

**On The Aparasahaja,
Or “Inferior Simultaneously-Arisen Joy”**

Shri Sahajananda

*The mystery of the universe can never be understood unless it is revealed in love.
Baul saying in the Vividha-dharma-sangita*

Part One

A story is told of the late Fritz Perls that when he attended a lecture by Abraham Maslow, he created some sort of commotion to draw attention to his conviction that Maslow was full of baloney. I would like to suggest that Perls, the great clown of gestalt therapy, was merely green with envy, since he hadn't been the first to think of the sublimely simple theory behind Maslow's “actualizations”: that the Eastern concept of *samadhi* could be employed in Western psychology to like effect. (Perhaps I should have written “deceptively simple”, as Maslow's “peak experience” does not equate with *samadhi* in anything but a qualitative way.)

I am troubled by the distinct possibility, however, that we will forget Maslow, just as we have forgotten another great American thinker, Charles Sanders Peirce, the logician. There! You didn't know who Peirce was, did you? Neither does 99.99% of the population, I suspect. Clue: a collection of his essays was published posthumously under the title, *Chance, Love, and Logic*.

But now, back to Maslow. In his 1976 book, *Religions, Values, and Peak Experiences*, Maslow, drawing the usual distinction between spirituality and religion, suggests that we refer to the former as religion (with a small “r”) and to the latter as Religion (with a capital “R”) so that we can readily “differentiate the subjective and



naturalistic religious experience and attitude from the institutionalized, conventional, organized Religions...” (p.viii.) Maslow intellectualized certain philosophical tenets that were expressed in the vernacular of their time by the Sahajiyān philosopher-poets (including Saraha, Kabir, and the authors of the *Kanhas*, *Caryas*, and *Dohas* - anticlerical, ecstatico-mystical poems), whose era encompasses the 9th through 17th centuries. (It is my contention that these essentially Gnostic sentiments were part of a worldwide awakening, and it might be said that the medieval Sahajiyāns of India represented the survival of antinomian Gnosticism at a time when the movement was undergoing a crisis in the West, culminating with the Albigensian Crusade early in the 13th century. It should be added that Sahajiyānism was an amalgamation of Hindu, Buddhist, and Sufic philosophy, which indicates, among other things, that it “showed up” the inadequacies of three of the four major world Religions. Its closest approximation in the West, the Troubadours, were guilty only of a minor heresy: romantic love.) There is another connection between the Eastern Sahajiyāns and Western Gnostics — Aurobindo hinted at it — and we shall examine it briefly in a moment.

Maslow decried the tendency of Religions to allow dogma and formalities to replace if not pervert the founder's mystic experience, illumination, or “great awakening, “ and to eventually forget or distort the image of the “charismatic seer” who began the faith. “Organized Religion,” he concluded, “the churches, finally may become the major enemies of the religious experience and the religious experiencer.” Maslow, a self-described practitioner of what he called an “uncovering (Taoistic, noninterfering) psychotherapy,” wound up wondering whether we might not rear our male offspring in the belief that “all his mysteries were...true mysteries.” For example, we could teach our young men to think of their penises... as phallic worshippers do, as beautiful or holy objects, as inspiring as mysterious, as big and strong, possibly dangerous and fear inspiring, as miracles which are not understood.

Thus we might empower the young man with a “B-attitude” (Maslow's delightful pun, combining his B — for Being — Values (“Wholeness,” “Dichotomy-transcendence,” “Aliveness,” &c.) with the Western religious notion of “perfect blessedness or happiness”). This assists the youth in thinking of his orgasm “in the same way that the Tantrists” do: i.e., as a unifying experience, a holy experience, a symbol, as a miracle, and as a religious ceremony.

How very different a view than the one espoused by most Western religions — that sex is shameful and dirty and should be used only for procreativity.

But, of course, tantra is not exclusively sexual either in theory or praxis. Whatever yogic or magical means they take, all true tantrists view their goal as



attainment of that state known as *Sahaja-samadhi*. It may be that such a state may only be known by the yogin-ascetic, but the Fire Serpent, Kundalini, may be sufficiently aroused in anyone, theoretically, even the most *artha*-bound individual. Quite often, Kundalini is only partially aroused in such persons, and if they are sufficiently evolved, the Snake may hover in and about the *Anahata*, or “Heart Chakra,” where resides *aparasahaja* in all its manifestations.

