



DIVYADHVAÑISĀRA

(jñeyatattva prajñāpana)

Part - 2

Pravacanasāra gāthās 93 to 126

Pravacanasāra written by Śrīmad KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya
Tattvapradīpikā (commentary) by Śrīmad Amṛtacaṇḍra Ācārya
with lectures by Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kāñjīsvāmī

Foreword by

Dr. Paras Mal Agrawal

Retd. Professor of Physics, V. University, Ujjain;

Emeritus Visiting Professor and Research Professional Oklahoma State University, USA

Edited by

Professor Jayanti Lal Jain (Manglayatan, Beswan, Aligarh)

Translation by

Br. Hemchandji Jain 'Hem'

(Retd. Sr. Manager/Steam turbine engineer)

Bharat Electricals Ltd. Bhopal

Co-translated by

Shri. Rajesh Gandhi (Amdavad)

Smt. Bhairavi Daftary (Mumbai)

Published by

Shri. Kund Kund Kahan Digambar Jain Tirth Suraksha Trust (Mumbai)

Printed by: NIMKAR PRINTERS, Khadilkar Road, Mumbai
Contact: 9221533843

Typesetting by: ANFRAND Infotech Pvt. Ltd.
Contact: +91 9833766446

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be produced, stored in retrieval systems, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the publisher's prior written permission.

© Author

First edition: Year 2024

Vira Nirvāṇa: Year 2550

Printed: 275 copies

Pravacanasāra: jneya tattva prajñāpana-dravya sāmānya adhikāra

ISBN: 978-93-85930-43-8

Actual Cost: *Rs.250/-*

Subsidised price: Indian Rs. 100/ USD 1.20\$/per book

For suggestions or clarifications, please contact:

Rajesh Gandhi – rcgandhi@gmail.com

Mobile: +91 8511170710

Bhairavi Daftary – bdaftary84@gmail.com

Mobile: +91 9821521592

Donors for printing:

Dhanlaxmi Chandrakant Gandhi

Roopa R Gandhi

Amrish R Daftary



Śrīmad Bhagvad Paramapūjya Śrī KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya Bhagavāna



Śrīmad Bhagvad Paramapūjya Śrī Amṛtacaṅdra Ācārya Bhagavāna



Adhyātma Yugsr̥ṣṭā Parama Pūjya Sadgurudeva Śri Kanjīsvāmī

GLIMPSES ON THE LIFE OF PŪJYA GURUDEVA ŚRĪ KAÑJĪSVĀMĪ

Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kañjīsvāmī was born in Umrāla, Gujarat, India, on 21st April 1890 (*Vaiśākha Suda 2, Vikrama Samvat* 1946) to mother Ujamba and father Moticandbhāi. The young Kañjī took primary education in Umrāla but moved to Palej, near Vadodara, with his father, after his mother passed away. At that time, he was merely eleven years old. He joined his father's grocery business at the young age of seventeen. He was very sharp, honest, righteous, and straightforward in business. But the young Kañjī was more interested in following the path of Jain saints. Even while running the shop, he somehow found time to read scriptures and meet knowledgeable ascetics. He informed Khuśalabhāi, his elder brother, about his decision to forsake the worldly trappings, and he took *Śwetāmbara Sthānakvasi* renunciation at the age of twenty-four.

Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kañjīsvāmī's conscience was searching for the eternal truth, and as destiny would have it, in the year 1912 AD (V.S. 1978), he found the ultimate scripture on spiritual science. The '*Samayasāra*' written by KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācāryadeva. He knew his search had come to an end. With his deep contemplative understanding, the truth, as revealed by the great *Tīrthāṅkara*, opened to him, and he experienced his true self. He left the *Śwetāmbara Sthānakvasi* monastic life and declared himself to be a celibate scholar of the *Digāmbara* path as revealed in the '*Samayasāra*'. He stationed himself in the town of Songadh, Gujarat, from 1934 onwards.

He studied almost 200 scriptures and continuously gave sermons on them thrice a day for 45 years. He brought out the basic principles of *dharmā*, as revealed in the great scriptures and taught the right path of spiritual progress.

Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kañjīsvāmī is considered to be a revivalist of the path of *Bhagavāna Mahāvīra*. He was instrumental in revolutionizing the perception and practice of Jainism, thereby propagating the true path of liberation to thousands of believers. Philosophy and truth had always existed, but ritualistic teachings had eroded true practice. The focus had changed from self-realisation to rituals and false beliefs. Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kañjīsvāmī was instrumental in steering the masses towards the true understanding of *dharmā*.

Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kañjīsvāmī's life inspires us to seek the path of liberation. His entire assertion was based on the principle that anyone who considers his body or possessions as "I am this, this is mine" is on the wrong path, while one who meditates on its antithesis that "I am not others, they are not mine, I am one knowledge" is on the right path to meditating on the pure self. This is the remedy to end of all future lives,

in the present life itself. This was the path and the objective he set for his followers. If Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kañjīsvāmī had not explained the true principles, they would probably have been lost entirely. We are deeply indebted to our revered Pūjya Gurudeva for leading us by practice and perception towards the path of liberation.

On 28.11.1980 (V.S. 2037 Kartak Vad 7), Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kañjīsvāmī made his departure to heaven in a state of *samādhi*, leaving behind his devotees bereaved and creating a void that can never be filled.

FOREWORD

Pravachansara is one of the best works of Ācārya Kundakunda. It contains the essence of *Pravachanas* (discourses) of Tirthankaras in 275 stanzas in Prakrit. Nearly 1000 years after Ācārya Kundakunda, Ācārya Amritcandra provided this globe with the translation in verse form, together with the explanation of each stanza, in Sanskrit, known as **Tattvapradipika**. Again, in the 20th century, nearly 1000 years after Ācārya Amritcandra, Adhyātma Murti Kanji Swami was kind enough to provide us with a detailed explanation of all these stanzas in Gujarati/Hindi through his well-preserved lectures (**DivyaDhvanisar**). Now, my friends Pandit Shri Hemchandji Jain ‘Hem’ and Dr Jayantilalji Jain, together with Shri Rajesh Gandhi and Smt. Bhairavi Daftary has taken the lead in providing the English translation of Pravachansara as well as the related writings of Ācārya Amritcandra and discourses of Shri Kanji Swami.

This spiritual book covers stanzas 93 to 126 of Pravachansara. In this book, readers interested in the basic spiritual aspects and those interested in modern science will find valuable content for their interests. The science of distinction (*bheda-vijnāna*) between self and non-self, and the identification of non-changing (*dhruva*) aspects of every soul as well as of every *dravya* behind the changing modifications (*paryāya*) covered in this book are the key concepts of great significance to scholars interested in spirituality and peace. Likewise, a modern scientist would be amazed and will benefit from the metaphysics covered in these stanzas.

In my opinion, it is a great literary work in the field of spirituality that could not have been possible without the long experience and expertise of Pt. Hemchandji. In him, one finds a mini encyclopedia containing hundreds of stanzas of Jain scriptures. I am very much pleased with the devotion of his team for this gigantic task. I express my hearty congratulations to them and look forward to seeing the completion of all 275 stanzas in the near future.

I believe and hope that this book will prove valuable to all seekers of East and West in the realization of one’s true self.

Dr. Paras Mal Agrawal

Retd. Professor of Physics, V. University, Ujjain;
Emeritus Visiting professor and Research Professional,
Oklahoma State University, USA

EDITORIAL

There has been an eternal quest for the theory of knowledge and knowable. Knowledge is power, and so goes the common saying. It is indeed power, as those who possess knowledge have an edge in all walks of life, so much so that the present-day growth is attributed to knowledge-based developments/advancements.

Pravacanasāra epitomizes the preaching of great Tirthankaras on the theory of knowledge. It presents the essence of the eternal nature of a soul in terms of its unique property of knowledge. It has been explained in two parts – knowledge and knowable. *pravacanas* (lectures) of Gurudeva Shri Kanji Swami on the first part of knowledge have been published in the first volume, which has been well received by the readers and scholars. The first part contains verses from 1 to 92, and the second part on knowable has verses running from 93 to 200. Lectures of Shri Gurudev on the same have been translated and incorporated in this second volume till the 126th verse. These are concerned with the exposition of knowable reality or simply stating the subject of knowledge.

How to know the subject of reality remains an enigmatic question. However, this is of crucial importance in Jain Philosophy as it determines the subject matter of *samyak-darshan* or right belief, which is the first step on the path to liberation or moksha. Amritchandra Ācārya, who has written the commentary on this text, is at his best in explaining the substances, their attributes, and their modifications. Gurudev Shri Kanji Swami has done yeoman services in explaining the same in the language that can be understood by the present generation of scholars and laymen who are otherwise not clear about its intricate meanings.

One needs to know our ‘own existence’, and the same has been explained in this volume and has been elaborated in different verses and lectures of Gurudev Shri Kanji Swami. The principles underlying the functioning of a substance are explained in these verses. Soul and other substances have been functioning eternally or since infinite times, but their story of functioning is hardly narrated. This text and the present volume, in particular, depict the same. It is indeed a wonderful text and worth understanding in detail. Gurudev’s lectures provide a rare opportunity to delve deep into the subject. For illustration of the same, some verses are mentioned here. In verse 93, it is stated that

those are the false believers who are attracted by modifications, and they have been called *parasamaya*. Modifications are of various types, such as homogeneous, heterogeneous, attribute modifications and intrinsic modifications. There is a fascinating description of various distinctions. The substance is self-realized and self-existent by its own intrinsic nature, so says verse 98. The nature consists of modifications of origination, destruction, and permanence. These manifestations are caused by one's own nature of substance and are not caused by any external factors. If existence is not by itself, then it would come to its end by not being permanent, or when supported by external factors, it would cease itself when support is withdrawn, as asserted in verse 105. Further, qualities or modifications of a substance cannot exist separately from it, just as yellowness cannot exist separately from gold. As the same substance remains in different modifications, the same soul remains in transmigration from one modification to another, like from human to heaven, animal, or hell (verse 112). Ācārya introduces the concept of sevenfold (*saptbhāgi*) narration to remove all contradictions that may arise in knowing one's own existence. The trio verses (124-126) describe one's soul substance infinite existence in terms of three characteristics of knowledge consciousness, deed consciousness and fruit of deed consciousness. This can also be called the soul's evolution story or its dynamics. In the narration of such a story, no connection to other substances can be established. It remains an exclusive narration of soul substance. As it is often said that the experience of a soul is the ultimate objective of the study of philosophy, verse 126 welcomes and felicitates the realization of a pure soul and glorifies the same by stating that it is the result of the determination that soul substance itself is the doer, itself the means to attain the same and experiences the fruit of the same. Such is the marvellous and independent evolution of soul substance.

Pandit Shri Hemchandji Jain 'Hem' is a leading Jain Scholar and has made an outstanding contribution to Jain Philosophy by publishing books in English, thereby making it available to the vast majority of English-speaking readers. Recently, he published the text of *Pravacanasāra* in English with the commentary of Amritchandra Ācārya and that of Pandit Hemrajji Pandey. He is assisted by Shri Rajesh Gandhi and Smt. Bhairavi A. Daftary who have done excellent work in bringing out various publications as well as this volume. The same team has done the commendable work of translating lectures of Shri Kanji Swami on *Pravacansāra* of the 1st chapter, namely Jñāna Tattva Prajñāpana, which has been published in the first volume.

The entire work of translations is very tedious. Translation of philosophical literature necessitates utmost devotion and dedication besides the knowledge of both the languages and the subject matter. As the original text is in Prakrit and commentaries in Sanskrit/Hindi, translating them into English poses several problems. Lack of suitable/

Editorial

appropriate words, different meanings of words, differences in the construction of sentences, grammatical requirements of a language, differences in the use of English words for similar words due to lack of standard usages, etc. The use of italics becomes imperative in view of maintaining consistency with the original language as it provides the bridge between the two languages. Some may find them irritating in pronunciation and smooth reading. One has to bear with this as this has to be done in the larger interest of the subject, various types of readers, and proper communication across languages, keeping the original words intact. All these and other such problems make the task of translation onerous. Notwithstanding these, great efforts have been made by Panditji and his team to make translation as smooth as possible. However, if some readers find any incongruity, please endeavour to find the right meaning and let the authors know the same so that these can be kept in mind for future publications.

Shri Kanji Swami's lectures have made the text of *Pravacanasāra* easy to understand and comprehend the subtle meaning of the same. English readers will be greatly benefited from this publication of the text. The soul is made up of knowledge, and the text focuses on the subject matter of knowledge. As this text is part of the syllabus in many Universities across the world and other academic institutions, the English rendering of lectures of Shri Kanji Swami is a great landmark. The ultimate benefit lies in the realization of the soul, which can be made possible through the study of the nature of the soul, which is facilitated by this kind of publication.

Professor Jayanti Lal Jain

Mangalayatan University, Beswan, Aligarh

PREAMBLE

Pravacanasāra is a magnum-opus of *Ācārya KuṇḍaKuṇḍa deva* and is a boon to those interested in the pursuit of spirituality in this 5th era. A compendium on the *gāthās* and *tīkās* by the name of *Tattva Pradīpikā* was written by *Ācārya Amṛtacandra* in Sanskrit a thousand years ago. This text reveals the supreme truth in its highest form. The eternal nature of the soul and non-soul substances is described in this book from the viewpoints of both substantial (*dravyārthika*) and modification (*paryārthika*) aspects. This text is the direct revelation of the teachings of omniscient *Bhagavāna*. Hence the compilation of its lectures by *Pu.Gurudeva Śrī KāñjīSvāmi* is called '*Dīvyā Dhvani Kā Sāra*'. It is an authentic *śāstra* on real metaphysics, which presents profound principles with logic and examples.

There are three main chapters in this book:-

1. *jñāna tattva prajñāpana* (knowledge reality) *gāthās* 1-92
2. *jñeya tattva prajñāpana* (knowable reality) *gāthās* 93-200
3. *caraṇānuyogasucak culikā* (conduct of Jain monks) *gāthās* 210 - 275

The first section of *Pravacanasāra* is *jñāna tattva prajñāpana*. This part, with its English translation of *gāthās* and *tīkās*, along with the lectures of *Pu. Gurudeva Śrī KāñjīSvāmi* was published by Shri Kund Kund Kahan Digambar Jain Tirth Suraksha Trust in November 2020, The second section of *Pravacanasāra* is *jñeya tattva prajñāpana*. This second book is of the first sub-second section of the second section, from *gāthās* 93-126. They are called *dravyasāmānya adhikāra*, which is being published by the above trust. It has English translations of *gāthās* and *tīkās* of *Tattva Pradīpikā*, along with the translation of the lectures of *Pu.Gurudeva Śrī KāñjīSvāmi* on it.

At the insistence of my fellow co-translators, translation of all the original *gāthās* and *tīkās* of *Tattva Pradīpikā* has been completed by me - Br. Pandit Hemchandji Jain. This entire compilation has already been published. The translation of *pravacanas* of *Pu.Gurudeva Śrī KāñjīSvāmi* is done by Shri Rajesh Gandhi, Ahmedabad and Smt. Bhairavi Daftary, Walkeshwar Mumbai.

Below is the summary of all the topics covered in the second chapter of *jñeya tattva prajñāpana* (knowable reality):-

Sum and substance of knowable reality:-

This second section is an exposition of the knowable reality and is focused on the basic constituents of this universe as known in *kevalajñāna*, along with the distinction between knowledge and knowable. In short, this section comprises 108 *gāthā sūtras* (from 93 to 200) and is sub-divided into three segments as under:-

1. *dravyasāmānya prajñāpana* (exposition of substance in general) from *gāthā* 93 to 126.
 2. *dravyaviśeṣa prajñāpana* (exposition of substance in particular) from *gāthā* 127 to 144.
 3. *jñāna-jñeya vibhāga adbhikāra* (distinction between knowledge and knowable realities) from *gāthā* 145 to 200
1. *dravyasāmānya prajñāpana*: In (*gāthās* 93-126), common nature/general characteristics of all substances are described. “*saṭ*” (existence) is characteristic of all substances possessing attributes (*guṇas*) and modifications (*pariyāyas*) and *saṭ* is comprised of unity of origination, annihilation, and permanence. Without establishing the existence of a substance, a detailed description is not possible. Although all substances are *saṭ*, each substance has its own independent existence. From the viewpoint of common/general existence quality of all substances, such existence is termed *mahāsattā* (*sādṛśya astitva*) and from the perspective of individual “existence quality”, the existence is termed *avāntara sattā* (*svarūpa astitva*). This chapter is the backbone of Jain philosophy, as in this, the core of substance matter is described. The distinction between two substances is defined as separateness, and the distinction between substance and its attributes-modifications of a substance itself is defined in the form of otherness. This is a unique and path-breaking concept. *jīva* and *puḍgala*, or two *jīvas*, are separate entities because their space units (*pradeśas*) are separate. So, separateness is the characteristic of substances having different space units. And non-identicalness between substance-attributes-modifications of a substance is the characteristic of ‘otherness’. Knowledge (*jñāna*) and perception (*darśana*) are not totally separate, but they are distinct with their own qualities. There lies otherness between the attribute (*guṇa*) and the possessor of those attributes (substance/*guṇī*).
 2. *dravyaviśeṣa prajñāpana*: (*gāthās* 127-144). In this chapter, six kinds of substances, *jīva*, *puḍgala*, *dharmā*, *adharma*, *ākāśa* and *kāla*, are explained by dividing them into two categories: living and non-living, corporeal and non-living corporeal, non-corporeal, *loka* and *aloka*, operative and inoperative, with spatial units and without spatial units, etc.
 3. *jñāna* and *jñeya vibhāga adbhikāra*: (*gāthās* 145-200). In this chapter the knowledge and knowable reality are described in such a manner that it gives rise to discriminative

Preamble

knowledge. A knowledgeable person thinks that he is neither body, nor mind, nor voice/speech, nor the cause of these, nor doer (agent) of these, nor causer of these, and nor the approver of these doers, because body, mind and speech are made up of pudgalas, and pudgala (material substance) is an aggregate/mass of matter particles (*paramānus*). I am a pure self (soul), and that pure soul is devoid of touch, taste, colour, smell, and speech (word/sound). I possess the quality of sentience / consciousness, which is not cognizable by any physical sense or mark, and it has no definable configuration.

In the absence of discriminative knowledge, an attached/passionate self binds *karma*, and a detached/passionless self is not bonded with *karmas*. This should be known, and in short, is the gist of bondage of soul.

For continuation, the history of Jain scriptures, and the summary of *jñāna tattva prajñāpana* (section one), can be found in the preamble of the first volume. The first volume consists of the translation of *gāthās* and *tīkās* as well as translation of pravacanas of *Pu.Gurudeva Śrī KāñjīSvāmi* on *jñāna tattva prajñāpana*. For those interested in a deeper understanding of the text, these are useful references.

I thank Dr. Parsamalji Agrawal for his encouraging foreword. I would also like to thank Prof. Jayantilalji Jain for taking out the time to edit this text with such dedication, which has been crucial for this publication. My gratitude to Shri. Kund Kund Kahan Jain Tirth Suraksha Trust, Mumbai for printing this translation. Lastly I thank all those who have been actively involved in translating this text. Further, I am sure that Shri. Rajesh Gandhi and Smt. Bhairavi Daftary will continue in their endeavour to complete the translation of *Pu.Gurudeva Śrī KāñjīSvāmi*'s pravacanas on all the other remaining *gāthās* and see this task to the end.

Jai Jinendra
Br. Hemchandji Jain hem
Rtd Sr. Manager BHEL Bhopal MP
Deolali/Bhopal

NOTE FROM THE CO-TRANSLATORS

Our translation of the lectures of Pūjya Gurudeva Śrī Kāñjivāmī, on *Pravacanasāra*, under the guidance of Br.Paṇḍita Hemachandji Hem ' has been a memorable journey, with the last leg still to go.

The second volume, with the encouragement of Paṇḍitjī, along with the dedicated guidance and detailed scrutinizing of every word by Professor Jayantilalji Jain (Manglayatan), is now ready. This volume has been even more inspiring for us. We have covered this distance in about three years and hope we can complete the remaining of this arduous task in the near future. The in-depth study of Gurudeva Śrī's lecture on this great scripture *Pravacanasāra* has been a humbling experience, and we only wish that we set ourselves on the higher path of self-evolution as has been revealed by the great masters.

The original lectures by Gurudeva Śrī were edited by Late Shri Amrutlal Narsibhai Mehta and were printed in the daily bulletin "Śrī Sadguru Prasad" in Gujarati language. Shri Khimchandbhai Jethalal Sheth rechecked each and every word, and then it was shown to Gurudeva Śrī and finalized. In this way, it was ensured that the printed matter was authentic. The said lectures were translated into Hindi and printed in five parts. The first three parts have been translated from Gujarati to Hindi by Late Shri Vinod Jain (Chhindwara, M.P.), and we have further translated them into English.

Due to the limitation of English vocabulary conveying the principles as revealed in the language of the masters has been a continuous challenge. We realised in the course of our work that we needed a standardised system of spelling the non-English words to ease our work and to make reading this text a joy for the readers. For this, we turned to using IAST(international alphabet of Sanskrit transliteration), which is on par with the Harvard-Kyoto system. This has brought symmetry to writing non-English words in the English alphabet. The need to use original, non-English words in an English translation may seem unnecessary. However, as we study Jain concepts and principles, we must accept that the journey from being an academician to a true learner of this system requires an in-depth and subtle understanding of these concepts, which are best described in the original language.

In the translation, we have tried our best to maintain the flow of the language while keeping the principles intact.

To ensure correct pronunciation of the transliterated words, we felt it necessary to provide a soft guide. The chart below shows the Devanagari letters with their corresponding transliterated letter.

अ - a	आ - ā	इ - i	ई - ī	उ - u	ऊ - ū
ऋ - ṛi	ए - e	ऐ - ai	ओ - o	औ - au	अं - am
क - ka	ख - kha	ग - ga	घ - gha	ङ - nga	
च - ca	छ - cha	ज - ja	झ - jha	ञ - ña	
ट - ṭa	ठ - ṭha	ड - ḍa	ढ - ḍha	ण - ṇa	
त - ta	थ - tha	द - da	ध - dha	न - na	
प - pa	फ - pha	ब - ba	भ - bha	म - ma	
य - ya	र - ra	ल - la	व - va	श - śa	ष - ṣa
स - sa	ह - ha	ज्ञ - jña	क्ष - kṣa	त्र - tra	

Below is a guide on the sound associated with each transliterated English alphabet which is with diacritics.

vowels

अ a - a is pronounced like 'a' in America

आ ā - ā is pronounced like 'a' in barn

इ i - i is pronounced like 'i' in bit

ई ī - ī is pronounced like 'i' in litre

उ u - u is pronounced like 'u' in put

ऊ ū - ū is pronounced like 'u' in dude

ऋ ṛ - ri cerebral, is pronounced like 'ri' in rip

ए e - e is pronounced like 'e' in grey

ऐ ai - ai, is pronounced like 'ai' in aisle

ओ o - o is pronounced like 'o' in over

औ au - au is pronounced like 'ow' in cow

consonants

क ka, ख kha , ग ga, घ gha, ङ nga are gutturals, arising from the throat
nga is pronounced like 'ni' in onion.

च ca, छ cha, ज ja, झ jha, ञ ña are palatals, arising from the back of the palate
ca palatal is always pronounced like 'ch' in chop.
ña is pronounced like 'gn' in igneous.

ट ढा, ठ था, ड ढा, ढ ढा, ण ña are cerebrals, with tongue touching the roof of the mouth
ña is a soft echo of the preceding vowel h after a consonant, with an extra breath after the consonant.

त ta, थ th, द da, ध dha, न na are dentals, with tongue touching the back of the teeth
na is pronounced like 'n' in uncle.

प pa, फ pha, ब ba, भ bha, म ma are labials, arising from the lips

य ya, र ra, ल la, ळ la, व va, ह ha
ha is alone pronounced like 'h' in honey.

श śa - is pronounced like 'sh' in shout
ष ṣa - is pronounced like 'sh' in leash
स sa - is pronounced like 's' in 'sam'
क्ष kṣa - is pronounced as 'ksha' as in rickshaw
ज्ञ jña - jña is pronounced as 'gna' as in prajña

We hope that this will make the journey of studying this text extremely enjoyable and engaging for all readers.

We will be missing our duty if we do not make a special mention of the intrinsic part Professor Śri Jayantilalji Jain has played in bringing this text to the printing level. His dedication to being true to the subject on hand and his meticulous and thorough checking have been a boon for us. Despite our efforts, if there is any misstep or any unintentional misrepresentation, then that fault is only and only of our limited *kṣayopṣama jñāna*. We seek forgiveness for that and request our readers to email the mistake to us so that we can duly correct it in the next prints.

Jainam Jayatu śāśanam

(may the glory of the path of Jina always be ablaze and victorious)

Rajesh Gandhi (Ahmedabad)
Bhairavi Daftary (Mumbai)

FROM THE DESK OF THE PUBLISHER

Shri Kund Kund Kahan Digambar Jain Tirtha Surkasha Trust was formed with the objective of protecting Digambar Jain pilgrim places and Jinvānī (scriptures). The initiative was taken during the celebration of the Pañca Kalyāṇaka Mahotsava of Parmāgama Maṇḍira at Songadh in March 1974. The trust was formed under the guidance of Pt. Shri Babubhaiji C. Mehta (Fatehpur). It was launched on the 87th birth anniversary of Rev. Shri Kanji Swami by Shri Sahu Shantiprasadji Jain, one of the most prominent personalities of Digambar Jain Samāja.

In the last 50 years, the trust has initiated several activities to conserve Digambar Jain pilgrim places and sacred texts. A small synopsis of the same is presented below.

Restoration of temples:

1. Antariksh Parshwanath, Sirpur, the protracted legal fight is going on, Br. Shri Dhanyakumarji Belokar has served for this cause for around 27 years.
2. For the last 40 years, we have actively participated in the activities of Bharatvarsiya Digambar Jain Tirthakshetra Committee, Mumbai. Shri Vasantbhai Doshi, our trust's President, is the senior vice president of this committee and President of its Legal Committee.
3. Work on Neminath Bhagwan's Tonk on Girnarji, Siddhakṣetra.
4. Updating the legal documents, land records and title survey of a large number of our temples and pilgrim centres by Pt. Jnanchandji Jain.
5. We have constructed a magnificent temple of Tirthankar Shri Parshwanath Swami at the eternal Siddha Kṣetra, Sammed-Shikharji, with a grand Pañca Kalyāṇaka Mahotsava. Simultaneously, the Kahan-Nagar Society was also constructed there for the accommodation of mumukshus. The trust is building a gallery which will showcase the life of Śrī KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya and Śrī KañjīSvāmī and the tenets propagated by them.

Service to Jinvānī

It was observed that there was a dearth of Digambara Jain scholars. Keeping this in mind, Shri Todarmal Digambar Jain Siddhant Mahavidyalaya was started at Pandit Todarmal Smarak Bhavan located at Jaipur under the aegis of our Trust. It provides various courses for graduating as Shashtri/Pandit with the sole objective of spreading the message of real metaphysics around the world, as explained by Śrī KañjīSvāmī. Today, more than 1200, shastris/scholars have already graduated from this institute as well as other institutes, put together, who are spreading this message the world over. We spend Rs. 6.00 million every year on this college.

Publication of religious books and literature.

After Gurudeva Śrī KañjīSvāmī (1890 AD-1980 AD) left for the heavenly abode, this trust published original śāstras by Digambar Jain Ācāryas, which were unpublished until then. Thousands of books have been printed with the increasing demand of Parmāgamas from the mumukṣu community.

From the Desk of the Publisher

Many books have been published in various languages, Samayasāra, Pravacansāra, Niyamasāra, Aṣṭa Pāhuda, Pancāsti Kāya (Panca Parmāgams of Śrī KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya deva), Mokṣa Mārga Prakāśaka being few of them. Dr. Pt. Shri Uttamchandji Jain (Seoni) made a major contribution towards this endeavour by way of editing and translating the above texts.

In keeping with the current trend of communicating in English and with the increasing demand for such books from scholars, this trust initiated the translation and publishing of a few books in English. Notable among them is Mokṣa Mārga Prakāśaka.

The trust has already published the English version of the Pravacanasāra text with its exposition, Tattva Praḍīpikā tīkā, written by Śrī Amṛtacaṇḍra Ācārya, along with pravacanas delivered on them by Śrī KañjīSvāmī on the first chapter, Jnāna Tattva Prajnāpana from gāthā 1-92 in 2020.

An English version of full text of Pravacanasāra text with exposition Tattva Praḍīpīka Tika has also been published by our Trust in 2022. Both the above texts were translated by Br. Pt. Śrī Hemchandji Jain 'Hem' and his team.

Pravacanasāra is one of the most important texts of Digambar Jain philosophy. Currently, the text is being taught and referred to by many scholars worldwide, in various universities and colleges interested in learning Jain philosophy and oriental religions. The objective of this exercise is to spread the correct interpretation, as explained by Gurudeva Śrī KañjīSvāmī.

Pravacanasāra is broadly divided into three chapters. This book is on verses 93 to 126 from the first part of the second chapter- *jñeya tattva prajñāpana-dravya sāmānya adhikāra*, this has been called *samyag darśan adhikara* by Śrī Jaysena Ācārya. The translation of this book is based on the Pravacanasāra text translated by Śrī Hemchand Jain. We wish to publish the English version of the rest of the chapters, work on which has already started.

Shri Hemchandji Jain 'Hem' (Bhopal/Deolali), Shri Rajesh Gandhi (Amdavad) and Smt. Bhairavi Daftary (Mumbai) has put much effort into this book. We thank Dr. Shri Jayantilalji Jain, Dean of Manglayatan University, for editing and reviewing the text. The trust is sure it will benefit the scholars/students and the young generation who have a deep interest in the Jain philosophy but are not proficient in Indian languages, especially for those staying outside India.

On this occasion, we remember the invaluable contribution made by our past presidents: Shri Babubhai Mehta, Shri Lalchandbhai Modi, Shri Babuji Jugalkishorji Jain, Shri Dhanyakumarji Belokar, and Shri Anantbhai Sheth.

We take this opportunity to thank Gap Meta Ventures Pvt. Ltd. Navi Mumbai, who did a great job printing this book.

We are happy to announce that our Trust has completed 50 years of serving the cause of Jains and Jainism, and we are celebrating the same most magnificently and appropriately.

Vasantbhai Doshi (President)

Mahipal Jnayak (Hon Secretary)

Shri Kund Kund Kahan Digambar Jain Tirtha Suraksha

Trust, Mumbai Date: 21 February 2024, Mumbai

BOOK IS AVAILABLE AT THE FOLLOWING PLACES

INDIA

Ahmedabad

1. Shree Kundkund Kahan Digambar Jain Paramagam Charitable Trust Simandhar Swami Digambar Jain Mandir (Vastrapur) Bodakdev, Ahmedabad 380054
Tel: 079-26870259
2. Shri Rajesh Gandhi, Mob: 8511170710
3. Shri Chiren Shah, Mob: 9426083030

Bengaluru

Shri Adinath Bhagwan Digambar Jain Mandir 141 Rangaswamy Temple Street, Chickpet, Balapet Cross, Near Upparpet Police Station Bengaluru 560053, Tel: 080-22912990

Bhopal

1. Shree Kundkund Kahan Digambar Jain Trust Shri Digambar Jain Mumukshu Mandal Chowk, Bhopal 462001 Tel: 9993354533
2. Gyanoday Tirthdham Bhopal-Vidisha Highway, Dewangunj, MP 464651 Tel: 9425027245 Contact: Shri Hemchand Jain, Mob: 9373293167

Chaitanya Dham

Chaitanya Dham At Post, Dhanap, N.H. No.8 Gandhinagar, Gujarat Tel: 079-23272222, 9409274139

Deolali

Pujya Shree Kanjismami Smarak Trust Kahan Nagar, Lam Road, Deolali Nashik 422401, Tel: 0253-2491044

Jaipur

Pandit Todarmal Smarak Trust A-4 Babu Nagar, Jaipur 302015 Tel: 0141-2707458

Kolkata

Shree Kund Kund Kahan Digambar Jain Swadhyay Mandir Trust 43/2A Paddupukur Road, Bhawanipur, Kolkata 700019 Contact: Amit Jain, Tel: 09874751818

Manglayatan

Extended NCR 33rd Milestone, Aligarh-Mathura Highway Beswan, Uttar Pradesh 202145 Tel:09359555555

Mumbai

1. Shree Kundkund Kahan Digambar Jain Tirth Suraksha Trust 173-175, Mumbadevi Road, Zaveri Bazar, Mumbai 400002; Tel: 022-23446094
2. Shri Simandhar Swami Digambar Jain Mandir 47, Church Road, off S.V.Road, Ishwar Park Vile Parle (W), Mumbai 400056; Tel: 022-26631165
3. Smt. BhairaviDaftary, Mob: 9821521592

New Delhi

Atmarthi Trust Adhyatmatirth Sadhana Kendra

Ghewra Mod, Rohtak Road, New Delhi 110041 Contact: Bimalji Jain, Tel: 9810005428

Ponnurmalai (Ponnur Hill)

Acharya Kundkund Jain Sanskruti Centre M. Pots VadavanakkamVadi, Tah: Vanadevasi
Dist: Tiruvannamalai Tamil Nadu: 604501; Tel: 04183-225033

Udaipur

Shaswat Dham

Airport Road, Tulsidas Ki Sarai,

Post: Gudli via Zinc Smelter

Udaipur, Tel: 9414103492

INTERNATIONAL

KENYA

Praful D Raja, P.O. Box # 41217, Nairobi, Kenya, Email: spraja@mitsuminet.com

UK

1. President, Digambar Jain Association The Broadway Wealdstone Harrow, MIDDLESEX HA3 7EH
2. Sheetal V. Shah, Flat No.9, Maplewood Court, 31 Eastbury Avenue, Northwood, MIDDLESEX HA6 3LL.
Email: sheetalvs@aol.com

USA

1. Hasmukh M. Shah, 304 Tall Oak Trail, Tarpon Spring, Florida 34688.
Email: kahanguru@hotmail.com
2. Jyotsna V. Shah, 602 Hamilton Ave., Kingston, PA 18704-5622.
Email: jyotsana2@yahoo.com

Soft copy available on: atmadharma.com, vitragvani.com

Contents

Foreward	vii	gāthā 109	210
Editorial	viii	gāthā 110	214
Preamble	xi	gāthā-111	217
Note from the co-translators	xiv	gāthā-112	229
From the desk of the publisher	xvii	gāthā 113	233
Contents	xxi	gāthā 114	247
gāthā 93	1	gāthā 115	255
gāthā 94	20	gāthā 116	260
gāthā-95	47	gāthā-117	272
gāthā-96	69	gāthā-118	276
gāthā-97	81	gāthā-119	280
gāthā-98	93	gāthā-120	284
gāthā-99	99	gāthā-121	287
gāthā 100	136	gāthā-122	291
gāthā 101	146	gāthā-123	294
gāthā-102	156	gāthā-124	297
gāthā-103	173	gāthā-125	303
gāthā-104	178	gāthā 126	308
gāthā-105	182	śloka 7	315
gāthā-106	185	śloka 8	316
gāthā 107	194	śloka 9	317
gāthā 108	204	Glossary for gāthās 93 To 126	318



❧ *gāthā* 93 ❧

अथ ज्ञेयतत्त्वप्रज्ञापनम् - तत्र पदार्थस्य सम्यग्द्रव्यगुणपर्यार्यस्वरूपमुपवर्णयति —

Now, *jñeyatattva* (principle of *jñeya*) is explained here, meaning the principle of *jñeya* is being told. In that, first, the correct description of substance in the form of *dravya-guṇa-paryāya* (substance-attribute-modification) is explained:-

अत्थो खलु द्रव्यमओ द्रव्याणि गुणप्पगाणि भणिदाणि ।

तेहिं पुनणो पज्जाया पज्जयमूढा हि परसमया ॥ ९३ ॥

attho khalu davvamao davvāṇi guṇappagāṇi bhaṇidāṇi |

tehiṃ puṇo pajjāya pajjayamūḍhā hi parasamayā || 93 ||

Meaning: *padārtha* is in the form of substance, substances are called *guṇātmaka*, and *paryāya* (modification) comes from *dravya* (substance) as well as *guṇā* (attribute). *paryāya mūḍha jīva* (those perplexed by modification) are *parasamaya* or *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* (with erroneous belief).

īkā: Whatever *padārtha* (object) is known in this world, consists of *dravya* (substance), that which is *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya* (a mass of width/area wise generality) and *āyata-sāmānya-samudāya* (a mass of lengthwise generality). It being made from *dravya* (substance), it is in the form of *dravya* (substance). And substance, owing to its being the abode/shelter of *vistāra-viśeṣa-svarūpa-guṇa* (consisting of horizontal area-wise specific qualities) is a mass of *guṇas* (attributes) And modifications/which are *āyata-viśeṣa-svarūpa* (lengthwise particularities), whose characteristics are made up of the above said *dravyas* and *guṇas*, is *dravyātmaka* (substantial/consisting of substance) as well as *guṇātmaka* (consisting of attributes).

In that, the reason for acceptance of the oneness of many substances is *dravya paryāya* (substantial modification). It is of two kinds: (i) *samāna jātiya* (homogeneous) and (ii) *asamāna jātiya* (heterogeneous). (i) *samāna jātiya* (homogeneous) consists of many *pudagala* (matter particles). e.g., a molecule of two or three *paramānus*, etc. (ii) *asamāna jātiya* (heterogeneous) consists of *jīvapudgalātmaka* (*jīva* (embodied living beings) and matter), and by the attribute of celestial being, man, etc., supports the acceptance of attribute-modification to be the reason. That also is of two types: (i) *svabhāva paryāya* (modification with intrinsic nature) and (ii) *vibhāva paryāya* (modification with alienated nature). In that, in all substances, by their own *agurulaghu guṇa* (attribute of constancy of individuality), every *samaya*, experience of the manifested manifoldness of *ṣaṭ*

sthānapatita hānivrddhi (six places of falling increase/decrease), is *svabhāva paryāya* (modification of intrinsic nature) and (ii) *vibhāva-paryāya* (modification of alienated nature). Due to *sva* (*upādāna*/substantial cause) and *para* (*nimitta*/instrumental cause) of colour, etc., or *jñāna*, etc., the oneness occurring in the modifying earlier or latter states, due to which the *svabhāva viśeṣa* (particularity of nature) which arises is *vibhāva paryāya*.

Now this (above said statement) is confirmed by an example:-

Just as a complete piece of cloth being composed of a permanent *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya* (mass of width/area-wise generalities) and running *āyata-sāmānya-samudāya* (mass of lengthwise generalities) is inseparable from it. Similarly, the entire *padārtha* (complete substance), termed as *dravya* (substance), being composed of the permanent *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya* (mass of width/area wise generalities) and the running *āyata-sāmānya-samudāya* (mass of lengthwise generalities) is *dravya maya* (with substantiality).

And just as in a complete piece of cloth, being made of the attributes of permanent *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya* (mass of width/area wise generalities) or running *āyata-sāmānya-samudāya* (mass of lengthwise generalities) is inseparable from attributes and so is *guṇātmaka* (with attributes). Similarly, in objects, the permanent be it *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya* (mass of width/area generalities) or *āyata-sāmānya-samudāya* (running mass of lengthwise generalities), which is termed as *dravya*, being made of qualities/attributes, is unobtained without attributes, so is *guṇātmaka*.

And further, the way that which is made of many cloths (made of more than one garment), two swathes of cloth which are stitched, three swathes of cloth which are stitched are *samāna-jātiya-dravya-paryāya* (homogeneous substantial modification); similarly, there are *samāna-jātiya-dravya-paryāya* (homogeneous substantial modification) made of multiple *pudagala* of two- *aṇus*, three-*aṇus*, etc.

And the way those two swathes, three swathes stitched together, made of silk and cotton, are *asamāna-jātiya dravya paryāya* (heterogeneous substantial modification). Similarly, multiple *jīvapudgalātmaka* like celestial beings, humans are *asamāna-jātiya dravya paryāya*.

And sometimes, in a piece of cloth, by way of its own gross *agurulaghu guṇa* (constancy of individuality attribute), occurring over a period of time, due to many types of modifications, attains manifoldness, which is *guṇātmaka svabhāva paryāya*.

In that way, in all substances by subtle *agurulaghu guṇa*. every *samaya*, experience of manifoldness, by manifestation of *ṣaṭ sthānapatita hānivrddhi* (six places of falling decrease/increase), is *guṇātmaka svabhāva paryāya* (intrinsic modification of attribute).

And as in a cloth, the arising of multipleness seen in the form of *svabhāva viśeṣa*, due to oneness of the earlier state, which exists due to *sva-para* (self/non-self) of colour, etc., is

guṇātmaka vibhāva paryāya. Similarly, in all *dravyas*, due to colour, etc., or *jñāna*, etc., the oneness which exists with the earlier state, which causes the arising of manifoldness seen in the form of *svabhāva viśeṣa* (nature of particularity), is *guṇātmaka vibhāva paryāya* (alienated modification of attribute).

In fact, only this illumination of the intrinsic nature of *dravya* (substance) *guṇa* (attribute) *pāryaya* (modification) of all objects, as preached by omniscient Lord *Jīna*, is beneficial-excellent-perfect and acceptable, and no other is; because most *jīvas*, owing to their taking shelter/support of *paryāya*-which is a state of embodied existence only, are lying in a state of misbelief becoming *para samaya* (false-believer) having *moha* (delusion) which is characterized by untrue perception of reality.

bhāvārtha: *padārtha* (object) is *dravya-svarūpa* (form of substance). Substance is with infinite qualities/attributes. Modifications arise from substance and attributes. Modifications are of two kinds:- 1. *dravya-paryāya* (substantial modification) and 2. *guṇa-paryāya* (attributive/qualitative modification). Further, *dravya-paryāya* are of two kinds:- (1). *samāna-jātiya-dravya-paryāya* (homogeneous substantial modification), e.g., molecules of two atoms, three atoms, etc. (2) *asamāna-jātiya dravya paryāya* (heterogeneous substantial modification), e.g., human beings, celestial being, etc.

Further, *guṇa paryāya* is of two kinds:- (1) *svabhāva-guṇa-paryāya* (intrinsic attributive modification) e.g., *siddha's guṇa-paryāya* (disembodied omniscient God's intrinsic attributive modification). (2) *vibhāva guṇa paryāya* (alienated attributive modification), e.g., mundane being's *mati jñāna paryāya* (sensory knowledge caused by substance itself or something else).

Thus, revealed by the omniscient *Jīneṅdra*, characterised nature of *dravya-guṇa-paryāya* (substance-attribute-modification) of all *padārthas* (objects) is only in accordance with reality. Those *jīvas* who do not know *dravya-guṇa* take shelter of/remains engrossed in embodied modification only, owing to not knowing their own characteristic nature, and they are *para samaya* (non-self conscious *jīva*).

pravacana on gāthā 93

Now section with the main and subtle principles starts –

What does *jñeya* mean? *jñāna* of *ātmā* knows subjects of self and non-self, it decides about them. So, that which is suitable to be known by *jñāna* is called *jñeya*. Here it is being told that what should those who want the benefit of *ātmā* do?

That *jñāna* which is not directed towards self, cannot correctly decide about even one substance as it is stuck in the knowing of non-self,

THOSE WITH FRAGMENTED JÑĀNA STAY WITH ERRONEOUS BELIEF

The way a lump of salt is filled with saltiness-similarly *ātmā* is a *pinḍa* (conglomeration/mass) of infinite attributes like *jñāna*, *ānaṇḍa*, etc. He is always the knower by nature. An ignorant forgets his own pure nature by not focusing towards it, and focusing on *punya-pāpa* and associated circumstances, believing his own existence to be through them.

ātmā residing in this body is separate from the body and consists of knowledge. *ātmā* is eternal, and its knowledge is also eternal. An ignorant does not turn his present state or present perturbed *añśa* (part) towards self but turns it towards non-self. So, forgetting the eternal *añśa* (part), he believes in the present part. The oneness/ownership with a small part, with associations and with *śubhāśubha* (auspicious-inauspicious) *vikārī* (impure) *bhāvas* (thoughts) is the constant contempt of *jñāna*, and that is called *hiṅsā* (violence).

Ignorant believes completeness in one part. He believes himself to be *rāgī* (with attachments) and believes his existence to be in the form of guardian of body, etc. Believing his ownership in associations of present modification of *punya-pāpa* (virtue-vice) compassion-charity, country and society, he maintains his interest in auspicious-inauspicious impure dispositions. He forgets the non-associated, unperturbed, knowing *tattva* (substance). So, he does not know the self and non-self *jñeya* (knowable) the way they are and sees and believes them to be the opposite of what they are. He differentiates *jñeyas* as *iṣṭa* (favourable) and *aniṣṭa* (unfavourable) and knows only associations of *punya-pāpa*. Hence, he is a *mithyadrṣṭi* (false believer).

Only by understanding the intention/opinion of a *jñānī* can the secret of *tattvas* be understood. *ātmā* is the complete substance in one *samaya* (smallest unit of time), it has no beginning or end. Leaving the focus of non-self, the present modification turns towards self, it focuses towards the eternal *añśī* (whole) then, *dharma* in the form of *samyak darśana* arises. If a mistake is understood correctly, then the mistake does not stay. In this *gāthā*, the main principle has been explained. Forgetting the substance, one who is stuck in *punya-pāpa*, which arises with the focus of non-self, knows only a part- knows only the *pariyāya*, so he is *pariyāyamūḍha* (perplexed in modification). *rāga* (attachments) arises with focus of *añśa* (part), and an ignorant believes benefit in it. Therefore, *mithyātva* arises, and he is called a *pariyāyamūḍha*.

This *gāthā* is going to reveal a sublime secret. *padārtha* (object) is the form of *dravya*(substance). Here *dravya-guṇa-pariyāya* (substance-attribute-modification) all three together means *padārtha*. *Triloknātha* (*Bhagavāna*) omniscient has said all substances to be in the form of *dravya-guṇa svarūpa* (substance and attribute, by nature). *padārthas* (object) includes all six *dravyas*. Words reveal the meaning. All *padārthas* (objects) which exist in this universe are by nature in the form of *dravya*. They have been named as *dravya* because *vastu* (substance) attains/knows its own attribute-modification, is attained, is

covered, modifies or flows in a sequential manner. One *guṇa* is not present within another *guṇa*, but *guṇas* are present in *dravya* (substance). The way-sugar by nature is sweet only, similarly, *ātmā* is in the form of infinite attributes like *jñāna*, etc. The area of attributes and substance is not separate. *pariyāya* means the present state of *guṇas*. (Here, auspicious and inauspicious attachments and belief of oneness in the heterogenous state of modification of human is called *pariyāyamūḍhatā*).

Gold is a substance, and it stays constant; necklace, bangle, earrings made from it are *pariyāyas* (modification). Substance is said to be with attributes. *pariyāya* rises from its own substance and attribute, but it is not its nature to rise from a separate substance-attribute or from non-self substance.

SCIENCE OF SUBSTANCE AND ITS APPLICATION

Every substance is separate through all three *kālas* (time phases of past-present-future). If it is said that there are infinite substances, then infinite is in the form of infinite, but one substance is not the form of another substance, and it is never due to another. Similarly, it is seen that *ātmā* and body, both substances being different, seeing them by the characteristic of distinction, both do their own *kriya*(activity), as separate forms, through all three *kālas* (time phases).

parmāṇu (smallest unit of matter), which is a substance, is with attributes of touch, etc., through which various modifications manifest. It does not need to occur from some other substance; similarly, the state of substance, *ātmā*, is also from *ātmā*, and it is not through some other *ātmā*. One who forgets this independent nature of substance believes completeness in a small part (modification) and opposes the *anṣi* (beholder of small parts).

One *parmāṇu* substance does not do the work of another *parmāṇu* substance. If the body is diseased, it cannot cure the disease. No one can stop the process of greying of hair, old age, wasting of body, or separation. Even then, due to *moha* (delusion), ignorant believe that non-self substance and its modifications are dependent on him, but it is not so; because the substance and attribute from which modifications arises, is at one with that substance; who else can do it?

The base of *pariyāya* is substance, but forgetting this, and focusing on the present part, or on impure modification in the form of distinction and body, and having belief of oneness, that he can get something from them, and something can be done in them, is called a *pariyāya mūḍha* (perplexed with modification). They oppose those who understand this.

He who ascends on the pure blemish-free nature of substance can never be *pariyāya mūḍha*. He turns the present modification towards self and modifies as one with the undivided self-substance, and so is called *dravya drṣṭivāna* (one with the focus on substance) or *samyagdrṣṭi*. Because his modification becomes undivided with the

blemish-free substance, he does not have the state of *pariyāya mūḍha* (perplexed with modification), but he knows self and non-self *jñeyas* (knowables) as *jñeyas*, and seizing the undivided/whole *svajñeya* (self knowable) has the state of being intent upon self.

He whose interest, focus or inclination remains towards the undivided pure nature of substance, of one *samaya*, keeps his focus on the root wealth of the pure nature of self. Even then, he knows attachment which arises due to present weakness as a form of *jñeya*, so he never becomes *pariyāya mūḍha*.

That *jīva* who, due to his present inclination towards non-self, has oneness with compassion-charity, virtue-vice, attachments, etc., and body, believes virtuousness in *rāga* – believes it worthy of doing; due to this, he believes the part with auspicious-inauspicious attachment to be the whole. Such a *jīva* has been called *pariyāya mūḍha-mithyadrṣṭi* by *Bhagavāna* because his interest and focus are on associations and *vikāra* (impure thoughts) only; he forgets the non-associated knower.

Every *ātmā*, by nature, is the eternal form of *parmātmā* (supreme *ātmā*), but due to his own new mistake, every *samaya*, he becomes delusional with the part which modify. The knowing sentient blissful self is complete in one *samaya*. Can the existing pure nature of self be incomplete? No. In every *ātmā*, complete pure nature is filled in the form of efficacy. That which is *prāpta* (complete/already obtained) is *prāpti* (is obtained). From where did the ability to become the state of *parmātmā* and attain the state of supreme bliss come to those who attained this state? It is said that this ability has come from his own substance-attribute-modification.

In this way, every *ātmā* has the state of *parmātmā*, the state of omniscience, within. Despite being the complete pure nature of *ātmā*, he who joins to the present *añśa* (infinitesimal part) of manifested *jñāna* to *vyavahāra* of *punya-pāpa* and has oneness/ownership of it, becomes a *pariyāya mūḍha* by having interest of body and attachments, which is opposite of the eternal pure nature—the whole.

In this existing universe made of six substances, whichever substances can be known, all those substances, all the six substances, are complete in their own self-existence, in their own nature and are undivided. They are not due to any other substance. In other words, every substance being made up of *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya-svarūpa* (aggregate of the form of area wise generality) and *āyata-sāmānya-samudāyātmaka* (aggregate of generality of sequential modifications) form of substance, is substance itself. This exists through all three time phases; It exists by its own eternal efficacy (aggregate of attributes), along with its sequential modification; but its existence or modification is not due to any other substance.

He who respects pure nature of *jñāna* does not respect thoughts of *mithyātva*. *ātmā*, by nature, is omniscient. In this universe, substances of all three *kālas* are *anādi* (with no

beginning)-*anaṅta* (with no end). *jñāna* definitely knows them in the form of *jñeya*. By saying that, ‘they are known’ – what is being said? That it is not done by anyone else. What do, those who have annihilated the lower state of *jñāna* and have become evidently manifested omniscient, know? They know that all substances are eternal and are going to stay eternally. And the omniscient knows all substances through his *jñāna*, but it is not the nature of any substance that someone be its doer of that which ‘is, is, is’ or that it be made by someone. Be an omniscient or an ignorant, no *ātmā*, can do anything of the body or any other *jīva*, etc., because modification of every substance is from its own substance and attribute.

Every *ātmā* by nature is *jñāna*, therefore it can be known that his present modification arises from his own self, and modification of non-self is due to its own self. But one cannot do anything, to any other *jīva* due to desire or knowledge, either by body, etc., or by *jñāna*. Though this being the nature of substance, the ignorant have only attachment-aversion-delusion by believing that he can do something of non-self. Or, knowing self and non-self the way they are in modification, he leaves attachment of *aṅśa* (a small part) and non-self. He reveres the blissful nature and stabilizes within. *sukha* (bliss) is only with *jñāna*-one who respects such a complete nature, does not respect incomplete and opposing thoughts.

SUBSTANCE IS EXPLAINED THROUGH ATTRIBUTE-MODIFICATION

What kind are substances of the universe? Substances of the universe are *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāyātmaka* (aggregate of area wise generality). Those divisions which exist with support of substance and are equal in expanse to substance are called *vistāra viśeṣa*, (area wise particularity) which are *guṇas* (attributes). *ātmā* has *jñāna*, *darśana*, *cāritra*, etc., of which none are before or after, but they are all together.

In every substance, with its own auspices, there are *vistāra* (breadth/expanse) *sāmānya* (generality), which are spread all over. That assemblage of attributes is substance. Substance is a mass of attributes. From this statement, it should be understood that attributes of self are within the self, by the self, but not from non-self. If this is known, then interest in non-self will go, and interest and immersing in the undivided pure nature of self will arise. This is the way of attaining *dharma* or bliss.

Here discussion is of the true science of substance. The truth which has been told by the *sarvajña vītarāga* (omniscient passionless). *Ācāryadeva* has defined it very clearly. All substances are there in the universe, by nature, are permanent and they exist. Modification of their states is due to themselves because those states originate from those attributes and they modify. Substances and their efficacies are permanent, so no one makes them, protects them or destroys them. But those substances stay permanent and modify by their own nature. In this way, all substances have their limitations, and

no one can change that. If this absolute limitation of substances is not known, then one will never be able to leave the perplexity of doer-ship and take auspices of one's own pure knowing nature, and will also not be able to determine *jñeyas* (knowables). If he knows the independence of infinite substances and its boundless limitation of *anādi-anañta*, then with consideration of non-self and of nature of self, he will come within the limitation of nature of *jñāna*. With that comes the limitation of *sañsāra* (transmigration) in the form of attachments-passions.

If one does not believe substance in its definite form, then he goes into unlimited *kaṣāya* (passions), and if he believes it, then he will swim across transmigration. Every substance is *saṭ* (complete/existing by self). Its modification is only due to its own self. In the universe, there are infinite-unlimited substances. If someone else is believed to be its doer, then the limitation, that all substances are changing with permanence due to their own self, will not remain. Infinite attachment and passion of doership arise for him who believes in doership and dependence, and this is called *sañsāra* (transmigration). If nature of substance and its system-limitation is not believed, the way it is then on having opposite *śraddhā-jñāna-cāritra*, there will be perversion in the self, and if it is accepted the way it is, then he will be happy.

So, *tattvas* should be known the way they are explained in *āgamas*, as told by the omniscient, and by associating with those who have experienced it. Without efficacy, substance which is the bearer of efficacy cannot exist. Nature of efficacy is undivided with the bearer of pure nature. Therefore, all *śaktis* (efficacies) which are present in the substance have to modify sequentially, every *samaya*. This has been explained here.

This chapter is about the science of substance. In this universe, whichever substances are worthy of knowing, all those, each and every substance, are complete and undivided in the existence of self—and complete within the limitation of its own nature. They are in the form of *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāyā* (aggregate of width/area wise generality). Their *vistāra-viśeṣa* (width/area wise particularity) are attributes. An aggregation of attributes like *jñāna*, etc., in *ātmā*, touch taste etc., in *pudgala* is the substance. In *ātmā*, *jñāna*, etc., and in *pudgala* substance, touch, taste, etc., are an aggregation of attributes, which is the substance. Attributes stay all together with the auspices of self-substance, as *vistāra viśeṣa* (area-wise particularity), and modifications stay in the substance, sequentially one after another, within the limitation of one *samaya*.

All substances in the universe are of the same type. Whoever distinguishes them as favourable-unfavourable; does not believe in the nature of self and non-self the way it is. He opposes the pure nature of *jñāna*; this is due to false belief, and that is sorrow and cause of sorrow.

vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya (aggregate of width/area wise generality) is called substance. Many attributes stay separate in it. If these distinctions are made secondary, then in the

aggregate of these attributes, the one state of *ātmā* in the form of generality is experienced. Substance is an undivided mass of these infinite attributes in the form of *vistāra-sāmānya rūpa* (form of area-wise generality).

āyata-sāmānya-rūpa-samudāya (aggregate of length-wise generality) - *āyata-* means vertical flow which is related to *kāla* (time). State modifies one after another in the sequence of time. At whichever time, whichever state(modification) is meant to arise, that occurs, and in the second *samaya*, second modification arises. In this way, flow of sequential modification keeps occurring. If the distinction of these sequential modifications is seen as secondary, then the state of oneness of substance in the form of generality is experienced. So, the undivided mass of sequentially modifying modifications is substance.

In one *samaya*, one modification of one attribute modifies. State of *mokṣa* cannot be present along with the state of *saṁsāra* (transmigration). *samyaktva* cannot be there with *mithyātva*. Presence of *krambaddha* (sequence bound) is due to its own substance-attribute, but not from any other substance.

The way, gold is *sāmānya dravya* (generality of substance), which is a mass of attributes like yellowness, stickiness, etc., Over time, the undivided mass of all the respective modifications of earrings, necklaces, etc., which occur, - is gold itself. In the same way, the nature of all six substances - *jivā*, *pudgala parmāṇu*, *dharma*, *adharmā*, *ākāśa*, and *kāla*-is due to their own independent limitations. But their nature is not due to anything else.

Every substance is a mass of the pervading non-sequential efficacies and all eternally arising sequential modifications. Substance is *jñeya* in the form of substance-attribute-modifications. Self is *jñāna* which is separate from auspicious-inauspicious perturbation and which knows them in their limitations. To be at one with the pure nature of that which is a mass of *jñāna*, etc., attributes and have belief-knowledge-equanimity in it, is *dharma*.

Question: Where does *vyavahāra* (conventionality) come in this?

Answer: *jñāna* is with auspices of *ātmā*. To know it is *niścaya*. That which is in the form of non-self *jñeyas* (to know non-self *jñeyas*) as separate non-self is *vyavahāra*. Nature of substance is pure, that is, *niścaya*, and with its auspices, to know the division of blemish-free modification which arises, is *sadbhūta vyavahāra* (acceptable conventionality). To know the remaining *rāga* is *asadbhūta* (non-acceptable) *vyavahāra* (conventionality). *ātmā* cannot do anything of non-self. Hence his *vyavahāra* is not in non-self. Even if some ignorant believe otherwise, believes he can do *vyavahāra* of non-self substance, can keep or leave them, is not the nature of *ātmā*.

He who believes one *samaya* of modification to be due to non-self has refuted the existence of all substances in all three time phases. He has not believed even one

substance to be complete. Every substance is a mass of modifications of all three time phases (past-present-future). From that, if any one state of any one *samaya* is taken out, or it is believed that its modification has occurred due to non-self, then that substance will be destroyed. For example, if a man is hundred years old, and any one state of one *samaya* is removed from the middle, then he will not remain a complete person, i.e., he will be destroyed. Similarly, every substance pervades undivided in all its modifications from eternity to infinity (no beginning or end). If any modification is believed to be because of non-self, then the belief of any substance of universe does not remain. His belief of *jñeya* (knowable) and *jnātā* (knower) is destroyed.

THE SCIENCE OF SUBSTANCE HAS BEEN GIVEN WITH GRACIOUSNESS BY
PASSIONLESS SAINTS (MUNIS)

Digambara saṅgha Amṛtandra Ācārya used to stay in the forest. Taking a dive in the well of nectar of innumerable space points of *ātmā*, he used to stay engrossed in the *nirvikalpa* (unwavering) *ātmadhyāna* (focus of *ātmā*/pure psychic activity). He is the one who has served this nectar. *artha*=*padārtha*'s nature of substance; and what kind are substances? They are a mass of non-sequential attributes and sequential modifications. By saying that modifications arise from substances and attributes the independent limitations of every substance through all three time phases is proved.

Now *guṇa* (attributes) are defined. And what are attributes? One substance gives auspices to infinite such attributes. Such infinite *viśtāra viśeṣa* (horizontal area-wise particularity), are the form of attributes. As it is made of these, substance itself is the form of attributes. Undivided from attributes-that is substance. Like that whose base is *paramāṇu*, such colour, smell, taste and touch are undivided substance, and that is *paramāṇu*. One who believes substance through auspices of attribute, his focus is on division. “*dravyāśrayā nirguṇā guṇā*.” When this has been said, there, attributes are many, and they are with their own auspices, but one attribute is not present within another. All attributes are mutually unsupported. This is the limitation of independence of attributes, which has been stated.

Attributes are in a non-sequential form in the substance. They are undivided and, together, with substance. Modifications are devoid of substance-attribute. With the focus of tranquillity, he who has *vītarāga-dṛṣṭi* (passionless view) and he knows *jñeyas*, for him *vītarāga-cāritra* (passionless conduct) is blissful.

This section is on *jñeya*. All substances which are capable of being known in *jñāna* are called *jñeyas*. Universe is a conglomeration of six substances. All substances are in it, being *anādi-anaṅta* (no beginning- no end) exist by themselves; they are not created by anyone. They are always in the form of their own *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* (substance-space-time-modification), but they are not in the form of *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of non-self substance.

Nature of a substance is substance, attribute and modification. In that, with auspices of self substance, are infinite attributes which are spread through all its space, in an undivided state. This undivided mass of all attributes is substance. Its basis is *kṣetra* (space). Its present new arising modifications is *kāla* (time), and the efficacy of infinite attributes, is called *bhāva*.

ātmā, etc., all substances are a mass of substance-attributes-modification in the form of efficacy, in one *samaya*. From that, every *samaya*, new modification keeps manifesting and changing. Their base is their attributes, and the base of attributes is substance. Substance and attribute are unchanging, eternal, in the form of efficacy, and stay in a non-sequential manner. And, through the sequence of time, their modification arises sequentially, one after the other. That is why all modifications are never seen to manifest together, but at whichever time, whichever modification is sure to arise, it manifests only at that time. If the nature of substance is decided in this way, then *jñāna* can stay stable in *ātmā*.

Without knowing the exact nature of self and non-self *jñeyas* (knowables), *jñāna* cannot arise. That is how the system of all *jñeyas* is set. *jñāna* decides everything. If, with the *bheda jñāna* (knowledge of distinction), *jñeya* and nature of *jñāna* are not decided, then the fault of doubt-delusion/myth is not erased. Then *jñāna* is unable to stabilise in the infinitesimal part. That is why, firstly nature of *jñāna* and *jñeyas* should be decided firmly. If truth is not heard, there is no effort to understand it, and it is said that *vrata*(vows), *tapa* (penance), *upvāsa* (fasting) should be done, and compassion should be shown, that's it! To them, it is said that never in any *kāla* (three-time phases) has the path of benefit been attained with this method.

In substance, attributes stay altogether according to the expanse of area of substance. Their support is substance. So, substance has been called *guṇa svarūpa* (nature of attribute). From the view of flow of time, how many ever states arise sequentially, they are the nature of substance only. Therefore, all whose defining features are attribute-modification, being made of substances and attributes, modifications of substances are of substance as well as attribute.

In this way, every substance has its *anādi-anaṅta* (no beginning – no end), independent limitations. Despite this, if someone believes that the state of one substance is due to another substance, then he is a *mithyadrṣṭi*- revolting against the infinite truth. There can be no benefit or loss in *ātmā* due to any other substance, nor can there be any changes. If its modifications were to arise due to non-self substance, then there will be no limitation of any substance.

One who is perplexed with modification experiences only despair, and if one has understood correctly, then he experiences equanimity by his own nature. Here, one who knows that modification arises with auspices of substance-attribute has not been called

pariyāya mūḍha (perplexed with modification). But one who does not accept the system of independent substance the way it has been told above has false beliefs, and his focus is stuck on associations and impure dispositions. He who believes in only one part is called *pariyāya mūḍha*; How does benefit-harm or *dharma-adharma* occur? He does not know this, so in every way, he experiences only despair. Millions of rupees, prestige, and high position will not be able to stop undesirable *gati* (life-form), but if correct understanding is done, then the eternal sentient becomes a sanctuary/shelter of self by itself, whereby he experiences power of the eternal nature.

NOW, IN WHICH WAY AND HOW DOES A *PARYĀYA MŪḌHA JĪVA* DOES ATTACHMENTS IS TOLD.

For the ignorant to believe oneness in numerous substances, substance-modifications are in the form of *nimitta*, and they are of two types- 1) *samāna-jātiya*(homogenous) 2) *asamāna-jātiya*(heterogenous).

1. Substance which is *parmāṇu* (physical matter particle), have many *skandha* (more than one *parmāṇu*) like two *parmāṇus*, three *parmāṇus*, etc. Substances like body, etc. which are seen with association of *pudgala* (physical matter), are many *samāna jātiya dravya-pariyāya* (homogenous substance-modification). Each and every *parmāṇu* is separate in it. Substance-attribute-modification of every *parmāṇu* is eternal, with each having separate self-nature. Their state arises only from them. Ignorant do not believe separate to be separate, but believe it to be the nature of substance. He does not know the separate nature of each; therefore, he believes associations to be the main substance-believes many to be one. He attaches himself to *samāna-jātiya-pariyāya* (homogenous modifications) and becomes *mūḍha* (ignorant). He does not believe *jñeya* (knowable) as a form of *jñeya*, but distinguishes them as desirable-undesirable, and makes them the subject of distress, due to which he becomes a *pariyāya-mūḍha* (perplexed with modification).
2. *asamāna jātiya pariyāya* (heterogenous modification). Ignorant believes the form of *jīva* and *pudgala*, which are humans, *devas*, etc., to be one. He believes existence of self and non-self to be from them. He who does not believe numerous as numerous in *asamāna jātiya pariyāya* (heterogenous modification) believes all to be one. He believes, in benefit-loss, of one due to another and in existence of one due to the other; in this way, owing to his belief of oneness in everything by *mithyā partibhāsa* (erroneous illusion), he remains *pariyāya mūḍha* (perplexed with modification)-this identifies an ignorant.

guṇa-pariyāya are of two types –1) *svabhāva-pariyāya* (natural modification) 2) *vibhāva pariyāya* (unnatural modification).

1. In all substances, due to their own *agurulaghugūṇa* (attribute because of which one substance does not take form of another substance, one attribute does not take form of another attribute and attributes in each substance do not disperse and spread out) that which manifests every *samaya*, having the experience of multiple-ness of *chaha sthāna* (six places) *hāni* (loss)- *ṽṛddhi* (gain), is the *svabhāva* (natural) *pariyāya* (modification).
2. In modifications of touch-taste-colour, etc., and modification of attributes of *jñāna*, etc., from the view of *nimitta* (auxiliary cause) of self and non-self, the state of *naimitika* (effect) which arises, is *vibhāva* (impure) *pariyāya* (modification).

Those modifications arise according to their momentary *upādāna* (substantial cause), which does not have the nature of being one. Modifications which are *aśuddha*(impure) are called *vibhāva pariyāya*. Those *vibhāva guṇa pariyāya* (unnatural attribute modifications) are of two types,-*vibhāva artha pariyāya* (extrinsic modification related to all attributes except shape) and *vibhāva vyañjana pariyāya*(extrinsic modification of the attribute of shape). This impurity arises only in two substances-*jīva* and *pudgala*. *vibhāva pariyāya* do not arise in *dharma*, etc., four other substances.

Question: Can *vibhāva* (unnatural) be called *svabhāva*(natural)?

Answer: Yes, attribute of *vibhāva* is its own nature of modification, that is why it is called *svabhāva*. *aśuddha upādāna* (impure substantial cause) modifies by itself, but to explain *nimitta*, from the view of *nimitta*, it is called *sāpekṣa* (relative) and *naimittika bhāva* (modification of effect). The same modification from the view of *upādāna* is called *upādeya* (acceptable) or *kārya* (effect). Due to that which is modifying because of *nimitta* of self and non-self, a decrease and increase seen in the earlier as well as later states. That multiple-ness in the form of nature of distinction is *vibhāva pariyāya* (unnatural modification)

In *kevala jñāna*, infinite pure modifications are analogous. But as there is complete purity in them, it is not called *vibhāva* (unnatural); so, multiple-ness of modification is not a fault, but when modification of attribute modifies as impure, then arising of *karma* is said to be *nimitta*.

If *naimitika* substances (*upādāna*/substantial cause) manifest as impure, then the other is said to be *nimitta*. But if one believes that as there was origination of karma, so *vikāra* (perturbation) arose; believes non-self to be reason for the state of self; he will never get a chance to have belief in the *sva* (self) *sāmarthya* (ability).

Ignorant *jīva* believes modification to be the entire substance and believes separate substances to be one. Modification is undivided from attribute and substance. Instead,

he sees it as a distinction arising from non-self. That is why that *jīva* is *pariyāya mūḍha* (perplexed with modification) and a *mithyadr̥ṣṭi*. Therefore one who wants to have true focus, must first know the nature of *deva-guru-śāstra* and substance, as told by *sarvajña vītarāgī deva* (omniscient passionless *Bhagavāna*). He must know the nature of nine *tattvas*, know the nature of *bhāvaliṅgī* (true *muni*) *digambara saṁta* like *Śrī KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya*, who are moving ahead on the path of *mokṣa*, and study *āgamas* (scriptures) written by them. If it is decided that nature of substances is such- and not of any other form, he can attain oneness with his nature which is only *jñāna*, and by understanding the method of being stable in it, he attains the blissful state.

That which is suitable to be known in *jñāna* is said to be *jñeya*. There are three types of *jñeyas*, substance, attribute and modification. The one that is an undivided mass of infinite attributes is substance. With substances, attributes are in the form of *vistāra-viśeṣa* (area-wise particularity) and consecutively originating-annihilating modifications, every *samaya* which are the present states, are modifications. These arise in matter (substances) by way of its own substance and attribute; One who believes that *pariyāya* arises due to non-self, that *jīva* does not believe in the undivided self and non-self *jñeya* and believes entire substance to be in a small part. With the belief of oneness with body, etc., associated things, he becomes *pariyāya mūḍha*. This is called *samsāra* (transmigration).

One whose focus is towards pure self, through *jñāna* can understand the appropriateness of substance. Every substance is *dhruva* (constant), hence its nature and attributes which are in the form of efficacies, are *dhruva*. Its present work (modification) occurs from them and not from non-self. This nature of pure self is the truth and is unhindered, and is not difficult to understand. But if a false statement has to be called truth, then many bases of falsehood will have to be laid. Even that will not be enough (or the falsehood will be caught); therefore, truth is straightforward. Understanding by being *madhyastha* (equable) and *jijñāsu* (seeker), by aligning one's focus to the truth, *tattva* (principle/ substance), which has not been known since infinite time, can definitely be known through the nature of *jñāna*.

A new state arises from substance, every *samaya*, and those modifications do not arise from non-self; but he who believes this part to be the whole substance, has not understood the real nature of *jñeya*. He who has not believed that *aṅśa* (part) is from the *trikālī* (eternal) *aṅśī* (whole) has neither correctly understood *jñeya*, nor *jñāna*, which would have made understanding of substance-attribute-modification easier. The example of cloth is given to explain this principle.

Entire cloth is made up of colour, touch, etc., whiteness, etc. Such *vistāra-sāmānya samudāya* (aggregate of width/area wise generality), and *āyata-sāmānya-samudāya* is the continuous running (in the form of flow), sequentially, in chronology of time, being

a lengthwise generality. It is formed by these modifications. Cloth is not separate in its *kṣetra* (space), *kāla* (time), and *bhāva* (modification) and is at one with its self-nature.

What is *artha* or *padārtha*? That which attains its own attribute-modification experiences, is called a *padārtha*. Non-self substance cannot attain it, cannot experience it. In substance, attribute is non-sequential, or all together, and modifications are chronological. It modifies sequentially at its own self-time. Through the running *āyata sāmānya samudāya* (lengthwise generality), substance is steady also.

The way steps are taken with the help of legs; legs are seen running one after another, sequentially, in a chronological manner; similarly, *vikāri* (perturbed) or *avikārī* (unperturbed) modifications arise from substance-attribute. Sequence in which the modification is meant to come, only that one comes at its own time - it manifests. Every substance is organised with the limitation of a system in which attributes are together, and consecutive modifications arise sequentially.

Attributes which are present in substance are spread horizontally in the area equal to that of self substance, and modifications modify lengthwise in the sequence of time as an uninterrupted sequential flow. When this is known, then oneness with outside attachments/ outer circumstances go away. When focus goes on the mass of infinite attributes-modification, the eternal substance, and not on only that which is as much as modification, then doers-ship or being an enjoyer, and sense of ownership goes away. Through belief, knowledge and steadiness of oneness on the pure nature and bearer of pure nature, one becomes the form of *dharma* by himself; then *jīva* is called a *dharmi*.

The example of a cloth which has attributes horizontally by way of *kṣetra* (area-wise), and modifications which arise sequentially, has been given. Similarly, every substance, be it *ātmā*, *parmāṇu*, etc., is by nature in the form of substance and attribute-modification. Or that substance which is steady by *vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya* (aggregate of area wise generality) and through the order of time, definite, steadily, sequentially modifying *āyata-sāmānya-samudāya* (aggregate of vertical-wise generality), is made by them and that is *dravyamaya* (composed of substance only). Similarly, one's *ātmā* also is substance-attribute-modification, and hence they are known through the nature of pure self. One's nature is not separate from attributes, but it is made of attributes. If this is decided, then he is called a truly wealthy person.

Now example is given to explain *vibhāva* (unnatural) modification. If things of the same type are joined, then they are said to be *samāna jātiya* (homogenous) *dravya-paryāya* (substance modification). Many types of *pudgalas*, like *dviaṇuka* (two *parmāṇus*) etc., are *samāna-jātiya-dravya-paryāya*. Like cloth made of a mix of cotton and silk threads, many types of *jīva-pudgala* forms of modification of *deva* etc., are *asamāna-jātiya dravya paryāya* (heterogeneous substance modification). Further, like in some cloth, due to its own gross *agurulaghū guṇa* (attribute because of which one substance does not take the

form of another substance, one attribute does not take the form of another attribute and attributes in each substance do not disperse and spread out) the consecutively modifying state, due to various kinds of modification, attains multitude-ness; it is a qualitative natural modification. Similarly, in all substances, every *samaya*, by the *sūkṣma* (subtle) *agurulaghu guṇa* (attribute of constancy and individuality), the experience of *hāni-vṛddhi* (decrease-increase) with auspices in six places, is a qualitative natural modification.

Due to modification of colour, etc., in the cloth, accompanied by the reason of self/non-self, the result of multipleness of the particularity of nature, seen due to the sequential state, arising in the earlier and later states, which modify due to its own efficacy, is *gunātmaka vibhāva paryāya* (qualitative unnatural modification).

