants me to read what Miśra... Dr. Miśra in San Francisco [unable to confirm the reference]. He wants me to read what he has written about Sūtra 48.

“In the state of samādhi, intuitive knowledge is direct truth-bearing. Hence it is identical with direct truth. Therein is the faculty of essential cognition. In one whose mind-stuff is concentrated in samādhi, intuitive knowledge which arose in this state is technically called ṛtambharā, truth-bearing, truth-identical, truth-in-itself. The term itself expresses the meaning. It is not symbolically representative of truth, but is truth in itself, devoid of even a trace of false understanding.”

Well there it is. As much as it can be described, that describes it fairly well.

V7: Cognition seems a better word for it.

R: There's cognition at the lowest level of ignorance, there's cognition.

V7: I know, I know, but it allows you to have some other mode of thinking about it....

R: Ṛtam doesn't allow you to have ignorance. It doesn't allow ignorance. Cognition does.

V7: I know. Any word we use there does. But we have a choice between different words.

R: Well, remember that the word we're actually talking about is ṛtam, and not perception, or conception, or cognition, or any of those words. Ṛtam. It has a meaning in itself

V8: Maybe because our language is so one-dimensional; if we used mathematics and pure perception.

R: Use whatever word will make it click in your mind. It doesn't matter if it's sense perception or not. You have to get the idea.

V7: It isn't even the word. It's trying to talk about that and what words connote. It isn't the word itself.

Q: The word ṛtam, does it relate to the word 'ritti' in meaning the cure, 'ritti', would that be ṛtam?

R: Wait, quiet please.

Q: You have to reach an enlightened state to experience ṛtam. Where all other states would actually be in sādhana.

B: Satyam is a vast word.

R: If satyam is going to confuse the issue, we should leave it out. Babaji is trying to clarify it by bringing in satyam, but if it confuses, leave it out.

Q: Truth with a capital T and truth with a little T.

V1: Māyā, like everything is an illusion.

B: There is no māyā in ṛtam.

V1: It's beyond it.

- R: In satyam, there is a touch of maya, there can be. In the lower level of satyam, in the everyday satyam, there's a taint of maya.
- Q: A taint of maya? It would be maya itself. I mean you could say the world....
- R: How do you separate it from its taint? If you do that, then you've got viveka khyāti.
- B: The word ṛtam is used to describe a specific stage of truth. This book says truth without any ignorance.
- R: OK, any other questions on 48? Maybe 49 will clear things up a little bit.

**BC: Sūtra 49: Śrutānumāna-prajñābhyām anya-viṣayā viśeṣārthatvāt**

**This knowledge (ṛtambharā prajñā) is different from the knowledge acquired through testimony and inference because it has a particular object.**

śruta	heard or testimony.
anumāna	inference
prajñābhyām	from two higher consciousnesses
anya	another
viṣaya	object
viśeṣārthatvāt	because of having a particular object

In this sūtra, the knowledge attained by the highest stage of nirvicāra samādhi is explained as different from the knowledge gained through testimony and inference (Sūtra 1:7). There are three sources of right knowledge: direct cognition, inference and testimony. Every element has two forms: common and specific. (Or general and specific, genus and species, that's where we get those two terms.) The common form is that which is seen in all elements of that class, and specific form is that which denotes a particular form in that class.

For example, dog is a common form. All dogs have certain characteristics, but there's a specific form of the dog within the dog class. By inference and by testimony, we attain a common knowledge of an object. Even by direct cognition, we don't get right knowledge of a specific form. All these three sources are within the limits of mind and mind has no reach to show the subtle form which is tanmātra, ahaṁkāra, mahat tattva, prakṛti of an object. By inference and testimony we can attain only a common knowledge of the gross of subtle object. But we can get knowledge by direct cognition of an object, which will be a common knowledge. Just as we see the sun, moon, trees and attain a knowledge which doesn't include their subtleties, a specific knowledge of an object can only be attained by becoming absolutely expert in nirvicāra samādhi which is called ṛtambharā prajñā. In nirvicāra samādhi, the object is special which is subtle and extends up to prakṛti. A yogi attains knowledge of the object's subtlest form to its largest form extended

BC: [Continued]

up to prakṛti. (In Sūtra 45 this was explained.) The result of ṛtambharā-prajñā is explained in the next sūtra. And that knowledge is different from that derived through testimony or from inference because it relates to particulars.