Of course, it would be impossible to explain the Inferior Simultaneously-Arisen Joy without first explaining *sahaja* itself, and here we wander into a huge field of prickly cactus, a realm where academics find the stuff of doctoral theses and cavil mongering among themselves.

Maslow himself admits that the “peak experience” (which I believe is a Western synonym for *aparasahaja* at the very least) is “essentially ineffable (in the sense that the best verbal phrasings are not quite good enough),” which perhaps explains why those who *try* often get themselves in a lot of hot water, as witness that great Sufi martyr, Mansur al-Hallaj, or, for that matter, Teilhard de Chardin, Roger Bacon, or Raymond Lull, all Sahaja Saints in my book.

That said, we could agree with Maslow that some value lies in simply adumbrating the *qualities* of the “peak-experience.” That is, the “described attributes of reality” when the latter is “perceived in peak-experiences, *or* as a list of irreducible, intrinsic values of this reality”. He goes on to list some 14 categories of attributes, and then suggests that they are to be distinguished from such “attitudes or emotions of the B-cognizer *toward* [such attributes]”: awe, love, wonder, sense of mystery, fusion with, joy, rapture, bliss, ecstasy, and so forth. For our purposes, however, it is sufficient to examine *sahaja* and *aparasahaja* according to the attributes /values of “Wholeness” and “Dichotomy-transcendence,” which are linked together in Maslow's list as #'s 4 and 4a.

Sarahapada, one of the great Sahajiyan philosopher-poets, spoke of *sahaja* as a sublime form of *ananda*, or bliss, which is “free from all mental constructions.” (Das Gupta, 1969, p.81.) Cryptically, he insists that the state cannot be attained — the bliss of one's *sahaja*-nature cannot be experienced — unless the body, speech, and mind “are destroyed.” Of course, he means this metaphorically, in the way, say, that alchemists had to “destroy” the *prima materia*, or chaotic prime substance, in the process of transmutation, which yields alchemical “gold.”

Similarly, Tilopa (or Tilopada), says in a *dohd* (short poem or song), that *sahaja* is a state where all the thought-constructions are dead and *prana* (the “vital wind”) is also destroyed. He adds that as “the secret of this truth is to be intuited by the self,” it cannot



be explained, and it is “inaccessible to ordinary foolish people,” just as it is “unknown and unknowable to scholars.” (Das Gupta, p.80.)

Sex, as I have stated, is only one of many ways to attain to *sahaja-samadhi*. In *Liber AL vel Legis*, II:21, it is stated, “Think not, o king, upon that lie: That Thou Must Die: verily thou shalt not die, but live. Now let it be understood: if the body of the King dissolve [a rather obviously alchemical formula], he shall remain in pure ecstasy forever...” In “Comment by OTz PTN 690 Upon the Second Chapter of *Liber AL vel Legis*,” (Archive of Black Moon, reference P.V.N.) We’re told that this tantric arcanum directs the adept to expend all his or her energies on raising their own kundalini force, and that:

“Thou shalt not die” refers to the supreme moment when orgasmic death is circumvented by the awakening of that which the false ego has kept forcibly asleep, so that ego-death seems not to have happened, for when the false ego dies, the Observer awakes...”

All of this depends upon pranic energy being brought up through the *nadis*, or “veins” (I actually prefer the word “channels”), drawing left-brain logical thought down to Malkuth/Muladhara and right-brain intuition up into Kether/Sahasrara via the equilibrating capabilities of the Shushumna. (Archetypically, this has corresponded to the figure eight Mobius strip that is traditionally painted onto the Magician *atou* in Tarot. Only a magician would be capable of balancing these energies. But he is an advanced adept, not a “show” magician.) The trip from the Garden to Paradise is that from Earth to the Pleroma, the Ascent of Gnosis bearing a direct equivalency to the raising of Kundalini.

