

CLASS at Wisdom's Goldenrod, Hector, NY
with Anthony Damiani (AD)
December 8, 1982
PB PARAS; PHILOSOPHY; SAGE

TOPIC: PB Paras

SUBJECT: Philosophy

SUBSUBJECTS: Sage, Jivanmukta, Nirvikalpa vs. Sahaja, Sadat, Mahadevan, Ramana, Lao Tzu

CONTENTS:

PB PARAS ON THE SAGE

SADAT; MAHADEVAN; THERE IS NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN A JIVANMUKTA AND A SAGE; THE SAGE'S EXPRESSION IS ALWAYS PARTIAL

SAGES DIFFER IN TERMS OF THEIR FUNCTION AND GOAL, NOT IN TERMS OF THEIR AWARENESS

NIRVIKALPA VS. SAHAJA

SADAT; MORE ON THE PARTIAL NATURE OF A SAGE'S EXPRESSION; SAGE, JIVANMUKTA, BODHISATTVA, BUDDHA; A BUDDHA HAS A WORLD-WIDE MISSION

MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE TAKES PLACE ON THE PENULTIMATE STAGE OF THE IMAGINATION, THIS IS STILL NOT REALITY; NON-DUALITY

MORE PB PARAS ON THE SAGE; LAO TZU; KING JANAKA AND SAHAJA

A SAGE EXPERIENCES THE WORLD AS THOUGHT

BOOKS READ FROM OR REFERENCED:

- Paul Brunton, *Notebooks*. 16 vols; Vol. 1 entitled *Perspectives* [*Persp.*], published 1984-1988. Some Paul Brunton Notebook paras are, as of 2018, unpublished, and are noted as such.
- Paul Brunton, *The Hidden Teaching Beyond Yoga*
- Plotinus, *The Enneads* (MacKenna translation, 4th ed.)
- *Mandukya Upanishad*
- John Burroughs, "Waiting" [poem]
- Ashtavakra, *Ashtavakra Samhita*

PLOTINUS QUOTES READ OR REFERENCED: III.8.6

DIAGRAM referred to not with this transcript version.

NOTES:

- Anecdotes about PB throughout transcript highlighted in yellow.
- RC read paras from the Brown Vinyl volume (bv), the beginning of 25v, and the Yellow Vinyl volume (yv).
- Earlier transcript versions exist.

TRANSCRIBED from Audio Cassette Tapes by HP, JF, et al. in 1992 as part of the set for *Living Wisdom*. V11 version 2018. Reformatted from V11 version by JRM & JF 2019-2020, with Subheads and Table of Contents added by JRM. In 2024, IT updates prefatory matter and footer, replaces tape markers with audio file markers, adds and alters Subheads to make more accurate, completes Book List, adds Plotinus quotes section, corrects typos/errors, adds new notes within transcript, reformats to accord with new conventions. **Readable edited transcript – V14.1r.**

AUDIO FILES: 1982 1208a, 1982 1208b. [Note: “Tape” and “Side” refer to original audio cassette tapes that were later digitized into .MP3 Audio Files.]

1982 12/08 at Wisdom's Goldenrod
PB Paras; Philosophy; Sage
Readable Edited Transcript

PB PARAS ON THE SAGE

[Audio File 1982 1208a Begins]

PB: "Just as Pythagoras and Socrates were maligned and even put to death by those who either misunderstood or misrepresented their teachings, so Epicurus, another Greek, has been maligned ever since his own time, although he fortunately died a natural death. Incidentally, he died of the stone. It could be that there was an excess of calcium in his body and that it had got concentrated in the wrong place, producing the stone in the bladder or the kidney--for he tried to live a simple life and ate only barley, bread, and cheese and drank only water. There was probably an excess of cheese in his diet, producing the excess of calcium. However the point I wish to make is that he is supposed to have preached heathenism, the pursuit of pleasure and enjoyment as being the highest good, but the truth is, as demonstrated by his simple life, that he was an ascetic. He did not believe in cluttering himself up with a lot of possessions and he sought the freedom from anxiety which this gave him. The freedom from those desires for luxuries and comforts which fill most people left him with a serene mind. This serenity was enjoyable and pleasant; so what he meant by pleasure was a pleasure of living the good life, not the pleasure of living the animal life. But if he is to be judged by his diet, his philosophy was incomplete and imbalanced." (25.3.510)

PB: "The worth of these men who stand out in history and biography is a standard against which we can measure ourselves. They are useful in other ways also to encourage, to inspire and to console."
(unpublished, bv/251/2)

PB: "The divine presence does not leave the enlightened man when he goes to sleep and return to him when he awakes, nor does it leave him when he enters the state of dream and return to him when he leaves it; it is in truth something which is ever present. If he enters the sleeping state, he enters it while in the light of knowledge, and the same applies if he enters the dream state." (25.2.175)

PB: "One may quote Jesus, Krishna, and the *Upanishads* for the rarity of the self-realized man, but most people will be astonished that I should quote such a shrewd, practical, worldly man as Cicero who wrote: "I think it oftener happens that a meal brings forth a cold than that Nature produces a sage." But Cicero himself writes somewhere that he believes profoundly in God." (25.3.58)

PB: "Visions, mental states, and experiences may succeed each other progressively or otherwise as they do with the yogis, but they are not the same as a continuous stabilized awareness of that which is behind all these temporary states." (25.2.40)

PB: "All these sufferers come to him in their need and expect so much from him, but he must expect and ask nothing from them; he is to be content with this one-way transaction. If he wishes anything in return--even an acknowledgment of service rendered much less a payment in any mental, emotional, or physical form--the ego has reared its head and the service is impure. If he helps them, it is out of natural goodwill to all men." (25.4.44)

PB: "If he has both inspiration and technique his message will carry authority, power, enlightenment, and hope to those who can receive it." (25.5.29)

PB: "Many readers of *The Hidden Teaching Beyond Yoga* became both concerned and critical when I pointed out the limited nature of the mystical states. What they did not know is that this was part of the esoteric doctrine given to the few students of the higher philosophy both in India and in several other Asiatic countries. This was confirmed in my meeting with Professor A.J. Arberry (of Cambridge), who translated some of the Islamic mystical works into English. He quoted the tenth-century mystic and philosophy Gunaid of Iraq, "Truth comes *after* states and ecstasies and then takes its place." Swami Siddheswarananda of the Ramakrishna Mission and a lecturer at the Sorbonne in Paris also told me before he passed away that V. Subrahmanya Iyer of Mysore, who had been one of his teachers, had been initiated into the traditional esoteric doctrine of the original Shri Shankaracharya and that it was not written in the books, but taught privately only." (25.2.32)

PB: "The sage includes the saint, but is not limited by him. The sage possesses qualities and attributes which may be missing in the saint." (25.3.124)