VIKĀRA IN THE PRESENT STATE IS DUE TO ONE'S OWN SELF-IF IT IS SEEN IN THIS WAY, THEN FOCUS WILL GO ON GENERALITY OF PURE NATURE. FOCUS IS NOT COMPLETELY ON AŅŚA (PART); SO HE IS NOT PARYĀYA MŪḌHA.

The result of multipleness in the form of particularity of pure nature which is seen due to the state of sequence arising consecutively, modifying as preceding-succeeding states, due to the reason of self/non-self of colour, etc., and *jñāna*, etc., is *gunātmaka vibhāva paryāya* (qualitative unnatural modification). Even *samsārī jīva* (mundane beings) modify as per their own natural attributes and as per their nature to modify sequentially due to their own self. But no one exists or modifies due to non-self. If this true state is understood, then arguments and fights will not remain. *jñāna* of self will become firm, and stay within its own pure nature. Opposing this, one who believes the complete substance to be in the minute part has attachment of non-self association, and cannot be equanimous.

Now *paryāyamūḍha jīvas* (those perplexed with modification)? have been explained:-

1. He believes the association of many *paramāṇus* (smallest unit of matter) to be one substance. *samāna jātiya dravya paryāya* (mass of homogenous substance modification) are more than one; even then, he believes them to be one. That is why he is *paryāya mūḍha* (perplexed with modification)

Physical body and *jīva* are *asamāna jatiya* (heterogenous), but not believing this, he believes modification of one by another on the basis of non-self. Believing existence of one part due to another, he believes that *jīva* has *vikāra* due to *karma* and *karma* is created due to *jīva*. He does not believe that the part and whole are undivided and believes oneness with non-self; Therefore, he who thinks completeness in a part, and believes many as one does not believe that *aṅśa* (modification) will manifest with the auspices of substance-attribute, or believes that modification manifests from non-self. As he is a believer of only division, that *jīva* is *paryāya mūḍha* (perplexed with modification)

Perturbed or unperturbed state arises due to one's own self, but he who believes modification of one *samaya* to be the complete substance is also called *pariyāya mūdha* (perplexed with modification). One whose focus is on *aṅśa* (a part) has a belief of oneness with *vikāra* (perturbation) and associations, so he cannot see the eternal, *sāmānya* (general) nature. A clear and unwavering system of substance-attribute-modification has been explained by *Ācāryadeva*, and it is the system as propounded in the lineage of *Śrī Sarvajña*, which is the truth. So, the system of omniscient of illuminating the nature of substance-attribute-modification of all substances is appropriate, excellent and completely sufficient, but none other is so. Many *ekāntika jīvas* (who believe in singularity) take support of only modification or of one *aṅśa* (small part) and attain *moha* (delusion), whose characteristic is the non-attainment of *tattva*, or lack of knowledge of *tattva*, due to which he is *para samaya* (non-self substance). He believes that increasing-decreasing modification is related to substance and believes associations and *vibhāva* (unnatural modification) to be good and his existence to be in it. See! This *gāthā* is divine. *Digāmbara* saints have told the complete order as revealed by *sarvajña*. If the logical system of substance-attribute-modification is understood, then his *moha* (delusion) will be destroyed, such is the state of substances. Besides *sarvajña*, *kevalī* (omniscient), no one else knows this system of substances, and this has been propagated by *saṅta* (saints).

pravacana on bhāvārtha of gāthā 93

This is the first *gāthā* of the section on *jñeya*. In this, the nature of all six substances has been explained to be steady and non-sequential as substance-attribute, and modification has been explained as sequentially flowing in the form of *āyata-sāmānya-rūpa* (nature of length-wise generality). In this, no substance is left out. Here, it is said that the undivided mass of attribute is substance. Or nature of attribute-modifications is substance. Therefore, *padārtha* (matter) consists of substance, and attribute consists of modification. Every substance, every *samaya* (smallest unit of time), is complete in every form.

Matter by nature is in the form of substance and substance is with infinite attributes. Modification arises in substance and attribute but modification does not arise from *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of any other substance. *pariyāya* are of two types 1) *dravya-pariyāya* 2) *guna-pariyāya*. In this *dravya-pariyāya* are of two types 1) *samāna-jātiya* 2) *asamāna-jātiya*.

In that, *skāṇḍha* (mass of *paramāṇus*) from two *aṅśu* (particles) to infinite *paramāṇus* (smallest unit of physical matter) are *samāna-jātiya dravya pariyāya* (homogeneous substance-modification). Humans, *devas*, etc., are *asamāna-jātiya dravya-pariyāya* (heterogeneous substance-modification). Besides this, *guna-pariyāya* are also of two types.

- 1) *svabhāva paryāya*- e.g., like the modification of *siddha*
- 2) *vibhāva paryāya*-e.g., like the modification of *mati jñāna* (sensory knowledge)

This is the way, nature of the substance-attribute-modification of all substances has been shown in the teachings of *Jinendra Bhagavāna*, and is the accurate truth. *jīvas*, who do not know this, take auspices of only modification, which is a small part. They believe only a part- either body or attachments to be complete, and in doing so, they forget *añśī*-the nature of pure substance. They do not believe in the distinction and independence between the self and non-self and do not know the nature of one's own self, so they are *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* (with erroneous belief). *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* are called *para samaya*. It is not so that those born in other religions are *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* and those born as *Jains* are *samyakdr̥ṣṭi*. But one who does not accept the present state of substance to be of that substance and believes it to be from non-self, in his focus, he believes the present *anśa* (part) to be complete. Therefore, he is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*. There is no fault in deciding on what is the truth and what is not. In fact, it is firmness of belief.

In every substance, by the auspices of its own substance-attribute, new states arise constantly. This is its own constancy. There is no one else who can manifest this. He who believes the state of one substance to be dependent (dependent on another) is an *adharmi* (non-believer) who believes all substances of the universe to be dependent.

He who believes system of a substance exists because he took care, and if he were not to take care, then the system would not stay, believes the entire substance to be in a modification, and he is a *paryāya mūḍha*. If there are twenty-five thousand rupees in a safe, but one believes it to be five thousand rupees, then *jñāna* is incorrect. Similarly, the universe which, is in the form of the eternal six substances, and is the system of the nature of substance-attribute-modification, is explained by omniscient. If one believes the opposite of that, then his *jñāna* is incorrect, and if he does not believe in the six substances, then his *jñeya* (knowable) is incorrect. Guru who advises opposite to this is also false, and *devas* mentioned in false scriptures which propagate false *tattvas* are also false. Here there is no enmity towards anyone, but with the acceptance of truth, determination on the nature of *jñeya* is done.

Substance-attribute-modification is undivided within themselves and is separate from non-self. In this way, sentient, non-sentient substances are complete by it self and not by non-self. Hence self can do nothing of non-self, and non-self can do nothing of self. Momentary *vikāra* (perturbations), which arises due to focus on non-self, is sorrow. Self is not just as much as associations of body, etc., or equal to the state of *vikāra* (perturbation) and sorrow. To experience the eternal undivided nature of

substance in this way, is *samyag darśana*. Consecration of truth is necessary from the beginning. Believers of contrary to this, believing that first auspicious attachments should be done, then *vītarāgata* will arise, are opposer of truth from the onset. No one has been criticized here, but it has been shown that what one with erroneous thoughts believes.

ātmā cannot eat roti (Indian bread), and he cannot leave it either but he believes that everything is dependent on him. In reality, the definition of eating is that those substances experiencing their own attribute-modification, have come into that *ākāśa*(space) due to their own reason; their certain kind of state is called eating or meal. *ātmā* does not eat, and neither does body. *jīva* can not eat even if he desires to; only an ignorant, by way of his desires eats, *rāga-dveṣa*, and perturbation of joy and sorrow. One who sees associations and present part, cannot see the separate-distinctive nature of substance but sees them opposite of what they are and believes it to be so, is called a *pariyāya mūḍha* (perplexed with modification) *parasamaya* (non-self). He who believes in the eternal, unperturbed nature is not *pariyāya mūḍha*.

Many *jīvas*, with focus on the outside, take auspices of the state of only the present one *samaya*. They do not believe in the eternal pure nature but believe growth of current knowledge, effort and part of auspicious attachment as the complete *ātmā*, or believe *vyavahāra*(conventionality) to be *dharma*. Even if *jīva* with such belief, take *dravyalinga* (observing outer rules of a *digambara sādhu* without self-realization) and has auspicious dispositions conducive of going to the ninth *graiveyaka* (a higher *devaloka*), they are opposite of *dharma*, and remain *pariyāya mūḍha*.

Acceptance is according to belief. Focus of ignorant is on one part and associations, so he cannot but stay away from the belief that his present is dependent on non-self and non-self is dependent on him. He believes that he can stop speech, can decide not to pluck flowers, can leave food, can stop the body, etc., and holds on to the belief that he can do the state of non-self, which is the belief in doer-ship.

Knowing substance in the correct way and by increasing oneness with self-substance, he can become *samyagdr̥ṣṭi* or at one with purity of focus and belief of *mithyātva* will go. *samkiti* may be seen in the midst of the opulence of a kingdom, but so what? Associations are separate from him. In his focus, he has forsaken impure dispositions of all kinds. Ignorant may be away from associations, but even then, he holds on to all types of attachments because he believes good and bad of non-self from non-self and believes substance to be equal to the present modification.

☆☆☆

❧ *gāthā* 94 ❧

अथानुषङ्गिकीमिमामेव स्वसमयपरसमयव्यवस्थां प्रतिष्ठाप्योपसंहरति —

Having thus raised the topic connected to the previous *gāthā*, deciding upon this system of *sva samaya*(self-*ātmā*), and *para-samaya*, non-self (non-self *ātmā*) (or knowing the distinction between *sva samaya* and *para samaya*) the epilogue is told-

जे पज्जएसु गिरदा जीवा परसमइग त्ति णिद्धिद्वा |
आदसहावम्हि ठिदा ते सगसमया मुणेदव्वा ||९४||

je pajjaesu ṅiradā jīvā parasamaīga tti ṅiddiṭṭhā |
ādasahāvamhi ṭhidā te sagasamayā muṅedavvā || 94||

Meaning: Those *jīvas* who are immersed in *pariyāya*(modification) have been called *para samaya*; those *jīvas* who are steady in the pure nature of *ātmā* should be known as *sva samaya*.

ṭīkā: Those *jīvas* who trust in heterogeneous substantial modification consisting of *jīva-pudagala*, which is the root of all ignorance, are impotent to realize the intrinsic nature of *ātma svabhāva* (nature of *ātmā*) as described in previous verse-93, and so assume self-force there(or they are with force only towards heterogeneous substance modification), and whose uncontrolled *ekānta* (one sided) view runs unbridled, they get deceived by notions of I-ness and mine-ness, believing - ‘ I am this man only, this human body is mine’, having fallen from *ātma vyavahāra* (conduct of *ātmā*) which is in the form of shining forth of unwavering sentient spirituality only, and taking shelter of *manuśya vyavahāra* (human behaviour) in which he has embraced all sorts of mundane activities, becoming *rāgī-dveṣī* (with attachment-aversion). They, becoming attached to *karma* in the form of non-self substance (becoming associated with *karma* which is in the form of non-self substance), really become *para samaya*, or modify as form of *para samaya*.

And those *jīvas*, stationed by the distinctive *dravya-guṇa-pariyāya* (substance-attribute-modifications), which is the nature of *bhagavāna ātmā*-which is the root of all knowledge-taking auspices of that, being capable of manifesting *ātma svabhāva* (nature of *ātmā*), the way it has been told earlier, by extricating the sense of self-force towards (all kinds of) modifications and stations itself in the pure nature of *ātmā* only(immerses in it), they who have destroyed the insistence of accepting any *ekānta dṛṣṭi* (one-sided view) by naturally developed *anekānta dṛṣṭi* (view of pluralism), have destroyed all insistence of *ekānta dṛṣṭi*, in human, etc., *gatis* (states of existence) and in body of those *gatis* held by them,

not effectuating arrogance-ownership, thus realizing the uniform self-*ātmā* resembling a jewel-lamp taken around through many rooms, and attaining *ātmā* in its form of oneness (experiencing it) and accepting unwavering only sentient *ātmavyavahāra*, and not taking shelter of *manuśya vyavahāra* in which are embraced all non-self activities. They, owing to ceasing manifestation of attachment-aversion, take refuge in *parama udāsīntā* (supreme indifference), having abandoned contact of all other non-self substances and being at one with their own self substance only, become *sva-samaya*, or modify in the form of *sva samaya*.

bhāvārtha: ‘I am a man, I do all activities of body, etc., I am the owner of spouse, child, property, etc., I accept and leave them’ – believing so is human behaviour. ‘I am an unwavering sentient only’ - believing-modifying so is *ātmavyavahāra*.

Those engrossed in modifications of human, etc., have *ekānta* (one-sided view); they take shelter of human behaviour and have attachment-aversion. Thus, owing to having contact with other non-self substances in the form of *karma*, they are adherents of *para-samaya*. Those who are staying in nature of self have *anekānta-dṛṣṭi* (view of pluralism) and not taking shelter of human behaviour, they take refuge in *ātmavyavahāra*. Hence, they do not undergo attachment-aversion, i.e., they remain extremely indifferent; thus, they, not keeping contact with other non-self substances-karmic matter, are connected only to self-substance *ātmā*; hence they are adherent to *sva-samaya*.

pravacana on gāthā 94

Body-mind-speech, *śubha-aśubha rāga* (auspicious-inauspicious attachments), the present infinitesimal part, is *pariyāya* (modification). *jīva*, who is absorbed in it, has been called *para samaya*. And that *jīva* who knows self and non-self as form of *jñeya* (knowable), know that *aṅśa* (part) is from *aṅśī* (the whole). Due to this, he stabilises in pure nature of *ātmā*, and he is called *sva samaya* (self *ātmā*).

jīva who take auspices of *asamāna-jātīya-dravya-pariyāya* (heterogeneous substance and modification), which by nature is *pudgala* (matter) and is the root of all ignorance, do not know *jñeyas* as nature of *jñeya*. As they assume oneness and completeness in a small part, they make it a subject of *mithyā* (erroneous) *pratibhāsa* (reflection)-making it the main reason of *mithyātva*. They all are unworthy of accepting the pure nature of *ātmā* or its experience, as explained earlier, or are *napuṅsaka* (impotent/without power), and they assume their power to be in body, etc.

He who has missed his own pure nature, which is eternal, with infinite attributes, completely capable of effectuating (accomplishing), supremely powerful nature, believes his all to be in temporary *vibhāva* (unnatural) thoughts and in association of body. Auspice of non-self, which is *śubha-aśubha vyavahāra* (auspicious-inauspicious

conventionality), is a part in the form of *jaḍa* (non-sentient); he who is interested in this and believes auspices of blemished modifications to be *puruṣārtha* (right effort), being devoid of effort towards *jñāna*, which decides correctly, effortlessly between the self, and being without *puruṣārtha* (true effort) that *ajñānī* is a *napuṁsaka* (impotent). He argues against discussion on *sūkṣma* (subtle) *niścaya*(absolute truth)*dharma* and believes he can keep society happy by this. Through such beliefs and in any which way, he believes body to be *ātmā*. Pure nature of *ātmā* is eternal, embodiment of *jñāna* and without associations or *punya-pāpa*. He insults/disregards this and excitedly puts his strength and effort towards activity of body or the present state of body. By giving importance to the body by thinking that body should be good, if it is healthy, then everything is okay, and giving importance to non-sentient state of *punya-pāpa*, he is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* who gives importance to all such *asamāna jātīya dravya paryāya*.

If *jñāna* knows substance the way its pure nature of self is, then *jñāna* becomes pure, and with arising of purity, focus and belief become correct. Every substance has *vistāra viśeṣa* (spread area wise particularity) and *āyata viśeṣa* (modification, lengthwise vertical particularity). From that, *vistāra viśeṣa* has been explained earlier, and now *āyata viśeṣa* or *paryāya* (modification) is being described. Modifications are of substance and of attribute as well. *dravya paryāya* are of two types –

1. *samāna jātīya dravya paryāya* (homogeneous type of substance modification)

A stick is *samāna jātīya dravya paryāya*. In that, each state of every *parmāṇu* is on the basis of its *dravya* and they form a *skāṇḍha* (more than two *parmāṇus* enjoined) due to its own self. Even then, an ignorant believes the state of stick is due to him, or tools, etc. Ignorant sees associations, and he does not believe that base of that modification is *pudgala dravya* and not *jīva dravya*. This is his *paryāya dr̥ṣṭi* (focus on modification). And state of that stick is not due to tools either. Tool is a separate substance, so it cannot modify the state of stick; even then, to believe that state of stick is due to tools and attachment of *jīva* is delusion.

2. *asamāna-jātīya-dravya-paryāya*-(heterogeneous types of substance modification)

Body and *ātmā* stay in the same space, and they are *asamāna-jātīya-dravya-paryāya*. An ignorant believes that *ātmā* can do activity of body; this modification of *jīva* is seeing associations. *pudgala* is the base of modification of body and not *jīva*. But he does not see this, so he is *paryāya mūḍha* (perplexed by modification), and he does not attain *dharma*. *guna-paryāya* (attribute-modification) are of two types.1) *svabhāva-paryāya* 2) *vibhāva-paryāya*.

3. *svabhāva paryāya*- In all *dravyas*, due to their own *agurulaghu guṇa*, every *samaya*, multiplicity of *ṣaṣṭhāna patita hāni vṛddhi* (six places ascension due to its nature of degeneration-regeneration) occurs. This is modification of *svabhāva* (true nature of self). Infinite times increase, innumerable times increase, numerous times

increase, infinite parts increase, innumerable parts increase, numerous parts increase - in these six ways, there is an increase. Then infinite times decrease, innumerable times decrease, numerous times decrease, infinite parts decrease, innumerable parts decrease, numerous parts decrease in these six ways there is decrease. In total, there are twelve types of degeneration and regeneration.

Due to *agurulaghu guṇa* (that attribute due to which one substance does not turn into another, one attribute does not turn into another, the infinite attributes in a substance do not disintegrate or separate), subtle changes in the form of multiple times decrease-increase occurs in the modification of all *jīvas*, be it *saṃsārī* (mundane beings) or *siddha* (liberated *ātmā*) and it occurs in all *dravyas* (substances). This is a very precise and subtle concept, and it is *āgama gamya* (perceptible through scriptures).

2. *vibhāva paryāya*- Due to its own self, there is an increase and decrease in the state of its *guṇas* (attributes), like *jñāna*, *darśana*, *vīrya*, etc., in *ātmā*. In that, non-self substance is *nimitta*. *jñāna* increases in a moment and decreases in the next, perturbation also increases and falls every moment. In this way, increase-decrease keeps occurring. Purity reduces and grows in a moment, in modification. So, there is a distinction between earlier and later states. Due to this, multipleness arises in *svabhāva viśeṣa* (particularity of nature), and that is *vibhāva paryāya*.

svabhāva viśeṣa, mentioned earlier, means - that it is doer of self, and it occurs in self, so it is called svabhāva. This *vibhāva paryāya* (unnatural modification) occurs in *saṃsārī jīvas*. Decrease and increase in states of attribute, as *vikārī* or *avikārī* (perturbed-unperturbed) is *vibhāva paryāya*. *jīva*, who believes this multipleness to be due to non-self or due to *karma* and believes his nature to be only as much as the part of *paryāya*, is a *paryāya mūḍha* (perplexed by modification) because multipleness, which arises, does so on the basis of its own eternal attribute and lower state occurs, due to his own ability to be stuck. He who does not believe this concept and believes that this arises due to non-self, does not attain *dharma*.

In this way, multipleness of black-red, sour-sweet, sticky-dry, etc., which arises in modification of *pudgala*, is its *vibhāva paryāya*. Ignorant believes multipleness of modification to be due to outer associations or due to *jīva*. He believes that the yellow state of mango has arisen due to grass, or *jīva* has taken care to ripen it. But base of this multipleness is its own touch, taste, smell and colour. He does not believe that manifestation of modification is based on these attributes, so he is *paryāya mūḍha*, and *dharma* will not arise in him.

jīva, who knows his own *paryāya* as well as *paryāya* of other substance and believes that it has arisen due to non-self but does not believe its base is its attributes, does not have true *jñāna* of *guṇātṃkā paryāya* (modification of one's own attributes), and he will not attain *dharma*. Now, this concept will be affirmed further through examples.

1. Qualities of touch, taste, colour, etc., are eternal in a cloth, and state of being like old-new, black-white, etc., states arising by its flow are distinctive. If these are seen as secondary, then cloth is made from that which is *sāmānya* (common/present at all times). Similarly, in *ātmā*, eternal attributes like *jñāna*, *darśana*, *cāritra* are *viśeṣa*(distinctive) attributes. And that which arises, continuously like a flow, one after another, be it *vikārī* (impure) or *avikārī* (pure) states, are *viśeṣa*. If these are not taken into focus, then that which exists is what *ātmadravya* is made up of and that is *sāmānya* (common-ness).
2. For example- Cloth is made of its attributes and modifications. They are not separate from its attributes of touch, etc., so cloth is *guṇātmaka* (qualitative), meaning qualities of cloth are in cloth. In this way, *ātmā* is not separate from its attributes of *jñāna*, *darśana*, *cāritra*, etc. So, the nature of *ātmā* is its attribute only.
3. The way cloth is made of the same type of thread, and if it is stitched into a garment, then that is *samāna jāṭīya dravya paryāya*(homogeneous type of substance-modification). Similarly, *skandha*, which is made with two or more *parmāṇus* (smallest unit of matter) of *pudgala*(matter), are *samāna-jāṭīya-dravya-paryāya*; other *skandhas* of *pudgala* should be understood similarly.
4. The way threads of cloth made of silk and cotton being of separate types are *asamāna-jāṭīya-dravya-paryāya*. (heterogenous types of substance-modification). Similarly, *jīva-pudgalātmaka* (forms of sentient and non-sentient) form of *devas* and humans, are *asamāna jāṭīya dravya paryāya* because *jīva* is a sentient substance and body is an insentient matter substance.

Whether it is *samāna-jāṭīya-dravya-paryāya* or *asamāna-jāṭīya-dravya-paryāya*, every modification manifests based on its own substance. Even then, ignorant *jīva* believes that it is due to his presence that modification of *pudgala* occurs or that body moves due to his presence, but he is unaware that the base of modification is substance. That is why he is a *paryāya mūḍha*, and *dharma* does not arise in him.

5. Due to its *sthūla* (gross) *aguru-laghuguṇa*, various states arise in a cloth which is varied, and that is *guṇātmaka* (qualitative) *svabhāva* (nature) *paryāya* (modification). Similarly, in all substances, due to its own *sūkṣma* (subtle/imperceptible) *agurulaghu guṇa*, the multiple times increase and decrease of states of attributes in every *samaya* takes place, and that multipleness is *guṇātmaka svabhāva paryāya*. This is a *sūkṣma* (subtle) concept.
6. Distinction is seen in when due to its present capability and *nimitta*, cloth turns blue or yellow. It smells good-bad, becomes dirty, etc., and in that, hand or something else is *nimitta*. Similarly, in *ātmā*, increase-decrease of *jñāna*, *darśana*, *vīrya*, etc., and in *pudgalas*, distinction is seen due to change in touch, taste, smell, etc. This multipleness is *guṇātmaka* (attributive) *vibhāva* (impure) *paryāya* (modification).

Here, the term *svabhāva viśeṣo rūpa pravartī* has been used. This does not mean that decrease and increase in its state is due to *karma* or non-self substance, but it means that it occurs due to the ability of its own modification, and at that time, non-self substance is *nimitta*. Understanding of *sva-para* (self/non-self) has been given here. In *vibhāva* (impurity), there is a presence of *nimitta* or *para* (non-self).

vyñjana paryāya (modification related to shape of substance) of every substance or *artha paryāya* (all modifications except those related to shape) modify into decreasing or increasing states because of itself. But it is not that some other substances can change it. If it is believed that modification is based on its substance and its eternal *śaktis* (efficacies), then nature of substance-attribute-modification has been understood correctly.

In *dravyātmāka* (substantiative) *paryāya*, *pradeśatva guṇa* (attribute due to which substance is sure to have any shape), and undivided modification of all other attributes of substance are covered. In *guṇātmāka paryāya* (qualitative modification), state of every attribute, one by one, as separate attributes, has been explained. In reality, in *darvya paryāya*, nothing is left out. And by saying *guṇa-paryāya*, mass of *vyñjana paryāya* and mass of *artha paryāya* are inseparable, that is *darvya paryāya*. In *darvya paryāya*, explanation is from the view of *abheda* (inseparable) and in *guṇa-paryāya*, explanation is from the perspective of *bheda*(separate).

In reality, *sarvajña* (omniscient) *Bhagvāna* has explained the nature of state of all substance-attribute-modification of all substances, in this way. It is complete and transcendental. Every modification manifests on the base of its own substance and attribute but does not arise on the base of any other. There is no other system besides this. If ignorant *jīva* says in any other manner, then that is not the teaching of *sarvajña*, and it should be understood as words of *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*. Many *jīvas* see merely manifested state; due to their belief being contrary to the true nature of substance, *darśana moha* arises; so *jīvas* are *para samaya* or *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*.

Ignorant does not believe in his own eternal nature and efficacies. He believes himself to be only as much as the shape, infinitesimal part or *rāga*, which arises in modification of *matijñāna* (sensory knowledge) or *śrutajñāna* (scriptural knowledge) and as the manifested shape of human, etc. He believes himself to be as much as the shape, part or impurity. The focus of that *jīva* is not on self, but on non-self. His focus is on *rāga*, which has arisen, and he believes it to be due to *karma*. and Shape that has manifested to be due to body or due to *nāma karma* (*karma* which gives form etc., to body); his focus is entirely on non-self. It may be any modification - *vyñjana* or *artha paryāya*, pure or impure - all modifications that arise in self are due to its own self. But not due to non-self.

Focus of ignorant goes towards the increasing-decreasing state, and he believes the cause of this decrease-increase of state to be due to non-self substance, so his focus is always on that. But decrease-increase of state is related to its own substance-attribute, but his *jñāna* does not know this.

Modification of every *paramāṇu* is due to its own self. Despite this, ignorant believes that because associations were present, so states of *paramāṇu* of the opposite substance have occurred. But he does not think about whose is this state of *paramāṇu*. He does not accept *aṅśī* (whole), which is the base of *aṅśa* (small part) and accepts only *aṅśa*, and he believes *aṅśa* is due to non-self. His focus is only on present and on *bheda* (distinction). He sees the body but does not see self.

One who sees only his own modification does not see his own substance-attribute. One who sees only modification of non-self does not see substance-attribute of non-self. *jīva*, who believes that modification of non-self is due to him and modification of self is due to non-self substance, is a *pariyāya mūḍha, ajñānī*. Through all three *kālas* (time phases), there are many ignorant *jīvas* and very few *jñānis*.

Question: Modification is of self, and one who accepts modification is called *mūḍha* (foolish), so it would seem that modification is not believed in. According to this belief, substance alone is *kūṭastha* (unchanging), hence this does not seem to be true. Why have those who believe in their own modification been called *para samaya*?

Answer: Listen! modification exists, this should be believed, and it is not being said that substance is always *kūṭastha* (unchanging), but it has been said that modification rises from its own substance and attribute. *jīva* who believes that modification arises on the basis of non-self, or believes entire substance to be as much as only the modification, who does not see substance-attribute, from which modification arises, and sees only an *aṅśa* (part), that *jīva* is *para samaya* or *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*, because he believes that existence of the present modification is due to non-self. The focus of this *jīva* is towards non-self and not towards self. A person standing on the edge of a lake sees waves that are at the shore but does not believe in the lake from where waves are coming and immersing into, does not believe in the lake, and does not have real knowledge of the entire lake. Similarly, modification does arise in *ātmā* and goes as well, but without believing in the substance attribute which is the base from which modifications arise and goes, one who believes only in the modification, is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*. He does not see either self or non-self substance.

Ignorant, on seeing modification of negative attributes, have hatred and on seeing modification of *kevala jñāna* of *Kevalī Bhagvāna*, has attachment; this *jīva* a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* despite having *bhakti* of *Bhagvāna*, as his focus is on only on modification. This ignorant *jīva* believes that if *karmas* move away then modification of *kevala jñāna* manifests, or that it has manifested due to auspicious attachment, or that it has arisen from a part of *śrūta jñāna* (scriptural knowledge), but this is partial focus. However, the base of *kevala jñāna* is neither absence of *karmas*, or auspicious attachment nor the earlier modification. But *ātmā*, which is *aṅśī* (that of which *aṅśa* is part), is the storehouse of *jñāna* and is, by nature, its own powerful, eternal substance. From that, modification of *kevala jñāna* flows every *samaya*, but ignorant do not believe this.

jñānī does not believe that because *Bhagavāna* exists, so attachment has arisen, or someone else has abused him, so he is angry, or that because auspicious attachment has arisen, so *jñāna* has manifested. Whatever be the modification, whether of *jñāna*, attachment or aversion, the base of modification is its self-substance and attribute, and it is not non-self substance. He who believes that by being in *cāritra guṇa*, *rāga-dveṣa* arise due to one's own weakness, his focus goes on self substance, then focus on substance or modification of non-self stops. He who believes that modification of non-self is due to the base of its own self is a *darvya drṣṭi*. This way, on seeing the self substance, which is a storehouse of peace and *jñāna*, residual *rāga-dveṣa* weakens, and through exceptional *puruṣārtha* (effort), he stabilizes in his own pure substance to attain *vītarāgatā* (passionless state) and *kevala jñāna*.

All substances, by nature, are substance-attribute-modification. This has been indicated in the discourse of *Jineñdra Bhagavāna*, and this nature of substance-attribute-modification of all substances is their true form. In all three *kālas* (time phases), *jñānīs* have said this only.

jīva who does not know substance and attribute and sees only modification, that *jīva* is an *ajñānī*. *ajñānī* believes that *samyaktva* arises due to *deva-guru-śāstra*, that on seeing the idol of God, *śubha bhāva* (auspicious thoughts) arise, shape of *ātmā* is due to *nāma karma* (*karma nimitta* in shape, etc., of body) and that modification of non-self is because of presence of self. But modification arises on the base of substance and attribute. On deciding that if self is stuck in non-self, attachment arises, he becomes the knower of *rāga*, and *darvya drṣṭi* (focus on self substance) occurs.

Ignorant *jīva* believes *jñāna* occurs from non-self or from auspicious attachments. Modification of *nimitta* is due to its own substance and attribute, it cannot work on any other substance. *jñāna* arises in modification of *jñāna guṇa*, but that modification does not arise due to *nimitta*. *śubha rāga* (auspicious attachment) is *vikārī* (distorted/perturbed) modification of *cāritra guṇa* (attribute of conduct) and occurrence of *jñāna*, is modification of *jñāna*. From modification of one attribute, modification of another attribute cannot arise. Ignorant believes that *kṣāyika samyaktva* (experience of self which never falls) arises due to *Kevalī Bhagvāna*, that action of hand at the time of *pūja* is due to himself, auspicious attachment is due to the idol, and because of auspicious attachment *jñāna* arose. Further attachment to business is the reason for getting money, another *jīva* has held a sword in his hand, so he is angry etc., but all such thoughts, beliefs and words are of an ignorant. He does not believe that every modification is due to the auspice of its own substance-attribute. If attachment is required for one's own *jñāna* and *dharma*, then dependency will continue. For modification of one's own *dharma* he will have to look at attachments, and for attachment, he will have to look at *nimitta*. If this were so, then *jīva* would never be able to separate himself from non-self and focus towards self. *vastu*(substance) is one

and attributes are many; They cannot be one. States (modifications) manifest one after another every *samaya*. So *jīva* should focus on substance and attributes that are in the form of efficacy and not on modifications.

Question: Even *abhavyas* (those who will never attain *mokṣa*) have substance and attributes, isn't it? Then why do they not attain *dharma*?

Answer: Without *jñāna* of one's own *pāriṇāmika svabhāva* (that which is constant, not connected to changes in *karma*), even with the presence of substance-attribute, work cannot be accomplished. There is a mine of gold under the Sumeru Mountain. But what is its use? Similarly, *ajñānī jīva* focuses on attachment and *nimitta* but does not focus on the un-manifested eternal *dravya*, which is the storehouse of efficacy and is filled with joy and peace, so what is its use? In the same way, there may be a high manifestation of knowing of outer knowledge, but if *jīva* does not accept the mass of *jñāna* which is present within, then even if though nature of that *jīva* may be the unchanging constant, it is of no use to him. His work remains unaccomplished. That *jīva* is *paryāya mūḍha*, and he does not attain *dharma*. He believes only in modification. On the outside, he may be a Jain, but in his belief, he is a *boudha mati* (believer of Buddhist principles).

jīva with *bheda jñāna* (knowledge of distinction) know the truth that attachment which arises, does not occur due to non-self but occurs due to one's own weakness. Further modification of one attribute does not arise from modification of another attribute. In this way, he practises correct *bheda jñāna* (knowledge of distinction) between his own substance-attribute-modification and non-self *nimitta*, etc. Various states arise in other *jīvas*, in *Kevalī Bhagvāna*, in seekers, in ignorant *jīvas*, even in *parmāṇus*, state of dryness, stickiness, heaviness-lightness, etc., arises. They are dependent on their respective substance and attributes. *vyñjanaparyāya* of non-self, i.e., the one related to shape and those related to other states, arise due to their own substance-attribute, and not due to substance-attribute of any other substance. In this way, *samyagjñānī* has correct *jñāna* of substance-attribute-modification, whereas *mithyādrṣṭi* does not have appropriate knowledge of self, and neither of non-self nor of substance-attribute-modification of *pudgala* (matter substance). All his *jñāna* is *mithyā* (erroneous).

To believe that in the mundane state *vicitratā* (variegation) of attachment and *pāpa* (sins) has arisen due to *karma* is a delusion. But *jñānī* believes that he is a mass of substance and attribute. *vikāra* (perturbation) has arisen by getting stuck in non-self due to his own weakness. So, by taking auspice of pure nature of self, he attains *samyag darśana* and *samyag jñāna*, and on becoming complete, he attains *kevala jñāna*. This is the only *dharma* and path to *mokṣa*.

Is *karma* the reason for attachment in a seeker? No.

Does *mithyādrṣṭi* transmigrate due to *karma*? No.

Is it due to *karma* that *jīva* is in *nigoda* since eternity? No.

Is it due to *aghāti karmas* that modifications of attributes of *yoga*, etc., of *Kevalī Bhagvāna*, are incomplete? No!

Due to one's own ability, modification of every *jīva* modifies as incomplete or opposite. Some *jīva* may have acquired bondage of *naraka*. But it is the thought of ignorance to believe that at the time of death, he had inauspicious thoughts, so, he went to *naraka*. No modification arises from *nimitta*. It's not that earlier modifications had this *saṅskāra* so it occurred. Further, it is also not the case that because modification of one attribute has arisen, so, modification of other attributes manifests. And neither is it that inauspicious attachments occurred because there was bondage of *karma* to going to *naraka*.

It is not that because *Śrenika Raja* had bondage of *karma* to become a *Tirthankara* in the future, so he will be a future *Tirthankara*, neither is it that he will attain liberation because of it. If this type of appropriate *jñāna* is attained, then focus will move away from *karma*, non-self substances, *nimitta*, earlier modification, and modifications arise in future.

Since eternity *jñānī* have been explaining the pure nature of *ātmā*. But (*ajñānī*) does not leave focus of *nimitta* and modification. The way parents tell their son-‘Listen! Whatever you wanted, we have given, now be quiet!’ Similarly, *kevala jñānī* father is telling the ignorant that “O *jīva!* you have been explained and given knowledge of nature of substance in every way, from all sides and in the correct form. Now on today's auspicious day, forsake dependent views, be calm, and savour in pure nature of self to become happy.

Now in this *gāthā*, which is connected to the explanation of earlier *gāthā*, the decision of system of self substance and non-self substance is made, and then *upsaṅhāra* (epilogue) is presented. *jīva*, who is engrossed in modification, has been called *para-samaya*, and *jīva*, who is stationed in pure nature of *ātmā*, is known as *sva-samaya*.

Question: Modification is of self, then why are those who believe in modification called *para samaya (mithyādr̥ṣṭi)*?

Answer: Ignorant *jīva* believes that *kṣāyika bhāva* (state of annihilation of *karma*) arises from *kṣayop̥śama bhāva* (annihilation cum subsidence of *karma*); that *jīva* believes arising of modification from another modification, and modification of one attribute, to come from modification of another attribute. But actually, be it modification of *jñāna* or *cāritra* or any other modification, it arises on the base of its own substance-attribute-modification. He who does not accept this is a believer of modifications and is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*.

Question: In *śloka* 6, of *Pravacansāra*, it is said that attainment of *kevala jñāna* is with focus on *praśama*(peace). Has this not been said?

Answer: Listen! modification of *kevala jñāna* arises on the basis of its own substance and *jñāna* attribute, but does not arise from *praśama* (peace). *praśama* means *kevala jñāna* arises after manifestation of *vītarāgatā* (passionless-ness), but base of *kevala*

jñāna is not modification of *cāritra guṇa*. Their *nimitta-naimitika* (cause-effect) relation has been shown, but that does not mean that one modification is dependent on another. *vītarāgatā* is on the base of one's own *cārita guṇa*, and *kevala jñāna* manifests on the base of its own *jñāna guṇa*. *cāritraguṇa* and *jñānaguṇa* are on the base of *ātmā* or from the viewpoint of *abheda* (undivided), every modification manifests on the base of its own substance.

jīva, who understands correctly, becomes *sva-samaya* and attains *dharma*. Some *jīva* understand the meaning of words in this *gāthā* in a different way - that *para-samaya* is *anyamati* (of some other faith) and *sva-samaya* (self *ātmā*) is *Jain mati* (according to one's own belief). But this is his mistake, as Jain is not a sect. *jīva*, who is blinded only by modification and believes that rising of modification is from non-self or from earlier modification, but does not accept that substance-attribute which is the base of modification, despite being in the Jain sect, is *para samaya* (non-self). *jīva*, who correctly believes that modification of self is on the base of its own substance-attribute, and is not from non-self, is *sva-samaya* (self *ātmā*).

In the section of *jñeya*, the first and second *gāthā* have formed a strong base. Then walls and roof have been made in such a way that the building will surely be strong, meaning *jīva* who understands the secret of first and second *gāthās*, and puts pillars (support) in the form of *samyag darśana-jñāna*, for him the palace of *kevala jñāna* will surely be ready.

pravacana on tikā of gāthā 94

He who takes shelter of *jīva pudgalātmaka*-(sentient/ physical matter) *asamāna-jātīya-dravya-paryāya* (heterogeneous types of substance-modification), which is *pudgalātmaka* (physical matter) is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*. *jīva*, who believes only in modification, believes body to be his own. Body is *asamāna-jātīya-dravya-paryāya*. Even then, *ajñānī* believes its activity is due to *jīva*. *jīva*, who accepts only modification, has attachments on seeing *skāndhas* (conglomeration of *parmāṇus*). Ignorant believes that attachment arises on seeing *laḍḍūs* (Indian sweet) or that attachment arose because he saw the body of a woman.

He does not see that even in *skāndhas* (matter) which are *samāna jātīya* (of the same type), modification of every *parmāṇu* (smallest particle of matter) is on the basis of its own substance and attribute, and modification of *rāga*(attachment) is on the base of self. He sees only associations but does not see his pure nature.

Further, in *asamāna-jātīya-dravya-paryāya*, modification of both substances, *ātmā* as well as body, are separate, and they are dependent on their own substance. Despite this being so, ignorant believes that because he has a body, *dharma* arose, and body could walk because *ātmā* was present.

If *jīva* attains right belief and believes that every modification is on the basis of its own substance-attribute, does not believe non-self substance to be the reason for attachment, turns to see self, with focus on pure self, and remains merely the knower of attachment, then *samyag jñāna* and *dharma* arise, and he becomes *vītarāga* and manifests *kevala jñāna*.

This is the section on *jñeya*. It is called the section on *darśana viśuddhi*. This section is for attaining *kevala jñāna* or for increasing purity after attaining *samyag darśana*. *kevala jñāna* is definitely a new morning/ new beginning. Support of *jñāna* is *ātmā*, but on deciding that non-self substances or attachment is not its base, there is an absence of *rāga* and complete state in the form of *kevala jñāna* manifests. New morning which arises with focus on pure nature of self, stays from now till eternity; this is said to be a new year.

In the second *gāthā* of *Samayasāra*, definition of *sva-samaya* is given in the first line and of *para-samaya* in the second line. Here in *Pravacansāra*, in this section on *jñeya*, in the second *gāthā*, explanation of *para-samaya* is given in the first line and *sva samaya* has been explained in the second line because here, increasing purity after attaining *samyag darśana*, and manifestation of *kevala jñāna* is proved. Characteristics of the ignorant since eternity have been told, meaning *para-samaya*, and then *sva-samaya* has been explained. *ātmā* and body which is physical karmic matter are *asamāna jātiyā*. It has been explained in the first line believing them to be one is why the ignorant of eternity does not turn towards *ātmā*. After that, in the second line, *sva samaya* (self *ātmā*) is explained.

Substance *ātmā* is filled with its own pure nature; such knowledge, belief and engrossment occur only from the substance. He who does not have this inner focus of *ātmā*, and is interested in body and *punya*. Body is *asamāna-jātiya*, but he believes it to be his own. This is the root of ignorance. In the first *gāthā*, it has been said that this *jīva* is *paryāya mūḍha* (perplexed by modification).

ātmā is a substance and a mass of eternal efficacies. It is a mass of *viśāra-viśeṣa-jñāna-darśana* and *āyata-viśeṣa* meaning modification. The state of *darśana-jñāna*, etc., comes from substance-attribute. *jīva* who does not take auspices of such a nature and takes auspices of *asamāna-jātiya* substance-modification, is an *ajñānī* (ignorant). It is the very root of all *avidyā* (ignorance).

To believe in the pure nature in which *vastu* (substance) is eternal, efficacies are infinite, and modification arises from substance every *samaya* is the reason for *kevala jñāna*. With auspices of substance, the *samyak* (true) modification of belief, knowledge, and conduct is *ātma vyavahāra* (activity appropriate for *ātmā*). To say that with this *ātma vyavahāra* (*samyak-darśana-jñāna-cāritra*) *kevala jñāna* manifests, is also *vyavahāra* (conventionality), because modification arises from substance-attribute, but one modification does not arise from another modification.

Ignorant *jīva* does not respect this pure nature of *ātmā*; he takes auspices of body, *nimitta* or *asamāna-jātiya-dravya-paryāya*. But he does not take auspices of his own

substance and attribute. He believes himself to be only as much as *punya* and *pāpa* (virtue and vice). Hence, he is impotent in experiencing pure *ātmā*. To take auspices of the insentient, which is the conventional activity of humans, and its fruit is *nigoda*.

jīva who believes his modification to be with auspices of substance-attribute and does not accept any part of *punya-pāpa*, or of modification, or non-self *nimitta*, attains the true activity of *ātmā*. Because the reason of *niścaya* (absolute truth) is substance itself.

sādhaka (seeker) may have *vikalpa* (psychic thought activity) but his focus is not on them, his focus is on substance-attribute. He has *śraddhā* (belief) of the eternal undivided whole. From where does the state of *mokṣa* and new morning in the form of *kevala jñāna* flow? They are experiencing *kevala darśana* and *kevala jñāna* with auspices of substance-attribute. They do not experience modification from another modification. Modification of *siddha* also comes from his own substance-attribute.

ātmā-vyavahāra (activity appropriate for *ātmā*) is belief-knowledge and engrossment in the substance as independent, attribute as independent, and modification as independent, and this is the absolute *mokṣa mārga*. *jīvas* who do not listen or think about it believe body-mind-speech to be their own and put effort into it.

Even *śāstras* talk about *nimitta*, that *dharma* cannot arise without *śubha bhāva* (auspicious thought). Ignorant, with focus on associations, does not understand its true meaning and put his effort towards unnatural *bhāva* (psychic activity), which is dependent on *nimitta*, are opposite of self, and that's his preparations for going to *nigoda*.

Ignorant *jīva* looks for *nimitta*, and *jñānī* looks for substance-attribute. He who wants to manifest a new morning in the form of *kevala jñāna*, must have belief in the eternal substance. *rāga-dveṣa* (attachment-aversion) arise in his own modifications, but they arise when *jīva* is stuck on non-self. That is why *rāga* has not been called *vyavahāra*, but pure/unblemished modification, which arises with auspices of pure nature of self, has been called *vyavahāra*. *jīva* attains true belief-knowledge, manifests the state of *siddha* with true power, and actively pursues with great effort, is *purṣottama* (best among all men). *jīva*, who uses his effort for non-self, is impotent and will go to *nigoda*; because that *jīva* is disregarding *ātmā*, and with that, he is dishonouring infinite *jñānīs*. He uses his effort towards wrong beliefs.

Some may question why did *Ācārya* use such strong words here?

Here only two points have been told. He who is blinded by modification is *para samaya*, and who is engrossed in substance-attribute is *sva samaya*. Only these two points have been explained. He who is engrossed in modification is *para samaya*, and he who is engrossed in substance and attribute is *sva samaya*. For accomplishment of *kevala jñāna*, *Ācārya Bhagavāna* has written this chapter of *jñeya* (object of knowing).

Ācārya Bhagavāna says-‘Wake up! understand the essence of these words. Words do not know that these meanings are filled in them. Auspicious attachment, which arises with focus of words, also does not have the knowledge that ‘I am *rāga*, and I will make others attain *dharma*’. Modification does not have the strength to give rise to another modification. So, removing focus from speech, auspicious attachment and earlier modification, and by understanding the correct *bhāva*, belief and focus on eternal nature should be done. Incomplete modifications of *jñāna*, *darśana*, etc., in *ātmā*, shows evidently, but *ātmā* is not only as much as the extent of current ability to know. Present modification of *ātmā* does not arise from earlier modification. Modification comes from *Mānasarovara* (holy lake) of *jñāna*, *darśana* within, which is completely filled to the brim. An eight-year-old boy/girl can also do this and attain *dharma*. A child of eight years also can attain *kevala jñāna*.

Focus of *ajñānī* is on non-self substances, *nimitta* and on an infinitesimal part. His focus is on the outside. He puts all his strength into that, but he does not have faith that modification comes from the eternal substance- attribute, hence he is impotent.

Complete pungent taste of lindi-piper (piper longum) comes from its own self. One percent, or even incomplete ninety–nine percent, does not come from the stone, but in the belief of ignorant, this is not acceptable. True pure nature of *ātmā* is the root of all knowledge, and ignorance of pure *ātmā*, as mentioned above, is the root of all ignorance.

The ignorant is unaware as to from where do state of *śraddhā*, *jñāna*, *vīrya*, etc., which arises every day, comes from. He sees associations and *nimitta*. From the wave of water which has gone, a new wave will not arise; similarly, from earlier modification, present modification does not arise. *jñānī* sees the body of water, and that is *jñāna*.

Meaning of *maṅgala* - *maṅga+la = maṅgala*; *maṅga = purity*; *la = bringing or brought*, makes one get, that is *maṅgala*. Or the other meaning is *mam+gala = maṅgala*; *mam=body*, *punya*, one which removes arrogance of *kṣayopkṣama*, + *galayati = removes it*. That is real *maṅgala*.

Siddha Bhagavāna is present and *āsarīrī* (without physical body). He does not have association of *punya*. No *deva-guru-śāstra* are there, even physical body is not there. Earlier modification has been destroyed, even then complete state of *jñāna-darśana-vīrya* keeps manifesting to Him. Modification arises from His own substance. From mundane to *siddha*, base of modification is substance. But *ajñānī jīvas*, who put all their strength in non-self, do not get free from worldly substances. One whose strength is stuck in managing non-self has been called an impotent.

A foolish person in the world is called a donkey. If he does not like it, then he must remove his donkey-like mentality. Here *Ācārya Bhagavāna* has said impotent. But he has no hatred towards anyone; his underlying meaning is that one must not put his

strength in the opposite direction. *jīva*, who gets stuck in non-self and in a small part, may or may not be called impotent, but he will become impotent and go to *nigoda*. Ignorant of the world may make fun of *jīva* who has belief of substance. Even then, he will attain *dharma* and the state of *siddha*.

behada (extreme focus) of *ekānta* (singularity) rises in an ignorant. Here meaning of *behada* (without an end) is the eternal nature which is filled with unending happiness and joy, but he does not know this, or his contrary efforts are stuck on non-self and *añśa*. He attaches himself and sees himself as one, with one *nimitta* to another, one *śubha bhāva* to another. In this way, his unchecked focus is on many *nimittas*.

dharma arises only with auspices of self substance. To believe that *dharma* will not arise from *nimitta*, *punya* or earlier modification is *anekānta*. But it is *ekānta dṛṣṭi* (focus of singularity) to believe that it is beneficial if *nimitta* is present, *dharma* will arise if *punya* is present, or that if earlier *saṅskāra* are present, then it will be beneficial. Belief in *mithyātva* is thrown up from *ekānta*. Modification which turns to *dharma* by having belief in the knower, meaning the *dharmi*, is called *sahaja* (natural). But it is said that *mithyātvabhāva*, which arises with belief in non-self and association, is thrown up; because *mithyātva* does not arise from pure nature. It is not a modification of pure nature. It is a modification which has arisen with focus of one *samaya*, on non-self. There is no springing forth in substance. *vastu* (substance) is *sahaja* (natural/pure). So, it is said that the focus of *ekānta* springs forth.

Kuṇḍakuṇḍa Ācārya Bhagavāna heard the *māṅglika* (supremely auspicious) *divyadhvani* (om sound of *Bhagavāna*) of *Sīmaṇḍhara Bhagavāna* (*Tīrthaṅkara* physically present in *Mahāvideha*) and wrote this *Pravacansāra*. On this supremely auspicious new morning of this new year, *jīva* who will understand the preachings written in it, and will have belief of his own unrestricted *jñāna*, nature of happiness, will attain *samyaktva* (experience of pure self) and on attaining higher equanimity, will manifest *vītarāgatā* (passionless-ness) and *kevala jñāna*.

In *gāthā* 93, it was said that substance is in the form of substance, and substance is a mass of substance-attribute-modification. Its attributes of *darśana*, *jñāna*, *cāritra*, etc., are in form of *vistāra* (spread throughout, horizontally) and modify together; and modifications are *āyata viśeṣa* or vertical form. They occur one after another. From substance-attribute, substance-modification, and attribute-modification arises. It is incorrect to say that if *nimitta* or non-self substance is present then modification arises. Modification of *dharma* or *mithyātva*, arises from substance-attribute and not from non-self.

jīva, who does not understand this, his focus goes on non-self substance, but due to interest in non-self, interest of self does not arise.

Modification arises from its own substance-attribute. *jīva* who does not believe so, believes in ownership of *samāna jātīya skandha* (matter of the same kind) and *asamāna jātīya*

(not of the same kind) substance-modification, and manifests *mithyātva*. In the context to self *jīva*, other *ātmās* are also *asamāna jāṭīya* substance. Ignorant has the delusion that if sense of hearing is present, then *śāstra* can be heard and then *jñāna* will arise. This is the root of all lack of knowing. Modification of *kevala jñāna* does not come from any of the *mati, śruta, avadhi* or *manah: paryaya jñāna*, neither does it come from modification of *punya, nimitta* like *sahanana* (body type), etc. But focus of ignorant is on associations. Ignorant does not believe that bangle, ring, etc., jewellery of gold is not made by hand, by hammer or from earlier shapes, but it comes from gold; this is the root of lack of knowing. He, whose focus is on *nimitta*, does not look within. He gets attracted on seeing a woman, happiness is due to senses, *jñāna* arises due to *deva-guru*, belief arises due to *guru*, increase of knowledge is due to *śāstras*, hatred is due to enemy, desire to kill arises if there is a sword, if any *jīva* is unhappy, then thought of pity arises, if there is an idol then auspicious thoughts arise. In this way, manifests contrary knowledge, and gives prominence to associations.

If existing substance focuses on *sāmānya śakti* (general attributes), then modification arises from it, and even if its auspice is not taken, it comes from that. Ignorant believes that modification comes from non-self, but even modification of ignorant does not come from non-self, it comes from the substance.

jīva, who does not believe in the unending nature and believes that work is done due to *nimitta*, is dependent on *nimitta* through three *kālas* and three *lokas*. Therefore, it has been said that his unending focus is jumping. He puts strength in non-self, and his logic is also contrary. By insulting substance-attribute, new modifications of *mithyātva* keep jumping up. Attachment arises due to association. Pure nature will manifest due to associations. Ignorant manifests thoughts of ignorance, like other people laugh at him; therefore, he too is laughing, if another criticizes, he is angry, and if someone is praising him, then attachment arises, or attachment arose on seeing *Bhagavāna* or *jñāna* arises due to words, and he applies all his effort in the being of non-self.

In the third part of *gāthā* 93, the words “*tehiṃ puṇo pajjāyā*”, has a very deep principle in it. Believing that support of all modifications is its own substance and attribute brings immense peace; instead of this, ignorant *jīva* uses his unending *vīrya*(power) in an opposing manner, with *anañtānubandhī rāga dveṣa*, and by believing that modification arises due to non-self. That is why he is not happy.

Believer of, ‘self is, because *jñeya* (knowable) is there’, and modifications are there because senses are there, believes he is only a *manuṣya*. Ignorant believes that because he is present, words should come, if he has the capability of *jñāna*, then *nimitta* of *jñānī* will have to come, *jñāna* has bloomed by listening to words, if money is there then one can get free time for *satsamāgama* (divine discourses of guru) if a shop is there, then *rāga* will arise.

Question: Work is done in both *nimitta* and *upādāna* in one *samaya*, so time creates delusion. *jñāna* arises at the time that words are heard, isn't it? Is that why ignorant makes a mistake?

Answer: No. It is not true that they modify in one *samaya*, so he is making a mistake. In one *samaya*, all six substances are modifying. *svakāla* (self-time) of every substance is in that substance. Self-time of *upādāna* (substantial cause) cannot be the self-time of *nimitta* (conventional cause).

Focus of ignorant is on associations, which is why he makes mistakes. If he leaves the belief that because substance exists so self exists, then it creates the appropriate interest that self is the complete *sva-para prakāśaka* (illuminator of self, non-self) knower by nature and all else is *jñeyas* (object of knowing) then he will have a resolution and misbelief will be removed. On arising of true knowing of self, efficacy of illumination of non-self, which is within, blooms. In that arises the knowledge of how attachment and *nimitta* are.

This is the section of *jñeya* of *Pravacansāra*. In this, the true knowledge of substance-attribute and distorted or undistorted modification has been given.

Distortion does not occur due to non-self substance, but it occurs due to one's own fault. After having this knowledge, in *Samayasāra*, in the subject of *dr̥ṣṭi* (belief) it is said that *rāga* is not the eternal nature of self. *cāritra moha* (delusion of conduct) is the work of *karma*. But when is this? When correct knowing as told in *Pravacansāra* is done, that modification of *jñāna* does not arise from non-self *nimitta*, from auspicious attachment, or from earlier modification, but rises from substance-attribute. When this is accepted, then, complete comprehensive true knowledge that *ātmā* is a mass of substance-attribute-modification arises, and after having *pramāṇa jñāna*, these kinds of thoughts occur. In *Samayasāra*, to keep thoughts on the topic of *dr̥ṣṭi* (focus/belief), it has been said that *rāga* is not in the nature of self. Self is the one who has become at one with substance. Diverseness of thoughts is not self. There is no multipleness of thoughts in *jñāna*, and nature of *jñāna* is not due to thoughts/ psychic activity. In this way, teachings of both *śāstras* should be joined and understood the way they are correctly.

Ignorant creates oneness and ownership in non-self and believes that as self had attachment, so non-self substances had to come when hatred occurred, then enemy had to come, if ability to know was there then *Samayasāra śāstra* had to come, rail tracks came due to the train, when it is time for *roti* to be made, then pan and lady had to come, if words are there then attachment arises, because one's interest increased, so *deva-guru* had to come, because *lokāloka* is there so *jñāna* is there, because modification of *jñāna* occurs, so *lokāloka* is there, son was born so attachment of arranging for his life had to be done, and in this way, he wastes all his energy on associations. He uses his knowledge of associations, and throws up undiluted *ekānta dr̥ṣṭi*, due to which he cheats himself.

jñānī asks are you a living *jīva* or not? If the self is, then *rāga* and *jñāna* will arise. But *rāga* and *jñāna* is not present due to non-self. If it is believed that modification arises on the base of one's own substance-attribute, then *rāga* will be incapacitated, self becomes knower of *rāga*, and unblemished modification arises. Joy of sentience is unmoved, or it is not that someday it will shake. Unblemished modification arising from the base of self substance is *ātmavyavahāra* of self (the activity of *ātmā*).

Activity of body, mind, speech or of business trading is not *ātmavyavahāra* at all. But by getting stuck in non-self, thoughts of compassion, charity and *vyavahāra ratnatraya*, are also not *ātmavyavahāra*. However, unblemished pure modification of *samyag darśana-jñāna-cāritra* only is *ātmavyavahāra*, and that too is *vyavahāra*. This is because *niścaya* (absolute) is the generality of pure nature of *jñāna*. Manifestation of belief-knowledge and conduct of *ātmā* is bound to arise in him who has pulled his *vīrya* (strength) from non-self, turned it towards self and has interest of *ātmā*.

He who does not have belief in such a pure nature and has focus on associations has moved away from *ātma vyavahāra*. This does not mean that an ignorant had *ātmavyavahāra* earlier and then he fell from it. But falling from *ātmavyavahāra* means that *ātmavyavahāra* should arise on the basis/auspices of pure nature of self. But ignorant does not take auspices of pure self, which is why it has not manifested. *jīva* does *vyavahāra* (conventionality/actions) of being a human.

jīva, who believes himself to be dependent and insults his pure nature of substance, is insulting infinite *Siddhas, Arahāntas* and all *jñānīs*.

With auspices of pure nature of self, only joyousness of sentience should manifest. Thoughts of *vyavahāra ratnatraya* do not enter in the joyousness of sentience: to stress on this, it has been said that it is *vilāsamātra* (only joyousness).

With auspices of pure nature of self, *samyag darśana-jñāna-cāritra* blooms. In that, the nature of modification of *samyag jñāna* is with *sva-para prakāśaka* (illuminator self and non-self), due to which it knows *rāga* of non-self or *vyavahāra ratnatraya*. *vyavahāra ratnatraya* is not *ātmavyavahāra*, but if it accepts such a nature of *jñāna*, which is only *jñeya* (object of knowing) of modification of *jñāna*, then *ātma vyavahāra* manifests and *mokṣa* will arise. And if this is not accepted, then undissolved *ekānta dṛṣṭi* is any way arising since eternity, there is nothing new in it. Ignorant *jīva* has ownership of non-self and focuses on associations or is extremely possessive of all aspects of activities, *nimittas* and associations.

If due to *punya*, some worldly person of sixty years of age who is childless and has a wealth of twenty lakhs (two million) has a handsome son, then with he will raise the child with so much love and will speak endearing words that due to his son, his family tree has survived. Saying so, he hugs the son to his chest, or if his son earns millions and comes from abroad, then on meeting him, his father says that 'you have made the

family proud'. In this way the way he meets his son and loves him (this is merely an example because there is no peace or joy of *ātmā* in a son or in money). Similarly, an ignorant *jīva* claims ownership of all associations and *nimitta*, by saying that activity of non-living, like activity of *punya* should be done or that association of *deva-guru* was good for him, or that everything worked out fine because of *punya karma*, or *dharma* occurred because of life of a human and if there is *punya*, then *dharma* can occur. With this, he takes the auspices of *nimitta* and associations.

Here the word *samasta* (everything) has been used. It means that if *lokāloka* is there, then 'I' exists, and if 'I' exists, then *lokāloka* is there. Despite self being separate from infinite *jñeyas*, he believes that if *nimitta* is there, then it is good for self, that work in non-self is done because he is present. Believing this, he mixes non-self and self, and becomes possessive about it. This is his ignorance. Whoever has these thoughts of *mithyātva* (erroneous belief) is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*.

Leaving the belief that *jñāna* and *darśana* are pure nature of *ātmā*, ignorant believes that body and *punya* are his and they are his *kartavya* (duty). Body *karma*, etc., are *para jñeya* (non-self knowable), and *ātmā* is *svajñeya* (self knowable). Self is meant to be known as the form of self, and non-self is meant to be known as form of non-self. Mass of substance-attribute and modification, be it perturbed or non-perturbed, is *svajñeya*. When belief arises that perturbation in *svajñeya* is due to self, then self becomes the knower of *rāga*. Self *ātmā* is where growth of sentience is. On knowing this, *ātmavyavahāra* is manifested. But ignorant *jīva* knows *para jñeya*, which is the activity of body, mind, and speech, to be *svajñeya*, so *ātmavyavahāra* does not manifest.

Ignorant mixes the existence of all *jñeya* in the form of *sva jñeya* and does the *vyavahāra* (conventional activity) of a human, which brings transmigration of birth and death in 84lakh life forms. Substance-attribute-modification of self are *sva jñeya*, and from substance-attribute of self, every *samaya* modification flows out chronologically. Forgetting this, ignorant believes oneness in the activity of non-self and adopts these activities as his own. If non-self substance is agreeable, then he does *rāga*, and if it is disagreeable, then he does *dveṣa*. Not believing that modification of self comes from self, he believes that it comes from non-self, and by believing so, develops oneness with infinite *jñeyas*, and he himself does not remain in the form of *sva tattva* (self substance). *jīva* who believes *samayaktva* manifests from an idol is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*; because *samayaktva* comes from the auspices of self substance. On knowing this the self true *jñāna* arises due to efficacy of *sva-para prakāśaka*. With knowing the self, *para*-the idol is known. It is explained that before arising of *samayakta*, what kind of auspicious *rāga* was present and at that time, what kind of *nimitta* was present. But *samayaktva* did not arise due to the presence of *nimitta*.

Modification arises with focus on the knowing self. Then on arising of *jñāna* of self, the ability to know non-self blooms. As soon as *upaśama* (settling down) *kṣayopśama* (destruction cum subsidence of *karmas*) or *kṣaya* (annihilation) of *karma* occurs, it is

known just the way it is. But it does not mean that because *karma* have become mild, so *samyaktva* arose. It is understood that when knowledge of self arises for the first time, only *jñānī puruṣa* will be present as *nimitta*, mere words or *śāstra* cannot be *nimitta*.

Now what *samaya* has been explained.

bhagavāna ātmā is not mixed with non-self substance, and it is well established in its own substance-attribute and *vikārī* (perturbed) or *avikārī* (unperturbed) modification. Here, opposing modification of *śraddhā* is *mithyā darśana*, opposing modification of *jñāna* is *ajñāna*, opposing modification of *ānanda* is *dukha*, opposing modification of *svabhāva* is state of *vikāra*. That which is steady in its *vikārī* or *avikārī* modifications, and that has been called *svabhāva*. Here, ‘*svasya bhavanam svabhāva*’- has been said. To know the self nature, which is undivided from its own substance-attribute-modification and separate from non-self substances, be it infinite *siddhas*, *jīvas* of *nigoda*, *karmas*, etc., is the root of all knowledge.

One who is capable of respecting such a pure nature of *ātmā*- substance which is a *piṇḍa* (mass) of attributes-modifications and its modifications flow from it’s own substance-attribute, in other words, *jīva* who puts his effort only in pure nature, removes his strength away from modification. He, who believes *jñāna* and *rāga* to be from non-self, has focus of non-self. On deciding that *rāga* arises due to self, focus moves away from non-self and goes on the eternal nature and attributes of self. So, he becomes the knower of *rāga*. Modification of *samyagdarśana* is sure to manifest to him. In this way, *jīva*, who is interested in his own pure nature, steadies in his own pure self. His focus of *anekānta* (confluence of pluralism) blooms easily, and he destroys his entire grip on focus of *ekānta* (singularity).

It is said that in a state of ignorance, the view of *ekānta* rises, and here it is said that *drṣṭi* (focus)of *anekānta* has bloomed easily, because modification of pure nature of self is natural. That is why it is said to be *sahaja* (natural).

ātmā is in the form of *ātmā*, and is not in the form of other *jīvas* or non-living substances. *rāga* or *jñāna* arises from self, but *rāga* or *jñāna* does not arise from non-self substances. From such examples, *anekānta* in relation to non-self should be understood.

Now in self substance, *anekānta* should be understood as follows:-

Substance is a mass of infinite attributes, but one attribute is not the complete substance.

Substance is a mass of infinite modifications, but substance is not only one modification.

One attribute is by its own nature, but one attribute is not a complete substance.

One attribute is in the form of its own nature, but not is not the form of another attribute.

jñāna is in the form of *jñāna*, but not in the form of *darśana guṇa*-it should be understood this way for each and every attribute.

One attribute is in the form of itself, but it is not only as much as the present modification.

One modification is in the form of itself, but it is not the complete substance.

One modification is in the form of itself, but is not the form of a complete attribute.

Present modification of one attribute is by its own nature, but it is not the form of earlier modification of that attribute.

Present modification of one attribute is by its own nature, but it is not the form of future modification of that attribute.

Substance-attribute-modifications are in one *pradeśa* (space points), but they are different due to difference in characteristics.

In this way, the *sūkṣma* (subtle) view of *anekānta* blooms in substance-attribute modification. Substance-attribute-modification by nature is the complete substance, is *sva jñeya* and is one, and due to their separate characteristic within, they are *aneka* (not one/ many).

Substance and attribute are eternal, and modification is of only one *samaya*. Characteristic of substance is to possess infinite attributes. The characteristic of every attribute is different from each other. The way characteristic of *jñāna* is to know, characteristic of *sukha* is lack of perturbation, etc., and characteristic of modification is *utpāda-vyaya*(origination-annihilation). Nature of generality is not present in the whole *añśa* (part), and *añśa* (part)is not the complete nature. On attaining this true view of *anekānta*, the view of *ekānta* goes away. In the state of ignorance, he used to believe that *rāga* arises due to non-self and *jñāna* arises due to non-self, but that was *mithyā ekānta* (erroneous singular view) in non-self. He believed himself to be only as much as one modification, as much as *kṣayopśama* or *rāga*. That is *ekānta* in self substance. With attaining the correct view of self, obstinacy of view of *ekānta* goes away.

All obstinacies like, *deva-guru-śāstra* are present then his modification of *jñāna* arises, state of non-self substances is due to his presence, or if *samyaktva* arises, then *cāritra* should arise, if auspicious thoughts are done then *samyaktva* will arise, leave. Focus on *anekānta* arises because *darśana-jñāna-cāritra*, all three, have their own distinctive nature. It is the obstinacy of *ekānta*, to believe that as much one attribute has manifested, another attribute also should manifest that much. Now this obstinacy goes away because modification of *cāitra* comes from *cāritra* and does not come from *darśana* and *jñāna*.

Obstinacies of *ekānta*, that despite the blooming of knowledge of nine *pūrvas* (*śāstras*), why did *samyaktva* not arise? One *jīva* attained *kṣāyika samyaktva*, then why did his *cāritra* not manifest? Another *jīva* had *kṣayopśama samyaktva*, even then, how did *cāritra* manifest to him?-all these go away.

A *jñānī* does not have obstinacies like, his *vairāgaya* (passionless state) is because of his mild *kaṣāya* (passions), and so he must be having true belief, or that if *samayagdr̥ṣṭi jīva* has modification of war, then his *samyaktva* will go away or that *kṣāyika samyag dr̥ṣṭi* has only a certain type of *cāritra*.

He who has the view of *ekānta* with non-self substances and believes his *sva jñeya* (self-knowable) to be as much an *añśa*, has *ekānta dr̥ṣṭi*; when all those view of *ekānta* are destroyed, *dr̥ṣṭi* of *anekānta* blooms, in his own substance-attribute-modification and in relation to non-self.

Ownership and arrogance in *gati* (life form) of humans, *devas*, etc., and in their bodies, the belief that they are of self and are because of self, has gone away from a *jñānī*.

The way a candle which is taken in different rooms is still the same. It does not become like the room at all, and it does not do the work of non-self. In the same way, *ātmā* enters different bodies but remains the same. It never becomes the form of body and does not do the work of body- a *jñānī* knows this. Any other kind of candle will blow out, will requires oil, etc., or if it falls, it will be extinguished. But *ratnadīpa* (light of a jewel) does not require any other substance, and it does not get extinguished by wind, etc. Similarly, *ātma ratna* (*ātmā* which is like a jewel) does not require body, senses or other *jñeyas* for its light of *jñāna*. By knowing *svajñeya*, *para-jñeya* gets known by itself.

Here it is said that obstinacy in *gati*, etc., goes away. That is being explained further. The ability to become the form of human, etc., in one's own modification is *gati*. *gati* of body is absent in *ātmā*. *gati* is the modification of *ātmā*, in that *gati nāma karma* (*karma* which gives fruit of physical body) is merely a *nimitta*. *gati* of the body is *para-jñeya*, and to a *jñānī*, insistence in *gati* of body, or in *gati nāma karma*, goes away. But self is not as much as the part of *niścaya gati* (absolute life form), which is the ability to be so in its own modification. The insistence of the result of *gati* has been given up by *jñānī*. Because *pariṇāma* is modification, and modification is not the complete substance. Despite being with *gati* and *gati* being with its own modification, self is not just that much. Modification arises according to *gati*, but he is *akhaṇḍa* (undivided) *jñāna svarūpa* (pure nature of *jñāna*). This is the view of *anekānta*.

There is a release of insistence of all non-self substances, impermanence, *karma*, body auspicious attachments, and present modification like, having *vajravṛṣabhanāraca samhanana* (adamantine body type) will give *kevala jñāna*, or if there is bondage of *tirthaṅkara nāma karma*, then *Tirthaṅkara* state will arise, or if auspicious dispositions arise in the present then he will get benefit of *deva-guru-śāstra* in the future, or if one has *kṣāyika samyaktva* then he will attain *kevala jñāna*, or if other *jñeyas* are present then *jñāna* will arise. *jñānī* do not have such a view of *ekānta* that modification of *maṇḍira* occurred due to auspicious thoughts, or that with modification of *maṇḍira*, auspicious

dispositions will arise, and self will evolve. He believes his present substance-attribute modification to be in the form of *sva jñeya*. So, by accepting substance-attribute-modification as independent, he accepts *anekānta* in all these three; hence his *dr̥ṣṭi* (belief) is true.

Leaving the belief in existence of *svajñeya* and believing *para-jñeya* to be self, believing self to be non-self, is the view of *ekānta*. This view of such *ekānta* has gone away from *jñānī jīvas*. On experiencing pure self *ātmā*, *jñānī jīva* adopt *ātma vyavahāra* (activity of *ātmā*), which is the non-perturbed sentient, with pure joy. Belief in *deva-guru-sāstra* is tremulous/unsteady/wavering, whereas joy of sentience is unmoving. Pleasure and joy which has manifested remains manifested. At no point does it shake. *jñānī* has manifested such a *vyavahāra* of *ātmā*. This *svasamaya* (self-substance) is *tattva* (essence) of *ātmā*.

ātma vyavahāra in the form of *samyag darśana-jñāna-cāritra* is manifested to *jīva* who takes auspices of his own *svajñeya*. Here in *Pravacansāra*, *samyaktva* has been explained from the pre-dominance of *jñāna* and modification of *cāritra*, which is *svajñeya*, has been highlighted. *svajñeya* has been described as a mass of substance-attribute and distorted or undistorted modifications, which is the complete substance. However, in *Samayasāra*, from the predominance of belief view point, it has been said that pure modification, which arises with focus on pure nature, is *jīva*, and all else, like modifications of *vikalpa*, etc., are *ajīva* (non-living). The intent of both these statement made in separate styles is the same, difference is in the way it is presented.

jīva who takes auspices of *svajñeya*, does not take support of any *manuṣya vyavahāra*. His false belief that *rāga*, etc., occur due to non-self substance, has gone. He does not believe that because right belief manifested, attachment-aversion will go, and because attachment-aversion will go, so *kevala jñāna* will manifest; it has been explained in this way in *Pravacansāra*; whereas in *Samayasāra* it is said that, a *samyag dr̥ṣṭi* does not have *bandha*, their enjoyment is the cause of *nirjarā* (shedding of *karmas*). It is said from the prominence of view of belief that a *samyag dr̥ṣṭi* destroys all eight *karmas*, but here it is not said so, as it is from the view of the prominence of *jñāna*.

It is said in *Samayasāra* that pure nature is a *vastu* (substance), and impure dispositions are *avastu* (non-substance). In *Pravacansāra*, it is said that substance-attribute, be it blemished or unblemished modification, are all *svajñeya*, and other *ātmās* and non-self substances are *para-jñeyas*.

It is not that because true belief occurred so true conduct manifested, or because attachments were mild so true conduct manifested or *samyag darśana* occurred or attachments reduced so a state of dispassionate-ness arose, or if auspicious dispositions are done, then *samyaktva* arises. In this way, each and every modification has been shown as independent; current modification does not occur from *nimitta* or previous

modification. ‘*tehim puṇo pajjāyā*’ meaning modification of that time, be it *vikārī* or *avikārī*, is on the base of its own substance-attribute, but it does not occur because of *nimitta* or previous modification.

jīva who takes auspices of such a *bhagavāna ātmā*, which is the unmixed substance-attribute-modification, manifests *samyaktva*; that *jīva* does not have thoughts of oneness with non-self substance or with just a part; due to this his *rāga-dveṣa* has stopped, and he does not take support of supreme passiveness. It means he takes auspices of his own pure nature, then *rāga-dveṣa* do not manifest. Hence, dispassionate passiveness is manifested, so it is said that he takes support of supreme dispassionate passiveness.

Modification of every attribute is on the base of *ātmā*, which is a *guṇi* (with attributes). *jñānī* knows that he who has lesser auspices of his *svajñeya* has *rāga*. And if he were to take complete auspices, then he will become *vītarāga* (passionless). With auspice of self, he manifests *puruṣārtha* (true effort) to become *vītarāga* (passionless). In other words, *jñānī* does not take auspices of modification. Not believing that because *samyagdarśana* arose so *cāritra* must manifest, or *samyaktva* has occurred so the state of *siddha* must arise, or *cāritra* has manifested so *kevala jñāna* should occur, and not taking auspices of modification, he takes auspices of his own *svabhāva* which is the form of a mass of substance-attribute-modification. *jñānī* knows that as he does not have complete auspices of *svabhāva*, *vītarāgatā* and *kevala jñāna* has not manifested.

