

1979-12-13 THE APHORISMS OF PATAÑJALI as Taught by Baba Hari Dass, Pāda II Sūtra 1-4, at Mount Madonna Center

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

Q: denotes a question.

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.

U: is other voices in the notes which were unattributed.

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

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 V1, 2, ... to protect their privacy.

R: Today we'll start with Sūtra I, Sādhana Pāda (second chapter). We'll review that and then we'll proceed.

BC: [Sūtra 1:] **Tapah-svādhyāyeśvara-praṇidhānāni kriyā-yogaḥ**

Austerity, self-study and surrender to God constitute kriyā yoga, or practical yoga.

Kriyā yoga means practical yoga and includes methods of austerities for self-purification, self-study for self-observation, and surrender to God for evolving self-awareness.

Tapah - austerity. The word tapah means heating, just like a goldsmith melts gold and it gets purified. All the impurities burn away. In a human being, all those impurities are desires, so the burning of desires is tapah, or austerity.

Austerities are of three kinds:

- 1) Physical austerities which is to bear heat, cold, hunger, thirst, etc. willingly.
- 2) Austerity of speech which is to remain silent or to talk only to express love or to chant God's name or the scriptures.
- 3) Austerity of the mind, which is to develop positive thoughts in the mind, not to give room to anger, hatred, jealousy or any kind of unwanted thought.

Austerity is not physical penance; sleeping on a bed of nails, freezing the body in snow, etc., without any aim of eliminating desires. The desires are eliminated by putting limits on desires, and that limit should be decreased gradually. (R: That is, the circle should be tightened around the desires, decreasing the desires; not that you're letting up on your limit gradually.)

BC: [Continued]

Just as a horse trainer uses force sometimes to train the horse, and sometimes uses love and compassion. In this way a trust is created between him and the horse. In the same way, the mind which is full of desires is trained. (R: Sometimes using force; sometimes using love and compassion.)

In the Śrīmad Bhagavad Gītā, the method of tapaḥ is explained. Kṛṣṇa is speaking. “Arjuna, this yoga is neither for him who overeats nor for him who observes a complete fast. It is neither for him who is given to too much sleep, nor even for him who is ceaselessly awake” (6:16). “Yoga, which rids one of woe, is accomplished only by him who is regulated in sleep and wakefulness” (6:17).

Also, the three kinds of austerities are explained: “Worship of gods, those who are on the spiritual path, one’s elders and wise men, purity, straightness, continence, and harmlessness; this is called body penance” (17:14). “Words that cause no annoyance to others and are truthful, agreeable and wholesome, as well as the study of the veda, and other śāstra and the practice of repetition of the Divine Name; this is known as the austerity of speech” (17:15). “Cheerfulness of mind, placidity, contemplation on God, control of the mind, and perfect purity of inner feelings; all this is called austerity of the mind” (17:16).

“This threefold penance performed with supreme faith by yogis expecting no return is called sattvic” (17:17). Rajasic austerity is explained: “The penance that is performed for the sake of renown, honor, and worship, as well as for any other selfish gain, either in all sincerity or by way of ostentation, and yielding an uncertain and momentary fruit. That again is rajasic, dominated by the quality of rajas guṇa” (17:18). “Austerity which is practiced through perversity and is accompanied with self-mortification or is intended to harm others; such austerities have been declared tamasic, having the quality of tamas guṇa” (17:19).

All these austerities are for self-purification and attaining happiness. (R: That covers tapaḥ, austerity.)

The second thing that makes up kriyā yoga is svādhyāya. It means self-study, trying to see your own self in different perspectives. It also means study of scriptures. By studying scriptures, we understand our own weakness and we know what we should develop in our lives and what we should reject from our lives. Self-observation can be done through the scriptures or by concentrating on our own actions. (R: Establishing a witness consciousness.)

The third component of kriyā yoga is Īśvara praṇidhāna. It means surrender to God. It also means to put your consciousness in your self awareness. Devotion to God by the mind, speech, and action; by losing the ego of being a doer; by offering the result of action to

BC: [Continued]

God. Also by the chanting of Om̐ as explained in Samādhi Pāda, Sūtra 28. Also see in this reference, Sūtra 23, Samādhi Pāda. By practicing tapasya, calmness of the body and the senses is obtained. By practicing svādhyāya, the mind becomes fit to attain knowledge. By Īśvara praṇidhāna, self-surrender, steadiness of mind is attained. Tapaḥ, Svādhyāya, and Īśvara praṇidhāna are also included in Sūtra 32 of this chapter, under the heading of niyama. The author put these three things as kriyā yoga in the beginning because it involves acts of self-purification, self-observation, and evolving self-awareness which are very important to make the foundation of samādhi strong.

HA: [Vyasa paraphrased]

The yoga attained by a yogi with an engrossed mind has been stated before in Samādhi Pāda. This sūtra tells how a devotee with a restless mind can also attain yoga and it gives the sūtra: tapaḥ, svādhyāya, Īśvara praṇidhāna are kriyā yoga.

Vyasa says that one can't get perfection in yoga without self-discipline. The vāsanā, the prints of desires, are so old that they can't be effaced without austerities. He says from beginning-less time, all of our desires and tendencies have existed, that we can't just say, I'm going to change now, because the habit's too strong. In order to change, we have to totally change our life habits consciously in order to have any effect on the vāsanā, these ancient prints. So austerity is necessary. Svādhyāya, repetition of a sacred mantra and/or study of scriptures relating to freedom from bondage. And Īśvara praṇidhāna, surrendering all actions to the great master, God.

R: Are there any questions on Sūtra 1?
So we'll move to Sūtra 2.