PB: "It would be a poor thing for the sage if he had to sit down and squat in meditation in order to lift himself into peace. This is why he may or may not make a practice of meditation. For whether he meditates or not he always enjoys his inner peace." (unpublished, bv/255/3)

PB: "Whenever he could, Lao Tzu went to the mountains and there--sitting alone and looking down from a height--he put human beings and their worldly existences into the proper proportion. As he was also a human being, he was able to reduce his own egoism and tranquillize his own desires and recast his sense of values until the great peace came over him and he was enlightened." (25.3.80)

PB: "Because he ever practises calmness, other persons may think him to be indifferent to them, to what is happening, and to his own actions, as if he were performing them somewhat casually; but in this they would be mistaken. For the detachment within him lies deep down and consists in a general attitude towards worldly life based upon knowledge, understanding, philosophy. He is not heedless but attentive, not unresponsive but touched by situations calling for sympathy, not neutral where right or wrong are concerned, not neglectful of duties and responsibilities, not *careless* in work but *carefree*." (25.3.511)

PB: "One of the foremost features of enlightenment is the clarity it gives to the mind, the lucidity of understanding and luminosity which surrounds all problems." (25.2.277)

PB: "The sage's consciousness remains permanently serene and equable, at the same level whatever conditions prevail." (25.3.280)

PB: "The sage will not assume any exclusiveness or try to impress others with his superiority. He knows where the peasant stands in the scale of evolution and where the prime minister stands, but he will be equally possessed of good will to both." (unpublished, bv/257/4)

PB: "When the sense of this presence is a continuous one, when the knowledge of the mentalness of this world-experience is an abiding one, and when the calm which comes as a result is an unshakeable one, it may be said that he is established in the Truth and in the Real." (25.2.149) (quote reread)

SADAT; MAHADEVAN; THERE IS NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN A JIVANMUKTA AND A SAGE; THE SAGE'S EXPRESSION IS ALWAYS PARTIAL

VM: In relationship to that first line "When the sense of this presence is a continuous one . . ." it just reminds me of--several years ago when I saw PB, he was in France, he actually turned around and said to me--there was a big article in *Time* magazine about Sadat--he turned around and said, "Sadat is continuously aware of the presence of God--what more could he want." Now I don't know if Sadat was a sage; I certainly wouldn't go that far, but certainly he meets criteria one.

RC: He was speaking about Mahadevan as having a problem that most other sages had . . . what I picked up on was: "Are you calling Mahadevan a sage?" That surprised me that he would be speaking of Mahadevan as a sage, and he paused maybe five seconds and then he said, "Well, he has all the knowledge of the Vedic teachings at his fingertips, to quote relevantly to any question, and he's capable of doing all the meditations, and anyone who could do those two things I would call a sage." The problem he was speaking of was taking a point of view when you come out of the silence and when they get into a position of having to defend a point of view, they get caught up in conflict that isn't really necessary.

VM: (inaudible) In the reference to Mahadevan--he was slightly more careful, because he said something like, "Well they call him a sage, (inaudible)."

MB: . . . Are there times when it seemed like he used different criteria (for sages), that sometimes more people were included and sometimes less? . . .

RC: No, no, the only discussion that we really had about that was--after he had said that about Mahadevan and after a few other things that he said-- It became a real burning question for me at the time--in what way is a Jivanmukta something different than a sage, and I realized from the answer that I got that I put it backwards--it should have been the other way around "In what sense does a sage differ from a Jivanmukta?" But we talked for awhile and he kept trying to get me to say things he could either say yes or no to, or agree with or disagree with, and finally came up with a fairly simplistic formulation just in terms of how--the problem he talked about the sage as having--in that when they've come out of the stillness and identify with a certain idea or a certain essence or a certain point of view--and actually re-identify with it, get into the consequence of inherent limitations of any viewpoint, the viewpoint could be true as far as it goes, but it's not all inclusive, and therefore in a sense it's not ultimately true. So that basically what I was feeling was that the Jivanmukta didn't really come out of the silence in that sense, and since he didn't re-align with any particular point of view, that wouldn't be appropriate to say that he had "come out" of the silence. And if you spoke of it that way, it would be really hard to speak of a "he," but that the presence of the silence and the identity of the Soul with (inaudible) inextricably enmeshed.

And he said--what he said was interesting--he said, "Well, of course intellectually that would be a correct formulation, but you have to realize that those who live there wouldn't make that distinction."

LR: . . . If he came out of the silence, it would seem inevitable that he would have to assume some point of view.

RC: Well, this started way back the first week that I was there, because Alan had been coaching me before I left. He said, "I found a way to get PB to answer questions that he didn't answer for other people." . . . PB was more and more taking the policy of answering people by quoting other people, rather

than saying he thought such and such. He would deflect it and say, “Well, that’s what they think anyway.” It was also what he thought, but he didn’t have to say so. . . .

JG: How did you know that?

RC: Well, because he spoke about it as a technique. If it was possible to quote someone else who had already expressed a thought that it was better to do that than to take the chance of getting the negativity aimed at himself. (laughter) He didn’t like it. So I guess other people--when PB had done that with them, would ask him, “Well, what’s your point of view?” and he wouldn’t answer. So Alan had just changed this question to “And what is PB’s point of view?” and then PB would say “Well, PB says such and such.” (laughter) So the first time that came up (inaudible) I asked him “And what is PB’s point of view?” He set his book down and he looked at me with a mischievous smile and he said, “I sit quietly and I observe the various points of view--that’s all.” (He) picked up his book and--

LR: . . . It depends on what you mean by “point of view,” if by point of view you mean some--

RC: --bifurcation, subject-object, operation of differentiated intelligence as opposed to undifferentiated consciousness.

AD: It’s (inaudible) the reason-principles working.

LR: Is that what Anthony means by point of view? (laughter) Certain reason-principles of--

AD: That’s all.

LR: That’s the way I was thinking of it . . . that coming out of the silence you had to adopt--you couldn’t be the All, there had to be SOME limitation on the Absolute in order to speak at all.

AD: That’s what it means to come out of the Silence.

(LR/RC/LR/LD/LR/DB/RC/RG/AD request to speak louder/ = 3 min.)

AB: What is Anthony’s point of view?

AD: Three hundred and sixty of them.

RG: So there are 360 points of view.

AD: Oh come on, you know it’s more than that.

LR: What’s meant by point of view is that coming out of the silence it’s necessary to have a certain contact with the reason-principles that you work with.

RG: Right.

LR: Because you can’t work with them all at all times, and that’s what is meant by coming out of the Silence. That you have to pick up some point of view in order to operate in the world or even to speak.

RG: Was the implication that a Jivanmukta doesn’t come out of the silence?

RC: . . . What he seemed to accept as intellectually correct, even though those who live there wouldn’t make the distinction, wasn’t that he doesn’t come out of the silence. You could address it from different

directions--you could question it--can you really call it "he" and what is this person that we put a name on and follow back into the silence? He told me in other contexts that to try to assign a name to that was to cling to the form side and miss the point.