For the Sahasrara-chakra is the Pleroma in an ontological sense. (See writings of Aurobindo.) The Fall of Sophia in Judeo-Christian Gnosis equates to the Descent of the Shakti to the Muladhara, the Serpent of the Garden initiating this Other Eve into the Mysteries of the Tree of Knowledge of Good (*yang*) and Evil (*yin*). The Judeo-Christian Gnostic's soteriological ascent “through the Aeons,” or planetary spheres, is merely a metaphor for the *nadi-chakra* system. The “mental constructions” addressed by Saraha and Tilopa — yes, it's the same Tilopa who initiated Naropa, both Tibetan and commonly referred to as “Buddhists”! - are roughly equivalent to the *kleshas* as discussed in the writings of Shri Gurudev Mahendranath (Dadaji), and of course by Patanjali before him. Which is to say, *avidya*, or spiritual ignorance,&c. There is also a connotation of the spirit of the “Verses on Faith-Mind,” attributed to the Third Zen Patriarch:

The Great Way is not difficult for those who have no preferences. When love and hate are both absent everything becomes clear and undisguised. Make the smallest



distinction, however, and Heaven and Earth are set infinitely apart. If you wish to see the truth then hold no opinion for or against anything. To set up what you like against what you dislike is the disease of the mind. When the deep meaning of things is not understood the mind's essential peace is disturbed to no avail.

The way is perfect like vast space where nothing is lacking and nothing is in excess. Indeed, it is due to our choosing to accept or to reject that we do not see the true nature of things. Live neither in the entanglements of outer things, not in inner feelings of emptiness. Be serene in the oneness of things and such erroneous views will disappear by themselves.

When you try to stop activity to achieve passivity your very effort fills you with activity. As long as you remain in one extreme or the other you will never know Oneness.

Which is to say, you will never know sahaja-samadhi.

Part Two

In the first installment, I quoted Tilopa, one of the 84 Nath-Siddhas and, for all practical purposes, the founder of Buddhist Sahajayana (he was the teacher of Naropa, who taught, in turn, a great line of succession in Vajrayana/Yogachara Buddhism) for the proposition that the “secret” of the *sahaja* state is only “to be intuited by the self.” While the academics dicker as to what the very word, *sahaja*, means, the *sadhaka* who actually experiences it knows that it evades definition, categorization, characterization, and objectification. It simply *is*.

Sahaja-samadhi is the experience of “pure consciousness,” which is to say, the union of subject and object and total participation in the meaning universe. It is a state of existence devoid of conditions, qualities, and conceptions, and is therefore almost synonymous with the esoteric meaning of Buddhist “mindfulness.” Or, as Henepola Gunaratna has put it (*Mindfulness in Plain English*, 1994), it is “non-conceptual awareness,” a disturbing experience for Westerners, who traditionally have viewed mind and body as separate, and who rely upon projections of self to bolster their egos. If anyone has come close to describing the experience (which is, of course, essentially ineffable), it was the late Gopi Krishna, who might have been paraphrasing Abraham Maslow when he wrote:

What matters is that the basic characteristics of the mystical trance or samadhi are present in varying forms in the experience: an overmastering sense of wonder at the extraordinary occurrence, the unutterably glorious nature of the vision, a powerful



feeling of awe combined with inexpressible happiness, overflow of love, and entrancement or a state of complete or partial oblivion to the world.

Last, but not least, there is the vivid consciousness of a higher existence or of submersion into an ocean of knowledge in which all that was obscured is now explained. (Kundalini: The Secret of Yoga, 1972.)

Sahaja-bliss is realized upon transcendence of all dualities. The concepts of *advana* (nonduality) and *yuganaddha* (the principal of union) play important roles in the metaphysics of this *sadhana*.

But it is a mistake to take the idea of union in an always literal sense, else why would some celibate *sadhakas* experience *sahaja-samadhi* by meditative, yogic, or other austere practices? We're told that the first step toward transcendence is taken when the *sadhaka* recognizes the part played by *aropa*, or the attribution of qualities to an object. Eliade says that we come to see ourselves not in a physical, biological, or psychological way, but from the perspective of ontology. Nevertheless, the *sahaja* state is indefinable; it cannot be known dialectically, but "can only be apprehended through actual experience." (Eliade, *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*, 1958).

Lama Govinda describes the state as a natural extension of the *sadhaka's* "spontaneity of intuition" (*Foundations of Tibetan Mysticism*, 1960.) Throughout the writings on *sahaja*, one encounters references to its intended meaning as "natural" or "spontaneous," terms which find much disfavor in academic circles, as witness the continuing debate on whether the word means "non-conditioned," "co-emergent," or "together-born." (See, e.g., Kvaerne, 1975.) But I think that the term can and does embrace what in popular parlance we call a "lifestyle," and in that, at least, the words "natural" and "spontaneous" readily apply. Luis O. Gomez has shown how most Sahajiyans dedicated themselves so totally to the concept of *sahaja* that they became "long-haired, wandering *siddhas*," typically the "homeless madman wandering about with his female consort, or a householder-sorcerer" who "sought spontaneity, and saw monastic life as an obstacle to true realization. ("Buddhism in India," *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 1987.