BC: **Sūtra 2. Samādhi bhāvanārthaḥ kleśa tanū karaṇārthaś ca**

For developing the state of samādhi and for reducing the afflictions, kriyā yoga is practiced.

samādhi	trance
bhāvanārthaḥ	for developing the state of
kleśa	afflictions
tanū	reduce
karaṇārthaś	for making
ca	and

Kriyā yoga is practiced to serve a two-fold purpose. It reduces the causes of affliction and when the afflictions are removed, it makes the higher states of samādhi easier. As already explained in Sūtra I:23, the ultimate state of samādhi is reached through the practice of Īśvara praṇidhāna. By kriyā yoga the afflictions are reduced gradually. The more the afflictions are reduced, the greater becomes the capacity of a yogi to attain samādhi.

HA: **That kriyā yoga (should be practiced) for bringing about samādhi and minimizing the kleśa (the afflictions).**

[Vyāsa’s commentary paraphrased]

When kriyā yoga is properly performed, it conduces to a state of samādhi and considerably attenuates (or thins) all kleśa. The fire of discriminative knowledge sterilizes these thinned kleśa like roasted seeds. When they are weakened, thinned, they can’t obscure realization of the distinction between Puruṣa and buddhi (which in normal consciousness, we take to be one).

R: We’ll come to that, identifying the Self with the non-self, in the next sūtra or two. We’ve got a word here I want to point out. The word tanu in Sanskrit means to reduce, or to thin out and directly relates to the word attenuate or tenuous. It’s an English word that has a direct root in Sanskrit - tanu and tenuous.

HA: [Āraṇya’s commentary paraphrased]

The impurities of restlessness and dullness of the sense organs, born of rajas and tamas guṇa and inherent in them, are destroyed by kriyā yoga. Impurities in the sense organs, organs of perception, experienced as restlessness and dullness, are destroyed by kriyā yoga. So when impurities (such as caused by rajas and tamas) are destroyed, the mind automatically turns to samādhi. All we have to do is remove the impurities. Impurities are only the aggravated form of kleśa. In other words, when kleśa get aggravated, it makes more and more impurities of the mind and consciousness. So when impurities are reduced, kleśa are attenuated at the same time. When we work on the impurities, we don’t have to worry about removing the kleśa because they are automatically thinned, attenuated, and we can purify our mind and body.

When the kleśa... (remember, kleśa mean afflictions — the five basic trouble areas in life.) When the kleśa are ready for extinction, the thinned kleśa are made unproductive by discriminative knowledge, called prasamkhyāna, or samprajñāna or viveka. Kleśa reduced to the unproductive state by samprajñāna don’t give rise to vṛtti, modifications of the mind, just as fried seeds don’t sprout. For example, “I am the body” is born of kleśa [and actually partakes of all five kleśa. If you look at the phrase “I am the body” and you look at the kleśa, it relates directly to each one.] The knowledge “I am not the body” is born of samādhi and non-afflictive. It’s the opposite of kleśa. This knowledge that “I am not the

HA: [Āraṇya's commentary paraphrased, continued]
... body" destroys the former false belief that "I am the body" for all time. When, with the knowledge of the distinction between puruṣa and buddhi, the mind becomes inactive through paravairāgya, supreme dispassion, even this realization lapses. Even the realization of the distinction between puruṣa and buddhi lapses. All traces of prajñā, mental content in the form of higher knowledge, disappear from the mind. This is after paravairāgya. The kleśa then are unproductive, but still exist in a subtle, residual form, as Sūtra 50 in the last chapter told us.

R: In talking about the latencies - in asampraññāta samādhi, only the latencies are left. Remember the paint brushes getting finer and finer, the brushes to remove even the latencies. That's what's being discussed here; the kleśa are still in a residual latent form. It's also explained farther on in this chapter.

HA: [Āraṇya's commentary paraphrased]
Kleśa are attenuated, thinned out, by kriyā yoga. Kriyā yoga brings sampraññāna which renders the kleśa unproductive. The knowledge "I am not the body" is derived from samādhi. The attenuation of kleśa is a help in this process. The means of samādhi and attenuation of kleśa is kriyā yoga. The way to get samādhi and to attenuate the kleśa, thin out the kleśa, is kriyā yoga, that is calmness of the body and senses through tapasya (through tapas), a predisposition to realization through svādhyāya, self study, and steadiness of mind through Īśvara praṇidhāna. (R: I'll read that again.) The means of samādhi and attenuation of kleśa is kriyā yoga. Kriyā yoga means using those three: tapasya, svādhyāya, and Īśvara praṇidhāna. What that means is calmness of body and senses through tapas, a predisposition to realization through svādhyāya and surrendering to God, Īśvara praṇidhāna.

R: Questions on Sūtra 2?

Q: I have a question about kleśa. On what level of subtlety are kleśa and impurities defined. I'm just trying to figure in my mind what they are exactly.

R: The next Sūtra will define them. So we can hold that question for the next Sūtra.

V1: I have a question about the difference between buddhi and ahaṁkāra in relation to puruṣa. I thought that ahaṁkāra was the ego-sense, but in reading [Hariharānanda Āraṇya] here, he talks of buddhi being the I-sense also. And I couldn't distinguish, I didn't know what the distinction was.

B: Without the ego, buddhi can't discriminate.