References have been given in *śāstras* to explain that earlier modification of *vītarāgatā* is the cause of *kevala jñāna*. *vītarāgatā* is pure modification of *cāritra guṇa*, which arises in the twelfth *guṇasthāna* (stage of evolution). Therefore, it is not possible that *kevala jñāna* can arise from it. Modification of *kevala jñāna* arises from the attribute of *jñāna*, and the base of *jñāna guṇa* is *ātmā*, but it does not arise from earlier modification or modification of any other attributes. *jīva* with *rāga* can never attain *kevala jñāna*, but it arises only to a *vītarāgī*. In this way, to distinguish from *rāgī*, it has been said that *vītarāgatā* is the cause for *kevala jñāna*.

Due to lesser auspices of his own pure substance, modification of *jñānī* is not completely pure. With increase in auspices of substance, purity increases.

In *śāstras*, it has been said that *bhoga* (worldly pleasures) of a *samyag drṣṭi* is the reason for *nirjarā* (shedding of karmas). This means that no *jīva* can actively enjoy carnal pleasures of non-self substance, focus of a *jñānī* is not on *bhoga*. They do not believe that shedding of *karma* can occur due to attachment or that because *samyagtva* has arisen, so slowly *vītarāgatā* will arise. Without any confusion, they take auspices of *bhagavāna ātmā* which is unwaveringly and well entrenched in substance-attribute-modification. Due to nature of their *jñāna*, which is *sva-para prakāśaka*, they know their *jñāna*, which is *sva* and *para* meaning attachment, *nimitta*, etc., just the way it is. They remain knower of attachment. They have partial auspices of their own pure nature, which is why they have

correct knowledge of the presence of attachment. With deeper auspices of nature of self, they move further away from association of all non-self substances. No one can physically move away from non-self substances. If they try to move away non-self substance, then *mithyātva* will rise. Due to weakness, thoughts do arise to *jñānīs*, but they take auspices of their pure self. Hence, it is said that they have left association of all non-self substance, which are outer substances and thoughts.

In this way, by having auspices of the mass of substance-attribute-modification of self substance, *jīva* in reality would be *svasamaya*, meaning *vītarāgī* modifications arises in him. That is why *vītarāgī* modification is the essence of *ātmā*.

In this section of *jñeya tattva* independence of each and every modification has been explained. *jñānī* have weakness of one *samaya* because they have lesser auspices of their *svajñeya*. There is no other reason besides this. It is not that because there is *udaya* (arising) of *karma*, so *jīva* is in *sañsāra*. If there is a state of dependency in modification, like if *samyaktva* has arisen, then gradually *kevala jñāna* will arise, or that *kevala jñāna* will arise, then sequentially *jīva* will become *siddha*, then there is no purity. Every *vyñjana* and *artha paryāya* is from the base of its own substance. Weakness and progress of modification is on the base of its own substance.

In this way transformation of each and every modification is independent. In other religions, there is no reference to these concepts. They suppress the senses, become sky-clad, and may have *vairāgya* (detachment) also, but if this is not understood, then dharma cannot occur. Those of other religious sects have *grhīta mithyātva* (acquired falsity). Such subtle concepts are not anywhere except in Jains. Other sects say that on attaining *samyaktva*, *kevala jñāna* has manifested, but that is untrue.

There are infinite substances, one substance has infinite attributes. They have their pure or blemished modifications, and they all are *jñeya*. Because one attribute manifests does not mean that other attributes also should manifest. The shape of *ātmā* is due to its own self, but it is not due to the shape of body. In this way, by deciding on independence of every modification and by taking auspices of substance-attribute of self, *mithyātva* does not arise, and attachment-aversion also does not arise. Further, by taking complete auspices of pure self, state of *siddha* manifests.

Ignorant *jīva* say the opposite in the name of *vītarāga* and *śāstra*. But nature of pure substance does not change due to this, and *vītarāgī* (passionless one) does not say what ignorants say.

He who takes auspices of activity of humans, his transmigration does not end. *jñānī* takes auspices of *svajñeya*, so his transmigration does not arise.

In *śāstras* of *karaṇānyoga* (scriptures on cause-and-effect relationship), it is said that *vikāra* arises in *jīva* due to the arising of *karmas*.

In *Samayasāra*, it is said that *jñānī* is not the doer of attachment. Attachment is modification of *pudgala* (non-living).

In *Pravacansāra*, it is said that attachment arises due to one's own weakness.

So do these three types exist? The crux of all three statements is the same. It has been said -

'eka hoyā traṇa kāla mā paramārtha no pañtha'-Ātmasiddhi śāstra.

In *karaṇānuyog*, it is proved that karma is also one substance. In *Samayasāra*, attachment is not a part of the eternal pure nature of self. Therefore, from the view of belief/focus, attachment has been called *ajīva*. In *Pravacansāra*, it is said that attachment does not arise due to non-self, but when one gets stuck in non-self, by himself, then attachment arises. In this way, modification of attachment has been explained in the form of *jñeya*.

The way a businessman posts separate entries of all accounts of debit and credit in a ledger, in the same way, different aspects of all *śāstras* should be understood and integrated. *ajñānī jīva*, after reading these two *gāthās*, claims that modifications are his own, and if someone calls him a *pariyāya mūḍha*, then that person would be a *vedāntī*. In this way, he brings out meanings which are opposite to those in the *śāstras*; he who believes that modification arises due to non-self and that he is equal to modification, or he is as much as an infinitesimal part is said to be *pariyāya mūḍha*.

pravacana on bhāvārtha of gāthā 94

All beliefs like, self is human, it is the body, it is as much as the part which is equal to modification of a human, or activity of body is done by self, or he is grooming his son, or if he is there, then society is protected, or he has ownership of embracing-renouncing of spouse-child, wealth, etc., or if *siddha* is there then *rāga* of his *bhakti* (reverential singing) will be there, or if *Bhagavāna* is present then *divyadhvani* must emanate, etc., is *vyavahāra* of human. Such *jīva* believe non-self knowables to be his own, which is the modification of *mithyātva*. To believe that self is only the unmoving sentient joy or pure blemish free modification is the modification of *ātmā*, is the *vyvahara* of *jīva*.

jīva, who is steeped in the state of being a human, accepts only a part, believes arising of modification to be due to non-self. Whereas modification of self flows from substance. He who does not accept this, believes that all *jīvas* from *nigoda* to *siddha* and all *parmānus*, to be his own.

Nature of self is to know all *jñeyas* without distinction. Forgetting this, he believes some *jñeya* to be beneficial and protects them, and some to be non-beneficial and dislikes them. He divides *jñeyas* into two parts and has attachment-aversion along with *mithyātva*, believing in only an infinitesimal part and believing in that which illuminates only non-self. One who believes and accepts only his infinitesimal part accepts only an

infinitesimal of other substances as well. Due to this, he sees only current modifications of other substances. One who is *mūḍha* (perplexed) in one *aṅśa* is perplexed for both self and non-self.

jīva, who believes himself to be the complete *aṅśī* (beholder of all infinitesimal parts), is the knower of both self and non-self. He who believes himself to be separate even from the manifested *Kevalī Bhagavāna* becomes *Bhagavāna*. He who takes auspices of such a *bhagavāna* (pure nature of self), has the view of *anekānta*. Hence, he does not take auspices in *vyavahāra* of *manuṣya* (humans).

Self is not there because of non-self, and non-self is not there because of self. Self knows self and non-self, by way of his own *jñāna*, but non-self is not known because it is there. This is *anekānta*.

jñānī does not take auspices of such *vyavahāra* of humans that *jñāna* arises from *nimitta* or when *jñāna* is meant to arise, then *nimitta* will have to be present, or if one attribute-modification manifests then other attributes must also manifest, but they take auspices of *vyavahāra* of *ātmā*. It means that he takes auspices of his own substance. They take auspices of their *aṅśī* (the whole), that is why they do not become *rāgī-dveṣī*. Those *jīvas* who do not correlate with *para dravya* and join only with pure self *dravya*, attain *dharma*.

On perceiving *svajñeya* along with *bheda jñāna*, state of *cāritra* manifests. This is why there is no arising of attachment-aversion in a *jñānī*. They remain supremely detached. In the state of *ajñāna* (ignorance), focus was on the current state of modification of non-self, like body, idol, etc., and other such substances. That relationship has gone. He keeps a relationship only with his pure self, and that is why he is *svasamaya*.

In these two *gāthās* of the section on *jñeya*, pillars of a palace have been piled. On that, with focus on peace, the palace of *kevala jñāna* will be made. Or *mumuksū* (those who desire liberation), who will understand the truth in these two *gāthās*, will surely manifest *samyag darśana*.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-95* ❧

अथ द्रव्यलक्षणमुपलक्षयति –

Now characteristic of substance is given -

अपरिच्यत्तसहावेणुप्पादव्ययधुवत्तसंबद्धं ।

गुणवं च सपज्जायं जं तं दव्वं ति वुच्चंति ॥ ९५

apariccattasahāveṇuppadavvayadhuvattasambaddham |
guṇavaṃ ca sapajjāyaṃ jaṃ taṃ davvaṃ ti vuccanti || 95 ||

Meaning: That which is endowed with *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) without leaving its nature and is with *guṇas* (attributes) as well as *pariyāyas* (modifications) is called *dravya* (substance).

tikā: Here (in this universe), that which is perceived with the trinity of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) and with the duality of *guṇa-pariyāya* (attribute-modification), without creating any distinction in the *svabhāva* (intrinsic nature) is *dravya* (substance). In that (in these six words – *svabhāva*(intrinsic nature), *origination* (origination), *vyaya* (annihilation), *dhrauvya* (permanence), *guṇa* (attribute), *pariyāya* (modification)) the nature of *dravya* is *astitva sāmānyarūpa anvaya* (constancy in the form of existence of generality). This *astitva* (existence) will be specified in two ways: 1. *svarūpa astitva* - existence of intrinsic nature. 2. *sadṛśya astitva* - existence of common nature.

1. *origination* means to originate, to manifest, to emerge, evolving of newer modification.
2. *vyaya* means disappearing, annihilation, destruction, of former modification.
3. *dhrauvya* means constancy, stability, continuance, permanence
4. *guṇa(s)* being *vistāra* (area wise) *viśeṣa* (particularity) being *sāmānya-viśeṣātmaka* (with generality and particularity), are of two types-

In that *astitva* (existence), *nāstitva* (non-existence), *ekatva* (oneness), *anyatva* (otherness), *dravyatva* (substantiality), *pariyāyatva* (to be a modification), *sarvagatva*(all pervasive), *asarvagatva* (not all pervasive), *sapradeśatva* (with spatial points) *apradeśatva*(without spatial points), *mūrtatva* (concrete) *amūrtatva* (abstract) *sakriyatva* (active), *akriyatva* (inert), *cetanatva* (sentience), *acetanatva* (non-sentient), *karṭṛtva* (doership) *akarṭṛtva* (non-doer), *bhokṛtva* (user), *abhokṛtva* (non-user), *agurulaghutva* (each substance remains as self and does not become non-self), etc., are *sāmānya guṇa* (general attributes), and *avaḡāhahetutva* (*nimitta* in giving space) *gatinimittatā* (*nimitta* in motion) *sthitikāraṇatva* (*nimitta* in lack of

motion), *vartanāyatanatva* (to modify) *rūpādīmatva* (to have physical attributes), *cetanatva* (sentience) are *viśeṣa guṇa* (particular attributes). *pariyāya* (modifications) are *āyataviśeṣa* (lengthwise particularity). They are of four types, as described in the verse 93.

dravya (substance), though being with *origination*(origination), etc., or with *guṇa-pariyāya* (attribute-modification), and having differentiation of *lakṣya* (that which is to be defined) and *lakṣaṇa* (characteristic/that which defines) there is no real difference because substance is so by its own nature – like a garment.

Like the garment, which has attained a soiled state, on being washed, originates in a clean, spotless state (in a blemish free form, in as much as the blemish free state), is defined by *utpāda* (origination). But it does not have distinction of nature with this *utpāda* (origination), as by its own nature it is so (or it modifies as the form of origination);

Similarly, any substance which has attained the earlier state, which being in the presence of appropriate outer instruments, modifies as numerous states – they, being accomplished by nature in the form of efficacy of the inner instrument of *svarūpakartā* (self which is doer of self), and *svarūpakaraṇa* (self which is instrument of self), originating as the later state is characterised by *utpāda* (origination). But it does not have difference of nature with this *utpāda*(origination), as it is its own nature to be so.

And as the same upper garment, originating as blemish free state and annihilation of the soiled state is characterised by this *vyaya* (annihilation), it does not have distinction of nature from this *vyaya* (annihilation) as it is so by its own nature. Similarly, the same substance originating as the later state and with annihilation of the former state is characterised by this *vyaya* (annihilation), but it does not have distinction of nature by this *vyaya* (annihilation), this is its own nature.

At the same time, the same upper garment, originating as blemish free state and with annihilation of the soiled state, and remaining constant by its stable state of being a garment (cloth) is characterised with this *dhrauvya* (constancy). But it does not have distinction from that constancy, and it is so by its own nature. So, the same substance, originating as later state, with annihilation of former state and remaining constant by its permanent state of being a substance, is characterised by this constancy/permanence. It does not have distinction of nature from that permanence, as it is so by its own nature.

And as the same garment is defined by *vistārasvarūpaviśeṣa* (area-wise specific attributes) (whiteness, etc.), it does not have distinction from these attributes; it is so by nature. So, the same substance is also characterised by *guṇas* in the form of *vistārasvarūpaviśeṣa* (area-wise specific attributes). but it does not have difference of form from these attributes, as it is so by nature.

As the same garment is characterised by the threads, which are in the form of *āyataviśeṣasvarūpa* (lengthwise particularities) *pariyāyavartī* (modifying one after another) (modifying as *pariyāya*, occupying the same space as *pariyāya*) threads.

But it does not have distinction from those threads, as it is so by its own nature. So, the same substance is also defined by *āyata-viśeṣa-svarūpa-paryāyas* (length-wise particularities existing in its modifications), but it does not have distinction with those *paryāyas*(modification), as it is so by its own nature.

pravacana on gāthā 95

Here, *Ācāryadeva* explains how *ātmā, pudgala* (physical matter) and other *dravyas* (substances) are identified. Without knowing this, distinction between *sva jñeya* (self-knowable) and *parajñeya* (non-self knowable) cannot be made. Every *ātmā, rajakaṇa* (physical matter), and other four *dravyas* are recognised through their own characteristics.

There are six *dravyas* (substances) in this universe. Without leaving their characteristic of *astitva* (to exist), they are characterised by the trilogy of *utpāda* (origination), *vyaya* (annihilation), *dhruva* (constant) and also with a pair in the form of *guṇa-paryāyas*(attribute-modifications)

Here, the sentence-‘*aparityakttasvabhāvena*’-has a profound meaning. *astitva* (existence of self) never mixes with non-self, and that which exists does not come from non-self. ‘*aparityakttasvabhāvena*’ means that which is the pure nature; without leaving that, without mixing into non-self, without taking anything from non-self, without leaving any part of self, without leaving itself from self, without breaking the pure nature into pieces, ... all these meanings are brought out of this sentence.

Origination of every *samaya* (smallest unit of time), *dhruva* (constant) of every *samaya* and *vyaya* (annihilation) of every *samaya* is connected to the attribute of existence of self and is not related to any other substance.

svabhāva (pure nature), which is explained in *gāthā* 93-94, is not the *svabhāva* referred to in this *gāthā*. With the *upasanhāra* (epilogue) of *gāthā* 94, that subject was completed there. Now, in *gāthā* 95, the subject has been presented differently. In *gāthā* 94, the mass of *dravya-guṇa-paryāya* (substance-attribute-modification), which had been called the nature of *ātmā*, that nature has not been referred to here. Here, *sattā guṇa* (attribute of existence)has been called the pure nature of *ātmā*. Origination-annihilation-permanence is not separate from the state of existence. In this *gāthā*, it will be said that *guṇa* and *paryāya* are also not separate from *astitva* (existence).

Due to state of walking originating in the body, it is known that body exists, but it is not known that it is with *ātmā*. Similarly, through its own permanence and annihilation, a substance is characterised. A student gains knowledge, without leaving his nature of being. This attribute of *jñāna* is *ātmā*. But *ātmā* of teacher is not characterised by this; in this way, substance is characterised by its own modification. Here, two characteristics have been given, to recognise a substance.

1) *utpāda-vyaya-dhruva* and 2) *guṇa* and *pariyāya*.

guṇa (attribute) is included in *dhruva* (permanence), and *utpāda-vyaya* (origination-annihilation) is included in *pariyāya* (modification). But for detailed elaboration and clarity, both characteristics have been explained separately. *svabhāva* (nature), *utpāda* (origination), *vyaya* (annihilation), *dhruvya* (permanence), *guṇa* (attribute) and *pariyāya* (modification). These six words have been explained in detail.

1. *svabhāva* of *dravya* (nature of substance) - *astitva samānya rūpa anvaya* (sameness in form of general existence) or is...is...is.... pure nature of *dravya* is inherently as one. (*anvaya* means *sādṛśya* (sameness)*ekrūpa* (of one kind)).
 - a) *svarūpa astitva* (existence by pure nature)–Existence of own nature of every substance is *svarūpa astitva*. Every *ātmā* exists by its own nature of *caitanya* (sentience). Other *ātmās* exist by their own nature of sentience. Numerous *paramāṇus* (smallest unit of matter) exist by their own attribute of colour, etc. In this way, every *ātmā* and *paramāṇu*, etc., are separate by their own individual nature of existence.
 - b) *sādṛśya astitva* (sameness of existence) - All substances, from the view of existence, are with *sādṛśya astitva* ...is.. is. meaning from the view of existence, *jīva*, *pudgala* and all other four *dravyas* are equal.
2. *utpāda*- meaning of *utpāda* is to originate/manifest. Without leaving its nature of *astitva samānya rūpa* (form of general existence), manifestation of state of *utpāda* (origination) takes place. With this, the substance is characterised.

Body of a *jīva* moves while living, and on its death, the body does not move. Then manifestation of the state of not moving characterises the substance of body, but it does not characterise *ātmā*. The question that because *ātmā* was there, so body moved, and if *ātmā* is not there, then it does not move, does not arise.

One *samaya* mango is green, and the second *samaya* it becomes yellow, then manifestation of the state of yellowness, characterises substance - the mango. But it does not characterise other associated things like grass or *jīva*. On seeing the idol of *Bhagavāna*, auspicious thoughts arose. In that, without leaving the general nature of being of self, auspicious thoughts have arisen, and that characterises the substance, *jīva*, but does not characterise the idol.

3. *vyaya-vyaya* means to annihilate, to be destroyed.

Annihilation of the state is without the destruction of its existence or it is the nature of generality. With this characteristic of *vyaya*, the substance is characterised.

What is the reason for destruction of the green state of mango? Non-self substance is not its reason because annihilation occurs while keeping its relationship with its nature of existence; in other words, substance is not completely destroyed. Annihilation of the

green state of mango characterises the substance mango, but it does not characterise *nimitta* or association.

In one *samaya*, in one *paramāṇu*, more than two attributes become *snigdha*(sticky), and in the second *samaya*, that is destroyed, and infinite attributes become sticky. In *jīva*, in one *samaya śubha bhāva* (auspicious thought) is destroyed or *aśubha bhāva* (inauspicious thought) is destroyed, then that destruction characterises that *jīva*. But it does not characterise/denote *nimitta-deva-guru* or family. By understanding this, the question that - one *pudgala* in one *samaya* is *snigdha*, and in the second *samaya*, it is *ruṣka* (dry)how is that? Or why is there the peculiarity that one *jīva* does a lot of *śubha bhāva* in one *samaya* and does *aśubha bhāva* in the second? This question does not arise because destruction is the characteristic of substance.

4. *dhrauvya*: To stay/ to be permanent-without leaving the nature of generality of existence, to remain in the form of *dhruva* (unchanging). By way of attribute of this *dhruva* (permanent), substance is characterised. This nature of being permanent is not due to other substances. *paramāṇu* is characterised by the nature of permanence of *paramāṇu*, but *ātmā* is not characterised by that. Similarly, *ātmā* staying in the state of *dhruva* (permanence) characterises *ātmā* but does not characterise the body.

This is elaborated upon - *viśeṣa* (special/specific) *guṇas* are all together. The way *jñāna darśana*, etc., of *jīva*, and *guṇas* of sweetness, etc., in sugar, are non-sequentially and all together. All *guṇas* are present in one *samaya*, not before or after. Similarly, despite *pariyāya* being in a sequence, it arises *krambadha* in a regulated way, one after another, without breaking its sequence just, like a chain. Those substances are characterised by each of these attribute-modification. In this, the state of *jñāta-dṛṣṭa* (knower-seer) is proved. Whether it is said to be *niyamita* (*krambadha*) sequential or *samyaka niyata* (correct constant/true) or call it *dharma*, they all are one and the same.

5. *guṇa*- There are two types of *guṇa* (attributes) – *sāmānya* (general) and *viśeṣa* (particular/specific). From this, *sāmānya guṇa* (general attribute) is being explained below-

- 1) *astitva*- Without leaving its nature of *astitva* (existence), *dravya* (substance) is characterised by the *astitva guṇa* (attribute of existence). This attribute is present in all six substances.

In other *śāstras*(scriptures), it is said that *ātmā* is characterised by *cetanā* (sentience), and *pudgala* (physical matter) is characterised by *rūpitva* (tangible attribute of matter). Here, it has been said that substance is characterised by every attribute and every modification. So *apekṣā* (view point) should be understood appropriately.

2. *nāstitva* - Without leaving its nature, every substance is characterised by *nāstitva*

guṇa. This attribute is present in all six substances. Every substance is with the absence of non-self. Other substances, without leaving the nature of *astitva*, are known by their *nāstitva guṇa*. Non-self is known by the *nāstitva* (non-existence) *guṇa* of non-self, and self is known by *nāstitva guṇa* of self.

3. *ekatva* - Without leaving its *astitva guṇa*, every substance is characterised by its *ekatva guṇa* (attribute of oneness). This attribute is present in all six substances. This *śakti* (efficacy) is explained in 47 *śaktis* written in *Samaysāra*. Every substance is *ekatva svarūpa* (in the form of oneness) with its substance-attribute-modification.

All attributes mentioned here are *pariṇāma svarūpa* (nature to modify), they are not just *dharma*. Attributes can be *dharma*, but *dharma* (characteristics) cannot be attribute. Here, all attributes which are with modification have been explained.

4. *ānyatva*- Without forsaking its existential nature, every substance is characterised by *ānyatva guṇa*. This *guṇa* also is present in all six substances. This *ātmā* is eternally separate from other *ātmās* and is also eternally separate from other substances. These substances are recognised by *ānyatva*.

In attributes, it should be understood that all *dharmas* are taken in pairs like; *astitva* is taken with *nāstitva*, *ekatva* is taken with *ānyatva*.

5. *dravyatva* - Without forsaking its existential nature, every substance is characterised by *dravyatva guṇa* (attribute of change). This *guṇa* is present in all six substances. Due to *dravyatva guṇa*, all substances are *dravita* (constantly fluid/changing).
6. *pariyāyatva* - Without leaving its own nature to exist, every substance is characterised by *pariyāyatva guṇa*. This *guṇa* is in all six substances. Due to *pariyāyatva guṇa*, every substance modifies. In *dravyatva*, the idea is to be *dravita* (be fluid/changing) in general, and *pariyāyatva*, it is specific - to be *dravita* (be changing) with focus on *pariyāya*.
7. *sarvagatatva*- Without leaving its nature of existence, every substance, *jīva dravya*, *dharma dravya*, *adharmā dravya*, *ākāśa dravya* are characterised by *sarvagatatva guṇa*. Meaning of *sarvagatatva guṇa* is to be widely pervasive by way of space. The above four substances have a large *kṣetra* (area). Here, attributes have been said to be *sāmānya* (common), but that does not mean that they have to be present in all six substances. If they are present in many but not all six, still they are called *sāmānya*. It should be understood so.
8. *asarvagatatva* - Without leaving its own nature to exist, every *paramāṇu* and *kālāṇu* are characterised by *asarvagatatva guṇa*. Meaning of *asarvagatatva guṇa* is to pervade in the smallest possible area. *kāla* and *paramāṇu* are characterised by their spread in the smallest area, and pervading in a large area characterises *jīva*, *dharma*, *adharmā*, *ākāśa*.
9. *sapradeśatva* - Without leaving its own nature of existence, *jīva*, *dharma*, *adharmā*,

ākāṣa are characterised by *sapradeśatva guṇa*. *jīva*, *dharma* and *adharmā* are *asankhya pradeśī* (covering innumerable space points) and *ākāṣa* is *ananta pradeśī* (with infinite space points).

10. *apradeśatva* - Without leaving its own nature of existence *kāla* and *paramāṇu* are characterised by *apradeśatva guṇa* because *kāla* and *paramāṇu* are of one *pradeśa* (one space point only).

In this way, substance by the name of *kāla* is proven. Many *jīvas* do not believe in *kāla dravya*, because *kālāṇu* is characterised by *apradeśatva* and *asarvagatatva guṇa*. But that is incorrect.

11. *mūrtatva* - Without leaving its own nature of existence, infinite *pudgala dravyas* are characterised by *mūrtatva guṇa*. *mūrtatva* or *rūpitva*= that which is with *sparsa* (touch) *rasa* (taste) *gāndha* (smell) *varṇa* (colour). From the view of type, *pudgala* substance is one, but from the view of numbers, it is infinite, and as all of them have *mūrtatva guṇa*, from that point of view, it is said to be a *sāmānya guṇa*,

12. *amūrtatva* - Without leaving their nature of existence, *jīva*, *dharma*, *adharmā*, *ākāṣa* and *kāla* are characterised by *amūrtatva guṇa* (attribute of being abstract). *amūrtatva* or *arūpitva* (without physical form of some kind). Except for *pudgala*, *jīva*, etc., all other five substances do not have characteristics of touch, taste, smell, or colour.

ātmā is separate from body. *ātmā* and *jaḍa* (non-sentient) are recognised by way of their respective attributes. If belief of self is done along with recognising *ātmā* and *jaḍa*, then inner experience of self will manifest. Whatever *vastu* (substance) exists, it is never destroyed. Without leaving its nature of existence, substance is characterised by origination-annihilation-permanence and its attribute-modification. It should be understood to be so in all attributes.

13. *sakriyatva* - With this *guṇa*, *jīva* and *pudgala* substances are characterised. *sakriyatva* means to have *kṣetrāntara* - to move from one place to another. *ātmā* is characterised by its own *sakriyatva guṇa*, and *pudgala* is characterised by its own *sakriyatva guṇa*. Body does not move because of *ātmā*, and *ātmā* does not move because of body. Book moves, then it is seen moving due to its own *sakriyatva guṇa*, but it is not seen to be moving by hand, and hand is known by its own *sakriyatva guṇa*.

Question: Is it not seen that one has pushed the other?

Answer: Every substance moves from one place to another due to its own self. In one body of *nigoda*, there are infinite *jīvas*, they all move together at one time. Every *ātmā* moves due to his own *sakriya guṇa* but not because others are moving. Every *jīva* is distinguished by its respective *sakriyatva guṇa*.

14. *akriyatva* - With this *guṇa*, *dharma*, *adharmā*, *ākāśa*, and *kāla* are characterised. *akriyatva* means to be steady. From *anādi* (with no beginning), all these four substances are exactly where they are and will be there till *ananta* (with no end). Each of these substances is characterised separately by way of its own *akriyatva guṇa*.
15. *cetanatva* - Every *ātma* is characterised by this *guṇa*, as it is present in every *jīva*. So, in this context, it has been called *sāmānya* (general). *cetanatva* means the ability of *jñāna darśana* is present only in *jīva* and are not present in non-living substance. *cetanatva* of every *jīva* is separate. They are recognised by way of their own *cetanātva guṇa*, but one *jīva* cannot be recognised by the *cetanātva guṇa* of other *jīvas*. By *cetanatva guṇa* of the disciple, the disciple is recognised, but guru is not recognised, and by *cetanatva guṇa* of the guru, guru is recognised.
16. *acetanatva*-With this *guṇa*, *jaḍa* (non-sentient) substance is characterised. This *guṇa* is present in *pudgala*, *dharma*, *adharmā*, *ākāśa* and *kāla*. *acetanātva* means absence of *jñāna* - to be non-sentient. Scriptures, idols, body, senses, all are *acetana*. There is no *jñāna* in them.
17. *karṭṛtva* - All six substances are characterised by this attribute. No substance is the doer of any other substance. Every substance is complete in itself by itself. If there are no substances, then everything will become zero/non-existent, but nature of substance is not such. Saying that substance exists means that no other substance can be its doer. *jīva* and *pudgala* or *pudgala* and *pudgala* do not join together and do any work. Every substance does work in itself due to its *karṭṛtva guṇa*.
18. *akarṭṛtva guṇa*- All six substances are characterised by it. Every *guṇa* is recognised by the fact that it does not do anything of non-self substance? *ātmā* is recognised by this *guṇa*, which does not do any work of the body. The one who is compassionate is not recognised because he saved another *jīva* from dying, but he is recognised by *guṇa* that does not do anything in other *jīva*. *ātmā* is recognised by such an *akarṭṛtva guṇa*, which is unable to do anything of the body. *jīva* is recognised because he is not the doer of non-self, but he is not recognised as being the doer of non-self. *jīva* is recognised by being the doer of self but is not recognised by being *akartā* of *sva* – such is *anekānta*(confluence of pluralism).
19. *bhokṛtva* - All six substances are characterised by this *guṇa*. Every substance has the attribute to experience its own *prayāya* (modification). It is said that *jīva* has eaten *roti* (Indian bread) or has enjoyed/experienced wealth. But this is untrue because *roti* and *jaḍa* substances are recognised by their own *bhokṛtva guṇa*. *jīva* is not recognised by that, and a *jīva* is not recognised by *vikāri* (delusional) modifications experienced by an ignorant.

WIn this *gāthā*, the undivided substance is explained by making distinctions. *utpādayaya* (origination annihilation) are modifications, and substance is characterised by

them. *dhruva* (permanence) is a *guṇa* (attribute), and substance is characterised by it.

In this way, by way of six attributes – *astitvasvabhāva*, *utpāda vyaya*, *dhrauvya*, *guṇa*, and *pariyāya*- every substance is characterised.

In other *śāstras*, *ātmā* has been shown by way of attribute of sentience or by the twelve sub-division of *upyoga* (psychic activity). Here in this *gāthā*, *ātmā* has been explained through the above six characteristics. ‘*apriyaktasvabhāvena*’ means without dividing your own nature of *astitva*/existence (without breaking or dividing), with all above characteristics, every substance is proved.

jñāna is that which knows all *jñeya* (knowables). With these modifications and attributes, a substance exists and other substances exist because of attribute and modification of that substance. Without mixing one into another, *jñāna* knows infinite *jñeyas* and knows everything separately.

Question: If one tries to know so much, then will there not be a heap of *vikalpa* (psychic activity)?

Answer: Listen! As nature of *jñāna* has not been understood, so this doubt arises. Modification of one *samaya* of *jñāna* has the ability to know infinite substances and their infinite attributes, along with their modifications, in one *samaya*.

In *upsaṅhāra* (epilogue) of the chapter of *jñāna*, it was said that, with focus on *praśama* (peace), for manifestation of *kevala jñāna*, chapter on *jñeya* will be told. If all this is known with focus on destruction of *rāga*, then *rāga* will not increase. In fact, it will keep reducing, *vītarāgatā* will arise, and *jñāna* will increase.

20. *abhogatrīva* – All six substances are characterised by this *guṇa*. Not even one substance can experience another substance. *jīva* is recognised by attribute, which cannot experience *ladoo* (Indian sweet), etc., eatables.

21. *agurulaghu* - Without leaving its nature of existence, all six substances are characterised by *agurulaghutva guṇa*. Every substance is identified by this attribute, due to which it does not modify as another substance. *ātmā* is identified by the attribute, due to which it does not modify into the form of a body.

In this way, *sāmānya guṇas* have been described. Now *viśeṣa* (special/particular) *guṇas* are described: -

It is to be understood that this speciality/particularity is present in every *guṇa* without forsaking its *astitva guṇa* (attribute of existence).

1. *avagāhanahetutva*-With this *guṇa*, *ākāśadravya* is characterised. *asādhāraṇa avagāhana guṇa*, or that which gives *avagāhana* (place to stay) to everything, all together. Such an attribute is present only in *ākāśa* and not in any other substance.

2. *gati nimittatā* - With this *guṇa*, *dharmā dravya* is characterised. *dharmā dravya* is *nimitta* in the movement of substances which move, which are *jīvas* and *pudgalas*.
3. *sthitikāraṇatva* - With this *guṇa*, *adharma dravya* is characterised. *adharma dravya* is *nimitta* for stopping movement, of substances which stop by themselves while moving, which are *jīvas* and *pudgalas*.
4. *vartnāyatanatva* - With this *guṇa*, *kālāṇu* are characterised. As it is present during the modification of other substance, *kāla dravya* is characterised by this. Many *jīvas* believe *kāla* to be merely a metaphorical *dravya*, but this, however, is untrue.
5. *rūpādimatva* - *pudgala dravya* is characterised by touch, taste, smell, and colour, -e.g., wood, stone, etc., But *jīva* is not recognised by colour, etc.
6. *cetanatva* - With this *guṇa*, *jīva dravya* is characterised, and with sentience of every substance, every sentient is characterised separately.

In this way, substances are recognised by *sāmānya* and *viśeṣa guṇas*.

7. *pariyāya* - *āyata viśeṣa* or vertically modifying state which occurs one after another. According to *tikā* of *gāthā* 93, these are of four types-

- 1 *samānajātiya dravyapariyāya*
- 2 *asamānajātiya dravyaparayāya*
- 3 *svabhāva guṇapariyāya*
- 4 *vibhāva guṇaparayāya*

With each of these *pariyāya*, that particular substance is characterised.

1. *samānajātiya dravyapariyāya* - Saying that two or more than two *paramāṇus* are identical proves that they are not merged. *paramāṇus* are known from the viewpoint of being identical, but they are not known as one, or they do not merge. So, with this *pariyāya*, it is perceived that every *paramāṇu* is a separate substance.
2. *asamānajātiya dravyapariyāya* – By saying this, it is characterised that *ātmā* and body are not the same or that they are separate.
3. *svabhāva guṇapariyāya* – By its own respective *pariyāya* of *agurulaghutva guṇa*, every substance is known.
4. *vibhāva guṇapariyāya* - *ātmā* is characterised by *matijñāna*, etc., and with the modification of black, white, etc., *vibhāva* (impure) modification of *pudgala* is characterised. *jīva* is recognised by *rāga*. It is stated here that *rāga* is *lakṣaṇa* (characteristic), and *jīva* is *lakṣya* (objective). *jīva* is recognised by its *vyañjana pariyāya* (modification of attribute of shape), and with the *vyañjana pariyāya* of *pudgala*, *pudgala* is recognised.

Every substance is *lakṣya* (objective), and origination-annihilation-permanence is *lakṣaṇa* (characteristics). Every substance is *lakṣya*, and attribute-modification is

lakṣaṇa. All substances have a relationship with their own nature of existence.

With the distinction that *jaḍa* is recognised by the activity of *jaḍa*, and *ātmā* is recognised by the desire to do *bhakti*, *jñāna* of *rāga* (attachment) arises. If desire of *hiṃsā* (violence) arises, then self must think about, whose desire is *hiṃsā*? *vibhāva paryāya* (unnatural modification) of *hiṃsā* arises on the base of his own substance-attribute but not because non-self hates him or gets angry at him. With this knowing, he understands substance-attribute, which reduces the intensity of thoughts of violence and separates *svajñeya* (knowing the self as knowable) from *parajñeya* (non-self knowable). His substance and attribute are pure, and when this *jñāna* arises, then he is no more the owner of *rāga* but becomes knower of *rāga*. This is how *dharma* arises.

If *rāga* arises, then whose is *rāga*? Of *jīva*.

jīva is of what kind? It is eternal, pure

guṇas are of what kind? They are eternally pure.

In this way, by affirming *jñāna* of *svajñeya*, *jñāna* (knowing of *ātmā*) increases and modification of *rāga* is destroyed.

The way when cloth which is in the state of being with dirt is washed, then the state of cleanliness arises, and it is recognised by that state of origination. Cloth is decided upon by its state of cleanliness, but from that, cleanliness, soap, washing stone, washing stick or hand cannot be decided upon. Without leaving its nature of *astitva* (existence), cloth has become clean.

Question: Without washing and just by being around, how will cloth become clean?

Answer: Every cloth is clean due to its own self, because nature of cloth is not separate from arising of cleanliness. Cloth has modified by itself into the clean state.

Like this example, substance which has attained the earlier state, such a substance also modifies into numerous states, with the presence of appropriate outer instruments. New states of every substance are due to its own self, and substance modifies accordingly. Then, at that time, presence of only that type of appropriate *nimitta* occurs.

When numerous types of states arise, then presence of appropriate *nimitta* is there. When auspicious thought of study of *adhyātma śāstras* occurs, then *Samayasāra*, etc., *adhyātma śāstras* (spiritual scriptures) are appropriate *nimitta*. But *śāstras* of *kathānuyoga* (religious moral stories) like *Padmapurāṇa*, etc., will not be *nimitta* at that time.

It has been said that whatever originates, with that origination, that substance is characterised. Substance is to be proved here by origination of one *samaya*, annihilation of one *samaya* and permanence of one *samaya*. Here, substance is not being proved by *vikāra* (perturbation) or annihilation or eternal permanence, since infinity. But in fact, each and every present *paryāya* is proved to be independent, and substance is recognized/identified by it.

In *Tattvārtha Sūtra*, *jīva* has been identified by the modification of *upyoga* (psychic activity). In *dravyānuuyoga*, *jīva* is characterised by *upyoga*, which is present eternally and which it is at one with. In *Pravacanasāra*, *astitva bhāva*, along with modification of origination-annihilation-permanence, as well as attribute-modification, all six *lakṣaṇa* (characteristic), are shown as separate, and in every characteristic *jīva* is characterised. Therefore wherever, whatever has been said, that should be understood exactly that way.

Substance which has attained the earlier state and has proximity to the presence of outer instruments/requisites, manifests in many ways in different kinds of states. It occurs by that inner means, which is with the ability of pure nature in the form of *kartā* (doer) and *karāṇa* (instrument).

Destroying the earlier manifested state, every substance attains new modifications every *samaya*. How is that so?

Inner realisation being in the form of *kartā*, in the present *samaya*, and with the efficacy (ability) of self's *karāṇa*, new states are manifested. This is the undivided nature of every *ātmā*. As its nature is to be separate from *para*, he does not get stuck due to any *rāga*, *nimitta*, etc. This is an eternal principle; there may be appropriate *nimitta*, but that too has changed its earlier manifestation and arises anew due to the ability of its own nature, its own *kartā* and *karāṇa* and that state being inseparable from its own substance (it not being separate), it imparts knowledge of that substance. But it does not show any correlation of doing anything on any other substance. This nature of *anekānta* is present in every substance.

paramāṇu changed from the state of red to green, or the change of in the state of location/place, etc., or another state has occurred, this has arisen due to the ability of independent nature of self *kartā* and self *karāṇa*. Here, the discussion is not about the eternal, but it is about the present independent modification of one *samaya*. *pariyāya*, which by nature is *utpāda*, shows its own substance, but it does not show any relationship with someone else.

In the entire substance, infinite attributes and modifications in all its pure and impure states, through all three *kālas*, are included.

In every substance and in its infinite attributes, earlier state changes, and new state arises due to its own ability of self. In that, the form of self *kartā* and self *karāṇa* is connected to the undivided and is eternally separate from all other substances. This is the nature of every substance. So, the ability of *dravya*, *kṣetra*, *kāla*, *bhāva* (substance, space, time, modification) of any other substance is not present in its efficacy. No substance has the capacity to hold another substance, to know or make known the origination-annihilation of another substance. But, every *aṅśa* (infinitesimal part), in the form of origination, by itself, shows *aṅśī* (whole), which is the base of *aṅśa*. In other words, it shows itself to be inseparable from self substance and separate from non-self substance-such is *anekānta*. This keeps alive the independence of every substance.

First, the reference was to the one who sees only *pariyāya*, who is a *pariyāya mūḍha*. Now, here, undivided form of substance-attribute-modification of all substances and their independence in the form of *kartā-karaṇa*, has been explained. *aṅśa* of attachments also proves the independent existence of sentient substance; because eternal *aṅśī dravya* is recognised by the present part.

Through the state of *rāga*, etc., or *jñāna*, etc., *ātmā* is known, but it is not known that it makes a difference in anyone. Relation of present *pariyāya* is with the eternal substance-attribute, and it shows separation or distinction from non-self. With such a focus on *anekānta*, foolishness of belief in *pariyāya* goes away, and oneness arises in one's own pure independent nature. With the power of this, blemish free state which is free of attachment, arises. It has not been said that on seeing attachments, associations come into focus. However, here, it is said that *jīva* has modified the earlier part of attachment, and the next (new)state has arisen. With focus on independent substance, of *kartā-karaṇa* (doer-instrument) is not seen with any relation to non-self substance.

Through *astitva* or origination - annihilation - permanence, attribute - modification, substance is known, but no relation is seen with non-self. As soon as attachment is known (the thought comes), the question arises that from where has this attachment come? Then, it is said that attachment has arisen by opposing *vītarāgatā* (passionless state). That part, which arises new at all times, is going to keep changing. But that which is not changing by is the eternal substance *ātmā*. This can be known.

Seeing is by *ātmā*. Base of *jñāna*, which sees, is *ātmā*. Keeping that as primary, on knowing *jñeyas*, with focus on *praśama* (peace), every substance is characterised by its own attribute-modification, and this is known.

Present rising modification of substance is not separate from the nature of self; such is the nature of substance.

Due to the current ability of substance, whatever state of origination occurs is not due to *nimitta* or due to the earlier *pariyāya*, but is due to the independent ability of *ahetuka* (without any reason) nature of self.

***anekānta* is the path of *Jīna* and the seed of *kevala jñāna*.**

1. Arising of current modification is due to the absence of earlier modification. It cannot be due to the presence of current modification. This is the nature of *asti-nāsti* (existence/non-existence) *anekānta*.
2. Modification does not occur due to any *nimitta*. In fact, it arises due to self- such is the nature of *asti-nāsti anekānta*.
3. Origination-annihilation of substance is inseparable from its pure nature, it is not separate - this is *anekānta*.

4. The part which is origination shows its own attribute as well as substance but does not show any other substance.

vītarāga (passionless) cannot be manifested by *nimitta* of attachment, beneficial *karma*, *deva*, etc., or body, etc.,. It is not the case that because they are there, so *ātma* is there. Knowing that *jñāna* is on the basis of *ātmā* and with focus on complete *vītarāgatā*, by knowing self and non-self *jñeyas* through attribute-modification that substance is known. As there is no arising of attachment in this, only the unblemished state arises. In this way, teachings here are with primary focus on *jñāna*.

Modification changes independently every *samaya*. By knowing this, *nimitta-naimitika* relationship cannot be understood. This is because, it is with the absence of *nimitta* and earlier *pariyāya*, and constant origination of new modification occurs due to the efficacy of the nature of its *kartā*, which in turn shows the substance. In this, there is no question of subjugation to another. At that *samaya*, there is no place for the thought that first a modification was there, but in the second *samaya*, why did another kind of modification arise? Because it is so by nature. To believe that it is not dependent on another is *samyaktva*.

Question: Finger of a living human being moves, but why not of a corpse?

Answer: Modification of every *samaya* is independent, it is so by nature. Some may say that substance has the ability/efficacy, but work that is done is according to the *nimitta* present. But this is a false belief. This is because annihilation of the earlier state and generation of new state, are related to the efficacy of their own *kartā-karaṇa*; such is *jñeya*, and to know this is the nature of *jñāna*.

Question: *nimitta* is not present then will we need to wait for it?

Answer: The inherent ability of that *samaya* is the *kartā-karaṇa* (inner instrument) of that *samaya*, and in the next *samaya*, there is a new inner instrument. *nimitta* is modifying due to its own reason, due to its own inner instrument. If work is done, then it is said to be *nimitta*. All exist due to their own self. That is why no one has to wait for another. Constantly, every *samaya*, sequentially, regularly, modifying, present state, shows the substance through the nature of its *kartā-karaṇa*, and such is the nature of substance, which cannot be of any other kind. This is the eternal principle.

On knowing any part, be it attachment, etc., and by focusing on self, the complete substance is known, then he will be called the knower of *jñeya*, and if attachment is very low, but if focus is only on modification, then he is looking at associations; that is why he believes that associations bring benefits or losses. So, he experiences only intense attachment.

From the current part, the complete substance is known. This *jñāna* knows self and non-self. Every *samaya*, there is a new inner *sādhana* (instrument), and earlier modification is not the instrument; It is not that the inner instrument of *kartā-karaṇa* of *kevalajñāna*

which has arisen at the present *samaya*, is due to *kevalajñāna* of earlier *samaya*. In fact, at every *samaya*, a new *kartā-karaṇa* is the instrument. In this way, when *kṣāyika samyaktva* (pure irrevocable belief) arose, it is not due to the earlier modification but it is due to the efficacy of the inner *kartā-karaṇa* of that *samaya*. This shows the *abheda* (undivided) connection with substance, but it is not dependent. It is not subjugated even to the earlier modification. It is undivided with self and not separate; such is its nature. *kṣāyika bhāva* (disposition which appears with complete annihilation of destructive karmas) arose, and that will stay without an end due to itself, this is called *sthūla* (gross) *rjusūtranaya* (without any association with past or future modifications, that knowing which makes only the preset modification its subject). To say that it will stay every *samaya* due to inner *kartā-karaṇa* (doer-instrument) form of efficacy, is called *sūkṣma* (subtle) *rjusūtranaya* (without any association with past or future modifications, that knowing which makes only the preset modification its subject).

Every *ātma* and *paramāṇu* on being known by its own nature of instrument of *kartā-karaṇa*, is characterised by origination of a new state. That is why there is no distinction of nature from them. Origination of current modification shows the substance, that this modification is of this substance.

Question: What is the reason or who is characterised by *samyag darśana* (right belief) which manifests in *ātma*?

Answer: *ātma* is recognised by its undivided state of modification as it. *kartā-karaṇa* becomes the inner instrument modification of that *samaya*. The principle says it has not modified because there was some *nimitta* or *karma* was of low efficacy, or teachings of guru were present, auspicious attachment was there, or earlier modification was there. That is not the reason for inner instrument to arise. And it is so in no other way - that is *anekānta*. Relation-auspices of modification of *samyagdarśana* is only with *ātmā*. *puruṣārtha* is the focus of current modification on the substance. But doing outer activities or having auspicious thoughts, is not *puruṣārtha* (true effort).

Origination of state of purity shows *sattā* (existence) of *ātmā*. But relationship with non-self is not so that because *deva-guru-śāstra* were present, so state of purity arose. Present state of modification of every *samaya* arises due to the independent efficacy of that *samaya*, but it does not arise due to any other and neither does it arise due to the faculty or presence of earlier modification.

It is not so that because *kṣāyika samyagdarśana* (pure irrevocable belief) was present or *śukla dhyāna* (pure concentration) was present, so *kevala jñāna* manifested. With this annihilated modification, substance is characterised, but it does not characterise the present modification. Modification of *kevalajñāna* is due to the ability of efficacy of that *samaya*, but not due to the earlier or later *samaya* and not due to *nimitta* either. Such is the nature of substance. Till such a pure nature is not focussed upon, *dharma* cannot arise.

Question: Is it so that because *vītarāga cāritra* was followed for millions of years, so *kevalajñāna* arose in innumerable years?

Answer: No. In fact, modification of *kevalajñāna* arises due to the ability of inner efficacy of nature of *kartā-karaṇa* (doer-instrument) of present modification, and that shows the *jīva* substance. If its reason is said to be substance or attribute, then they were present from the beginning, so why did modification not manifest till now? Hence, that modification manifested by the independent inner efficacy of *kartā-karaṇa*. It is true that modification shows its own substance-attribute. But it is not so that the modification has arisen from it.

Existence of the present modification is independent, and in that, even the earlier modification is not its cause. It is said to be the cause, metaphorically only. Efficacy of modification, which is active in the present modification, was not present in the earlier one. So momentary *upādāna* (substantial cause) shows efficacy of the independent present modification of that *samaya*. This is *niścaya* (absolute truth), and to say that its relationship is with substance is *vyavahāra* (empirical truth).

Modification of *cāritra* (conduct) does not arise due to modification of *samyaktva*. The stick does not move with the support of fingers but moves due to its present efficacy, and this shows its own substance.

New modification has not arisen due to annihilation of earlier modification. This state shows the substance. Knowing of annihilation is not the reason for origination. It imparts the knowing of the substance in which the part of knowing of annihilation is undivided from it. Substance modifies in the form of origination-annihilation. But here, it is said that every modification with its constantly changing state, every *samaya* is independent.

The second modification of *kevala jñāna* or state of *siddha* which manifests, does not manifest or stay because of the modification of *kevalajñāna* or state of *siddha* of the first *samaya*. It will stay because of the inner instrument of that *samaya*, which is the ability *kartā-karaṇa*. On understanding this, focus will go on self-substance, and equanimity will arise along with infinite effort of *śraddhā* (belief) and *jñāna* (knowledge).

If substance is focussed upon, along with current effort then its relationship is with the self substance, and it is not with earlier or later modifications or with any *nimitta* or any *kāla*. So, if independent *saṭ* (existence) is accepted and he feels an acceptance from within, then peace will come. '*varte āntara śodha jo*'. Modification, which modifies within, shows the substance, and not any other. This kind of independence exists in every *jīva* and *ajīva*.

Now annihilation is explained – Pure state originates and impure state is destroyed in a cloth, and that is characterised by annihilation, but its nature is not separate from

annihilation. In fact, by nature, it is such. In this way, the part which is annihilation shows the complete substance and not any other.

For e.g., *samyagdarśana* (true belief of self) arising due to its own modification along with destruction of *mithyātva* shows the substance *jīva*. It is shown that absence of *mithyātva*, *rāga*, etc., also are modifications of substance. Here in *Pravacanasāra*, it is explained from the view of *jñāna*. That is why be it unblemished or be it impure origination-annihilation, it is said to be in *svajñeya* (self knowable). In *Samayasāra*, as it is said from the view of belief. *rāga*, etc., and thoughts as per *kṣayopśama*, etc., are seen as *parajñeya* (non-self knowable). Destruction of the state of *karma* of *darśana moha* (*karma* which is *nimitta* in delusion in belief) shows it to be *pudgala* (matter) substance. But it does not show that *jīva* attains *samyaktva* due to that.

Question: It does have *avinābhāvī sambāndha* (necessarily connected relationship), is it not?

Answer: When *samyagdarśana* is manifests, then (absence of *darśana moha* is said to be the reason), (from the view of *upcāra* (metaphorically)). But here, in the independence of the present modification of a substance, earlier modification is also not the cause, then where is the possibility of a relation with non-self? In reality, present modification does have a relation with substance, but that too is *vyavahāra* (empirical truth). Without understanding such *sūkṣma* (subtle) concept with complete clarity, greatness of *saṭ*, (existence), does not arise and respect for *asaṭ* (falsities) does not go.

Question: Did *kevala jñāna* not arise with destruction of four *ghāti karmas*?

Answer: No, because destruction of four *ghāti karmas* show *pudgala* substance but does not show *jīva* and *kevalajñāna*. They show the *jīva*.

Question: Till all *karmas* are not completely destroyed, why does complete purity not arise in *ātmā*?

Answer: The present ability of modification of *karma* of that *samaya* does not show the efficacy of earlier modification. They merely show the substance, but do not show any other relationship. State of *jīva* at that *samaya* shows the relation with substance *jīva* by way of the nature of independent efficacy of *kartā-karana*, but not with any other. This acceptance of independence of modification of every *samaya* only shows the independence of the present modification, which by nature is *saṭ* (existing). Annihilation does not show origination but shows only the substance.

Destruction of attachment from *ātmā* does not show destruction of *jaḍa karma*, and destruction of *mithyā śraddhā* (erroneous belief) does not show destruction of the *mithyātva karma*. In fact, through efficacy of that *samaya*, it shows relation of modification to its own substance through origination-annihilation.

Here from the primary view of *jñāna*, all modifications of substance are shown. Discarding of *mithyātva* attachment, etc., is also self *pariyāya* and is *sva jñeya* (self knowable). By saying that substance modifies this way - *aṅśa-aṅśī* (part-whole) are not separate, but it is separate from non-self. This is brought into focus by the substance. In *Samayasāra*, it is said that the discarding of attachment is also only in name. *jīva* does not have the ability to become into the form of attachment. This statement, is primarily from the view of *darśana* (belief), Therefore, wherever whatever is said, should be understood in the appropriate way. It is valuable to understand the nature of substance with the help of sharpness of *jñāna*.

Modification with *kṣayopśama* (annihilation cum subsidence of karmas) does not arise from *udaya bhāva* (arising psychic activity) or *śubharāga* (auspicious attachments) or *vyavahāra* (empirical truth) and *kṣāyika bhāva* (disposition which appears with complete annihilation of destructive *karmas*), and does not arise from *kṣayopśama bhāva*(modification of annihilation cum subsidence of karmas).

From modification of one *samaya* of modification of *kṣāyika*, modification of second *samaya* does not arise. It arises due to the efficacy of the new modification of that *samaya*. This shows its relationship with *jīva* substance. Annihilation of modification of *kṣayopśama* does not show origination of modification of *kṣāyika*, but it shows the substance.

To say that *kevalajñāna* has come from *śukla dhyāna* (purest concentration) is a statement from the view of *vyavahāra*(empirical). Substance is such that from the view of *nīścaya*(absolute), *kevalajñāna* has arisen due to the efficacy of that *samaya*. It has come exactly this way in *jñāna*, and the same has come in the words of *jñānī*. Origination-annihilation occurs in modification of every *samaya* due to the independent ability of the inner nature of its *kartā-karaṇa*, and that highlights its substance. He who believes this, will have oneness with substance, and he will attain *samyagdarśana*.

Cutting of vegetables shows annihilation of its *paramāṇu*, but it does not highlight the knife. In this way, change of desire in *jīva* highlights the *jīva* substance – but origination-annihilation does not have the ability to show the relation with another. In this way, even though there is a oneness and independence of substance-modification, forgetting this and believing that self has done for someone or got done something, there's improvement or deterioration due to someone, has broadened or become bulky, etc., all such beliefs are a misconception. Whatever type of desire whoever did that shows the relation of oneness with his substance. But something was done outside or has been done, that *vikalpa* (thought activity) does not show anything else. Without undivided existence, *kartā-karma* (doer-effect/work done)cannot exist. Who does the work of propagating religion outside, who does the work of medicines, hospitals, schools, etc.? Change in situation of the modification of substance shows its relation

with substance and not with any other because there is no distinction of nature between origination-annihilation and substance, and it is separate from non-self. Independent origination-annihilation, which arise in modification of every *samaya*, shows its substance but not any other. In this way, by turning the focus on substance, *vītarāgī śraddhā* (passionless belief) arises.

To believe that modification of *kṣāyika samyaktva* manifests the modification of *cāritra*, is *mithyā ekāntavāda* (erroneous belief in singularity); this is because it arises from substance-attribute, but this *pariyāya* cannot arise from another attribute or earlier modification or from *nimitta* or attachments. It arises from the independent efficacy of that *samaya*. If this nature of *anekānta* is known, then *vītarāgī śraddha* and *jñāna* arises. Later that *jīva* modifying into the form of *vītarāga* (passionless) *cāritra* (pure conduct) attains modification of *siddha*. In this way, from that modification, substance is characterised, or it is recognised.

When *jīva* goes from one place to another - modifies from one *gati* (life) to another, then that modification shows the *jīva* substance but does not highlight *dharmāstikāya* (ether matter, *nimitta* in movement). When *samyagjñāna*, which knows self, arises, then it has the ability to know non-self, but by knowing astronomy or geography, *jñāna* does not arise. *jñāna* and happiness, etc., arise on the base of *ātmā*. It is not that because of presence of *nimitta* or attachment earlier modification the present, *jñāna*, *sukha*, etc., manifests. Proclamation that-this kind of *jñeya* is independent every *samaya*, and knowing it is the reason for *samyagjñāna* and *samyagdarśana*.

Every substance exists with such a state of *dravyatva*; staying permanent is characterised by *dhrauvya* (unchanging state). In every *ātmā*, *paramāṇu*, etc., substance, new modification manifests due to the present efficacy of its own form of *kartā-karaṇa* (doer-instrument). Substance is known, because it is identical to it, but it is not known because of the belief that it has even a little relation with any other substance. This is an eternal principle.

Focus of *ajñānī* (ignorant) goes on association-dissociation of outer activities, or it goes on *karma*. He believes that because food did not arrive, so attachment went away, clothes, money, etc., have left, so attachment went away. But this is an erroneous belief. Occurrence of non-self in this way does not reduces attachments. Whichever state has been destroyed, that state shows its own substance; but does not show the existence of any other.

Modification in which attachment is reducing shows the *jīva* substance. If *arāgī* (without attachment) *ātmā* is focussed upon, only then, attachment reduces in reality. But to believe non-self to be the cause of presence or absence of attachment is delusion.

To believe that non-self substance did not come in the stomach, so *jīva* had modification of *upavāsa* (fasting), is the same as seeing modification of one substance through another substance, which is with its own modification. An *ajñānī* believes that if he

were to leave home and go away into the forest, there will be peace. But no *ātmā* leaves substance-attribute-modification of the self and goes out. One with the focus on benefit or loss due to associations has forgotten the independent self substance and sees only the non-self.

Arising of a clean state of the cloth and annihilation of the dirty state shows the cloth. But if cloth is forgotten and the washerman is seen, then that is the view of association of the ignorant. *sāmāyika* is not done with the body. If modification is to be seen, then the knowing of the permanent knower-seer, one who is constantly existing modifier, should be done. There is not a trace of attachment in it. The one who is the reducer of attachment is completely without attachment. As much equanimity that arises with the belief of complete *jñānānanda* (knowing-joy), that much is *sāmāyika* and there is no manifestation of attachment there.

At every *samaya*, every substance exists due to its own nature, and it does not exist due to support of any other substance. Book exists due to the support of its own self and does not exist due to the book stand. Because *dhruvatva* (attribute of permanence) of the book shows the book and does not show any other substance. Similarly, *dhruvatva* of *ātmā* is not due to the body but is due to its own self. Matter particles stay due to *dhruvatva* of matter particles, but basis of no association is required for them to exist.

The world sees associations, but *samyoga* (association) is not the nature of substance. Every substance by nature is *aparityakta* (non-abandoned). Therefore, without leaving its own nature, it retains the state of *dhruvatva* and exists. Nature of cloth to remain as cloth and it is not separate from the cloth. *dhruvatva* is the essence of cloth. Similarly, *ātmā*, *paramāṇu*, etc., substances, all manifest constantly into a new state every *samaya*, attain the state of annihilation of the previous state, and by permanence which is the state of *dravyatva*, it remains *dhruvya* (indestructible). They are known by their own existence. But they are not known separate from them; they are so by nature. By this, it is decided that every substance, in the smallest unit of time, is known by its own efficacy of nature of origination-annihilation-permanence. Modification, which occurs, does so by its own state of existence but not by non-self. The dependency that substance which exists by self, may have to survive with the support of another at any point does not ever arise. Non-self substances do not change due to desires. “I can do something for non-self.” he, who has this kind of arrogance, cannot see his pure nature, which is only the knower.

Origination-annihilation-permanence of *ātmā* is not due to any other cause because this pure nature constantly identifies *jīva* substance. No other has any right on it. Changes in activity of body show *rajakaṇas* (smallest matter unit) of the body, but they do not show attributes-faults of *jīva*, and it does not show what *jīva* has done. Furthermore, cloth is identified by its own *vistāra viśeṣa* (horizontally spread attributes) attributes because there is no separation of cloth from its attribute-this is so by its nature. Diseases

like paralysis, etc., may happen in the body; one cannot walk or talk, or disease cannot be cured; so, if body is of *ātmā*, then this should remain under the control of *ātmā*, but this is not so. In this way, body is recognised by its own attributes.

People want to see attributes and faults through associations, which is a delusion. The way, from five bodies seen in a mirror, if any one body is believed to be his own, then that is delusion. Similarly, by activity of body, if activity of *ātmā* is identified, then he is unaware of the independent nature of substance. In association of the body with *ātmā*, *ātmā* should be identified by attributes of *ātmā*.

Owner of the *jaḍa paramāṇu* (smallest unit of physical matter) is *jaḍa* substance. No one has any right over it. Every substance works independently, within the limitation of its own self. The concept that one substance does not have the support of any other substance should be understood and firmly believed in. The belief that if associations leave or if external associations are renounced, then pure nature of substance can be understood is untrue. Perception of seeing tangible association changes, and substance stays permanent, eternally. This thought should be internalised and thought on, deeply, then experience that every substance is independent will arise. *jñānī* knows that non-self modifies due to its own self. But *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* believes that if he leaves non-self substances, then *dharma* will arise. This way, he believes in dependency, and that is sorrow.

From every substance, every *samaya* modification arises. This is the substance which is recognised by *vistāra viśeṣa guṇa* (horizontally spread particular attributes).

To believe that because he had thoughts of organising for others, so everything remained organised, otherwise it would have become disorganised, or for practising renunciation, if he goes into isolation, then it will be good, is delusion; because association of the universe will stay through all three time phases.

Question: If this is so, then why do *munirāja* leave non-self substances?

Answer: *ātmā* can neither take nor leave non-self substances because that which is separate from existence of self is left out, anyway.

Question: Then how will attachment be reduced?

Answer: To say that attachment is destroyed is from the view of *nāsti* (absence). Thinking of removing attachments creates new desires. In the seamless *jñānānanda* (knowing and joy) existence of pure nature, there is no attachment. In this way, by staying in the form of *jñāta* (knower), he remains equanimous, then the extent to which attachment does not arise, that much is *tyāga* (renunciation), which has no relationship with associations.

If *jñāna* would arise by hearing, everyone who hears should have equal *jñāna* but that is not seen to happen. Everyone understands by themselves according to their own

ability. Whatever is understood, the same is alleged on *nimitta*. *vikāra* (perturbed) or *avikāra* (unperturbed) forms arise due to itself, but they do not arise due to favourable or unfavourable association. Therefore, substance is recognized by whatever *bhāvas* (modification) which arises, and it cannot be recognised by anything else.

Every *ātmā* and every *rajakāṇa* (smallest unit of matter) are recognised only by their own present state and their eternal attributes. State of modification of every substance, which is flowing constantly, arises at that time on its own basis. But to believe that it has arisen due to support of some other is a great delusion.

By seeing water flow in the river, does not create a burden, and neither is there a feeling of attachment towards it; but if a full pot is put on the head, then burden is felt; similarly, substances in the universe, modify according to their own efficacies, and they show existence of the substance. In knowing this, there is no sorrow. But, he who instils doer-ship in it, does not believe non-self substance to be *jñeya* (object of knowing/knowable); instead, he believes that he has done-got done, so much and carries the burden of attachment, but if he were to think about the nature of substance, then this attachment would reduce. If he realises that the self's permanence exists, then he will not feel the burden of others; if he were to turn his interest towards the eternal self, then reduction of distortions will occur, interest in distortions will move away, and happiness will be experienced in the eternal nature.

Every substance is recognised by its own attributes. When a body has disease, it is not *ātmā*, but the non-living *paramāṇus* which are recognised.

The way the same cloth is recognised by sequential vertical threads, which occur one after another, and their nature is not separate from the cloth. Similarly, *ātmā* and *paramāṇu*, etc., are recognised by flow of origination-annihilation of the *āyata* (vertical) *viśeṣa* (particular/specific) modification. But they are not recognised by any other associations.

In *nyāyaśāstra*, by way of indirect proof, they explain assumptions through *nimitta*. Fire is recognised through smoke; if this is there, then that will happen. By way of song, a singer can be recognised. Similarly, here, the main one who establishes independence of substance is the Omniscient Lord, and by Him, this assumption has been established. But first, the nature directly experienced by self, with the auspices of self, has to be ascertained, after that, *vyavahāra* of logical analysis or test and knowing of non-self is said to be correct. Without knowing the knower of self, knowing of everything else is an illusion of comprehensive true knowledge.

☆☆☆

❧ *gāthā-96* ❧

अथ क्रमेणास्तित्वं द्विविधमभिदधाति; स्वरूपास्तित्वं सादृश्यास्तित्वं चेति ।
तत्रेदं स्वरूपास्तित्वाभिधानम् -

As per succession, *astitva* (existence) is of two types: *svarūpa astitva* and *sadr̥śya astitva*. In that here *svarūpa astitva* has been explained -

सम्भावो हि सहावो गुणेहिं सगपज्जएहिं चित्तेहिं ।
दब्बस्स सक्कालं उप्पादक्कयधुवत्तेहिं ॥ ९६॥

sabbhāvo hi sahāvo guṇehiṃ sagapajjaehiṃ cittehiṃ
davvassa savvakālaṃ uppādavvayadhuvattehiṃ ॥ 96 ॥

Meaning: At all times, *astitva* (existence) of a substance is with attributes and its own various kinds of modifications. It is with *utpāda* (origination), *vyaya* (annihilation), and *dhrauvya* (permanence). This is the intrinsic nature of a substance.

ṭīkā: *astitva* (existence) is really the nature of *dravya* (substance). That *astitva* (existence) is independent of all other *sādhana* (instrument), it has no beginning or end, and is causeless, always one, always modifying in a uniform occurrence, being different from impure disposition/alien nature, being with attribute and substance, despite, there existing manifoldness in them, not having distinction of *pradeśas* (infinitesimal units of space/spatial units), it maintains oneness with the substance, so why should it not be the nature of *dravya*? (it definitely is).

The way that *astitva*(existence), in relation to each and every substance, ends individually, in that way, it does not end individually in relation to *dravya*, *guṇa* and *paryāya* (substance-attribute-modification) because they are established mutually (or as *dravya*, *guṇa* and *paryāya* (substance-attribute-modification) being established mutually by one another. If one does not exist then the other two also cannot be established their *astitva* (existence)is one only; just like gold.

As in gold, those qualities and modifications which are not seen apart from gold in respect of *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*(substance-space-time-modification) are found associated with the process of holding the characteristic nature of yellow, etc., attributes and ring, etc., modifications, as its *kartā* (doer), *karāṇa* (instrument), *adhikarāṇa* (base), which originate from existence of gold- such yellowness, etc., attributes and ring, etc., modifications being the existence of gold are the characteristic nature of gold itself. So, that which is not seen apart from *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of *dravya*

(substance) is found associated with the process of holding characteristic of attributes and modifications as its doer *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument), and *adhikaraṇa* (base), which originated from the existence of substance - such attributes and modifications being the existence of substance is characteristic nature of substance itself. The yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., which is not seen separate by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of gold, is the existence of gold, because the form of existence of yellowness etc., and earrings etc., is assumed by gold, it is with the existence of gold that existence of yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., is established/proved. If gold would not be there, then yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., would also not be there. Similarly, attributes and modifications which are not seen as separate from *dravya* by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* is the existence of *dravya* itself because as *dravya* assumes the forms of attributes and modification, it is with the existence of *dravya* that attributes and modifications are established/proved. Such an existence is the nature of *dravya*.

And, as in gold, that (gold) which is not seen apart from yellowness, etc., attributes and ring, etc., modifications in respect to *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* is found with process of holding characteristic nature of gold as its *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument), *adhikaraṇa* (base), which is originated by yellowness, etc., attributes and ring, etc., modifications. Existence, which is the main instrument of gold, occurs/is produced by it, is its nature; This existence of gold which is not seen separate from yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., that yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., itself is its existence. Because, as yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., assume the nature of gold, it is with the existence of yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., that gold is established, proved. If yellowness, etc., and earrings, etc., were not there, neither would gold be. Similarly, the existence of *dravya*, which is not seen as separate from *guṇa-paryāya* (attribute-modification), is the existence of *guṇa-paryāya* itself. Because as nature of *dravya* is assumed by *guṇa-paryāya*, it is with the existence of *guṇa-paryāya*, that *dravya* is established/proved. If *guṇa-paryāya* would not be there, then *dravya* would also not be there. Such an existence is the nature of *dravya*.

(The way it has been explained that the existence of *dravya* and *guṇa-paryāya* is one, with the example of gold, in the same way, with the example of gold, it will be proved that *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence and existence of *dravya* is also one).

The way, that which is not seen as separate by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of gold, in the form of *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument), *adhikaraṇa* (base), assuming the nature of *utpāda* (origination) of earrings, etc., *vyaya* (annihilation) of armlet, etc., *dhrauvya* (permanence) of yellowness, etc., and which is established/proved by the existence of gold which is occurring as *utpāda* (origination) of earrings, etc., *vyaya* (annihilation) of armlet, etc., *dhrauvya* (permanence) of yellowness, etc., by which gold exists, that is the nature of gold. Similarly, that which is not seen as separate by *dravya* by *dravya-kṣetra-*

kāla-bhāva, in the form of *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument), *adhikaraṇa* (base), assuming the nature of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) and whose existence is established/proved, by the occurring *dravya* – that *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* by which *dravya* exists, is its nature. (Existence of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya*, which is not seen to be separate from *dravya* by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*, that existence is of *dravya* itself; because as *dravya* assumes the existence of *utpāda-vyayo-dhrauvyo* (origination-annihilation-permanence), it is the existence by *dravya* that numerous *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (originations-annihilations-permanence) are established/proved. If *dravya* were not there, then *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) would also not be there. Such an existence is the nature of *dravya*).

Or, *utpāda* of earrings, etc., *vyaya* of armlet, etc., and *dhrauvya* of yellowness, etc., which is not seen to be separate by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*, that which assumes the form of gold by way of *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument), *adhikaraṇa* (base), and that which is established/proved by the occurrence of *utpāda* of earrings, etc., *vyaya* of armlet etc., and *dhrauvya* of yellowness, etc., - such a gold whose existence being the main instrument by which is it proved/established, is its nature. Similarly, that which is not seen as separate by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* assumes the nature of *dravya* by *kartā*, *karaṇa*, *adhikaraṇa*, which is established/proved by the occurring of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya*-such existence which is the main instrument by which *dravya* is established/proved, is its nature. (the existence of *dravya*, which is not seen as separate from numerous *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence), that is the existence of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya*; because as the nature of *dravya* is assumed by numerous *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (originations-annihilations-permanence), *dravya* is proved/established by *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya*. If *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* were not there, then *dravya* would also not be there. Such an existence is the nature of *dravya*).

bhāvārtha: There is no *pradeśabheda* (spatial difference) between *astitva* (existence) and *dravya* (substance), and that *astitva* is *anādi-anaṅta* (without beginning and end), and it always modifies with a causeless uniform condition, therefore it is of a different form, from the impure/alien nature. It being so, *astitva* (existence) is the characteristic nature of *dravya* (substance).

astitva (existence) of *guṇas-paryāyas* (attributes-modifications) and that of *dravya* (substance) are not different, and it is one and the same because *guṇa-paryāyas* originate from *dravya* and *dravya* is originated/proved by *guṇa-paryāyas* only. Similarly, *astitva* of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* and that of *dravya* is also the same as *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* as they originate only from *dravya* and *dravya* originates/is proved only from *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya*. In this way, *svarūpa-astitva* (existence of characteristic nature) is explained here.

pravacana on gāthā 96

“In all six *dravyas*, there are two types of *astitva*(existence)” –

1. *svarūpa asitva* 2. *sādr̥ṣya astitva*. *ātmā*, etc., all substances are eternally undivided from their own *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*(substance-space covered-time-modification/ essence) and are completely separate from non-self–this is called *svarūpa astitva* (natural existence).

The existence of substance, which is attributes through all times, by many types of its own modifications and by *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence), is, in reality, the nature of substance, and that is called *sādr̥ṣya astitva*.

In every *dravya*, this *astitva* is present in the form of its own nature. It does not require any other instrument; therefore, since *anādi-ananta* (without beginning or end), without any reason, because it is modifying in a state of oneness, its characteristic is separate from the attribute of *vibhāva* and there is no incompleteness in it.

Attribute of *astitva* or its existence is a hundred per cent in every substance. Opposite to this, if it is said that in a substance, seventy-five per cent of existence is due to itself and twenty-five per cent is not, or seventy-five per cent is due to self and twenty-five per cent is due to non-self, then this is contradictory; because that which ‘is’, in that there is no incongruity or incompleteness. Further, existence does not need the support of any associations. Hence, every substance exists independently due to its own *astitva guṇa* (attribute of existence).

State of *ekendriya* (*jīva* with one sense only) is unfavourable and trivial, while state of *siddha* is complete and appropriate. But in that, what difference did it make in the being of substance, in its existence? This is because attribute of *astitva* is without the lower state of *vibhāva*, and modifies completely in a steady sequential constant flow.

Even though there is plurality between *bhāva* (modification) and *bhāvānatva* (holder of modification), there is no distinction of space occupied by them, because of which there is oneness with substance, then why should it not be the nature of substance? Definitely, it will be. Further, the way existence stays separate in each, *ātmā*, *paramāṇu*, etc., and becomes complete in it, in the same way, *astitva* is not complete with just any one of substance-attribute-modification; because they are established/proven by each other, so attribute of *astitva* in substance-attribute-modification is one. Therefore, *astitva* of all the three pervades all together. Hence, it is one only, and it is not distinct by *sva dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* (self-substance-space-time-modification). If this is known, then he himself is the base of his own attribute-modification. Existence of these three is in the self, and the self is of these qualities. Therefore, due to its own nature self has no need to look for it outside of self or look at another for help; neither does he have to wait for time or some associations. On understanding this, if he turns towards the pure self and experiences it, then he himself is the sea of sentience and joy.

If a fish living in the sea tells someone to get water, then they will say that you already have water, then why are you asking for water from others? This means the existence of self is forever complete within the self in the form of *nirapekṣa* (absolutely irrespective), so why should he be asking from others?

Substance means the sum total of attributes, in that the permanently existing *anvayaśakti* (eternally existing efficacy) is an attribute. The *krambaddha* (sequential, in regular succession without a break) state, which arises in attributes, one after another, flowing in the form of origination-annihilation, is modification. Existence of all three is one. Knowledge, belief, happiness, conduct, etc., of *ātmā* and touch-taste-smell-colour of *paramāṇu*, these attributes, with their modifications, is *niścaya* (absolute truth). They do not exist due to any other substance. Here, by way of the undivided existence of substance-attribute-modification of *svajñeya* (self-knowable) existence of all substances is being proved.