Benjamin Walker might have been describing Shri Gurudev Mahendranath Paramahansa ("Dadaji") when he wrote of the Sahajiyans "living a spontaneous and uninhibited life, free from the bondage of artificial conventions and social restraints":

The followers [of sahajiya] believe that truth is not to be attained through reading, philosophy, fasting, ablutions, and the construction of images, penance, mantras, or sacrifice. They prefer natural occupations like farming, fishing, and weaving



to artificial modes of livelihood, and rustic life is their especial delight. They hold that the most natural acts are the most meritorious....

(Walker, *The Hindu World*, 1968.)

This has nothing soever to do with Sahajiyans being of the pashu, or animal, nature, but rather involves their commitment to the antinomian ideals of being or becoming beyond “good” and “evil,” which, of course, are the hallmarks of dualism. To me, the expression “artificial conventions” is the most important, for, in our Way, we seek enlightenment not through fixed teachings, but by what the Prajnaparamita-sutra characterizes as “an intuitive process that is spontaneous and natural”

(Bhikshu Wai-tao and Dwight Goddard, *A Buddhist Bible*, 1957).

Das Gupta identifies sahaja with the Brahman of the *Upanishads* and Advaita Vedanta, but it is also the *Nirvana-dhatu* of canonical Buddhism, as it is the *tathata* (“thatness”) of Ashvaghosa, and the negatively described “absolute reality” of Nagarjuna. It is the *abhuta-parikalpa* or the innate absolute with the potency of all objectivity and subjectivity but in itself bereft of all dualism, or the *pure consciousness (vijnapti-matrata)* of the Vijnana-yogins. It is again the Vajra-dhatu or the Vajra-sattva of the Vajra-yanists.

It is the Bodhicitta in the form of the unity of Shunyata and Karuna, it is the Maha-sukha or the Supreme Bliss. All these ideas have merged in the idea of Sahaja of the Sahajiyas. (Das Gupta, 1969, emphasis added.)

We shall shortly deal with the concepts of the *Nirvana-dhatu*, *tathata*, *abhuta-parikalpa*, *vijnana*, &c. For the time being it is important to note that, once again, we encounter the notion of such a thing as a “pure consciousness” or state of being totally free from cognition of duality. In this state, the entire universe is viewed not as an ego-construct, but as partaking of the nature of the self. In the tantras, we find the idea of the world having proceeded from the bliss (*ananda*), the cessation of all duality. Saraha-pada and the other Sahajiyas define sahaja simply as “that stage of bliss which is absolutely free from all mental constructions.” (Das Gupta, 1969.)

In his *Atma-Darshan*, Atmananda (a.k.a. Krishna Menon) observes that we are prisoners of the “attribution of reality to things which rise in thoughts.” Form, he suggests, exists “only as the object of seeing and never independently of it,” nor can an object exist “for a moment unless cognized by thought. When thought changes, the object changes also.” (Cf. *The Dhammapada*, sayings attributed to Gautama the Buddha.) These philosophical principles are born out by the New Physics, especially the apparent subject-object dichotomy. Compare Atmananda's statement on the matter, from the Vedantic point of view, with that of a prominent quantum physicist, John Wheeler.



It is the experience of all that, when viewed carefully, everything that is not oneself can exist only as the object of oneself, who is the subject. The object is also seen to have an inseparable connection with oneself. There is no form without seeing; there is no sound without hearing. One views oneself as seeing and hearing, and thus takes the stand of the perceiver of these objects. In truth, seeing, hearing, etc., are themselves objects. When they are viewed as such, one's stand is in pure consciousness, which is the perceiver. The idea of perceiver will also disappear there. Whenever the stand taken by the perceiver changes, the perceived also changes accordingly.

(Atma-Darshan: At the Ultimate, 1946, quoted in Arthur Koestler, The Lotus and the Robot, 1969.)

We had this old idea, that there was a universe out there, and here is man, the observer, safely protected from the universe by a six-inch slab of plate glass. Now we learn from the quantum world that even to observe so miniscule an object as an electron, we have to reach in there...So the old word observer simply has to be crossed off the books, and we have to put in the new word participator. In this way we've come to realize that the universe is a participatory universe. (Quoted in A Question of Physics, 1979.)