R: Who is discriminating without ego? Ego needs a discriminator, I mean buddhi needs someone to discriminate. Ego is always in buddhi, but the grosser form of ego is in

- ahaṁkāra. Ego is related to the sense organs, the organs of cognition. Buddhi is the highest organ of cognition, which we'll get to in the next sūtras.
- V2: Buddhi has also been called super-ego; it's where the I-sense is located
- R: Super-ego, that's a good term. It's the seat, it's the location of the I-sense and it steps down and becomes a grosser form in ahaṁkāra.
- B: It's in mahat; buddhi is in mahat; it's in the first creation.
- V3: Would it be correct to say that attenuation of the kleśa and attaining samādhi are two different ways of describing the same process?
- R: [Restating] Would attenuation of kleśa and attaining samādhi be two different ways of describing the same process?
- B: It's the same thing.
- R: That's what we said before, is when the kleśa are attenuated by purifying, automatically the mind turns to samādhi.
- B: Cleaning a table; removing dirt from the table; two different ways of describing the same action. It's the same result; you have a clean table afterwards.
- V3: So the way it's written makes a point of describing both processes, but in actuality one could just be in parentheses of the other.
- R: No, because there are ways to approach each of them individually. If there were no distinction between them, no distinction would be made in the sūtras. There are separate words for them separate ways of describing them, because they are separate things. They're qualitatively different.
- B: The result is the same; the process is different.
- R: One can work on the kleśa directly, for instance; or someone can totally disregard the kleśa and only try to purify his mind and body. Then automatically he will be reducing the kleśa. Any other questions?
- Q: I've got a question about tapas. If a person is suffering from disease or... [inaudible], do you get more spiritual benefits by accepting it as sādhana or just living with it as an ordinary person would?
- R: If a person has some affliction, such as a disease, would one get more benefit from it, would it become like sādhana, if one accepted it as tapas, or does that make any difference?
- B: When it is accepted, then the mind will get pure.
- Q: What if it's not accepted? What if a person fights against it and won't accept it? Does the mind get more impure?
- B: Then more pain.
- Q: Does it still purify though?
- R: Even if one doesn't accept it, does it still purify?
- B: The mind accepts at the end.
- Q: It just takes longer, though.

- V1: Babaji, is there a special way to read the scriptures, a special state of mind to try to cultivate when reading the scriptures?
- B: The Indian method is to read every morning, only Sūtras. When you memorize it, then the mind thinks on each Sūtra. They don't explain it at first; first memorize it.
- Q: [Inaudible] ... just the phrase itself?
- B: Explaining it is higher level. When all sadhus sit together and talk.
- Q: Is it best to do this before formal sādhana, before you practice your meditation?
- R: Should the study, svādhyāya, be done before one sits for meditation?
- B: Early in the morning, after bath, they chant a few sūtras.
- R: Any other questions on 2?
- V4: I don't know if this refers to 2 exactly, but it does refer to tapas. If in earlier years of this lifetime, you realize that you were into a lot of kleśa and actions like that, and you're on a spiritual path and you feel that the things you're working on haven't really dealt with the earlier kleśa, does that then mean that in another lifetime you'll have to come back and work those through, or will being on a spiritual path bring in some of those earlier kleśa to work? Do you understand what I'm saying, or does this not refer to this?
- R: I think you're mixing up terms. Kleśa aren't something that you had earlier and don't have now; kleśa are eternal in a sense. They are saṃskāra that everyone has. They're as general as we can get. They're the fewest and most general afflictions. These are something that we don't get rid of until samādhi starts burning them away. So you may have been more affected by them in your former life, but you're not free of them yet, so you're still working on them.
- V4: I didn't mean that one was free of them, but it's like you realize that you're consciously working on some things, but you haven't really hit some earlier problems and I just wondered if that eventually comes out of itself, or whether...
- R: I think you're talking of symptoms of kleśa, not the kleśa themselves.
- V4: OK, well, whatever it is that I'm talking about, I just wonder, is this worked on then in this time of life or do those earlier experiences have to be repeated in another life and be met and dealt with?:
- R: The times that you weren't facing the afflictions?
- V4: Well, experiences, yeah.
- R: You're the sum total of everything you've been in the past, and you're working on yourself now, that's all you can do. There's no future for it.
- Q: I take it that she was saying that you do create tendencies of attenuation of the kleśa, so they do carry over. If you're working on yourself now, they do carry over into your next lifetime too. Is that what you mean?
- V4: Well, I guess in part what....
- R: She means doing actions earlier in her life when she had no knowledge of kleśa or getting out of kleśa. All those actions that she performed, she wants to know if, even if she's working on herself now, if those old actions are going to come back and haunt her in her next life.

- B: Two forces work together, knowingly or unknowingly, kleśa and thinning out of kleśa. They are mutually exclusive.
- R: You're either doing one or the other; there's no in-between. You're either thinning out the kleśa or thickening the kleśa.
- V4: We're still laying down saṁskāra and some of them aren't always that good.
- R: But they're all rooted in the kleśa. This will get explained further in the next Sūtra.
- B: If thinning out is weaker, then the kleśa will make stronger saṁskāra.
- R: If you're not trying hard to thin them out, then you're going to keep printing deeper negative saṁskāra. Conversely, from what he just said, if the positive force is greater, the force of thinning out the kleśa, then your saṁskāra prints are going to be less of the kleśa themselves, and deeper on the thinning process. So what you're doing is deepening those prints and effacing your earlier actions, your earlier saṁskāra. You're not changing the relationship of yourself to kleśa in past time, because kleśa still exist, you're working at the saṁskāra level.
- V4: Well, I thought that in terms of karma, I think I understand it, like in karma, I thought that actions that you've performed in the past have to come back to you.
- V5: In saṁskāra form.
- R: It's not like actions themselves are hanging around somewhere ready to attack. The fact that you've done an action makes a saṁskāra, makes a print. It's with you now; it's not something that's going to come later. You have it now already. It may be acted out or it may not. If there were not a way to bury or burn the saṁskāra, it would be senseless to have this class or do yoga.
- B: Saṁskāra can't sprout without the proper field.
- V4: I read a couple of times from different saints saying that every action has to be paid for in a sense, but I guess you're paying for it through your tapas or your effort.
- B: But not in one lifetime either.
- R: It's not necessarily in one life that it has to be paid. You have eternity.
- V4: Well, that's where we started from...
- Q: It's a comfort.
- R: Yes, it's a comfort. [Laughter] Any more questions on 2?
- Q: I was wondering if you could read again about the results of tapa... [inaudible] of mind and....
- R: Kriyā yoga... one way of defining kriyā yoga and its effects is, we do tapas for calmness of body and the senses, we [do] svādhyāya to predispose the mind to realization and we do Īśvara praṇidhāna to bring about steadiness of mind. Babaji puts it almost the same way:
- BC: By practicing tapas, calmness of the body and the senses is attained. By practicing svādhyāya, the mind becomes fit to attain knowledge. By practicing Īśvara praṇidhāna, steadiness of mind is attained.