By way of *dravya, kṣetra, kāla, bhāva* (substance, space, time, modification) existence of all attributes and modifications of gold can be recognised. The existence of gold is recognised through yellowness, etc., attributes, and earrings, etc., modifications. But the nature of gold is such that it is not recognised by the association of a goldsmith, etc.

The way gold is not seen separate from its attribute-modification, so *kartā* (doer), *sādhana* (instrument) and *ādhāra* (support), of the attribute of yellowness etc., and earring, etc., modification is gold only; but goldsmith, tongs, hammer, etc., are not. Similarly, all substances, by way of *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*, are not separate from their attribute-modifications. Hence, no substance has the nature to modify by *dravya, kṣetra, kāla, bhāva* of non-self.

ātmā, by itself, is the doer, instrument and support of its own knowledge-belief-conduct, etc. In this, no *deva-guru-śāstra*, disease-free body, etc., are doer, instrument and is not the giver of support either, because existence of their substance-attribute-modification is due to their own existence, but existence of this *jīva* is not due to them. In this way, existence of one cannot be proved by another.

In the current modification, modification of *dharma* or *adharmā* arises if he himself does so, but not due to some other reason nor due to inspiration or influence of someone else. Ignorant sees from the view of association, but *jñānī* does not see the existence of one through another.

He who believes that *dharma* can be done in a good place and time is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* (with erroneous belief) because nature of substance is not so. He who believes that he can speak the truth believes oneness with *dravya, kṣetra, kāla, bhāva* of *paramāṇu*. The desire that 'I will speak this' shows the *ātmā*. Because substance, space, time and modification of *paramāṇu* of speech assumes a separate existence from *jīva*, and its doer-instrument-base is *paramāṇu*.

Existence of attribute-modification of every substance, *dravya, kṣetra, kāla, bhāva* of every *samaya*, is by self, it is at one with the form of doer-instrument-base and is eternally separate from non-self. If this nature of every substance is known then experience of the independent, complete, self non-self *jñeya* occurs.

Every *ātmā, paramāṇu*, etc., substance is not separate from its own attribute-modification and its *dravya, kṣetra, kāla, bhāva*. It is not dependent on external support. Here, taking attribute-modification as the main reason, the doer, instrument and base, which prove the substance, have been explained.

Gold cannot be seen separate by substance, space, time, modifications, of yellowness etc., attributes and earrings, etc., modifications; but to prove gold as a substance, the doer-instrument-base in the form of attribute-modifications only are used.

Attribute-modification which makes gold, meaning attribute-modifications which assume the main form of instrument, is gold. Similarly, *ātmā*, etc., all substances are not seen as separate by *dravya, kṣetra, kāla, bhāva* from their own attribute-modifications; because that which are attribute-modifications, become the form of doer to prove the substance, become the main instrument and by becoming the main base, it assumes the substance. By this great principle, the belief that work is done by associations is destroyed.

In determining *paramāṇu*, its attribute-modification is the doer, base and main instrument. *paramāṇu*, cannot be proved by desire or *jñāna* of *jīva*, because *paramāṇu* do not exist due to *jīva*.

anṣī is substance, and if its *anṣa* (infinitesimal part) were because of another substance, then without *anṣa*, which is the current modification, where is the substance? Self is *ātmā*, but if it is believed that *dharma* of self is due to *deva-guru-śāstra* or because body was in good condition, so equanimity rose, then he has not accepted his existence by his own *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*. Existence of *ātmā*, or attribute-modification of *ātmā*, cannot be proved by external instruments or by the support of another substance because the main instrument to prove existence of *ātmā* is its own attribute-modification.

Movement of body is the real instrument to ascertain modification of *paramāṇu*. But *jīva* is not the instrument to move it; this is because, by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*, body cannot be seen separate from its *paramāṇu*. If body would be moved by *ātmā*, then it should be moving as desired, at every *samaya*. This is the great principle of complete independence.

Amazing! *jñāna*, etc., modifications of *ātmā*, being the *kartā-ādihāra* (doer-support) and main *sādhana* (instrument) assumes the *ātma* substance. Here, for deciding on the existence of *dravya*, attribute-modification have been said to be the main instrument.

Compassion towards others proves the existence of other, and desires of *ātmā* proves the existence of *ātmā*, but for deciding one substance, another substance's, *kartā*, *sādhana* and *ādhāra* cannot be the reason.

Question: For attaining *śuddhoupayoga* (pure psychic activity), is there any other instrument or not?

Answer: No, because its existence cannot be proven by *vyavahāra* (conventional viewpoint), which is in the form of auspicious attachment or due to any *nimitta*. If modification by itself modifies independently in the form of *śuddhabhāva* (pure modification), then attachment and *nimitta* are said to be instruments by way of *upacāra*(figuratively). But in reality, they are all completely separate because they cannot show the pureness of *ātmā*.

Manifestation of modification of *kevalajñāna*, becoming the true instrument, proves the *ātmā*. But it does not prove *vajravṛṣabhanāraca samhanana* (adamantine body), nor does it prove the absence of *karma*. Modification of *divyadhvani* (om sound manifesting from *Tirthaṅkara*) proves its *paramāṇu* but does not prove *bhagavāna ātmā*. Similarly, modification of *roti* (Indian bread) proves its own *paramāṇu* but does not prove the pan, fire, etc.

Question: In this, does not *nimitta*, as explained in texts of *vyavahāra*, get negated?

Answer: If this nature of *niścaya* is known, then appropriate knowing arises in relation to what kind of *nimitta kāraṇa* (auxiliary cause) is present, as explained in *vyavahāra śāstras*.

jñāna, which decides the meaning of self, non-self and is without any flaw of doubt, etc., that *jñāna* is *pramāṇa* (balanced). First, it is appropriately decided who is self, and only after that appropriate knowing of non-self arises, then it is called *pramāṇa*.

That substance-attribute from which modification which has arisen is the root and actual instrument of existence of substance, and none other is. When this is decided within, no distinction will be seen between the present self and the eternal. In fact, by nature, it is undivided and complete, and that will be seen. Only the path of *vītarāga* is such. With focus on self, when this *ātmā* is seen as undivided one, then *sva-para prakāśaka jñāna* (*jñāna* which illuminates self and non-self) manifests. After that, what is non-self is also known. It is not proved that he has understood by himself, so there must be someone to explain, but it is proved that by the modification of understanding, his own substance is proved.

With writing of the original *gāthās* of this *Pravacanasāra*, *Srī Kuṇḍa Kuṇḍa Ācārya* is not proven. He is a separate *jñāna svarūpa ātmā* (*ātmā* which is pure nature of *jñāna*) who is recognised on the base of the modification of knowing, and by the true instrument, which is the nature of *jñāna*.

If self is recognised by the root/actual instrument, which is the modification of self, then appropriate *jñāna* that non-self is due to non-self arises. Through all *kṣetras* (areas) and *kāla* (time), only this one concept exists, that by modification of every *samaya*, the presence of substance is proved. Therefore, there is no reason to look for any other.

‘*vacanāmarta vītarāga nā parama śānta rasa mūla*’, – these words prove the existence of *paramāṇu* but do not prove the knowledge of *jīva*. *kartā*, *ādhāra* and *sādhana* of every substance are eternally separate-if this is known, then the glory of *jñāna* arises.

Attributes-modifications are in the form of real *sādhana*, and substance is proved through them only. Substance is a mass of modifications of three-time phases. From these modifications of three-time phases, if one modification is not believed to be the real instrument, no substance can be proved.

In every substance, in comparison to modification of the past, modifications of future are infinite times more. However, many do not believe this. They believe that in comparison to modifications of the past, modification of future is only as much more as the present one *samaya*. But by believing this, substance cannot be proved. Modification is the main instrument. From this, even if one modification is presumed to be less, then substance cannot be proved. This is a very subtle concept. One *paramāṇu*, its infinite attributes, and its eternal modifications, in the form of efficacy, from that, even if one modification is taken out, then attribute will not be proved, and without attribute, substance cannot be proved.

For proving the substance, modification of every *samaya* is the real instrument, doer and base. In this, there is no dependency on anyone with anyone. Hence, there is a separation from non-self, and undivided, oneness with self is decided upon. This is the experience of *saṁyagdarśana*, *saṁyagjñāna*.

Question: Why is *nimitta* not been remembered at all?

Answer: *nimitta* is recognised by its own modification, It is remembered by saying that its instrument and support is that itself. *dravya-guṇa-paryāya* (substance-attribute-modification) *utpāda-vyaya-dhruva* (origination-annihilation-permanence), all are *saṭ* (existing) and without any cause. These are unrelated to *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* (substance-spacetime-modification) of non-self. So *vyavāhara* is accepting the pure nature and then knowing its relationships.

Question: In this, is there anything left to do?

Answer: *ānanda* (bliss) is in focusing towards the pure self-knowing this or focussing on the knowing nature of self, and not accepting *mithyātva*-that needs to be done.

Every *ātma* and *paramāṇu*, etc., substances have modifications every *samaya*, which is the main instrument for proving the substance. From this attribute-modification, existence of substance is recognised. Such is the nature of existence of substance.

From the wealth of one million, if even one cent is reduced, then one million cannot be proved. Present modification, which is in the form of origination-annihilation,

and mass of infinite such modifications is attribute. Mass of such infinite attribute-modifications is substance. From this, if even one modification is reduced or it is said to have arisen from *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of another substance, then substance can not be proved. Substance exists due to modification, modification (state of origination-annihilation of every *samaya*) is *ādhāra* (support), and substance is *ādheya* (one who is supported). Modification is *kartā* (doer/cause) and substance is *kārya* (work done/effect). Modification is *mūlasādhana* (main instrument), and substance is *sādhya* (one which is to be attained).

If modification of one *samaya* of attributes of *śraddha-jñāna-cāritra*, etc., of *ātmā*, is believed to be due to someone else, then without this infinitesimal part, substance cannot be proved, and the complete existence of self also does not remain. For example, if the age of a person is a hundred years, it includes every *samaya* of that time. If, from this age, one *samaya* is removed or believed to be generated due to *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of another, then the person's age of a hundred years cannot be proved. Similarly, if it is believed that in *ātmā*, attachment-aversions, knowledge, happiness-sorrow, arises due to *karma*, body, space or time and one *ātmā* is the doer, instrument or support of another *ātmā*, then no substance will be proved. No one's existence is due to any other because substance is with *astivaguṇa* (attribute of existence) and *guṇi* (beholder of attributes) does not have dependency on any other.

If it is believed that cloth burnt because of fire, then it will have to be believed that it was not the time for its modification, and if it is believed that the modification was due to non-self, then it is not possible for any substance to exist. If fire turned the modification of cloth into the form of fire, then fire has highlighted the cloth, but it will have to be accepted that fire has not done the work of maintaining/keeping the instrument, base and doer of substance.

In this *gāthā*, the term *sarvakāla* is used. In this, the present time is included in the form of the present modification. Therefore, substance can be proved only through *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* and by present modification in the form of origination-annihilation. But, no substance can ever be proved without its own attributes-modification.

Modification of one *samaya* of earring, etc., supports the entire gold. If the state of yellowness, etc., would not be there, then gold itself would not exist. So, existence of attribute-modification is the existence of substance, and this is the nature of every substance.

Now, it will be proved that existence of substance and *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) is the same, by way of an example.

As yellowness, etc., attributes, and earrings, etc., modifications are not separate from the existence of gold, so their origination, transformation and permanence are proved by gold. Gold is the *kartā-sādhana* of the origination-annihilation-permanence of its modification. But goldsmith, tongs, fire, etc., are not. It is not that, due to someone else's

dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva, or by someone's mistake, or by someone's expertise, the pot of gold broke, and a new crown was made.

He who knows that the base of annihilation and origination is substance attains equanimity. Those who believe that because the boy dropped ghee (clarified butter), so anger arose, or food was well cooked, so it was appreciated, or a child fell, so anger arose, believe origination-annihilation to be due to *dravya-kṣetra-kāla*, etc., of non-self. On seeing the present association and modification, when one believes them to be good-bad is *pariyāya mūdha* (perplexed by modification), *mithyādrṣṭi* (one with erroneous belief). If attachments-aversions, happiness-sorrow, occur due to non-self, then it should happen to all and should be of the same type, but that not so.

Support and doer of losing money is *paramāṇu*, and none other. If head breaks, then its base and cause are minute particles of the body. If it is believed that base of numerous designs of ornaments is gold, only then focus will go on substance, and with its auspices actual resolution will arise.

Such *anantānubandhī* (that which gives infinite bondage) *kaṣāya* (passions), that if *ghee* (clarified butter) falls in *khicadī* (soft lentil and rice porridge), then he has attachment, and if it falls outside the plate, then there is anger, is the cause of infinite transmigration. Its base-doer is *ajñānī jīva* (ignorant soul). He who sees only modification is *mūdha* (perplexed) *ajñānī* (ignorant), and if he believes that existence of other substances is only because of him, then he is opposing the substance which is the base of its origination-annihilation-permanence, in which opposition of self occurs. Belief that due to non-self or due to support of non-self, change in another or manifestation of another occurs, change or constancy occurs, is the belief/focus of dependency of infinite non-self substances, and this is the cause of infinite transmigration.

He who believes that as a robber stabbed, so there was a gash in the body, because good food was eaten, so the body is healthy, or hunger was satiated, or food was not eaten, hence fasting occurred, or thoughts remained good, has not accepted the independent existence of any substance.

Now, for proving the substance, *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) of present modification is stated to be the nature of the main *sādhana-kartā-ādihāra* (instrument-doer-base).

For example, that which is not seen separate by *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*, from the arising of earrings, etc., destruction of amulet, etc., and permanence of yellowness, etc., - such a gold has been sustained by these modifications. On basis of annihilation of the earlier state, arising of the new state, and gold-ness remaining as it is, is the existence of the nature of gold.

Question: If it is believed that substance exists, so attribute-modification exists, and if attribute-modification exists, then substance exists, then will not the error of mutual dependency arise?

Answer: As they exist as one, this error does not arise.

In all substances, there is a constant process of origination, annihilation, and permanence taking place. These processes are not separate from the substance and it is this that allows them to exist. Without the necessary instruments, actions, and underlying foundations, substances cannot be proven to exist. If it is suggested that these processes are the result of some other cause, then substances themselves will cease to not exist. Every modification or change in a *paramāṇu* (the smallest physical matter particle) is not due to any other *paramāṇu*, nor is it the result of someone's wishful thinking or knowledge. When a pot breaks, it's natural for clumps of mud to arise. Absence of this natural occurrence means that the nature of that substance does not exist. Ignorant *jīvas* fail to distinguish between the main reason and associations and therefore ignore the existence of the actual nature of a substance. This lack of interest identifies their substance. All substances exist through their own origination-annihilation-permanence of every *samaya* (smallest unit of time).

It is not due to desire that someone can go to Songadh. The desire to go there was present for some time, and existence of self was proven at that time by the modification of that time, and existence of second *samaya* was due to the modification of that *samaya*. For proving of self, in the present, current modification is the main instrument, reason and base, and self is *ādheya* (one who receives a base/support). But it is not that self exists because desire was there in the past, or knowing was done, and beneficial/ non-beneficial attachments were done, or teachings were heard. Self exists on the base of present modification in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of non-self is left far behind, but none can exist even on the base of earlier modification. Existence is not proved by modification of past or future but is proved by modification, which is in the form of main instrument in the manifestation of origination-annihilation-permanence of present modification of the substance. When this is known, then focus of substance arises, and dependency ceases.

Nature of existence of every substance is assumed by its main instrument in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. They are not separate from existence of substance. Auspicious attachments of compassion, charity, originated, and at the same time, inauspicious attachments were annihilated, which proves the existence of *jīva* substance. But he did not do anything in non-self.

Question: Does modification of attachment prove the existence of *ātma*?

Answer: Yes, it is the *vikāri* (perturbed) modification of attribute of *cāritra* (conduct). This modification proves the attribute, and attribute proves *guṇi* (bearer of attributes). Attachment of one *samaya* has its infinite, indivisible parts. From these, even if one is not believed, then without the existence of infinitesimal part, that which is with infinitesimal part cannot be proved. If earlier modification is not annihilated, then origination of new modification cannot be proved, and without that substance cannot be proved.

In this way, with the existence of *utpāpa-vyavya-dhrauvya*, existence of substance is proved.

Question: Should pure *aṣṭadravya* (eight substances for rituals) be taken for *pūjā* of *Bhagavāna* or not? If desire to read *Samayasāra* arises, should it be picked up and read or not?

Answer: It does not have the dependency that because we have attachment of these, so *aṣṭadravya* and *Samayasāra* came. Current desire proves the existence of *jīva* substance. But it does not have any relationship with *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva* of non-self. *jīva* has no control over the movement of iris of the eye. One *paramāṇu* has no right in the work of another *paramāṇu*.

Question: What kind of *śraddhā* (belief) should we work with?

Answer: With belief based on self-substance, it should be believed that no desire has made me, and *vikalpa* (thoughts) shows the existence of self. It is not proven that with movement of the iris, the eye moves. Ignorant who sees through gross associations see this as singular *niyativāda* (fatalism). But through all three *kālas*, modification of every substance is *niyata* (destined) and is never in any other way - such *samyak anekānta*, existence of the substance is proved, then focus on substance will be without doubt and with firmness.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā- 97* ❧

इदं तु सादृश्यास्तित्वाभिधानमस्तीति कथयति—

Now, in the *gāthā 97*, existence of *sādr̥śya astitva* (nature of general existence) is explained -

इह विविहलक्खणाणं लक्खणमेगे सदित्ति सव्वगयं ।
उवदिसदा खलु धम्मं जिणवरवसहेण पण्णत्तं ॥ ९७॥

*iha vivihalakkhaṇāṇaṃ lakkhaṇamegaṃ saditti savvagayaṃ |
uvadisadaṃ khalu dhammaṃ jīṇavaravaśaheṇa paṇṇattamaṃ || 97 ||*

Meaning: The true preacher of *dharma*, *Jīnavara R̥ṣabha* (first *Tirthaṅkara Jīna*), while preaching *dharma*, declared that *saṭ* (to exist) is the one, *sarvagata* - omnipresent common characteristic of existence (*sādr̥śya astitva*) of all substances.

tikā: Here, in this world, all substances, although, exhibiting their multifariousness by process of remaining separate from one another and fixing the boundary of each substance, are defined/recognised by their own *svarūpa astitva* (existence of specific characteristic nature); even then, *saṭ* (to exist), *sādr̥śya astitva* (omnipresent existence of common nature) prevalent in all substances should undoubtedly be known as one, and it leaves the multifariousness, which belongs to all substances and ignores the fixed boundary of each substance.

Thus, the expression *saṭ* (to exist) and cognisance of all sorts of substances expressed by *saṭ* represent existence of all substances. If this were not so, then any one substance could be termed *saṭ* (existent), some other as *asaṭ* (non-existent), another substance as *saṭ* and *asaṭ* (existent and non-existent) and some other substance as *avācya* (impossible to describe). But this is undoubtedly contradictory (to call something *saṭ* or *asaṭ* or *saṭ-asaṭ*, and *avācaya*), whereas the point of *saṭ* is such that expression and knowledge of it being representative of all substances can be proved by the example of a tree.

In the case of many different kinds of trees, diverse and manifested based on their own *svarūpa astitva* (existence of characteristic nature), which is a specific distinction of an individual tree is assimilated by oneness established by the ‘genus’ tree, which is a *sāmānya lakṣaṇa* (general characteristic) and manifests as *sādr̥śya astitva* (existence of common nature). So, in the case of different kinds of substances, diversity is manifested on basis of their own *svarūpa astitva* (existence of characteristic nature), which is a specific differentiation of individual substance, is assimilated by oneness established

by *satpanā*/being existent, i.e., it is a *sāmānya lakṣaṇa* (general characteristic) and manifests as *sādr̥ṣya astitva* (existence of common nature).

And as in the case of these trees, although (their diversity) is assimilated by oneness established by the genus 'tree' as a general characteristic and manifests as existence of common nature, even then, diversity manifested on basis of their own *svarūpa astitva* (existence of characteristic nature) which is a specific distinction of an individual tree, still comes forth. So, in case of all substances, although (diversity) is assimilated by oneness established by genes '*sat*' (being/existent), which is a general characteristic and manifests as the existence of common nature, even then, diversity manifested on the basis of their own *svarūpa astitva* (existence of characteristic nature) which is a specific differentia of individual substance, still springs forth.

Many, i.e., many in terms of number and many types or like mango tree, ashoka tree etc., having their own *svarūpa astitva* (existence of characteristic nature), each being separate from the view of *svarūpa astitva* there is diversity, but from the view of being a tree, that which is the common characteristic of all trees, shows the *sādr̥ṣya* (commonality) state. From that view, there is a commonality among all trees. When this oneness is highlighted, then diverse nature becomes secondary. In this way, many or infinite and multiple types or six types of *dravyas*, have their *svarūpa astitva* as separate; hence, from that view, there is multiple-ness in them. But from the perspective of *sat* (to exist), that state, which is the common characteristic of all substances and shows sameness amongst them, has a oneness in all substances. When this oneness is made primary, then diversity becomes secondary. In this way, when the commonality of - to exists- is taken as primary, when all substances' existence becomes main, manifoldness becomes secondary. But even at that time, the manifoldness of existence of all substances, and their diversity, is highlighted very clearly.

[In this way, *sādr̥ṣya astitva* (existence of common nature) has been explained]

pravacana on gāthā 97

Now *sādr̥ṣya astitva* (common characteristic of existence) is being explained -

While imparting the divine discourse, *Tirthankara Bhagavāna* said that in the universe, at all times, all substances exist in different forms by nature of self, and they are not like each other. Despite this being so, their characteristic of attribute of existence pervading in all substances, which is *sādr̥ṣya astitva*, is common to all.

Existence is present in everything. Nothing can be removed from this commonality of existence. The immensely miserable state of lifeform with only one sense (*nigoda ekeṅdriya*) and state of *siddha*, extremely violent and non-violent, anger and forgiveness, fragrance and stench, one who intensely opposes *tattvas* (fundamental principles) and one who accepts

it with understanding etc., all are together in this universe. The thought of why is there such variegated-ness that ‘self is *jñāna*, and that is *jñeya*’ has no place in *jñāna*. The focus and understanding that as existence, everyone is equal is the cause for *vītarāgatā* (passionless state).

Question: Does belief in one *Brahmā* bring about a lot of *vītarāgatā*?

Answer: No. In believing that, independent existence of none of the substances is accepted. If all are one and with blemishes, will this *jīva* also be with blemishes? Whoever is with intense desires may be suffering due to ignorance, but self-being separate from them can be liberated by becoming *vītarāgī* (passionless), independently. Singularity (*ekānta*) of believing in *advaita* (non-duality) does not have even an iota of *vītarāgatā*. Because, in this, it is believed that self is in the form of one with the entire universe. Believing that self is not separate means, that as others are passionate sinners, sorrowful and ignorant, self also cannot become *vītarāgī*. But at no point can anyone’s nature be due to another. Making all a part of the general knowable, and to be *jñāta-dṛṣṭā* (knower-seer) of all is called *vītarāgatā*. *ekānta* existence is not an independent entity. But in that, power of nature is seen as secondary, and existence of all substances is seen as primary.

jñānā does not question why does someone oppose the truth, and some respect it, or why a sinner of yesterday became virtuous today? This is because he knows that also, to be a knowable of the universe. Knowledge which does not negate the existence of anything, is the cause of *vītarāgatā*.

In this universe, every substance is characterised by the specific attribute of existence, which is an elaboration of variegation (showing plurality), staying completely separate from other substances, modifying as distinct and separate from non-self, or being present and always, creating boundaries for all substances.

That which is one *samaya*, is in all *samayas*. That which separates for one *samaya* will be separate from non-self in all states through all three-time phases. And it is undivided within its own *dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva*. Therefore, boundaries of any *guṇa-paryāya* of any *ātmā* does not go into any non-self *jīva* or into anybody, etc., and nothing of anyone comes into it – such is the nature of substance.

Those who believe that *ātmā* cannot change *sūkṣma paramāṇu* (minutest, subtle/indivisible matter substance), but can change *sthūla* (gross) body, etc., have not understood the boundaries of a substance. *jīva* can desire, but he cannot make the pace of body faster or slower, so to think that if he wants to go to three villages, he should walk faster, and if he wants to go to one village, then he should walk slowly, is incorrect. This is because he cannot make the body’s pace faster or slower.

Existence of every substance is mutually distinct. Ignoring this boundary, he should see *saṭ*, which is the all-pervasive *sādṛśya astīva* (commonality in existence), and it should

be seen as one. To see anything without agitation and surprise, and to know these, without any thoughts, is the of *vītarāga* focus.

All substances are existing, and no one is excluded from this. ‘Exists’-in such a *sādṛṣya sattā* (existence of being) is known. ‘Exits’- in words, comes due to speech, and the same comes in *jñeya*, too. If all substances do not have the same state of existence and *jñāna* is not the kind which can take all substances into focus, then some substances should exist, and some should not, but it is not possible that at any point in time, any substance can be without existence.

By saying ‘it is’, the knowing of that which is not, does not occur; but substance is there - *jñāna* knows that. *Siddha* is there, and so is *nigoda*; they are all in one *samaya*. Existence of non can be negated, and *vītarāgata* arises by belief of this. If it is understood that all are present, then *jñāna* knows that self is due to nature of self, and non-self substances are due to nature of non-self. When *tattva* exists, then its knower is also there, and one who speaks about it is also there.

It may be said that *siddha* should be there, and *nigoda* should not be there, or that aroma should be there, but stench should not be there, one who respects should be there, and one who disrespects should not be there, but this does not happen. All are present, and by accepting the existence of all, *vītarāgata* arises.

Question: Should pure *ātma* be respected or not?

Answer: If it is known that this is the inherent nature, then respect for pure *ātma* occurs, but respect for pure *ātma* cannot be through *vikalpa* (thoughts). By erasing thoughts, the *astitva* (existence) comes into focus. If all *jñeyas* are not accepted as equal by way of existence, then attachment-aversion or belief of good-bad is sure to arise.

jñāna knows that substance is not attribute; attribute is not as much as modification, and modification is not in the form of substance-attribute; even then, from the general attribute of existence of all substances, existence of none is left out. If existence is not there, in *jñāna*, in speech and in the world, then contradiction will arise.

In this universe, there are infinite *paramāṇus*, *ātmās*, etc. They have numerous states – and it is impossible for them to have none. Every substance exists by its own self and is separate from non-self; even then, all are ‘existing’. In *jñāna*, this kind of *sāmānya saṅgraharūpa astitva* (collective commonality of existence) is known. Speech also has the ability to explain this. In this way, ‘it is/existence’ does not separate anything but integrates every substance within existence, and such a *vītarāgī jñāna* does not imagine attachment-aversion towards anyone.

No *ātma* has a relationship with another *ātma* or with a body, etc., or *paramāṇus* To know this with focus on one’s own *ātma* is *samyagdarśana*.

jīva has perturbation or lack of perturbation, happiness or sorrow, due to its own self, and not due to non-self. But it is incorrect to say that non-self is not present in self,

and neither does non-self exist as non-self. At all times, all substances stay within their own boundaries. If all are seen from the view of *sāmānaya saṅgraha astitva* (collective commonality of existence), then *vītarāgī vijñāna* (passionless-scientific understanding) is not amazed at seeing multiplicity in self and non-self *jñeyas* as well and does not question, how can this be? Nor does it think that this should happen and that should not happen, or this is good, and this is not good, and by not believing in any of these, it expands. *saṭ* which is words, and *saṭ*, which is *jñāna*, is the knower of all substances. If it were not so, then some substances would exist, and some would not exist.

Question: Will substances which are *saṭ* (existing) become *asaṭ* (non-existing)?

Answer: Yes! Because *saṭ* (existence) is from the view of self and from the view of non-self, that substance is *asaṭ* (non-existent), but this is not what is being explained here. Here, all existence is seen collectively with the commonality of existence and the *jñāna* which knows it, is explained. From existence of all, separating some and negating its existence should not be done as it is not so that some substance exists and some do not. It will come in the pages ahead that by *sva dravya-kṣetra-kāla-bhāva, ātmā*, etc., which are *saṭ*, are *asaṭ* (non-existence) from view of non-self. If this is believed only then, *anekānta* (confluence of pluralism) will be maintained.

This *ātmā* has no relationship with other *ātmās*, insentient karmic matter, etc., both are eternally separate. Modification of attachment-aversion occurs due to weakness of self and infinite attributes of self as well as their modifications, are present in existence of self, due to self, and not due to non-self. Believing that temporary attachment is not the nature of eternal self, is an acceptance of pure *ātmā*. In knowing *jñeya* after the emergence of *samyagdarśana*, uncertainty of why this is so, or the ignorant belief that non-self is the reason for attachments, does not occur. After that, he remains a knower of all, just as they are. After that, attentiveness towards *saṭ* will be beneficial.

In the modification of self, thoughts of compassion-charity, vows, passions, anger, etc., are due to self. To know this existence of modification in the form of modification is *saṭ ruci* (genuine interest). Even then, it is a state of one *samaya*. If its very existence is not accepted, then the nature of eternal, pure self will not exist.

The belief that self is as much as *punya-pāpa*, attachments, etc., attachment arises due to non-self, one can do work of non-self, or due to auspicious attachments, or with the support of auspicious attachments, and due to auspices of separate attributes or due to true *deva*, etc., *samyagdarśana* arises, is *mithyātva*. By removing these through true *jñāna*, having auspices in self substance, and embracing the self, *samyagdarśana* occurs.

On knowing *svajñeya*, he also knows that attachment is not pure nature. But it is the modification which arises due to one's own weakness. In this way, knowing of self accepts that, too. Non-self cannot bring any advantage or disadvantage. He who knows

the existence of modification, as ‘existing’, to him, why is this so? Such surprise, due to ignorance, does not arise. By increasing purity and expanding the greatness of *jñāna*, he attains *vītarāgata*.

Knowledge of existence is such that it takes into account all substances. If this were not so, then some substance would be *saṭ*, and some would be *asaṭ*, existence of some would be of partial existence and partial non-existence, and some would be indescribable. However, reality is the opposite of this.

There are infinite attributes, and their support is the substance, which is *sāmānya dhruva* (common constant). Their modification, existing for one *samaya*, arising sequentially, is the existence of one *samaya*, and its existence in *bhāvavāna* (*ātmā*, which is the beholder of modifications) is due to itself. Modification of attachment, etc., is *svajñeya* (self-knowable), but modifications are not in the form of substance-attribute.

If all substances are known in every way through *astitva guna*, then no erroneous thoughts arise. *jñāna* knows just the way things are. Some have modification of *nigoda*, some have accomplished modification of *siddha*, some are *sādhaka* (seeker), some are *virādhaka* (opposer), etc., each is the way it is.

There are many types of *paramāṇus*. Their forms are so by their own self. In this way, all *jñeyas* (knowables) are present in the state of existence in one *samaya*. In a *jñānī*, the thought, that how is this so, does not arise, as it is with the force of *mithyātva*. Thoughts which arise due to weakness have reconciliation in *jñāna*. *dharma-adharma* in self is not due to the other person; their thoughts are in them. All exist - *jñāna*, which decides this, manifests the greatness of *jñāna*, staying with equanimity in *jñāna*, proving only *vītarāga vijñāna* (science of passionless-ness), manifests in the form of *kevala jñāna* (omniscience).

All substances ‘exist’-words have the ability to say this. *jñāna* has the ability to know that all substances exist. All substances exist, and this ability of *saṭ sāmānya rūpa jñeyatva* (existence in the form of knowable common generality) is present in all substances.

If this is so, then if this happened, why did it happen, or should it not have happened? Such thoughts have no place in it. They are *jñeyas*, and this *jñāna* is only the knower-what is there to oppose in this?

Oh! He became a brat! That modification is also a state of existence. Milk was spilt, and the house was damaged. The person responsible did not know how to clean it up. Why did this happen? But listen! Why shouldn’t things change according to their current efficacy? Origination-annihilation-permanence is the nature of existence. In that, how did this happen? Such thoughts are not present; because *jñāna* also has the efficacy to know precisely that, in that *samaya*. To know the existence of all substances by accepting that at this *samaya*, only this will occur, is the focus of *vītarāga*, and on the strength of this, he modifies in the form of *vītarāga*.

When many even-uneven variegated states arise in this universe, it is due to its own self, and self is only the knower. Knowing this, brings his focus mainly on substance and interest of self with an unflinching focus works here. He sees attachment, which arises in the state of *sādhaka* (seeker), to be due to weakness and does not see them as having arisen due to non-self. From the aspect of that modification, this does occur; this kind of discretion in the knowing of existence expands the state of equanimity and passionlessness.

Question: In the speech of Omniscient and in His *jñāna*, all this comes together, but how does it come to the one with lesser knowledge?

Answer: All *sva-para* are *jñeyas*. In one *samaya*, all these keep their own complete existence along with their own attribute-modifications. They are as they are. One with lesser knowing has this kind of true belief and knowledge. Existence of attributes and modification of one cannot be due to another-this belief is true *puruṣārtha* (effort).

When desire for *bhakti* (benedictory singing) arises, then *darśana* (bowing) of *Bhagavāna* occurs. As *Tirthankara Prabhu* himself was present, desire for *bhakti* arose. This kind of amazement, which is with *antānubandhi*, is not present in a *jñānī*. He doesn't believe that something will happen due to non-self. Suddenly, if an angry enemy comes to hit, then the fear which arises is not because of the enemy.

Perturbation, which arises due to slight weakness, is *jñeya*. Ability of *jñāna* at that time was to know only that. No one is an enemy or a friend. Self, which is *sva jñeya*, and all others, which are *para-jñeya*, are present in one *samaya*. When is it that they do not change according to their own ability? Wherever it is seen, at that time, that particular thing occurs as it is meant to-knowing this, *jñānī* does not think why this has occurred. This kind of attachment occurs in a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*, but does not arise in a *jñānī*. The way a *Kevalī* knows, the self is a knower in exactly the same way and this is the passionless focus.

Everything is together, and the same comes in *jñāna* and in speaking as well. It is possible to affirm that existence of all substances can be known together.

The essence of a thing is established by its inherent nature, acknowledging and believing in this truth is *dharma*. Self turns its focus on this pure nature and is its knower. He who has this kind of belief and knowledge, only he has the true *dharma* of charity, penance, vows, *sāmāyika*, *pratikramaṇa*, and his dispositions of *mithyātva* have gone.

With the acceptance of pure nature of self, *pratyākhyāna* (giving up/forsaking) of *mithyātva* occurs. Taking or forsaking non-self is not within the self, and only the knowing nature of pure self is embraced, which is the extraordinary *dharma*. If it is known that the entire universe in the form of nine *tattvas*, is just the way it is, then true *jñāna* arises.

The general collective existence shows trees which are many and varied in type, as same. When seen in this way, the separate identity of each tree is obscured. In the same way, separateness of every substance is eternal, even then, when all are seen through attribute of existence only, then their plurality gets obscured.

siddhas are infinitely happy, *jīvas* of *nitya nigoda* are extremely unhappy, there are seekers as well as non-seekers, some are *ekāvatārī* (with only one *bhava* left), and some *abhavya* (who will never be liberated) are also there, they are all included in the existence of one *samaya*. *jñānī* does not have the question of, how is this? Experience of agitation, perturbation, and astonishment are rooted in *mithyātva*. Hence, they obscure such plurality of thoughts or do not allow them to occur.

When *Tirthankara Bhagavāna* attains *mokṣa*, *Samvasaraṇa* disperses. As soon as *Cakravartī* takes *dīkṣā* (ordination), *navanidhāna* (nine types of invaluable treasures) go away, and everything looks desolate. So why is this? But a *jñānī* does not have this kind of uncertainty and dismay which is born out of *mithyātva*. At those times, this is how things were meant to be, and *jñāna* also knows the same. Everything is known as it is and this is the virtue of the knower. Besides this, with a focus on outer activities, if he has auspicious-inauspicious attachments, then that is of no value in the path of *dharma*.

Every substance exists as self, by its substance-attribute-modification, and does not exist by non-self. When focus turns towards this non-contradictory *ātma*, if it is said that it exists then no existence is left out. In this *ātma*, perturbed-unperturbed states are just as they are and whatever states of other *ātmās* and *paramāṇus*, etc., are they also are exactly so. This is the belief of *jñāna* which accepts things as they are, without any attachment or aversion. This state of being is called *vītarāgatā*.

At whichever time, whatever state it is meant to occur occurs exactly that way, in that, the thought of how is this possible? is not there. By believing some *jñeya* to be favourable or unfavourable, they do not have such astonishment in the form of attachments because knowing is the nature of self. There is no thought of believing anything to be beneficial/non-beneficial. Knowing that attachment arises due to weakness and is present, is the nature of the self.

jñānī does not believe that state of infinite *pudgalas* and *jīvas*, which occurs at whichever time, should be in a specific way for them to be appropriate. Self, while staying within its nature of knowing, is the knower of existence of self and non-self *jñeyas*. This is *dharma* and *vītarāgatā*. This is how it is known through all three time phases by *Trilokanātha Bhagavāna* (Lord of three *lokas*), and the same has come in His teachings.

This subject is profound. Since eternity, this *jīva* has not known the truth. All substances stay permanent within their own efficacy and modify. No other substance or person has the right to modify it, keep it, or distance it. To believe that efficacious substance exists within its permanent efficacies is *samyagdarśana*. Without understanding this, if one

has feeble attachment in anything that is done in the name of religion, then it is *punya*, but it is not *dharma*.

All substances are with existence. And ‘existence’-such is *jñāna*. All these substances are just so, and *ātma* is their knower. But he is not the doer of thoughts of what should happen or not. All substances stay separately within the nature of their own self. Knower of their existence in one *samaya* is *ātma*. Experience of this passionless nature is *samyag darśana*.

jñānī does not believe that *Tirthankara Bhagavāna* is there, so attachment arises. Thoughts of attachment may arise in anyone, but they occur due to the ability of that particular time. By knowing that when an enemy arrives, adversity is seen, or when the body is infected with a disease, it is due to themselves, self has no regret, and even at that time, only *jñāna*, which has auspices of self, arises. Attachment arises due to one’s own weakness. Making them knowable and focusing on passionless pure nature of self turns the knowing into blemish-free *sva-para prakāśaka jñāna*. (knowing which knows self and non self).

Existing substance, existing *jñāna* and ‘existence’, with attachments, are all in one *samaya*. Eloquent discourse (*vāṇī*), which says this, is also included in *saṭ* substance, even then it is separate. In juxtaposition to true knowledge, all *jñeyas* are so. *jñānī* do not believe in changing anything. *saṭ* is only the knower, and its nature is *jñāna*, it is self, and this true experience has been called *samyagdarśana* by *Bhagavāna*.

Existence is there, and such a *jñāna* is the permanent nature of every *ātma*. In the state of a seeker, if some auspicious or inauspicious attachments arise, a *jñānī* does not think, why has this happened? Because to know the kind of attachment present at that time is the ability of *jñāna* of self. In the knowing nature of self, this should happen, and that should not happen, is not there. Then, how can the concept of doing something for non-self or that compassion or service can be done for others, remain? An ignorant believes he can do it, but that is his delusion. If it is known that whatever has happened is only due to that substance at its appropriate time and whatever has happened to the self is due to self, then he is *samyagdṛṣṭi*.

Everything in this universe is eternal, stays permanently on its own base, and modifies. No god, etc., is its doer-destroyer-caretaker. All physical matter and living beings are by nature with no beginning or end. Its efficacy of nature is eternal, and the ability to modify every *samaya* is independent. Forgetting this when one believes that he can damage or improve someone, can bring together good *nimittas* and leave bad ones, is not accepting the existing nature of *jñāna* and negates the infinite independent *saṭ*.

Omniscient *Bhagavāna* knows everything in one *samaya*. But He is not the doer-destroyer-caretaker of anything. He has not held on to anyone’s inherent nature, but Omniscient *Bhagavāna*, explains, what the righteous one should do. He says that all

substances should be seen as existing through existing knowledge. All six substances and substance-attribute-modification exist, and *jñāna* is also present. All these substances are capable of being known, are always independent, and the way 'I' (omniscient) see them, 'you' (all *jīvas*) should also see them. If self is the knower, then it remains as the knower of existence in *jñāna*. Attachments which arise due to weakness should also be seen as knowable of self, while self is devoid of attachment, and is the eternal pure nature of *jñāna*. It should be known that it is impossible to arise, change, or be permanent because of anyone else.

In this, it has been explained what kind are *sarvajñadeva*, true guru and true *śāstra*; because true *deva-guru-śāstra* explain the existence of all substances just the way it is. Of whichever substance, at whichever time, whichever modification is meant to occur, that happens precisely so, and no one can change anything in that. *jñāna*, which exists, knows the self/non-self *jñeyas*, exactly the way they are; but its *jñāna* or attachment does not have the power to do anything in anyone or get anything done in any other. If he knows that *jñāna* knows exactly this way and true *deva-guru-śāstra* preach precisely this true pure nature, then he has accepted the true *deva-guru-śāstra*.

Here, *mahāsādr̥ṣya astitva* (great commonality of existence) is accepted. It is being told that such is the most excellent, ultimate system, that at whichever time, whichever type of state is meant to be, of every substance, exactly that arises, in that way because of it. This is the independent glory of that system, and no other substance has any authority over it.

It is not that because he got hurt with a knife, so he's in pain. His pain is due to his own weakness, and at that time, it was the nature of his *jñāna* to know that. *ajñānī*, who sees associations, does not believe so, but even then, the nature of substance is such.

Modification of every substance arises new every *samaya*, due to its own ability; in that *bhavya-abhavya*, *siddha-sādhaka*, *punya-pāpa* all are present, and they have to be known in the form of their existence.

Coal need not be seen as gold, but it should be known that it is in the form of coal at that time. Just because it is known does not mean that it can be changed.

At the time when varied states of favourable-unfavourable modifications are seen, great *upsarga* (attacks) are seen, if one sees it as, this is how it was meant to be, then his effort is towards true *jñāna*. But he who has his thoughts on non-self has the question of why this is so, and his effort is towards attachment. *jñeya* (knowable), which is known at that time and modification of *jñāna*, which arose, was meant to be exactly so. Statement which speaks the truth is such. Accepting the knowing nature in this way is *samyagdar̥ṣana*.

Bhagavāna has said that *sarvagata* (universal attribute) is one in all substances. *jñāna* knows this, and speech comes out due to speech. Ignorant says that speech comes out

due to him, but it is not so, because *ātma* is always *arūpī* (non-physical) in which words are not present. It is known in true *jñāna* that words are due to words, and self is due to self.

In self and non-self knowable, modifications which are imperfect-perfect, or passion and passionless, exist just the way they are, and arising modifications of that time are known in the arising *jñāna*. *samyagdarśana-jñāna* means not having any disposition to bring changes in that, and being in the state of only a knower. It is the belief of one's own knowing self and infinite omniscient *Bhagavānas* have said so.

Knowing the truthful, illuminated *jñāna* of self just the way it is, is nature of self and that itself is the efficacy of self. It does nothing in non-self. Non-self knowables are not due to self, neither is self not due to them. By accepting this, the conceit of believing infinite non-self substances as self, is destroyed. Low thoughts, that benefit or loss are due to non-self, goes away. Even if some unfavourable situations arise, thoughts that, what will happen? is not there. He who believes in the knowing nature of self, does not have this kind of fear or regret.

All substances 'exist'. By knowing this, all of them do not become one. They all modify in the same *samaya*, altogether, in their own substance. All these are known in *jñāna*, but this *jñāna* does not conjoin with any other substance.

If general existence is considered uniform, even then, diversity of every substance is not destroyed, and every minutest indivisible particle remains separate. It is not that because *karma* arises so *rāgījīva* has attachment or that because *rāgījīva* has attachment so *karma* arise. When *karma* arises, if attachment is done, then new karma will arise, and if it is not done then it will not occur. Further, it is also not true that because attachment is there, so *jñāna*, which knows it is there. Despite knowing all *jñeyas*, nature of *jñāna* is entirely separate from all.

jñānī does not believe that as attachment is there, so new *karma* comes, and *karma* is there, so there is bondage. *karma* is there, and its existence is accepted. By knowing that substances like cold-hot, sour-sweet, etc., are all in their own place in one *samaya*, true *jñāna* does not become one with them.

The existence of knowledge, existence of knowable and existence of speech, all are there. Existence of one shows existence of the other. This is the reason for passionlessness, and *dharma*.

Outer activities, like, *sāmāyika*, fasting, vows, and penance, which are dependent on body, have been believed to be *dharma*, since eternity; whereas in reality, it is not *dharma*. If attachment is low while performing these activities, then it is *punya* (auspiciousness). People have not yet heard the fundamental nature of *dharma*. *dharma* of one second can ensure *mokṣa*.

Question: Is subject of *svarūpa astitva* (existence of self-nature) the subject of *jñāna* and *sādṛṣya astitva* (commonality of existence) the subject of *darśana*?

Answer: No. Both are subjects of *jñāna*. Knowing with distinctions like general-particular is *jñāna*, and without any distinction, knowing the general is *darśana cetanā*. *jñāna* knows self and non-self *jñeya* as existing; in that belief, perception and sentience, all are included.

Here, *samyagdarśana* with predominance of *jñāna* is explained. *jñānī* knows that *sūkṣma* (subtle) *jñāna* is unblemished, as its base is *ātma*. This is with focus of complete *vītarāgata*. *jñeya* has the ability to be known, with focus on the complete state.

Without being stuck on knowledge that all substances exist, if true *jñāna* is known, then it is called *mokṣa mārga*. All are due to themselves, and knower of all these is self *ātma*. If it is not known that all are independent and separate, then all substances cannot be recognised correctly. Except for the path of *vītarāga*, this system has not been rendered in any other philosophy. Path of *vītarāga* is not a sectarian belief but the unveiling of the nature of substance.

In the present time, in *Mahavideha Kṣetra*, *Sīmaṅdhara Bhagavāna* is present in the body form. Such infinite *Tirthaṅkaras* have already existed, and they all have said the same thing. No substance-attribute-modification can conjoin with any other and become one with them. When singular existence is made primary, then multiple-ness becomes secondary, but neither becomes non-existent.

In one body of *nigoda*, there are infinite *ātmās*. They all exist by their own complete efficacy. While from the view of space, they are together, by way of nature of self, all these infinite *ātmās* are always separate.

dharmī jīvas does not believe that he is in sorrow because his 20-year-old son died. He who believes happiness and sorrow due to non-self is an ignorant. *dharmījīva* does not believe anyone to be father-son, enemy-friend, favourable-unfavourable. They exist due to themselves, and self exists due to self. Despite having such a nature, if he believes any changes can be done in one by another, then he does not believe in the existence of any substance. Independent existence of every *samaya* is that everything exists due to their own self. To know this is called *dharma*.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-98* ❧

अथ द्रव्यैर्द्रव्यान्तरस्यारम्भं द्रव्यादर्थान्तरत्वं च सत्तायाः प्रतिहन्ति -

Now, origination of one substance from another substance, and manifestation of existence as a separate substance from *dravya*, has been refuted (i.e, now it is decided that no other substance is created by (self-existing) substances and existence (*sattā/astitva*) is not an object different from substance):-

द्वं सहावसिद्धं सदिति जिना तच्चदो समक्खादा ।
सिद्धं तथ आगमदो णेच्छदि जो सो हि परसमओ ॥ ९८ ॥

davyam' sahāvasiddham' saditi jina' taccado samakkhādā |
siddham' tadha āgamado ṇecchadi jo so hi parasamao || 98 ||

Meaning: Omniscient lords, the *Jīnas* have correctly said that *dravya* (substance) is self-proved/realized by its *svabhāva* (intrinsic nature) and is *saṭ* (self-existent) by *svabhāva* itself. Moreover, it is proved/realized in *āgama* (scriptures) also. One who does not accept/believe it as such is a *para samaya* (non-self, conscious, misbeliever).

ṭīkā: Substances are not created by other substances because all substances are self-proved/realised by their self-existent intrinsic nature. Their being is self-proved/realized by their intrinsic nature, which is without beginning and end because substance, which has no beginning or end, does not depend on any other means. It is possessed of its own nature of attributes and modification, which is the fundamental means, by holding such nature, stays by being self-proved on its own.

That which originates by substances is not a different substance, as it is its momentarily occurring modification. For instance, *dviaṇuka* (mass of *paramānus*), etc., as do humans, etc. As the nature of substance is without any limitation, it exists through all three-time phases and hence does not originate.

Now, let us ascertain that, just as a substance is proved/realized simply by its own intrinsic nature, so in the same way, it is *saṭ* (to exist) is proved/realized by its own intrinsic nature, should be decided; because it is derived from the state of existence which is its intrinsic nature (*dravya* being *saṭ* (to exist) such characteristic nature of substance is constituted by its own self-existing form of intrinsic nature).

From *dravya*, existence/origination of another *dravya* is not obtained (it is not possible, does not happen, is not appropriate), and that whose conglomeration by which *dravya* exists. (This is being explained as under) -

Firstly, there is no *arthāntara* (separate substance) by *yutasiddha* (that which is proved together) of *saṭ* (to exist) along with *sattā* (existence/*astitva guṇa*) because no *yutasiddhatā* is seen between them, the way it is seen between stick and holder of stick.

Secondly, by way of *ayutasiddhatā* (no mutual connectivity) also, there is no *arthāntara* (separate substance). It may be said that ‘this is in that’ (i.e. existence/*sattā* is in substance), as this can be experienced, it could be possible. Then we ask him on what ground has such an experience arisen, that - this is in that? If it is said that it is based on *bheda* (differentiation/distinction between *dravya* and *sattā*) then it is asked, ‘What is that differentiation?’ Is it of *prādeśika* (local space-wise) or *atādbhāvika* (being non-identical)? (But) it cannot be *prādeśika*/local, because *yutasiddhatva* (proved by way of connection) has already been rejected earlier. If it is said that it is *atādbhāvika* (non-identical), then it is correct because it has already been declared in the scripture- ‘that which is a substance is not an attribute’. But (here too, it must be kept in mind)- this *atādbhāvika bheda* (non-identical differentiation) is not the cause of experience of auspices with a singularity that ‘this is only this way’, because this *atādbhāvika bheda* (non-identical differentiation) by itself emerges and/or submerges independently’. It is as follows -

When *dravya* is said to attain *pariyāya* (or when substance modifies by its modification, or modification is accepted by the substance-so it is seen from the view of *pariyāyārthika naya*)-at that time- like this garment is white, whiteness is its attribute, etc., - this *dravya* is with *guṇa*, and this is its *guṇa*, this kind of *atādbhāvika bheda* arises. But when a substance is caused to be accepted by a substance (i.e. when a substance accepts its substance- thus viewing it from *dravyārthika naya* (substance stand-point)), then all manifestation of *guṇa vāsanā* (manifestation of the belief that there are many attributes in a substance) is sunk/set, and to such a *jīvas*-like garment is white only, etc.,-seeing that ‘*dravya* is such only’, all *atādbhāvika* (being non-identical), distinctions submerges. With distinctions submerging in this way, experience, due to its auspices (due to it), submerges. With submerging of distinctions, *arthāntara* (separate substance) due to *ayutasiddhatva* (no mutual connectivity) is submerged. So, everything becomes one *dravya* and exists. And when distinctions emerge, with their emergence, experience, due to its auspices (due to it), emerges. With the emergence of that experience, *arthāntara* (separate substance), due to *ayutasiddhatva* (no mutual connectivity), emerges. Even at that time, that *dravya*, emerging by its *pariyāya* - like a wave of water is not different from water mass (or sea is not separate from waves). In that way it is not separate from *dravya*. It being so (it is determined) that substance itself is *saṭ* (exists). He who does not believe this is *para-samaya* (non-self-conscious soul)

pravacana on gāthā 98

Every substance is always existing. *jñāna* has the ability to know. *saṅg jñāna*, which exists, is filled with efficacies and leans towards *ātmā*. This is what is meant by the term “knower of all”. When one knows about attachments, he does not identify with them, and this is how he sees/knows everything. However, he does not interfere with the activity of any other substance. This is *vītarāga dṛṣṭi* (passionless focus).

Here, it is said that, from one substance, another substance, from one attribute, another attribute or modification of another substance cannot arise. Every *samaya*, a new modification arises from the substance, but a new substance cannot be created from it. The way from *roti* (Indian bread), made from flour, knowledge, happiness, etc., of *jīva*, does not manifest. It is not possible that by joining with some association, attributes become one with substance, increase or grow. New modifications keep arising *krambaddha* (sequence bound) from infinite efficacies of every substance. It manifests from that which exists and not from some other substance.

When thoughts of vows-penance are on the outside, bondage of *punya* occurs. But the unblemished, pure nature does not increase; *ātmā* has no religious observance. A sudden manifold increase of unblemished modifications may be seen in a *dharmī jīva*, and a sudden increase in colour, etc., may be seen in *pudgala*, but this is the manifestation of their own existence. Work has not been done by someone from outside. *guṇa* (attribute) does not stay separately from *guṇi* (substance/holder of *guṇa*/attribute). But all the infinite *gunas* of *ātmā* or *pudgala* stay separate from non-self and do their work through self substance only. New modification which arises proves the self substance. It does not prove *dravya-kṣetra* (substance-area covered) of any other substance.

It is not that because *ātmā* is within the body, so blood is present. Blood, which is present, proves the existence of *paramāṇu*. In *ātmā*, earlier the modification of *jñāna*, *cāritra*, etc., were of lower quality, and then they improved, but they did not come from *deva-guru-śāstra*, water, food or light. It has arisen due to the infinite efficacies of its own substance-attribute. It has been said that existence is not separate from substance.

Jinadeva (*Tirthaṅkara*) have said that *ātmā*, etc., every substance is proven by its own nature-is definite, and by way of attribute of existence, it is existing since eternity. This is confirmed through *āgama* (holy scriptures). Even then, if one does not believe this, then he is definitely a *pariyāya mūḍha* (perplexed by modification) who sees through associations. As substance has existed since eternity, from one substance, another substance or attribute does not arise. By nature, all are proved by their own attributes and modifications. They have not manifested because there is an *īshvara* (God) who is the doer.

This orderly state of existence from eternity till infinity is due to its own attribute of existence. All substances are *svayam siddha* (axiomatic) by their own attribute-

modification. No *Parmeshvara* is their doer. The doer of origination of new modification and annihilator of old modification is substance itself.

jaḍa paramāṇu (smallest unit of physical matter), etc., are in the attribute of *jada*, by its own self. *cetana* (sentience) is also *svayam siddha* (axiomatic) by its own attribute-modification. He who does not believe this, believes neither in self nor in non-self.

Child, money, food, etc., do not come from any other substance, but at the time of *pudagala parāvartana* (since eternity, the cyclic association of soul with physical matter of all kinds), whichever modification was meant to be of that substance, does occur. Arising of new modifications of substance is due to their own self. Every *guṇa-guṇi* (attribute-holder of attributes) is undivided with the self. As they have no beginning or end, there is no requirement for any other instrument for the arising of new states.

Every *ātmā*, etc., all substances retain their own attribute-modification and modify accordingly. But the base of existence of none is due to another's substance-attribute modification, nor is their existence due to influence of any other substance, and all exist from eternity till infinity by themselves.

New states of *ātmā* and *paramāṇus* keep arising due to itself. This modification of substance is not another substance, but modification is present because it is *anitya* (impermanent). Substance-attribute are *dhruva* (permanent), and new modification arises every *samaya*, which is as much as every *samaya*. Iron turns into ashes, and green vegetation is cut up, but they have not turned into a new substance. Modification arises from substance but does not arise from another modification.

A new substance does not arise if two *paramāṇus* join into one, but a new modification does arise. When *skāndha*, consisting of more than one *paramāṇus*, is destroyed and a new *skāndha* consisting of three *paramāṇus* is formed, it does not arise from the previous *skāndha* but rather from the underlying substance.

Question: Does a modification not arise from another modification?

Answer: No. If to a mass of ten *paramāṇus*, five *paramāṇus* join. Then, it is incorrect to believe that a new modification arose from the earlier modification. New modifications keep arising with auspices of their own substance attributes.

During monsoon, many *rajakaṇa* (minute matter particles) become one, by their own efficacy, turning into frogs, etc. A thousand vegetation types grow, so are we to believe there were no *jīva* or matter particles in the world earlier, and new ones have formed? Or have new substances formed from the earlier one? No one's substance-attribute arises as new, but new modification arises from the substance

paramāṇus were originally not visible as *sthūla* (gross). Still, they independently transition from *sūkṣma* (subtle) to *sthūla* (gross). New modifications of clouds, etc., of the human body, etc., keep arising every *samaya*, but new substances do not arise.

Now, the way substance, being eternal, does not become new; in the same way, *sattā* (existence), attribute, is proved by its eternal nature in the *guṇi* (holder of attribute), which is the substance. Every substance has its *saṭ* (to exist), and this attribute is made up of nature of existence of the substance. Existence is not separate from substance. It is not that by joining of existence with substance, substance would be called at ‘one with existence’.

Some believe that new attributes come with association. For example – first, there was no smell in the soil, but when water fell on it, a fresh smell emitted-but it is not so. The un-manifested modification of the attribute of smell, which was inherent in it, manifested in the gross form. Attribute is never separate from *guṇi* (holder of attribute).

- 1 When a person is in association with a stick, he is called the one with the stick. However, attribute of existence of substance, which has existence-ness, is not because it is conjoined with the attribute of existence. *ātma* and its attribute of *jñāna*, etc., or attribute of existence, do not conjoin with non-self. But they are at one with the pure nature of self. Unlike the stick and one with the stick, attributes of existence and existing substance do not have *yutasiddha* (existence with conjunction) state.
- 2 Even though *ayutasiddha* (existence without conjunction), *saṭ* (substance) and *sattā* (attribute of existence) are not one. It can never be proved that *ātma* and attribute of existence are connected to non-self. Attribute of existence is not connected to substance in the way that fire is connected to heat.

If it is said that attribute is present in *guṇi*- then the question is, on what basis is this believed? If *guṇa-guṇi* are believed to be so with auspices of *bheda* (distinctness), then how are they distinct? Meaning are they distinct by *pradeṣa* (space points), or is the distinctness *atādbhāvika* (shares the same space but are not one)? The way food is separate from plate, that kind of separateness of space is not there in *guṇa-guṇi*. Because between them, *yutasiddha* (proved by way of connection) state has been denied earlier. But it can be said to have *atādbhāvika* (being non-identical) distinction, meaning, that which is attribute, is not substance, and that which is substance is not attribute. So, there is said to be *kathāncita* (in some ways) *bheda*(distinctness) between substances. This distinction is not *ekānta*(singularly), but it is *anekānta* (confluence of pluralism).

On seeing, with focus on distinctions, from the view of *pariyāyārthika naya* (an aspect of knowing from the view of modification), *atādbhāvika bheda* (distinction which is not spatial), that, this is its attribute, this substance is with attributes, becomes primary. But when substance knows/accepts substance, then on seeing from the view of *dravyārthika naya*, which sees without distinctions, all perturbations related to distinctness and its beliefs, as well as all thoughts of attributes and its distinctions, do not remain. With this, all experiences connected to distinctions are submerged.

Undivided focus, which sees the distinction that characteristics of *guṇi* and *guṇa* are different, as secondary, do not have thoughts of attributes. Here, there is no reference

to non-self at all. Or there is no spatial distinction between *guṇa-guṇi*. Distinctions in attribute can be known only when the primary focus is on *bheda*. But if seen from the view of *abheda* (undivided), such *bheda* cannot be seen. When one immerses within the substance, thoughts of *bheda* do not arise, and there is no question of seeing non-self substance-space, etc.

A journey of the mountains can cause perturbations; in that, there is dependency on non-self. Therefore, if one wants to remove perturbation and become truly happy, then one must go for the pilgrimage of this mountain which is in the form of a mass of infinite attributes, and see it as *abheda* (undivided). In the *nirvikalpa* (unwavering) state, distinction of *guṇa-guṇi* does not remain.

The way waves cannot be separated from the water body means waves are not separate from the sea. In the same way, attribute-modification is not seen as separate from substance. Modifications arising from the substance with its wealth of infinite attributes are not separate, but they are the undivided existence of one eternal substance; in that attribute or modification does not arise from any association with another substance.

Activity of every *paramāṇu* occurs because of that *paramāṇu* and activity of *ātmā* is by *ātmā*. Every substance being with complete efficacy and eternally existing by its own self, is its own *iśvara*. It does not require any other association, space, time, etc., and constantly manifests its own new state by itself, which is *samyak ekānta*; only this is *dharma*. He who does not believe this is one with *mithyā ekānta* (erroneous singularity) and is *para samaya* (focussed on non-self), is *mūḍha* (ignorant). *Dharma* cannot arise till this is not believed. Charity, compassion, *pūjā*, *bhakti*, etc., are all zeros without the numeric one preceding them.

★ ★ ★

अथोत्पादव्ययध्नौव्यात्मकत्वेऽपि सदद्रव्यं भवतीति विभावयति

Now it is explained that even though substance is with *utpāda* (origination), *vyaya* (annihilation), *dhrauvya* (permanence), it is *saṭ* (exists)

सदवद्विदं सहावे दव्वं दव्वस्स जो हि परिणामो ।

अत्थेसु सो सहावो ठिदिसंभवणाससंबद्धो । ९९॥

sadavaṭṭhidaṃ sahāve davvam`davvassa jo hi pariṇāmo |

atthesu so sahāvo ṭhidisaṃbhavaṇāsasambaddho || 99 ||

Meaning: *dravya*, which is within its own intrinsic nature, is *saṭ* (exists). *pariṇāma* (manifestation) of substance, which is with *utpāda*, *vyaya*, *dhrauvya* (origination, annihilation, permanence), is the *svabhāva* (characteristic nature) of all substances.

tīkā: Here (in relation to this world), substance being permanently contained within its *svabhāva* (characteristic nature) is *saṭ* (exists). Characteristic nature is the *pariṇāma* (manifestation) of the oneness of *utpāda*, *vyaya*, *dhrauvya* (origination, annihilation, permanence), of *dravya*.

Though *vastū* (self-expanse) of a substance being an indivisible whole, *aṅśa* (infinitesimal part), which is present in *vistāra krama* (horizontal sequence of expanse) is *pradeśa* (spatial units). By the complete existence of *dravya*, it being one, the subtle *aṅśa* (infinitesimal part) present in *pravāha krama* (flow of sequence) are *pariṇāma* (modification). The reason for *vistāra krama* (horizontal sequence of expanse) is the mutual absence of *pradeśas* in each other; similarly, the reason for *pravāha krama* (flow of sequence) is the mutual absence of *pariṇāmas* (modification) in each other.

As those infinitesimal spatial units (*pradeśas*) arise in their own place by way of their own pure self, and perish by way of the earlier state, and being all around, mutually, strung together, connected uninterruptedly (*anusyūti*), made of state of one *vastū*, are non-originating imperishable, and with origination-annihilation-permanence. In the same way, these modifications being manifested by their own self, at their own self-time, destroyed by their earlier modification, and being all around mutually, strung together, connected uninterruptedly, in a single sequential flow, by way of which they are non-manifested-imperishable and hence are with *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya*. Further, the smallest, final point of *vastū*, which is due to the destruction of earlier *pradeśa*, is generation of the next *pradeśa*, and that state of one *vastū* which is created by mutual *anusyūti*, is the state of *anubhaya* (like neither of the two). That

way, smallest part of the sequential flow is the destruction of earlier *pariṇāma*. That, itself, is the state of *utpāda* of the next *pariṇāma*. A single sequential flow made of the mutual *anusyūti* is, by nature, *anubhaya*.

In this way, by nature, possessed of threefold *pariṇāma paddhatti* (system of modification) (or successive generation of modification), not transgressing its intrinsic nature, one should joyfully accept existence of *dravya*. Just like in the example of a pearl necklace - In the case of a hanging necklace with a definite length, threefoldness is easily recognised where all pearls are visible, each in its own place. Subsequent pearls manifest in their subsequent place, and preceding pearls do not manifest in subsequent places. The string, through the whole necklace, strings them together through a common thread and is present in all places. In the same way, he who accepts the *nitya vṛtti* (permanent existence), in such a modifying *dravya*, all modifications manifesting at its own self-time and later modifications, manifesting at later self-time and earlier modifications not manifesting at that time, with all around mutually created *anusyūti* (connection along with continuance), the flow is continuous (lasting/permanent), and its three-fold characteristic is proved.

bhāvārtha: Every substance always stays within its own *svabhāva* (characteristic nature), so it is *saṭ* (existent) and that *svabhāva* consists of manifestation of origination-destruction-permanence. As infinitesimal spatial unit of the orderly extension of a substance is a *pradeśa*, in the same way, a tiny portion of a substance's orderly modifying process/flow is *pariṇāma* (manifestation). Every *pariṇāma* originates in its own destined self-time and form, destroys as precedent form, and every *pariṇāma* remains permanent as one form, which is devoid of origination-destruction, owing to one modifying process form in all manifestations. So, there is no time difference in origination-destruction-permanence, and these three exist simultaneously. Thus, substance always exists in the tradition of manifestations of such form of origination-destruction-permanence; therefore, substance by itself possesses the nature of origination-destruction-permanence, similar to that of the necklace of pearls.

pravacana on gāthā 99

This *gāthā* of *Pravacanasāra* is divine. In this *gāthā*, *Ācāryadeva* has answered the enigma of the pure nature of substance. *pariṇāma* (modification) with *utpāda-vyaya-dhruva* (origination-annihilation-permanence), is the nature of *dravya*, and in that nature, *dravya* is permanently stable hence *dravya* is *saṭ* (exists).

To explain the constant modification of origination-annihilation-permanence of every *samaya* in a substance, *Ācāryadeva* has given the example of *kṣetra* (area), which has innumerable space points. The way the entire expanse of substance, or if the substance is taken into consideration by way of area covered, then its *vāstu* (area) is one. In the same way, if all modifications of every *samaya* of all substances, of all three-time phases,

are taken into focus altogether, then its *vṛtti* (to be/existence) is one. The way there is *pradeśa krama* (manner/sequence of space points) in area occupied, similarly modification of substance has *pravāha krama* (sequence of flow). The way infinitesimal part of *vistārakrama* (horizontal sequence of expanse) of substance is *pradeśa* (space point). Similarly, infinitesimal part of *pravāha krama* of substance is modification.

This chapter of *Pravacanasāra* is on *jñeya*. Hence, here it is said that all *jñeyas* (knowables) exist. They are known exactly the way they are, all together, in *jñāna*. *ātma* is an ocean of *jñāna*, and the entire *loka* is an ocean of *jñeya*, and they only have a relationship of *jñeya-jñāyaka* (knowable-knower), between them. They do not have *kartā-karma* (doer-work done) or *bhogtā-bhogya* (user-usable) relationship. From this, *vītarāgata* (passionless-ness) arises because only in *jñeya-jñāyaka* relationship there is no attachment-aversion or any desire to change or act-change anything. In every *gāthā* *Ācāryadeva* has sown the seeds of *vītarāgatā*, so, every *gāthā* brings out *vītarāgatā*.

In *Samayasāra*, in the ‘*sarva viśuddha jñāna adhikāra*’, it has been said that substance arises with sequential modifications of its own self. After saying this, the entire topic of *samyagdarśana* has been explained there, with a focus on substance. Here explanation is from the pre-dominance of *jñāna*. Hence, by saying that all substances are stationed in their modifying nature – complete *jñāna* and complete *jñeya* have been explained. Belief in the nature of all *jñeyas* and belief in the pure nature of *jñāna*, which knows them is *samyagdarśana*.

Every *ātma*, every *paramāṇu*, *dharmāstikāya*, etc., all substances are completely separate and exist by themselves. Seeing by way of commonality, from the view of space covered, every substance is undivided; it is one. However, subtle infinitesimal part of expanse of that *kṣetra* is *pradeśa*. From six substances, space covered by *paramāṇu* and *kāla* is of one space point only, and space covered by *ātma* is innumerable space points. Though they are one in its entirety, even then, its last smallest part is *pradeśa*. Here, the example is of *kṣetra* and understanding origination-annihilation-permanence modifications of substance is the principle. By taking expanse of innumerable *pradeśas* altogether, *kṣetra* of substance is one, similarly the eternal and unending flow of modification of every substance, by way of its entirety is one, and the smallest part of this entire flow is *pariṇāma* (modification). Without separating each modification, on seeing the eternal flow of modification together, it is one. Starting from *anādi-nigoda* (life of *nigoda*, with no beginning) to *ananta* (with no end) state of *siddha*, modification of substance is one. Entire *kṣetra* of substance is spread all at once. If it is not seen from the view of distinction of *pradeśa*, then its *kṣetra* is one. Similarly, in the flow of *trikālī* substance (substance existing through all three-time phases/eternal), if distinction of modification is not done, then the entire flow is one, and every part of the flow of sequential modification of that eternal substance is *pariṇāma*.

Here, sequence of expanse of *pradeśa* is in relation to *kṣetra*, and flow of sequence of *pariṇāmas* is from the view of modification. *Ācāryadeva* has tried to explain the nature of *pariṇāma* by giving example of *kṣetra*.

This is the description of substances which are fit to be known in *jñāna*. Though the concept is very subtle, it is all *jñeya*! Hence, it can definitely be known in *jñāna*, and the knowing nature of self can know all *jñeyas* (knowables). *ātmā* is a knower and is self-knowable as well, and other *jīva-pudgala*, etc., are *para jñeya* (non-self knowables).

Innumerable space points of *dharmāstikāya*, etc., are lying, spread out, expansively, just the way they are, infinite *pradeśas* of *ākāśa* are spread out, expansively as they are. In them, sequence of not even one *pradeśa* is ever broken- none goes ahead or back; similarly, *pravāha krama* (flow of sequence) of substance, which is from without beginning or end, is never broken. By saying flow of sequence, *Ācāryadeva* has shown *jñeyas*, (knowables), which are from eternity to eternity, as altogether and orderly. *pravāha krama*, means that sequence of all modifications is in order, and no *pariṇāma* i.e., modification, moves ahead or back. This experience encompasses focus of substance and *vītarāgatā*.

Here, the example of space points has been given to understand the highly subtle principle of *pariṇāmas* of every *samaya*. They also seem very subtle, but compared to *pariṇāma*, they are gross. If nature of substance comes into focus, then it is not difficult to understand. With the example of a staircase, it is said that seeing from the view of the space covered, the entire staircase is as it is, and its smallest part is *pradeśa*, but when seen from the view of length, there is a flow of steps, one by one, and the flow of the entire staircase is one. Every step is a part of the flow of the stairs, and flow of the staircase does not break. If many divisions are made between two steps, then every ascending minute part should be understood to be a modification. Similarly, every *ātmā* is spread out over innumerable *pradeśas*, is one, every part of its *kṣetra* is *pradeśa* and existence of the complete substance, from the view of eternal flow, is one. Every part of every *samaya* of that flow is *pariṇāma*. Sequential flow of those *pariṇāmas* (modifications) is *kramabaddha* (sequence bound), like the steps of a staircase. Flow of those modifications does not move forward or go back, knowing everything just the way it is, is the nature of *ātmā*. If substance is not accepted the way it is and is believed to be different from what it is, then that *jñāna* (knowing) and *śradhha* (belief) are incorrect.

It is explained that one modification is absent in another. The reason for extension of expanse (horizontally) is a mutual absence of *pradeśas* in one another, similarly, reason for the flow of sequence is a mutual absence of *pariṇāmas* (modifications) in one another.

Reason for sequence of expanse in substance, or from the view of *kṣetra*, the reason for horizontal expanse is the mutually separate state of *pradeśas*. There is an absence of the first *pradeśa* in the second, due to this kind of separate state of each *pradeśa*, the horizontal sequence of expanse is created. If one *pradeśa* were not absent in another,

then one *pradeśa* would modify into another, and they would become one *pradeśa*, then there would be no expanse of substance. Substance will become a single *pradeśī* (with one space point) only. So, by saying that they are in *vistāra krama* (horizontal sequence of expanse), it is understood that one *pradeśa* is not in the form of another. *vistāra krama* signifies *anekānta* (multiple-ness) because there cannot be a sequence if only one exists. *anekānta* can be established only when it is decided that all are not one, but are separate. And if there is *anekānta*, only then, there can be *vistāra krama*. Therefore, the cause of sequential expanse is the mutual absence of *pradeśa* in each other.

Like *vistāra krama* (horizontal sequence of expanse), the nature of *pravāha krama* (sequential flow) is explained. On saying sequential flow, multiple-ness of modifications is proved, and by saying multiple-ness of modifications, absence of one in another is proved. If there is an absence of one in another, only then will there be multiplicity. If this were not so, then all modifications would become one. In *vistāra krama*, there is an absence of one space point in another, similarly, in *pravāha krama*, there is an absence of one modification in another. With the absence of one modification in another, *anādi-ananta* (no beginning-no end) sequential flow is present. This is the nature of substance. Substance exists in this nature of modification.

Here, sequence of expanse is in the form of an example and flow of sequence is in the form of principle. The example is not applicable in all substances. The expanse of *pudgala* (physical matter) and *kāla* (time) substance is of only one *pradeśa*. Hence, the example of mutual absence of space points is not applicable here. But the principle of *pravāha karma* is applicable uniformly in all substances.

Like *vistāra krama* (horizontal sequence of expanse) of *pradeśas*, substances have a long sequential expanse which is from eternity and till infinity. This sequential flow is only possible, when there is an absence of one modification in another. The first modification is not present in the second, and the second is not in the third one. In this way, due to the absence of modification in one another, there is a flow of sequence in substance. In the *anādi-ananta* flow of substance, one after another, serially/sequentially, modification manifests. All such substances are *jñeyas* (knowables) only. With an appropriate experience of these knowable substances, *nirvikalpta* (unwavering) and *vītarāgata* (passionless-ness) arises in belief, and only that is the true path of *mokṣa*.

Oh! The concept that, where there is an absence of one modification in the other, in the same substance, then how can the belief that one substance can change something in the state of another substance hold. He who believes that one *tattva* changes something in another *tattva*, or that the sequence can be changed in a substance is unaware of *jñeya tattva*.

The belief that he has earned money due to his intelligence is false. This is because modification of brain is the sequential flow of brain, and money earned is the

modification of sequential flow of *pudgala* (physical matter). Both substances modify separately and independently in their own sequential flow. *ātma* is within its own flow of modification, and *jaḍa* substance (physical matter) is within its own sequential flow. The existence of both substances is separate. He who understands the nature of substance is free from erroneous beliefs like self can change non-self or that non-self can change self. He remains a knower of all substances. The way *Kevalī Bhagavāna* knows everything without passion, similarly, self knows, in the same way. As he is still in the state of *sādhaka* (seeker), attachment-aversion does arise due to his wavering state, but that too is knowable of the knower. Attachment-aversion does not arise with oneness of *jñāna*, but attachment-aversion arises when *jñāna* is in the form of *jñeya*. Therefore, by belief, the seeker is also a complete *jñāta* (knower).