HA: [Paraphrasing from Vyāsa's and Āraṇya's comments]

Ordinary knowledge relates to generalities because it uses words which are descriptive of general properties only. So also with inference; only general conclusions can be reached. Such as "where there's smoke, there's fire." But what are the specifics about the fire? That is not told. Wherever there is contact, there is knowledge. And when there is no contact, there is no knowledge. So no object of verbal communication or inference can give knowledge of particulars of an object. That is, give the full knowledge of the object. Besides a thing which is subtle, hidden, or situated at a distance can't be known by ordinary observation. The knowledge of particulars relating to subtle elements or to the receiver is obtainable through the enlightenment of samādhi. Therefore, this particular form, this particular knowledge, is different from general knowledge derivable from verbal communication testimony or inference.

R: Any questions?

V4: Is that saying then that even through sort of intuitive processes you can't experience this higher knowledge unless you've gone through samādhi? I mean aren't there flashes of truth that people sometimes get at intuitive levels, without having gone through the samādhi?

R: Can one have flashes of ṛtambharā-prajñā or when it dawns, is it there? This means ordinary flashes of intuition during the day.

B: You remember in previous sūtra we read that some are born with some abilities. Some people have that knowledge which is the result of their sādhana: in previous births.

R: What we call intuition in just the daily, general sense, isn't ṛtambharā.

V4: Does that mean then that in former lives you had attained a higher level than you're at in this life?

R: Going back to that sūtra you were talking about, about prakṛtilaya, does that mean that in a past life, if you're born a prakṛtilaya, does that mean you had a higher level in last life than you have in this life?

B: It could be, if one gets confused at time of death.

V4: I wasn't thinking only of prakṛtilaya, but also of ordinary people who have attained to higher stages and who are getting flashes in certain times in this life. So that could possibly mean that a person like that had attained a higher level of consciousness than they're at in this life.

R: It wouldn't necessarily; it could be a foreshadowing of the knowledge you're going to get in this life.

B: The mind possesses all kinds of knowledge and sometimes knowledge can come up. It doesn't mean that ṛtambharā-prajñā is attained.

- R: This is a very specific state of consciousness after, only after perfection in Nirvicāra.
- V4: Is it right to say, as much as one can say in language, that ṛtam is... well, we generalize from a specific from a general concept, right. I mean we have a knowledge of dogs as a class, but we also have the knowledge of a particular dog. Can one say then that ṛtam is a generalization of specific, subtle truths that have been understood of one has come to, and that's a higher generalization of those truths? Do you understand what I'm trying to...
- V3 It's different from direct knowledge.
- B: There's no conceptualizing going on. You don't have to compare it with anything else.
- V4: It just is... is-ness... hmmm.
- Q: What form of knowledge would morals come under?
- R: Morals?... The form of knowledge?
- Q: Yeah, ṛtam... or...
- R: Satyam. It's ideas of right behavior or truth.
- Q: ... [inaudible]... conceptualizing... [inaudible] ...
- R: It can be, it can turn into ṛtam if that is the object of your concentration, the quality of morals or a certain moral quality. In the fullness after perfection in the nirvicāra samādhi then you can get the ṛtam of that moral.
- V6: It seems like he's taken us with each sūtra to a seedless samādhi, is that right? Like ṛtambharā just shows us how it's almost going over into the seedless samādhi.
- R: Yes, we're getting subtler and subtler.
- B: He explains each stage of viveka khyāti.
- R: He has to be so specific so people aren't deluded about the state they're in. The mind is so subtle that the subtleties have to be pointed out to someone who hasn't experienced the fullness of the whole process.
- B: Viveka khyāti without ṛtam... or adhyātma prasāda.
- R: You can't have viveka khyāti without adhyātma prasāda.
- V6: In viveka khyāti, subject and object have been dropped, is that right? So there's no more subject-object, it's all gone.
- B: What is avidyā? (Ignorance.) It's opposite is viveka khyāti.
- V6: Just 'is-ness'... just that...
- R: Just 'is-ness', just being.
- V6: Is that so?
- R: Viveka khyāti means discriminative wisdom. It implies discrimination is going on. At that stage, and only at that stage, one is able to separate puruṣa and prakṛti.
- Q: So it's still going on?
- V5: And then whatever one perceives is ṛtam, filled with ṛtam.
- B: In the light of that discriminative wisdom, all things shine in their ṛtam, in the purity of truth.
- V6: Yeah, so there is only the perceiver.