RG: Could it be understood from that that these two kinds of being are two sides of one? That you can't really distinguish them? . . . The Jivanmukta and the sage seem to be two sides of one realization--one in the silence and one the exposition. Or are they different levels of attainment?

RC: To have these qualifications in terms of being a sage, like Anthony has given the example: you can have so many pounds of gold. It's still all gold. It doesn't matter if one is one pound, and another is five pounds and so on--that there could be different levels of intensity--PB talked in terms of "certain measures of peace," possessing a certain measure of peace--it seemed to be a hierarchy of attainment within what you would call sages. I don't know if 'Jivanmukta' is the right word or not, but I had a sense that that was--literally that the individual that was present was living in the One, rather than living in the Nous, and that's where he was actually living.

LR: I don't know what you mean by individual--

(VM/RC/VM/RC/St/LR/St/. . . AH/=student discussion on "horse sense" = 3 min.)

AD: I still don't understand what you said.

AB: Can we have the original quote? . . .

RG: The question seems to imply that there were beings you could call sages and there were other beings you could call Jivanmukta or something else and these were two different kinds of attainments or realization. Is that the case or is that not the case? And if it seems one is speaking to the experience of the silence, then another is speaking to the unfoldment of that experience, or one living always in the silence and the other maybe not always living in the silence.

AD: Isn't Jivanmukta the sage, the man continuously enlightened?

RG: That's what I think.

AD: (Living?/Lives?/(Inaudible)) in the knowledge.

RG: Yes, and is that different than what we could understand by sage? Isn't that what we mean by sage, or not?

AD: No. Usually the contention in Hinduism is that the Jivanmukta and the Videhamukta (Q: delivered through release from the body)--one is freed while living and the other is freed after death. PB made a remark somewhere that you do NOT achieve total freedom until you die, or are free of the body, but until that time you can be referred to as Jivanmukta or a person who always lives in the knowledge. (Q: refs. = 25.2.110-113)

RG: So that would be a sage.

AD: Well, assuming that there is an uninterrupted continuous awareness--whether he's asleep or dreaming or awake--that that is not interrupted--he would assume he's a sage. Unless he has some qualifications that Randy was referring to, that would distinguish a sage from a Jivanmukta.

RG: That's the question--are there? The general understanding we've had is they're the same thing, the same idea.

AD: Yes, Randy, were you qualifying that in some way, or--I can't hear back here--are you qualifying that?

RC: I don't know if they were the same, but I got the sense, especially after he had spoken of Mahadevan as a sage, in the terms that he spoke of him, I didn't know if it was the same thing, and so I just asked him about that distinction, and he wanted to know how would I formulate it if I was going to try to do so. And then the way that it finally came out was in terms of either the issue of coming out of the silence and taking a point of view and getting involved in the--I guess now I would say the re-identification of the consciousness with the ego.

PC: But wouldn't that disqualify someone from being a sage?

AD: No, he won't IDENTIFY with the ego, he can't, by definition, anymore. But if he expresses himself, he has to use the ego to express himself, and that has to be partial, that can't be total.

DR: You wouldn't speak of him as coming out of the silence, then.

AD: He doesn't come out of the silence. He's either dead, or he's keeping still.

DR: So he still has the capability of using his vehicle, this tool, while still remaining in the silence.

AD: While being a sage, while being a Jivanmukta.

LR: If he DOESN'T come out of the silence, he's dead or he's totally still. You're saying he has to come out of the silence to speak?

AD: Yes, if he comes out of the silence and speaks, it's got to be partial. It can't be any other way.

RG: What's partial?

AD: His expression. You can't say everything all at once, at one time. Even the sage.

RG: But the sage--when you say "come out"--for him to be a sage, wouldn't you say a part of him never comes out of that?

AD: Well, look, let's go back to the example we used Saturday--remember? Would you draw a little circle on the board for me? (laughter) --Smaller--inside of that bright green--

On the one hand you got Richard Goldman, dream character, and the table that Richard is looking to sell. (lots of laughter) Alright, and you remember what we said immediate perception was? I mean, if you put a face outside that circle, alright, like draw your face outside the circle (laughter), he said you didn't need any eyes, ears or nose to perceive.

Now if you lived outside that circle, you would be in that knowledge-awareness, wouldn't you? And you could imagine dream Dickie inside waking up, going to sleep and dreaming. But you could say

of dream Dickie that he's awake now, that is, the real Dickie could say, "Oh, look at him. He's awake now." And then he goes to sleep and he says, "He's sleeping now--Oh look at that, he's having dreams too." That would all be within that circle. But the perception that's taking place in the awareness goes on--it's uninterrupted. Now if he tries to function through that dream character, it's got to automatically be limited, because a dream character is constructed.

RG: . . . But if the sage comes back into the dream and starts to speak through his vehicle, isn't there that part of him which never leaves the consciousness of himself as the dreamer?

AD: Yes, yes--he's always that.

RG: Right, and yet he's using his vehicle within the dream to speak.

AD: Yes. But then you could also understand the very nature of that construction, that mental construct, which we're calling Richard Goldman, is constituted in a certain way, and can only express within the limits of the way it's constructed. The divergences, the differences, are inevitable and the partiality is inevitable.

SAGES DIFFER IN TERMS OF THEIR FUNCTION AND GOAL, NOT IN TERMS OF THEIR AWARENESS

DB: Anthony, this whole thing started with the conversation about Mahadevan and he made the point--

AD: Well, you're not going to know about Mahadevan.

DB: . . . It reminds me of another quote of PB, he said that Mahadevan had all the Vedic texts available to answer any question and he was capable of all the meditations, in another quote of PB's where he says, I read all the books, I did all the meditations, and that wasn't enough.

RC: And then I learned what they all had to learn.

AD: And then what?

RC: The whole passage started out "I read all the books, I studied all the teachings, met all the teachers, did all the meditations, and THEN I found out what they all had to learn."

AD: Yes. What was the point?

DB: The point being, that with Mahadevan, there was a problem sages had in terms of expressing truth from the particular point of view of the tradition that they've been associated with--that was something that someone from PB's perspective didn't have. . . . There seems to be a distinction between these two types of attainment. And that is that when the vehicle, say for example with PB, there was no limitation of the reason-principle that it could function with.

AD: What makes you think so?

DB: Well, in the sense that the quote that Randy spoke of, when he was asked his point of view, he said, "I simply sit and watch the various points of view"--I don't remember if that's exactly how it was said--but it does seem to be a distinction. He recognizes the truth of any one of them.

AD: But any sage could do that. The point is what's the distinction between Mahadevan and PB. What's the difference? They're both sages let's say, ok, what would be the difference?

CdA: I can repeat what you said in the past. (laughter)

AD: What's the difference?

DB: I would understand Mahadevan to be a Vedantist and PB to be capable of expounding the truth from any point of view.