- Q: Is that to be mixed up with, or confused with Paramahansa Yogānanda's kriyā yoga?
 R: Yes, it's to be confused with it. [Laughter]
 B: The word 'kriyā' means physical action. Any yoga done with the physical body is called kriyā yoga, in the most general sense. Āsana, prāṇāyāma, worship and pūjā are all kriyā yoga. For pūjā, there is a term - kriyā karma. In Yogānanda's kriyā yoga, they do all the prāṇāyāma, āsana, mudrā, mentioned in the haṭha yoga books.
 R: But it's a mistake to call that yoga 'kriyā yoga' in exclusion to all other... that no other yoga is kriyā yoga. That's simply not true.

- Q: Is there a significance to the order that Patañjali wrote tapas, svādhyāya, Īśvara praṇidhāna?
 B: The main tapas is prāṇāyāma. Some scriptures mention it.
 R: He wants to know if there is a significance to the order; could they be mixed up just as easily?
 B: The order's not important.
 R: Just those three things have to be present to be called kriyā yoga in Patañjali's definition. The three together make kriyā yoga.
 B: Svādhyāya is also japa.
 R: ... repetition of God's name.
 B: Īśvara praṇidhāna includes meditation.
 R: So in one sense you can look at it as prāṇāyāma, japa, meditation. It's a natural sequence.

- V3: How does meditation, svādhyāya and Īśvara praṇidhāna constitute physical yoga?
 R: He says some of the methods don't seem physical and they're still included in physical yoga. Svādhyāya and Īśvara praṇidhāna don't seem physical to him.
 B: Japa, meditation are physical.
 Q: [Inaudible]
 R: The body does something.
 B: Laya Yoga is not. You just sit in Laya.

- V3: A practice such as ātmavicāra would be considered physical?
 R: Ātmavicāra is self-inquiry, asking yourself 'who am I?'.
 B: In Raja Yoga it is not; in kriyā yoga it is. You use the body to think.
 R: Any other questions on 2?

BC: **Sūtra 3. Avidyāsmītā rāga dveṣābhiniveśāḥ kleśāḥ**

Ignorance, egoism, attraction, repulsion, fear of death are the pains, the afflictions, the kleśa.

avidyā	ignorance
asmitā	egoism
rāga	attraction
dveṣa	repulsion
abhiniveśa	fear of death
kleśa	afflictions

These five are the pains which create obstacles. They reinforce the saṁskāra in the citta. Avidyā is the root cause of these afflictions.

HA: [Commentary of Vyasa, paraphrased]

What are those kleśa? (R: Avidyā - misapprehension about the real nature of things, or ignorance. Asmitā - egoism. Raga - attachment, desire. Dveṣa - antipathy, aversion. Abhiniveśa - fear of death, are the five kleśa, or afflictions.) The afflictions are the five forms of wrong cognition. When they manifest actually, they strengthen the sway of the guṇa. They bring about changes and set in motion the flow of cause and effect, and in conjunction with one another, bring about the fructification of action.

[Commentary of Āraṇya, paraphrased]

The common feature of all the kleśa is erroneous cognition which is a source of pain. When the kleśa prevail, the activity of the guṇa remains deep-rooted, because the real nature of the self remains unseen. And these kleśa set in motion cause and effect. Every moment the guṇa change into mahat, ahaṁkāra, etc., and the afflictions underlying the functions of mahat, ahaṁkāra, etc. bring about the fruition of actions.

R: Any questions on 3?

Q: Could we take that part we just read... changes into mahat, ahaṁkāra...?

R: He says every moment the guṇa are changing into mahat, ahaṁkāra, etc.

V6: What's an example of guṇa changing into mahat, or what does that mean?

R: Well, it means that this isn't something that just happens once. That the guṇa, at the beginning of creation, all of a sudden the guṇa appeared and became mahat and then ahaṁkāra, and then it didn't happen any more. That process, the print of that, the saṁskāra is repeating always, at some level. Just as even on the most physical level, our very cells change completely in a very short period of time and a person is never the same even from one moment to the next because of the atomic structure changing. The nature of the guṇa is change and they affect, they put out, they set off the cause and effect because of the attachment that we have to the guṇa and their play. That's my understanding of it.

B: Prakṛti, mahat, ahaṁkāra, and the five tanmātra equal eight and they are non-ātman, but by avidyā, they are taken as ātman. Ātman is puruṣa.