- R: Right. In nirvicāra, we've already established that, that it's only the receiver.
- V6: So we're just getting subtler, but still there is a perceiver. That's what I'm getting to, because of the object-subject.
- R: All right, there's still mental content. Once we get rid of mental content, then we're in nirbīja, there's no more support, no pratyaya, there's no mental content, it's the interval between vṛtti, between fluctuations. Nothing there. Nothing.
- V6: Nothing, that's what I wanted to know.
- V8: In ṛtam, in knowing the truth of a particular object in its essence does that truth include all time sequencing?
- R: Yes. We've already established that that happens in nirvicāra, that the knowledge of an object under all conditions, at all times, is known, simultaneously; there's no time sequence.
- Q: Are you saying there's no truth beyond ṛtam?
- R: No. There's no truth about objects higher than ṛtam. [Laughter] These guys... [inaudible]... be believed.
- Q: Has Babaji experienced ṛtam?
- R: Have you experienced ṛtam as it's being described here?
- B: I don't know, What is ṛtam? [Laughter]
- R: We know it's not satyam.
- B: "Ṛtam, satyam, param-param", is one verse; "Ṛtam is a satyam which is beyond beyond."
- R: Ṛtam is a kind of satyam which is beyond even saying 'beyond.' No wonder we can't get it.
- V3 Babaji, as I have understood it, viveka khyāti is the bridge between sabīja and nirbīja samādhi...
- R: Conceptually speaking.
- V3 Yeah, conceptually speaking, so what I'm wondering is, between the perfection of nirvicāra until all saṃskāra are burned, is that just a..., the way I understand it is as a continuum? In other words, it starts out from sabīja, śrī pierces mūla and then it's nirbīja. And I'm wondering if that process takes time, or is it just a..., is viveka khyāti just a way of conceptually explaining what happens, or is just a stage?
- R: Does one go from the highest level of nirvicāra right into nirbīja, and then viveka khyāti is only using words to explain what happens between, or is there an actual stage of viveka khyāti that has a time, sequence in time?
- B: Aspirants are of three categories: mild, medium, and intense.
- R: Actually nine categories, because each has three levels that repeat in each category, as we learned before. There's your mild-mild, .... [Laughter]
- B: It's a general way of proceeding from level to level. Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahansa attained nirbīja samādhi so fast and his guru Totāpurī Bābā took 40 years.
- V3 I guess another way to ask my question is: is viveka khyāti a way of describing the result of nirvicāra, or is it actually a stage that one goes through between stages?

- B: It can be a stage if you stay there. It's a result; its viveka khyāti.
- R: What he's saying, by example, is that one can go right to nirbīja or one can take 40 years to get to nirbīja once viveka khyāti is done.
- V3 But nirvicāra had to be perfected and then once it's actually....
- R: In order to get viveka khyāti.
- V3 And they reinforce each other.
- R: In the next sūtra we'll explain that more, but we won't go into it today... We have until 11:00 today? Oh, well, maybe we'll....
- B: If there's no paravairāgya, then viveka khyāti can't take you to nirbīja.
- V3 So one could be perfected in nirvicāra and be there for awhile, depending on one's saṁskāra before one goes into nirbīja samādhi!
- B: Yes.
- R: According to the type of person, they are in those three categories. Rāmakṛṣṇa was intense-intense. Totāpurī was only intensely mild [Laughter] or mildly intense; it could be either. OK, any other questions on 48 or 49?