AD: Well let's say they're both sages, what's the difference?

EC: Well, PB is PB.

AD: That's very true so far but it's still a tautology.

RG: I don't believe you could qualify it on the expos-- the-- that through which they expound the doctrine. Because merely because Mahadevan happened to be born in India and was a Vedantist, you would disclaim any traditional Buddhist sage or Hindu sage just because-- Shankara, just because they expressed the doctrine through Vedanta.

DB: It's not a disclaimer.

RG: That's no essential difference; that's only a matter of how their intellects unfolded the teaching; it doesn't have anything to do with the realization.

AH: If they were both sages, the only possible distinction could be in the manner in which the truth is being expressed.

AD: No, they'll both express the truth. But if they're two sages, the difference evidently would be in terms of their function or their goal.

AH: But the similarity would be in terms of the perception of all points of view.

AD: They'd all be sitting in that realm, but they have different goals to work towards. Mahadevan has one thing to do; PB had another thing to do. PB had to go through what he had to do because he had to. And Mahadevan had to go through the Hindu doctrine. But their goal was different.

RG: But they're not essential distinctions. . . . function in the world.

AD: No, they're not; they're not essential distinctions. From their point of view, they're quite superficial distinctions. But nonetheless, the goal that PB had to work for, and the goal that Mahadevan had were different. Another sage might have an entirely different--he might be ruler of a state, he might be doing something entirely different.

AH: That goal that makes them different?

AD: It doesn't make them different. As he just pointed out, that's not essential, if you're defining a sage.

AH: The distinction between PB and Mahadevan is only a distinction within the realm of--

AD: Your conventional truth. But in the realm of the empirical world they have a different work to do. They have a different work to do.

AH: So what is the difference between the sage--

(Side 1 of original cassette tape digitized as 1982 1208a Ends; Side 2 Begins)

AD: --I have a certain historical background and you have a certain historical background, and that yours may be a hundred times richer than mine--that wouldn't make us sages. The sages need continued awareness that's unbroken through all the states of consciousness. That makes the sage. Everything else is incidental. Now if you want to bring in the fact that PB had a versatile background, he traveled and done all these things, and the other one stayed put in one place, that's quite secondary.

BY: The sage's expression may have something to do with their mission or their goal so that the sage, for instance, Ramana, which had a certain training and so forth, would give a very--

AD: He didn't have any training!

BY: --Would have a very different teaching than PB would, and so forth, and that it's not essential to sagehood or to the truth that they lived in, but in terms of the world's receiving the teaching, there would be great differences.

AD: That's the difference, isn't it? That PB had to present an integral doctrine to the West, and therefore needed this comprehensive full framework to operate with. Ramana had no such goal, had no such function. But they're both sages. That's the important thing--that continuous unbroken awareness-- that is what counts. The other things are all secondary. Until you're there, then you don't know-- But when you're there then you know what the goal is, what it is you're supposed to do. And you do just that, precisely and accurately.

PC: Wouldn't the sage's goal in the empirical world be determined though to some extent by the (inaudible)

AD: I can't hear you.

PC: Wouldn't the sage's goal in the empirical realm be determined to some extent by the ego that he's been able to develop?

AD: You can bring in all kinds of variable X's. It doesn't matter.

PC: Not to say that that would determine him as a sage, but that that would figure in what his work in the world was.

AD: You see, those are imponderables.

PC: I just thought when we discussed the ego that that seemed to be an important point, that developing the richest and fullest vehicle for expression was part of what we were working on.

AD: Yes, one can infer that but who in the world would follow something like that up?

AS: It seems as if this ego development goes on at the same time as a breaking down and whatever. At some point there is what he calls Sahaja--(inaudible) unbroken awareness. The state in continuous unbroken awareness can happen at different levels or different richnesses of the development of the ego. And whenever it does happen, the state of the ego will be secondary, as it were; the state of the whole development will be secondary. . . . Secondary to being a sage.

RG: It seems it's almost secondary to his mission. It's not like the ego he develops is going to determine what his mission is, it's like his mission is going to determine what his ego's structure is going to be like, which is prior to the unfoldment of that particular ego-structure in one lifetime. Ramana's mission didn't entail developing an ego structure that had to relate to anybody. But it doesn't seem to be a result of the development of his ego structure.

PC: Right.

NIRVIKALPA VS. SAHAJA

RC: . . . We've talked before in terms of the difference between the mystic and the philosopher. Is it possible for a mystic to have continuous awareness of the presence?

AS: Somewhere in those notes he says . . . like the thing that Ramakrishna said to Vivekananda when Vivekananda said he wanted to remain in Nirvikalpa for X number of days at a time.

AD: Three-four days at a time, and just came out to eat, and Ramakrishna says "You're a fool."

AS: Ramakrishna said, "No, there's a higher state." And in many of the notes it seemed like PB made that distinction--he says the mystic certainly is one who can go into Nirvikalpa, but he's still got to come out. Whereas the philosophic sage is one who can remain in the unbroken awareness in all the states. And he really seems to strongly distinguish between Nirvikalpa and Sahaja. And he seems to continuously use Nirvikalpa with the mystic whereas for the sage the attainment is (inaudible) unbroken.

LDm: But I thought Nirvikalpa was spoken of as union with the highest.

AD: No, it's just a thought-free state.

RC: He compared the two in one place. He said "Nirvikalpa is psychologically more profound but Sahaja is metaphysically more complete." (Q: ref. = 23.7.301 & Persp. p. 243)

AD: Yes, and the difficulty with mystics is their emotionality is really a huge problem to deal with. It's overwhelming and it leads to excesses of unbalance. I think you read a quote where sometimes they'll have to spend a few lives just to get this straightened out--that they're so overwhelmed with that.

RC: When we hear things like--

AD: If I could just add to that, the question Louis asked, Nirvikalpa, for instance, is a thought-free state, so you are not going to witness the wakeful consciousness, the dream consciousness, the sleep consciousness, so you have to remain like a stone, practically, for all practical purposes. And you can't get anything done, you know, you can't chop your wood, make your fire, heat the house, keep the kid warm--none of that can be done. But you can be a sage and do those things--carry wood, heat the house, eat your dinner.

LDm: I always thought the difference between Sahaja and Nirvikalpa was that one was knowledge of the World-Mind or the Nous and Nirvikalpa was a union with the highest Brahman or One. Maybe that's my own misreading.

AD: No, in Nirvikalpa, you have no thoughts. In the case of the Sahaja, is where even if thoughts come, they too are Brahman. So it's always considered a superior state. Because you do not REJECT the world. You understand the world, and in that way, in understanding it, you comprehend and take it into yourself again. Whereas--that's the way the higher teaching would explain it. The lesser teaching, the teaching below that, is that Nirvikalpa, or thought-free, is the highest state and one can't go beyond that. You can see the consequences of the Nirvikalpa and the consequences of that would be a disaster for everyone living. Life would come to a halt. Stop.