The average person simply believes that his sense impressions of “objective reality” are somehow “true,” while the Sahajiyan is a participator. Or, really, to be fair, it could be said that the average person participates, but he is unaware.

Part Three

I cannot recall when I first experienced the *aparasahaja*, though I clearly recall two of the early instances as if they were yesterday. One was the birth of my first son, Alexander, born April 6, 1978. The second was a magickal working in the VIII [degree] in a forest not far from Mt. Mansfield in Vermont. The woods of New England are a magical place. Perhaps all forests are. It is easy to understand the popularity of the “earth religions” after removing oneself from the city and spending any significant amount of time in the rural mountains of America.

I had come to Vermont to write, thinking it an easy commute to New York, the publishing capital of America, where I might sell my wares. Although the deadening New England winters would eventually take their toll (in 1977-78, there was a stretch of ten straight days with no temperature higher than 30 *below!*) the summers were enchanting in the best sense of the word.



We lived in an old barn at the base of a 3,700-ft. mountain blanketed by birches, maples, and pines. The barn had been converted into over-and-under duplex apartments within easy bicycling distance of a place I called “the grotto,” although there were no caves to my knowledge. I simply felt that the appellation “fit” for some reason. There, a mountain stream had etched a course through the rocks, forming a series of pools where one might bathe and become totally immersed in the glamour of the ghyll, its very spirit - the spirit of the place. Sun rays streamed down through the lime-green leaves, creating mottled patterns of light and shade on the path from the gravel road to the grotto itself. Many times, I would lie naked in the pools, staring up at the treetops and sky beyond.

On more than one occasion, I felt the presence of the forest gods including, yes, old Pan Himself. It was a perfect place for VIII [degree] offerings of the flesh of the celebrant to the Oneness of All Creation. One such occasion, at the moment of orgasm, I experienced an epiphany: the realization that Creation is One and that, with It, we are all, all of us, One; that Life is One - there are no boundaries between our world and that of the vegetable and animal worlds. And, finally, we are One with the Gods, the subtle spirits, and all living things, indissolubly bound together as One. This banishing of all dualities is the essence of the *aparasahaja*. Muktananda said: “Meditate on your Self. Honor and worship your own being. God dwells within you as you.” This is an expression of the *deha-tattva*: In the sexo-magical praxis of tantra, masturbatory rituals can be transformed into a form of meditation. Dadaji included a masturbatory rite in his writings on Nath-Siddha *sadhana*. Engaging in such a working on a mountainside would seem all the more efficacious; after all, many Shaivite regard Mt. Kailas as the lingam of Shiva. The Holy Phallus as Summit.

In the second part of this essay, I introduced the concepts of the *nirvana-dhatu*, *tathata*, *abhuta-parikalpa*, and *vijnapti-matrata* and promised to explore their relationship to the experience of *aparasahaja* in a later installment. This is a “tall order” if only because, to a certain extent, we are mixing philosophical apples and oranges. But it is the way of the Sahajiyans to do just that - to borrow from all the flowerings of spiritual *gnosis* as a hummingbird drinks from the blossoms of a goodly variety of plants. Let me first emphasize one fact: *aparasahaja* is but the first *glimmering* of the *enstasis* that, theoretically, characterizes *sahaja*. It is the untying of knots only up to the Heart Chakra. As the song goes, “the best is yet to come.”

The *sadhaka*, to judge from the writings of the Sahajiyans, at the moment of his or her experience of *aparasahaja*, *intuits* the “ultimate principle” of the Yogacharins, Vijnanavadins, and Tantric Buddhists, variously described as the *abhuti-parikalpa*, the *vijnapti-matrata*, the *nirvana-dhatu*, &c. S.B. Dasgupta, in both *Obscure Religious Cults*,



and the later *Introduction to Tantric Buddhism*, argued that Mahayana Buddhism, in its later manifestations, gravitated toward (or came full circle to) the Vedantic view of the Absolute and even, in some cases, posited “a Being - sometimes as the personal God, the Lord Supreme...the Vajra-sattva,” or unity of emptiness (*shunyata*) and manifestation. He even went so far as to say that there was no essential difference between the Yogachara conception of “God” and that of Vedanta.

We have seen how union of all dualities is the ultimate goal of the yogin. When both the transcendent and the phenomenal are united, the Vijnanavadins say that their totality is the *dharmadhatu*, the commingling of the absolute and the relative.