V6: I guess what my question is about is how you connect that whole theory of the guṇa to the whole theory of progression through mahat... how they connect with each other.

- R: Evolution is only possible because of the guṇa, because of a disequilibrium in the guṇa. That evolution is rooted in the kleśa and as long as we are in afflictive consciousness, that play of the guṇa and the whole creation of everything is always going on. We're always re-creating it; we're never letting it stop.
- V6: So it's kind of like there's two ways of saying it. One is the threefold divisions into the guṇa and we can also say there is a progression through mahat and ahaṁkāra and down through prakṛti and the tanmātra...
- R: Right. What's the first thing that is formed out of prakṛti? It's mahat, it's the ego, the 'I'. Even though it's the pure 'I', still it's 'I' and that root ignorance is causing all the other afflictions and keeping the evolutionary cycle churning away.
- V6: Then you can talk about it in terms of sattva not being completely predominant in mahat. It's not absolutely completely predominant.
- R: Well, the other two guṇa are with it, but it's predominant. They're in equilibrium, it's said, but sattva is said to be predominant because it's a pure state. It's a state of such harmony and balance, and it's in creation, so it's considered sattva is predominant. But things have started to alter already. And then it steps down again and is extremely altered.
- Q: What about the attraction for God? How does that cause suffering?
- R: He's putting devotion to God in rāga category and wants to know how attraction to God can be an affliction?
- B: Anurāga. It is devotion to God. There is dispassion to the world. Dispassion to the world is mixed in with devotion to God.
- R: So it's a special quality of rāga. It will also have to be transcended, but first you go there, go to that and get rid of the other things. And then take care of the one that's....
- Q: So if you wanted to take on the pure qualities, you'd initially set up an attraction for God. So what about the opposite of that which would be dispassion....
- R: Just a second.
- B: The word 'rāga' means attraction to the world. So Anurāga changes it and refers it to attachment to God. So it's of a different nature entirely.
- Q: It's more sattvic.
- R: It's different as well as being more sattvic.
- Q: What if you meet a wicked person or hear of a wicked thing happening and you start to feel hatred for that, would that, having that aversion to something, doesn't that give you bad qualities? If you have a strong dislike for something or someone?
- R: He's talking about an initial awakening of dispassion that it manifests as repulsion....
- Q: I'm not talking about repulsion, I don't think, I'm talking about just hatred. [Laughter]
- R: How can you be repulsed by something without hating it?
- Q: Yeah, I suppose it's part of it, but I'm just saying, what if you hate a wicked person? Can you become like that person just by that strong feeling of aversion?
- R: If you hate a wicked person, will you become like that person? Because you're expressing hatred; because you hate to see that?

- B: Hate is affecting you in the first place.
- Q: [Inaudible]... because Patañjali says further on in the sūtra I think that if you cultivate indifference toward the wicked....
- R: That's further back in the sūtras.
- Q: Well, I forgot where it was... you know, different attitudes toward different things....
- R: Indifference toward the wicked is what is to be striven after.
- Q: If, even in the sattvic state, if we achieve that sattvic predominant state, do the guṇa continue to have their play, their interchange, the only difference being that we're no longer attached, there's no longer... we're no longer affected by the cosmic play of nature, of the guṇa?
- R: You're saying, 'if we become sattva predominant, can we become rajas predominant at the same time?'
- Q: Is the rajas and tamas still...?
- R: They're still functioning, but if you're predominant in one, you're predominant in it and so that's going to hold sway over the others.
- B: When rajas and tamas are wiped out, then you dissolve into Puruṣa.
- Q: Then you can obliterate the tamas and the rajas?
- R: He said when they're wiped out, that's the end though. All you can do is dissolve into Puruṣa at that point. Up until that time, there's still the play of all three guṇa, even though one is predominant.
- V1: But they're all three in equilibrium.
- V2: They're not really in balance; they're just inactive. Equilibrium is only in mūla prakṛti.
- R: Well, it's written in the notes; it says, "also in mahat", so it must have gotten changed. Equilibrium means perfectly balanced.
- B: Sattva guṇa and the two other guṇa cancel each other's force. Like two iron balls of equal weight hit each other and stop. In mahat there's no activity until rajas activates.
- R: Any more questions on 3?

BC: Sūtra 4: Avidyā kṣetram uttareṣām prasupta-tanu-vicchinodārāṇām

Avidyā is the field of the other four kleśa, whether they be dormant, thin, scattered, or expanded.

avidyā	ignorance
kṣetram	field
uttareṣām	of the following
prasupta	dormant
tanu	thin
vicchinna	scattered
udārāṇām	expanded

Avidyā - ignorance: Just like a seed grows only in the ground, in the same way the seed of afflictions grows only in the field of ignorance. The fruit of the afflictions is the creation of obstacles; the root cause of afflictions is ignorance.

Prasupta - dormant: The seeds of kleśa are in the citta but still not sprouted; just as the desire of sex is in the dormant stage in childhood and when maturity comes, those desires start sprouting.

Tanu - thin. These are the kleśa that are weakened by developing positive qualities or by the practice of kriyā yoga. They are unable to act, even if objects of the senses are present, but the desire still remains in the citta in very subtle form. Kleśa are weakened:

- 1) by developing discrimination, attaining knowledge, ignorance is weakened;
- 2) by developing discrimination, egoism (asmitā) is weakened;
- 3) by developing neutrality, rāga and dveṣa (liking and disliking) are weakened;
- 4) by developing non-attachment, fear of death (abhiniveśa) is weakened.

By developing saṁyama (which you will recall is practicing dhāraṇā, dhyāna and samādhi all together), all kleśa are weakened.