LDm: So even when . . . Plotinus had union with the One four times or whatever, he still had ideas--he wasn't in the thought-free state, he still had--

AD: He was in a thought-free state.

You remember the quotation where you had the four initiations, Randy? I think you read it last week. (Ref. = 25.2.97 & Persp. p. 347) He speaks about four levels or four grades--the first grade where thought slows down, it is very gentle, and there's the second state where there's no thought at all. I don't know if you remember the one.

AH: But in the case of a sage, he doesn't go in and out of the silence. The silence and the sage are in some sort of unity.

AD: That awareness and the sage are identical. He never loses that.

AH: I got confused when we talked of going in and out of the silence. . . . How could you speak of anyone going in and out if it?

AD: Well, the metaphor silence or pure awareness are used synonymously and identify, because in comparison the wakeful state and the dream state are really quite noisy. Whereas that's a very peaceful, very quiet state. And when they speak about the silence, or they speak about this thought-free state where there's just awareness, you actually WITNESS the ego going to sleep, becoming wakeful, having dreams--you witness all of that.

AH: . . . But you're speaking metaphorically when you say "you witness"?

AD: Like the YOU is outside that circle.

AH: It's not an individual consciousness in any sense.

AD: Well, it's consciousness, but you would call it YOU. I'm not going to call it somebody else. I'm going to call that's me. That's me--the other guy isn't me.

AH: If the state of deep sleep is Witness--which we agreed that it is, according to these teachings, that's possible--that's not a witnessing in any discursive or dualistic--?

AD: No, it's not witnessing the way you understand it.

AH: Sleep is not an object to that consciousness?

AD: Yes, the various states of consciousness are objective to it. But it's not the way you understand objective in this set-up, the empirical set-up. It's not experienced that way.

AH: Well, then what is meant by objective?

AD: It's distinct from that awareness. It isn't that awareness. There's no mistaking one for the other. And it feels more intensely YOU than what you might call yourself--you now. Much more.

RamS: Just a comment--the word 'Sahaja' really means 'easy.'

AD: Means?

RS: Easy.

So the sage who is in (Sahaja) samadhi, that means he just doesn't have to sit down in meditation to get into deep samadhi. It is always available to him. Any moment he can just go into samadhi or any moment he can come out and express through his ego and all that.

AD: Well, I'll buy the first part. Easy or natural.

RS: Literally the word 'Sahaja' means--

AD: Comfortable. Did you find it, Randy?

RC: No, I didn't find it.

AD: Alright.

RG: Anthony, if we go back to the Witness of the various states, it seems it can't really be "as object," because if he knows those objective states as none other than his consciousness--

AD: I told you, don't use that analogy, you're going to transpose the analogy, the way we understand subject and object here, you're going to transpose it and think that the whole of what's in the circle is objective to the witness. It won't work, the analogy.

RG: . . . It may be a thought, but the thought itself is known as none other than his consciousness.

AD: It may be--

RG: It may be thought, or object, but that thought or object is known as none other than himself also.

AD: Yes, but again, it's a correct intellectual formulation, Dickie, but I don't think the import can be carried. We'll continue with others, Randy, if you can't find it--

SADAT; MORE ON THE PARTIAL NATURE OF A SAGE'S EXPRESSION; SAGE, JIVANMUKTA, BODHISATTVA, BUDDHA; A BUDDHA HAS A WORLD-WIDE MISSION

PC: I would be curious to know what PB said about Sadat--that he was always aware of the presence of God.

AD: I'm sorry--

PC: When PB said about Sadat that he was always aware of the presence of God, was he referring to that kind of continuous unbroken awareness, do you know?

AD: Yes.

Randy, why don't we continue with some more, it's alright, don't worry.

RC: So you think PB was speaking loosely then when he was talking about sages coming out of the silence? Do you think PB was just speaking loosely when he spoke about a lot of sages having the same problem when coming out of the silence, taking a point of view?

AD: Well, what I think he means by that --and again this is an opinion, alright--what I think he means by that, is when the sage talks, as soon as the sage talks he's out of the silence, in the sense that he's given utterance. Once he gives utterance, he has to break that whole integral vision and operate partially.

LR: Is that like the Plotinus quote where the sage is vision, but where (inaudible)? (Q: Plotinus, III.8.6: "The Sage, then, has gone through a process of reasoning when he expounds his act to others; but in relation to himself he is Vision.")

AD: Yes.

LR: Do you think--

AD: And once you use reason, it has to be partial. Even the best. And that's why there is no totally comprehensive statement of the doctrine, and it's taken mankind many thousands of years to produce different traditions--each, so to speak, partial statements of that doctrine. But we know enough now, even from our studies, that it would be impossible to ever give a statement of the transcendent unity of religions, in spite of people like Schuon or Guenon--it's out of the question.

RC: I remember another time that he told me, "They all tell me that I HAVE to have some point of view, that I have to be a Vedantist or a Buddhist or a particular sort of--"

AD: No. Not a real philosopher, never!

RC: He said, "It would be more appropriate if I were to go through a list of things, and say I AM an Advaitin, I AM a Vivatin(?), I AM a Vishishtadvaitin, I AM a Buddhist. I could honestly say that I AM all of those things, but if they tried to pin me down to any one of them and say that's ALL that I am, then they wouldn't be seeing what I am."

AD: I think that's the point of view that's prevailed here for a long time, too. Any attempt to avoid synthesis can only lead to a gross exaggeration and vilification of philosophy. Any single point of view, I don't care what point of view it is. So if you say you're a Buddhist to me, I say fine. If you say you're a Vedantist, fine. But I'd like you to add a few other DOZEN, you know, to make it a complete statement.

RC: Like he was saying in that context that if someone was to be a spiritual liberal, to talk in terms about how all these different points of view lead to the highest, is poppycock, if they haven't followed any one of them there to be sure that they can say it about at least one of them. And I guess it's something in that perspective that I was curious about in terms of--someone who actually, within their being and in

knowledge, experienced the validity of a certain point of view, in terms of, like one way in which the Nous perceives its prior, and another way in which the Nous perceives its prior and so on. And that is it possible for someone to have access to more than one view of real being?

AD: Well, what do you think about Plotinus?

RC: I think absolutely, definitely. I think that's what it means for someone to have the One as his basis, I think they're driven to that.

AD: And they would recognize the collectivity of Ideas.

RC: Now in using the word 'sage,' would you say all sages have the One as their daemon?

AD: I don't (inaudible).

LrD: That's an odd way to say it.

RC: Well, that's what I was going after with the question of distinguishing the Jivanmukta from the sage. And whether he's guided by a unific daemon or a daemon of a different order?

TS: It seems that PB made some suggestion which was . . . some of his comments about Plotinus and some of his own references to something . . . also raises a question for myself--there's a difference between being established in the enlightenment and having some experience of the Soul in the One . . .