By knowing the true nature of self-substance, one becomes the knower of all six substances, and all six substances are known in *jñāna*. In another prominent scripture, '*Svātmānubhava manana*', it is said that *ātma* becomes the *saptam* (seventh) substance. This is said to explain that self *ātma* is *jñāta* (knower), and all six substances are *jñeya* (knowable).

The complete mass of *kevalajñāna* is in *ātma*, and mass of all *jñeyas* in the form of *lokāloka*; is present outside of it. Only thing that remains is the nature of knowable-knower. In the realm of knowable and knower, there is no place for attachment or aversion, nor any need to change anything. Oh! One should at least accept this pure nature of the knower! Its acceptance is passionless belief, and in it is the seed of *kevala jñāna* and *vītarāgtā* (passionless-ness).

Here two points have been proved -

1. First, with example of *kṣetra* (space covered), one entire aspect of the eternal flow of substance has been explained, and naming its most subtle part, *pariṇāma* (modification), existence of substance has been proved. From the view of undivided existence, oneness and from the view of *pariṇāmas* (modifications), multiple-ness has been explained, proving *ekatva-aneekatva* (oneness-multiple-ness) in existence.
2. Mutual absence in *pariṇāmas* is proved.

Now elaborating further, origination-annihilation-permanence will be deduced from it.

The way *pradeśas*, being in their own place, originate by themselves, are destroyed by way of their earlier state, and by singularity of substance created with all around mutual continuity, they neither originate nor are they destroyed and hence are with origination-annihilation-permanence. In the same way, these modifications originate and are destroyed by their own nature at their own time, and by the one flow created by their all around mutual continuity, so they neither originate nor are they destroyed, and they are with origination-destruction-permanence.

Here, reference to *pradeśa* is in the form of example, and reference to *pariṇāma* is in the form of principle.

Nature of substance is origination-annihilation-permanence, and in that nature, substance is always in it and is *saṭ* (existing). First, the concept that, despite disposition of substance being unbroken and being one from eternity till infinity, its sequential flow is modification, has been proved. These modifications do not modify in each other and they are absent in each other. Now this is elaborated to bring out origination-annihilation-permanence. In this also, first, example of *kṣetra* is given.

If one *kṣetra* of the entire substance is taken, then its *pradeśa* is devoid of *utpatti-vināśa* (origination-destruction). As these *pradeśas* are mutually absent in each other, they are in their own respective *kṣetra* existing by their own self-*kṣetra*, and are not existent in the earlier *pradeśa*. That *pradeśa* is by its own self in the form of origination, and in correlation to earlier *pradeśa*, it is in the form of absence. So, all *pradeśas* are in the form of origination-annihilation. If expanse of all *pradeśas* is taken together, then all *pradeśas* of substance are in the form of permanence. In this way, all *pradeśas* are in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence in one *samaya*.

Here, origination-annihilation-permanence of *pradeśa*, which have been referred to, has to be understood from the view of *kṣetra*. According to the statement given above, modifications of every *samaya* are all with origination-annihilation-permanence. From the view of *anādi-anaṅta* (without beginning or end), continuous flow, modifications are *dhruva* bereft of origination-destruction. These *pariṇāmas* are with origination within themselves, and from the view of earlier modification, they are in the form of destruction. In this way, all *pariṇāmas* are in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence, and these origination-annihilation-permanence *pariṇāmas* are the nature of substance.

First, the entire *kṣetra* and aggregation of origination-annihilation-permanence of all *pariṇāmas* have been established. However, this does not refer only to *ātmā*, as it is the nature of all substances. But here, it is said with the predominance of *ātmā*.

From view of space, origination-annihilation-permanence applies to innumerable *pradeśas* of *ātmā*, in one *samaya*. Similarly, all modifications which modify in the sequential flow of *ātmā*, respectively, arise at their own self-time, by their own nature, are absent with respect to earlier modification and from the view of unbroken flow, neither originates nor is it destroyed. So those *pariṇāmas* are with nature of origination-annihilation-permanence.

All modifications of substance originate by their own nature, in their own self-time, are absent by way of the earlier state, and from the view of unbroken flow, are permanent, devoid of origination-destruction.

By saying ‘*sva-avsara*’, (self-time) of *pariṇāmas*, *Ācāryadeva* has explained a unique concept. How many ever *pariṇāmas* are in one substance, only that many *samayas* are in three *kālas*. And how many *samayas* are in three *kālas*, only that many *pariṇāmas* are there in one substance. That’s it! If one achieves this, then the experience of realizing the nature of oneself will arise. Every *pariṇāma* of substance has its own separate self-time. *pariṇāma* of three *kālas* are known altogether, and *ātma* is their knower. In this kind of knowable-knower state, there is no passion, there is only passionless-ness. First, if this belief is ascertained, then passionless belief arises. After that, by being equanimous in one’s own nature of *jñāna*, passionless conduct arises.

Oh! Whether it is said to be self-time of *pariṇāmas* of substance or *krambaddha pariṇāma*, (sequence bound modification) for experiencing it, focus has to go on the eternal substance only. By accepting self-time of *pariṇāma*, focus does not go on *nimitta*. All erroneous beliefs like, if *nimitta* is present, then modification arises, or there is a change in modification due to *nimitta*, perturbation arises due to *karma*, or supreme truth will arise while doing *vyavahāra* (conventional conduct), or *pariyāya* arises on the base of another *pariyāya*, go away. If every modification of substance exists within its own self-time, then where is the need to look at *nimitta*? How can beliefs that self changes non-self, or due to non-self changes come about in self, hold? Only knower and that which is known stays. This is the path of *mokṣa* and is *samyaka puruṣārtha* (true effort).

Eternal modification of every substance is part of its flow, like a chain. The way parts of a chain cannot be moved forward or backwards, and they remain where they are; similarly, *anādi-anaṅta* (no beginning or end), modifications of substance do not move forward or backwards in their own self-time. Every *pariṇāma* exists in its own self-time. Here, discussion is of modifications of three time phases, which are in an unbroken sequential chain, in which there is origination-destruction-permanence.

First nature of origination-annihilation-permanence of modifications is proved, and after that, it will be proved that *pariṇāma* being within its nature of self, that substance also exists with the endowment of origination-annihilation-permanence. For knower to believe in such a pure nature of substance, to accept it and to give up the belief that he can make changes in non-self is *samyaktva*. And to remain knower of nature of substances is *dharma* in the form of *vītarāgata* (passionless-ness)

In *Pravacanasāra*, the chapter of ‘*jñāna tattva prajñāpana*’, ascertains the nature of *jñāna*. In this second chapter, *jñeya tattvas* (knowable substances) have been described. Nature of *ātma* is *jñāna* and modifications which arise in *jīva-ajīva* at its own self-time through three time phases are *jñeyas*. By experiencing this, desire to change any arrangement of substance or desire to move modifications, forward or back, does not persist. Therefore, *jñāna* becomes steady in self. The real cause of passionlessness and omniscience is this.

saṭ is believing in the existing nature of substance, just the way it is. But if substances are seen as something other than their existing nature, then that belief is erroneous. Belief of truth is being ascertained here. To exist is an attribute of substance, and it is with origination-annihilation-permanence. Experience of this nature of existing truth is *samyagdarśana* because this is the true belief in *tattvas* (tenets/fundamental principles). At this point, discussion is of modifications. But in belief of *pariṇāma* (modifications), belief of *pariṇāmī* (beholder of modifications/substance) also occurs, because modifications are of the eternal substance only. Modifications, not being separate from *pariṇāmī* (beholder of modifications), in the belief of one, belief of second is present. *pariṇāma* does not arise in a vacuum, but arises on the base of *pariṇāmī*. Therefore, by deciding on *pariṇāma*, belief of *pariṇāmī* substance also arises. By removing focus from only *pariṇāma* and focusing one's *jñāna* towards the eternal nature of substance is *samyagdarśana*, and that is the root of *vītarāgatā* (passionless state).

In this *gāthā*, the arrangement of substance has been described in a divine way. All substances exist, they are by nature with modification, which is with origination-annihilation-permanence. This has been explained.

Here, the following five points have been proved: –

1. In its totality, in the substance, there is a oneness of flow from eternity to infinity.
2. Then, in sequential flow, modifications, which are in the form of very subtle infinitesimal parts, are absent in one another.
3. After that, in its entirety, eternal modifications of the entire substance are by nature with origination-annihilation-permanence. In its example, all *pradeśas* of substance from the view of *kṣetra* have been proved to be with origination-annihilation-permanence.
4. Origination-annihilation-permanence state has been shown to be within one modification.
5. As substance is constantly present in the flow of modifications with origination-annihilation-permanence, it is with origination-annihilation-permanence, and so it exists.

From the points discussed above, in the third point, only *jñāyaka bhāva* (knowing self-nature), has been explained by saying that in their own self-time, eternally, all modifications have origination-annihilation-permanence simultaneously.

Here, example of *pradeśa* has been given to explain origination-annihilation-permanence of modification. If it is asked that instead of giving some other simple examples, why did *Ācāryadeva* give the subtle example of *pradeśa*? To them, it is said, listen! entire *kṣetra* of substances with all their *pradeśas* are spread out non-sequentially, and their modifications are manifested sequentially, so in comparison to *pradeśa* explanation of *pariṇāma* (modification) is subtle. Here, the profound and subtle concept of origination-annihilation-permanence of modification is explained. So, the

subtle example of *pradeśa* had to be taken. If an outer gross example had been given, then subtlety and profoundness of the principle would not have been understood. So, such a subtle example is needed.

In this universe, there are six substances, which are infinite *jīvas*, infinite times infinite *pudgalas*, one each, *dharmāstikāya*, *adharmāstikāya*, and *ākāśa* and innumerable *kālāṇus*. From them, *jñāna guṇa* (attribute of knowledge) of every *ātma* knows sequentially arising manifestations of all six substances and substance-attributes, as well. He who knows this nature of *jñāna* definitely knows modifications of attachment. But he does not believe attachment to be his inherent nature, does not believe attachment to be *dharma*, and does not believe he can move modification of attachment forward or backward. That modification of attachment exists at its own self-time, and *jñāna*, which knows this attachment, also exists at the same time. Knowing of attachment is not because, modification of attachment is known in the form of existence in the eternal sequential flow, but it is the nature of *jñāna* to know.

jñāna, which knows the complete self-knowable, knows attachment to be a part of self-knowable. Along with the knowing of eternal *añṣi* (one who is with infinitesimal part), he knows *añṣa* (infinitesimal part) as well. If attachment is not known in every way as a part of self-knowable, then the complete self-knowable state does not arise in that *jñāna*. Hence, it will be incorrect. If *añṣa*, in the form of attachment, is seen as complete self-knowable, and eternal substance-attribute are not made self-knowable, then also that *jñāna* is false. Substance, attribute, and all modifications-the three combine to complete *svajñeya*. *samyajjñāna* does the work of knowing the bearer of infinitesimal parts, which is with the part inclined towards the eternal substance-attribute, as well as non-self. Here, it is explained how the nature of knowables is known in true *jñāna*.

Nature of all substances is with origination-annihilation-permanence. In all substances, modifications arise every *samaya*. Those modifications manifest sequentially, with no beginning or end, therefore, that flow of modifications is from eternity to infinity, in its own self-time. Even the smallest part of this sequential flow is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. In every *samaya* from eternity to infinity, modification of each *samaya* is self-existing. *jñāna* knows such existing modifications, but cannot change them in any way. For example-eyes can see substances like fire or ice, etc., but they cannot change them in anyway. Similarly, modification of *jñāna* also knows *jñeyas*, just the way they exist, but cannot change them in any way. When it is decided in *jñāna* that in its own self-time, whichever modification arises at whichever time, at that time, only that modification is meant to manifest, and no other modifications arise at that time, then, there is no arising of false thoughts to straighten or reverse any *jñeya*, and neither does attachment-aversion arise.

Oh! Just see! Decision of *krambaddha paryāya* (sequence bound modification) is so profound. Belief that modification of substances changes due to non-self does not exist, even a substance cannot forward or reverse its own modification. The way eternal substance cannot change into something else; similarly, its modification of every *samaya* also cannot change into something else. A living substance cannot change into a non-living substance, and a non-living substance cannot change into a living substance. Eternal existence does not change, in the same way its present existence also does not change. Eternal substance does not change, similarly the time at which its modifications from eternity to infinity which arise every *samaya*, are meant to arise also, cannot change. The present/current part of eternal flow, exists in its own self-time-with this belief, desire to bring changes in self or non-self does not remain. So *jñāna* remains only the knower and does not get stuck on the focus of modifications. *jñāna* does the work of knowing and experiencing this nature of pure *jñāna* is *samyag darśana*. Before attaining *kevala jñāna*, *jīva*, with this knowing/experience, becomes the child of *Omniscient Bhagavāna*. From the view of *śraddhā*, even *sādhaka* (seeker) is the knower of all.

By ascertaining origination-annihilation-permanence nature of all substances, desire to bring changes in self or non-self disappears, and only the work of knowing in *jñāna* remains. There is no anxiety to bring changes in non-self. Hence, why is this so? this question should not arise at all in *jñāna*, and he should become equanimous in self. In this, the ultimate effort of *jñāna*, effort of the path of *mokṣa*, and manifestation of *kevalajñāna* are included. He who has a sense of doer-ship in non-self will not be able to experience pure nature of *jñāna*. Due to this, he does not have true effort of the knowing nature, and manifestation of *puruṣārtha* (true effort) of *jñāyaka*(the knower) does not arise.

Oh! All substances exist in their own modifications which arise at their own time; in that, how can anyone bring any changes? Listen! your nature is to see. Keep the one who knows as the knower, do not make knower the anguished one. Experience of pure knowing nature is *samyagdarśana*. A *mithyādr̥ṣṭi* believes that self brings changes in non-self and non-self brings changes in self. He does not have a clear perception of the nature of *jñāna* and *jñeya*. Be it *jaḍa* or *cetana* (non-sentient or sentient), all substances of the universe, exist in their own sequence of modification. No one can move forward or back and whichever infinitesimal part exists does so in the present. He who believes that self will be careful and will take care of body is a *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*. Every *paramāṇu* of body exists in its own flow of sequential modification, and no one can change that sequence. To change anything anywhere is not the work of any attribute of *ātma*, but along with knowing of *sva* (self) to know *para* (non-self) is the *svaparaprakāśaka* (illumination of self/nonself) work of attribute of *jñāna*. Experience of this is the cause of liberation.

Every substance keeps modifying eternally. All modifications in its eternal sequential flow are in the form of origination, annihilation, and permanence. In their own self-time, from their own aspect, all modifications are in the form of origination, from the aspect of previous modification they are in the form of annihilation, and from the aspect of mutual connection with each other in undivided sequence, they are in the form of permanence. All modifications of a substance, exist in their own time. Those modifications are not *asaṭ* (non-existent, in the form of annihilation) from the aspect of their own self, but from the view of earlier modification, they are non-existent (in the form of annihilation), and without distinction of earlier-later, if undivided flow is seen, then all modifications are permanent. Whenever it is seen, substance is present in its current modification, neither in the past nor the future. Current modifications of three *kālas* of substance are by nature absent in earlier modification, by its own state of self modification, it is in the form of origination, and from the aspect of undivided flow, it is in the form of permanence.

Here, it has been stated that there is an absence of earlier modification in the present modification. So earlier *saṅskāra* (impression) does not come in the present, and neither does earlier *vikāra* (perturbation). It is not so that present perturbation is due to the earlier perturbation and so it is occurring in the present. By believing that present modifications arise independently with auspices of substance, *jñāna* and *śradhha* turn towards substance. The way eternal non-sentient matter does not change into sentience and sentience does not change into non-sentient matter; similarly, every *aṅśa* present also does not change into another *aṅśa*. Each *aṅśa* of each time exists just the way it is. The way omniscient *Bhagavāna* is a knower; similarly, one who experiences the true nature of substance, perceives himself as *jñātā*.

Leave aside making changes in non-self, here it is said that substance cannot move back or forth its own *aṅśa*. The earlier *aṅśa* does not go back, and later *aṅśa* cannot come forward. By ascertaining this, his intellectualism of *aṅśa* goes away and focus on *aṅśi* (that which is with *aṅśa*) arises. Due to this, origination of modification of *samyaktva* and annihilation of modification of *mithyātva* occurs.

jñāna attribute of *ātma* exists on the base of *ātma*. By nature, it is the knower, and its modifications of three time phases arise, at its own self-time, on the base of the substance. It is not the nature of *ātma* to reduce-increase, move back-bring forward, its current/existing modification. It cannot make changes in modification of non-self, either. Nature of *ātma* is to know self, non-self, and all *jñeyas*, just the way they are. Belief of this knowing nature of pure self is attainment of *samyaktva* of *ātma*.

Question: Is not the desire, to change modification of *mithyātva* and turn it into *samyaktva*- seen in everyone?

Answer: See! *samyagdarśana* arises on the belief of knowing nature, in that *mithyātva* definitely goes away. When modification of *samyaktva* manifests, modification of

mithyātva is not present, so where is the question of changing it? *samyaktva* will not arise with a focus on removing *mithyātva* and manifestation of *samyaktva*. But when focus is on the substance, then manifestation of *samyaktva* occurs. In that, earlier modification of *mithyātva* is annihilated, hence changing even that modification ceases. By moving away from *mithyātva*, *ātma* knows modification of *samyaktva*, which manifests. But it does not move forward or backward, any sequence of modification.

Oh! In any substance, whichever is its current present modifying part never changes – in this, only *vītarāga vijñāna* (science of passionless-ness) is present. There is no thought of changing modification, and incongruous thoughts like, why this so? are not present. Therefore, impurities of both, *śradhhā* and *cāritra*, settle down.

Omniscient Lord has said that each modification of every *samaya* of the eternal substance exists. Substance exists, and modification also exists. Whoever does not understand this existence, and thinks that self can bring about changes in modification has not believed in the pure nature of substance, the omniscient *Bhagavāna*, *guru* or *śāstra*. He has not believed any of these.

In an eternal substance, when is the present not there? It is always there. Any present part of a substance, is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. A substance is continually modifying in the present. That present is being proven here as *svayama siddha sat* (proved to be existing by self). Eternal existence will not turn into physical matter; similarly, it's every current *aṅśa* also will not turn around or move back and forth. He who knows this pure nature of self and has belief of his *jñāyaka svarūpa* (knowing self nature), is *dharma*.

Through all three *kālas*, modifications of all three *kālas* are with origination-annihilation-permanence. Present modification of this *samaya* was not there one *samaya* earlier, it is a new manifestation. So, it is in the form of origination, and modification, which was there before that *samaya*, that modification is annihilated. Present modification has arisen with annihilation of the earlier modification. So, in relation to the earlier modification, that modification is in the form of annihilation, and from view of the unbroken flow of modifications of all three *kāla*, that modification has not manifested and is not in the form of destruction either, it is permanent. This way, when seen from the view of flow without beginning or end, every modification by nature is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence.

Desire to bring changes in modification of any substance is *mithyātva* in the form of *paryāyabuddhi* (thoughts of only modifications). He has not experienced the pure nature of *jñāna*, nor does he know the nature of origination-annihilation-permanence of *jñeya* (knowables). No one can bring about any changes in the existing substance, one can only know. If someone believes in bringing changes in an existing substance, then his belief cannot change the existing substance, but his *jñāna* will be false. *Bhagavāna*, in

his *kevala jñāna*, knows substances exactly the way they exist, and He has said the same. *Bhagavāna* has merely known the existence of substances, but he is not the doer of His speech. His *ātmā* exists in His own modification of *kevala jñāna*, and all substances exist in their own state of existence. *ātmā*, which is *jñāyaka mūrti* (embodiment of knowing nature), does only the work of knowing. Experience and modification of this is the path of *mokṣa*.

Bhagavāna is the knower-seer of the entire universe. He does not have attachment-aversion towards any, nor does He change anything. Like *Bhagavāna*, the nature of self-*ātmā* also, is only to know. All should believe in their knowing nature and leave the desire to bring any changes in substances. He who believes in his pure knowing nature is the knower of attachment-aversion, which arises due to unsteadiness. Whoever believes in this nature of *jñāna*, only he has belief of *Arihantadeva*, he believes in *ātmā*, has belief in *guru* and *śāstra*, only believes in the nine *padārthas* (*tattvas*/fundamental realities) and only has belief in six substances as well as their current *añṣa*. This is called *samyagdarśana* and *samyagjñāna*.

Knowing is the only *puruṣārtha* (effort) of *ātmā*. Knowing is *dharma* of *ātmā*. Path of *mokṣa* and *vītarāgata* are inherent in it. Infinite *Siddha Bhagavañtas* (liberated omniscient) also do only the work of knowing every *samaya*.

Self and non-self, both *jñeyas*, are present in *jñāna*. Knowing that *jñāna* is the knower makes *jñāna* the *sva-jñeya* (knowing of self by self). If *jñāna* is believed to be a doer of attachment, etc., or believed to be a changer, then he has not known the pure nature of *jñāna*. As he has not made himself the knower of self, his *jñāna* is erroneous. When it is said that all modifications of a substance, exist in their own self-time, then it is effortlessly understood that self-nature is the knower.

In this *gāthā*, by giving an example of *kṣetra*, first existence of substance has been proved. Infinitesimal parts of its eternal flow have been stated, and those *añṣas* (modifications) which are absent in each other, are the reason for their multiple-ness, and that has been proved. After that, from all modifications of the entire substance, that which exists in their own self-time has been explained.

In relation to the current modification of every *samaya*, the presence of origination-annihilation-permanence is being stated. First, it was about all modifications. Now, it is from the view of only one modification. After this, origination-annihilation-permanence will be explained in reference to *pariñāmī* (that which is with modification/substance) substance.

The way smallest part of a substance in terms of space points is in the form of destruction from the aspect of earlier space point, and the same space point from the aspect of later space point is in the form of origination, and the same is in the form of experience from the aspect of that which is made by the mutually connected one substance.

Similarly, the smallest part, by way of flow of *kāla*, is in the form of destruction of earlier modification, which itself is, by nature, originator of the next modification and that itself, made by mutually connected one single flow is *anubhaya svarūpa* (not in the form of either of the two).

If one space point is taken from *ātmā*, which is with innumerable space points, then that space point (from the view of area) is in the form of absence of earlier space point, and is in the form of origination of next space point, and from the view of the undivided area, it is permanent. Similarly, if seen from *añṣa* of sequential flow with no beginning or end, that modification is in the form of permanence. In this way, every modification is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence.

Where reference is to origination-annihilation-permanence of all modifications, by saying that ‘each is at its own self-time’, the independent self-time of each modification has been explained. Here, the words origination-annihilation-permanence have not been used, as they have been explained in context to one modification. As only the current modification has been taken, its self-time is included in it.

By understanding that, removing earlier modification is not applicable as there is an absence of earlier modification in the currently modifying modification, it is understood that the present modification exists in present, and there is nothing to change in it, so focus does not remain on only present modification, and due to the unity of *pariṇāmī* (substance) and *pariṇāma* (modification), *samyaktva* manifests. Destruction of earlier modification with false belief, is inherent in it, and that does not need to be pushed. Origination of modification of *samyaktva* is in the experience of pure nature of *jñāna*, which is the experience that, self cannot change any modification, self only knows. Inherent in that is the destruction of *mithyātva*. The need to destroy *mithyātva* and manifest *samyaktva* is not required. As soon as this focus on pure self arises, existing modification of that *samaya*, by itself being in the form of origination of *samyaktva*, destruction of *mithyātva*, and modifications connected to each other with their undivided flow, is permanence. So, every modification is *saṭ* (existing) with origination-annihilation-permanence.

Entire substance exists, similarly, its present also exists. In the eternal flow of substance, every *añṣa* of every *samaya* exists. Modification of present *samaya* exists due to itself and not due to the absence of earlier modification. That present *añṣa* is not due to non-self, but it is due to self. Present *añṣa* of every *samaya* is independent by its own self in its own existence in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence.

This kind of description of nature of substance is nowhere else except in that which is said by *sarvajña* (omniscient). All *tattvas* (substances) of the world are existing. If its second modification does not arise due to the first modification, then what can anyone do about it? One remains merely the knower. If it is believed in any other way, then substance remains unchanged, but *jñāna* of self becomes erroneous.

Present *aṅśa* of a substance exists. Present modification of every *samaya* has been proven to exist. Here context is not to *aṅśa* being on the basis of substance. If existence of modification were to be due to the substance, then every modification would be identical. Therefore, existence of modification has not been taken due to be due to substance, but it has been stated that modification of every *samaya* exists by itself, and substance itself exists by way of modification of the current modifying state. Present *aṅśa* of flow is independent due to that particular *aṅśa*. In this way, it is proved that existence of every *samaya* is without any cause. Existence of every *samaya* is *ahetuka* (gratuitous/without any reason). Each *aṅśa* of every *samaya* of the three time phases of all substances is an independent existence. *jñāna* knows it just the way it is but does not change it. It does not mean that just because *jñāna* has known, so that part is like that. It exists by itself.

Present modification is in the form of annihilation of previous modification; so present modification is not dependent on earlier modification either. Then how can it be that due to non-self substance, some change can be done in them? It is not that because *Kevalī Bhagavāna* attained *kevalajñāna* in first *samaya*, so, he attained *kevalajñāna* in the second *samaya*. But *kevalajñāna* of current modification of that second *samaya* exists as *aṅśa* of that *samaya*. Second *samaya* does not exist due to the existence of first *samaya*. Similarly, it is not that *Siddha Bhagavāna* had modification of *siddha* in the first *samaya*, so modification of *siddha* arose in second *samaya*. In *siddhas* and in all substances, *aṅśa* of every *samaya* is an independent existence by itself.

The language used here is not about origination-annihilation-permanence of *aṅśa* modification in its own self-time; because explanation is about currently modifying one modification, and modification which exists in the present is its *svakāla* (self-time). That which is present in every modification through all three time phases, is its self-time. It does not leave its present existence and go either back or move ahead. This way, every modification of the present is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence.

In this *gāthā*, till now, four points have been explained: –

1. Undivided flow of substance is one, and its sequential modifications are *aṅśa*.
2. In those modifications, there is multiple-ness, because they are mutually absent in one another.
3. There is a commonality of origination-annihilation-permanence when the entire mass of all modifications through all three time phases is taken.
4. By taking one *aṅśa* of the entire flow, it is said that every modification has origination-annihilation-permanence.

After deciding upon origination-annihilation-permanence of modifications, origination-annihilation-permanence will be proved in *pariṇāmī* (beholder of modification), i.e. the substance.

Without transgressing the inherent nature of substance, which exists in the trilogy system of modifications, existence of triple characteristics is accepted as is.

All modifications of substance are by nature with origination-annihilation-permanence. And substance which is present in the sequential modification of those modifications is also with origination-annihilation-permanence.

Like modification, which is with origination-annihilation-permanence, if substance would not be with origination-annihilation-permanence, then it modifies in the sequential succession of modifications, so it is with origination-annihilation-permanence. System of modification means, the way links of a chain cannot move backwards or forward, similarly, flow of modifications does not change. At whichever time, the flow of modification of substance occurs sequentially; at that time, only that modification occurs, and not any other.

This is the description of the existing nature of substance. Substance has the nature to exist, existence is with modification, which is with origination-annihilation-permanence, and *Bhagavāna* has said this to be the identification of substance. ‘*saṭ dravyalakṣaṇa*’, (characteristic of substance is to exist) is the nature of self to know. The way *saṭ* (existence) is, so self should know! If one thinks of straightening or reversing the existing substance, then his *jñāna* will be incorrect. After the belief that substances exist, and self is its knower – unsteadiness of thoughts does occur, but that does not have the strength of *mithyātva*. Hence, with the strength of belief of such *jñāna* and *jñeya*, unsteadiness of those thoughts will break to give way to *vītarāgatā* (passionless-ness) and *kevalajñāna* (omniscience).

Sarvajña deva (omniscient Lord), in His *kevalajñāna*, has seen the nature of substance completely, just the way it is, and His divine speech has revealed the same. If nature of substance is known the way it is and believed in, then *jñāna* (knowledge) and *śraddhā* (belief) will become *samyak*. If nature of substance is not known the way it is and believed to be in any other way, then *samyag jñāna* and *samyak śraddhā* do not arise, and without that, true vows-penance, etc., will not occur.

Till now it has been said that every sentient and non-sentient substance exists by its own self. Modifications arise in them each and every *samaya*. Those modifications are with origination-annihilation-permanence. Main substance is eternal, unconnected and its existence is proved by its own self. It is not made by anyone, and is never destroyed. Whenever it is seen, it exists and modifies every *samaya*.

In modification of every *samaya*, there is origination-annihilation-permanence. Substance exists in it. In every substance, the number of modifications is as many as there are *samayas* in the three time phases. For example, if a mass of gold is kept for a hundred years, then all modifications like bangles, earrings, necklaces, etc., from that mass of gold, have a common mass, which is gold. Similarly, every substance is a mass of all modifications which occur during three-time phases. These modifications arise

sequentially, one after another. Flow of all modifications of three-time phases is the sequential flow of substance. And *añśa* (part) of one *samaya* of that sequential flow is modification. Number of modifications in a substance are only as many as the *samayas* which are there in three *kālas*. Origination-annihilation-permanence has been proved in each of those modifications. Every modification is with origination-annihilation-permanence in its own self-time. Modification of one substance cannot arise from another substance, and no modification can go back or forth. With this determination, omniscience is ascertained, and focus turns on the knowing substance.

In the state of *jñāna* of *ātmā*, attribute of *jñāna* modifies. Attribute of *jñāna* will also modify in the next state that arises, and at the time of third state also, the same will modify. So, in flow of second, third, fourth, etc., all states, its mass is the attribute of *jñāna*. Substance is a mass of such infinite *gunas*. From aspect of modifications which arise in the substance every *samaya*, they are in the form of origination, from the view of absence of earlier state, it is the form of annihilation, and from the view of the part which exists in the uninterrupted flow, it is permanence. Modification which is with this origination-annihilation-permanence, is the nature of every substance. And in such a nature, substance permanently exists. So, it should be understood that substance by itself is also with origination-annihilation-permanence.

Every substance is permanent with change. If substance were only permanent, then actions of happiness, sorrow, etc., would not happen. And if substance were to singularly modify, then it cannot be an eternal constant. In the very next moment, it will be completely absent. Hence substance is neither only permanent, or nor only changing, but it stays permanently and changes every moment. In this way, substance can be said to be permanent with change or with origination-annihilation-permanence- both would mean the same. Substance which exists in the modification which manifests in the smallest unit of time, is permanently unchanging. Statement that, in its every modification, there is a state of origination-annihilation-permanence becomes clear. Now, it is said that substance itself is with origination-annihilation-permanence.

All substances are existing. When it is said that substances exist, their existential quality is included. Existence of substance has been proved earlier in *gāthā 98*. Substances exist, and existence is with origination-annihilation-permanence. Any substance is eternal, or at every *samaya*, it exists with origination-annihilation-permanence. It does not stay in the past or future, it exists in the present only. If the present of every *samaya* were not with origination-annihilation-permanence, then the eternally modifying nature of substance would not be proved. So, a substance exists in the modification of every *samaya*, which is with origination-annihilation-permanence. The way substance eternally exists, similarly, its modifications of all three time phases also exist in every *samaya*.

After proving every modification to be with origination-annihilation-permanence, now substance which is present in modification will also be proved to be with origination-annihilation-permanence.

Presently modifying modification of substance is origination by its own self. It is annihilation in relation to its earlier modification, and in its undivided flow, it is permanent. In this way, modification is with origination-annihilation-permanence. And in that modification, substance is present. So, substance also is with origination-annihilation-permanence. By proving origination-annihilation-permanence of modification, origination-annihilation-permanence of *pariṇāmi* (that which is with *pariṇāma* (modification)), is also proved. So, the trio of characteristics of substance is accepted. *anumodanā* means to believe with interest/agreement, and accept it from the bottom of the heart.

If this concept of modification of every *samaya* is understood, then there will be no ego of desire to make any changes in non-self, and focus will not remain merely on modifications of attachment, etc., but focus will move towards the eternal substance.

The way sentience, which is present in eternal existence, remains sentient only, and that which is non-sentient remains non-sentient, i.e. sentience does not destroy to become non-sentience, and neither does non-sentience destroy to become sentience. Similarly, in existence of one *samaya*, that modification which exists in that *samaya* that arises only at that time, but does not arise either before or after. Eternal substance exists, in the same way present also exists. The way eternal existence does not change into something else, similarly, the present existence, though modifying, does not change into past or future form. Existing present modifications of three-time phases of every *samaya* do not leave their self-time and become modifications of earlier or later *samaya*. How many ever *samayas* are there in three-time phases, that many modifications are there in a substance, and whichever time, whatever present modification is there, that modification does not leave its present state to become that of past or future. That's it! Every modification is of present existence in its own self-time. That existence cannot change. The way sentience cannot be changed into non-sentience, similarly, in the eternal flow of substance, present modification of each time cannot be moved forward or backwards.

Substance is from eternity to infinity, similarly, its presence of every *samaya*, by way of flow, is from eternity to infinity. Substance and its present cannot be moved forward or backwards. Substance always stays in its present. It never exists without its present, because from three-time phases, if present of one *samaya* is removed, then eternal substance cannot be proved. Mass of present of three-time phases is the existence of substance, and every present modification of three-time phases exists in its own self-time. It is in the form of origination by itself, by way of earlier modification, it is in the form of annihilation, and from the view of undivided substance, it is in the

form of permanence. Existence is with such modification of origination-annihilation-permanence, which is the nature of a substance. Who can change such an existence? Existence can be known as it is, but no one can change it.

jñāna knows the nature of substance-attribute-modification just the way it is. *añśa* (infinitesimal part) is known in the form of *añśa*, and eternal existence is known in the form of eternal substance. By knowing the nature of the eternal substance, interest in only a small part disappears, and belief moves towards the eternal nature. When belief is of *añśa*, it is understood in the form of *añśa*, and when *añśi* (beholder of *añśa*) is believed in the form of *añśi*, then the force of entire belief moves away from *añśa* towards the eternal substance-attribute. This is *samyagdarśana*. Substance-attribute-modification-all three are known by self. In one *samaya*, the whole mass of substance-attribute-modification is known by self. That modification is of one *samaya* only, and focus on that can last only for one *samaya*. Substance is eternal, so equanimity increases when focus is only on it. With interest in it, the force of *śraddhā* increases. In this way, by making substance the knower of self, *samyaktva* is attained. Because of this, the other name of this chapter on *jñeya* is also *samyaktva adhikāra*.

Self-knowledge is completely separate from knowing one's non-self. Here, attachment is included in self-knowledge. *Samayasāra* has been explained with the dominance of *dravyadr̥ṣṭi* (belief/focus on substance). There, focus is on the pure nature of self, so attachment becomes secondary. Therefore, it is said that attachment does not arise in *ātmā* at all; attachment is similar to non-sentience. There, from the view of *dr̥ṣṭi* (focus), attachment has been seen as non-self, and focus of substance has been shown. Here, in *Pravacanasāra*, it is said from the view of *jñāna*. To show the complete self-knowable, attachment also has been seen as *svajñeya* (self-knowable), but the complete knowing does not come only in attachment. Substance-attribute-pure nature, which is without attachment, is also *svajñeya* (self-knowable). So, by knowing substance-attribute-modification, in the form of self-knowable, belief of oneness with attachment, goes away, and force of belief moves towards the substance. By accepting only attachment as a complete substance, experience of complete *jñeya* (knowable) does not arise. With experience of complete *svajñeya* (self-knowable), which is in the form of substance-attribute-modification, force of that experience moves towards the eternal; therefore, the eternal becomes main/primary, and force of interest increases towards it. In this way focus of substance is inherent in it.

Self-knowable is substance-attribute-modification of the self, as one. Attachment is also *svajñeya* (self-knowable), and by knowing so, force of belief moves away from attachment and turns within. He who has forgotten the eternal substance and accepted only the manifested part as knowable has erroneous belief. When *upayoga* (psychic activity) is in the form of efficacy which turns towards the inner pure self, then all three, the substance-

attribute-modification, are known as knowable, only then is it believed that self-knowable has been taken into complete experience, and only then is it said then he knows the pure nature of substance-attribute-modification as told by *sarvajñā*.

When jaggery is known as jaggery, and poison is known as poison, only then is that knowledge correct. If jaggery is known as poison, and poison is known as jaggery, then that knowledge is incorrect; it is erroneous. Similarly, substance-attribute-modification, all three are together, and are complete self-knowable of one *samaya*. It is said to be correct knowledge only when substance is known as substance, attribute is known as attribute and modification is known as modification. Suppose it is not known just the way it is, or *kṣṇika* (momentary) *pariyāya* (modification) is believed to be the complete substance or *kṣṇika pariyāya* only is seen as complete substance. In that case, that knowledge is not correct. Without correct knowing of substance, belief cannot be correct, and without true knowledge and belief, true conduct, passionless state, or liberation will not manifest.

The leaning towards belief of eternal substance, complete self-knowable is experienced and then true efficacy of *jñāna* to know *parajñeya* manifests. Present state of *jñāna*, whose focus is on attachments, and believes this state to be the complete self-knowable, that modification of *jñāna* was erroneous. It does not have the ability to illuminate self and non-self. And when *jñāna* in its present modification sees the eternal complete substance as knowable and leans towards it, then that *jñāna* becomes *samyaka*, and in that, the efficacy to illuminate self and non-self manifests.

As soon as it is decided that substance is that which exists in a sequential flow of modification, then the force of belief leans towards substance, and belief becomes true. In that modification, traces of attachment do exist, which is not outside the purview of *jñāna*. *jñāna* accepts that in the form of *svajñeya*. In this way, if complete self knowable (substance-attribute and *vikārī* (perturbed) or *avikārī* (unperturbed) modifications) is accepted, then *samyagjñāna* of all three, substance-attribute-modification arises.

jñāna, which accepts all three parts (substance-attribute-modification) of *jñeya*, is *samyak*, and *jñāna*, which accepts only one part (attachment only), is *mithyā*. If he accepts *ātmā* as completely without attachment, then that *jñāna* is erroneous. Because modification of attachment does arise even in a *sādhaka* (seeker). If those modifications of attachment are not known in the form of self-knowable, then it will be assumed that he does not believe in the substance which exists with modification of attachments.

Modifications of attachment are also included in the system of modifications of three-time phases. Modifications of attachment are not separate from conventional flow of modifications of substance. A substance exists by modifying in the conventional flow of modification of three time phases.

Modification could be of *nigoda* (lowest life form, with one sense) or *siddha* (liberated), all are in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence and in that modification, substance exists. Substance exists in the system of modification, which is present, sequence, which is present, conventional system which is present, and nature, which is present. That substance does not transgress its own nature of modification of origination-annihilation-permanence. Here, the word ‘nature’ does not mean pure modification but includes all modifications, be they perturbed or unperturbed, as all modifications are nature of substance and are included in self-knowable. Manifestation of pure modification starts for him, who knows this. Only by knowing that, non-self knowable does not exist in self-knowable, and self-knowable does not exist in the non-self knowable, can passionless belief arise. On deciding that *svajñeya* of self is separate from *parajñeya*, intention of support towards any *parajñeya* does not remain. So, true belief arises with auspices of self-substance. The entire substance is *pariṇāmī* (beholder of modifications), and it’s one *aṅśa* (part) is *pariṇāma* (modification). Without inner focus of the complete *pariṇāmī* substance, real knowledge of *aṅśa* of *pariṇāma* cannot arise. Substance does not leave the sequential flow of modification, it exists in that conventional flow only. When this is ascertained, then where does the force of focus go? It goes only on the substance, isn’t it? In this way, *dravyadṛṣṭi* (focus on substance) is also understood.

Substance is eternal, with a mass of infinite efficacies. As soon as it is known that modification is merely an *aṅśa* (part) with a duration of one *samaya*, force of belief turns towards the mass of infinite efficacies. With this, experience of substance occurs, and correct *jñāna* of both substance and modification arises.

Every substance exists in its own modifying nature. Those modifications have three characteristics (origination-annihilation-permanence). Therefore, these three characteristics exist even in the substance which exists in that modification, because existence of substance is not separate from nature of modification. Origination-annihilation-permanence is included when it is said that substance ‘exists’. It can never be proved that substance is without origination-annihilation-permanence. By saying that modification exists, that modification is also with origination-annihilation-permanence. Existence cannot be without origination-annihilation-permanence. Therefore, existence requires acceptance of these three characteristics.

First, one should understand the correct teachings related the nature of substance and affirm it as it is. After that, knowing will be without any doubt, and when knowing is without doubt, inner churning of thoughts should be done, then *nirvikalpa* (unwavering) experience will manifest. But how can there be any inner churning when knowledge is erroneous and is ridden with doubts about what will happen? In absence of doubtless knowing, inner churning will also be false, i.e., erroneous knowledge and belief will arise. First, the state of substance should be focussed upon. Without taking substance into focus correctly, of what will the churning be?

Substance does not cross the boundary of modification, because modification exists. If a substance were to cross the boundary of modification, then it will cross the boundary of existence. Then, it cannot be proved that substance exists. Substance exists in the sequential flow during all three-time phases.

Oh! This path is for experiencing the total self knowable. Whether it is said to be *samyak niyativāda* (determinism), or effort of true *mokṣa mārga* (path of liberation), said to be *vītarāgatā* (passionless-ness) or *dharma*-everything is included in it.

Ācāryadeva says only this is the nature of substance. Manifestation of unparalleled bliss is inevitable to him, who knows this nature. As soon as substance is known with its three characteristics, *ātmā*, by itself, inevitably leans towards *samyak svabhāva* (equanimous pure nature of self), and when substance modifies in the form of *samyak-svabhāva*, an experience of unparalleled bliss arises. So here it is said to accept such nature of substance from the aspect of bliss.

It should be noted that substance does not breach the boundary of any modification, so focus goes only on substance, *pariṇāma-pariṇāmī* (modification-beholder of modification) become one, so entire existence becomes one, entire self-knowable becomes undivided. He who knows and believes in such a self-knowable will surely attain true experience of self and unparalleled bliss.

An omniscient knows *lokāloka* just the way it exists, in the same way, *samyag dṛṣṭi* accepts it in the form of *jñeya*, and the nature of *jñāna* which knows *lokāloka* is also accepted as *svajñeya*. Here, inclination tilts towards *svabhāvavāna* (beholder of pure nature) substance. With the force of that interest, manifestation of *nirvikalpatā* (unperturbed state) is inevitable. Experience of bliss is always along with *nirvikalpa* (unperturbed) state.

Question: Why does information like, in how much time how many *jīvas* go to *mokṣa*, not come in this?

Answer: Here, the calculation of, in how much time, how many *jīvas* attain *mokṣa*, is not predominant. But the predominant discussion is how can *mokṣa* be attained? If self were to recognise this true nature by himself, then he would attain *samyaktva* and *vītarāgatā* which would lead to *mokṣa*. The question that, when will *mokṣa* be attained? Which is with the predominance of time is not there, but how *ātmā* will attain *mokṣa* is the primary intention; that is being explained here.

If existence is accepted just as it is, true *jñāna* will manifest, and peace will arise. This *gāthā* has two same numbers-99, and two nines have an even more profound significance. There are nine types of *kṣāyika bhāvas*, so number nine stands for *kṣāyika bhāva*. And two nines together, show *sambhāva* (equanimity), which denotes a passionless state. *kṣāyika samyaktva* (complete annihilation of *darśanāvārṇiya karma*) and *kṣāyika cāritra* (total annihilation of *cāritra mohaniya karma*) both will arise

together. This number has such a divine explanation. Whatever the number is, one's own *bhāva* (belief/experience) must be superimposed.

In the current changing modification, substance exists. So, the entire substance exists in the present. That substance is with origination-annihilation-permanence. By saying origination-annihilation-permanence here, its existence has been proven.

ātmā exists, *jaḍa* exists, infinite attributes of one substance exist, modification which arise through three-time phases at their own time, exist, and modification of every *samaya* exists with origination-annihilation-permanence. That's it. There are no changes in this existence. If this is accepted, then the question of changing *mithyātva* and manifesting *samyaktva* does not arise because whoever accepts this has accepted his own knowing nature, and has turned towards his substance, which is his self-nature. In the current modification, *samyaktva* manifests by its own self. Earlier modifications of intense sins are not an obstruction to the current modification because they are absent in the present. The opposing belief that modification of extreme sins of past will obstruct the present is the real obstruction. But sins of the past are not an obstruction even to him. One who believes that intense modification of sins of past will be an obstruction at this *samaya* does not know the substance with its triple characteristics. If he were to know the substance with its triple characteristics, then he would not believe that earlier modification would be an obstruction in the present because, in the present manifestation of that substance with triple characteristics, there is an annihilation of previous modification. He sees the modification of every *samaya* as an independent existence, and then his focus goes on the substance of which those modifications are. So, by focusing on substance, he has manifestation of only *vītarāgatā*, so *mokṣa mārga* is included in this.

vītarāga or *rāga*, *jñāna* or *ajñāna*, *siddha* or *nigoda*, if modification of any one *samaya* is removed, then existence of substance cannot be proved because substance exists in the modification of that *samaya*. Therefore, substance which currently exists in its own sequentially modifying flow should be believed to be with origination-annihilation-permanence, which is with *ānanda* (bliss).

To prove that substance, which stays in its own nature, exists—first, it is said that modification is with origination-annihilation-permanence. By this, its nature is proven, and in that, it is proved that self-nature substance always exists.

To prove origination-annihilation-permanence of modification, the example of *pradeśa* (smallest unit of *ākāśa* substance) was given. Now, origination-annihilation-permanence of substance will be explained with the example of a string of pearls.

In a necklace of pearls with a definite length, all pearls are seen in their own place. Pearls in the latter places cannot manifest in place of the earlier pearls. Due to the presence of creator of the mutually strung state, which is the thread, the necklace is with

triple characteristics. For example, if a hanging necklace of 108 pearls is taken, then every pearl is seen in its own position. Pearls positioned later will be seen in the later position, and pearls positioned earlier will be seen in the earlier position. So, in relation to those pearls, there is origination of necklace. By seeing pearls one after another, focus moves away from the earlier pearl, so the earlier pearl is not seen in the second place. In relation to this, there is annihilation of necklace. And the seamless thread that mutually connects the pearls, is in the form of permanence. In this way, the necklace has characteristics of origination-annihilation-permanence.

Every pearl of the necklace stays in its own place. The first pearl does not become second, and second does not become third. Whatever is, wherever, it stays precisely there. In the first place is the first pearl, second pearl is in the second place, and seamless thread of necklace is throughout. While moving a rosary of pearls one after another, the pearls come in contact with the finger. In relation to this, the triple characteristic of origination-annihilation-permanence, attains its prominence.

In the example, it was a necklace of definite length, in principle, it is the constantly present substance.

In the example, it was a hanging necklace, in principle, it is the modifying substance.

In the example, pearls had their own respective place, and in principle, modification has its own respective self-time.

Complete substance, with origination-annihilation-permanence exists, and no changes occur in that. Till the entire existence does not come into focus in this way, steadiness will not arise in *jñāna*. He who desires to change non-self will have impatient, vexatious, and restless *jñāna*. And by knowing of existence, desire to bring changes in anything does not remain. Therefore, knowing becomes steady, stable in self and remains in the form of a knower. Such a complete substance, in the form of the entire existence, is preset with modification of origination-annihilation-permanence. With focus on substance, there is origination of *samyaktva*, annihilation of *mithyātva*, and with the focus on substance, sequentially *vītarāgatā* keeps increasing. This is the only way for manifestation of *dharma*.

Every substance exists permanently. That substance is constantly modifying, as explained in the example of a hanging necklace. Its modification manifests in their own self-time. Sequence of beads of a rosary is set in a definite manner, and moving the rosary beads does not break that sequence; similarly, modifications of three *kālas* of a substance have their own definite self-time. They arise only in their own self-time, neither before nor after. As soon as this is decided, *vītarāgatā* in *jñāna* arises. When this is believed, infinite *vīrya* (power) turns away from non-self towards self substance. Focus, only on modification is destroyed, and as focus towards substance arises, *vītarāgatā* occurs. Modification of other substances modify as per its own self-time and modification of self, modifies according to its own self-time. As soon as this is decided, desire to change modification in non-self or

self, does not remain, and self attains intense concentration on self *jñāna*, which is said to be *dharma* and the path of *mokṣa*.

On one side is *kevalajñāna*, and on the other side are all modifications of three-time phases of substance, each arising in its own self-time. These cannot be changed at all; because modifications of a substance cannot change. Fortitude arises in *jñāna*, only by experiencing this state of substance. As soon as *jñāna* steadies and turns towards self, modification of *mokṣa* will arise. In this way, path of *mokṣa* is inherent in the experience of *krambaddha* (sequence-bound) modification.

From the view of generality, it is said that all modifications of substance manifest in their own self-time. Now, origination-annihilation-permanence is applied to it. At any given time, substance is seen to be modifying in the present modification. Of whichever time, whichever modifications are there, at that time, only those manifest. Earlier modifications do not manifest at the time. While proving origination-annihilation-permanence of earlier modification, it was said that present modification is in the form of annihilation (destruction/absence) of earlier modification. Here, to prove origination-annihilation-permanence of substance, there is a change in the phrase, and it is said that at the time of manifestation of the present modification, earlier modification does not manifest. So, from the view of those earlier modifications, substance is in the form of annihilation. From the view of modification in which substance exists, it is in the form of origination. From the view of its earlier modification (which is not manifested at this time), substance is in the form of annihilation. And from the view of the undivided flow of all modification of substance, its nature is that of permanence. In this way, the state of the three characteristics in substance is decided in *jñāna*. *jñāna*, which determines *jñeya*, steadies in self. This is called the experience of true self with true belief in the nature of substance.

While chanting with rosary beads, first bead comes in touch with the finger, then it is released, and second bead comes in touch with it, at that time first bead is not in touch with the finger. So, from view of touch of the first bead, there is an absence of rosary, and from view of touch of the second bead, there is a manifestation of the rosary, and from the view of the rosary itself, its flow is continuous, therefore rosary is permanent. In the same way, substance exists in modifications which manifest sequentially one after another, and origination-annihilation-permanence applies to it.

If someone were to ask that origination-annihilation occurs in modification, and substance is only in the form of permanence, that it has no modification! Then answer to that is, substance is not singularly constant. But its nature is *nitya-anitya* (permanent-changing). So, with changing of modification, substance which exists in those modifications, also gets modified. Due to origination-annihilation of modification, substance also modifies in the form of origination-annihilation. Without modification of substance, origination-

annihilation of modification cannot happen, and an unbroken state of permanence of substance also cannot exist. So, substance is with origination-annihilation-permanence. But it is not that origination-annihilation is only in modification, and substance remains permanent, and it never has origination-annihilation. Substance which exists in origination-annihilation-permanence of modification also has these triple characteristics in one *samaya*. Oh! Self or non-self modification of every substance occurs in their own self-time. By deciding that modification of non-self substance occurs due to origination-annihilation-permanence of that substance, and modification of self arises sequentially from one's own self substance, focus moves away from non-self substance and turns towards the self. Even in self, focus moves away from modification because new modification does not arise from the said modification, but manifests from substance. Therefore, focus goes on substance, and he experiences eternal existence. With experience of this eternal existence, substance flows in its own modification, which is in the form of its own nature. And he modifies by destroying the flow of perturbed modifications. Therefore, substance is surely in the form of the triple characteristics.

First, origination-annihilation-permanence of modification was explained, and here origination-annihilation-permanence of substance is being explained.

Existence of substance or being of substance is with origination-annihilation-permanence. Existence of substance is not merely in the form of origination, merely in the form of annihilation, or merely in the form of permanence. But its existence is with three characteristics of origination-annihilation-permanence. There is no such separate existence as origination-annihilation and permanence; they all form one existence.

Earlier, it was said that modifications which arise, are origination, in relation to itself, in relation to earlier state, it is annihilation, and concerning the unbroken flow, it is permanence. Here, the sum total is shown by applying origination-annihilation-permanence to substance. It has been said that modifications which keep manifesting in substance, one after another, are the origination of substance, earlier modifications do not manifest, so they are the form of annihilation of substances, and substance being a seamless existence through all modification, are permanent. In this way, all three characteristics apply to the substance.

All substances arise in the form of their present modification. Modifications which were before, do not stay in the present. So, it is in the form of absence of earlier modification, and substance exists as *dhruva* in the form of the undivided flow of all modification. Substance which exists in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence is the infallible truth of existence which is chiselled in stone. In such an existence, nothing moves forward or backwards. Accepting this existence in *jñāna* is like being chiselled in stone, and desire to make changes or the perplexity of why so? is removed. *samyak*

śraddhā (true belief) and *vītarāgatā* are inherent in it, meaning the path of *mokṣa* manifests.

The science of substance is being explained here. Whatever the nature of substance, to know it exactly the way it is, is the science of substance. There cannot be peace without belief in this kind of science of substance.

When it is known that every substance is by nature with origination-annihilation-permanence, the fence of distinction of substance is built. In origination-annihilation-permanence of self, there is an absence of non-self, and in origination-annihilation-permanence of non-self, self is absent. Self is in substance-attribute-modification of self, and in substance-attribute-modification of non-self, there is non-self. By deciding this, one leaves ownership of non-self substance and turns towards self-substance. He himself becomes the protector of his own substance-attribute-modification, meaning with the auspices of permanence, manifestation of pure modification arises, which is *dharma*. When he believed that he could change non-self, he had only delusional thoughts due to his leaning towards non-self. As he was not protecting his own substance-attribute-modification, it was *adharma*.

In this *gāthā*, by showing existence with origination-annihilation-permanence, *Ācāryadeva* has explained a unique concept. This is about the modification of present *samaya*; because the entire substance exists in the current modification. It means that modification and substance both are together. Substance is never without modification, and modification is never without substance. Its not possible that modification manifests in the present, and substance remains in the past. Further, it is also not possible that substance is there, but modification is not. So, it should be understood that modification and substance, both are together in the present. The current modification always arises in substance, in its own self-time. At any time, substance exists in its present modification. To experience such a substance, which exists in the present, is the root of *vītarāgatā* (passionless-ness).

Existence of modification, is the modification of self-time. Time and modification are not two separate entities. For whomever, at whatever time the modification arises, only that modification exists. Substance which exists in that modification is in the form of origination, substance does not exist in the earlier modification, so it is in the form of annihilation and universally, from the view of the whole, substance is in the form of permanence. In this way, the trio of characteristics of origination-annihilation-permanence is proved.

jīva, *ajīva*, all substances, and all their modification are without beginning or end, and they all exist. That existence is proved by itself. It has no maker or modifier. The way no substance leaves its nature to become something else, similarly, no modification of substance moves forward or back. Modification arises at its own self-time in substance. Earlier modification does not arise, and substance remains as an undivided flow. By

knowing such a substance with the nature of origination-annihilation-permanence, experience of one's own knowing nature occurs. With focus on that knowing nature, *bhagavāna ātmā* flows as its own pure self. Flow of impure dispositions is destroyed, and in that undivided state, he is permanent. In this way, with arising of passionlessness, *kevalajñāna* and liberation are attained.

We bow, with deep reverence, to the saints who have explained this exceptional path of the science of substance, which is beyond any worldliness and have shown it to be the reason for liberation.

pravacana on bhāvārtha of gāthā 99

All substances always stay within their own nature therefore, they exist. Nature is in the form of modification with origination-annihilation-permanence. Every substance, through all three *kālas*, stay within its nature or stay in its own modifications. Gold exists in its modification of earrings, necklaces, etc., similarly, all substances exist in their current modifications. No substance exists separate from its modification. No substance transgresses its own nature of modification to change into modification of non-self, and modification of non-self does not transgress and change into the modification of self. All substances stay separate in their own modification. *ātmā* exists in its modification, be it of *jñāna* or attachment, etc., but *ātmā* is not present in the state of a body. In the state of a body, *pudgala* (physical matter) is present. In infinite nanoparticles of the body, every particle exists in its own state. He who sees the nature of substance in this way never has thoughts of oneness with non-self and does not have attachments and aversions of oneness with modification.

ātmā and all other substances arise in the form of their own new state every *samaya*, are destroyed in the form of the older state and in the form of unbroken nature of substance, is permanent. Modification of every *samaya* is with origination-annihilation-permanence. Modification is the *svabhāva* (nature), *svabhāvavāna* (holder of nature) is the substance which beholds the nature of self and exists in its own nature of modification. It never occurs that any substance, leaving its own nature, exists in the nature of another, or changes the nature of another. In states of body, *pudgala* (physical matter) exists, *ātmā* does not exist in them, and he who believes that *ātmā* can do something in it has erroneous belief.

Bitterness is present in opium, etc., and in modification of origination-annihilation-permanence of opium, jaggery is not present. Origination-annihilation-permanence modification of sweetness, etc., prevails in jaggery, and opium does not prevail in that. Similarly, in *jñāna*, etc., which is origination-annihilation-permanence of *ātmā*, *ātmā* is present, and senses, or body does not prevail in it, so *jñāna* of *ātmā* does not occur through body and senses. In modifying nature of origination-annihilation-permanence

of *pudgala*, only *pudgala* prevails, and *ātmā* is not present in them. Therefore, *ātmā* does not do any activity of the body, etc. In this way, every substance is present in its own nature. That's it! To know the nature of substance is *vītarāgīvijñāna* (science of passionless-ness), and *dharma* manifests only from that.

It is the nature of every substance to stay within its boundary. No substance has the efficacy to come out of its own boundary and do something in non-self. Every substance stays independent in its own existence in such a state of substance. If this is stated from the view of *asti-nāsti anekānta* (confluence of existence/non-existence), then every substance exists by its own *svacatuṣṭaya* (quadruple of *dravya-kṣetrā-kāla-bhāva*) by way of its self *asti* (existence) and by way of non-self *catuṣṭaya* (quadruple of non-self) it is in the form of *nāsti* (non-existence). Every *tattva* (substance) exists separately in this manner. By deciding so, self-substance is known as separate from non-self substance, and when focus goes on substance, which is pure by nature, and exists in one's own nature, then that is the reason for true experience of self, true knowledge, and passionless state.

To know substance just the way it is, is *samyag jñāna*. If jaggery is known as jaggery and opium is known as opium, then true knowledge of jaggery and opium exists. But if jaggery is known as opium or opium is known as jaggery, then that is false knowledge. Similarly, substances of this universe, whether *jaḍa* (non-sentience) or *cetana* (sentience), are independent. Every substance exists by itself in its own nature of origination-annihilation-permanence, and to know this is *samyag jñāna*. To believe that something can be done in one substance by another is a false belief because he has not understood the nature of substance just the way it is, and believes the contrary.

Nature of *ātmā* is *jñāyaka* (to know), and the nature of substances is *jñeya* (knowable), It is not their nature to make changes in substances, neither is it the nature of *jñāna* to make changes in their nature. Eyes see opium in the form of opium and jaggery in the form of jaggery but does not change opium into jaggery nor jaggery into opium. Opium also does not leave its nature to become jaggery. Similarly, knowing nature of *ātmā* knows all self and non-self *jñeyas* as they are, but does not change anything in them. *jñeyas* also do not leave their own nature to transform into something else. That's it! Experience of this nature of *jñāna* and *jñeya* is *vītarāgī śraddhā* (passionless belief), and such is the science of *vītarāga* (passionless).

The work of *samyagjñāna* is to know *jñeyas* just the way they are independently. *jñāna* does the work of knowing. It does not do the work of changing anything anywhere. Every substance is proved by itself and exists by itself, and it has the characteristics of modification. Those modifications have the nature of origination-annihilation-permanence, or in substance, every *samaya*, origination-annihilation-permanence occurs. Substance exists in them. This is because existence is stable while existing in its own modification. If a substance were to ask refuge from another substance for being in its own existence,

then existence of that substance does not remain. The nature of existence is to stay within its own modification. Existing substance itself is with origination-annihilation-permanence. If existence of its own origination of modification were to arise due to another, then that substance would not exist with origination-annihilation-permanence. If it is believed that substance exists with its own origination-annihilation-permanence, then acceptance of independence of modification definitely arises. With the belief that modification does not occur from modification but comes from the modifying substance, focus goes on the modifying state and turns towards self-substance. With focus on self-substance, *samyak śraddhā-jñānā-cāritra* arises, which is the reason for *mokṣa*.

Question: When gold and copper are mixed, do they not blend into one another?

Answer: Listen! Understand the state of a substance. Gold and copper will never blend into one another. It is said that gold and copper have mixed, from the view of association, but seen from the view of nature of substance, gold and copper can never blend into each other. It is because particles of gold exist in their modification of gold-ness, and particles of copper exist within their own modification of copper only. One particle does not exist in the modification of another particle. Even from two particles of gold, one particle does not exist in another particle. If one substance blends into another and second one blends into the third, then no independent substance will remain in this universe. Saying that gold and copper have combined only proves the distinction between the two substances. This is because mixing occurs between two substances. If there is only one substance, there is nothing to mix. Therefore, by saying they blended, the separate existence of both substances is proved.

Every substance exists by the nature of self. If someone believes the opposite, it will not change the nature of substance. Even if opium is believed to be jaggery, bitterness of opium will not go away. If opium is eaten, believing it to be jaggery, then it will taste bitter only. Similarly, even if it is not believed that substances are just as they are, not believing them to be independent and believing them to be supported by another substance, substance will not become dependent. But because one has a contrary belief of existence, his *jñāna* is *mithyā*. Fruit of that *mithyā jñāna* is transmigration cycle of *caurāsī* (84 lakh life forms). Some *jīva* with auspicious attachment of *punya* believe it to be *dharma*, but *dharma* will not arise due to attachment. However, because he has known the nature of substance to be the opposite of what it is, the fruit of that *ajñāna* (lack of true knowledge), will be to have the transmigration in 84 lakh life forms.

When it is known that modification is nature and substance is the beholder of nature, then focus turns towards the beholder of nature, which is the substance. At the same time, *samyaktva* originates, *mithyātva* annihilates, and permanence remains as the undivided whole.

Every substance exists, and existence is proved by itself, eternally. If existence were not eternal (through all three phases of time), then it would prove to be *asaṭ* (non-existent).

But substance is never non-existent. Substance is eternal, so it has no *kartā* (doer), as the eternal has no creator. If it is said that there is a creator, then it will be proved that substance did not exist prior to that time, or the constant state of a substance will not remain. Substance is with eternal existence, and that substance is with nature of modification. Only eternal substance, through three-time phases, creates its present, which is the modifications. Those modifications also exist in their own self-time. The way *Iṣvara*, etc., is not the doer of the eternal substance, in the same way, doer of present modification of eternal substance has no other *nimitta*, *karma*, etc. Substance is within in its origination-annihilation-permanence of every *samaya*, therefore, it exists. If a substance were to take support of origination-annihilation-permanence of another substance, then it cannot exist by itself. So *jīva*, who knows the existence of substance in its true form, does not believe anyone else to be the doer of any substance or of any modification of substance. If he were not to believe so, then he has not really understood the existence of substance.

Oh! This *jīva* has spent an eternity with focus on outer rituals and activities without knowing the nature of existence of substance. But he remained unaware of the nature of existence of substance. Hence, he is transmigrating in the universe.

Substance modifies in its own modification, and it does not stay separate from modification. By knowing that at the time of every modification, entire substance exists with it, one will not believe himself to be as much as a momentary attachment of that *samaya*. He believes in the complete substance without any attachments, and as he breaks interest in attachments, the force turns towards experience of complete substance and *bheda jñāna* (knowing of distinction) between attachment and *ātmā* arises. Self does not exist in non-self, and non-self not exist in modification of self. But self exists in self's modification. By understanding the independence of modification and *pariṇāmī*, interest does not turn towards non-self, and does not remain on modification either. But it turns completely towards the *pariṇāmī* substance.

By understanding that substance modifies in modification, thoughts of modification go away and focus turns towards substance. *vītarāgatā* is present in it. This substance will exist in future modifications of *kevalajñāna*, so desire to see future modifications of *kevalajñāna* also does not remain. With focus on substance, *kevalajñāna* is sure to arise in a short time.

Self is in its own modifying nature. Nature of modification is origination-annihilation-permanence, and *ātmā* substance exists in that. With this focus on self-substance, *mithyātva* of believing gain-loss from non-self does not remain. There, *samyagjñāna* is present in the form of origination, *mithyā jñāna* is present in the form of annihilation and the undivided form of modification in *jñāna* is the state of permanence. This is the form of *dharma*.

Refusing to believe that modifications are of *pariṇāmī*, and believing that modification is due to non-self, shows that *pariṇāmī* has not been taken into focus at all. It shows

a belief that non-self is a doer of modification, meaning that self and non-self are believed to be one; hence, this is *mithyā* belief. However, when the belief arises that modifications are their own *pariṇāmī*, then belief in independence of modifications as well as *pariṇāmī* arises *samyakruci* (true belief) of self substance evolves and erroneous belief is destroyed.

See! This description is of the state of substance. *Jaina darśana* (belief and philosophy followed by *Jainas*) is neither sectarian nor imaginary. *Jaina darśana* describes substances just the way it has been seen by *sarvajña* (omniscient) *Bhagavāna*. Be it called *Jaina darśana* or nature of substance, knowing it correctly destroys one's transmigration through *bhava* (lives). If nature of a substance is believed to be opposite of what it is, then due to incorrect belief of substance, *jñāna* will be erroneous, and transmigration will not end. *mithyātva* has been considered to be the greatest sin, and it is the root of infinite *saṁsāra* (transmigration). Nature of modification is to be with origination-annihilation-permanence, and nature is due to the beholder of nature. In this way, by bringing into focus *svabhāva* and *svabhāvavāna*, belief that self can do origination-annihilation-permanence of non-self and non-self can do origination-annihilation-permanence of self is destroyed. So, by turning towards self's *svabhāvavāna*, *ātmajñāna* (true knowing of *ātmā*) arises. This is the beginning of *dharma*. Outer activities, which are believed by people to be *dharma*, are its fruit.

Substance is that which stays within its attributes and modifications. Substance does nothing outside its attribute-modification, and no other can do anything in the attribute-modification of a substance. In this way, belief in separate substances is *samyagdarśana*. First, *samyag darśana* arises thereafter, vows of *śrāvaka* and *muni* arise. Without experience of *ātmā*, from which state of being can one have vows, etc.?

A dog walking under a cart has the delusion that the cart is moving because of him, when in reality, every *parmāṇu* exists completely independent in modification of the cart, and modifies independently. The dog exists in modification of the delusion of a dog. Cart and dog do not exist in the modification of each other. Similarly, modifications of non-self arise due to their own self, but ignorant *jīva* believes that modifications of non-self are due to him, which is of no use. Modification of every substance exists, in that what can anyone else do? Such is the independent nature of substance, and *Sarvajña Bhagavāna* has seen this in his *jñāna*. It cannot be that the nature of substance does not have to be the way *Bhagavāna* has seen, or that *Bhagavāna* does not know the nature of substance the way it is. Meaning that *jñāna* (knowing) is not dependent on *jñeya* (object of knowing/knowable), and *jñeya* is not dependent on *jñāna*. *jñeya* is an independent existing nature of substance, and *jñāna* is also an independent existence. First, this existing nature should be understood! Only he who understands such a nature knows substance in the form of substance.

In modification of *karma*, *puḍgala* (physical matter) exists, and in modification of *ātmā*, *ātmā* exists. Neither exists in the other's modifications. *karma* does not make *ātmā*

transmigrate. Not knowing one's own independent modification and due to the false belief that karma makes him transmigrate, *jīva* is transmigrating. *karma* has not made him lose his way. Arising of origination-annihilation-permanence every *samaya* is the nature of each substance. If this is understood, then focus will go on that which is the beholder of substance and with focus on substance, *samyaktva*, as well as *vītarāgatā*, manifests. He who has this focus has acquired right belief and dharma.

If existence of one *samaya* of substance were to be due to another, then its current existence would not remain, and due to the destruction of present existence, eternal existence would also be destroyed. Meaning that without accepting present modification as an independent existence, existence of eternal substance cannot be proved. *mithyātva* arises with the belief that the present state of substance is due to another substance or due to *nimitta*. This is *mithyātva* because it shows that he does not have the acceptance of existence. Existence is not destroyed, but there is an absence of truth in believing opposite of what the state of substance is. There is an eternal existence which is not made by anyone. Believing this independent existence to be dependent is *mithyātva* and *adharmā*. People believe *adharmā* in black marketing, etc., but they are unaware of the greatest sin, which is contrary belief. *mithyātva* is the great black marketer in the field of *dharma*. Due to this black marketing, there is an imprisonment of transmigration through 84 lakh life forms. If existence is accepted the way it is, then the great sin of black market of *mithyātva* is removed, and true *dharma* is manifested. Hence nature of substance, as told by *sarvajña*, should be understood properly.

kṣetra of *ātmā* covers innumerable space points, smallest *aṅṣa* (infinitesimal part) of that *kṣetra* is *pradeśa*. In this way flow of complete substance is one, and smallest *aṅṣa* of that continuous flow is modification.

From the view of *kṣetra*, the most subtle part of substance is *pradeśa*, and from the view of *kāla*, the most subtle part of substance is modification.

Modification comes from *pariṇāmī*. Modification of *samyagdarśana-jñāna-cāritra* manifests when one focuses on *pariṇāmī* and takes its auspices. Then he becomes equanimous, and moving forward, becomes complete.

Every modification arises at its own time; it is absent from the view of earlier modifications, and by way of unbroken flow, it is permanent. From the view of its own nature, modification of *kevalajñāna* is in the form of origination at its own self-time, from the view of an earlier modification of lesser knowledge, it is in the form of annihilation and in the unbroken flow of substance, modification of that *kevalajñāna* is *dhrūva*. In this way, all modifications, in their present self-time, are with origination-annihilation-permanence. And in each of these, the then-current modifications of substance exists-meaning, substance is complete in the present. *jñānī* does not seek *kevalajñāna* and does not focus on it. That is because the modification which does not exist in the present *samaya*, will occur in the future, and

its existence will be at that time. So *jñānī* focuses on the pure existing nature of self, which is in the present, he focuses on the existing nature of the *dhruva* substance, and keeps his focus on it.

From this point of view, in *Niyamasāra*, modification of *udaya-upśama-kṣayopśama-kṣāyika* are said to be *vibhāva bhāva* (perturbed modification). Not only modification which exists in the present is an infinitesimal part, but even the modification of *kevalajñāna* is an infinitesimal part. That modification of *kevalajñāna* does not exist in the present and will manifest in future. So, a *jñānī* does not have focus on the time of modifications. Here, at the time of present modification, experience of the existing substance, in the form of *dhruva*, has been explained. *vītarāgatā* arises with focus on substance. The crux of the meanings of *śāstras* is *vītarāgatā* and *vītarāgatā* arises with focus on pure nature. *vītarāgatā* arises with focus on the inner pure nature of substance and on the nature of self. When focus stays on the pure nature of substance, *vītarāgatā* occurs. In this way, only focus on *dhruva* nature of the substance is useful. There is no reason to look for modification or focus of modification. Keeping the focus on pure nature of *dhruva*, and by remaining a knower of modification, *vītarāgatā* arises by itself.

Although *vītarāgatā* is the only purpose, but the question arises that how can that *vītarāgatā* manifest? By looking for modification of *vītarāga*, it will not arise, but with auspices of *dhruva* substance, the intention of *vītarāgatā* comes to fruition in modification. Therefore, it can be said that the gist of *śāstras* is *vītarāgatā*, or gist of *śāstras* is focus on substance-both mean the same.

ātmā is of self, which is the same as that of *Bhagavāna*, there is no difference in the pure nature of both. Focus of such a pure nature only, is the essence of *śāstras*.

Here, origination-annihilation-permanence of modifications is being explained, and from that, how understanding of *vītarāga* comes about, is stated. In modification, permanence is present from the view of unbroken flow. **Now, flow of modification does not occur altogether, and therefore, with the ascertainment of permanence of modification, focus goes on the pure nature of substance.** Without focus on *dhruva*, nature of origination-annihilation-permanence of modification cannot be ascertained. When is modification called permanent? From view of the entire uninterrupted flow of modification, it has been called permanent, but the entire flow does not manifest in one *samaya*. Therefore, one who decides on modification being permanent, his focus moves away from a single modification and goes on *dhruva* substance. From the view of modification its permanence cannot be decided. An unbroken flow of modification is not within one modification. Therefore, without focus on the undivided, eternal, pure nature of substance, origination-annihilation-permanence of modification also cannot be understood.

Substance is complete in one *samaya*. On deciding that its modification has origination-annihilation-permanence focus goes on substance. From the view of present modification,

it is origination, from the view of earlier modification, it is annihilation; and from the view of undivided flow, it is permanence. So, with attention on the undivided flow, focus goes on *dhruva* and at that time, origination-annihilation-permanence of modification are decided upon.

Question: Where is *puruṣārtha* (effort) in this?

Answer: When this is decided upon, then *puruṣārtha* starts working towards substance, and *vītarāgatā* also begins. Modifications occur in their own self-time, they keep manifesting, but he who determines the nature of substance will focus only on *dhruva*. Without focus on substance, this concept cannot be understood.

In this chapter on *jñeya*, reference is not only to *para prakāśaka* (illumination of non-self) but it is about *para prakāśaka* (illumination of non-self), along with *svaparakāśaka* (illumination of self by self), which is with the focus on self. As soon as *svaparakāśaka* arises with focus on the nature of *dhruva* of self, then, the knowing that all substances of the entire universe, which is *paraparakāśaka* also arises automatically in the knowledge. Substance is also with origination-annihilation-permanence, but when does this belief arise? When interest of knowing the sentient substance and its focus arises, then all this is decided upon. The way true *jñāna* evolves only with the knowing of self, similarly with focus on *dhruva* only, true knowing of origination-annihilation can arise.

Nature of substance is such that non-self does not have to be seen at all and only focus cannot be on one's modification either. This is because state of *nirvikalpa* (pure psychic activity) arises by moving *vikalpa* (psychic activity) away. Therefore, origination-annihilation of modification also is not to be looked at. Substance is complete in the present whenever it is seen, and by focusing on such a substance, sequence of flow remains as it is, and *dravyadr̥ṣṭi* (focus on substance) manifests. In that *dravyadr̥ṣṭi*, successive modifications of only the *vītarāga* state keep manifesting. This is the essence of this verse 99.