**BC: Sūtra 50: Taj-jaḥ saṁskāro anya-saṁskāra-pratibandhī**

**The saṁskāra born of ṛtambharā prajñā prevent the saṁskāra of others of the sabīja samādhi.**

taj	of it
jaḥ	born
saṁskāra	impression
anya	other
saṁskāra	impression
pratibandhī	preventer

Citta has four stages as we have described. Before samādhi, the citta is covered by the saṁskāra of vyutthāna, awakening. When samādhi is attained, then the saṁskāra of the knowledge attained by samādhi also appear on the citta. The samādhi itself imprints on the mind and makes saṁskāra. These saṁskāra are stronger than the saṁskāra of vyutthāna, of awakening. Because samādhi prajñā, knowledge, is purer than vyutthāna prajñā; by this... (R: OK, the saṁskāra are stronger of samādhi than of vyutthāna because the knowledge of samādhi is purer than the knowledge of vyutthāna.) ... by this pure knowledge, the essence, the real knowledge of an element is attained. The more real knowledge is attained, the more its saṁskāra will be stronger, which will reinforce the samādhi. And stronger samādhi prajñā is attained. In this way the strong saṁskāra of samādhi prajñā remove the saṁskāra of vyutthāna prajñā. By gradual removal and suppression of saṁskāra of

vyutthāna, the samādhi gets finer and finer until nirvicāra samādhi is attained. Or the highest stage of nirvicāra samādhi, ṛtambharā prajñā, truth-bearing knowledge is attained. This ṛtambharā prajñā develops saṃskāra of prevention of saṃskāra of other samādhi (R: That makes it harder to go into a lower samādhi. And easier to stay in the higher samādhi.)

Again, the more saṃskāra of other samādhi are prevented, the more ṛtambharā will get strong and that gives intensity to the saṃskāra of prevention of the lower state, until all the saṃskāra of vyutthāna and other samādhi are completely wiped out. For example, a wall is covered by different kinds of good and bad pictures. (R: That's your mind.) A person gets a knowledge to wipe out all those pictures. This initial awakening is called vyutthāna. He starts painting the wall. Now, on the wall are impressions, saṃskāra, of those good and bad pictures as well as impressions of the paint. Imagine just a thin layer of paint. You can still see through it somewhat. You can't see clearly the pictures because the paint's obscuring, but it's not totally paint. You see the paint and the pictures both. In order to cover those pictures one puts on more coats. Now the pictures are covered; you can't see the pictures at all. But the brush marks are there which are the saṃskāra of ṛtambharā-prajñā, the saṃskāra of prevention. Up to this stage, this is all sabīja samādhi. Now the person uses finer and finer brushes and removes the brush-marks. (It's like you're using finer and finer brushes; it's like in sanding, you go through finer and finer grits.) No impression of any kind exists there and that is called nirbīja samādhi.

R: The brush gets so fine that eventually you're just using an air brush, and it leaves no brush-marks. Further notes:

HA: [Vyāsa paraphrased]

When knowledge is acquired through samādhi, a yogi gets new latent impressions of such knowledge. (So...)

**The latent impressions of such knowledge is opposed to the formation of other latent impressions.**

(R: The saṃskāra of this higher knowledge is opposed to the formation of other saṃskāra.) The latent impressions (R: the saṃskāra formed by [knowledge born of samādhi]) inhibit latent impressions of objective life, which includes all the lower samādhi and everything else. When these are inhibited, they can't produce cognizable modifications. (They don't produce anything that comes into the mind in the form of a thought.) When cognized modifications or vṛtti, thought-waves, are shut out, samādhi is there, samādhi is present, which gives [knowledge born of samādhi] which makes saṃskāra itself. That knowledge also makes saṃskāra. But by their very nature these saṃskāra are conducive to the destructions of afflictions, ignorance. They disincite the mind from its tendency to produce modifications. (... or thought. The more we progress in samādhi, in the higher

states of samādhi, the less inclined we are to think at all, much less think worldly thoughts.) But still mental effort exists until the attainment of viveka khyāti.

[Āraṇya paraphrased]

The impressions formed and retained by the mind of any knowledge received in any way, makes saṁskāra. Recollection of a saṁskāra is memory. All knowledge and action occur with the assistance of saṁskāra. There are two main classes of saṁskāra, contaminated and uncontaminated, from ignorance and from correct knowledge, respectively. Knowledge is antagonistic to ignorance, in the same way that light is antagonistic to darkness. When light increases, dark just isn't there any more. In the same way when knowledge increases, ignorance disappears in respect to the amount of knowledge that's present.