RS: In Buddhist terminology sage is equivalent to Bodhisattva, while Jivanmukta is Buddha.

AD: Yes.

RC: Would you say that again?

RS: Bodhisattva is equivalent to sage, and Jivanmukta is Buddha.

AD: Yes.

RC: In the Buddhist terminology as equated with the Hindu terminology.

St: Like in terms of the meanings of the words?

AH: Can we summarize the comparison of PB with Mahadevan?

Mahadevan had mastered all the meditations, and had the whole of the Vedanta at his fingertips, so he's a sage. But PB's a Jivanmukta because there's a continuous unbroken awareness, whereas for Mahadevan perhaps it's only available in transcendent--

RG: No. But he wouldn't be a sage--

AD: No. I suspect that he meant Mahadevan had uninterrupted awareness.

AH: So there's no difference between Bodhisattva and Buddha according to what Ram said. No difference between Jivanmukta and sage.

AD: I don't think there's any difference between them, no. Except that in the case of the Buddha, he's got a world-wide mission. I mean in the case of a Buddha you could see a whole civilization is given an

impetus, and the groundwork for a whole culture and a whole civilization arises. So he has, let's say, a MISSION to perform, a certain work, whereas another sage might want to retire in a forest, don't even want to be known, sits quietly, and if you come by, he just makes out he's a dumb little ol' peasant, you know. Or he might throw rocks at you. (laughter) You can't predict the behavior of these people. (laughter) I mean, they're not normal. (laughter)

RC: So the quote they all took off from was--three things here:

PB: "When the sense of this presence is a continuous one, when the knowledge of the mentalness of this world-experience is an abiding one, and when the calm which comes as a result is an unshakeable one, it may be said that he is established in the Truth and in the Real." (quote reread) (25.2.149)

AD: That's worthwhile reading again. Is that a criterion he's offering?

RC: That's how we started the whole discussion.

AD: Let's read it again.

PB: "When the sense . . ." (reread)

SDx: . . . this seems miles apart from the criterion of knowing all the scriptures and being able to do all the meditations.

AS: Except that one of the meditations might be to remain in unbroken awareness . . . (inaudible). Like the *Mandukya*, one of the meditations is to be able to remain aware through all the other three states, and (inaudible) . . . You don't know what all those meditations are.

AD: Well, as a matter of fact the one we were reading Sunday is considered a higher point of view than the *Mandukya*.

AS: I imagine to be able to do all the Vedantic meditations, from all these texts . . . the one we were reading Sunday (inaudible).

AD: Alright, Randy, let's go on.

EM: Could I just ask one brief question? . . . So that when PB says that someone like Sadat--I guess I want to bring up Sadat because his life was so different than these other two people that we're talking about--but when he says that Sadat was always--he always had the awareness of the presence of God, would you also say that Sadat was a sage? Or was he a mystic? Now--

AD: No, no, I think he was a mystic. Brother Lawrence for instance constantly had the presence too. The presence of what?

EM: Well, they use the term "the presence of God," so then--

AD: Yes. So what would that mean? You studied a little bit. What would he mean? It would mean the Soul, right?

EM: Yes.

AD: What is a SAGE aware of?

EM: So he's aware of the presence of the One or the--

AD: And he's operating as a KNOWER. Shall we get on?

PB: "When it is said that--"

AD: Of course I'd like to add, Elaine, that from our point of view, the presence of the Soul or the presence of the One is the same. I mean, what's the difference? But from the point of view of a sage, let's say like Plotinus, he will make those distinctions, so will PB. They'll make the distinctions.

But, they'll bury it. So many of the saints, medieval saints, you know, they had this presence, they felt it continuously. But it isn't the Truth, the abiding Truth, the Truth of the Fourth State. It isn't that.

We'll take either--because as a matter of fact the Hindus do speak about these three as indifferently. They speak about these three Hypostases indifferently. They call all three of them the Absolute. So from our point of view, it makes a lot of sense. From the point of view of the sage, no, the distinctions he'll make if he has to. Alright, Randy, I'm sorry.

RC: I think he said one other thing to me that might make sense in terms of covering the three Hypostases in terms of Plotinus. In terms of distinctions within sagehood, he talked in terms of there being--he used the word very gingerly, but couldn't come up with a better word--like MEASURABLE differences in the continuity of the presence, the intensity of the peace, and the frequency of the intuition.

AD: Yes, I would refer to that as the criteria by which humanity's spiritual beings, you know, the criteria for the spiritual men of humanity. That would be a criteria. In his case of course it was continuous, very intense, the peace was always available. He'd chase you out for-- you know, if you were making noise or something. (AD laughs a bit)

MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE TAKES PLACE ON THE PENULTIMATE STAGE OF THE IMAGINATION, THIS IS STILL NOT REALITY; NON-DUALITY

PB: "I tried to make it quite clear in *The Hidden Teaching Beyond Yoga* that just as psychic experiences were not to be sought for their own sake, so even mystical experiences were not the highest goal. It was only when their intermittent nature became obvious, however remarkable and uplifting they may have seemed, that one who experienced them was ready to seek for the higher Truth. This was not only a matter of personal feeling, but also of impersonal intuitive knowledge confirmed by reason and experience." (25.2.34)

(quote reread, followed by student discussion = approx. 1 min.)

LDm: . . . There's still a duality, in that it's "I am experiencing this."

AH: But I think that's another cause of suspicion of mystical experience.

AD: They're still on a penultimate stage of the imagination. You become aware of that. And no amount of superlatives will take it away from that stage.

AH: No matter how grand or exalted the experience is, eventually it has to be seen as imagination.

AD: A penultimate stage of the imagination. It's not the imagination in the gross as we understand it and experience it in ordinary wakeful consciousness.

AH: But is that to say, Anthony, that the penultimate imagination, is in no way, or can never be that perceiver, that consciousness? That's the distinction that has to be made between mysticism and philosophy.

AD: It's still not reality. It's not going to be applicable.

DB: The occasion for the recognition of this fact takes place within the context of standard waking consciousness--normal waking life. One reflects on the experiences that one has had and somehow it occurs to one that's not the truth. And this is-- I'm not quite sure I understand how that is [one/two words inaudible]

AD: It might be that it (would/wouldn't) occur to you or I, but it would occur to someone like PB.

DB: Ok.

AD: And he wrote the *Hidden Teaching*, I think that was prior to the Jivanmukti stage. And the statement he makes there is that through his personal feeling and intuition he had already grasped the fact the mystical level was not dominated by reality, and was not that reality. But it would be only the person who has disciplined and who has developed an extreme rational consciousness that would be able to see through the superlative effulgence of the mystic state, and its shortcomings.

DB: That seems to be in some respects the flower of the rational development, because it does make that insight possible, whereas previously it was something that couldn't occur.