Substance is boundless. In it, the treasure of *kevalajñāna* is filled. One can extract as many divine mysteries as one wants from it. With its focus, it can be attained. It may be said that from *sāmānya* (general) *viśeṣa* (specific) is obtained, or that substance is with origination-annihilation-permanence or that from substance, flow of fixed sequential modification arises, essence of all these statements lead to the pure nature of substance only and with the interest of pure nature of *dhruva*, *samyaktva*, and *vītarāgatā* manifests. This statement is about inner focus. Knowledge of *śāstras* is not about being a *paṇḍita* (academician).

It is about the subtle concept of continually occurring origination-annihilation-permanence in modification. It is correct to say that potter does not make a pot, or *karma* does not create perturbations in a *jīva*. But this concept is even more subtle than that. Clay by itself destroys the state of mass and creates the modification of a pot, and from the view

of flow of clay, it is permanent. By understanding the nature of origination-annihilation-permanence of all substances, non-self substances become useless for self. This is because self does not facilitate origination-annihilation-permanence of non-self, and origination-annihilation-permanence of non-self, does not manifest due to self. So, for origination-annihilation-permanence of self, there is no need to turn towards non-self, and one need to only look towards the self. When he sees his own modification, his *jñāna* turns inwards, towards the nature on which it is modifying, and based on that beholder of modification the flow of *vītarāgī* modifications keep manifesting. So, with auspices of *dhruva*, flow of *vītarāgī* modification arises, and flow of passionless modification keeps manifesting.

By ascertaining that *ātmā* cannot do anything of any other, focus of any other substance does not remain, but only the focus of self remains. On deciding that one's own modification arises within the self, and due to self, one sees only the *dhruva* substance within. From here, flow of modification arises, and remains. As soon as focus turns towards *dhruva* (as soon as focus on *dhruva* manifests), *samyak* modification arises. If focus is not on *dhruva*, then due to focus on modification, *mithyātva* manifests. Therefore, by understanding the nature of origination-annihilation-permanence of substance, and with focus on the *dhruva* nature, origination of *samyaka vītarāgī* modification manifests— this is the essence of all that has been said.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā* 100 ❧

अथोत्पादव्ययध्रौव्याणां परस्पराविनाभावं दृढयति-

Now, mutual concomitance (*avinābhāva*) of origination destruction and permanence is ascertained:-

ण भवो भंगविहीणो भंगो वा णत्थि संभवविहीणो ।

उप्पादो वि य भंगो ण विणा धोव्वेण अत्थेण ॥ १००॥

*ṇa bhavo bhaṅgavihīṇo bhaṅgo vā ṇatthi sambhavavihīṇo |
uppādo vi ya bhaṅgo ṇa viṇā dhovveṇa attheṇa || 100 ||*

Meaning There is no *utpāda* (origination) without *vyaya* (destruction), and there is no *vyaya* (destruction) without *utpāda* (origination); (as a matter of fact) neither *utpāda* (origination) nor *vyaya* (destruction) can be without permanence.

ṭīkā: In fact, there is no origination without annihilation and no annihilation without origination. There is neither origination nor annihilation without permanence/stability, nor is there permanence without origination and annihilation.

That which is origination is annihilation, and that which is annihilation is origination, and that which is origination and annihilation is permanence, and that which is permanence is origination and annihilation. For example - origination of a pot is the destruction of clod, because *bhāva* (modification) into another state is due to the manifestation of the nature of absence i.e. *bhāva*(modification is seen, is illuminated by the nature of absence to be another state).

And that which is the destruction of clod of is the origination of jar/pot, because absence is manifested by the nature of *bhāva* to modify into another state(i.e. annihilation is illuminated by nature of origination into another state). And origination of jar and destruction of clod, is the permanence of clay because *vyatireka* (change of state), does not transgress *añvaya* (sameness). And permanence of clay is origination of the jar and destruction of clod, because *añvaya* (sameness) is exhibited through *vyatirekas* (distinctions), i.e., *vyatirekas* do not overpass *añvaya*.

If this is not accepted to be so, then it would mean that origination is different, annihilation is different, and permanence is different (or all three are separate). If this were to be so, then the faults which would arise are explained here:-

(1) In that condition, when jar/pot is accepted to be having *utpāda* (origination) only (irrespective of destruction and permanence), then due to the absence of cause of

origination, there would either be no origination or only *asaṭ* (non-existent) will originate. Thus, if jar/pot would not originate, then there would be no origination of any modification (or the way pot would not originate similarly in the universe, no modification of any substance would manifest (this fault will arise). Or in case of origination of non-existent, there would be origination of flowers in the sky, etc., also (i.e. substances would evolve from nothing, this fault will arise).

- (2) And in the case when clod is accepted to be having *vyaya* (annihilation) only (irrespective of origination and permanence, clod which only annihilates), then due to the absence of cause of annihilation, either there would be no annihilation, or there would be annihilation of *saṭ* (self-existent) itself.
- a) If there would not be destruction of clod, then there would be no destruction of anything (this fault will arise)
 - b) Or in case *saṭ*(existence) would annihilate, then *caitanya* (sentient), etc., also will annihilate (i.e. all substances will be completely destroyed-this fault will arise).
- (3) In the case of clod, which was to attain only the state of permanence, due to the absence of permanence along with distinctions-oneness, there will be no permanence, or only the momentary will become permanent.

And here, if there would not be permanence of clay, then there would be no permanence of any existing substances (i.e., if any clay would not remain permanent, then like that clay, (a) no substance of the world would remain permanent, would not exist - this fault will arise). (b) If momentary would be permanent, then momentary psychic activity of the mind would also become permanent (i.e., every thought of the mind would become eternally permanent; this fault would arise).

In substance, the ensuing modifications originate, along with that earlier modifications annihilate, and with it, the inseparable state with permanence of oneness exists, which is illuminated by the characteristics of unobstructed triage of characteristics, and it should definitely be accepted.

pravacana on gāthā 100

In a substance, origination-annihilation-permanence, are always together. If they are believed to be separate, then the following faults will arise:-

FAULT WHICH ARISES BY BELIEVING ONLY IN ORIGINATION

If origination is believed to be without annihilation and permanence, then without the presence of *utpādāna kāraṇa* (substantial cause), origination cannot be proved, or only non-existence will manifest. Annihilation of *mithyātva* is the cause of manifestation of *samyaktva*. Without *ādhāra* (base) of permanence of *ātmā* and annihilation of

mithyātva, if only manifestation of *samyaktva* is looked for, then it will not be found. Without the base of permanence, from where will origination manifest? And without *abhāva* (absence) of modification of *mithyātva*, how will modification of *samyaktva* arise? Cause for manifestation of new modification is the annihilation of earlier *paryāya* (modification), and the base of manifestation of new modification is permanence. If manifestation were to be without the base of permanence, then non-existence would manifest. If *mithyātva* were not destroyed, *samyaktva* would not manifest. If manifestation of *samyaktva* were to be believed without the state of permanence, then the situation of manifestation of non-existence would arise.

Without absence of clod and permanence of clay, manifestation of pot is impossible. Similarly, without constancy of substance and destruction of *adharma*, manifestation of *dharma* will not occur in *ātmā*. Without auspices of the eternal, permanent substance, *dharma* cannot arise. If it were to arise without the base of permanence, then *asaṭ* (non-existent) would arise.

See, happiness is desired, isn't it? So, where should one look for happiness? Base of happiness is the permanent *ātmā*, and reason for happiness is destruction of misery. If happiness is sought there, it will be found. Happiness cannot be from a house, body, wife, or wealth. But *dhruvatva* (eternal constancy) of *ātmā* is the base for manifestation of happiness, and annihilation of perturbation is the reason for manifestation of happiness. If both these are not accepted, then happiness cannot arise. With annihilation of auspice of non-self, and with auspice of permanence, happiness manifests. So, for happiness, it is necessary to have one's interest in permanence only.

In all examples, it is shown that manifestation of every *samaya*, of every substance, cannot be without permanence and annihilation. Listen! If the desire is to manifest peace, it should be sought in one's permanence. Peace will manifest only with the base of permanence. Absence of restlessness has been said to be the cause of peace. But, that absence of restlessness and manifestation of peace will occur by focusing on permanence. So, even for peace, it is necessary to focus on the nature of permanence.

Every *samaya*, *ātmā* and *jaḍa* (physical matter) modifies as origination-annihilation-permanence. If those origination-annihilation-permanence were not independent and were due to another substance, then that substance would not prove to be axiomatic. Origination-annihilation-permanence of every substance is subject to its own self. It is the nature of substance to have all three in one *samaya*. In *gāthā 99*, it was proved that substance is with origination-annihilation-permanence, and here in *gāthā 100*, it has been explained with further clarity that origination-annihilation-permanence of substance are all together. If they are not believed to be together, then substance will not be proved, and fault will arise, as described here.

What if one believes only in origination and does not believe in annihilation and permanence to be with it? It is explained here that absence of clod is the cause of origination of pot. Without that reason of origination, pot will not manifest. Or, without permanence of clay, pot will manifest. In *ātmā*, *samyagdarśana* cannot manifest without the support of permanence of sentience and annihilation of *mithyātva*. If manifestation of *samyaktva* is sought without destruction of *mithyābhrānti* (erroneous delusional belief) by focusing on non-self, then it will not be found. Further, without the support of sentient *ātmā*, *samyagdarśana* will not manifest.

Permanence of *ātmā* and annihilation of *mithyātva* is present along with manifestation of *samyaktva*. Without accepting both these, manifestation of *samyaktva* cannot be proved. Without permanence of clayness and destruction of the state of clod, manifestation of pot cannot be proved, and if this state in the form of pot does not manifest, then *samyaktva*, state of *siddha*, etc., no state will manifest, in this universe. If pot were to manifest without clay, then there could be flowers in the sky as well, meaning new manifestation would continue to occur without the base of existence of a substance. The fault that, without *ātmā*, *samyaktva* will arise, would occur. Without auspice of permanence of *ātmā*, *samyaktva* can never arise. To believe that there is benefit from non-self is an erroneous interest. Without an absence of interest in outward focus and without auspices of permanence of the self-substance, *samyaktva* cannot arise.

The same should be understood in relation to manifestation of *samyagjñāna*. *samyagjñāna* arises with support of permanence of the sentient *ātmā*, and with annihilation of ignorance. Without sentience, which is permanent and annihilation of ignorance, manifestation of *samyagjñāna* will not be found. Similarly, it should also be understood for manifestation of *cāritra* (true conduct). Outer rituals, or sky-clad state, are not *cāritra* of *ātmā*. *cāritra* or passionless modification of *ātmā* manifests with an absence of attachment and adherence to the permanent *ātmā*, which is with sentience and happiness. It will not arise with attachment of *mahāvratā* (great vows), etc. Without both, adherence to the state of permanence and absence of attachment, modification of *vītarāga* will not manifest.

Similarly, manifestation of *kevalajñāna* will not occur without adherence to the permanent, sentient nature of self and annihilation of the earlier incomplete state of *jñāna*. Complete *jñāna* will arise with the permanent state of *ātmā* being present and with the destruction of incomplete *jñāna*.

Final state of *siddha* also arises with the permanent state of *ātmā* and with destruction of the state of *saṁsāra*.

Here, permanent state is *sadbhāva sādhana* (existing instrument), and annihilation is *abhāva sādhana* (absent instrument).

Examples apply to all manifestations of all states of all substances of the universe, be it *jaḍa* or *cetana*. No state can manifest without permanence of substance and annihilation of earlier states.

If pottery could be made without clay, then without any substance, like flowers in the sky, modifications could arise in the universe. There are no flowers in the sky, in the same way, without constant nature, modification cannot manifest. If rabbits were to have horns, tortoises were to have hair, or there were flowers in the sky, then without adherence to permanent nature, *samyaktva* could arise. But, without presence of permanence, no modification can manifest from a void. Therefore, along with manifestation, annihilation and permanence also should be accepted. This kind of origination-annihilation-permanence is the nature of substance. This is how it is known in the *jñāna* of omniscient. The same has been told in His teachings; saints have known, and *śāstras* have the same teachings. He who does not see this nature of substance does not know *deva-guru-śāstra* in its true form.

Existence is simple, easy and well-understood. However, due to ignorance, it is believed to be tough. So, it seems complicated. With *saṭ samāgama* (congregation for understanding truth of the highest order), by being calm, one can understand that truth is simple and easy. Without understanding this nature of substance, bliss cannot manifest.

Nature of self substance is with origination-annihilation-permanence every *samaya*. Without absence of interest in *vikāra* (perturbation), without adherence to the permanent *ātmā*, *samyaktva* cannot manifest. If a substance does not have permanence and annihilation, then manifestation will not occur. In this way, by believing only in origination, a situation of absence of origination also arises. This has been explained. Now, annihilation will be explained.

FAULTS WHICH ARISE BY BELIEVING ONLY IN ANNIHILATION

If annihilation is believed to be without permanence or origination, then the same fault will arise. There cannot be annihilation, without permanence and origination.

It is not possible that in clay, the state of clay is destroyed, but the state of pot did not manifest, and clay did not remain permanent. If it is said that interest in non-self substance has been destroyed, but interest in self substance has not arisen and a constant state of *ātmā* has not been experienced, then that statement is erroneous. It cannot be that, at the moment belief of happiness in non-self is destroyed, at that very moment, interest/belief in *ātmā* does not arise, and its constancy is not experienced. Without arising of *samyaktva* and the permanence of *ātmā*, destruction of *mithyātva* cannot occur.

Cause of destruction of clod, is the manifestation of pot, in the pot, clayness remains permanent, and clod is destroyed. Despite destruction of the state of clod, clayness

remains constant. If arising of the new modification and permanence of substance is not believed in, then due to the absence of cause, no modification will be destroyed, or existence itself will be destroyed. Without manifestation of interest in self and without auspices of permanent *ātmā*, even if an attempt is made to destroy erroneous interest, then, annihilation will not occur at all. Even if it is believed to be so, then with destruction of erroneous interest, *ātmā* itself will be destroyed. So, without manifestation of permanence and origination, only annihilation cannot occur. This should be understood for all attributes and modifications.

Nature of substance, as seen and told by *sarvajña deva* (omniscient Lord), is eternal through all three time phases, is perpetual, and exists exactly so. If anyone thinks otherwise, then there will be no change in the existence of substance due to these thoughts, but there will be *mithyātva* in his belief.

Some say there is no requirement to understand anything else after removing attachment-aversion. He should be asked that in which state will he be equanimous so that he can remove attachment-aversion? Without believing in manifestation of the state of *vītarāga* and permanent state of *ātmā*, he cannot accept his own existence, and attachment-aversion will not go. If state of permanence is not accepted, then without auspice of permanence of the sentient, attachment-aversion cannot be destroyed. It is wrong to believe that attachment-aversion can be destroyed without permanence. If destruction of attachment-aversion is believed to be without permanence, then with destruction of attachment-aversion, *ātmā* will cease to exist. If manifestation of *vītarāgatā* is not believed, then attachment-aversion will not be destroyed, because without arising of the subsequent modification, earlier state cannot be destroyed. Annihilation of attachment is origination of *vītarāgatā* (passionless state), and permanence of sentience is present in it. Attachment is destroyed with focus on permanence, and it manifests passionless-ness. In this way, origination-annihilation-permanence all three are together. Without manifestation of *vītarāgatā* (passionless-ness), attachment-aversion cannot be destroyed. If, without permanence of sentience, attachment would destroy, then with the destruction of that attachment, the existing *ātmā* will also be destroyed. Therefore, it should be understood that origination-annihilation-permanence, all three together, form the substance.

If the reason for absence of clod is not accepted with the manifestation of pot, then from clay, the state of mass will not be destroyed, and if clod is not destroyed. Similarly, in the world, modifications of ignorance, erroneous belief, attachment-aversion, etc., none will be destroyed. No one will attain an absence of *samsāra* and will not attain liberation either. Without belief in permanence, if destruction of attachment-aversion is to be believed, then due to this belief, *ātmā* would destroy. But *ātmā* is never destroyed, and in the belief of the one who believes in the destruction of attachment-aversion, without belief in permanence, existence of *ātmā* does not remain, or there is an absence of *ātmā*.

karma is the modification of physical matter. Destruction of first modification cannot occur without manifestation of the second modification. *ātmā* does not destroy *karma*. One who believes that *karma* should be destroyed because it is an obstruction to *ātmā*, has erroneous belief. It is a mistake to believe in destruction of attachment-aversion without auspices of permanence. Destruction of physical *karma* takes the auspices of permanence of physical matter and of origination of the new modification. It is not so that the modification of the *vītarāga* state of *ātmā* destroys the physical state of *karma*. With auspices of permanence in *ātmā*, state of *vītarāgatā* arises, so there is destruction of attachment. Origination-annihilation-permanence of a substance has a relationship with that substance only, but origination-annihilation-permanence of one substance has no relationship with another substance.

This is the supreme principle of eternal truth about the nature of substance. If it is believed that God has made *jīva*, and is the doer, or it is believed that whatever *nimitta* is present, modification will be just like that, and in this way, some other substance is believed to be the cause of modification, then both these beliefs are *mithyā*. In that, independence of substance does not remain. In every substance, every *samaya*, independently by itself, its own origination-annihilation-permanence manifests. If it is said that the entire substance is made by someone else or that the state of substance is made by someone else, then from the view of *paramārtha* (ultimate truth), there is no difference in the erroneous belief of both.

He who has not known origination-annihilation-permanence nature of substance of one *samaya*, indeed has a fault in his belief. There is annihilation of one modification, but at that *samaya* itself, if a new modification does not arise, and its permanence does not remain, then existence itself will be destroyed due to the presence of only destruction. Then, the situation of destruction of all substances of the universe will arise. When permanence of sentience remains and state of *samyaktva* manifests, only then is the state of *mithyātva* destroyed.

Existence of every *samaya* is with origination-annihilation-permanence. If all three are not believed to be together, then existence cannot be proved. Origination-annihilation-permanence is due to non-self is an erroneous belief, and along with that, if it is believed that origination-annihilation-permanence are without each other in a self, then he too does not know the nature of substance.

If manifestation of *samyaktva* is believed to be due to *deva-guru*, then it cannot be proved. Without destruction of *mithyātva* and permanence of *ātmā* in self, *samyaktva* cannot be proved. In this way, annihilation of *mithyātva* also cannot be proved without manifestation of *samyaktva* and permanence of sentience.

It is a *mithyā* belief that spending money is *dharma* of *ātmā*. Destruction of one modification of money, is the cause for manifestation of the subsequent modification of

money, but it is not the cause for modification of *dharmā* of *ātmā*. Destruction of earlier modification and manifestation of the next modification have been said to be the mutual reason for each other. *mithyātvā*, which is destroyed with auspices of permanence of *ātmā*, is the cause for manifestation of *samyaktva*. But without manifestation of *samyaktva* and permanence of *ātmā*, if *mithyātvā* is believed to be destroyed, then the very existence of *ātmā* will not remain. So, with belief of only annihilation, the situation of destruction of *ātmā* will arise. With this belief, all existing substances of universe will also be destroyed. In other words, without origination and permanence, one who believes only in annihilation becomes like *nāstika* (non-believer).

Even if effort is made to destroy attachment-aversion without manifestation of *vītarāgatā*, attachment-aversion will never be destroyed because it is destroyed with focus on the permanent nature. Without focusing on the constancy of *ātmā*, only by reducing attachment, the situation of absence of *ātmā* will arise. Listen! By trying to focus on reduction of attachment, attachment does not reduce, but when auspices of permanence is taken and state of *vītarāga* is manifested, then attachment is destroyed.

Be it sentience or non-sentience, by their own nature, origination-annihilation-permanence is present in all substances of the universe. If someone believes only in origination, then he believes only in the new manifestation of substances, and if someone believes only in annihilation, then he believes only in the destruction of substances – such a believer does not believe in *sarvajñā*, in *guru*, in *śāstra* or in nature of *jñeyas* and neither does he believe in his own knowing nature of *ātmā*. *deva-guru-śāstra* also teach the state of substance in the same way. Such is the nature of *jñeyas*, and nature of *ātmā* is to know them. Such an existent state of substance is worth understanding. When this is understood, only then can there be peace and passionless-ness, in *jñāna*. Without understanding the true state of substance, there can never be peace and passionless-ness in *jñāna*.

1. origination – cannot be without annihilation and permanence
2. annihilation – cannot be without origination and permanence.

These two principles have been proven. Origination and annihilation both cannot be without permanence. This is also covered in these two points. Now, the third point will be proven that:-

3. permanence – cannot be without origination and annihilation.

Faults which arise by believing only in permanence without origination and annihilation are explained here:

FAULTS WHICH ARISE BY BELIEVING ONLY IN PERMANENCE

If only existence of permanence is believed in, then that permanent substance transgresses origination and annihilation. Without destruction of clod and manifestation

of pot, where will the state of constancy of clay be? Without modification, the beholder of modification cannot be proved. Without generation-destruction, who will decide the permanent? Permanence does not decide itself, but by manifestation of new modification and destruction of earlier modification, decision of permanence is arrived at.

If it is said that *ātmā* is only eternally unchangeable, then earlier, he too had not believed in the unchanging *ātmā*, but had believed it to be *pariṇāmī* (continuously changing). That belief was destroyed, and belief that *ātmā* is unchangeable has manifested. In this way, one who believes in the unchanging self, in that the state of origination-annihilation is included. So, without origination-annihilation believer of unchangeable also cannot be proved.

Substance is not permanently unchanging, but its nature is *anekānta* (confluence of pluralism/opposites). Substances are in the form of permanent with change, singularity-multipleness. In this way, its form is *anekānta*. If the manifestation of new modification and annihilation of earlier modification does not occur in a substance, then its nature of change and multipleness will not be proved. Or origination-annihilation, which is momentary by nature, will become permanent. Therefore, substance of every *samaya* will be proved to be separate, and there will be a state of permanent multipleness in the substance. If this were to happen, the undivided state or oneness and permanence of substance cannot be proved. Therefore, in substance which is with *anekānta*, permanence should be believed to be along with manifestation of new modification, and annihilation of earlier modification.

A substance has the inherent characteristic of origination of the next modification, annihilation of earlier modification and state of permanence from the view of the undivided relationship. Such a substance, without any obstruction, is with the triple signifying form of origination-annihilation-permanence.

Here, origination is manifestation of the new modification, so the term used for it is – one who looks for procreation. Annihilation is the destruction of the present modification, so the term used is – one who begins the destruction. And that which is permanent, is about its state; so, the term used for it is – one who is the knower of the state of modification. In this way, a distinction has been made in the presentation of all three concepts.

In every substance, there is origination-annihilation-permanence every *samaya*. If all three are not accepted together, then fault arises. By stating that fault, state of the inherent and essential character of origination-annihilation-permanence is further affirmed.

If only origination is believed, then without destruction of earlier modification, new modification cannot manifest, or without auspices of permanence state of existence will not be there. Therefore, only if origination-annihilation-permanence are together in one *samaya*, then origination will occur.

If only annihilation is believed, then without manifestation of a new modification, the earlier modification will not be destroyed, or without the state of permanence, if annihilation occurs, then the very existence will be destroyed. Therefore, in one *samaya*, if origination-annihilation-permanence all three are together, only then annihilation will be proved.

If only permanence is believed, without origination-annihilation, then due to absence of distinction between origination-annihilation, the state of permanence will not remain, or only one *anśa* (infinitesimal part) will become the entire substance. Therefore, state of permanence can exist only if origination-annihilation-permanence are together in one *samaya*.

Without manifestation of any one modification like pot, etc., and without any earlier modification like a clod, etc., permanence of clay will not remain. And if permanence of clay does not remain, then like clay, permanence of no substance will remain, and everything will be destroyed.

Or if the momentary, becomes permanent, then thoughts, attachment-aversion, ignorance, *karma*, all will become constant/unchangeable. If there is no origination-annihilation, then manifestation of *samyagjñāna* and destruction of *ajñāna*, destruction of *saṁsāra* and manifestation of the state of *siddha*, end of feeling of anger and arising of feeling forgiveness will not occur.

Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that origination-annihilation-permanence are all together. The summary is that along with destruction of earlier modifications, with manifestation of ensuing modifications, and from the view of concordance/connection, the substance has an *avinābhāvī* (inseparable) relation with permanence. The association should be done that origination-annihilation and permanence, all three are present in substance without any obstruction, this should be decided upon, without any doubt. Only origination, annihilation or state of permanence is not the characteristic of substance. But origination-annihilation-permanence are all three together, which are the characteristics of a substance.

In this 100th *gāthā* in the chapter of *jñeya*, the inseparable state of origination-annihilation-permanence, is reaffirmed. Next, in *gāthā* 101, the difference in the existence of origination, etc., with substance is negated. Or it will be proved that substance is not separate from origination-annihilation-permanence, but all are one substance only.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā 101* ❧

अथोत्पादादीनां द्रव्यादर्थान्तरत्वं संहरति –

Now, it is concluded that *utpāda* (origination), etc., objects are not different from the *dravya* (substance): -

उत्पादद्विदिभंगा विज्जंते पज्ज एसु पज्जाया ।
दव्वम्हि संति णियदं तम्हा दव्वं हवदि सव्वं ॥ १०१ ॥

uppādaṭṭhidibhaṅgā vijjante pajjesu pajjāyā
davvamhi santi ṇiyadaṃ tamhā davvaṃ havadi savvaṃ || 101 ||

Meaning: *utpāda-dhrauvya-vyaya* (origination-permanence-annihilation) exist in *pariyāyas* (modifications) and *pariyāyas* indeed exist (indivisibly) in substance, therefore all these (threefold characteristic nature) is substance.

ṭīkā: In fact, *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) are dependent on modifications, and these modifications are dependent on substance; so, all these together are one substance only, and there is no other separate substance. Primarily, substance exists by modifications i.e., modifications are with auspices of substance because *samudāyī* (aggregated one) consists of the form of *samudāya* (aggregate), like a tree.

A *samudāyī* (aggregated one) tree is an aggregation of stems, roots, and boughs. It appears to depend on its stems, roots and boughs; similarly, a *samudāyī dravya* (aggregated substance), being an aggregation of *pariyāyas* (modifications), appears to depend on its modifications. Modifications are dependent on *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) because *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (origination, annihilation-permanence) are qualities present in an *aṅśa* (infinitesimal parts of a substance), e.g., as a seed, sprout and tree.

These three portions, namely seed, sprout and tree, belonging to and being states of a fully grown tree as a whole when envisaged together, appear to depend on their individual qualities of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya* (annihilation-origination-permanence). Similarly, in the beholder of parts, which is the *dravya*, annihilating, emerging and remaining the same, being within its attributes, all three are seen to be together.

But if (i) annihilation, (ii) origination, and (iii) permanence (not accepting these to be indivisible portions of substance) are upheld (individually) to be substance itself, then everything would be *viplava* (confounded). This is clarified as under:

1. If only annihilation of substance itself is accepted, then all substances being characterised by ‘momentary annihilation’ would get destroyed at the same moment, which would result in *śūnyatā* (emptiness/nihilism) of all substances, or *saṭ* (existence) would be destroyed.
2. If only origination of a substance itself is accepted, then all substances being characterised by ‘recurring originations’ every moment, each one would continue originating as an endless number of substances, or else there would be origination of *asaṭ* (non-existent).
3. If only permanence of substance itself is accepted, then due to the absence of ‘successively occurring existences’, there would either be non-existence of substance or *kṣaṇikatva* (perpetual momentary state). Hence, *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauṇya* (origination-annihilation-permanence) must be accepted to be dependent on *pariyāyas* (modification) and *pariyāyas* (modifications) to be dependent on substance. So, all this is merely one substance.

bhāvārtha: Seed, sprout and full-grown tree are parts of a tree. States of annihilation of seed, origination of sprout, and permanence of tree exist simultaneously and together. Thus, annihilation is dependent on seed, origination is dependent on sprout, and permanence is dependent on the state of tree; annihilation, origination and permanence are not different from seed, sprout and tree-state. And seed, sprouts and tree-state are not different objects from the tree. So, all this is a tree only. In the same manner, annihilating state, emerging state and permanent state, all three are parts of a substance. The three states - annihilation of annihilating state, origination of emerging state and permanence of stable state, exist together, simultaneously. Thus, annihilation is dependent on the annihilating state, origination is dependent on the emerging state and permanence is dependent on a stable state. Annihilation origination and permanence are not different objects from those states /modifications, and those modifications/states, too, are not different objects from substance. Hence, all this is merely one substance.

pravacana on gāthā 101

Origination, permanence and annihilation occur in modification, and modification by principle is in substance, so everything is a substance.

In reality, origination-annihilation-permanence takes auspices of modification, and these modifications take auspices of substance. Hence, all are one substance only, and they are not distinct from the substance.

First, modifications take support of the substance because *samudāyī* (sum of aggregate/substance) is by nature the same as *samudāya* (aggregate/attributes and modifications).

It is not that annihilation, origination, and constancy of substance is of substance only. Each of these does not cover the entire substance. But some modifications originate, some

annihilate, and some are permanent. This means origination, annihilation, and permanence, all three are due to the support of modification, and the mass of these modifications takes auspices of substance. (Here, the meaning of *pariyāya*/modification is to be understood as an infinitesimal part of substance). Modification is a part, and substance is the bearer of these parts.

A tree is an assemblage; it is made of a collection of trunk, roots and branches. Tree appears to be with the support of trunk, roots and branches. Similarly, *samudāyī* (sum of aggregate), the substance, being with the collection of modification, appears to be with the support of modification. The way trunk, root and branch are parts of a tree, and all three together make a complete tree. Similarly, modifications are infinitesimal parts of a substance, and those modifications are with support of the substance. Part of a substance is not separate from the substance.

In *gāthā 100*, it was proved that origination-annihilation-permanence, all three, are mutually inseparable and are inseparable also from substance also. Here, it is being proved who these origination-annihilation-permanence belong to - do they belong to the substance or to modification? Origination, annihilation and permanence belong to modifications and not to substance. The three modifications, which are origination-annihilation-permanence, are due to auspices of substance only. Parts of a substance are not separate from the substance itself. And origination-annihilation-permanence are due to the support of modifications.

Origination-annihilation-permanence takes support of modifications. In other words, origination-annihilation-permanence is dependent on modification because they are the characteristics of these infinitesimal parts. Origination-annihilation-permanence, which is present in substance, is not due to non-self, is not in non-self and is not of non-self, but they are of their own modifications. Origination, annihilation and permanence are of modification. By nature, a substance is an assemblage of these three infinitesimal parts. When *samyagdarśana* arises, origination-annihilation-permanence of that *samaya* is as follows:- During that *samaya* from the view of modification of *samyak*, it is – origination, but complete *ātmā* does not originate. From the view of annihilation of *mithyātva*, it is *vyaya* – but complete *ātmā* does not annihilate, and from the view of existence of parts in continuous flow, it is permanent– but complete *ātmā* does not become permanent. In this way, origination-annihilation-permanence are not of the complete substance, but they each are an infinitesimal part of the substance, and those parts are of substance only. They are not due to modification of non-self, neither are they the part of modification of non-self.

Question: Perturbation is not the permanent nature of self. Then that infinitesimal part must be arising in non-self, is it not?

Answer: No! Origination of perturbation is also due to its auspices of the modification of *ātmā*, and that modification is due to auspices of the substance *ātmā*. It is not due to auspice of rising of *karma*. Modification of perturbation is also a part of *svajñeya* (self-knowable). Complete *svajñeya* will not be proven if the perturbed part is said to be of non-self or its cause is said to be non-self. If any one part is removed, then *ātmā* will not be proved. And if origination of that perturbation is not accepted as the infinitesimal part of modification and is believed to be totally of substance, then the entire substance will be with perturbation. The non-perturbed nature will not remain *jñeya* of self, and even by removing perturbation, a state of lack of perturbation will also not arise.

Origination-annihilation-permanence are of modification. Modification arises in the substance. In this way, everything has been taken into the substance.

Pot, clod, and state of clay are aggregate of the nature of clay. Without these three parts, clay cannot be proved. In that, origination is with auspices of the pot, and permanence is with auspices of state of clay. The three parts, pot, clod and clay-ness are with auspices of clay. In this way, everything is included in clay.

Question: Who arises the modifications of attachment, etc., in *jīva*? Whose are they? Are they of substance, modification or of non-self?

Answer: Modification of origination is neither of non-self nor of substance. But they are of substance *ātmā* of that *samaya*. State of origination is modification of *jñeya* of self.

Origination-annihilation-permanence are together. This was proved in *gāthā 100*. Here in *gāthā 101*, it is being said that origination-annihilation-permanence is *aṅśa* (modification), and those modifications are of substance itself. By saying this, all these three have been taken into one substance.

With origination of any modification, the whole substance does not originate as new, but only the new modification arises. That modification is with the auspices of substance.

With the annihilation of any modification, the entire substance is not destroyed. But only that modification is destroyed, and it is with auspices of the substance.

In the flow of modification, the state of permanence is not permanence of the full substance, but state of permanence is from the view of *aṅśa* (modification), and that state of permanence is also part of the substance, but it is not the complete substance. That part of substance is with auspices of the substance.

Origination-annihilation-permanence are small parts, and aggregate of these parts is the substance. In this way, all are included in the substance.

Origination-annihilation-permanence are not with auspices of substance i.e., origination-annihilation-permanence are not of only the substance, but they are of modification, and those modifications are of substance. In origination-annihilation-permanence, the entire substance is not a part of just any one of them. In fact, they are of each and

every substance. Origination does not change the complete substance. They show each and every modification, and assemblage of all these three modifications shows the substance. Substance is in the form of a collection of modifications.

In one *samaya* of any substance, all three, origination-annihilation-permanence, exist with auspices of modification. Entire substance is not made up of merely modification, annihilation or permanence. So, they are not with auspices of substance, but they are with auspices of modification. Characteristic of origination is with auspices of some modification; characteristics of annihilation are also with auspices of some modification and characteristic of permanence is also with auspices of some modification. Therefore, they are said to be characteristic of modification, and modification is with auspices of substance; without distinction, all are included in the substance.

Origination, annihilation, and permanence are with auspices of infinitesimal parts, and those parts are with auspices of substance. Origination is of an *anśa* (infinitesimal part), annihilation is also of an *anśa*, and permanence is also of an *anśa*. In each of these infinitesimal parts, the complete substance is not included, but substance is in the form of a mass of a collection of *anśa*. Substance is *anśī* (beholder/bearer of *anśas*), and origination, etc., which are with its support, are its *anśa*. This statement is explained with the example of a tree. The way bearer of infinitesimal parts, the tree, is seed, sapling and tree-ness. These three parts, which are with auspice of their own characteristics, seem to be together. Similarly, modification of *anśī*, is annihilating, originating and remaining permanent. Such divisions, in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence, are experienced to be together, with auspices of their own characteristics.

In a substance, origination, annihilation and state of constancy are an *anśa* (infinitesimal part). Complete substance is not included in each of these *anśa*. This means that these origination, annihilation and permanence are not substance. The three parts of a tree are, seed, sapling and tree-ness, which are permanent, and all three parts together are the complete existence of tree. Similarly, in the substance, *ātmā* – there is origination of the part of *samyaktva*, annihilation of the part of *mithyātva*, and permanence of belief. Origination-annihilation-permanence is infinitesimal parts, but not of the bearer of infinitesimal parts. Origination is not from the view of substance, but origination is from the view of modification which arises in the substance. Annihilation is not from the view of substance but is from the view of the earlier annihilated modification. And state of permanence is not from the view of only the entire substance but is from the view of unbroken, steady modification (from the view of substance-ness). So, origination-annihilation-permanence are with auspices of *anśa* (modification). The moment substance modifies with a new modification, that very moment there is annihilation of earlier modification; and at that very moment, from the view of substance, it remains in the form of permanence. So, origination-annihilation-permanence all three, are dependent on *anśas*, but origination-annihilation-permanence are not only of *anśī* (substance).

Here, permanence has also been called modification from the view of *añśa* (infinitesimal part), but commonality of substance is present in that. Only permanence does not include the entire substance. Hence, that, too, has been called *añśa*, and since it is an infinitesimal part, it has been called a modification. So, state of permanence is also said to be with auspices of modification.

Here, a detailed explanation is given on what kind of fault will arise if origination, annihilation or permanence are believed to be only of the *añśī* (bearer of modification), which is the substance.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF ANNIHILATION OF THE ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IS BELIEVED TO OCCUR

If annihilation of earlier *añśa* is not accepted, and it is believed that the entire substance is destroyed, then in merely one moment, substance will be destroyed, meaning existence itself will be destroyed.

Instead of believing in annihilation of modification of *mithyātva*, if *ātmā dravya* is believed to be destroyed, then *ātmā* will be destroyed in a moment. Existence of the first *samaya* will be destroyed in the second *samaya*. *añśa* is destroyed, instead of that, if it is believed that *añśī* has destroyed, then it will destroy all substances in one moment, or existence of substance will be destroyed.

By believing in annihilation of substance, the fault of absence of all substances will be proved. The second fault to arise is that modifications will be destroyed. Therefore, there is no annihilation of substance, but only infinitesimal part of substance is annihilated, and that annihilated part is with auspice of the bearer of infinitesimal parts/the substance. No part of one substance can be with the auspices of another substance. Further, be it perturbed or unperturbed, origination-annihilation of no modification can be due to auspices of another substance. It is with auspices of that substance only. Attachments do not arise with auspices of *karma*. But it is with auspices of modification at that *samaya*. Annihilation of erroneous belief of *jīva* is not due to auspices of *deva-guru*. However, it is dependent on the annihilation of earlier modifications. In this way, modification itself is the auspice of origination-annihilation-permanence.

IF IT IS BELIEVED THAT EVERY ORIGINATION IS OF ENTIRE SUBSTANCE, THEN WHAT HAPPENS

If origination is believed to be of substance itself, then momentary modification will become the substance and every moment a new substance will originate. Each of the infinite modifications of a substance will become a substance. So, one substance will turn into infinite substances, or without substance, a state of non-existence will originate.

With clay, the state of pot is manifests, but clay itself is not manifested. If manifestation of one part is believed to be a whole substance, then one modification itself will turn into the

complete substance. Each one of the infinite modifications of one substance will turn into a new substance. The fault that one substance will turn into infinite substances will arise. It is true that there are infinite attributes in one substance, and one substance has infinite modifications also, but one substance does not create infinite substances. New modification of substance manifests, but substance itself does not manifest as new. If a substance itself would manifest as new, then non-existence will manifest. So, in believing that whole substance manifests, these two faults arise. First, one substance will turn into infinite substances, and second, a state of non-existence will arise. Therefore, the entire substance does not manifest, but modification manifests. And that part which manifests is of the substance.

IF THE ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IS BELIEVED TO BE PERMANENT, THEN WHAT HAPPENS

If the entire substance is believed to be permanent, then without the sequentially arising modifications of origination and annihilation, substance itself will be destroyed, or substance will become momentary. Substance is not merely permanent but is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. Instead of this, if a part of permanence is taken as the entire substance, then belief in the bearer of these parts does not hold good, and substance will become momentary. So, the entire substance is not just permanent, but a part of the substance is also permanent.

Origination-annihilation occurs in one *samaya* only. But origination-annihilation is not of the same modification of that *samaya*. Origination is of the current modification of that *samaya*, and annihilation is of the earlier modification. That which annihilates in one *samaya* does not originate during that same *samaya*, and that which originates, does not annihilate. Modification, which is with auspice of origination, is separate and modification with auspice of annihilation, is separate. But the time of these origination and annihilation is the same. At whichever time whichever modification is annihilated at that time that modification does not originate. Modifications arise in the sequential manner of annihilation of one and origination of another, annihilation of second and origination of third.

When a seed is destroyed, then sapling manifests, so seed and sapling are sequentially occurring modifications. Permanence of tree cannot be retained without them. Sequentially arising modifications cannot occur without origination-annihilation, and without sequentially modifying states substances cannot exist. Sequential modification of annihilation of earlier modification and origination of ensuing modification will not occur if one were to believe substance to be permanent only. Without arising of this kind of sequential modification of annihilation of earlier, and origination of latter, where will the permanent substance stay equably? So, permanent substance itself will be destroyed, or one would assume substance to be momentary. In this way, believing the whole substance to be only permanent is also a fault. Whole substance is not only permanent, but it is the unmoving part of a substance.

Origination-annihilation-permanence are together, but they are parts of the whole and not the whole substance.

By not believing origination-annihilation-permanence to be together, and faults which arise by believing only in origination, only annihilation or only permanence have already been told in *gāthā* 100.

Here, faults which arise by believing in origination, annihilation and permanence of the whole substance, have been explained.

In this *gāthā*, *Ācāryadeva* wants to prove that origination, annihilation, and permanence are not separate from the substance, and are included in the substance itself.

1. If only manifestation of substance is believed, then substance will not comprise of annihilation and permanence.
2. If annihilation of substance itself is believed in, then origination and permanence will not be a part of the whole substance
3. If permanence is believed to be substance itself, then origination and annihilation cannot comprise of the whole substance. Therefore, origination-annihilation-permanence is with the auspices of modification and they all are one substance only.

Ācāryadeva has proved the nature of substance with logic and argument. Substance itself does not originate, it does not get destroyed and it does not remain permanent. But a part originates, a part is annihilated, and a part remains permanent. So, origination-annihilation-permanence are of modifications, and those modifications are of substance. So, all are one substance.

pravacana on bhāvārtha of gāthā 101

ātmā and *parmāṇu* (physical matter) are *jñeya* (knowables), and in one knowable, origination-annihilation-permanence, make the complete substance.

Seed, sapling and tree-ness— all are parts of a tree. All three, annihilation of seed, origination of sapling, and permanence of tree-ness, together make a tree. In one *samaya*, it is the complete tree. Annihilation is with auspices of seed, origination is with auspices of sapling, and permanence is with auspices of tree-ness. To annihilate, originate, and remain permanent are not in the form of distinct substances of seed saplings and tree-ness.

Annihilation of erroneous belief in *ātmā*, origination of *samyak bhāva* in *ātmā* and *ātmā* remaining permanent, are *añśa* of *ātmā*. All these three together make the complete *ātmā*. The complete *ātmā* comprises of annihilation of an earlier state of infinite attributes, origination of the present state and permanence of attributes. None of the three parts are due to non-self. *parmāṇus* of karma do not manifest due to *ātmā* or state of attachment in *ātmā* is not due to karmic matter particle. But attachment manifests due

to its own efficacy, annihilation of early attachment, and *ātmā* stays permanent through both. So, all three together form the substance.

The finger was twisted, and from that, it straightened. So, substance is made of annihilation of the twisted state, manifestation of being straight and finger being permanent. But finger does not straighten due to *ātmā* or attachment, neither is its twisted state destroyed, and form of permanent state is prevent always. If origination and annihilation are believed to be due to non-self, then the complete substance cannot be proved.

If substance is believed to be only as much as the annihilated state, then the whole substance will be destroyed. If substance is believed to be only as much as a manifestation, then one substance will turn into numerous. Without sequentially arising modification, if permanence is believed, then with existence of only permanence, substance is likely to become momentary.

Hence, the complete substance is made by all three being together in one *samaya*. If it is believed that state of attachment-aversion of *ātmā* is due to *karma*, then origination-annihilation-permanence of *ātmā* cannot be proved. This means that *ātmā* – the substance – will not exist. If it is believed that karmic bondage occurred due to attachment-aversion of *ātmā*, then without origination-annihilation of *karma*, *karma* substance will not be proved. Hence, if every part is proved within itself, only then, every substance will be proved.

Annihilation of attachment depends on the modification which destroys attachment. Origination of passionless-ness depends on originating modification, and state of permanence is dependent on the equable state. Annihilation is not due to non-self, so, the whole substance does not comprise just of annihilation. Origination is not due to non-self, so, the whole substance does not comprise of just origination. Permanence is not due to non-self, so, the entire substance does not comprise of only permanence.

Origination-annihilation-permanence are independent and are together as substance. But ignorant *jīva* believes attachment to be due to *karma* or has the ignorant belief, that substance is only an infinitesimal part.

If any one part is presumed to be due to non-self, or if the entire substance is assumed to be only as much as one part, then that, too, is an erroneous belief.

All three parts are independent, and all these three together make one complete substance, but they are not three different substances.

Manifestation of speech is due to manifestation of *parmāṇu*, but it is not due to desire of *jīva* or due to lips.

Annihilation of attachment is due to modification, which is meant to be annihilated but is not due to *karma*.

jīva does not understand the independent nature and without its understanding does fasts and follow vows, if at that time he has mild passions, then there will be auspicious attachment, but it will not be *dharma*.

If existence of one *samaya* is not accepted, then existence will not remain. If knowable is not understood correctly, then even *jñāna* will not be correct. And if *jñāna* is not correct, then belief will not be correct.

jñāna may be less, but if it is *samyak* (true), then that too can bring an end to transmigration. If there is much knowledge, but the knowing is *mithyā* (without true belief of self), then transmigration will continue. Therefore, *samyakjñāna* should be attained.

Origination is not due to non-self, and neither is it due to annihilation. Annihilation is not due to non-self, and neither is it due to origination. Permanence also is not due to non-self and neither is it due to origination-annihilation.

Each and every modification exists, and all three together are the complete substance. In the state where it is said that it exists, and then it is said that it exists due to another, then substance itself will not exist. After accepting that origination-annihilation-permanence exists, then in knowing, it should be understood that the entire substance is one.

Origination is due to origination, annihilation is due to annihilation, and permanence is due to permanence. Substance is not separate from the modification of origination-annihilation-permanence, and these modifications are not separate from the substance. Therefore, all these together are one substance.

In this way, correct knowing of knowables should be done. Here, with a predominance of knowing, *samyakśradhha* (true belief) is stated.

The inner *nimitta* (instrumental cause) of origination is permanence and annihilation.

The inner *nimitta* (instrumental cause) of annihilation is origination and permanence.

The inner *nimitta* (instrumental cause) of permanence is origination and annihilation.

The inner *nimitta* (instrumental cause) of modification of one attribute is modification of another attribute.

☆☆☆

❧ *gāthā-102* ❧

अथोत्पादादीनां क्षणभेदमुदस्य द्रव्यत्वं द्योतयति -

Now, rejecting differences in moments of time of *utpāda*(origination) etc., the concept of substance is explained:-

समवेदं खलु द्रव्यं संभवतिदिणाससण्णिदद्वेहिं ।
एक्कम्मि चैव समये तम्हा द्रव्यं खु तत्तिदयं ॥ १०२ ॥

samavedam' khalu davvam' sambhavaṭṭhiṇāsasaṇṇidaṭṭhehiṃ
ekkammi ceva samaye tamhā davvam' khu tattidayam || 102 ||

Meaning: In the same *samaya*, *dravya* (substance) is actually identified with (is at one with) *arthas* (matters) which are *utpāda* (origination), *sthiti* (permanence), *nāśa* (annihilation), so amalgamation of that trio is actually *dravya* (substance).

ṭīkā: (First doubt is presented): - Here(in this universe), that which is the moment of birth of a *vastu*(substance), it is pervading by its inception only, is neither moment of permanence nor moment of annihilation, (so it is different); and that which is moment of *sthiti*(permanence), is neither moment of *utpāda* (origination) nor the moment of *nāśa* (annihilation), as it exists through the interspace of both; and that which is the moment of *nāśa* (annihilation) is neither the moment of *utpāda* (origination) nor the moment of *sthiti* (permanence); because a substance originates and stays after which is destroyed, so that cannot be its moment of birth or permanence.; thus, on thinking logically, the time of origination, etc., are separate and not one and the same – this can be understood. or, moment of *utpāda* (origination), moment of *sthiti* (permanence), and moment of *nāśa* (annihilation) appear to be at separate times, they cannot be one- this seems to be understandable.

(The above doubt is answered/reconciled as under):- Differences in the time of moments of origination, etc., can be accepted only when it is admitted that the substance itself originates, remains stable by itself, and perishes by itself. But this is not accepted/proved so (because it is accepted/proved that): - origination, etc., is of *pariyāya* (modifications); then how can there be a difference in time? (it cannot be). This is clarified as under:-

In the presence of the experience created due to the potter, stick, and wheel, the moment of birth (origination) of pot, is the exact moment of destruction of clod, and in both these states, the exact moment is the state of permanence of clay-ness. Similarly, experience which is created in the presence of inner and outer instrument, the moment of origination of latter

pariyāya (modification) is the moment of annihilation of the earlier *pariyāya*(modification) and state of being *dravya* which exists through both, is permanence.

Origination annihilation and permanence exist, respectively, in each *rāmpātra* (clay pot), in clod and in clay-ness, and they are seen as one in that one moment in the clay, which has contact with the threefold inherent nature. In the same way, origination, annihilation and permanence exist respectively (in any substance), in the latter *pariyāya* (modification), in the earlier one and in permanence and are seen as combined with each other at that moment within the substance, which is its threefold inherent nature. And as origination, annihilation and permanence, which exist respectively in *rāmpātra*(pot), clod and clay-ness are only the clay and nothing else. In the same way, the latter *pariyāya*, earlier *pariyāya* and origination, annihilation, and permanence, which exist in *dravya*, are *dravya* itself and not any other substance.

pravacana on gāthā 102

In *gāthā* 100, it was said that there is no difference in modification of each substance. Origination is not without annihilation; annihilation is not without origination, and origination-annihilation is not without permanence. Here, it has been explained that there is no difference in modification of any of the three. After that, origination-annihilation-constancy exists in modification, and modification is in the substance; because of this, all modifications together are a substance. This has been explained in *gāthā* 101. Now, it is explained that none of all these three occur at separate times or origination-annihilation-permanence, all are at the same *samaya*.

Origination-annihilation-permanence, all three are parts of a substance, and despite being in the form of identical parts, the three are not same from the view of efficacy of infinitesimal part. Because in comparison to origination and annihilation, the part of permanence is more efficacious.

Substance is a mass of infinite attributes. In that, permanence is permanence of infinite attributes. Entire substance is included in the permanence of attribute of *śraddha* (belief). So, focus and appropriate knowing of that which is permanent will give rise to the appropriate knowledge of origination-annihilation.

Once *jīva* has knowing of the efficacy of permanent pure substance, he does not have thoughts of importance of non-self. Without any diversion, by focusing towards the permanent commonality. modification of *dharma* manifests and modification of *adharmā* is destroyed.

There is a gross fault in believing that origination-annihilation is due to non-self substance or *nimitta*. Appropriate knowing of origination-annihilation cannot be done even by *vyavahāra* (auxiliary / instrumental cause) without focus and knowledge of the permanent, which is with infinite efficacies.

To divide the three parts of a substance and take them into focus is the subject of *paryāyārthikanaya* (modification view point), to include all three, and taking into focus the complete substance, which is *svajñeya* (knowing of self) is the subject of *pramāṇa* (that which takes the whole as its subject).

When all three are shown as independent, then existence of all three is accepted. Every infinitesimal part exists by itself. This means origination is due to origination; annihilation is due to annihilation, and permanence is due to permanence. Every part is independent of the other part. This has been stated, but when asked that, with whose auspices future origination will occur then it is said that, origination occurs with auspices of permanence but it does not occur with auspice of non-self. Origination is due to origination; annihilation is due to annihilation, and permanence is due to permanence. In this way, all three parts are shown as independent.

Body-mind-speech is knowable, which is non-self; they are non-self substances. Their origination-annihilation-permanence is in that substance only. Origination-annihilation-permanence in *ātmā* does not manifest due to these non-self substances. This means, *dharma* will not arise in *ātmā* due to parts of non-self, and *adharma* will not be destroyed from *ātmā*, so, *ātmā* will not remain stable.

Benefit or loss to self is not due to charity to non-self or by violence on non-self. But benefit of self is due to auspices of the state of permanence, a belief in self and by deciding so, appropriate belief of pure state manifests, impure state is destroyed, and permanent nature of self remains stable. In this way every modification modifies by itself and exists without dependence on each other.

Without accepting the efficacy of existence of one *samaya*, efficacy of entire substance cannot be accepted. Now, it is being explained that all three parts are in one *samaya*; there is no difference in time.

Substance, in reality, is at one with modification of origination-stability-annihilation, of one *samaya*. So, aggregation of these three is the substance. Manifestation of *samyagdarśana*, *ātmā* being in a state of permanence and annihilation of *mithyadarśana*, all are in one *samaya*. Arising of desire, *ātmā* remaining permanent, and annihilation of earlier desire, all are in the same *samaya*.

Lifting of finger and desire of *ātmā* are at the same moment. But it does not mean that one has done anything for the other or vice versa. Despite the self-time of both being one, they do not exist due to each other. In fact, origination-annihilation-permanence of the finger is during one *samaya* of physical matter of the finger. Origination-annihilation-permanence of *ātmā* is during one *samaya* of *ātmā*.

Now, to clearly define *samaya*, a doubter raises the question that substance has its own moment of origination, which, being encompassed by origination, cannot be the moment

of stability and annihilation, so they should be at separate moments. Moment of stability being between the moment of origination and annihilation, cannot be the moment of origination and annihilation. And for moment of annihilation, substance originates, stays stable and is then destroyed, therefore, it cannot be the moment of origination and stability. So, by applying appropriate arguments, it does not seem possible that the *samaya* of origination-annihilation-permanence is the same. They seem to be occurring at different times.

In this argument, it has not been said that origination or annihilation arises due to *karma* or associated circumstances. But an ignorant assumes that there is a difference in time between the three, which is negated here.

Any substance, originates, stays for some time and is later destroyed. The way a child is born, lives through his life and dies. Ignorant says that the time of origination-annihilation-permanence is separate in this way.

Argument of the ignorant is that *mithyā* (erroneous) belief has been destroyed, but at that *samaya*, whether *samyagdarśana* manifested or not is not known and after the *samaya* that erroneous belief is destroyed, *dharma* will arise, and *ātmā* stays between these. He claims that it does not seem to be that, at the time when *samyagdarśana* arises, exactly at that time *mithyādarśana* is destroyed and exactly at that *samaya* *ātmā* is stable. He thinks there's a difference of time between them.

The reason for this argument is, that his focus is on associated substances. Associations come, they stay, and then leave. His focus is on that. But every *ātmā* and *parmāṇu* is independent – his sight is not on this focus of nature. Therefore, he makes a mistake.

Now resolving the above doubt, the ignorant is told that if at the time of origination, the entire substance was to originate, at the time of annihilation, the entire substance was to be destroyed, and at the time of permanence entire substance was to be in the state of permanence, then the argument about the difference in time of origination-annihilation-permanence would be true.

With origination of *dharma*, if the entire *ātmā* would turn into the form of *dharma* and with the annihilation of *mithyātva* the entire *ātmā* would be destroyed, then the argument of difference in time could be accepted; but this never happens. Because origination-annihilation-permanence, are infinitesimal parts of a substance. Modifications of origination and annihilation occur while substance is constant. *ātmā* remains permanent in the form of *ātmā*, while *mithyādarśana* is destroyed, and *samyagdarśana* is manifested. Therefore, the argument of difference in time by the ignorant is untrue. In the next *gāthā*, it will be decided that origination-annihilation-permanence, are modifications, meaning infinitesimal parts. And all three together make the complete substance. So, there is no difference in time in the occurrence of these three.

Ignorant sees association and believes that the finger moved due to *ātmā*; pot was made due to the fingers; it stayed for some time and then was destroyed. In this way, there is a difference of time in origination-annihilation-permanence. But origination-annihilation-permanence of clay is in clay. No one's existence is due to anyone else, and there is no difference in time either.

If the entire substance were to turn into one part, then the above argument by ignorant would be true. But it is not so, because a complete substance is not only in origination, or only in annihilation, or only in permanence, but, all three together make a substance. Therefore, there is no distinction of time among them. Similarly, origination of *samyagdarśana* in *ātmā*, annihilation of *mithyādarśana* and permanence of *ātmā*, all are in one *samaya*; there is no difference of time amongst them. In this way, origination-annihilation-permanence in every *ātmā* and *parmāṇu* is at the same time.

ātmā and *parmāṇu* are substances. Origination-annihilation-permanence occurs at the same *samaya* in them. Origination of the new state, annihilation of the earlier state and stability in the form of permanence, which is concurrent with constant nature, are in one *samaya*.

Here, an ignorant doubts that first pot is made, then it stays, and later it is destroyed. Similarly, a book was new; it remained for some time, and later, it was torn. A child is also born, lives for a few years, and dies. Similarly, *laddoo* (Indian sweet) is made; it stays for some time, and then is eaten, meaning it is destroyed. In this way, all three are not seen to be occurring simultaneously. In any of these examples, there seems to be a difference of time in origination-annihilation-permanence. However, nothing is made and destroyed immediately. First, a thing is made, then it stays, and then it is destroyed. So, the argument of an ignorant is that there seems to be a difference of time in the state of origination, permanence and annihilation.

An ignorant argue further that first, *dharma* arose, then *ātmā* comes into focus, and after that, *jñāna* arises; if penance is done, then ignorance will be destroyed. However, exceptional knowledge does not manifest immediately. In this way, there seems to be a time difference in the moment of origination of *dharma*, moment of permanence of *ātmā* and moment of annihilation of *adharmā*.

Here, *Acārya Bhagvāna* says listen! Your statement is not true. There cannot be a difference in time of origination-annihilation-permanence. Every *samaya* new modification manifests, earlier state is destroyed, and *ātmā* stays permanent. In this way, all three parts are together. With understanding of this, if focus goes on the permanent substance, then *mithyātva* will be destroyed in one *samaya*, *samyaktva* will originate and *ātmā*, which is in the form of constancy, remains as it is. In this way, physical matter and sentient substances are independent every *samaya* and in every modification. To decide this is the crux of origination-annihilation-permanence.

In *Pravacanasāra gāthā* 93-94, it is said that he who believes only in modification is *parasamaya* (non-self). Modification is of substance. It is explained that by having the appropriate knowing of substance-modification, he who stabilises in the pure nature of *ātmā*, is *svasamaya* (pure self).

In *gāthā* 95, it is said that every substance, without leaving its inherent nature, is characterised by origination-annihilation-permanence and attributes-modification. Hence, substance is proved by way of independent modification of every *samaya*, and *nimitta* has been explained with it. In the *tīkā* of this *gāthā*, *Acārya Amritcandra* has said that due to the proximity of presence of appropriate outer instruments, substance modifies in various ways. These modifications have been proved to be independent and irrespective of any other substance, and then their relativity is explained.

In *gāthā* 96 with, the word '*svakālam*' *Acārṇya Bhagavāna* has said that every substance modifies by its own substance, space, time and modification, but it does not modify with the substance, space, time and modification of non-self substance. Modification of every substance is by itself, and it occurs in its own self-time, but it does not modify with *nimitta* or earlier later than its scheduled time.

1. That which stays eternal by itself is substance, and its efficacies are constant. Without interest and experience of this, appropriate knowing of modification of every *samaya*, and of self-time, cannot arise. With arising of interest of self-substance or self-nature, its knowing occurs, then substance-space-time-modification of self and substance-space-time-modification of non-self substance is understood.
2. Even in the nature of substance-attribute-modification, without interest in substance-attributes, true knowledge of modification cannot arise, which means that with interest and knowledge of substance-attribute, correct knowing of every modification arises.
3. In the nature of origination-annihilation-permanence, without focus and knowledge of *dhruva* (permanence), correct understanding of origination-annihilation cannot arise. On focusing and knowing of permanent, true and correct knowing of origination-annihilation arises

By ascertaining that self is one, and it is eternal by self, is a permanent/constant substance and has eternal infinite efficacies in self, appropriate understanding and interest manifests, and *samyagjñāna* does arise.

From *nigoda* to *siddha*, every matter particle and every *ātmā* are modifying within themselves. There is no difference in time of origination-annihilation-permanence in them.

By proving origination, etc., in *gāthā* 95, concept of *nimitta* was explained, and associations have been explained after establishing the pure nature. *svacatuṣṭaya* (self's substance-space-time-modification) is present every *samaya*. Every substance exists by its own *catuṣṭaya* and does not exist by *catuṣṭaya* of non-self. With interest in substance

and attributes in this way, real understanding of modification arises. Substance and attributes are permanent, modification is with origination-annihilation, and time of all three is the same. This means that they are all present at the same *samaya* and all together. With an understanding of the bearer of efficacies and efficacies, an understanding of state of substance arises. By proving that this manifestation is due to self, *nimitta* has been explained in *gāthā 95* and *gāthā 102*.

Be it called origination-annihilation, modification or *svakāla* (self-time) – they are synonyms. Here, it should not be understood that origination-annihilation occurs from a non-self substance. One whose interest is on associations, his focus always goes on associations; He does not understand where, what is being proved.

One who believes that body will stay till the end of life, is seeing *skandha* (mass of *paramāṇus*), the gross form. This association may be gross, but *svacatuṣṭaya* of the smallest matter particle and *ātmā*, are in their own respective self, and not in non-self. However, an ignorant does not focus on such a nature.

In *gāthā 95*, *nimitta* was explained/highlighted, but there was no doubt there. From *gāthā 96* to *101*, in all *gāthās*, substance has been proved through six characteristics of substance-attribute-modification, origination-annihilation-permanence. So, after establishing the nature of substance in these nine *gāthās*, here in *gāthā 102*, *nimitta* is explained.

By explaining nature of existence of each and every modification, it is stated that there is no difference in time in their origination-annihilation-permanence. It has been elaborated how a doubter, leaving this focus of nature, sees only associations in various ways. After much effort, obstinacy of focus on associations is released, and when this goes, *dharma* arises. This has also been explained.

By perturbation, modification, attribute-modification, origination-annihilation-permanence or by self's quaternity (substance-space-time-modification), etc., be it by any one characteristic, the one who wants to see the pure nature, does so. For example, if perturbation arose, then whose is it? Perturbation arose in self-substance, because of the self. By deciding that it did not arise in non-self, nor due to non-self, focus goes on self-substance, and focus of pure nature arises by focusing on eternal efficacies like pure conduct, etc., and on substance-attributes which are pure. *ānanda* (pure joy) manifests, meaning *dharma* also arises at that very *samaya*.

Even while thinking, musing about this non-sensory nature of substance, he focuses on associations and makes the mistake of thinking that there is a difference of time between the two.

Cloth is new; it stays for some time, and then it tears. Similarly, body is born, stays through its life, and then is destroyed. In this way, an ignorant believes mass of matter particles to be the main substance. Due to this, he believes in origination-annihilation-

permanence in gross matter of particles, which is perceived by senses. But he does not see the non-sensory nature of origination-annihilation-permanence occurring in every substance without leaving its existing nature. It is imperceptible to gross senses. Therefore, he has doubts.

Appropriate knowledge of origination-annihilation-permanence arises with the correct knowing that self which stays constant is the eternal substance. With appropriate knowing of pure nature correct knowing of association occurs. But with the knowing of associations and *nimitta*, true knowledge of pure nature cannot occur.

Ignorant do not believe that efficacy of knowledge is permanent, and with auspice of that permanence, annihilation of lesser knowledge and manifestation of *viśeṣa* (particular) knowledge arises. He believes that if associations and speech are present, then *jñāna* (knowing) arises, and if they are absent, then he cannot know. Such a *jīva* believes only in the distinction of time, but he does not accept that he has *jñāna*, which is constant, by nature and at this *samaya*, the earlier state of knowing is destroyed, and a new state of knowing is surely originating.

In the cold weather, till the hearth is near, one feels warm, and if the hearth is removed, then one feels cold again; Similarly, if there is fire, then water gets heated, and if fire is removed, then water becomes cold – in this way, ignorant sees everything through associations, but he cannot accept the concept that water has the efficacy to become hot so it became hot.

Acārya Bhagavāna says that if in one infinitesimal part of origination, etc., the entire substance is included, then this would be true, but that is not so. Every substance, while existing by itself, all its three parts, modify every *samaya* altogether, and independently.

The absolute state of substance is explained, and knowing is imparted about which alleged other substances were present, at that time.

Pot, which is the alleged result of the presence of a potter, stick, wheel and rope, the moment of birth of *rāmapātra* (pot) is the same as the moment of annihilation of the mass of clay. And in both of them, clay-ness which is present is the moment of permanence. In this way, moment of origination, annihilation and permanence is the same, and not separate.

Ignorant sees outer associations, but at that time, what is the knowing and absolute nature of substance? That is not seen. In reality, pot is not made because of potter. And it is not true that because pot was supposed to be made, so potter had to come. Further, there is no difference in the time of the making of pot and destruction of the mass of clay. Pot is made from clay at the same time as those modifications, but not in the earlier or later *samaya*.

Question: If this is so, then before the time of the pot being made, why was the pot not made?

Answer: Before the time pot was to be made, it was the time of origination of some other modification. It was some other's self-time. So, the question of why this happened at this time and not at any other time does not arise. Similarly, when a pot is made, then a potter, etc., outer *nimitta* are present in. Knowing of existence is highlighted in this way. The question that if potter had not come, then pot would not have been made, or potter came so pot was made has no relevance in relation to existence. It has been shown that wherever there is *upādāna* (substantial cause), there is *nimitta* (auxiliary/instrumental cause). Where absolute/whole substance is *nimitta*, the adventitious substance will be there.

In the example of *rotī*, moment of origination of *roti*, moment of annihilation of dough, and moment permanence of *paramāṇu* are the same. At that time, woman, rolling pin, etc., *nimitta* are present. Along with the appropriate knowledge of self-time, knowledge of *nimitta* of substance is given.

In every substance, during the presence of adventitious substance by inner and outer instruments, the moment of origination is the moment of annihilation of earlier modification, and that is the moment of permanence in both. Origination of *samyagdarśana* in *ātmā*, annihilation of *mithyādarśana*, and the time of *ātmā* remaining constant are the same, there is no difference in time.

‘*āntaraṅga sadhana aur bahiraṅga sādhanō dvārā āropita saṅskāra ki upasthiti main*’ (by inner and outer instruments, in the presence of adventitious substance) -- this sentence has deep meaning, which has been explained here.

Every substance modifies independently, and in that origination-annihilation-permanence, all are together. This has been proved earlier. Now, it is explained that when origination, annihilation, and permanence occur, at that time, there are two *āropita sādhana* (adventitious instrument).

Origination of modification of *samyagdarśana* in *ātmā* occurs, then *ātmā* becomes the doer of *samyagdarśana* and *ātmā* is its instrument, and its base is also *ātmā*. In this way, distinguishing *kartā-karaṇa-ādhāra* (doer-instrument-base), etc., is *āntaraṅga āropitā sādhana* (inner auxiliary cause) and origination of modification of *samyagdarśana* is *niścaya* (realistic/absolute) work done.

kartā-karaṇa-ādhāra (doer-instrument-base) of origination which exists cannot be the constant *ātmā*. By accepting absolute in origination, the division of doer, instrument, base, etc., of *samyagdarśana* in *ātmā*, is the inner auxiliary cause and *deva-guru-śāstra*, etc., are outer instrument of *samyagdarśana*. This should be understood in every perturbed or non-perturbed modification. Modification of that *samaya* is *niścaya* (absolute) and *nirpekṣa* (irrespective), and substance is its *vyavahāra* (conventional) inner instrument. Outer substances like *deva-guru*, etc., are its outer auxiliary instruments.

Now, this concept is applied to origination-annihilation-permanence.

Origination of every *ātmā* and *parmāṇu* exists, meaning to say that it takes support of only origination is *niścaya* (absolute) and non-contingent. To say that origination occurred due to permanence or *vyavahāra* (conventionality) is due to annihilation of earlier modification. It is the adventitious auxiliary inner instrument and outer substances are the adventitious outer instrument.

Annihilation of modification occurs in every *ātmā* and *paramāṇu*. To say that only the support of annihilation is taken, is absolute and non-contingent, but to say that due to origination of earlier modification and permanence, the present modification was destroyed is *vyavahāra* (conventionality), and that is auxiliary inner instrument and outer substance is outer auxiliary instrument.

Permanence exists in every *ātmā* and *parmāṇu*. To say that permanence takes support of permanence is absolute and non-contingent. To say that permanence is due to origination and annihilation is *vyavahāra* (conventionality) and is the adventitious auxiliary inner instrument, and outer substances are adventitious auxiliary outer instruments.

Attachment arises due to attachment, and not due to annihilation of earlier modification of attachment or due to the permanent *ātmā*, and neither is it due to wife or family. Despite this, to say that, attachment is due to *ātmā*, or due to permanence, is the inner adventitious auxiliary instrument and wife-family, etc., are the outer adventitious auxiliary instrument.

Modifications or infinitesimal parts are absolute. To prove this, parts of the substance have been called *vyavahāra*. This is the system of *jñāna* or the system of omniscience. In this way, the system of pure nature has been proved.

To say that when matter particles of Indian bread come near the space of *ātmā*, then it is the origination of these matter particles to move away from another space and enter the stomach, is the absolute truth. Annihilation of an earlier state of matter particles and permanence of particles is the inner adventitious auxiliary cause, and the desire of *ātmā*, as well as hand, etc., are the outer adventitious auxiliary causes.

Question: From alike-ness, how will distinctiveness originate? Or permanence is the same, and origination-annihilation is changing. So, from permanence, how will origination arise?

Answer: When undivided substance is explained, then it is said that origination comes from permanence. That which is manifested is in the form of origination, but from where does modification of the future come, and where does it go? To that, it is said that it comes from the permanent substance and goes back into it. When the eternal permanent is to be shown, then this is said: in absolute terms, all three parts exist. In that, the phrase - from alike the non-alike comes, is not applicable. To that which exists in the present, likeness and distinctness do not apply.

Origination-annihilation-permanence all three exist. Every *samaya* exists, exists, and exists; so, to existence, alikeness and distinctness do not apply. Alikeness and distinctness are applicable among all three and in relation to each other. The permanent part is always as it is, so it is called alike/same, and origination-annihilation manifests-destroys, so they are all non-alike/distinct. In the same way, from the view of sequence between modification of first *samaya* and second *samaya*, one modification has been said to be distinct from the second modification.

There is a contradiction between the nature of origination and permanence, between nature of annihilation and that of permanence; so, there is a distinctness between them. There is a contradiction between the nature of permanence and origination-annihilation. In this way, there is a sequence between the state of one *samaya* and of second *samaya*, so they are distinct. Therefore, they are dissimilar. All three parts are absolute. That which exists has no comparison. If comparison is applied to the absolute existing modification, then there will not be any existence.

In origination of the pot of clay, the absolute cause is itself; clay is its inner auxiliary instrument, and potter is its outer cause.

Absolute reason for the origination of *samyagdarśana* is itself. In that, constant *ātmā* is the inner adventitious auxiliary cause and *upśama* (settling down of *karma*), etc., is its outer adventitious auxiliary cause.

In reality, all three parts exist, and are absolute. Relativity can be understood correctly only if absolute is understood. After understanding the absolute instrument, the adventitious instrument can be understood.

Annihilation is not caused by origination and permanence, origination is not caused due to permanence and annihilation, and permanence is not due to origination and annihilation – in this way, all three existence are in one *samaya* by themselves and are independent – this should be understood.

Question: In one *samaya*, a certain type of attachment is destroyed, and in the second *samaya*, some other kind of attachment is destroyed – what is the reason for this?

Answer: That itself is its own reason, there is no other reason. Existence of annihilation at that *samaya* is its reason.

Question: In *Siddha Bhagavāna*, from the time of becoming *siddha* to eternity, state of omniscience originates, so something may be reducing from the state of permanence of the *siddha*, isn't it? Since eternity, every *samaya*, the least state of *matīśruta jñāna* arises in *jīvas* of *nitya nigoda*. So, is the permanence of *nigoda* a little more than the permanence of *siddha*?

Answer: No! Because the permanent nature of every substance is the same. Occurrence of more or less origination is related to the existence of origination of that *samaya*. It has no relation with permanence. Lesser or higher state of origination of *jñāna* is not due to

the lesser or higher state of permanence. Permanence stays the same in all states from eternity till infinity. To say that the reason for origination is permanence, is *vyavahāra* (conventionality) and not *nīścaya* (absolute). Therefore, origination, which is the present substance, its inner adventitious instrument, is permanence and annihilation.

nimitta cause moves according to its own ability from one place to another. When it is time for modification to move from one place to another, they present themselves by themselves, but they do not appear because they are dependent on another. Here, it is stated that during the self-time of *naimitika* (effect)modification, *nimitta* (cause) presents itself.

Absolute reason for origination of the modification of one *samaya* in *ātmā* is not the constant *ātmā*, but that constant *ātmā* is the adventitious internal cause. So, the belief that attachment or *samyaktva* arose due to outer associations or due to *nimitta*, or *nimitta* had to come, is gross ignorance.

See! This is the chapter on the principles of *jñeya* (knowable). Here, it is explained that every infinitesimal part is an absolute, unimposed existence. After that, knowledge and belief in the undivided independent *ātmā* is explained. This has a section of *samyagdarśana* primarily from the view of *jñāna*.

The time of occurrence for pot of clay to be made from clay is the same as the time for the clay to be destroyed and that itself is the time for the permanence of clay-ness. The pot of clay occurred from clay, in that, annihilation of earlier state of clay and clay-ness are the inner instruments, and potter, wheel, etc., are the outer instruments.

Absolute cause for origination of *samyagdarśana* is its origination by itself, annihilation of *mithyātva*, permanence of *ātmā* are the inner adventitious instruments and *deva-guru-sāstra* are outer adventitious. Origination-annihilation-permanence – these three parts exist independently, due to themselves, and one part has the ability to be *nimitta* to other parts. Ability to be *nimitta* is present in the other two parts. Annihilation and permanence have the ability to be *nimitta* to origination. Origination and permanence have the ability to be *nimitta* to annihilation. Origination and annihilation have the ability to be *nimitta* to permanence.

Time of modification of origination, time of annihilation, permanence to have the ability to be internal *nimitta* and the time of *nimitta*, of outer associations is the same; it is not separate. One *samaya* is not divided, but in one *samaya*, all three infinitesimal parts modify.

Outer *nimittas* also can be of many types; in the modification of *ātmā*, *kāla dravya* is outer *nimitta*. In *samyakśraddhā*, *deva-guru-sāstra*, annihilation of *karma*, etc., are outer *nimitta*. Outer *nimittas* can be one or many.

Origination is at the time of origination; annihilation is at the time of annihilation, and permanence is at the time of permanence, but they do not occur in a disorderly manner.

They are existing substances. When they are present, then infinitesimal parts of substance are in the form of *nimitta* to each other and outer substances are also present at that time.

The question that, ‘what if it were not there?’ does not arise in that which exists. So, the question that if *deva-guru-sāstra* were not present, then *samyagdarśana* would not manifest is irrelevant; To give a correct understanding of *nimitta* to him who does not believe in *nimitta kāraṇa* (auxiliary/instrumental cause), it is said that with the belief in true *deva-guru-sāstra*, *samykṭva* manifests, but here existence of *upādāna* (substantial cause) is being proved. Hence, the question that if *nimitta* is not present, then work will not be done, does not arise. At the time of modification, which is in the form of origination, the inner *nimitta* is permanent, and annihilation of earlier modification. Outer *nimitta* is *deva-guru-sāstra*. Here, knowledge of the existing substances is shared.