So as the saṁskāra of samādhi increase, the saṁskāra of ignorance decrease, which makes fewer and fewer unwanted thoughts. Knowledge brings with it detachment, and attachment is nothing but ignorance in the form of hatred, anger, possessiveness, etc. This is the way in which viveka khyāti brings paravairāgya, supreme dispassion, as a result of the quality of consciousness gained, the quality of the knowledge gained, the attachments... the truth gained about all objects is realized, therefore attachment to those objects disappears. After viveka khyāti, the mind ceases to act. Hence, Vyāsa's statement regarding that mental effort is necessary until viveka khyāti. Viveka khyāti is realization of the distinction between supreme detachment to prakṛti, to everything created, so much so that the mind ceases functioning. Your dispassion gets to such a state that there's no desire even to think.

R: Questions... yeah.

Q: In your example of the pictures, when you reach nirvicāra, wouldn't... the pictures?

R: Nirvicāra, no. What are the pictures?... Saṁskāra. When do saṁskāra get burnt? Nirbīja, not nirvicāra.

Q: So you're still covering.

R: You're still covering.

Q: How do the saṁskāra re-exert themselves in sabīja samādhi?

R: He wants to know how someone that's attained nirvicāra for instance, how they can still be affected by saṁskāra afterwards?

B: The world's pull is also working, like Buddha explained that maras were pulling him at that same time when he was on that same level of consciousness, right before Nirbīja stage, before his complete enlightenment, he described the state of consciousness of maras, of voices of the past; the ancient saṁskāra were pulling him and fighting with him.

Q: So sādhana is important all the way up to Nirbīja? So you're always painting, you should be painting all the time.

B: It never stops. It stops and the paint starts painting you. You are pulled (up to nirbīja)

R: Or say that the paint peels off and the pictures come to the surface again.

Q: No. no.

V6: Up! Up!

- R: Oh, Okay, in nirbīja.
- Q: That would be considered nirbīja samādhi.
- R: OK, now I understand. I was going the other way.
- V5: ... just fell.... [Laughter]
- R: It was easy! [Laughter]
- Q: What is the point? The light of right knowledge? That covers up saṁskāra.
- B: Sattva.
- R: So first it's positive qualities; it's limiting your desires and adding positive qualities to your mind. Until after some time, positive qualities cover all negative qualities and then you start covering the positive qualities, until you see no qualities at all. And then as Babaji says, the paint covers you as well.
- Q: With what?
- R: With what? It was just an example.
- B: A siddha who lived in the cave in the Kara jungles, Once the queen of Nepal who had tuberculosis came to him to get cured. He told her to stay in the next cave. After a month, she was cured but Kara-Bābā got attached. He married the woman. And his disciple killed himself, went crazy and killed himself, because he couldn't stand it.
- Q: He was attached too?
- R: He saw that his guru fell, it was apparent.
- B: His disciple lived with me.
- V3: Its like saying that as you progress on the spiritual path, the tests will get harder and that's why there's a need for sādhana all the way.
- Q: It says in the Bhagavad Gītā, or I think the Rāmāyaṇa, when Rāma is explaining things to one of his people that if one follows the path of wisdom, or gnosis, that it's very hard, because it's a person's own efforts in that case, then it's really easy to fall.
- R: He's talking about jñāna yoga.
- Q: Jñāna. Whereas a person who follows the path of bhakti, or surrender, it's not near as prevalent. It doesn't happen as much. I remember reading that specifically, that a person who follows the path of jñāna it's very easy to fall because it's due to your own efforts, whereas with surrender, it's not so easy.
- B: You mean butter falls on porridge.
- Q: I like butter on porridge.
- R: Still you can use it.
- Q: [Inaudible]
- V3 Once you get to the samādhi level, they start becoming one... jñāna and bhakti
- B: Surrender is the main point.
- R: Saying all you have to do is surrender, that's a big statement.
- Q: In one of these sūtras it says "accomplishment of samādhi by self surrender, or surrender to God." It says you can't even accomplish samādhi without surrender. Does that mean that you can't accomplish samādhi without the sense of surrender anyway?

- R: No, it gives all the methods and then it says, “or by surrender” as another method. You can forget all the other stuff if you can just surrender to God. You can have everything without doing anything else. But it’s a big ‘if’.
- Q: That is one of the observances, surrender to God.
- B: That is in yama and niyama. Īśvara praṇidhāna.
- R: Shall we do 51 or stop? Stop at 50... There’s one more...the next time we will do 51 and review the first chapter. ....OK, we will do 51.