RC: This is a pivotal point in what he means by jnana--that there is an awakening in awareness to THAT which transcends experience and isn't to be verified by experience. That seems to be the big distinction in both the bhakti and the karma orientations: one remained within the context of experience. Whereas what he's speaking of here is an awareness of something--an awakening to awakening that doesn't require--

St: Something to be aware of.

RG: When you said before that the mystic doesn't perceive reality, if you allow the mystic to have Nirvikalpa, I don't see how you could not say that in that non-experience, in that thought-free experience, he doesn't contact Reality.

AD: He doesn't (what)--?

RG: He doesn't have reality in the--

AD: Because Reality has to include thoughts too.

RG: It seems the problem arises when he comes out of the Nirvikalpa.

AD: There it is, right there.

RG: . . .

AD: And it confronts them.

RG: With a dilemma.

AD: Yes.

RG: He hasn't taken in the world.

AD: And the non-dual would take both in. That was the amazing statement PB made about Plotinus--you remember?--he had tremendous powers of concentrating--WITH thought or WITHOUT thought.

And the difficulty that most yogi-mystics have is precisely that, that when they come out of Nirvikalpa, the confrontation with the world is an ordeal--they cannot bring them together. And they go back, and they keep going BACK to that state of the superlative, you know, exuberance and emotionality and subjectivity and the prodigality of one's awareness, because that's what it impinges on. But nonetheless when they come out they're faced with the fact that thought is contradicting that, and the highest standpoint reconciles the two of them--the Nirvikalpa, the no-thought state, and the thought-state. So that although in the beginning the person goes around saying he has thoughts, this too is Brahman, and he doesn't suppress them, he doesn't banish them. He knows that they are Brahman. Whereas the mystic will not do that.

RG: While he's in the Nirvikalpa, there's not a question. He is confronted with the reality of the world, which the philosopher then experiences as the reality of what the mystic also experienced in Nirvikalpa, but didn't know it when he returned to the world. So it's--

AD: That was (PB's/(inaudible)) doctrine. That does reconcile the two. But only if you go to the highest. You stay just one hairbreadth short of that and this conflict is like a thorn.

Let's have a few of them now.

MORE PB PARAS ON THE SAGE; LAO TZU; KING JANAKA AND SAHAJA

RC: Oh, these ones I'm reading tonight by the way, are all recent. These were all within the last ten years.

PB: "A man finds his greatest fulfilment of life, his greatest joy and happiness, in spirit, so that in reducing lower things he misses nothing at all, for he has outgrown them. This was the belief, feeling, and practice of one man who became a veritable sage--Plotinus!" (25.3.178)

PB: "The white loincloth which Ramana Maharshi usually wore served him for most of the year, except during the cooler nights of the mild South Indian winter, when he added a shawl. He had few other possessions. I remember a fountain pen, the old-fashioned liquid ink filling-with-a-glass-syringe type. With this he did his writing. There was also a hollowed-out coconut shell or gourd painted black, in which he carried water for ablutions. He had little more and did not seem to want anything else. The most impressive physical feature about him was the strange look that came over his eyes during meditation, and he usually meditated with open eyes. If they looked directly at you, the power behind them seemed quite penetrative; but most often they seemed to be looking into space, somewhat aside from you, but very fixed, indrawn and abstracted, and yet aware." (15.2.419)

PB: "We may try to make this idea as clearly definable as we can, but nothing put into words can in the end be more than a hint, a clue, or merely suggestive." (22.3.273)

PB: "Being what he is in itself constitutes an unpreached sermon, an unuttered instruction and an unspoken wayshowing." (unpublished, 25v/3/2)

AD: Was this in reference to Ramana or was it a different quote?

RC: Well, that was a different quote, it was the one that came after that--fairly close after that, actually two quotes in between them.

AD: Could you read that again?

RC: The short one?

AD: The one you just read.

PB: "Being what he is . . ." (reread)

AD: Well, my association-- (pause)

PB: "The presence of such men in the world may not help us individually but must hearten us. For it confirms our sunniest intuitions and proves the reality of the mystical goal." (unpublished, 25v/5/2)

PB: "How heartening it is to get glimpses. But work for more than that; work for steady communion with it as the end." (unpublished, 25v/5/4)

PB: "Such a man has enigma and paradox between him and the world's understanding." (25.3.513)

PB: "The atmosphere which gradually grew around him was a holy one. That was the first impression: and it became stronger still as the minutes passed. For his concentration increased naturally." (unpublished, 25v/5/6)

PB: "Such a man is a focal-point for all that is noble." (25.3.544)

[Audio File 1982 1208a Ends]

[Audio File 1982 1208b Begins]

PB: "The illumined men wrote either out of their intellect or their intuition, sometimes for scrupulous academic scholars and sometimes for simple persons. A sage like Lao Tzu wrote for neither the one class or the other, for he put forward the deep paradoxes of life; but another man not less illumined may have provided footnotes on nearly every page." (25.3.115)

AD: Does he refer to anyone?

RC: Not here.

AD: Chuang Tzu? No?

RC: (inaudible)

AD: Hm?

RC: There is a quote, it's not in this batch but there is one quote that says that Lao Tzu's thinking is more easily understood by studying Chuang Tzu--that he made it more accessible. (Q: ref. = 15.4.74)

(request to reread “The illumined men . . .”)

PB: “The illumined men . . .” (reread)

AH: If sages can write either for scholars or for simple people then Lao Tzu wrote for neither . . . Is something being said about the position that Lao Tzu expresses--the deep paradoxes of life?

LDm: That wasn’t the quote.

AH: I just don’t get the upshot of that quote.

BS: Please read it again, Randy.

PB: “The illumined men . . .” (reread)

AH: I guess I was asking to characterize the impact of Lao Tzu. Would you say it’s poetic? Would you say it’s inspired?

AD: He leaves life the way he found it: mysterious.

St: Mysterious.

AD: Yes.

RC: Just because a person does footnote every page doesn’t mean he’s necessarily uninformed either. If he wants to convince academics, he probably will.

TS: Another one:

PB: “Confucius is reported to have met and talked with Lao Tzu, whom he thereafter called “the dragon.”” (15.3.86)

AD: With five claws, five fingers on them--what do you call them?

TS: Talons.

AD: You see the Chinese, the imperial dragon, has five talons, the regular dragon has four, and I think it was punishable by death if you used the one with five talons. So the real dragon has got five talons.

SM: That’s how many--

AD: I was referring specifically to the one with FIVE talons. My joke. Go ahead. (laughter)

(DB/RC/St/= 2 min.)

PB: “The extent of any other man’s enlightenment is not easily measurable, much less so in those cases where the other is no longer alive or has never been met.” (25.3.399)

PB: “If in one way he feels remote from most of mankind, in another way he is far closer to them than the ordinary person. (unpublished, yv/98/5)

PB: “He has earned this peace, his strength, his knowledge.” (unpublished, yv/98/6)

PB: “How hard are those early struggles to keep unperturbed amid troubles, how natural it seems to the well-established sage.” (unpublished, yv/99/2)

PB: “He is regarded as the embodiment of such a spirit, the incarnation of its virtues.” (unpublished, yv/99/3)

PB: “The intellectual argues where the sage announces.” (25.3.266)

PB: “His dependence is primarily not on other persons but on himself, on his innermost being.” (unpublished, yv/99/6)

DB: A longer one.