Vicchinnā - scattered: When certain kleśa are suppressed here and there by powerful kleśa, and in the absence of powerful kleśa start appearing, it's called the scattered state. For example, liking is thin when disliking is powerful. If disliking is absent, then liking reappears and vice versa. (R: He means there's not a continuous flow of one kleśa in the mind. He means that the others are still there, even when one is going.)

Udārāṇām - expanding: The kleśa that are expanding by being associated with their object and becoming active.

Avidyā is the root cause of all kleśa. By the destruction of avidyā (ignorance), all kleśa are also destroyed.

Fried seed: kleśa which are very thin become unproductive like fried seeds. By attaining viveka khyāti (discriminative wisdom), the kleśa become unproductive. Samprajñāta and viveka mean the same thing. The author didn't mention the fifth stage, the fried seed stage (dagdha bīja), because this is a favorable stage to attain samādhi.

R: Referring back to our question about mahat in the previous sūtra, Babaji has written: "In mahat, there is an equilibrium with unequal guṇa. In prakṛti, there is equilibrium with equal guṇa."

So the fact is there's an equilibrium, but sattva is predominant, so it makes unequal guṇa. The force of that harmony of equilibrium makes sattva predominant in that sense.

Q: Can you repeat that please?

- R: “In mahat, there is equilibrium but unequal guṇa. And in prakṛti, there is equilibrium and equal guṇa”. So nothing’s happening. In mahat, something’s happening, because of the force of sattva.
- Q: Is that where it’s been explained that rajas tries to make sattva predominant, to shine first and tamas restrains it?
- R: So that makes the equilibrium in the sense that nothing can happen except that sattva is shining.
- Q: Would the weight of rajas and tamas equal the weight of sattva?
- B: In prakṛti.
- Q: Wouldn’t they all three be equal in prakṛti? (R: Yeah.) In mahat, the weight of sattva would equal.... If we had three iron balls, the weight of sattva would be twice the weight of rajas and twice the weight of tamas. The two together would equal the weight of sattva?
- B: Sattva is increasing.
- R: You have to remember that mahat is not a fixed state, like...it’s not static, it’s part of a flow that’s going.
- B: Sattva is increasing; tamas is putting restraints, resistance.
- R: Rajas is doing both. Rajas is necessary for sattva to increase and it’s necessary for tamas to restrain.
- Q: So in the process of going in, nivṛtti, going from mahat up to mūla prakṛti, how would that function? Would sattva reduce, or would rajas stop functioning and they would all balance to an equilibrium?
- R: [Restating] In nivṛtti, in going backwards, to attain yoga, in going from mahat to the unmanifest state, to prakṛti, what happens, does sattva then reduce at that point or somehow, how do they come into that equilibrium where they’re also equal guṇa?
- B: When sattva is increased, the other two will start getting inactive. When they merge in prakṛti, all three guṇa will separate and become inactive.
- R: At that point, only sattva is active; at that point just before the merger back into prakṛti, just sattva... the other two have become inactive and sattva is the only active one. The force of sattva resolves it into prakṛti where even sattva becomes inactive. Part of the problem is that we’re talking as though this were something that we could look at and analyze and weigh and hold in our hand and say, “now here’s so much sattva and so much rajas and all this”. It’s not that way; it can’t really be put into words at all, but we’re only pointing at it. We’re going around it and trying to describe ways of talking about something that can’t be talked about at all essentially. It can only be experienced.
- Q: Is there any way to distinguish then between puruṣa and prakṛti? Are they just so intertwined that there’s no separation between those two principles, with that definition that there’s really no qualities to prakṛti, except for that of puruṣa or maybe....
- B: That is the distinction of the guṇa even though they’re inactive and in balance.
- Q: Well, no because you already dropped....
- V2: But they’re there.

- R: Even though they are formless, they are a form, compared to puruṣa, they are definitely a form. Compared to the world, they're formless.
- Q: It's a real slight distinction.
- B: Prakṛti is always with puruṣa, but they are completely two opposite things.
- R: Remember at that highest point of discrimination, buddhi represents all of prakṛti and that's what we're discriminating from prakṛti in our discriminative wisdom.
- B: Like a magnet and iron are always two different things, even though they'll always appear together if they are in proximity.
- R: The iron is deriving all of its power from the magnet.
- Q: So when we were talking about Īśvara, it could be... Īśvara is actually is prakṛti. If we're worshipping something with a form and that's the highest form, it would be prakṛti.
- B: Functioning God. God in his most subtle functioning is Īśvara.
- V2: The other day Babaji said Īśvara creates puruṣa and prakṛti. It's between Brahman and Puruṣa/prakṛti.
- R: Then who creates Īśvara?
- V2: It's Brahman who decides to create.
- B: They don't give birth to each other....
- R: He's written Brahman/Īśvara/puruṣa-prakṛti, in descending order. These are different functions. Otherwise they would be in the evolutionary process; if they weren't out of it, they would be in it.
- Q: I think I missed the part about, where the three guṇa become separate, is that because of the function of sattva?
- R: He says when they resolve back into prakṛti, they separate and become in equilibrium and are balanced, and inactive.
- Q: Is this before that, when sattva is....
- R: That's when sattva is predominant. In mahat, it's blending into mūla prakṛti. Sattva is the only guṇa functioning at that point, Babaji wrote.
- Q: But is sattva causal? Does it cause the merger with prakṛti?
- R: In mahat.
- Q: The functioning of sattva is not causal; it doesn't cause their being separate?
- R: In a sense it does. Mahat causes....
- V4: Is that when rajas starts to become active?
- R: Rajas has ceased becoming... rajas and tamas have ceased activity at this point. We're going in nivṛtti.
- V4: Isn't she talking about going into evolution?
- R: She's talking about... she's going back and forth. [Laughter] One foot in this world; one foot in the other. Mahat down?
- Q: Mahat up.
- V7: She asked if the predominance of sattva right before that merger into prakṛti causes that merger?
- Q: Yeah, that's what I asked.