**BC: Sūtra 51: Tasyāpi nirodhe sarva-nirodhān nirbījaḥ samādhiḥ**

**Also by suppression of that, (that is, saṁskāra of ṛtambharā prajñā) all new and old saṁskāra are suppressed and nirbīja samādhi is attained.**

tasya	of that
api	also
nirodhe	suppression
sarva	all
nirodhan	by suppression
nirbījaḥ samādhi	seedless samādhi

- R: The last one said that by suppressing the saṁskāra of ṛtambharā prajñā one will suppress the lower samādhi saṁskāra. This sūtra is saying that suppression of that also, saṁskāra of ṛtambharā prajñā, that nirbīja samādhi is attained.

BC: The example given in sūtra 50 explains that the finer brush is paravairāgya, supreme dispassion. When the samādhi gets deeper and finer, paravairāgya is developed. That paravairāgya wipes out the last saṁskāra on the citta which were created by ṛtambharā prajñā. Although those saṁskāra were only preventative, still they were seeds in the citta.

HA: [Vyāsa and Āraṇya, abbreviated and paraphrased]  
What else happens to a mind in which ṛtambharā prajñā is done? A stoppage of those saṁskāra also, objectless of nirbīja samādhi takes place through suppression of all modifications. Nirbīja samādhi is opposed both to samprajñāta samādhi and to the formation of saṁskāra of it, because the saṁskāra of paravairāgya or nirodha destroy the saṁskāra of samprajñāta samādhi.

HA: [Continued]  
That, the nirodha state itself, makes saṁskāra of nirodha, that the arrested state of mind itself makes saṁskāra of [arrested] state can be inferred from a knowledge of the length of

time one is in this state. The mind in this state is merged into prakṛti. Here there is nothing left to know; there is nothing left to acquire; so further acquisition of knowledge and the saṁskāra of such acquisition are stopped. The more the saṁskāra of nirodha, arrested mind, prints in the mind, the less inclined the mind becomes to receive objects. The mind eventually stops functioning altogether as the nirodha saṁskāra increases, and this state is called kaivalya, perfect isolation. Viveka khyāti gives the knowledge of the true character of all the energies of prakṛti and the difference between puruṣa and prakṛti. When the unworthiness of all knowables is realized, then their knowledge as well as their saṁskāra are renounced, or more correctly, left behind. The break between the disappearance of one modification and the appearance of another modification is nirodha. Paravairāgya inclines one more and more to nirodha, lengthening the time of the arrested state as one practices and deepening the saṁskāra of nirodha, that is the saṁskāra of the break in fluctuation, break in mental function.

R: Questions?

Q: You say that when a person enters nirvikalpa samādhi, the saṁskāra are suppressed or they disappear altogether?

R: In nirbīja samādhi, for all practical purposes, the saṁskāra have disappeared.

Q: And that's the highest state? You're talking about nirvikalpa?

R: Nirbīja. Remember, before, in the last class, nirvikalpa means 'without kalpa', without fluctuations in the mind and as in sabīja. Nirvitarka and nirvicāra are both nirvikalpa samādhi.

Q: Is there still a suppression in nirbīja? There's still the saṁskāra of suppression, you're still suppressing?

R: There's the saṁskāra of nirodha, yes, in nirbīja.

Q: So it's not the same as kaivalya where there's no suppression at all?

R: He's saying, when nirbīja first dawns, there's saṁskāra of suppression of nirodha, but in kaivalya even though saṁskāra are wiped out...?

B: You will still go to dharmamegha and then kaivalya.

Q: The dharmamegha stage is.... [Inaudible]

R: It's the stage that dawns after nirbīja samādhi, after one is attaining perfection in that.

V3 It's a part of nirbīja samādhi, one of the stages?

R: Right.

Q: Is there a specific, something to distinguish it?

B: It will be explained.

R: Remember, I was explaining the different levels of nirvicāra, there are different levels in nirbīja as well. Subtler and subtler levels.