At the time of origination of knowing, permanent *ātmā* exists, and earlier modification is destroyed. Here, the discussion is about origination-annihilation-permanence in one *samaya*, but it is not about annihilation of that which was earlier than this *samaya*, nor is it about the eternal permanent. It is about the permanence of infinite attributes and the present permanence of the entire substance. It is about that one *samaya*. Annihilation also is related to annihilation of the previous state, which was one *samaya* earlier, but not about annihilation before that. All three (origination-annihilation-permanence) exist together in one *samaya*.

This chapter is about *jñeya* (knowables), origination of one’s own present modification is *svajñeya* (self-knowable) and at that time annihilation and permanence are in the form of inner instrument of self-knowable and non-self substance, meaning, outer instruments are *parajñeya*.

Now it is being clarified as to why permanence is said to be for one *samaya*:-

When manifestation of all modifications needs to be understood, then the constant is said to be eternal. When it is told, on whose base do the future modifications arise, and where do modifications of the past go after annihilation, then it is said that origination is from the base of the eternal permanent. Modifications destroy and go into the permanent. One permanent has the inherent capability of having infinite originations. To show that the eternal permanent only, has the capacity to have infinite originations, is called an eternal constant. But that which exists through three-time phases exists in the present, and as no permanent modifies, either in the past or in the future, whenever it exists, it exists only in the present. Hence, it is said to be permanent of one *samaya*.

Permanence of each attribute is independent, and permanence of such infinite attributes is the permanence of one substance. When discussion is about one attribute, then permanence of one attribute should be understood, and when discussion is about the complete substance, then the complete substance being a mass of infinite attributes should be understood.

In bending of a finger, annihilation of its straight state and permanence of matter particles of the finger are its inner instruments, and desire of *jīva* is the outer instrument.

Similarly, absolute reason for origination of movement of the body of *KevalīBhagavāna* is origination, annihilation of the earlier modification of being stationary, as well as permanence of particles of the body are its inner *nimitta* and *yog* (vibration) of *ātmā*, *dharmāstikaya*, etc., are outer *nimitta*.

Every infinitesimal part is an independent/absolute substance. To recognise them through characteristics of other parts is *vyavahāra*.

Origination of a new state is the characteristic of origination, annihilation of earlier state is the characteristic of annihilation and for substance to remain permanent is the characteristic of permanence. All three parts have their distinct characteristics.

That which is the characteristic of origination, is not the characteristic of annihilation or permanence.

That which is the characteristic of annihilation is not the characteristic of origination or permanence.

That which is the characteristic of permanence is not the characteristic of origination and annihilation.

Characteristics are separate, so the character (identifying) mark is also distinct. If characteristics of all three were to be the same, they would all become one, but this does not happen. To recognise one characteristic, through characteristic of another, is to say by *upcāra* (transferred epithet).

All three parts have distinct characteristics; even then, modification or *samaya* cannot be divided. They do have the ability to be *nimitta* to each other. If they do not have the ability to be *nimitta* to each other, then there cannot be such an adventitious state either. Here, the word *saṅskāra* should not be understood as an influence; it should be understood as the ability to be *nimitta* or to be the presence of *saṅskāra*.

The way, annihilation and permanence are said to be inner *nimitta* to origination of modification of one attribute, similarly, modification of one attribute is the internal *nimitta* to modification of another attribute. This also should be understood appropriately.

Permanence and annihilation have no effect or influence on origination in the form of modification of *samyagdarśana*. In that case, to believe that external *deva-guru-śāstra* have any effect or influence in the modification of *samyaktva* is gross ignorance.

Here, whichever substances exists, have been explained.

1. If it were to be believed that there is no adventitious efficacy - then he does not have an appropriate knowledge of *nimitta*.
2. To believe that adventitious efficacy can influence *upādāna* is non-acceptance of the independence of *upādāna*.

Despite origination and annihilation, permanence being independent in clay-ness, pot and clod, in the substance which is touched by this tri-nature of substance, all three are together; they are seen at the same time. In the later and earlier modifications, and in permanence it is clay only, which is origination, annihilation, and permanence, and no other substance. Origination-annihilation-permanence, which exists in the later and earlier modifications, and state of substance, is the substance itself, and not any other substance.

From this, two principles are derived –

1. The difference in time between origination-annihilation-permanence has been removed, meaning all three exist at the same time.
2. All three together are one substance and not any other substance.

Nature of origination, annihilation and permanence – all three have a distinct independent nature, and they are not because of non-self. One nature is not due to another and all are in one *samaya* only, there is no difference of time among them. Despite all three having distinct natures, all three together make one substance.

Origination of modification of *siddha*, annihilation of modification of transmigration and permanence part, with its infinite efficacies – each of them exists separately. Though all three are separate, they together make one substance.

In this *gāthā*, the word *dravya* (substance) has been used with two meanings: –

In all three infinitesimal parts, the common part, which is *dhruva* (permanent), is called *dravya* (substance), and when all three parts together want to be referred to as *dravya* (substance), then the assemblage of both, *dhruva* (permanent), which is common and *utpāda-vyaya* (origination-annihilation), which is specific/distinctive, is also called a *dravya* (substance). Hence, wherever, whichever meaning is applicable, should be applied.

Origination of modification of *jñāna* is the existing substance which is by itself. But its origination is not due to an earlier state or due to speech.

Modification of each and every substance exists in its current state, but that modification does not exist in the earlier or later time. Earlier modification is not the present, but annihilation of earlier modification is the present. Even though characteristics of origination, etc., are separate, they are still *nimitta* to one another.

Annihilation is an existence by itself; this is not about the earlier modification, but it is about annihilation of earlier modification. Annihilation is not frivolous like the horns of a rabbit, which does not exist. Here, discussion is about the modification, which was just one *samaya* earlier, but is not about annihilation of modifications that occurred before that. If annihilation of modification earlier to that is taken into consideration,

then permanence of one *samaya* will not remain. Hence, here, the explanation is about annihilation of modification, which was just one *samaya* earlier.

Here, reference is to origination of one *samaya* and permanence which is besides the complete permanent part, that permanent is the third part. So, all three parts exist in the present – they exist. Hence, all three together make one substance.

Question: Is there any relativity in annihilation?

Answer: No, because annihilation is also an absolute existence. At the time of annihilation, earlier modification is absent. So, annihilation is also irrespective of any other. Origination-annihilation-permanence all three are absolute. In this way -

1. Nature of all three is distinct, but the time of all three is not different; it is one *samaya* only, and they do not occur at different times.
2. Despite the nature of all three being distinct, each are not a substance, but the three together make one substance. Every infinitesimal part touches the nature separately, meaning they are separate by nature, but all three are not of one nature.
3. That origination, which is the nature of origination, that is origination itself, that annihilation, which is the nature of annihilation, that is annihilation itself, and that permanence, which is the nature of permanence, is permanence itself.
4. All substances are touched by this trio of nature. Being touched by trio of nature, the complete substance is one. But by being touched by trio of nature does not mean that they are three substances.

Nature of origination is the manifested modification, nature of annihilation is the absent modification, and that part of equivalency which is seen, is the nature of permanence. Nature and characteristics of each are separate, and all three natures together are one substance.

Three natures are one substance, they are not three substances, and three natures is one substance which is not separate, that is the substance. These three are infinitesimal parts; these three are the nature, but they are not of the same nature. Despite the substance having these three natures, the three together make one substance and do not make any other substance.

All six substances have the characteristic of effort. Similarly, every modification has the characteristic of effort, and origination-annihilation-permanence also has the characteristic of effort.

In the effort of origination, effort of annihilation and permanence is *nimitta*.

In the effort of annihilation, effort of permanence and origination is *nimitta*.

In the effort of permanence, effort of annihilation and origination is *nimitta*.

In this *gāthā*, one infinitesimal part has been said to be the inner *nimitta* of the other two parts. To separate these two parts from outer substances, they have been said to be the inner *nimitta*. But still, from the view of each part, the other parts are external.

This kind of subtle explanation does not exist anywhere, even as *vyavahāra*, except in the teachings of *vītarāga sarvajña*. One must understand the principle of absolute substance and its nature just the way it is.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-103* ❧

अथ द्रव्यस्योत्पादव्ययध्रौव्याप्यनेकद्रव्यपर्यायद्वारेण चिन्तयति-

Now, origination, destruction and permanence of substance are considered by means of modifications of several substances:-

पादुब्भवदि य अण्णो पज्जाओ पज्जाओ वयदि अण्णो ।
दव्वस्स तं पि दव्वं णेव पणट्ठं ण उप्पण्णं॥१०३॥

*pādubbhavadī ya aṇṇo pajjāo pajjāo vayadi aṇṇo |
dāvvaṣṣa taṃ pi dāvvaṃ ṇeva paṇaṭṭhaṃ ṇa uppaṇṇaṃ || 103 ||*

Meaning: One *paryāya* (modification) of a *dravya* (substance) arises and another *paryāya* annihilates; *dravya* does not annihilate and does not arise (it is eternal).

āṅkā: As here (in this world), one molecule of a triple atom of homogeneous nature, which is a modification of several substances, annihilates, and another molecule of quadruple homogeneous nature, which is a modification of several substances arises, but those three or four matter-particles remains constant-neither destroying nor arising (they are permanent). In the same way, all homogenous substantial modifications destroy and arise, but the homogeneous substances remain constant- neither destroying nor arising.

And as one *manuṣyaparyāya* (human form) of heterogeneous substantial modification destroys, and another *deva paryāya* (celestial *deva* form) of heterogeneous substantial modification arises, but in both, the soul matter remains constant, neither destroying nor arising. Similarly, all heterogeneous substantial modifications destroy and arise, whereas heterogeneous substances remain constant-neither destroying nor arising.

Thus, substances in themselves are constant (eternal) but they undergo origination-destruction by their substance-modifications, so they are origination, annihilation and permanence.

pravacana on gāthā 103

In *gāthā* 102, modifications are with the three characteristics of origination-destruction-permanence. But substance which is with these three natures is one. Destruction of *mīthyātva*, origination of *samyaktva* and continuance of permanence are separate. Every substance has three natures. A substance which has three natures is not three but one.

Characteristic of origination does not originate from non-self, and origination of the second *samaya* does not occur due to first *samaya*. Similarly, they do not go backwards or forward either, it occurs at the time it is suppose to occur. It does not occur back and

forth or earlier-later. When *jnāna* becomes subtle and independent, then it is said that *yog* of *ātmā* has been done. Without this understanding, he cannot become an *ātmayogī*. To have such an experience and knowledge is the reason for peace and *dharma*.

Question: Associated substances exist, so modifications come from associations. Crumble of *laḍḍō* (Indian sweet) was the earlier state, from that *laḍḍō* was made. So, it may not be due to non-self, but there was a state of earlier association, and from that, new state of association has arisen, isn't it?

Answer: No! This is not true; because every state arises from the substance, but new modification does not arise from the earlier modification. In fact, a new state comes from substance. This topic has been extensively explained in *gāthā 102*.

A *skandha* (mass of matter particles), made of three matter particles, is the bondage between matter particles only, so it is called homogenous multiple substance modification. When, to the above said three matter particles, one more matter particle joins, then state of *skandha* of three matter particles is destroyed, and origination of the state of four matter particles occurs, and matter particle remains constant.

Question: Does modification come from modification?

Answer: No! Here some may argue that first, there was a mass of ten matter particles; then to that five matter particles were added, so it became a mass of fifteen matter particles. So, modification has arisen from modification. But this is an incorrect argument. Because there is a destruction of the former state, which was earlier in the form of the mass with ten matter particles, and with addition of five matter particles, a new state of the mass of fifteen matter particles originates, and the new modification has arisen from matter particles of the substance, but new modification has not come from earlier modification.

State of particles of *karma*, which were in the form of *kārmaṇavargaṇā* (mass of matter particles of *karma*), destroys, a new state of *karma* originates, and matter particles remain permanent. It is definitely not the case that due to attachment of *ātmā*, mass of matter particles of *karma* had to join. And neither is it that, earlier there were *karmas*, so there was bondage of new *karma*.

First, the flour was in the state of flour; then, by adding water to it, dough was made; in this, there is destruction of the earlier state, origination of the new state and matter particles are permanent. Cook has not changed its state. Similarly, that state did not change due to water, and state of dough was not made due to the earlier state of flour.

There is a destruction of the incomplete modification of *jnāna*, *darśana*, *vīrya*, *sukha* and origination of *anaṅta catuṣṭaya* (infinite four-fold state) of *kevala jnāna*, *kevala darśana*, *anaṅta vīrya*, *anaṅta sukha*, and *ātmā* are permanent. So, origination-destruction-permanence, all three are independent. Origination of the infinite fourfold state is not

because of the moving away of *karma*, nor did it originate due to the partially pure modification, and this should be understood in all *skandhas*(mass of matter particles).

Associated modifications have not made any changes in any other substance. Its earlier modification is not there (it is annihilated), and from earlier modification, new modification does not come. From its earlier infinitesimal part in the form of modification, new infinitesimal part in the form of new modification will not arise, therefore, it is incorrect to say that because of parts of some other substance, parts of this substance arises and manifests.

Similarly, no one makes the mass of *kārmaṇavargaṇā* (karmic body), *tejasavargaṇā* (auric body), mass of *audārikaśarīra* (physical body), mass of matter particles of speech, and *mahāskandha* (greater mass of matter particles). No *jīva* can change *skandha*, and from the earlier state, a new state cannot arise.

Mass of matter particle with two qualities of stickiness joins the mass of matter particle with four qualities of stickiness, and then the state of all those matter particles will be with four qualities of stickiness.

Question: Do the matter particles with four qualities of stickiness change the matter particles with two qualities of stickiness? And do other matter particles with four qualities of stickiness stay as they are?

Answer: In reality, no one changes anyone; matter particles with four qualities of stickiness which are present, do not remain as earlier matter particles with four qualities of stickiness. First, destruction of matter particles with two qualities of stickiness occurs, and the ones with four qualities of stickiness originate. That has not occurred due to coming of matter particles with four qualities of stickiness, and even in the matter particles with the four qualities stickiness, previous modification with the four qualities is absent, but that modification has changed and new modification with four qualities of stickiness has arisen. Modifications which are within the mass of the particles do not help each other. So to say that modification changed due to the wish of *ātmā* is gross ignorance.

One modification of the human state–non-homogeneous substance modification is destroyed, and second non-homogenous modification of *deva* originates, but in that *jīva* and *puṅgala* (physical matter) remain permanent.

Here *KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya Bhagavāna* has the bodily state of a *muni*, has realisation/ experience of *ātmā* and is going to become a *deva*. Hence, he has spoken about the state of *deva*.

There is destruction of the state of body of a human, origination of the body of *deva*, and matter particle remains permanent. *ātmā* in the form of a human is annihilated, it originates in the form of a *deva*, and *jīva* remains permanent.

In that: –

- *jīva* has not destroyed the human body, but it was destroyed at the time it was meant to be destroyed.
- Body did not change because of annihilation of *karma*, but it changed at the time that it was meant to change.
- Body and *ātmā*, share the same space, but still, no one changes because of the other.

Question: State of *siddha* arises due to the absence of *karma*, is it not?

Answer: Origination of state of *siddha*, is not due to the absence of *karma*, and neither is it due to its own earlier state.

Here, if someone argues that if *jīva* would not exist, then, whose would the origination be? And if matter particles were not present, then how would origination of a body take place? To them, it is said that the question if this were not so? does not arise (because they exist).

In non-homogenous substance modifications, from those with one sense in *nigoda*, to *devas* of *sarvārthasiddhi*, there is a state of annihilation of earlier state, origination of new state, in their *ātmās* and body, and *jīva* or *paramāṇu* remain permanent.

Ignorance does not exist because body stays in the same space as *jīva*. Nor can they do something for each other. But due to his own ignorance, the ignorant harbours this kind of contrary belief.

The statement that light spreads through the three worlds due to *Tirthankara* is said to provide an understanding of *nimitta*. In reality, origination of modification of light is due to its own matter particles, and *Tirthankara* is said to be *nimitta* in that.

karma does not force *jīva* into that life of non-homogenous substance modification in *naraka* because there was bondage of *karma* for life in *naraka*, All substances change their space due to their own self.

It is said from the view of *vyavahāra* that due to vibration of attribute of *yoga* in the state of *saṁsāra*, *jīva* attracts physical *karmas*. This shows *nimitta*.

But attribute of *yog* of *ātmā* never grasps physical *paramāṇu*. They come due to their own self.

Man does not die because of an accident, car does not stop due to absence of petrol, and medicine does not cure a disease; because in every homogeneous as well as non-homogeneous substance modification, the substance is permanent. Its earlier state is destroyed, and it originates in the form of a new state. So, all substances are, by nature, with origination-destruction-permanence.

The relation of *nimitta-naimitika* (cause-effect) shows that two substances are separate. To know that they work in two different spaces is the correct relationship of *nimitta-naimitika*. *nimitta-naimitika* does not mean that work is done by *nimitta*.

In one body of *jīva* of *nigoda*, infinite *kārmaṇa* (body made of *kārmic* matter particles) and *tejasa* (body made of auric light) bodies of infinite *jīvas* are present – despite this, according to the ability of each one, *kārmaṇa* body of all *jīvas* are *nimitta* to themselves respectively, but they do not mix with each other.

Homogeneous and non-homogeneous substance modifications are present. From earlier modifications, new modifications cannot arise, but they arise from the substance – this kind of correct understanding is the reason for *dharma*.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-104* ❧

अथ द्रव्यस्योत्पादव्ययध्रौव्याण्येकद्रव्यपर्यायद्वारेण चिन्तयति -

Now, origination, annihilation and permanence of a substance are considered through modifications of one substance:-

परिणमदि सयं दव्वं गुणदो य गुणंतरं सद्विसिट्टं ।

तम्हा गुणपज्जाया भणिया पुण दव्वमेव त्ति ॥ १०४ ॥

pariṇamadi sayāmdavvam guṇado ya guṇāmtaramśadavisitṭham |

tamhā guṇapajjāyā bhaṇiyā puṇa davvameva tti || 104 ||

Meaning: From the view of *sattā* (existence), without differentiation, substance itself modifies by way of attributes, into multiple qualitative modifications (or substance itself modifies from one qualitative modification to another qualitative modification), and its existence is undifferentiated and undivided from attributes and modifications therefore, attributes-modifications are said to be substance itself.

ṭīkā: *guṇaparyāya* (modification of attribute) are modifications of one substance because *guṇaparyāya* (modifications of attribute) are of one substance (or attribute-modification are modifications of one substance, because they are one substance only and not separate). Their one substance-ness is explained with the example of a mango fruit.

A mango fruit modifying by itself from the green state into a yellow state manifests its own existence by preceding and succeeding state of greenness and yellowness, therefore it, having one undivided existence with the states of greenness and yellowness, is merely one substance and not a different object. Similarly, substance modifying by itself from the quality of preceding state into quality of the subsequent state manifests its own existence by those qualities present in the preceding and subsequent successive states, it, having one undivided existence with qualities present in preceding and subsequent successive states, is merely one substance, and not a different substance. (like in a mango, the substance itself, modifying from preceding state to successive state, experiences itself by the preceding and successive modifications; its existence is undivided from the preceding and successive attribute modifications, so it is one substance only and not another. Or those attribute modifications and substances are by nature one substance only and not separate substances).

And, as mango fruit, arising in a state of yellowness, destroying the state of greenness, is the modification of one substance, with origination, destruction and permanence; in the same way, substance arising with modification of subsequent state, destruction of

preceding state, remaining permanent due to the quality of being a substance, the substance by way of one substance-modification is with origination-destruction-permanence.

bhāvārtha: In the earlier *gāthā*, origination, annihilation, and permanence of a substance was explained through modifications of several substances; and now in this *gāthā*, origination, annihilation, permanence of substance is explained through attribute-modification (by one substance-modification.)

pravacana on gāthā 104

Here, it is said that the substance itself modifies from one attribute modification to another attribute modification, and its existence is indivisible and inseparable from the existence of attributes and modifications. Through all this, substance remains one only. Attribute and substance cannot be modified separately. Substance modifies, and along with that all attributes also modify. That which is the existence of attributes is existence of substance as well, but because each and every attribute has a separate existence, it does not mean that substance is separate from it.

Attributes-modifications are one substance-modifications; that is because attribute-modifications have one state of substance. There are modifications of many attributes like belief, knowledge, conduct, etc., but that does not mean that substance is separate for each attribute. Matter particles may have different states of colour like red, green, etc., and they may have different and varied states of taste, but that does not make them multiple matter particles. States of red, green, etc., are parts of substance itself. They do not turn into multiple substances.

One *ātmā* and *parmāṇu* have infinite attributes. Substance modifies as a state of preceding and subsequent states of attribute, and because it is indivisible from the state of existence of substance, it is one only, and it does not turn into numerous. Existence of attributes-modifications is not separate from the existence of substance.

In the state of a seeker, there could be lesser knowledge in his modifications of *ātmā*, belief is complete as well as *samyaka*, but strength could be less. In this way, many types of attributes may have many types of states; even then, existence of the substance is one only.

Just because there are innumerable efficacies does not mean that there are innumerable beholders of those efficacies. Beholder of those efficacies is in the form of one, and it modifies in the form of many states.

Every substance exists, and it modifies according to the form of states of its own attributes. Substance, keeping itself as is, modifies as self, and does not modify into some other substance. Modification of many attributes is the modification of substance itself.

In *gāthā* 102, origination-annihilation-permanence were shown as independent. In *gāthā* 103, it was explained that substance modifications, whether homogeneous or non-homogeneous, are not due to earlier modifications, but come from substance itself.

In *gāthā* 104, it is explained that despite modifications of attributes being numerous and varied, substance remains as one, and those modifications are states of substance only.

Mango changes from a state of greenness to a state of yellowness. In that, it experiences its own existence. So, existence of a substance which is indivisible from the state of greenness and yellowness is one substance only and not any other substance.

Where did the state of green of first *samaya*, and the state of yellowness of the second *samaya* come from? Is it a separate existence? Ignorant has the delusion that - if existence changes, then it will become yellow, but existence is inseparable from mango; mango changes from green to yellow. Ignorant falsely believe that first the pot was raw, then it became hard, so matter particles have changed. But this is incorrect.

- 1 The number of infinitesimal parts of every physical matter particle remains constant. They neither increase nor decrease. For example, ignorant believe that touch and smell are two attributes, and they remain that many only, in that there is no increase or decrease.
- 2 Ignorant believes that if any physical matter has a green colour, then infinite attributes can become green, but it cannot become black from green or green from black.
- 3 Ignorant believes that with a change in the state of attributes, physical substance changes into another substance.

All these beliefs are delusions because a substance never changes into the form of another substance. While remaining within its own existence, its states keep changing. State of physical matter may be green in one *samaya* and yellow in the second, similarly state of touch-taste, etc., also keep increasing or decreasing.

In *jīva*, modification of *śrutajñāna* (scriptural knowledge) annihilates and *kevalajñāna* originates. Modification of *avadhi darśana* (clairvoyance perception) or *cakṣu-acakṣu darśana* (perception through eyes and through other senses) annihilates, and *kevala darśana* originates, but in that, substance does not become another substance. While keeping its existence, origination-annihilation occurs.

One *samaya* earlier *jīva* has lesser *jñāna*, and in the second *samaya*, he attains *kevalajñāna*. Can there be so much difference in origination? How did the lesser state of *jñāna* of first *samaya*, turn into the complete *jñāna* of second *samaya*? If it is one substance only, then why is there so much difference in its origination? Has another substance come? All such questions arise due to ignorance. The answer to it is that modifications of every substance occur while keeping its existence intact. This harmony is seen in the origination of one modification with origination of succeeding

modification, and that is the ability of origination, and substance itself remains undivided and modifies. In this process, there has been no change in the substance.

Origination has varied modifications, but because of it, there is no change of substance. Substance itself modifies from the preceding to the subsequent state, and there, it experiences its own existence. Existence of its attributes and its own existence is one, due to which attribute and substance are one, and there is no change in substance. Attribute-modifications and substance are in the form of one substance only and they are not separate.

State of body modifies from being warm to cold, even then its existence does not change, but *parmāṇu* substance, which is at one with one's own existence, modifies.

Question: Why does one rush to call a doctor if the body is shaking due to disease?

Answer: Shaking of body is not due to disease, but it is due to its own self. Earlier, there was not much fear within the self, but later, there was a specific modification of fear. That is the perturbed modifications of the attribute of conduct. *ātmā* itself modifies as the state of that attribute, but substance does not change into any other form.

Yellow state of mango originated, the green state was destroyed, and the mango remained as mango; similarly, substance originates in the form of subsequent modification, the form of preceding state destroys, and state of permanence stays as it is. Because of this, substance, by way of one substance-modification, is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence.

Permanence is an attribute, while origination and annihilation are modifications. Substance is the form of attribute-modifications or is as origination-annihilation-permanence. All three parts are of the substance and not separate.

pravacana on bhāvārtha of gāthā 104

In *gāthā* 103, by way of homogeneous and non-homogeneous substance-modification, origination-annihilation-permanence was explained, and it was also said that from *skandha* (mass of matter particles) state, form of *skandha* cannot arise. In this *gāthā*, origination-annihilation-permanence is explained by way of attribute-modification.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-105* ❧

अथसत्ताद्रव्ययोरनर्थान्तरत्वे युक्तिमुपन्यस्यति -

Now, through a logical explanation, it is presented that existence (*sattā*) and substance (*dravya*) are not two different objects: -

ण हवदि जदि सद्व्वं असुद्धुव्वं हवदि तं कथं दव्वं ।
हवदि पुणो अण्णं वा तम्हा दव्वं सयं सत्ता ॥ १०५॥

*ṇa havadi jadi saddavvam asuddhuvvam havadi taṃ kadhaṃ davvam |
havadi puṇo aṇṇaṃ vā tamhā davvaṃ sayam sattā || 105 ||*

Meaning:- If substance is not an existence (by itself), then, 1. definitely, it would be non-existent. (But that which is non-existent) how can it be a substance? Or (if it is not non-existent), then? 2. Then it is something else (different from *sattā*-existence)? (but how can that be)? Therefore, substance itself is existence.

ṭīkā: If substance is not an existence by its own characteristic-nature, then 1. It would either be non-existent or 2. Be separate from existence (*sattā*).

1. If it were non-existent, then, due to the impossibility of permanence, it would not remain stable, and substance would come to its end, and
2. If it were apart/separate from existence, then, sustaining itself apart from existence, its own existence would end by itself.

But if substance exists by its own characteristic nature, then

1. Due to presence of permanence, remaining stable, substance will show (i.e. substance proves) to be self-existent; and
2. Sustaining itself without being apart/separate from existence, its existence is accepted, and its purpose is only this much. Therefore, substance must be accepted to be a self-existing entity/an existence in itself because existence and that which is with existence are not separated, so they are not different (from one another).

pravacana on gāthā 105

Now, it is being explained that existence and substance are not separate.

If it is believed that attributes and beholder of attributes are separate then beholder of attributes will be destroyed. Therefore, from the time substance exists, its existence is present. This *jīva*, or any other substance, has not been created by any other substance or

self-existence does not come from the existence of another substance, and no substance can be separate from its own existence.

Attributes and beholder of attributes have distinction in terms of name, quantity and characteristics; but the space covered by them is not separate, it is undivided. Focus on self-substance, which is with existence, gives rise to *dharma*.

1. If substance did not exist by itself, then due to the impossibility of permanence of substance, substance itself will be destroyed, and it will not remain.
2. If substance was separate from its own attribute of existence, then there is no purpose of attribute of existence. Work of the attribute of existence is to maintain the existence of substance. If substance were to be separate from its attribute of existence, then there would be no purpose for that attribute of existence, and due to this, the incidence of complete absence of the attribute of existence would arise.
 - a If it is in the nature of substance to exist, then due to the presence of permanence, substance will remain steady and only then can substance be proved. Hence, attribute of existence proves the existence of beholder of attributes.
 - b By being steady along with attribute of existence, substance, proves the attribute of existence itself. Beholder of attributes proves the attribute of existence.

Question: Will modification of dreams be with existence?

Answer: Yes, that modification is also with existence. In modification of *jñāna*, the state to exist is never absent. In modification of one's own *jñāna*, modification of attachments, as well as substances seen in dreams, are known. So that modification is with existence. Dreams are definitely not a delusion-it is not a non-substance. It, too, is a substance. It is the ability of modification of *kṣāyopśamika jñāna* (limited knowledge manifested on destruction cum subsidence of knowledge obscuring *karmas*) of that *samaya*, and at that *samaya* that dream is seen.

In this verse, it has been proved that attributes-beholder of attributes are undivided.

Now it is stated that substance and existence do not have a distinction of space.

Every *ātmā* is with efficacies; if this is not believed, then the one with efficacy will be destroyed, and if it is believed that attributes are separate, then the purpose of efficacies is not proved. Beholder of efficacies cannot be without efficacies. Beholder of nature cannot be without nature. *ātmā* cannot be without attributes of *jñāna*, *darśana*, etc.

Here attribute of existence has been discussed. But it should be understood that substance is undivided from the existence of every single attribute. *ātmā*, which is with happiness, knowledge, and conduct, stays with its own *jñāna*, *darśana*, *cāritra*, *sattā*, etc., and is not separate.

By deciding on the belief that, attribute-beholder of attributes is undivided, the determination arises that knowledge, belief, conduct bliss, come from within the self,

and *mithyā* belief of infinity, that knowledge, belief, conduct bliss, etc., comes from non-self is destroyed. *dharma* is when focus goes on *ātmā* which is the beholder of attributes. Nature of self will be destroyed if bliss or knowledge, etc., were to come from non-self *jīva* or from physical matter. That *jīva* who believes knowledge, belief etc., to be due to non-self, holds the erroneous belief that attribute-beholder are separate, when in reality they are one. If bliss of self would come from money, dry fruits/nuts, dried milk, car, then *ātmā*, will be proved to be without bliss. Ignorant does not turn his focus towards substance, but his focus is on non-self.

Question: Does *kevala jñāna* not come from books or from modification of mind?

Answer: No, omniscience comes from the beholder of attributes, which is *ātmā*. In this verse oneness between attributes-beholder of attributes has been explained/stated.

Is the inclination of self on attribute-beholder of attribute or on non-self substances? Existence of bliss, knowledge, belief, conduct, is not separate from the beholder of attributes, which is the *ātmā*.

He, who believes that acquisition of non-self is a source of happiness, does not believe in the *jīva* substance, its attributes, or its modifications. He, who believes that from the existence of another substance, existence of self occurs, believes the attribute of existence and existing substance to be separate.

He, who believes that knowledge comes from *śāstra* or *guru*, believes attribute and beholder of attributes to be separate, and does not believe them to be one.

Modifications and beholder of modifications are not separate, efficacies and beholder of efficacies are not separate, and nature and beholder of nature are not separate. Hence, it should be decided that substance itself exists, or it should be determined that the attributes-beholder of attributes are undivided; there is no distinction between them.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-106* ❧

अथ पृथक्त्वान्यत्वलक्षणमुन्मुद्रयति --

Now, ‘separateness’ and ‘otherness’ are defined:

पविभक्तपदेसत्तं पुधत्तमिदि सासणं हि वीरस्स ।

अण्णत्तमतब्भवो ण तब्भवं हौदि कथमेगं ॥ १०६॥

pavibhattapadesattaṃ pudhattamidi sāsanaṃ hi vīrassa |
aṅṅattamatabbhāvo ṇa tabbhavaṃ hodi kadhamegaṃ ॥ 106 ॥

Meaning: *vibhakta-pradeśatva* means separate spatial points, so has been preached by *Bhagavāna Vīra* (the 24th *Tirthankara*). *atadbhāva* (means being *atat*, or not to be so), and that is *anyatva* (otherness). That which is not as the other, how can it be one? *kathāncita* (in some ways) *sattā* (existence) is not *dravya*, and *dravya* is not *sattā*, hence they are not one.

ṭīkā: *vibhaktva pradeśatva* (separate spatial point) is the characteristic of distinctiveness. That is not possible between attribute of existence and substance. That is because there is an absence of separate spatial points between *guṇa* and *guṇī*. The way it is between whiteness and cloth. The spatial points which are of whiteness – the attribute – same are the spatial points of *guṇī* (beholder of attributes) – so they do not have separateness of spatial points. Similarly, existence – the attribute – and its spatial points are the same as those of *dravya* (substance) – the beholder of attributes – hence, they do not have separateness of spatial points.

Despite it being so, they (attribute of existence and *dravya*) have *ānyatva* (separateness). This is because they have presence of the characteristic of separateness. Attribute of *atadbhāva* (not to be that) is the characteristic of *ānyatva* (to be separate). Existence and *dravya* have it because *guṇa* and *guṇī* have an absence of *tadbhāva* (to be that). The way it is between whiteness and cloth: it is this – one is the subject of the sense of sight, which is not known by other senses, and that is the attribute of whiteness. That whiteness is not the cloth. Cloth is known by all senses together. Cloth, which is known by all senses together, is not whiteness only, which is known only by the sense of sight and is not known by any other senses. Here there is an absence of *tadbhāva* between them.

Similarly, that which stays with auspice of another is *nirguṇa* (it is not made up of attributes), is made of only one attribute, is *viśeṣaṇa* (of a unique type), is *vidhāyaka* (maker of substance/attribute which shows substance), and is *vṛttisvarūpa* (has the nature to exist)–

this is the attribute of existence. Such an existence stays without auspice of any other, is with attributes, is made up of many attributes, is substantive, is one which is created/made known by its attributes, and is always present. Such is not the *dravya*, which is without any auspices is with attributes, is made of many attributes, is substantive, is one which is being created/known and is always present. Such a substance is without auspice of any, and is not the existence which stays with auspice of another, is *nirguṇa*, is made of one attribute, is a qualifier, makes/shows the *dravya*, and is with modification it is not this existence, *dravya* is not the attribute of existence. Hence there is an absence of *tad bhāva* between them.

Due to it being so, even though attribute of existence and *dravya* have *kathāncita* (in some ways) state of *anarthāntara* (substance which are undivided/substance which are not separate), even then there should not be a doubt whether they are completely one or not? Because *tadbhāva* is the characteristic of oneness and that which is not known as ‘that’, – how can they be completely at one? They are not; they are not one, but are *aneka*, as *guṇa* and *guṇī*.

bhāvārtha: Occupying of different *pradeśas* is the differentia of *prathakatva* (separateness), and not being identically the same is the differentia of ‘otherness’. In substance and quality, there is no ‘separateness’ even so there is ‘otherness’.

Question: How can *anyatva* (otherness) be in them which are not separate (do not occupy different *pradeśas*)?

Answer: “Otherness” can be in them just like the whiteness of cloth; *pradeśas* (spatial units) of cloth and its whiteness are not different, and there is no separateness in them. Even it being so, whiteness is seen by only one sense organ-eye; it is not known by tongue, nose, etc., the remaining four senses, whereas cloth is known by all the five senses. Therefore, (in a certain respect) cloth is not whiteness, and whiteness is not cloth. If it were not so, then, like cloth, its whiteness must also be known by all senses, but it does not happen so; therefore, even though there being no separateness in whiteness and cloth, the otherness does exist between them.

In the same way, even though there being no separateness in the substance and its existence, etc., qualities, ‘otherness’ does exist; because, though spatial units of a substance and its qualities being the same- not different, there being distinction of name, number, characteristics nature, etc., in substance and its qualities, in certain respect, substance is not of the form of quality and quality is not of the form of a substance.

pravacana on gāthā 106

ātmā and *paramāṇu* are always separate. There is an eternal distinction of spatial points between them. ‘Separation of spatial points is the characteristic of *prthaktva* (separateness)’. Spatial points of *ātmā* and body are completely separate, spatial points of *ātmā* and *karma* are also separate. One *paramāṇu* of body is distinct from spatial

point of the second *paramāṇu* of body; hence, *ātmā* can do anything for another *ātmā* or body, etc. This chapter is on the principles of *jñeya*. Spatial points of *sva jñeya* are separate from spatial points of *para jñeya*.

Characteristic of *prthaktva* (separateness) is seen by distinction of spatial points. *ātmā*'s spatial points are distinct from body, *karma*, and other *ātmās*. Hence, no *ātmā* can do anything of another *ātmā*, or of body, etc. *ātmā* cannot show compassion towards someone else because their spatial points are separate.

It is not possible for attributes of existence and substance to have separate spatial points because there is an absence of separate spatial points between an attribute and beholder of attributes. In other words, they stay in one spatial space only. Spatial points of whiteness and of cloth are not separate. Part of the attribute of whiteness is a part of cloth itself; they are not separate by way of spatial points. Hence, there is no difference of spatial points between them. The way attribute of existence is spread over innumerable spatial points, similarly, *ātmā* is also with innumerable spatial points; hence there is no difference of spatial points between attribute and beholder of attributes.

Some may ask to be shown a simpler *vyavahāra* so that it is easy to follow; to them, it is said, listen! This is *vyavahāra*. To make the distinction between attribute and beholder of attributes, is *vyavahāra*. To leave the distinction between attribute and beholder of attribute and to be one, is *niścaya*. With focus on *niścaya*, auspicious thoughts which come for understanding the nature of self, that is *vyavahāra*. But there is no benefit in it.

If it is clearly understood that there is no distinction of spatial points between attribute and beholder of attributes, then one experiences *niścaya*; after that, if there is attachment due to instability, then *dharma* is not destroyed. Without understanding oneness of spatial points of attributes and beholder of attributes, if auspicious thoughts occur, then they are not said to be *dharma*.

Despite there being no distinction of spatial points between attribute of existence and *dravya*, there is a mutual state of *ānyatva* (separateness) between attribute of existence and *dravya* - the beholder of attributes; because there is presence of characteristic of *anyatva* between existence and substance.

atadbhāva (it is not that) is equal to not being of that form; that is characteristic of *ānyatva*.

In a certain way, substance is not the form of existence, and attribute of existence is not the form of substance. There is an absence of 'to be that form' between the attribute of existence and substance. This is because, when *jñāna* becomes *samyak*, then the complete substance does not become *samyak*. Complete substance cannot be in one infinitesimal part. One attribute cannot be the nature of infinite attributes and one attribute cannot be in the form of beholder of attributes; now this is explained with an example.

Whiteness of a cloth is known only through the eyes. But this whiteness cannot be known by touch, taste, smell or speech. So, whiteness is the subject of the ocular sense organ. Cloth can be known by touch, taste, smell, sight and speech, meaning, cloth can be known through five senses. Whiteness, which is known by way of the ocular sense organ, and only that is not the cloth, which is known by way of five sense organs. Cloth, which is known by the five sense organs, is not only whiteness, which is known by way of eyes only. Whiteness is an attribute, and cloth has many attributes – like whiteness, existence, softness etc.

jñeya substance, which is the subject of eyes, is not the form of *jñeya* which is the subject of five senses and *jñeya* substance, which is the subject of five senses, cannot be merely as much as the knowable substance which is the subject of eyes. Complete substance is not in one attribute. Because of this, there is no oneness in cloth and whiteness, meaning cloth and whiteness have *atadbhāva* (is not that). In this way there is a distinction between attribute of existence – the *guṇa* and substance – the *guṇī*.

1. Existence is with auspices of *dravya*, and *dravya* is not with auspices of any other substance: –

Other attributes are also with auspices of *dravya*, but substance does not have auspices of another substance. Substance gives auspices to attributes but itself does not take the auspices of someone. So, substance is the giver of auspices (the one who gives auspices). Existence is not the same way in a substance as *ghee* (clarified butter) is in a vessel; because there is a difference of spatial points between vessel and *ghee*, but there is no distinction of spatial points between existence and substance. The way colour, smell, etc., are present in mango; existence is present in the same way in substance.

2. *sattā*, (attribute of existence) is, *nirguṇa*, and substance is in the form of infinite attributes: –

The way attribute of colour does not become the attribute of touch, similarly attribute of knowledge does not become attribute of effort or belief. In the attribute of existence, no other attribute enters, or in one attribute, no other attribute can possibly enter, so the attribute of existence is *nirguṇa* (without any attributes). There are infinite attributes in the substance, so substance is with attributes. (The way stick and holder of the stick have a difference of spatial points. However, substance and attributes have the same spatial points. There is a difference in spatial points between stick and holder of stick, but spatial points of substance and attributes are undivided).

3. Attribute of existence is one attribute, and substance is in the form of infinite attributes: –

In attribute of existence there is no other attribute, only the attribute of existence is present. If attribute of knowledge is taken, then it is made of only the attribute of knowledge. Similarly, each and every attribute should be understood. Hence, existence is made of only one attribute.

Substance is made of infinite attributes. Many attributes, like existence, knowledge, belief, conduct, etc., are present in *ātmā*. In *pudgala*, many attributes like existence, touch, taste, smell, colour, etc. are present.

4. *sattā* (existence of attribute) is *viśeṣaṇa* (distinctive), and substance is *viśeṣya* (substantive): -

Attribute of existence is a characteristic, it is the indication to recognise substance, and substance is that which is qualified, meaning substance is that which is recognised through its qualifying characteristics; the way *ātmā* is the substance and it is recognised by way of its qualifying characteristics of knowledge, belief, conduct, effort, etc. Similarly attribute of existence is *viśeṣaṇa* (distinctive), and substance is *viśeṣya* (substantive/one who is qualified); even then, there is no distinction of spatial points between distinctive and substantive.

5. *sattā* is *vidhāyaka* (one who creates), and substance is *vidhīyamāna* (one which is being created):-

Attribute of existence is *vidhāyaka* (one who creates). All attributes create the substance, or attributes are the ones which create the substance. Substance is *vidhīyamāna* (one which is being created). Substance is that which is created by attributes. It is not made by any non-self substance, but it is created by its own attributes and is complete in itself.

6. *sattā* is *ṛittisvarūpa* (state of modality/ with modification), and substance is *ṛittimāna* (that which is always present):-

That existence is not a substance, which is with auspice of another, is without attributes, is made of one attribute, is distinct, it shows and is with modification. Substance is without auspice of any other, is shown and is by nature permanent. Substance, which has the above six characteristics, is not the attribute of existence, which is with the above first six characteristics.

Here, example of only attribute of existence has been given. In this way, each attribute is not the substance, and substance is not an attribute. *ātmā* is not *jñāna*, and *jñāna* is not *ātmā*. Attribute is not substance, and substance is not attribute; hence, they have an absence of *tadbhāva* (to be so). This means, they have *atadbhāva* (not to be so), meaning that which is an attribute is not the nature of substance and that which is substance is not the nature of attribute. Attribute of existence and substance have an undivided-ness in some ways, meaning they do not have separation of spatial points, even then, they do not have complete oneness, because to be in the form of the other is the sign of oneness, but it is not known in the form of the other. They cannot be completely the same. Therefore, attribute and substance are separate, and in some ways, they are not one.

ātmā, body, as well as *karma*, are eternally separate. They have differences in spatial points, and *ātmā*, the substance and *guṇa* have *atadbhāva*. They both don't have separate spatial points, but have distinction of attributes. Modifications of both are separate. Without having this kind of clear knowledge, and understanding of the meaning of *sāmāyika*, if it is merely read and is believed to be *sāmāyika*, then that is not the real *sāmāyika* or real vows.

In reality, *ātmā* cannot keep the body motionless, because existence of body and existence of *ātmā* are completely separate and even their spatial points are separate. There is no owner of any substance; even then, ignorant believes that he can make the body sit, make good use of money and body, and *karma* is the reason for transmigration of *ātmā* - but this is his delusion. Without appropriate knowledge, ego does not go, and *jīva* does not experience real peace, and neither does he experience the real *svajñeya*.

To believe that self can keep, join, leave, protect or transmigrate one substance which has separate spatial points from another substance is an erroneous belief.

ātmā does not stay with auspices of the body, and it does not even stay with auspices of its own attributes; because *ātmā* gives auspices to its attributes. One attribute is with auspices of its own substance, but one substance is not with auspices of its attributes.

Here, it is said that *ātmā* does not have auspices of its own attributes, then the belief that *ātmā* is with the auspices of body, money, wealth, *deva-guru-śāstra*, and it survives because of them, is filled with ignorance.

Question: Was it not said in the early discourse that attribute is base and substance is *ādheya* (based on it)?

Answer: Listen! There it was explained that substance and attribute – is..is..is, if attribute does not exist, then substance also will not exist. This means that attribute is the base, and substance is that on which it is based. Presence of both was to be established, meaning it was said that where attribute is, substance will be there. Whereas, here, it is being explained that if *ātmā* is not with the auspices of one of its own attributes then it cannot exist with the auspices of substance-attribute-modification of another *ātmā*, because there is a distinction of spatial points between the two.

Book is not with the auspices of the wooden table, and neither is it with auspices of only the attribute of existence. Similarly, *ātmā* is not with auspices of *karma*, and neither is *karma* with auspices of *ātmā*. A poor man is not due to auspices of the rich man; *jīva* with transmigration is not with auspices of *Bhagavāna*, and student is not dependent on the teacher. Every substance is complete by itself, and its spatial points are separate from non-self. To say that they are due to auspices of each other and they are due to each other is the thought of ignorance.

Body and *ātmā* have separate spatial points; even then, to believe that *ātmā* is due to body and body walks due to *ātmā* is ignorance.

pravacana on bhāvārtha of gāthā 106

Spatial points of body and *ātmā* are separate and separate spatial points are the characteristic of distinctiveness. *atadbhāva* (not to be that), is the characteristic of *anyatva* (to be otherwise). Spatial points of substance and its attribute are not separate, but there is a distinctiveness between them, meaning they have *atadbhāva* because attribute is not the complete substance, and complete substance is not one attribute. Therefore, this proves plurality between attribute and substance.

Question: How can there be a distinctness between those which are not separate by way of spatial points? Spatial points of attribute and substance are the same, then how can there be separateness or distinctness between attribute and substance? Spatial points of *ātmā* and body or *ātmā* and *karma* are separate, so it is possible for *ātmā* and body or *ātmā* and *karma* to be separate, but when there is no separation of spatial points between *ātmā* and its attributes, then how can there be a distinctiveness between them?

Answer: Like cloth and whiteness, there can be distinctions between them. Spatial points of cloth and whiteness are not separate; hence, there is no otherness between them. Despite this being so, whiteness is the subject of only the sense of sight, and it is not a subject of the other four senses and cloth is known by all five senses. So, whiteness is not the cloth, and cloth is not whiteness.

If it were not so, and whiteness and cloth were to be one, then like cloth, whiteness also should be known by all five senses, or like whiteness, cloth also should be only the subject of the sense of sight, but it is not so. Whiteness is the subject of only the sense of sight, and cloth is the subject of all five senses, so based on this, it is decided that characteristics of both these are separate.

With this example, it is decided that even though substance and attribute of existence, etc., do not have separation of spatial points, they do have *anyatva* (to be as otherwise). Spatial points of substance and attribute are not separate, even if there is a difference in name, number, characteristic, etc., substance is not like attribute in some ways, and attribute is not like substance in some ways.

1. *sañjñā* - Name is called *sañjñā*. The name of attribute is an attribute, and the name substance is substance, meaning, by way of distinction of name, they are separate.
2. *sañkhyā* - There are infinite attributes in number, and substance is one in number, so there is a difference in number between them.
3. *lakṣaṇa* – Characteristic of attribute is to be with the auspices of some other; one attribute is not present in another attribute, and it creates the substance.

Characteristic of substance is to give auspices to attributes; it is a conglomeration of many attributes, and there is indivisibility in substance.

So, though there is no distinction of spatial points between substance and attribute by way of name, number, characteristic, etc., there is a distinction.

Question: By explaining this distinction, what is being explained? For *nirvikalpa* (unwavering pure psychic activity) state, all kinds of distinctions have been negated. In sermons, only understanding of the undivided *ātmā* is given.

Answer: With a focus on supreme peace, *jñāna* is purified. *jñāna* does not become the reason for attachments just because it knows in many ways. There are infinite types of *jñeyas*. *rāga* does not occur because of innumerable types of *jñeyas*. If it were the reason for attachments, then *Kevalī Bhagavāna*, who knows infinite *jñeyas*, should have attachments, but that is not the case.

Reason for attachments is not the knowledge in different types of forms.

Various types of knowledge are not the reason for attachment, and even many types of *karmas* are not the reason for attachment.

Reason for attachments is the efficacy of *rāga* of the *rāgī jīva*. In *śāstras*, it has been said that disposition tilted towards non-self is the cause of attachments, but non-self is not the cause of attachments.

Attachment does not arise by thinking about the distinction between substance–attribute or substance-attribute-modification as it is the modification of *jñāna*; but *rāgī jīva* has a part of *rāga*, so attachment arises.

Distinction of attribute-substance in *ātmā*, is not the reason for attachments. Knowing that there is a distinction between attribute–substance, is also not the reason for attachments.

It is not that because *ātmā* has different attributes like *darśana*, *jñāna cāritra*, hence attachments occur. There are such infinite attributes in *ātmā*. *jīva* can have *jñāna* of infinite things, but *rāga* does not arise in him.

The way substance-attribute-modification is not the reason for attachments; in the same way, knowing of substance attribute modification is also not the reason for attachments.

Division and undivided one whole, both, are the nature of a substance. If attachments would arise due to modifications or distinctions, then even *Kevalī Bhagavāna* should have *rāga*, but that does not happen. *rāgī jīva* has *rāga* according to his own efficacy and level of understanding. *rāga* arises, and to break this *rāga*, one must focus on the undivided and stabilise on it.

Question: In *Pravacanasāra*, knowing substance-attribute-modification as separate, has been said to be the reason for arising of blemish free *jñāna* and reason for *vītarāgatā*.

In *Niyamasāra*, having a distinctness of substance-attribute-modification has been said to be an act of necessary dependency. It is said that till *jīva* is stuck in this kind of distinction, he will not have *niścaya āvaśyaka* (absolute necessity/ experience of pure self). There is a difference between these two statements, why is that so?

Answer: In *Pravacanasāra*, knowing has been done through distinctions, it is with the focus on supreme peace, but not to increase attachments. If the appropriate understanding of self-knowable and non-self-knowable is done, then the greatness of self-nature is understood. Without knowing, who can be experienced? Where will equanimity be? In *Pravacanasāra* definition of *samyaktva* is principally from the view of *jñāna*. In *Niyamasāra*, it is said that, after knowing the distinctions, if one stops at distinctions, then *dharma* will not arise. Here, thoughts of distinction and attachments have been negated, but knowledge of substance-attribute-modification has not been negated. There, by negating thoughts of distinction and attachments, focus has been turned on *ātmā*. For experience of this undivided one, explanation is from the predominance of belief. Therefore, these two are not opposing statements. It is important to understand the meaning of whatever has been said, and where it is said.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā 107* ❧

अथातद्भावमुदाहृत्य प्रथयति --

Now, *atadbhāva* (non-identity/ it is not that) is clarified through an example: -

सद्दुव्वं सच्च गुणो सच्चेव य पज्जओ त्ति वित्थारो ।

जो खलु तस्स अभावो सो तदभावो अतब्भावो ॥ १०७ ॥

saddavvaṃ sacca guṇo sacceva ya pajjao tti vitthāro |

jo khalu tassa abhāvo so tadabhāvo atabbhāvo || 107 ||

Meaning: Extension of *sattā guṇa* (attribute of existence) is of threefold type – *dravya* (substance), is *saṭ* (existent), *guṇa* (attribute) is *saṭ* (existent) and *pariyāya* (modification) is *saṭ* (existent). Among these, the mutual absence of one into another, i.e. absence of *tad-abhāva* or absence of being of that form, is *atadbhāva* (non-identity).

ṭīkā: As a necklace of pearls is extended in three forms - namely in the form of necklace, string and pearls; so, one substance is extended in three forms- namely in the form of substance, attribute and modification.

And as whiteness-quality of one pearl necklace is extended in three forms-namely in the form of white necklace, white string and white pearl; in the same way, *sattāguṇa*(attribute of existence) of one substance extends in three forms - namely in the form of *saṭdravya*(existent substance), *saṭ guṇa*(existent quality), and *saṭ pariyāya* (existent modification).

And as in one ‘pearl necklace’, attribute of whiteness is not the necklace, or string, or pearl and as necklace, string, and pearl are not the attribute of whiteness, thus they have a mutual absence of one into another, i.e. *tad abhāva lakṣṇa*, or ‘characteristics of not being that’ or ‘absence of being that form’ is *atadbhāva* (non-identity) which is the cause of *ānyatva* (otherness). Similarly, in one substance, quality of existence is not the substance, or another quality of substance, or a modification; and substance, which is another quality or modification, is not the attribute of existence of this. Thus, they have a mutual absence in one another, i.e., *tad-abhāva-lakṣṇa* or characteristics of not being that or absence of being of that form is *atadbhāva* (non-identity) which is the cause of otherness.

bhāvārtha: In the extended narration of one *ātmā*, it is said to be in three forms-namely in the form of *ātmadravya* (*ātmā*-substance), *jñāna*, etc., *guṇa* (knowledge, etc., attribute) and *siddhatva*, etc., (disembodied, omniscient state, etc.) *pariyāya* (modification). In the same way, all other substances should be understood.

And, as *astitva guṇa* (attribute of existence) of *ātmā* is extended/narrated in three forms—namely in the form of *saṭ ātma dravya* (existent *ātma* substance), *saṭ jñāna*, etc., *guṇa* (existent knowledge, etc., attribute) and *saṭ, siddhatva, etc. paryāya* (existent disembodied omniscient, etc., modification). In the same way, we must understand about all other substances.

And, as *astitva guṇa* (attribute of existence) of one *ātmā* is not the substance *ātmā* (besides the attribute of existence), attribute of *jñāna*, etc., are not so, and neither are the modifications of *siddhatva*, etc., and that which is the substance *ātmā* (besides attribute of existence), or *jñāna*, etc., *guṇa* or *siddhatva, etc. paryāya* is not *astitva guṇa* (attribute of existence) - thus there is mutual non-identity (*atad-bhāva*) between them and owing to this there is ‘otherness’ in them. Similarly, we must understand about all other substances. So, in this verse, *atad-bhāva* has been explained with the example of attribute of existence.

(Here, it should be specially understood that whatever has been said about *sattāguṇa* (attribute of existence), the same should be appropriately understood in relation to other attributes. e.g., like attribute of existence, attribute of effort can be elaborated as *purūṣārthi ātmadravya* (substance with effort), *purūṣārthi jñānatva guṇa* (effort with qualities of knowledge, etc.) *purūṣārthi siddhatva ādi paryāya* (modification with effort of state of liberation, etc.) This elaboration has been done because spatial points are undivided. But as there is a distinctness of name-characteristics-effort, attributes of effort and the substance *ātmā*, attribute of *jñāna*, etc., or modification of state of *siddha* have *atadbhāva* (otherness). This *atadbhāva* is the reason for *anyatva* (distinctness) between them.

pravacana on gāthā 107

In *gāthā 106*, it was explained that even though substance and attributes do not have the distinction of spatial points, they do have the distinction of name, number, and characteristics. Now *atadbhāva* (otherness) will be clarified in *gāthā 107*.

Existence of one *ātmā* is separate from another *ātmā*, and it is also separate from the existence of other substances; it does not mix with anyone. Attribute of existence have been elaborated in three ways. The one with efficacies, efficacies and infinitesimal parts – all three together make one undivided existing substance; even then, between them, there exists *atadbhāva*. That which is the substance is not attribute or modification; that which is an attribute, is not a substance or modification and that which is modification is not substance or attribute. The absence of being that form, is *atadbhāva* (separateness).

Understanding the nature of substance in this appropriate manner is the reason for *samyagjñāna* (true knowledge). To know infinite substances, attributes and modifications, is not the cause of attachments. Allegation is made that distinction of substance-attribute-modification is the reason for attachments because *rāgī*, who is with

thoughts of divisions/separation, has attachments. If knowing of substance-attribute-modification is done without attachment, then it is not the cause of attachments.

In the seventh verse of *Samayasāra*, it has been said that distinctions like *jñāna*, *darśana*, and *cāritra* are due to *vyavahāra*, and from the view of *niścaya* these kinds of distinctions are not present in *ātmā*. There it is said that if one gets stuck in the distinction between attribute-substance, then he will not attain *samyaktva*. Here in *Pravacanasāra*, it has been said that the three distinctions in substance, which are existent substance, existent attribute, and existent modification, are the reason for blemish-free *jñāna*. So, would these *śāstras* be having opposing concepts/philosophy? No! Because there cannot be opposing statements between any *śāstras*.

jīva with attachments has thoughts of attachments only. In *Samayasāra*, this statement is made to get him to be at one with pure nature and to leave focus on distinctions. *jīva* with attachments is focused towards attachments. Therefore, thoughts of distinctions are blamed for being the cause of attachments, and the thought that – “I am undivided”, arises, but that too is not the pure nature of self. *jñānī jīva* turns towards pure self-nature. The distinction that this is pure nature, and self has to think about it, does not arise at the time of self-experience. In unperturbed experience, there is complete undividedness.

In *Pravacanasāra*, the expanse of all three, substance-attribute-modification has been explained. It is the cause for the blemish-free state and pure psychic activity of *jñāna* with a focus on *praśama* (tranquillity).

Nature of substance is to be with division. Nature of division is not the reason for attachments. Attachment does not arise because there is knowing of distinction of self and/or non-self, in *jñāna*. But attachment occurs to a *rāgī jīva* due to his own ability. Knowledge and knowable are not the reason for attachments.

When *jīva* has attachments, then it is alleged that the reason for his attachment is the distinction between attributes. *jñānī* cannot be stable in his knowing nature, so to attain purity, he increases his *jñāna* with a focus on *praśama* (tranquillity). This is not merely reading the pages of a *śāstra* or study of auspicious attachments. Effort and study, which is done with a focus on unperturbed nature, is the reason for increase in *jñāna*.

jñānī gives guidance to leave thoughts of distinctions and to attain the undivided-seamless *jñāna*. Distinction of substance-attribute-modification in substance, arises due to thoughts of modification – but it has not been stated that knowing of these distinctions should be left. Multiple-ness of *jñeya* comes in *jñāna*, and that is not the reason for attachments. *rāgī jīva* focuses on distinctions, and then, due to his own ability, attachments arise. So, it is said that one must focus on the undivided.

In this *gāthā*, the example of attribute of existence has been given. Similarly, other attributes also have the same expanse and should be understood so.

An attribute is not a substance, and it is also not another attribute or modification – due to this, there is *atadbhāva* between them. The entire substance cannot enter into one attribute. Substance is a mass of many attributes – hence *atadbhāva* is present, but there is no distinction of spatial points between them.

If one attribute were to become the beholder of attributes, then from one attribute, benefit of another attribute should be available, but that does not happen. Benefit comes by focusing on the permanent substance. If focus is only on one modifying attribute, it won't result in a pure manifestation of all the other attributes. One attribute is not the beholder of attributes (substance), and substance does not have only one attribute. In *paramāṇu* (smallest unit of physical matter), attribute of existence is not the complete substance and complete substance does not enter into the attribute of existence.

There is no *paramāṇu* (physical matter), in this *ātmā*, which is *paramātmā* (supreme *ātmā*), and there is no *parama ātmā* in non-living physical matter. There exists a distinction of modification in both. This kind of *bheda-jñāna* (knowledge of distinction) is the reason for passionless-ness.

Attribute of existence is not the complete substance; because substance is with attributes. One attribute is not infinite attributes; infinite attributes are not one attribute. With this kind of distinction in knowing of substance, exceptional purity in *jñāna* is created, but it is not the reason for attachments. It is the reason for being free of attachments, meaning it is the reason for a passionless state, for being free of impurities, and for manifestation of purity.

Ignorant *jīva*, who always believes attribute-substance to be one does not have appropriate knowledge, which is the *nimitta* cause of pure psychic activity. Correct knowledge only is the reason for experience of self.

At the time of experience, *samyagdṛṣṭi jīvas*, they do have *samyag jñāna* - which is that there is a distinction in certain ways, between attribute-substance; but there is no knowing that attribute-substance are always one. Many *jñeyas* are known in substance, and knowing this multiple-ness is not the cause of attachments. To leave thoughts of distinction and to bring about an undivided state, or to stabilise thoughts in the undivided is focus. In the seventh verse of *Samayasāra*, it has been said that distinction of attributes of *darśanā-jñānā-cāritra*, etc., should not be made.

There is no problem in *jīva* knowing all knowables through *jñānā*. Nature of *jñānā* is only to know. Nature of substance (*ātmā*) is not such that if one undivided *ātmā* is known, then there will be no attachment, but if many are known, then there will be attachment.

Pure psychic state comes on leaving attachments. Unperturbed state will not arise by leaving the knowing of multiple-ness. Removing knowledge of distinctions is not the reason for an unperturbed state. There is *atadbhāva* among substance, attribute, and

modification. They are known exactly the way they are. Substance and attribute are not separate, in the way *ātmā* and other substances are separate, because there is no distinction of spatial points between them. Substance and attribute are not completely separate, because in them, there is a distinction of name, number, characteristics, etc.

One string of pearls is elaborated in three ways – by way of necklace, by way of thread and by way of pearls.

ātmā and *paramāṇu* are separate substances. *ātmā* cannot change *paramāṇu* because there is an absence of existence of one in the existence of another. But it is not that existence of self is not present in substance-attribute-modification of self. The entire substance, which is a mass of substance-attribute-modification, is spread over all three, in the form of beholder of efficacies, and in the form of a part. In this way, the total substance is a mass of *dravya-guna-paryāya*(substance-attribute-modification), and it extends over all three.

For knowledge to become completely unperturbed, *jñāna* is divided into three parts. It is important to understand the viewpoint. Knowledge of divisions does not lead to attachments. Hence, it is not so that knowledge of distinctions should not be made at all.

It is being explained that one existence is pervading in all three.

Expanse of one substance is done, by way of substance, by way of attribute and by way of modification. Substance is not just in the substance, but it also pervades in attribute and modification.

Existence of substance and attributes is permanent, and existence of modification is of one *samaya*. If existence of that *samaya* is not present in modification then who decides that modification exists? If substance exists, but infinitesimal parts are not there, then existence of substance will not be proved. If modification is in the form of a part, then the entire substance is proved. At any point, if the present part is not in existence, then substance itself will not remain.

If a substance were to be without the infinitesimal parts, then substance itself would not be proved. Every *samaya* there is an undivided pervasion of all three parts.

Substance is in the generality of substance; attribute is in attributes, and substance is in modification. Like the garland of pearls, substance pervades in all three.

ātmā-substance-is completely free and is, by nature, un-bonded. He does not try to know this and stops in auspicious attachments and perturbation due to his own ignorance. He who believes auspicious attachments to be everything, loses the opportunity to become independent, unperturbed, and free of perturbed thoughts. Listen! Understand what is your existence! Only then you can revere the self.

One existence pervades in substance, attribute and modification.

If existence proves only existence of attribute, then substance and modification are not proved.

If existence proves only existence of modification, then substance and attribute are not proved.

If existence proves only existence of substance-attribute, then modification is not proved.

Hence, one existence pervades substance-attribute-modification, and it proves all three.

Expanse of necklace has been described in three ways - attribute of whiteness of pearls, white thread, and white pearls. Whiteness is not just in the necklace, or only in thread, or only in pearls, but is spread in all three. In the same way, attribute of existence, is in substance, is in other attributes and is in modification.

Existence of *ātmā* is not in non-self substances, but it is undivided in substance-attribute-modification of its self. Whole existence pervades the entire area of substance. With a real understanding of such an existence, ego in non-self ends and *samyajjñāna* manifests.

Without knowledge that existence of self is not in *nimitta*, and existence of *nimitta* is not in self, how can belief and decision of *dharma* arise?

Till here, it was said that attribute of existence pervades in all three; now it will be said that there is a mutual *atadbhāva* among substance, attribute, and modification.

In one necklace, that which is attribute of whiteness is not the necklace, it is not the thread, and neither is it the pearl. That which is the necklace, thread and pearl, is not the attribute of whiteness – characteristic of *tad abhāva* or *atadbhāva* is this kind of absence of one into another, and to be that way, is the reason for *anyatva* (distinction); similarly, attribute of existence of one substance is not the substance, is not other attributes or modification.

1. That which is attribute of existence, is not substance; because substance is a mass of infinite attributes. If attribute of existence itself were to be a substance, then substance cannot be a mass of infinite attributes. Therefore, existence of attribute is not the substance. This being so, there is otherness between attribute and substance.
2. Attribute of existence is not any other attribute: – attribute of existence is not any other attribute, meaning, it is not in the form of knowledge, belief, etc., Infinitesimal part of attribute of existence is in the attribute of existence, but it is not in any other attribute. Part of *jñāna* as infinitesimal part of *jñāna* is okay. But part of *jñāna* is not part of the infinitesimal part of attribute of *cāritra*, or as part of any other attribute, so there is *atadbhāva* between one attribute and another.

3. That which is attribute of existence, is not modification: – if one attribute were to enter only in one modification, then in the second *samaya*, second modification cannot manifest, and with destruction of modification, the situation of destruction of that attribute also will arise. But this is not so. From attribute, many modifications *manifest*; therefore, attribute is not only as much as modification. Hence, there is *atadbhāva* between attribute and modification. So, attribute of existence is not the substance; it is not any other attribute; in the same way, it is also not modification, and that which is modification is not the attribute of existence. There is an absence of being as another, among one another, meaning, there is *atadbhāva* which is the reason for distinction. With example of attribute of existence, it should be understood that there is otherness between each and every attribute and substance, between every attribute and other attributes, and between attribute and modification. There is *atadbhāva*, because of which there is *anyatva*.

Existence of substance – substance is in the form of its existence, and it is not in the form of existence of attribute or modification.

Existence of attribute – attribute is in the form of its existence, and it is not in the form of existence of substance or modification.

Existence of modification – modification is in the form of its existence, and it is not in the form of the existence of substance or attribute.

Between substance, attribute, and modification, there is a distinction of name, number and characteristics. However, they do not have the distinction of spatial points. This nature of *anekānta* should be understood; and that is the reason for knowledge, happiness and *dharma*.

Question: If so much knowing is done, then when will the knowledge get rest?

Answer: Listen! Reducing the unfettered nature of *jñāna* and making it narrow is not resting. That *jīva* is stopping his own *jñāna*. Nature of *jñāna* of *ātmā* is to know oneself as complete and undivided. It is to know substances of three-time phases, of three worlds in one *samaya*. Reverence of the ability of such a nature should arise.

To believe that nature of *jñāna* is with such immense efficacies is resting of focus, and to become undivided within the complete nature is complete rest.

Question: Till when this kind of *jñāna* should be done?

Answer: Neglecting *jñāna* and narrowing it, does not give rest to *jñāna*. Much may have been heard, but when special knowing arises with a focus on self, then narrowness of *jñāna* reduces and *jñāna* expands. *rāga* also reduces, and *vītarāgtā* increases. This is resting of *jñāna* and *cāritra*. The womb of *jñāna* is extremely large. It is the womb, in which the entire *lokāloka* can fit, and it is such that it removes all confusion.

To know self-knowable by existence of substance, attribute of existence, and existence of modification in the correct form, and is the reason for *samyajjñāna* and *dharma*.

Infinite *ātmās* and *paramāṇus* are separate, and in every substance, there are three distinctions. All *ātmās* and *paramāṇus* put together is not one *dravya*. But the three way distinction of substance, attribute and modification is in one substance only.

ātmā does not have ownership of body, because both are separate. Within *ātmā*, there is *atadbhāva* between substance, attribute and modification; because of that, there is *anyatva*. In one *ātmā*, there are three separate parts. Amongst them, that which is one part is not the second part; even then, there is no distinction of spatial points between them. That which is a substance is not an attribute, and that which is an attribute is not a substance – due to this distinction, there is *atadbhāva* between them.

Substance is substantive, and attribute is a qualifier. *dravya* is in the form of connected eternal mass of efficacies through three-time phases. Attributes of *jñāna*, etc., are its efficacies, and state of *siddha*, etc., infinitesimal parts, are the presently modifying *paryāya*(modification). Every *jīva*, be it with transmigration or *siddha*, has been described in these three ways.

Many believe that in the state of transmigration, *jīvas* stay separate, but after *mokṣa*, they all become one. This belief is incorrect because even there, every *Siddha jīva* stays separate. Every *Siddha ātmā* has also been described in three ways - the generality of substance, efficacies like *jñāna*, *darśana*, and state of *siddha*. Substance, attribute and modification are present as *atadbhāva*, in this manner.

Ignorant argues that if the all-pervasive is meditated upon, then an unperturbed state will arise. But listen! Without a correct understanding of the nature of self, meditation is not possible. Efficacy of one *samaya* of *kevalajñāna* is to know the three-time phases and three worlds; even then, this part is only for one *samaya*, and it is a modification of the attribute of only *jñāna*. Substance is a mass of infinite such attributes like *jñāna*, etc.

Modification is not an attribute, attribute is not substance, and substance is not modification. By understanding this kind of mutual-not to be so, and with appropriate knowledge of all three, experience of that which is with the ability of being un-distinct, un-divided, and with strength, arise. This correct focus will bring *dharma*.

Without this knowledge, real meditation cannot occur. *ātmā* is in the form of common generality of substance, is like attributes of *jñāna*, etc., and is in the form of state of *siddha*, etc. It has been explained with this triple expanse. Nature of all substances should be understood in the same way.

The explanation elaborates on the efficacy of existence of one *ātmā*, in the existence of substance, in existence of attributes of *darśana*, etc., and in modification of *siddhatva*, etc.

In *ātmā*, there is not only one attribute, meaning, it is not as much as only one attribute of existence, attribute of conduct, or attribute of faith. It has infinite attributes, and one

existence is not just in one modification, but it is in every modification. Existence of self is not in any other substance; because of this, it is not due to some other, and existence is not only as much as that which would be in one modification. But existence is spread in all three – substance, attribute, and modification.

Attribute of existence of one *ātmā* is not the entire *ātma* substance; it is not attribute of *jñāna*, etc., is not modification of state of *siddha*, etc. That which is *ātmā*, is attribute of *jñāna*, etc., or modification of state of *siddha*, etc., and they are not the attribute of existence. In this way, there is a mutual *atadbhāva* between substance-attribute-modification.

Here, it is to be noted that whatever has been said about the attribute of existence is applicable to the other attributes as well, like attribute of strength is in *ātma* substance. It applies to other attributes like *jñāna*, etc., also, and is in modification of the state of *siddha* as well. In the same way, expanse of each and every attribute can also be done; even then, taking into consideration name, number, characteristic and work, attribute of *vīrya* has *atadbhāva* with substance and modification, which is the reason for *anyatva*. Despite having non-distinct spatial points, complete *ātmā* does not enter in attribute of *vīrya*. Similarly, attribute of *vīrya* does not change into the form of other attributes, and attribute of *vīrya* is not merely the modification. There is *atadbhāva* amongst them.

In a *paramāṇu*, there is no distinction of spatial points between its substance, attribute of touch, etc., and its modifications. Even then, *dravya* is not merely one attribute of touch, attribute of touch does not become any other attribute, and one modification does not become the complete substance; in this way, they have mutual *atadbhāva*.

jīvas who are *niśayābhāsī* (with pseudo absolutism), like the argument of only singular erroneous absolutism or singular non-duality. They do not acquire the correct knowing that substance-attribute-modification has a large expanse and show a distinct disinterest towards true knowledge.

Ignorant *jīva* says that, after death, a person merges into the infinite, but existence of every *siddha* in the state of *siddha* is separate.

Those *jīvas* who attain the state of *kevala*, are not plagued with an incurable disease at the time of death; their bodies are not diseased, but their bodies are like *śfatika* (cornelian-precious stone); they do not eat food. Such are the characteristic of that body, and within them, *anaṅta catuṣṭaya*, *kevalajñāna*, *vītarāgatā* has manifested. This is the state of *kevalajñāni*. These are characteristics of *jīvas* who attain *kevalajñāna*.

A true seeker accepts every *ātmā* and *paramāṇu* to be separate. He does not believe that one substance can do anything of another substance. Existence of self does not pervade into non-self, but it pervades in the substance-attribute-modification of self; even then, there is mutual *atadbhāva* among the three, substance-attribute-modification. A seeker believes this, and he leaves his body with the experience of self and has a peaceful

death. They become celestial beings and have only one life left of transmigration, after which they will attain *kevalajñāna*. Without true knowledge of substance-attribute-modification, ignorant say that someone attained the supreme state while doing benediction of *Bhagavāna*. To them, it is asked, what is the body? What is benediction? Appropriate knowledge of these should be gained. Body is physical matter, and it's a non-self substance. Benediction/reverential singing is an auspicious, distorted state. *ātmā* is separate from this body, and this auspicious distorted state. *dharma* does not arise through *punya*. To play within such an *ātmā* along with *samyajjñāna* is *cāritra*. *jīva* who conjoins himself to his own self, along with this *samyajjñāna*, that *jīva* is a *yogī*. Therefore, appropriate learning of the self-knowable should be done.

In *Niyamasāra*, it is said that the *muni* who divides and stays in substance-attribute-modification, have non-self necessity (*vyvahanāra*) but does not have absolute necessity (*nīścaya*). There the meaning is that, *jīva* is stuck in attachments and separations. To destroy these, and to focus towards the undivided sentient, this has been said. Keeping focus on the undivided, *jñāna* should be made exceptionally pure. Knowing self-knowable and non-self-knowable with a focus on extreme tranquility is not the reason for attachments.

This is the chapter on *jñeya*, so to know by separating *svajñeya* and *parajñeya* is the reason for *samyagdarśana* and *vītarāgatā*—so it has been said here.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā* 108 ❧

अथ सर्वथाऽभावलक्षणत्वमतद्भावस्य निषेधयति

Now, it is negated that absolute absence (non-existence) is the characteristic of ‘non-identity’ (*atadbhāva*):

जं दव्वं तं ण गुणो जो वि गुणो सो ण तच्चमत्थादो ।
एसो हि अतब्भावो णेव अभावो त्ति णिद्धिदो ॥ १०८ ॥

*jaṃ davvam taṃ ṇa guṇo jo vi guṇo so ṇa taccamatthādo |
eso hi atabbhāvo ṇeva abhāvo tti ṇiddhiḍḍho || 108 ||*

Meaning: From the viewpoint of substance, that which is a *dravya*(substance), is not a *guṇa* (attribute), and that which is a *guṇa* (attribute) is not a *dravya*(substance) indeed; (because) this is *atadbhāva*(non-identity), absolute absence (non-existence) is not *atadhāva*(non-identity)-this is as revealed by omniscient *jīna*.