- R: [Restating] Can sattva be said to be causal at that point?
- B: Sattva is the cause.
- R: It doesn't have to do anything. In the fourth chapter we'll talk about it.
- V6: I've seen it said before that sattva means the balance of rajas and tamas?
- R: Did that get said before; is that what...?
- V6: No, I read that some place.
- R: He says he read somewhere that sattva is the balance between rajas and tamas.
- V2: The reconciliation of rajas and tamas, in that sense it's the balance.
- R: So we approach the guṇa and look at them in different ways. In one way, sattva and tamas are the two opposing qualities and rajas is the connector, but it can be looked at also in the way you just described, that sattva is the balance between rajas and tamas, between action and inaction. The other is between light and darkness and action is the intermediary.
- B: Rajas is the activator among the two. Sattva is the balancing force between rajas and tamas; between total action and total inaction, the balance is sattva.
- V6: In that way of putting it together where sattva is on the one hand and tamas on the other, then what would be the essence or substance of sattva? I understand it as balance, but I don't understand....
- B: Purity. Pure consciousness.
- R: And the other would be pure nescience, pure ignorance, tamas, in that case.
- Q: Would it be pure consciousness, or would it be pure intelligence, or...?
- R: Consciousness.
- V1: Is there avidyā in mahat; is there still ignorance in mahat?
- B: It starts from mahat.
- R: As long as you're still in mahat, there's ignorance. When you are out of mahat, you're out of ignorance.
- V1: The next step up is mūla prakṛti, right?
- R: Right.
- V1: And that's where the guṇa become inactive and separate? And the next stage is puruṣa where it's beyond everything?
- V2: I'd like to bring out the point that the guṇa are inactive in mūla prakṛti because they are separate. It's only when they're together that they act and produce some form.
- R: And the first thing that's produced is a predominance of sattva because of their equilibrium.
- V3: And then they separate again from ahaṁkāra?
- Q: How does that happen going from mūla prakṛti into mahat?
- R: Nobody knows. No one's ever been able to say what's happened. No one... ever. At least if they have it's been lost, completely.
- B: That's the only thing no one can explain.
- Q: No one can explain what? [Laughter]

R: No one can explain the transition, what happens between mūla prakṛti and mahat. Why or what... no one can explain.

Q: [Inaudible] [Laughter]

V2: Sāṃkhya says that the guṇa, though they're inactive in a productive way because they're separate, they are, each one by itself, in eternal motion and that a slight stress will start them colliding together to produce evolution. And the stress comes from karma, from leftover desires for creation. This is fine after the first evolution, but why it started for the first time....

R: That's right. Well, you see when we speak in terms of eternity, that's why we can never know about a first cause, because there really isn't one. Even though something happens in each creation like that, it relates so closely to eternity that it can't be put into words.

B: Karma starts from the second cause.

V2: What is the second cause?

B: Mahat.

R: The first cause is prakṛti.

V3: It's also the same in terms of the analogy that the one becoming two automatically becomes three.

B: In Tantra.

Q: Wasn't God just bored or something? Didn't he just want something to do? I've read some of the saints and they say....

B: Tantra explains much clearer.

R: ...[It] explains evolution and involution... it deals specifically.

Q: Didn't God just want a reflection of Himself, something to know Himself with? Isn't that why the creation's here?

R: [Restating] Didn't creation happen because God wanted a reflection of Himself? He wanted to see Himself?

U: That's a poetic way of explaining the unexplainable.

B: Icchā śakti - the will. Kāmakalā in Tantra. The will to create.

R: The nature of that śakti is creation, so that no one has to sit and think "I'm going to create now". It does it automatically by the force of its nature.

Q: It's not a desire of God to know Himself?

R: If God is worth knowing for us, he better know Himself. If God doesn't know Himself, who'd want to know God? We're already in that condition.

Q: ... duality when you talk like that....

B: Consciousness, will to create, and matter — these three energies work together.

Consciousness is cetanā śakti, the will to create is icchā śakti, and matter is kriyā śakti. The will to create and matter come at the same time.

R: The guṇa come from the śakti; the śakti are the first thing; the guṇa come from those. Jñāna śakti is always there.

V2: Cetanā śakti.
R: Divine knowledge.
V2: Cetanā.
R: OK, cetanā.
B: Conscious energy which is Brahman, the Absolute God.

Q1: So there's no sense in trying to figure out why it's all here, or why it ever happened?
R: That's svādhyāya; there is sense to it. It predisposes the mind to samādhi, to liberation.
Q2: I know, but even the person who's finally liberated....
B: As much as we can.
Q: What?
R: As much as we can. It's the analogy of the salt doll again. The story that Rāmakṛṣṇa [Paramahansa] used to tell. A doll made of salt that went to measure the depth of the ocean by wading in it and the salt doll didn't get very far out before he dissolved in the salt of the ocean. And that's likened to the state of one who's going to find out the full God. "I'm going to know God in its entirety." But on the way, he dissolves, so no one has ever known God completely.

Q: Probably when we reach that point we won't care then anyway.
R: If you do, you won't.
B: It could be the same as a tapeworm trying to find out where he is. [Laughter]
R: Just so we don't get too sublime....
V8: This process we're talking about, it's always going on, isn't it? The process of creation... it's not something that just happened once a long time ago when creation began... [inaudible] into our lives here....