RC: I want to leave this one for last, this batch.

PB: “If he has to meet someone who is regarded as a sage, he may quickly feel the stillness surrounding the man. If they sit down together and he feels disinclined to break the silence, it would be better not to do it but to take it as a signal to flout convention and let the initiative be taken by the sage himself.” (quote reread) (25.5.142)

(JG/RC/= 1 min.)

PB: “A true sage is more often than not unhurried in manner and slow in speech and eye-movement.” (25.3.402)

PB: “The sage does not need to pray for anyone nor does the other person even need to know that the sage has thought about or remembered him. For we are all held within the World-Mind. But if the sage does not think of the person, the latter must believe, or remember, or ask, or think of the sage if help is sought.” (25.4.260)

RC: This is a one-liner:

PB: “Only what the mind gives him *now* is alive and real for him.” (25.2.286)

PB: “The sage does not need to pray . . .” (reread)

RC: A page-and-a-half on Sahaja:

PB: “*Sahaja Samadhi* is not broken into intervals, is permanent, and involves no special effort. Its arising is instantaneous and without progressive stages. It can accompany daily activity without interfering with it. It is a settled calm and complete inner quiet.

“There are not distinguishing marks that an outside observer can use to identify a *sahaja*-conscious man because *sahaja* represents consciousness itself rather than its transitory states.

“*Sahaja* has been called the lightning flash. Philosophy considers it to be the most desirable goal.

“This is illustrated with a classic instance of Indian spirituality involving a king named Janaka. One day he was about to mount his horse and put one foot into the stirrup which hung from the saddle. As he was about to lift himself upwards into the saddle the “lightning flash” struck his consciousness. He was instantly carried away and concentrated so deeply that he failed for some time to lift himself up any higher. From that day onwards he lived in *sahaja samadhi* which was always present within him.

“Those at the state of achieved *sahaja* are under no compulsion to continue to meditate any more or to practise yoga. They often do--either because of inclinations produced by past habits or as a means of helping other persons. In either case it is experienced as a pleasure. Because this consciousness is permanent, the experiencer does not need to go into meditation. This is despite the outward appearance of a person who places himself in the posture of meditation in order to achieve something.

“When you are engaged in outward activity it is not the same as when you are in a trance. This is true for both the beginner and the adept. The adept, however, does not lose the *sahaja* awareness which he has achieved and can withdraw into the depths of consciousness which the ordinary cannot do.”
(25.2.138 & Persp. p. 350)

AD: Does it tell you the rest of the story that--

RC: About Janaka?

AD: Yes.

St: Did he got back on his horse?

AD: They he had to get his teacher because he got stuck like that on the horse for days. (laughter and student comments about the horse)

RC: There's a poem here that PB included from John Burroughs, and I guess he's telling us something about his state of mind? (and inaudible)

PB: “John Burroughs: “Serene, I fold my hands and wait; I rave no more ‘gainst time nor fate, For lo! my own shall come to me. I stay my haste, I make delays, For what avails this eager pace? I stand amid the eternal ways, And what is mine shall know my face. What matter if I stand alone? The waters know their own and draw The brook that springs in yonder heights; So flows the good with equal law Unto the soul of pure delight. The stars come nightly to the sky; The tidal wave comes to the sea; Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high, Can keep my own away from me.”” --(unpublished, 25b-c.0, yv/104/1)

LR: Anthony, was Janaka's teacher Ashtavakra? That story, was that Ashtavakra?

AD: Yes, that's the King Janaka who wrote that.

A SAGE EXPERIENCES THE WORLD AS THOUGHT

DB: . . . A question about an earlier quote-- I think it was about the third one, and he was speaking about the enlightenment going from one state to another, and always being accompanied by the presence of the light of knowledge.

PB: “The divine presence does not leave the enlightened man when he goes to sleep and return to him when he awakes, nor does it leave him when he enters the state of dream and return to him when he leaves it; it is in truth something which is ever present. If he enters the sleeping state, he enters it while in the light of knowledge, and the same applies if he enters the dream state.” (25. 2.175) (repeat of earlier quote)

DB: The question is concerning the difference between the enlightened man and the unenlightened man, other than just saying that the light of knowledge is always present in the enlightened man. Because it

seems there's a very big distinction between the ordinary man who has consciousness at this level--he is awake, he has consciousness, in sleep he has the same thing only less rational, and none in waking. And yet for the enlightened man his consciousness is continuous all the way through and he makes the distinction between this light of knowledge and the enlightened man. . . .

AH: What is the difference between ourselves and the enlightened man?

(DB/AH/DB/St/AH/DB. . . = student discussion about the enlightenment vs. non-enlightenment, states of consciousness and the light of knowledge. = approx. 15 min.)

DB: . . . It seems that the fact of an enlightened man presupposes at one time there was an ego which was only capable of self-consciousness within the waking state, or the sleep state, and that through the process of this purification, development, perfection, whatever, something happened so that it has within itself continuously the power of self-knowledge, not reflective the way we have it here or in the dream state.

AD: He's not saying all that. All he's saying is that the sage experiences the world as thought--intellective, vital. That's all he's saying.

DB: I'm sorry?

AD: He's saying that the sage experiences the world as either intellective or vital or vegetative. That's all he's saying. Just read the quote! Further than that, you can't go!

PB: "The divine presence . . ." (reread)

AD: Yes. (That's my boy?/(inaudible)). Yes, I know he's saying the sage experiences the world as one's thought, and that thought is graded, either (as/is) intellective, vegetative, or vital. That's all he's saying. There's no need to go into a lengthy analysis after that because you won't be able to. (inaudible)

AH: Thought is vegetatively experienced?

AD: (inaudible)

AH: Which end is which? Waking state is vegetative?

TS: Yes.

AH: Anthony, the three distinctions you made within thought, the waking state would be the vegetative state?

AD: It depends on who I'm talking about. (laughter)

(AD rings bell.)

AD: Thank you very much. Randy, do you have any more on that or shall we start another category?

RC: We have more.

AD: More?

RC: . . . This section is from where most of the stuff on glimpses is, if you want to start working on that.

AD: I'd like to start on the glimpses, because they're going to need it. We're all going to need a glimpse.

RC: . . . Sections on various definitions of the Overself, the ways in which it is one Overself for all beings.

AD: I object!

RC: Ways in which it has individuality.

AD: Good, that sounds good.

RC: Ways in which it doesn't evolve. Also on its relation to sense experience.

AD: Well, we'll have to call Red up and ask him to come back.

[Audio File 1982 1208b Ends]