V9: Some of the language that's being used, of suppression and the mind not functioning and so on... [inaudible]... for one thing, if people [?] were writing all this down and passing it on orally, and so on, they were operating at a very complex, sophisticated level. But they know these stages because they've been there and there they are operating at these levels,

- so for example, there's no memory, Babaji once pointed out when there are no saṁskāra. And yet the past is retained. It's not memory, but one still retains that and passes it on and acts on it.
- B: After samādhi, knowledge of truth is attained. Those people explained it by that knowledge.
- V9: And continued to act.
- R: He's saying if all saṁskāra are destroyed in nirbīja samādhi and memory is a form of saṁskāra, how can the person even have a memory?
- V9: ... [inaudible] but Babaji once explained that the absence of saṁskāra are no memory and memory is based on attachments, so memory is wiped out. There's knowledge of the past, but not memory, it's something else.
- Q: I just read in the book here that the highest knowledge... [inaudible]
- R: That's nirvicāra. The consciousness is switched in kaivalya. Because of the state itself, one can switch almost instantly from the highest level of consciousness down to the lowest level of earthly functioning.
- V9: Parallel to that, while it sounds at first like these levels include withdrawal from the world, or an acting desire to affect it anyway, while that appears to be the case, it turns out that some of the highest beings who've been there wind up acting very much upon the world, including for example, putting it down, passing it on, is acting very much on the world.
- B: A saint in kaivalya, if someone kills someone, the saint will get the knowledge of that act of killing; at the same time, he will see that nothing is killed and no one is killing; it's just a transformation of elements.
- R: He has knowledge of all the levels simultaneously. He was wondering how, from the past and from the people who've written the scriptures and past examples of high saints who've attained this state of nirbīja, that rather than becoming totally isolated from society, or from the world, it seems like they're often working even more than everybody else in the world, for the good of humanity.
- B: They were isolated in the real sense.
- V9: So that, it seems that when a certain stage is reached, it's then possible to see with such a different order of seeing, that it's then possible to come back as it were....
- R: And function, act in the world... because of the knowledge gained its possible to....
- V9: That the very passing on of that tradition is a kind of acting in the world, it seems to me.
- B: Acting in what way?
- V9: Well, as an example, the passing on of that knowledge.
- B: A man is standing on top of a mountain and sees a truck rolling downhill from the road. He can see everything clearly. When people come to him, he tells how it happened. He's acting in this way, and not going to people, saying, "I saw this."
- V9: Is there a certain stage of development associated with, so to speak, going back to serving as a channel for the knowledge?
- V3 One doesn't go to teach, but one may teach by reflex.
- V9: Uhhuh... it seems that there are a lot of stages characterized by withdrawal and then there are also people who will....

- B: Ramaṇa Maharṣi didn't go anywhere. But people came to him.
- R: Once he got to Aruṇācala Mountain, he stayed there the rest of his life. He never left again. But people from all over the world came to him. He would just lie on his couch and answer questions, if there were any. If not, he would lie there contentedly. Or maybe walk up the hill and down.
- V6: Well, the ego has been dropped so then it would just be the will of God that determines whether the person will go back into the world or disappear.
- B: What is the world and ego? Ego is gone; the world is gone.
- V6: Staying in the world and serving, isn't that what [he (V9)] is talking about?
- R: You see, it's not even the idea of staying anywhere, of going anywhere. That staying and coming and going disappears for the kaivalya saint. He's just where he is, just being there.
- V6: ... and whatever happens, happens.
- R: Right. He gave the example of Ramaṇa Maharṣi, when he had cancer of the arm and was dying. He was very close to death and the disciples were all going crazy with grief and he said, "everybody's saying 'he's going, he's going.' Where can I go? I'm here." He knew he was dying, that his physical body wasn't going to be there more than a couple of days.
- V4: But to the people who are remaining behind, he's going.
- R: They were not in kaivalya.
- V4: That's right, so to them he was leaving, he was gone.
- V2: I don't know if this is correct or not, but what I'm understanding is that withdrawal doesn't necessarily mean physical removal, although it can mean physical removal from proximity to the object, it doesn't necessarily mean that. So one could be in the same situation, for instance have householder duties or whatever, the form of which were regular and ongoing, while there was a progressive withdrawal and maybe even a perfect....
- R: Lāhīrī Mahāśaya is a perfect example of that who served as a civilian clerk in the army for 30 years, had five sons, and got enlightened.
- B: Kabīr Dās also; he was a weaver.
- V3 Babaji once said you could be in the world and not of the world.
- Q: Babaji, I've heard that saints that have attained the highest samādhi, I read this somewhere, they do have to retain a little ego to be able to teach. By God's will stay and teach in their bodies. Rāmakṛṣṇa [Paramahansa] often said he'd come down out of samādhi and... his disciples and had to conjure up some kind of desire like smoking or eating or talking... come down and have a talk with them.
- B: You're talking about kaivalya state.
- Q: Wasn't Rāmakṛṣṇa ... [inaudible]... the kaivalya state?
- R: Didn't Rāmakṛṣṇa reach kaivalya?
- B: His followers say he did. The body has its own ego to keep it alive.
- Q: Do you think it's possible to now identify with the body at all. What makes the body of a saint stay?