[Missing a page of notes here]

B: Home starts in mahat.
R: Home is where ma-hat is. [Laughter] Was that three or four?
Q: Four.
R: I didn't read my notes either.

HA: **Sutra 4. Avidyā is the breeding ground for the others, whether they be dormant, attenuated, interrupted or active.**

R: So we have one difference; instead of the word 'scattered' that Babaji uses, Svāmi Hariharānanda [Āraṇya] uses 'interrupted'.

HA: [Vyasa paraphrased]

The kleśa stays in the mind in a potential state and awakens or manifests itself when the mind turns toward its object. Attenuation means the kleśa thin when overpowered by contemplation of their opposite. Interrupted: the kleśa that gets suppressed for a time....

R: Babaji has 'scattered' for this.

B: 'Scattered' is not right. It's 'interrupted'.

R: O.K. It also says interrupted.

HA: [Vyasa paraphrased, continued]

Interrupted: the kleśa get suppressed for a time, but come back again. For example, when anger is un-manifest, at the time of attachment, the anger's not active. If you're attached to something and anger's not there, it doesn't mean that you don't have anger; it's just not manifest. So anger is interrupted. Again, when attachment is directed toward one object, it can't be said to be non-existent toward other objects. Just because we're directing the force of our kleśa toward one object doesn't mean we have no kleśa force for other objects. That's the interrupted state of kleśa; a break in continuity.

Active: the kleśa is active in reference to an object. All are kleśa regardless of the state of manifestation, but are categorized according to the peculiarities of the different state. They are all held in check by contrary contemplation and they are made manifest by favorable causes. All are but varieties of avidyā, of ignorance, because all are permeated by error. (R: Remember it says 'avidyā is the breeding ground of all the others. So they're all varieties of avidyā because they're all permeated by error.)

That's why avidyā is said to be the breeding ground. When an object is colored by avidyā, ignorance, it is followed by the other kleśa. (R: They come in tow automatically.) These are felt whenever there is avidyā, and they dwindle away when avidyā is thinned away.

R: So if we start getting rid of avidyā, the other kleśa start thinning out automatically — egotism, attraction, repulsion, fear of death, are all wiped out by wiping out ignorance, the primal avidyā.

V3: Doesn't it say in the sūtras that one is drawn into the previous one and that's how they're attenuated; like abhiniveśa is pulled into rāga and dveṣa, which would be pulled into asmitā? I think I remember that one.

R: He's asking if the kleśa resolve into one another as the elements do in bhūta śuddhi. Does abhiniveśa kleśa get absorbed by dveṣa and then dveṣa get absorbed by rāga and then rāga get absorbed by asmitā and then asmitā get absorbed by avidyā?

V3: [Inaudible]

R: Maybe as we go along it will get resolved a little bit.

V6: I think [Iqbal Kishen] Taimni says something....

R: The state of kleśa means a state where an afflictive mental modification is in operation. Last year Babaji wrote in this regard, the relationship of the kleśa and regarding this sūtra, that avidyā is the breeding ground.

BC: Avidyā is the root; asmitā is the trunk; rāga and dveṣa are branches; abhiniveśa is the fruit. Abhiniveśa remains in seed form in the other four.

Q: Would you repeat that?

R: - “Avidyā is the root.” It’s the breeding ground of all the others: its the root of all the others. All the other kleśa spring from avidyā, primal ignorance, original sin if you will (mixed metaphors).

- “Asmitā is the trunk.” From ignorance springs ego.

- From ego grow the branches of rāga and dveṣa, attraction and repulsion. “I like this”, “I don’t like that”. “I love this”; “I hate that”.

- Its fruit, the fruit that appears at the end of those branches, is fear of death, abhiniveśa, fear of losing all the things we love and hate, especially the ego. And “Abhiniveśa remains in a seed form in all the other kleśa.” There’s fear of death in ignorance, and in egoism and in attraction and repulsion.

Q: When you say love in this connection, do you mean love with attachment?

R: Lower-case love.

Q: I mean love without attachment.

R: Yes, not divine love - love with attachment, polluted love.

V3: When you say ‘afflictive modification of the mind is avidyā’, in that sense, on a high level would’t any modification of the mind by avidyā?

R: Yeah, by definition of the second sūtra.

V3: So then afflictive modification would be redundant.

R: Except, well, one wouldn’t... we’re speaking on this level; we’re not speaking on the highest level. On the highest level we don’t need to talk about the kleśa at all. All we have to do is say every thought is an affliction — it’s in the way; so all you have to do is not think. But because it’s not so easy, you’ve got to go on and define the kleśa and all of that.

V9: Isn’t that true relative to the level of where you’re at, that is, at a given level, thoughts of God let us say, are not afflictive...?

R: Well, that’s the point; that’s the whole thing. At this level, that’s not an afflictive thought; that’s a helpful thought. Even though at a higher level it is afflictive. So many times we run into that in the sūtras, that Patañjali’s talking at three or four levels at once.

- V9: In asking about the metaphor of the roots, trunk, branches and fruit is that, to carry the metaphor a step further, the fruit is the seed for the next tree, so that fear of death....
- R: That's right; it has ignorance in the seed, and it... that's right, that's right. It drops to the ground and another tree of ignorance springs up.
- Q: It's a vicious cycle.
- R: What time is it? Does class go to 11:00 now?
- Q: It's 10:45.
- Q: Class was over at 10:30.
- R: Class has been over for 15 minutes. [Laughter]

This material is licensed by Sri 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/>.