This is the *tathata*, or “suchness” of the *Lankavatara* and other *sutras*. Tadeusz Skorupski, in his essay on *tathata* in the *Encyclopedia of Religion*, says that it “is held to exist in all beings and thus to undergo no changes either in its perfect or defiled state: its nature remains uncreated and eternal.” He might as well have been describing the Vedantic atman. To get “in touch” with our own *tathata* is to realize the Buddha in ourselves. It comes to the fore with what Skorupski calls the “inner realization that the true nature of existence does not manifest itself through dichotomous appearances: knower-known, subject-object,” &c. This, too, is the only legitimate goal of our Nath-Siddha *sadhana*. Dualities arise in the main because of the *abhuta-parikalpa* (false, or unreal imagination) which, according to the *Lankavatara-sutra*, causes us to:

Grasp things as twofold, like a reflection of oneself in a mirror or in water, or one's shadow by the light of the moon or in a house, or like hearing an echo. Thus, by grasping at their own false imagination they imagine things and non-things...and never attain tranquility.

(Quoted in Edward J. Thomas, *The History of Buddhist Thought*.) Thomas characterizes *tathata* as “absolute reality.”

The *yogacharins* and *vijnanavadins* who provided tantric Buddhism with its ontology broke with their *madhyamika* predecessors over this very issue: whether that consciousness by which phenomenal existence is fabricated may be said to be “real.” They anticipated a central theme in quantum theoretical speculation, that “the image of an object is produced by the consciousness itself, there is no external object independent of the consciousness.” (Hattori Masaaki, “Yogachara”, *Encyclopedia of Religion*.)

This is consensus reality, a false construct composed of the ego projections of all sentient beings at any given moment in space-time. But consensus reality is notoriously faulty; borrowing from the *Mahayanasamgraha*, Masaaki gives some marvelous examples of how tricky such perceptions can be.



Thus, he explains, one and the same thing often is “represented differently by beings in different states of existence; for instance, that which is perceived by a man as a stream of clean water is represented as a foaming river by an inhabitant of hell and as a stream of pus and filth by a *preta* [so-called “hungry ghost”]. This shows that an object represented in the consciousness is a product of mental construction.

Another cause of frustration and suffering is that level of subconscious mind called “storehouse” (or “receptacle”) consciousness - the *alaya-vijnana*. Think of a big, invisible bowl where the effects of both our good and evil acts are stored. The yogacharins spoke of these effects as a form of *energy*, which they characterized as *bijas*, or seeds, from which grow, as the term implies, future phenomenal existences. These may be prevented from origination by certain forms of meditation; in particular *shamatha-vipashana*. Lamarckian ontology, Jungian psychology, and quantum theory would all seem to support the Yogacharin doctrine of the *alaya-vijnana*, where the objective world manifests, based upon “projected” characteristics, racial memory, and some kind of self-organizing principle akin to the morphogenetics of Rupert Sheldrake.

Finally, in the concept of the *vijnapti-matrata*, we come full circle to the notion of a realm of “pure consciousness,” which the vajrayanists identify with the supreme deity, or Vajra-sattva. Dasgupta says that the Buddhist tantras conceived it “exactly in the manner of the Upanishadic Brahman...the Self in man...the ultimate substance behind the world of phenomena.” It is also Sahaja, the greatest *siddhi*.

Enough of this academic speculation, you, the reader, may be silently screaming to these pages. What about praxis? What about *sadhana*? Alas, I must lease such considerations to a later essay, recommending, for now, that you read the appropriate chapter in Agehananda Bharati's *The Tantric Tradition*.

I will adumbrate only the characteristics of the *experience* of the *aparasahaja*, which includes a sense of elation, tingling sensations on the surface of the skin, “shivers” running up and down the spine (like sneezing without the snot), and most important, I think, crying out loud for sheer joy, for is it not written:

My ecstasy is in yours. My joy is to see your joy. — AL, I:13.

Let me also provide at least one practical note, which deserves more detailed analysis by, say, the Cultus Cucurbitus. The combination of *cannabis* or one of its cognate forms, such as *ganja*, taken together with the African tree bark, *yohimbe*, in amounts of at least 1,000 mg., is a sure aid to realization of *aparasahaja*, assuming one has been properly prepared through the discipline and insight of *laya-yoga*.