- R: The body's karma. It is called prārabdha karma. It's the type of karma that one's born with that the body has to fulfill. Ramaṇa Maharṣi and Rāmakṛṣṇa both had the prārabdha karma of cancer of the physical body. Regardless of the state of consciousness they attained, their physical body still had to go through that prārabdha karma, its own ego.
- Q: I've also heard of a saint .... [inaudible].
- B: Sombārī Bābā, Pushani Bābā [sic, Upāsani?], Buddha, all cancer.
- Q: Do you think it's possible to master the physical body so it doesn't have any karma and can transport around and ... [inaudible].
- R: Is it possible to have control over the five elements, dissolve and reassemble the atoms at will, transport physically, have no physical body karma?
- B: It's possible. Several saints showed it by appearing and dis-appearing. Ānanda (?) Svāmī also.
- Q: If the body has a karma, does it mean the body's not perfected and the body would also have to take a rebirth?
- R: If a saint gets kaivalya but if his body remains unperfected, will he still have to take another birth because his body didn't....
- B: The body never reincarnates.
- Q: But it does have karma....
- Q: Where does the body's karma come from?
- B: The process of it's formation.
- R: Which includes all physical factors and the subtle factors and the soul that incarnates into it and whatever it brings, physical factors and all that produce the body's karma.
- Q: ... [Inaudible].
- R: The individual, it's related to the individual, but in a way that the individual can totally free his consciousness from matter in the state of kaivalya, but still his body will have to die.
- Q: So is it possible for a person to be born in the state of kaivalya?
- Sh: Yes, this has already been said in the earlier sūtras. Prakṛtilaya and videha are born with it.
- Q: Well, they wouldn't actually be considered in the state of kaivalya, would they?
- R: Well, what that sūtra says itself, what Patañjali says, is that there are two ways, you either get it by means, nirbīja samādhi, asamprajñāta samādhi, you either get by doing methods of you can get it by birth. What he's saying is that two people can get it; some have it by birth and some get it by methods. Yeah, asamprajñāta samādhi, not necessarily kaivalya.
- Q: The body has karma and when he reaches kaivalya, you said it doesn't take....
- R: His body will finish its karma in this life. The body won't carry its karma from one life to the incarnation to the next. The body itself is its own karma. It finishes with it when the body finishes. One person might die in his sleep, a peaceful death; another person might suffer a terrible agonizing death. That's the body's karma, regardless of the state of consciousness that that person reached.
- B: A person who dies in asamprajñāta samādhi without kaivalya can take birth in kaivalya.
- R: He may live for a minute.

- Q: There is some time where the individual has to do some type of work.  
R: Yeah, you either get kaivalya or not. If you get kaivalya, you don't come back. If you don't get it, you come back.  
Q: That's the distinction I wanted to understand there.  
B: That's why so many stages.  
R: Also why so many people.  
V5: If it were easy, we'd all be gone.
- V1: What about babies that are stillborn?  
R: He said before, it could be a sage who just has a second to live, or it could be....  
Q: They don't even live like that.  
R: Some are born dead. Babies which are born dead or die in the womb... they weren't conceived dead.  
Q: Could that be a saint who has no body karma?  
B: Could be.  
R: It could, but we don't know that.  
Q: It doesn't have to be.  
V3 Thank you Babaji.
- R: We'll review two weeks from today; we'll review the first chapter. No class next Thursday; we'll have a run-through in the theater. [Rāmāyaṇa]

This material is licensed by Śrī Rama Foundation under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike license. The rights of use and limitations can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.