īkū: In a substance, that which is *dravya*(substance) is not *guṇa*(attribute), and that which is *guṇa*(attribute) is not a *dravya*(substance) - thus *dravya*’s “not being” form of a *guṇa* or *guṇa*’s “not being” form of *dravya*, is *atadbhāva*(non-identity), because by this principle alone *anyatva* (otherness) is established/justified. But absence (non-existence) of *dravya* is *guṇa*, and absence (non-existence) of *guṇa* is *dravya* - such sort of characteristic of absence (non-existence) is not the not-being form of *atadbhāva*(non-identity). If this were true, then it would result either in ‘the plurality’ of one substance or into *śūnyatva* (nothingness/nihilility) of both substance and attribute or into *apoharūpatā* (absolute negation-form). This is explained below:

(The following three faults will arise in believing that the absence of *dravya* is *guṇa* and absence of *guṇa* is *dravya*.)

1. As absence (non-existence) of *cetana dravya* (sentient substance) is *acetana dravya* (non-sentient substance), and absence (non-existence) of *acetana dravya* is *cetana dravya* - thus there is plurality in them; in the same way, absence of *dravya* would be *guṇa* and absence of *guṇa* would be *dravya* - then there would be plurality in substance, even though it being one.

(or the second fault, which is of both sides being non-existent, is in this way:)

2. The way within the absence (non-existence) of gold there is non-existence of quality of *svaṇatva* (being gold in general) and in absence (non-existence) of the ‘quality of being gold’, there is non-existence of gold, and thus there would be absolute

nihility/nothingness of both (gold and quality of being gold); in the same way, in case of non-existence of *dravya* (substance) there would be non-existence of *guṇa* (attribute), and with non-existence of *guṇa*(attribute) there would be non-existence of substance, which will result in absolute nihility/nothingness of both substance and quality.

(or there would be a situation of only denial, which would be the third fault)

3. As merely the non-existence of cloth would be pot and merely the non-existence of pot would be cloth - both would have a form of *apoharūptā* (absolute negation). In the same way, merely non-existence of substance would be attribute, and merely non-existence of attribute would be substance - so that both would have *apoharūptā* (absolute negation form).

Therefore, he who wishes to have oneness, *aśūnyatva* (non-nihility) and *anapohatv*(non-negation-ness) of substance and quality must accept *atadbhāva* (non-identity or not being so) as described above.

pravacana on gāthā 108

If this chapter on knowable is known correctly, then one's inner eye in the form of *samyagjñāna* will open, and will never close again, meaning false belief will not remain. By knowing infinite substances, infinite attributes and infinite modifications - delusion will be removed; but since eternity, *jīva* has given importance only to non-self substances and has been engrossed in that. Either he is waiting for someone to do him a favour, or some are completely submerged in pedantic rituals, and some are stuck in giving importance to only auspicious activities, due to which they do not have the magnificence of self's nature. Money comes and goes, but without understanding *ātmā*, impoverishment of modifications will not go. Thus, auspice of sentient wealth only, is worth taking.

There is a complete absence of one *ātmā* in other *ātmās* and of one *ātmā* in the body. But be it substance and attribute, or attribute and modification or substance and modifications, they do not have a mutual absence between them in all aspects.

In one substance, that which is substance is not an attribute; that which is an attribute, is not a substance – in this way, for substance not to be in the form of attribute, and attribute not to be in the form of substance is *atadbhāva*. But characteristic of *atadbhāva* is not that, with absence of substance, there is an attribute, and absence of an attribute will be a substance. If complete absence is believed between substance and attribute, or between *paramāṇu* and colour or between *ātmā* and attribute of *jñāna* then three faults will arise: –

- 1 There will be a situation of multiple-ness in substance.
- 2 There will be a situation of destruction of both substance and attribute.
- 3 There will be a situation of complete absence of both, meaning, *apoharūptā*

The self-knowable nature of *jīva* should be thought about, with concentration and calmness. Senses do not help in thinking about the self-knowable, then how can relatives-friends or *deva-guru-śāstra* be of any help? Till there is even a fraction of attachment, there will be dependency on the mind; but it has no connection with senses or body. *ātmā* by nature is *jñāna* - such a focus gives true results. Even in the present, flow of *jñāna* is without any support of senses or body. Body may not be moving, may be weak, even then *jñāna* continues as is. The way one remembers business, trading and friends-relatives, in the same way, he should remember what is his self-knowable nature. Outer substances do not touch him in any way.

ātmā and physical matter, both are separate substances. Between them stands a thick wall of absence of one into another – this kind of mutual absence of nature is not present between substance and attribute. Nature of absence which exists between *ātmā* and body, if that kind of absence is believed to be between substance and attribute, then three faults will arise:-

1. Occurrence of *anekatva* (multiple-ness) in substance: - Non-existence of body is *ātmā*, and non-existence of *ātmā* is body, both are extremely different. In this way, there is multiple-ness between *ātmā* and body, but if it is believed that absence of *ātmā* is attribute, and absence of attribute of *jñāna* is *ātmā*, then there will be multiple-ness in one substance. Meaning even though substance is one, there will be an incident of multiple-ness of substance. Spatial points of body and *ātmā* are separate; similarly, if spatial points of substance and its attributes were separate, then substance would attain multiple-ness. Such kind of absence should not be believed between substance and attributes.
2. Occurrence of *ubhayaśūnyatā* (absence of both): - With the absence of gold, there will be an absence of gold-ness, and with absence of gold-ness, there will be an absence of gold. If there were no gold, then there would be no yellowness, stickiness, etc., attributes of gold. In the same way, if there were no yellowness, stickiness, etc., then there would be no gold either. Hence, gold and its attributes of yellowness, stickiness, etc., will also be absent.

Similarly, with absence of substance, there is an absence of attribute, and with absence of attribute, there would be an absence of substance. As with absence of *ātmā* there will be an absence of attribute of *jñāna*, and with absence of attribute of *jñāna* there will be an absence of *ātmā*. By way of whichever mutual existence, whatever should stay, that does not stay. Therefore, it is not correct to believe a complete absence, between substance and attribute.

3. Occurrence of *apoharūptā* (being totally different): - The way absence of a cloth is the pot and absence of a pot is the cloth meaning, there is a complete negation between cloth and pot. They are completely separate; in this way, if it were to happen

that complete absence of substance is attribute and absence of attribute is substance, then the incidence of complete negation will arise. This fault is called *apoharūpatā*. Complete absence of *ātmā* is *jñāna*, and complete absence of *jñāna* is *ātmā*. If this is believed, then *ātmā* is with *jñāna* and *jñāna* is of *ātmā*-this statement, cannot establish any connection between *ātmā* and *jñāna*. Therefore, occurrence of the fault of *apoharūpatā* is not correct here.

ātmā cannot be without *jñāna*, and *jñāna* cannot be without *ātmā*; nature belongs to the beholder of nature. He who desires both and who does not desire complete negation should believe *atadbhāva* exactly the way it has been told, and it is inappropriate to believe it to be with such a fault.

Does body exist because *ātmā* exists?

No.

Does *ātmā* exist because body exists?

No.

Does one *paramānu* exist because another one exists?

No.

Because attribute of existence is there, so *ātmā* exists?

Yes.

Because *ātmā* is there, so attribute of existence is there?

Yes.

Wherever there is an attribute, there will be the beholder of attributes, and wherever there is the beholder of attributes, there will be an attribute. Even then, there is *atadbhāva* between attribute and beholder of attribute. It never happens that whether substance exists or not, attribute will be there and whether attribute is there or not, substance will be there.

It is not possible that despite presence of *atadbhāva*, attribute can do without the beholder of attributes and beholder of attributes can do without attribute. Is it so that shop is there because of *jīva*? No. But where there is attachment to shop, there is *jīva*. *jīva* and shop are separate, but attribute of conduct is not separate from *jīva*. Is it so that because, father is there, so the son is there? No. Is it so that because *guru* is there, so the disciple is there? No. In this way independence of both substances should be known.

Since eternity, ignorant believes that the shop runs due to him and everybody bows to him because of money. But both substances are completely separate. Money does not come because of one's own attachments, and attachments do not arise because of money because existence of attachment and existence of money are separate.

It is true that there is a complete absence between *jīva* with transmigration and money, but there is no absence of attachment between *jīva* with transmigration and transmigration. At

the time of attachment, if it is said that attachment does not exist, then attribute of conduct will not remain; because attachment is the modification of attribute of conduct of *ātmā*.

At the time of attachment, if existence of attachment is not accepted, then, with absence of modification, attribute of conduct also does not remain. And if there is no attribute, then, there cannot be the beholder of attributes. Therefore, the kind of complete absence that exists between self and non-self, does not exist between attribute and beholder of attributes. Attachment is the modification of self-knowable. At the time of attachment, substance is not without attachment and without substance, there is no attachment, but it is not so that if there is attachment, then there is money and because there is money, so there is attachment.

If attachments were present because of family and spouse, then with the separation from family and spouse, attachment should go away. If substances of the world were existing because of attachment, then they should go away when attachment goes; but attachment and non-self substances have no relationship whatsoever. Attachment is related to self-substance.

If *ātmā*, by itself, is stuck in perturbed thoughts, then attachment arises. In reality, he creates transmigration due to his own efficacy. If there is no transmigration in modification, then bliss and happiness should manifest, and if there is attachment in substance-attribute then, there cannot be an absence of attachment and state of *siddha* cannot manifest. So, attachment is not due to non-self, and it is not within substance-attribute. By understanding this correctly and focusing on the pure substance-attribute, attachment can be removed completely.

In earlier times, there was a prevalent custom that on the death of her husband, wife would sit on the funeral pyre and burn herself to death. This is extreme ignorance. Nature of *jñāna* of self exists, and there is a complete absence of the life of husband, in that of the wife. Their spatial points are completely separate. With this kind of right knowledge, resolution of bereavement should be brought about. But instead of this, if opposing thoughts arise and she burns herself, then, that is the highest state of ignorance. Thoughts of sorrow or thoughts of some other kind of weakness may come, meaning thoughts of killing oneself may arise, but instead of giving in to that, intense perseverance of *jñāna* should be done.

On getting money one feels happy, but what is the meaning of getting money? Does one get wealth in self's existence, or does it come into existence of self? Money does not come from the *kṣetra* of self, and self believes that he has money. And if it were to go away, then he believes that he has not got it, but this is his mistake.

Oh! self has attachment and not money. Attachment has not come due to money, but because self has the adverse modification of attribute of conduct, so he has attachment.

Money can be seen, but can it be seen due to whose existence? Money can be seen with the existence of money, or it can be seen due to existence of *jñāna* of self and is seen on base of that *jñāna*. Due to existence of knowledge, knowledge of self and non-self occurs.

Attachment is not due to non-self, and knowledge is also not due to non-self, and *jñāna* is due to existence of *jñāna*.

Ignorant *jīva* believes that if there is money then, there is arrogance. But if one is travelling with money and is robbed, then he would believe that it would have been better to travel without money, then at least his life would not have been in danger! Worry about money is not due to robbers, and it is not that because of money, there is a scare of death. Existence of every substance is separate. Modification of attachment and fear which arises is connected to self.

Car stops while running, because it's state of change of place is not to be, but it has not stopped because there was no petrol. There is a state of mutual absence between petrol and car. Existence of both is separate. State of stationary-ness of car, does exist. If existence were not to be its part, and it was to modify on the basis of petrol, then that part would not remain in existence. If modification were not to exist, then attribute would also not exist. Hence, substance would also not exist.

Here attribute and beholder of attribute are shown as undivided. The kind of mutual non-existence, which exists between petrol and car, that kind of non-existence does not exist between substance and its steady or moving state. Here, modification is of attribute, and attribute is of the beholder of attribute. Existence is in all three, substance-attribute-modification.

When water is heated, in that, the state of heat is water's own modification. Is there existence in the state of heat? Is the state of heat due to its own self, or is it due to non-self? It is due to self, but it is not due to fire. Ignorant believes that if fire is there, then heat is there, and because there is heat fire had to come, and that is his delusion.

Is attachment present due to *karma*? No. Ignorant believes that due to rising of *karma*, *jīva* has attachments. Each and every modification of attachment exists, and it is related to its own substance-attribute, and does not have any relationship with *karma*. Stuck modification of attachment shows attribute of conduct. At the time of attachment, attribute of conduct is not without state of attachment, and attribute cannot be without substance. It may be believed that perturbation is there because of non-self, but, non-self substance stays, whereas perturbation goes away. So, this statement is incorrect. At the time of attachment, there is perturbation, then attribute of conduct is there, and attribute of conduct is there, so the substance is there. In the state of *siddha*, there is modification of *siddha*, then, there is attribute in them, and if there is attribute then beholder of attribute is also a substance.

Therefore, he who believes that there can be changes in self due to non-self, destroys the very existence of his own self substance, *karma* and *nimitta*. Hence, *atadbhāva*, meaning *anyatva*, should be accepted in the appropriate way. The kind of absence that is present between *ātmā*, and body, should not be believed between substance and its attribute.

❧ *gāthā 109* ❧

अथ सत्ताद्रव्ययोर्गुणो गुणिभावं साधयति --

Now, it is being established that *sattā*(existence) and *dravya*(substance) are (respectively) related to be *guṇa* (quality) and *guṇī* (that which possesses the quality):

जो खलु दव्वसहावो परिणामो सो गुणो सदविसिट्ठो ।
सदवट्ठिट्ठं सहावे दव्वं ति जिणोवदेसोयं ॥ १०९ ॥

*jo khalu davvasahāvo pariṇāmo so guṇo sadavisittho |
sadavaṭṭhidaṃ sahāve davvaṃ ti jīṇovadesoyam || 109 ||*

Meaning: *pariṇāma* (manifestation), which (being in the form of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvya*) is intrinsic nature of substance, is the quality indivisible from *saṭ* (existent); substance staying in its intrinsic nature is *saṭ* (existent) - such is the teaching of *Jīna* (omniscient Lord) and this was described in *gāthā 99* also.

ṭīkā: Substance owing to its intrinsic nature to always stay in its intrinsic nature is *saṭ*(existent); this has already been proved earlier (in *gāthā 99*), and intrinsic nature of substance has been called *pariṇāma* (modification). Now, it is being established here that *pariṇāma* (modification), which is the intrinsic nature of substance, is *guṇa* (quality) which is indivisible from *saṭ* (existent) substance.

astitva(existence), which, is an intrinsic characteristic nature of substance, is termed as *saṭ* (existent) from the prominence of *dravya* (substance), and is *pariṇāma* (modification) which being an indivisible quality from that *saṭ* (existent), is intrinsic-nature of substance, because occurrence of substance, owing to its touching the threefold aspect of time continues modifying every moment through that intrinsic nature.

Firstly, *pariṇāma* (modification) is an intrinsic characteristic of *dravya* and (that *pariṇāma* with origination-annihilation-permanence) being the modification of substance (*dravya*), which is with existence, is inseparable from *saṭ*, which is *dravya vidhāyaka* (attribute that creates substance). In this way, existence is established to be *guṇa*(quality) and *guṇī* (possessor of qualities).

pravacana on gāthā 109

Now the state of being *guṇa-guṇī* between existence and substance is being established: – Modification is the nature of substance (which is origination-annihilation-permanence), and that modification (being undivided from existence) is an attribute. Substance being

within its nature, exists, which was stated in *gāthā 99*; here, the same has been said. Meaning, from the statement of *gāthā 99*, the essence of this *gāthā* is brought out easily. This verse shows substance without the distinction of *guṇa-guṇī*.

Substance which is permanently within its own nature is existent – this has been told in *gāthā 99*. Nature of modification is not unchangeable, but new modification arises every *samaya*. Earlier modification is annihilated, and substance remains permanent - such is its independent nature.

Nature of substance is said to be in the form of eternal, permanent, existence; existence is not separate from that. Origination-annihilation-permanence, all three are part of that existence, meaning, origination-annihilation-permanence occur in a substance, which is not due to non-self, but is due to the attribute of existence.

Nature of attribute of existence is origination-annihilation-permanence and it is not separate from substance; so attribute of existence modifies the substance in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. *guṇa* is the creator, and *guṇī* is the creation, *guṇa* makes *guṇī* and *guṇī* is made by *guṇa*. *guṇa* (attribute) always keeps the *guṇī* stable.

Existence of self is separate from non-self, but self is not separate from its own attribute of existence. Nature of self, which is origination-annihilation-permanence nature of self, is not due to origination-annihilation-permanence of non-self, but is formed by the self, by way of origination-annihilation-permanence of the attribute of existence of self. If origination-annihilation-permanence does not exist every *samaya*, then attribute of existence will not remain and if attribute which gives forms, does not remain, then substance which is going to be formed will also not remain. Origination-annihilation-permanence modification is the existence, and attribute of existence is of the substance; so *guṇa* and *guṇī* take support of each other.

Attribute of existence is the doer and substance is the work done; modification which originates is the doer and substance is its work done, modification of annihilation is the doer and substance is its work done; modification of permanence is the doer and substance is its work done – in this way, the relationship of doer and work done is mutually existing between substance-attribute-modification.

Modification of origination-annihilation-permanence is continuous and sequential. If these modifications were not there, then existence would also not be there, and if existence is not there, then substance will also not remain. Here, the undivided modification has been said to be the cause and *guṇī* (substance), which is eternal, has been said to be the work done.

Question: How can impermanent be the creator of permanent?

Answer: If it is not believed that the present part is of one *samaya*, then existence of substance cannot be proved; if there is an absence of that one *samaya* of present, then

there will be a situation of complete absence of the substance itself. So, it has been said that impermanent modification is the reason, and substance is the work done.

In this verse, it is said that modification of origination-annihilation-permanence is not separate from attribute of existence and attribute of existence creates the substance. By saying this, it has been proved that *guṇa* and *guṇī* are not separate.

Substance is permanent in its own eternal nature. Every *ātmā* and every *paramāṇu* are permanent and eternal in their own nature of origination-annihilation-permanence. Every *samaya* new manifestation originates, earlier manifestation annihilates, and *ātmā* or *paramāṇu* are steady in their form of permanence. So, it is said that it exists. Origination-annihilation-permanence, all three together, make the complete eternal attribute of existence.

In verse 99, it was said that substance is always, permanently steady, in its own nature, so it exists. Nature of substance is the oneness of origination-annihilation-permanence, so it had been said. Now, in this verse 109, it is decided that those modifications are not separate from existence – such is the attribute, so existence, meaning to exist, is attribute, and substance is the beholder of attributes.

The reason for nature of substance being maintained is the attribute of existence. This attribute of existence has been called *saṭ* primarily from the view of substance. Modification of substance, which is its nature, meaning, origination-annihilation-permanence is not separate from this *saṭ*, and modification which arose being three – origination-annihilation-permanence, that is *sattā*.

In *ātmā*, annihilation of modification of false belief, origination of modification of *samyaktva* and permanence of *ātmā* remaining as is, is the nature of modification, and nature of modification is the attribute of existence, and none other is so. Therefore, existence, as a form of attribute, is in the form of modification of origination-annihilation-permanence. *ātmā* is modifying in the form of existence, meaning as *sattā*. So *sattā* is *guṇa* and *ātmā* is *guṇī*. In this way, the inseparable relationship of *guṇa* and *guṇī* is proved.

In verse 99, the undivided state of *guṇa* and *guṇī* is shown by saying that substance stays within its own nature. It can be said that a substance exists in modification in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence, or a substance exists within the modification of origination-annihilation-permanence, which is the attribute of existence - the intent of both is the same because attribute of existence, by itself, is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. So, the form of modification of origination-annihilation-existence has been explained with the word *saṭ*. Modification of origination-annihilation-permanence is not separate from that attribute of existence, and it is the nature of substance. Modification is not different from the existence, meaning it is only one. This is because existence of substance is through all three time phases, which are the past, present and future. Due to this, existence modifies every *samaya* as the nature, meaning, it modifies as the nature of origination-annihilation-permanence.

Modification, which is the nature of substance, is origination-annihilation-permanence. It being permanently present with existence of substance, and attribute named *saṭ* is the creator of substance. Therefore, *sattā* (existence) is the *guṇa* and substance is the *guṇī*. Due to this existence, state of attribute and beholder of attribute of a substance is proved.

Attribute of existence is in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence and in that attribute, as well as the beholder of attributes is present. Due to this, movement of hand is not due to *ātmā*. Modification of origination-annihilation-permanence of hand is in *pudgala dravya*(physical substance matter), and origination-annihilation-permanence of *ātmā* is in the *ātmā*. Movement of hand is not due to the desire of *ātmā*.

Someone may have the thought to give money to charity, but a change of place of money is not due to these thoughts, and also it is not that because money transferred from one space to another, so such thoughts occurred. Here the intent is not to show the relationship of cause and effect. Modification of origination-annihilation-permanence of money is separate, and here they are shown as separate.

Initially, *jīva* had modification of attachment which destroyed due to itself. Origination of modification of giving charity arose due to its own self (but it did not arise because some other *jīva* was unhappy) and *ātmā* itself remained in the form of permanence.

It is not so that origination is due to non-self or that *ātmā* remained stable because of presence of certain substance. This has to be understood as *nirpekṣa* (irrespective). In the attribute of existence, every *samaya*, modification of origination-annihilation-permanence is present. These three modifications are attribute of existence, and *ātmā* is in the attribute of existence – this state of attribute and beholder of attribute is proved in *sattā* and *dravya*. Origination-annihilation-permanence of money and hand should be understood as independent of each other.

In this verse, there is no discussion of either a cause-effect relationship or of doer-doership, but it is explained how substance is every *samaya* and how it exists. By explaining how all physical matters and *ātmās* are modifying every *samaya*, it has been proved that modification itself is *sattā* and *sattā* is not separate from substance.



❁ *gāthā* 110 ❁

अथ गुणगुणिनोर्नानात्वमुपहन्ति -

Now, the (notion of) manifoldness/diversity of *guṇa* (quality/attribute) and *guṇī* (that which has the qualities) is refuted:

णत्थि गुणो त्ति व कोई पज्जाओ तीह वा विणा दव्वं ।

दव्वत्तं पुण भावो तम्हा दव्वं सयं सत्ता ॥ ११०॥

ṇatthi guṇo tti va koī pajjāo tīha vā viṇā davvaṃ |

davvattaṃ puṇa bhāvo tamhā davvaṃ sayam sattā || 110 ||

Meaning: In this world, without *dravya* (substance), there is no *guṇa* (attribute) whatsoever, and no *pariyāya* (modification) either; *dravyatva*(being a substance) means it has *bhāva*(attribute) of *astitva guṇa*(attribute of existence); therefore, substance itself is existence (self- existing).

ṭīkā: As a matter of fact, there cannot be any attribute or any modification existing separately from its substance. For example-yellowness of gold cannot exist separately from gold or the shape of an earring, etc. Now nature of form of *dravya* whose state is '*astitva*'(existence), that state of *dravyatva* (being of substance) being in the form of attribute named '*bhāva*', does it occur separately from substance? It definitely does not. Substance by itself is existence.

pravacana on gāthā 110

Here meaning of the word *dravyatva* is not to be taken as the common attribute, but it is said that, that which is *saṭ* (to exist), is substance, and *sattā* is *dravyatva* (state of existence). *dravya* and *dravyatva*, meaning, *saṭ* and *sattā* are not separate. Substance itself is changing – modifying. It is modifying as the attribute of existence. Attribute and modification are not separate from substance. Substance is modifying by way of attribute of existence and it is modifying as origination-annihilation-permanence; both are the same, they are not different.

(*ātmā* and *pudgala* substances stay within their own nature, this nature is in the form of modification of origination-annihilation-permanence, which is called *sattā guṇa*).

Existence will not be found devoid of substance.

State of existence will not be found devoid of substance

Origination-annihilation-permanence will not be found devoid of substance.

Modification of every physical matter and *ātmā*, is not separate from its substance. *paramāṇu* in the form of language is not separate from its *pudgala* substance. But its state is completely separate from *ātmā* and lips. So, the question that - one thing or another should be said in words, does not remain, because its existence is within itself and existence of *jīva* is within *jīva*.

Language, words, hands, and letters are all knowable substances. All these knowable substances are modifying in their own nature in the form of origination-annihilation-permanence. These substances will not be seen separate from their own nature or origination-annihilation-permanence of every knowable, but will be seen in them by themselves. They will not be seen in any other substance.

Origination-annihilation-permanence is seen as a part of the attribute of existence, and keeping attribute of existence with the beholder of attributes, the self-knowable has been shown as one.

Existence of self does not leave its own attribute of *sattā*, and does not merge with attribute of *sattā* or origination-annihilation-permanence of any other substance. And existence of non-self does not leave its own attribute of *sattā*, and does not merge with attribute of *sattā* of a *jīva* or with origination-annihilation-permanence of *jīva*. This way, self-knowable and non-self knowable should be understood as independent. This is *samyagdarśana* and *samyagjñāna*.

In reality, there is no attribute which is separate from its substance. Similarly, there is no such modification either. Attribute-modification of one substance does not merge with attribute-modification of another substance, and if their attribute-modifications are searched separately from the substance, then, they will not be found.

Attribute of yellowness, stickiness, etc., of gold, and its state of earrings, etc., are not separate from gold, meaning, that gold cannot remain in one place and yellowness, state of earrings, etc., be in another place. Similarly, *ātmā* cannot be in one place and its attribute of knowledge, belief, etc., and its state of *śrutajñāna*, or perturbed states be in another place; The reason for attribute being *dravyatva* which is known by the name of *astitva*, and the reason for *dravya* to exist, is the attribute of *dravya*, and it is not separate from *dravya*, so *dravya*/substance itself is *bhāva* or *sattā*.

dravya (substance) is not separate from the state of *dravyatva* (being a substance). The substance *Bhagavāna* is not separate from its state. Existence is not separate from its state of existence, so existence which is substance, is the state of being, which is inseparable from the substance – it is not a separate substance.

Existence of every *ātmā* and physical matter are separate, and existence of every substance is within itself. Modification of origination-annihilation-permanence of self is not separate from self, and they are separate from origination-annihilation-permanence of non-self. To have this knowledge of distinction is *samyag jñāna*.

A *samyagdr̥ṣṭi* frog also has the knowledge that he is inseparable from his own attribute and modification and is separate from attribute and modification of others. *samyagdr̥ṣṭi* frog does not have the state to say names of nine realities, nor can he speak, even then, every *samaya*, he has the experience and knowledge, that he is inseparable from his own attribute-modification and is separate from attribute-modification of non-self.

Without this kind of appropriate *bheda jñāna*, Millions of *ṇamokāra maṅtra* chants or *pūjā* is done, one may go for pilgrimage, and during that, if passions are mild then that could be the reason for *punya*, but it is not *dharma*. Those who chant the *namaskāra maṅtra* or do auspicious activities for attaining physical wealth are leaving the wealth of experience of self and are interested only in insentient wealth. For those *jīvas*, it is said that they are not even at level zero. The way oblation gets burned when put into the ritualistic fire, in the same way, an ignorant, in the desire to amass physical wealth, burns the wealth of pure nature of self, meaning he is sacrificing his own sentient self. Due to this, he does not get a chance to awaken his pure nature. Hence, his modification becomes of a lesser level, and he attains lower life forms.

Therefore, *jīvas* should attain correct knowledge of distinction and manifest *samyag darśana-samyag jñāna*. This is the path of *dharma* and complete peace.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-111* ❧

अथ द्रव्यस्य सदुत्पासदुत्पादयोरवितोरोधं साधयति -

Now, with respect to a substance, it is established that there is no contradiction between its origination from an existent (*sat-utpāda*) and its origination from a non-existent (*asat-utpāda*):

एवंविहं सहावे दव्वं दव्वत्थपज्जत्थेहिं ।

सदसम्भावणिबद्धं पादुम्भावं सदा लभदि ॥ १११ ॥

evaṃvihaṃ sahāve davvaṃ davvatthapajjayatthehiṃ |

sadasabbhāvaṇibaddhaṃ pādubbhāvaṃ sadā labhadi || 111 ||

Meaning: (As mentioned in earlier *gāthās*) such a substance, in its intrinsic nature, always attains an origination (*utpāda*) related-with an existent (*saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*) and related-with a non-existent (*asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*) when considered from substance standpoint and modification standpoint (respectively).

ṭīkā: Thus, this substance, as defined earlier, has an absolutely undefiled mark in all respects and is, in its existential intrinsic-nature without beginning or end, attains *utpāda*(origination); this *utpāda* (origination) of substance, when considered from substance standpoint is *saḍbhāva sambaddha* and when seen from the standpoint of modification it is *asaḍbhāva sambaddha*. This is explained clearly below.

When it is called *dravya* (substance) and not modifications, then substance, by means of *aṅvayaśakti* - which is without origination-annihilation, evolves simultaneously, supporting the substance and that *vyatirekas* (particular origination-annihilation) of origination - evolving *pariyāyas* (modifications) which have the nature of origination-destruction and proceed in succession. They have *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* (manifestation related to an existent nature of substance); as in the case of gold.

When, that which is called gold (substance) and not bracelet, etc., *pariyāyas* (modifications), by means of *aṅvayaśakti* (of sameness-general nature), which exists as much as gold, existing simultaneously, continuing as gold, highlighting the gold and then having those *vyatirekas* (origination-annihilation) of manifestations which exist as much as modifications of bracelet, etc., exist, prevails in succession and bring forth the modifications - such as a bracelet, etc., has *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* (manifestation related to an existent-nature of gold).

But when reference is only to *pariyāyas* (modifications) and not to substance, then by means of modifications, whose characteristic is origination-annihilation, those

particular distinctive *vyatirekas* of manifestations which have the nature of origination-annihilation, proceeding in succession, the prevailing modifications having *anvayaśakti* (sameness-general nature of substance), which is devoid of origination-destruction, if *dravya* seen from the view of modification, then making it secondary is (*asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*).

As is in the case of gold. When it is called a bracelet, etc., modifications and not gold, then modifications, by means of those particular distinctive manifestations which exist as much as modifications (bracelet, etc.) prevailing in succession and developing bracelet, etc., modifications-reaching energies of its sameness-general-nature which exist in gold, prevailing simultaneously and which supports gold, attaining those *anvaya śaktis* has *asaḍbhāvayukta utpāda* (manifestation related to nature of gold).

Now, while discussing from a modification standpoint also, during *asatutpāda*, those *vyatirekas* (origination-annihilation/exclusions) have simultaneous modifications, having efficacy of sameness, *pariyāyas* are like *dravya* (from the significance of *pariyāya*, origination-annihilations turning into *anvayaśakti*), the modifications are like *dravya*. The way manifestations of bracelet, etc., origination and its previous modification is annihilated simultaneously, having *anvayaśakti*, bracelet, etc., modification is gold. While discussing *dravya* also, in *saḍ-utpāda*, *anvayaśakti* which arises from *dravya*, having sequential modification, having origination-annihilation, that *dravya* and *pariyāyas* are one and the same. The way gold and sequential modifications are one and the same due to *anvayaśakti*, because of that, manifestations are of attributes, therefore bracelet etc., manifestations occur.

Therefore, from standpoint of a substance, *utpāda* (origination) is as *saḍ-utpāda* (existent-origination) and from standpoint of modification, origination is as *asat-utpāda* (non-existent). This thesis is absolutely faultless and irrefutable.

bhāvārtha: That which has existed earlier, its origination is called *saḍ-utpāda* (origination from existent), and that which has not existed preceding it, its origination is called *asat-utpāda* (origination from a non-existent). When *dravya* (substance) is considered primary and *pariyāyas* (modifications) are treated as secondary, then that which was existent, the same originates because substance exists in all three times phases (past-present and future); therefore, from substance standpoint, substance has *saḍ-utpāda*, and when *pariyāyas* are considered primary and *dravya* (substance) is treated as secondary, then that which was not existing has originated (because present modification was not existing in past); therefore, from modification standpoint, substance has *asat-utpāda*.

Here, one should keep in mind that substance and its modifications are not two different objects, so when modifications are signified, then whatever modifications exist in *asat- utpāda*, they are (nothing but) substance itself and when ‘substance is meant to be said’ then substance which is existing in *saḍ-utpāda*, it is modification itself.

pravacana on gāthā 111

Now absence of opposition between the existent origination and non-existent origination of substance is being proved: -

In every *ātmā*, every *samaya* new origination occurs. Attribute or modification cannot be seen without substance. Modifications are separate, and the principle that, from where does change occur in them? Is being explained here.

Modification occurs from every substance which is an existing entity; keeping that origination and existing substance as primary, it is said to be existent origination, and the present modification, which did not exist earlier and is present now, is called non-existent origination. This non-existent origination also has a relationship with the substance. Origination is only one but has two narrative styles.

From the view of substance, that which existed has not manifested in its present form of modification by itself, and from the view of modification, the present state which had not manifested earlier, that manifested when *nimitta* presented itself, or there was *asaṭ utpāda* due to *nimitta*. In both, origination has occurred due to its own efficacy. In both ways of explanation, origination is connected to substance, but it is unconnected to non-self substance. At the time of *asaṭ-utpāda*, nature of that modification manifests, and nature of modification can be seen distinctly, but it is not separate from substance.

Modification exists in substances, but it does not exist in other substances or associations.

Substance exists with modification, but it does not exist in other substances or associations.

asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda (non-existent nature of substance), has occurred by keeping the *anvaya śakti* along with it, but it has not occurred because of presence of non-self.

Question: Why has it been called *asaṭ utpāda*?

Answer: Present modification had not manifested earlier, but manifests in the present – from this view, it is called *asaṭ utpāda*. Modification is present every *samaya*? It is not possible that it would not be present any *samaya*. To say that, this modification was not there earlier, it has been called *asaṭ utpāda*, but because *nimitta* came, so different modifications arose - that is not so.

Question: In this, will not all *vyavahāra* go away?

Answer: If modification of self were to stop, then *vyavahāra* would stop, but modification of self never stops, it manifests every *samaya*. So, *vyavahāra* of self is there all the time. It never stops. However, if it is appropriately understood, then the madness of false belief in *vyavahāra* will stop, and *vyavahāra* of correct understanding will arise.

It has been said in scriptures, that *ātmā* is the enemy of *ātmā*, and *ātmā* is the friend of *ātmā*. This should be understood as, other *jīvas* are neither friend nor foe of *ātmā*. But belief of ownership of non-self substance and the delusion that one is happy or in sorrow because of them. This state of one *samaya* of delusion is the enemy of self, and *ātmā* by nature is the knowledge of self and an ocean of joy, it is neither the doer nor a changer of non-self – this state of true experience is the friend of self.

In this *gāthā*, origination is seen in two ways. Origination is only one, but it is explained in two ways. In both, the relation of origination is with substance. In the original *prākṛita* verse, it has been said that substance by itself always modifies, which has been explained in two ways - *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* and *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*.

1. Origination of right belief occurs only in *ātmā*. It has arisen from the attribute of belief. This origination is said to be *sadbhāva sambaddha utpāda* from the viewpoint of substance.
2. Modification of right belief was not there earlier and has arisen in the present. Therefore, this origination, from the view of modification, is said to be *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*. This origination is also related to the substance, meaning it has arisen from it and has not originated from a non-self substance.

According to both, *ātmā* has modified in the form of origination of modification of right belief. To say that - this modification has arisen due to *deva-guru-śāstras* is false.

Similarly, state of movement of hand occurs in physical matter, in that –

1. The occurrence of activity of origination of modification of change of place in physical substance is due to its own *kriyāvātī śakti* (efficacy of action). This origination is said to be *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*.
2. Present state of movement, which was not there earlier, has manifested in the present; from the view of modification, this origination is said to be *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*. This origination also is related to the substance and its efficacies.

It is untrue to say that because *ātmā* desired, so the hand moved-movement of hand, which is in the form of *asat utpāda* is related to the physical matter of hand, but not to *ātmā*.

Modification occurs in all six substances, and there are two ways to see them. In both, connection is only with one's own substance; it is not at all related to non-self substance.

jīva who believes *ātmā* and body to be one and believes *dharma* of *ātmā* to be with the activity of the body, will never attain *dharma*. *vyavahāra* of *ātmā* occurs only in *ātmā*, and it can never occur in any non-self substance.

The pure nature of self is absolute truth, and the unblemished modification, which arises every *samaya*, is conventionality. Till the nature of absolute truth and conventionality is not understood in this way, *dharma* will never arise.

This substance, as stated above, has unblemished characteristics in every way; this eternal receptacle substance manifests origination in its nature of existence. Six *dravyas* (substances) exist. No God has made them, they are complete in themselves and are with unblemished characteristics. There is never any obstruction in those characteristics. Existence is with origination-annihilation-permanence, and *saṭ dravya lakṣaṇam* being the existent characteristics of substance, is without obstruction. This existing origination-annihilation-permanence which is along with existence of substance, manifests origination in its own nature.

jātismaraṇa jñāna (knowledge of previous lives) is the origination of modification of one *samaya* of knowledge attribute, and destruction of *jñāna* of earlier *samaya* is annihilation, and substance *ātmā* is permanent. Earlier modification is not there in the present, but with the efficacy of the present modification of *jātismaraṇa*, the earlier states continue to be known. It is not that since earlier modification is not in the present, knowing of past cannot be done. Modification of one *samaya* of *jñāna* has the efficacy to know the three-time phases; hence it is not necessary that what was known earlier, cannot be known in the present. It can be known in the present time.

Modification of remembrance does not come from the earlier state. To say that it comes from the permanent substance, which is the efficacy of *jñāna* - is *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*, and present remembrance, which was not manifested earlier and has manifested in the present is *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*.

ātmā is pure nature in the form of knower and seer. If focus is that one cannot do activity of the body, and *dharma* does not arise from auspicious actions, then modification of *dharma* will manifest. When *nīscaya* manifests in self, then by way of transferred epithet, auspicious attachments are said to be *vyavahāra*. *dharma* is modification and not attribute. Origination of new modification of *dharma* occurs; whereas attribute is eternal in the form of efficacy. Substance is a mass of attributes-modifications. Self is an undivided idol of sentience. With understanding that attachments or *nimitta* is not self, modification of *dharma* manifests, that is said primarily from the view of substance. From that, it is said that through existing efficacy origination occurs, is *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* and modification of *samyaktva* not manifested earlier and which has manifested in the present is *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*.

Origination of movement, or being stationary of a body, is due to body. It is not that if *jīva* is present then origination of movement of body will occur, and if *jīva* is not present then origination of being stationary will occur. Origination of being stationary or movement of the body has a relation with substance – the body, but has no relation with substance the *jīva*.

Origination of substance is *saḍbhāva sambaddha*, when it is the substance which is referred to, and when modification is spoken about, then it is *asaḍbhāva sambaddha*. This has been explained clearly.

1. a. *anvaya śakti* is without origination-annihilation. (*anvaya* means similitude. i.e. only because of *jñāna* the form of state of oneness). Attributes never originate or annihilate. They are the same from eternity to infinity. For e.g., knowledge, belief and conduct are *ātmā*'s own efficacies. Touch, smell, sight, etc., are *pudgala*'s own efficacies.
 - b. *anvaya śaktis*, meaning attributes modify together. Knowledge, belief, conduct, etc., modify together, not back and forth.
 - c. *anvaya śaktis* or *guṇas*/attributes - substance is composed of these attributes. Efficacies are infinite, and substance is one.
2. *vyatireka vyaktiyā* = *vyatireka* means divisions. This is not that – form of division, which is modification, is *nimitta* in this *jñāna*, meaning a state.
 - a. It is with characteristics of origination-annihilation, meaning, it originates and annihilates every *samaya*.
 - b. Modification occurs one after another. It arises sequentially but does not arise altogether. At the time of *śruta jñāna*, omniscience is not present, and neither is *svarūpācaraṇa cāritra* present. At the time of modification of false belief, modification of right belief is not present.
 - c. From *vyatireka* originate modifications – they manifest, create the state.

When seen from the viewpoint of *dravya*, efficacies do not modify together, are without origination-annihilation from the substance, and through such efficacies, *saṭ-utpāda* of substance exists. Meaning that origination has occurred from those efficacies which ‘exist.. exist...exist’. But at that time, how is the substance? It is manifesting with modification, which is with origination-annihilation, occurring in a sequential manner; it is in the form of manifestation of division; there also the connotation is that substance originates with divisions. While signifying from the viewpoint of substance, attributes are primary, and modifications are seen as secondary. By doing so, modifications originate from efficacies which are existing in the substance; so, it is called *saṭ-utpāda*.

Permanence does not have divisions. Even when *anvaya śaktis* are signified as primary, substance does not separate *vyatireka* or manifestations (it is made up of it). Origination of sentient and non-sentient substances have a relation with their respective own substances. Origination of modification of non-sentient substance is related to *pudgala* substance, which originates from its efficacy of touch, taste, etc., but it is not related to *ātmā*. Substance also pervades in its own modification.

When and where can appropriate knowledge go? Merely increasing sensory and scriptural knowledge is not true *jñāna*. But *saṭ-utpāda* of true belief, which arises with the experience of the mass of internal efficacies, which is the *ātmā* substance, and is true *jñāna*.

Modification of *samyakjñāna*, which has arisen, has manifested from the efficacy of *jñāna*, which is within. When it is seen from the viewpoint of substance primarily, then it is said to be *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* of *ātmā*. At that time, self has not left *anvaya śaktis* of *jñāna*, etc.

ātmā itself is the beholder of attributes. To exist is its nature, but there is no distinction of space points in them. Origination of modification of substance *ātmā*, which is with unblemished characteristics, cannot be due to existence of non-self. Origination of *ātmā* does not occur in other substances. Other substances have their own origination in their existence.

Beholder of attributes, experiences origination of its on nature of existence. Substance attains origination through attributes; in this way, substance-attribute-modification has been taken as undivided. Origination of *samyagdarśana* is due to its own efficacy, but it is not so that because *karmas* moved away, so *samyagdarśana* originated.

When *ātmā* and *parmāṇu* attain origination by their attribute of existence, then that substance has origination of a new state every *samaya*. When stating from the view of generality form of efficacy, it is said to be *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*. For modification of *samyaktva* which was not present earlier and has manifested now, it is said to be *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*. Both views have a relationship with the substance only. If it is decided that origination occurs due to its own attribute of existence, then the false belief that modification arises due to another substance, goes away, and for *dharma* and happiness, only focus on substance needs to be kept.

On annihilation of modification of false belief, origination of modification of true belief occurs. When this modification is not viewed primarily, and substance is viewed primarily, then origination of true belief occurs from the efficacies of substance. Therefore, this origination is said to be *saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda*. This is explained by way of an example: -

When gold is said to be gold, it is not called a bracelet or necklace, etc., of gold, then their attributes/*anvaya śaktis*, like yellowness, stickiness, weight, etc., which stay together, prove the general substance, which is gold. Primarily from the view of substance it is said that bracelets, necklaces, etc., states of sequential modification wherein gold is always present, all have come from efficacies of gold. Yellowness, stickiness, etc., are concordant attributes, and through them, gold remains as the form of undivided concordant. In this way, proving gold and saying that modification exists is origination from the view of substance.

Origination from the viewpoint of modification - when only arising state is stated, and not the substance, then that which is with characteristic of origination and annihilation, and distinct efficacies which are sequentially arising states, is *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* of the substance. Even at that time, origination has occurred in relation to *anvaya śaktis*, which are without origination-annihilation, which exist together and form the substance. Despite being in the state of multiple-ness, substance does not leave its attributes to become the form of divisions.

asaḍbhāva sambaddha - that which keeps a relation with one which does not exist. When modifications are stated, keeping them as primary and attributes as secondary, then it is *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* of substance, meaning it is origination of that which was not existing. Its traits are as below: -

1. With *utpāda-vināśa* (origination-annihilation) – annihilation of modification of false belief and origination of modification of true belief; destruction of modification of *śruta jñāna* and origination of modification of omniscience – in this way modifications are with origination-annihilation.
2. With *kramāś: pravartī* (sequentially flowing) - the states arise one after another. At the time of annihilation cum subsidence of *karma*, destruction of *karma* does not occur. At the time of partial conduct, complete conduct is not present. They come one after another.

These modifications come one after another in a substance. Present modification was not in manifestation earlier, and when it manifests, meaning, from the view of modification when *asaḍ utpāda* of a substance occurs, that state is taken as primary and explained. It is not that because *nimitta* or non-self substance came or because they were there, so *asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda* occurred.

Omniscience, pure sentience, infinite happiness, and infinite effort, which are manifested in *Bhagavāna*, were not present in the earlier state. To say that in the earlier stages, knowledge, sentience, etc., states were incomplete, and this incomplete state was destroyed, and fourfold infinite attributes manifested, is *asaḍ utpāda*.

It is not so that origination of omniscience occurred because there was *vṛajravṛṣabhanāraca samhanana* (adamantine body). Neither is it that four obscuring *karmas* went away, so origination of *anañtacatuṣṭaya* occurred. *asaḍ utpāda* also arises by keeping its relation with substance, which is made of numerous efficacies.

When explanation is primarily from the view of modifications, efficacies are seen as secondary, but that does not mean that these efficacies are absent, or it is not so that *asaḍ utpāda* occurs from earlier modification.

asaḍ utpāda has not arisen from *nimitta*. Similarly, it has also not arisen from earlier modification. It has arisen by keeping relation with those efficacies which are present; but while explaining the significance from the view of modification as primary, these efficacies are seen as secondary.

In the example of gold, when states of bracelet-earrings, etc., only, are spoken about but not gold, then from the sequential states which exist in a bracelet, earrings (at the time of bracelet earrings are not present and at the time of earrings, bracelet is not present), origination of *asaḍbhāva* of only gold is there. Also, the state of bracelet, etc., is related to those efficacies like yellowness, stickiness, etc., which are in gold only and which modify altogether. State of earrings, etc., has not arisen by keeping only the efficacy

of yellowness, or stickiness, of the gold. Yellowness, stickiness, etc., prove existence of only gold. Modifications are related to it. Earlier, earrings were not there, and in the present, they are there - to say this is *asaṭ utpāda*.

How did any modification become new all of a sudden?

What is the reason for a green mango to turn yellow and for omniscience to arise from *śrutajñāna* at once? Did it get *nimitta* of association? Did omniscience arise because *karmas* moved away? No, this is not so. Relation of *asaṭ utpāda* is not with associations, *nimitta* or *karma*. It was not in manifestation earlier and manifested later, so it is said to be *asaṭ utpāda*. Relation of different modifications is with its substance only.

Question: Is it not true that, origination of state of *deva* occurred because of arising of auspicious *karmas*?

Answer: No! *asaṭ utpāda* of modification of life of *deva* occurred by keeping a relation with *jīva*, but it does not keep any relation with *karma*. In the same way, origination of *paramāṇu* of *karma* occurs by keeping relation with *karma paramāṇu* of non-living matter substance, but does not occur due to auspicious thoughts of *jīva*.

Here, it is not said that origination has occurred due to *nimitta*. Similarly, it is not about annihilation of earlier modifications either. It is about origination which is occurring in a sequential manner.

Question: One can speak only till *jīva* is in the body. After *jīva* leaves the body, why does the body not speak?

Answer: It is not true that because *jīva* did not desire so, or because *jīva* was not present, so words did not come out. But modification of speech, which was in the state of silence, occurred later. This *asaṭ utpāda* occurs by having a relation with substance, *anvaya śakti* and *paramāṇu*. It has no relationship with *jīva*.

From conventional point of view, it is said that someone stretched his hand so another *jīva* was saved from drowning. In reality, it was origination of the modification of survival, which was not there earlier and has arisen in the present, that has a relation with the efficacy of that *jīva*, but it has no relation with another *jīva* or the hand.

Origination of the state of a shop occurs because of the relationship with *paramāṇu* and its attributes. Present modification, which was not there earlier and occurs now, is *asaṭ utpāda*. Whereas, running of a shop has no relation with attachment of *jīva*.

Even when it is said from the view of modification, *asaṭ utpāda* of those numerous states being present with *anvaya śaktis*, does not change those modifications into the form of substance.

Example: Modification of right belief or conduct in *ātmā* is not separate from *ātmā* and is not alone. It proves that this modification is of *ātmā*, but modification of other substances does not prove that it is the *ātmā*.

asaṭ utpāda proves its own substance, but it does not prove any other substance. Shapes of necklaces, earrings, bracelets, etc., are made from gold. These states of shape, yellowness, stickiness, weight, etc., are attributes of gold and pervade in gold. But they do not have the presence of a hammer, tongs, hand of a goldsmith or attachment of a goldsmith. It proves that the substance is gold. It proves efficacies which are concordant.

In the state of a *rotī*, presence of concordant efficacies of touch, taste, smell, colour, *paramāṇu* of dough proves the substance, but it does not prove existence of a woman or rolling pin. Student is studying. The state of his expanse of knowledge shows generality of his substance, but it does not prove a prolific teacher. Whoever has manifestation of modification of *kṣāyika samyaktva* proves existence of its *ātmā*. But it does not prove the existence of omniscient Lord or *śruta kevalī*.

In this way, states of every substance prove the existence of that substance and not of another substance.

Listen! Explanation of such a high level of independence is being given; even then, those with a focus on associations do not see the pure nature of *jīva*. They see only *nimitta* and associations, this is truly very surprising.

Goldsmith was there, so the shape of gold was made; *Bhagavāna* was present, so right belief arose, etc.; in many such ways, he sees associations. But association is also a substance. Association should also be seen in its own nature. Presence of that association or origination of state of wealth proves existence of association, but does not prove another substance. To know *jñeya* correctly and to have *jñāna* with a focus on self is *samyak jñāna*.

General efficacies like knowledge, belief, conduct, etc., respectively, have origination and annihilation and modify the substance, whereas substance is the same as a modification. At the time of manifestation, *ātmā* is in the form of modification itself. It is not separate from modification. Modification of *kṣayopśama* (modification of annihilation cum subsidence) of *karma* is in the form of its substance, and *karma* manifests in the form of modification.

Question: In a grinding mill, the lower stone remains steady, and the upper stone turns. The permanent remains separate, and origination-annihilation keeps modifying. Is it in this way?

Answer: It is not true that substance and its efficacies remain steady, and modification modifies. Entire substance occurs in the form of modification, and modification stays with substance (permanence). Substance does not leave modification, and modification does not leave the substance.

Even while explaining about the substance, in origination of existence, *anvaya śaktis*, which originate the substance, constantly modify into a new state, one after another and

modify the substance in the form of that state. Substance itself will be in the form of modification.

añvaya śaktis of yellowness, stickiness, weight, etc., which originate the gold, manifest in the sequential modification, and alter into forms of earrings, bracelets, etc., of gold. Gold itself modifies in the form of that state. Efficacies of knowledge, belief, and conduct of *ātmā*, by itself, attain varying states one after another and come into the form of *matijñāna*, *śrutajñāna*, attachments or blemish-free states. *ātmā* itself modifies in the form of attachments, or in the form of *śrutajñāna*, knowing the self. From the view of *dravya*, it is *saṭ*

utpāda, and from the view of *pariyāya*, it is *asaṭ utpāda* – this statement is without fault or any obstructions.

pravacana on bhāvārtha 111

That existence which is already there, its origination is said to be *saṭ utpāda*, and that which does not exist, its origination is said to be *asaṭ utpāda*. When modification is seen as secondary and substance is seen as primary to explain a concept, meaning, states of *matijñāna*, *śrutajñāna*, etc., are seen as secondary and *ātmā* substance is seen as primary, then that which is in existence is what originates meaning, efficacies of knowledge, belief, conduct, etc., is what originates.

That which exists, from that, ‘existence’ has originated. Meaning, here, how did this occur? - that question does not arise. Attributes which are present have manifested by themselves. Due to this, from the viewpoint of *dravya*, substance is said to have *saṭ utpāda*. And when a substance is seen as secondary and modification is seen as primary, then, present modification which was not there earlier, has manifested. This is the reason, that from the view of *pariyāya* substance, it is said to have *asaṭ utpāda*. Two relations are associated with one origination. When relation to the substance is being explained, then it is said to have *saṭ utpāda*, and when relation to *pariyāya* is being explained, then it is said to have *asaṭ utpāda*.

Here it should be noted that substance and modification are not different substances. *kevalajñāna* is not separate from *ātmā*, and *ātmā* is not separate from *kevalajñāna*. In *pudgala dravya*, mango is not separate from its yellow state, and yellow state is not separate from mango. Due to this reason, even at the time of understanding from the view of *pariyāya*, modification, which is present in *asaṭ utpāda*, that is, substance itself, and that which is substance is modification. Efficacy of permanence remains in the form of modification, and modification remains in the form of permanence.

Modification of money does not turn into the form of *jīva*, but it remains in its form of permanent substance.

Modification of bread does not turn into form of a body, but its *paramāṇu* remains in the form of permanence.

A child does not turn into the form of his parents, but modification of *ātmā* remains in the form of permanence of his own *ātmā*. Modification of body remains as form of permanence of body. Nature of permanence comes into the modification of one *samaya* and occurs in the form of *pariyāya*. It is not that before annihilation, this state did not exist, and it originated later, so it stays separate. Modifications are related to its efficacy of generality.

It is not correct to say that if *jīva* is careful, then he can keep clarified butter properly and if he is careless then clarified butter will fall. Modification of carelessness of *jīva* exists by the permanence of *jīva*, but *jīva* cannot keep clarified butter, cannot take care of it, and or drop it either. Modification of clarified butter is due to the existence of its own *paramāṇu*.

So, it is proved that substance exists with manifestation of its own modification and modification exists by its own substance.

**(anvaya śakti- efficacies which are seen without origination and annihilation, are together and identify the substance)*

**(vyatireka śakti – efficacies which are seen with origination and annihilation and are sequential)*

**(saḍbhāva-sambaddha utpāda – it is correlated to existence – being together. When it is from the view of substance, then anvaya śakti is primarily focussed upon, and vyatireka śakti is taken as secondary. So, substance has saḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda (saḍ utpāda/origination of existing substance)*

**(asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda -- it is associated with that which does not exist eternally. From the view of modification, vyatireka śaktis are primary and anvaya śaktis are secondary. So, substance has asaḍbhāva sambaddha utpāda (asaḍ utpāda/origination of that which did not exist in the present).*

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-112* ❧

अथ सदुत्पादमनन्यत्वेन निश्चिनोति -

Now, *saṭ utpāda* (origination from existence) is determined by not being *ananyatva* (another object) :-

जीवो भवं भविस्सदि णरोऽमरो वा परो भवीय पुणो ।

किं दव्वत्तं पजहदि ण जहं अण्णो कहं होदि ॥ ११२ ॥

jīvo bhavaṃ bhaviṣṣadi ṇaromaro vā paro bhavīya puṇo |
kiṃ dāvattam pajjahadi ṇa jaham aṅṅo kahaṃ hodi || 112 ||

Meaning: *jīva*, due to having modifications, is born as a human, deva or any other state (of sub-human, hellish being) or liberated *siddha*. But by becoming human, *deva*, etc., does he leave the substantiality of being *dravya*? When he does not leave, then how can he be any other object? (or he is never any other object, he is as he is).

īkā: Firstly, substance is solely an existence which never leaves its *anvayaśakti* (energy of sameness-general nature), forming its substantiality. And whatever manifestation of a *vyatireka vyakti* (particular distinctive exclusion) takes place, which is a modification of substance, in that, *anvayaśakti* forming its substantiality is not lost, so substance is not another (different); i.e., in that *utpāda* (origination) also, is the same as substance, not another. Because of its energy of *anvayaśakti* (sameness), it is an imperishable constant. Therefore, due to its 'not having otherness', origination from *saṭ utpāda* (existent origination) of substance is proved conclusively.

This is explained as under:

jīvas (sentient) being substance and substance occurring necessarily in modifications, will definitely be in any one state/*pariyāya*, out of (five states of existence) - *nāraki* (hellish being), *tiryāṅca* (animal), *manuṣya* (human being), *deva* (celestial being) or *siddha* (liberated soul). But does that *jīva*, while occupying that particular *pariyāya* form, lose its *anvaya śakti* (energy of being same), which forms its substantiality? It does not lose it. If it does not lose, then, how can it become another? How can it not be the *jīva* which possesses the trio of existence of *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvyātamaka*, which it manifests as? So, how can he not be the same? (meaning, *jīva* which is *utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvyātamaka*, despite modifying as human, etc., as he does not leave his *anvaya śakti*, is not separate, it is the same).

bhāvārtha: *jīvas* (sentient) transmigrating as man, celestial being, etc., different states of existence, does not become another, and it remains the same *jīva*. This *jīva* of celestial

being is the same *jīva* who was a man in the previous birth, and in some other birth, he was a *tiryāṅca* (animal) - such sort of knowledge can arise. Thus, *jīva* substance, remains the same in all its modifications (states of existence). It does not become another substance; it remains the same. In this way, due to its 'not having otherness,' *saṭ utpāda* (origination from an existent) of a substance is proved with certainty.

pravacana on gāthā 112

jīva assumes the state of becoming human, celestial being, animal, hellish being. But on becoming human, celestial being, etc., does he leave his state of substance? No, he does not leave his being of substance. So, how can he be separate? He does not become separate, he remains as he is.

Firstly, substance never leaves its attributes, so it exists. *ātmā* never leaves its efficacies of knowledge, belief, conduct, effort, etc. Similarly, insentient matter never leaves its efficacies of touch, taste, smell, colour, etc. And manifestation of *vyatireka vyakti*, which arises in substance, also keep their relationship with attributes which have manifested. Therefore, substance is the same.

jīva becomes a hellish being or a celestial being from a human. He assumes different states, so due to this, do the general efficacies of *jīva*, like knowledge, belief, and conduct, get lost? Here, it is not stated that *jīva* became a hellish being due to *karma*, but when he attains that state due to his own ability, even then, he remains the same; he does not change.

When a mango turns from green to yellow or turns in the form of some other state, at that time, its *paramāṇu* do not separate from it. The state has arisen, by keeping relation with efficacies of touch, taste, smell, colour, etc. The relation is kept at the time of origination. Efficacies are not destroyed at the time of origination. They exist-and they are quiescent. Therefore, through *anaṅyatva*(separateness), *saṭ-utpāda*(existent origination) of substance is proved. Origination is one with the substance. This can be understood with an example: - *jīva* is a substance, and substance is modifying in different states. So *jīva*, is sure to manifest as the modification of any one – be it human, celestial being, animal, hellish being or liberated ones.

Generality in *jīva*, its attributes of knowledge, belief, conduct, etc., and any of its states of human, hellish being, or any other – all three show the undivided substance. State of a hellish being is not due to *karma*. Similarly, absence of *karma* is not the reason for the state of liberation. *jīva* has manifested in the form of a hellish being, etc. He is sure to remain in some form of modification, but he will never be in the form of another substance, and neither will he be due to another substance. State of hellish being in *jīva*, is definitely due to his own self, and not due to non-self. By saying this, the undivided knowable of substance-attribute-modification has been shown.

In *Samayasāra*, to show the subject of belief, permanent nature of substance has been explained; there the state of *jīva*, different stages of evolution of *jīva*, not being the permanent nature of *jīva*, have been called *ajīva*. Here in *Pravacanasāra*, it has been said that, it is *jīva* who modifies in the form of anger, arrogance, erroneous belief, ignorance, is in different places of birth, is in different stages of self-evolution. In this way, by showing the undivided knowable, beholder of parts, which is substance, has been explained. At the same time, substance remains as it is with its efficacy of permanence. This permanent substance is being shown here. Importance is of the beholder of efficacies. Showing the nature of all three, substance-attribute-modification, focus of substance is shown.

Does *jīva* leave its efficacies on occurring in the form of different modifications? No, it does not. If he does not leave his own efficacies, then how can *jīva* be separate at all? Meaning it cannot be separate; it remains as it is.

jīva, despite being in numerous states of human, etc., does not become dis-contiguous; it remains as it is.

jīva, despite being in the form of human, etc., modifications does not segregate. If origination of one *samaya* were not of *jīva*, then substance itself would not remain. If origination is believed to be due to *karma*, then substance will not remain. If origination were due to *karma* then, origination would become of someone else, but this does not happen. Hence, there cannot be substance without origination.

It is not so that because there was annihilation of *karma* of being human, there was the annihilation of life as a human.

It is also not so that there was origination of *karma* of the life of celestial being, so there was origination of state of celestial being.

It was time for the modification of human life to be over, so it was over, and it was time for the origination of the state of the celestial being of the *jīva*. Hence, that origination occurred. But he has not become a celestial being due to *karma*.

Here, *karma* has not even been mentioned, but it has been stated with a primary focus on *jīva*'s example of *gati* (life form).

At the time of modification of anger, arrogance, cheating, greed, *jīva* by himself, modifies into that form. But it is not so that anger, arrogance, cheating, and greed have originated due to rising of *karma*. Modification of *jīva*, or its being, is by his own self.

jīva has numerous modifications, so does it take the form of another substance? No! *jīva* remains as it is. New modification arises every *samaya*. Existence of permanence is to be in the form of modification. If this is believed to be due to non-self, then such a believer is a great ignorant. Without accepting existence of permanence, if only a part is accepted, then he is a *pariyāya mūḍha* (with focus only on modification).

Is it true that if *jīva* has bondage of auspicious *karma*, then he will go to *svarga*?

No! *karma* is physical matter, and *jīva* does not go to *svarga* due to physical matter. *jīva* goes to *svarga* due to the ability of its own self. In the state of *deva*, *jīva* is in that form, and origination of modification of *karma* of state of *deva* has occurred by *karma* becoming of that form.

It can be known that this *jīva*, who, at present, is a celestial being, was a human in his earlier life and was an animal a few lives before that.

In this way, like *jīva*, all substances stay where they are within their modifications and do not change their form into any other substance. Despite destruction of earlier states, its knowledge is possible. But it is not so that, because there was an earlier state the knowing occurred.

Despite there being the state of greenness and yellowness in *paramāṇu*, it remains as it is and does not become something different.

In *gāthā 111*, it was explained that there is no contradiction in a substance having *saṭ-utpāda* and *asaṭ-utpāda*, and in this *gāthā*, *saṭ-utpāda* has been explained with example.

In this way, due to the ability of substance not being as any other – there being no state of separateness in a substance, *saṭ-utpāda* is proved.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā* 113 ❧

अथासदुत्पादमन्यत्वेन निश्चिनोति –

Now, *asaṭ-utpāda* (origination from a non-existent) is determined by *anyaṭva* (being another):

मणुवो ण होदि देवो देवो वा माणुसो व सिद्धो वा ।

एवं अहोज्जमाणो अणण्णभावं कथं लहदि ॥ ११३ ॥

maṇuvo ṇa hodi devo devo vā māṇuso va siddho vā |

evaṃ ahojjamāṇo aṇṇṇabhāvaṃ kadham' lahadi || 113 ||

Meaning: A man is not a celestial being, nor celestial being is a man or a liberated soul; if it is not so, how can their non-otherness be established?

ṭīkā: Modifications, at the time of self *vyatireka* (manifestation of distinctness), being existent at that time only, they are non-existent at any other times. *paryāyas* (modification) being intrinsically connected to *aivaya śakti* of *dravya* (substance), *utpāda* (origination), which occurs sequentially in the state of modifications, arises at its own time, and in that, there is a non-existence of self *vyatireka* (manifestation of distinctness) manifestation of *paryāyas* (modification), so modifications are said to be separate.

Therefore, by way of distinctiveness of *paryāyas* (modification), *dravya* (substance), being the *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument), *adhikaraṇa* (base) of the nature of *paryāyas* (modification), is unseparated from *paryāyas* (modifications) -in this way it's *asaṭ utpāda* (origination of non-existent) is decided upon.

This is explained further by way of the example below: –

A human is not a celestial being or a liberated soul, and celestial being or human is not a liberated soul. It not being so – how can it be *anaṇya* (identical)? How can it not be separate from modifications of humans, etc., which occur in *jīva dravya* (sentient substance)? Transformation of rings, etc., (like bracelet etc., modifications) which arise in gold, like the gold, would it not be separate at every step, during every modification? (The way bracelet, earrings, etc., modifications are separate-they are distinct from each other and are not one. So gold, which manifests these modifications, is also separate. Similarly, as modifications of humans, *deva*, etc., are separate, so *jīva*, which manifests these modifications – from the view of modification, is separate.

bhāvārtha: Even besides *jīvas* being eternally existent, having no beginning and no end, there is non-existence of state of celestial being or liberated state of form of

attainment of pure self-soul during human state of existence; i.e., a man is not a celestial being or liberated one, therefore these states of existence are different from one another. Due to this reason, *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument) and base dwelling of those modifications - which is this *jīva*, also holds 'otherness' from point of view of different modifications. Similarly, each substance has 'otherness' from its different modifications point of view. In this way, 'otherness' being applicable to a substance, substance (is said to be) having *asaṭ-utpāda* (origination from non-existent).

pravacana on gāthā 113

Now *asaṭ-utpāda* is defined by *ānyatva* (separateness): -There are six substances: - *ātmā*, *pudgala* (non-living matter), *dharma* (medium of motion), *adharmā* (medium of rest), *ākāśa*(space), *kāla* (time). Among them, particular matter is tangible and all others are non-physical matter/intangible. Here, an explanation has been given with the example of human *gati* (life as a human).

When a *jīva* turns into the form of a human due to his own ability, at that time, he is not the manifested modification form of a celestial being. Human form is not the physical body which is seen from outside. Body is not the state of human-ness, in the same way, *nāma karma* (*karma* being auxiliary cause in giving form to body) is physical matter, and state of human is not due to that either. But that *samaya* is the ability of *jīva* to be in a state of human, hence it is so.

Modification of state of celestial being arises due to the ability of auspicious dispositions, and at that time state of human does not arise. Similarly, at the time of ability of modification to be a celestial being, modification does not have the ability to be *siddha*. One *jīva* will have only one state in one *samaya*, and not any other.

jīva, body, money, etc., are substances that exist by their own nature, in this world. No one can make substances which are there, and those which are there do not get destroyed at any time. Substances which are not there do not originate as new and no substance is substantiated due to any other substance.

Every substance modifies and is constant as well. If substance were only modifying, then without constancy, what is modifying? And if substance were only constant, then perturbation and non-perturbation cannot be proved. Further perturbation cannot change, and manifestation of the state of *siddha* cannot take place.

ātmā, by nature, is a knower-seer. It is a mass of infinite efficacies; every moment, different states keep arising in it. From the view of modifications at that time, *jīva* occurs in the form of different states. But its permanence is not isolated.

Seen from the view of permanent nature of substance, *ātmā* is as it is, that is to say, non-sentient does not become sentient and sentient does not become non-sentient. But, at the time of modification, from the view of modification, complete substance becomes

the form of modification in his own self. When modification arises at multiple places, then the entire substance also occurs in multiple places. If permanence were not to be numerous, like in modifications, then modification and substance would become distinct and separate from each other. But this does not happen.

At the time of modification of greed, there is modification of greed, and at the time of modification of satisfaction, there is modification of satisfaction. One does have the ability to change modification of greed of one *samaya*, into modification of satisfaction the next moment. Substance is permanent, and this complete *ātmā*, which is with focus on modification, modifies in the form of greed at the time of manifestation of greed. And at the time of satisfaction, he modifies as the form of satisfaction - in this way, from the view of modification, he is several/distinct every *samaya*.

At the time of modification of bracelet of gold, there is the state of bracelet. And at the time of earrings, there is a state of earrings. Seen from the view of modification, gold, at the time of bracelet, takes the form of bracelet, and at the time of earrings it turns into the form of earrings. In this way, it is separate and distinct.

Substance is independent and it has the efficacy to create an independent state every moment. Every substance modifies while being permanent. Its forms do change, but it does not change by destroying the self completely.

A substance does not change due to non-self substances or *nimitta*.

State of money, which is *jaḍa pudgala* (non-living physical matter) substance, arises one after another. State of going into one shop arises, in that there are different states of that *pudgala* substance, which are due to the efficacy of that insentient substance. Non-living substances are also separate and distinct when seen from the view of modification. But it is not so that, because *jīva* had the desire to earn money, money moved from one place to another, and because *jīva* was satisfied, money stopped coming.

From the view of generality nature of substance, every substance remains as it is. And due to the nature of modification, from the view of modification, it arises as distinct and separate.

If pure nature is in the form of manifestation, then there should be a manifestation of supreme joy in the present, but currently, there is transmigration, and hence there is perturbation. If inherent nature was not an ocean of joy in efficacy form, then state of perturbation would never go, and unperturbed state would never manifest.

Nature of pure state remains constant in efficacy, its state keeps modifying, and during manifestation of modification, permanence is not isolated. Also, it never happens that permanence is alone and modification occurs separately.

The way, udder of a buffalo is filled with milk and milk is taken out from it. Similarly, *Amṛtacaṇḍra Ācārya* has taken out the essence from the words of *KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya Bhagavāna* and has written this commentary and detailed clarifications have been given in it.

Meaning of the word *pariyāya-pari* means in every way, and *āya* means to modify. That which modifies in every way, due to its own self is called a *pariyāya*. *pariyāya* does not modify because of non-self.

Body does not modify because of the desire of *jīva*, and it also does not modify due to body. *ātmā* is constant, that is due to its own self, and its present modification or *pariyāya*, also, is due to its own self, but it is not due to non-self. Substance-attribute-modifications are self-dependent substances. That which is a substance, cannot be due to non-self.

The belief that *ātmā* can do activity of body-mind-speech is modification of *adharmā*. At the time of *adharmā*, modification of *adharmā* is present and the second moment, there will be the second modification of *adharmā* or *dharma*, and those modifications were not present during any other moment. *ātmā* remains eternal. At the time of unblemished modification, there will not be blemished modification, and at the time of blemished modification, there will not be unblemished modification, meaning the time of both is separate from each other.

Similarly, an example of the finger has been given to explain the same in *paramāṇu*-from the state of being straight, state of being slanted arose in the finger, and *paramāṇu* remained permanent. Slanted form did not arise from the state of being straight, and neither did it arise due to the desire of *ātmā*, but it was the ability of that *samaya*, due to which state of slanted form arose. Because substance is by nature existing and at the time of being straight there is presence of straightness and absence of slant. In the same way, at the time of slant, there is a presence of slant and an absence of straightness. The finger, at the time of state of straightness, is straight and at the time of slant, it is slanted. In this way substance is present during all the various states of modifications.

Performer of every *pariyāya* is substance itself. Instrument of every *pariyāya* is substance itself, and base of every *pariyāya* is also substance itself. One *pariyāya* has existence of one *samaya*, and during the second *samaya* it becomes non-existent. Present modification of *ātmā* is existing, and earlier modification is non-existent in the present modification.

So, earlier modification is not the cause of present attachment-aversion or whatever the state is, then to say that either non-self or auxiliary cause is the cause of present modification is gross ignorance. Here, modification of every *samaya* of all six *dravyas* has been called existing.

Without this *bheda jñāna* (distinction between self and non-self), correct understanding does not arise, so *dharma* and peace do not manifest. Greedy *jīva* of *saṁsāra* are attentive towards earning money, or if someone abuses him or insults him, then, he will hold a grudge (remembers it). But if he were to hold *bheda jñāna* that every modification is independent, or he accepts this in the correct way in his knowledge, then his transmigration will end, and he will become happy.

Every modification, manifesting as its own self-time exists at that *samaya*, and is non-existent during any other *samaya*. Anger or arrogance in one *samaya* is non-existent in the second *samaya*. One sentient substance by nature is present, and it is not present due to another sentient substance or due to a non-sentient substance - this kind of confluence of plurality is present in every substance. Similarly, modification of one *samaya* is present by its own nature and is not present in the earlier or later state – confluence of plurality is in *pariyāya* in this way. Similarly, infinite attributes are present in infinite modifications. If modification of one moment, were to become the form of modification of another moment then *asti-nāsti* (existence/non-existence) form of *anekānta* (confluence of pluralism) will not remain. Then, with destruction of modification, destruction of substance will arise. Each modification exists in one moment and is non-existent in the second moment. In the second moment, second modification exists, and in the third moment, the third modification exists.

When modification of the cosmos arose in *ātmā*, that is the existence of that *samaya*, and in the second *samaya*, it is non-existent. The doer, instrument, and base of every modification is the substance and none other. Substances of three *loka* are by their own nature and are not by the nature of any other. Every modification is by its own nature and is not by the nature of any other.

Omniscience of omniscient *Bhagavāna* manifested from His own efficacy of *jñāna*. His earlier state of lesser *jñāna* was destroyed, and a state of omniscience manifested. In the state of omniscience, there is a presence of omniscience, and there is an absence of lesser knowledge. From the view of state of omniscience of second *samaya*, state of omniscience of first *samaya* is absent, and substance remains permanent.

Every substance is independent, and when it is time for its modification to arise, modification arises at that time only, neither before nor after.

Question: How does *dharma* occur by understanding this concept?

Answer: Understanding this independence is real *dharma*. Present modification of self is not due to earlier modification of self. Self is with this independence. No one is capable of moving one's modification forward or backwards. Modifications are arising sequentially, and to believe that non-self can bring changes in self is gross ignorance. When such true belief arises, then belief dependent on associations, which is the desire to get happiness from infinite non-self substances, is destroyed. Even in self, modifications arise one after another, and there is an absence of one in another. Modification is momentary - it is a part - is a changing substance. By deciding so, attachment towards modifications will go away. As focus on modification is destroyed, focus goes on the permanent, sentient, knower, seer, sea of happiness, pure nature filled with efficacies, which is existing. When focus goes on that, then modification of true knowledge, belief and conduct is manifested. Then,

jīva, who is following this true *dharma* manifests the pure *ātmā*. In this way, destroying focus on associations and modifications and focusing on substance and pure nature is the reason for *dharma* and peace.

Time of modification of body, wealth, family, ancestry, dress, etc., are modifications of one *samaya* and their time of manifestation can be that *samaya* only; it cannot be any other time. Even within that substance, time of modification to manifest will not change. So, belief that an ignorant can do something to body, family, ancestry, country, etc., that he can bring about changes in them, or can make them happy, or he can get happiness from them, is a great delusion.

If this existing nature is understood, then attachment of non-self and modifications will go, and unperturbed state will manifest.

There is no effect of one substance on another. There is an absence of one substance in another; still, to say that it affects another substance is ignorance because this can never happen.

1. Absence of present modification in the earlier one is called *prāgabhāva*. There is an absence of modification of omniscience in the earlier modification of *śruta jñāna*.
2. Absence of present modification in the future modification is called *pradhvaṅsābhāva*. There is an absence of present modification of omniscience in the next modification of omniscience.
3. Absence of present modification of one non-living matter substance in present modification of another non-living matter substance is called *aiyonyābhāva*. The present state of one matter substance of body is absent in the state of another matter substance.
4. One substance is completely absent in another substance, and that is called *atyanta abhāva*. There is a complete absence of *ātmā* in the body. In this way, there is a complete absence of one *ātmā* in another *ātmā*.

The first three *abhāva* (absence) are among modifications, and the last one is between two substances.

To believe the substance and modifications, which are in the form of absence, to be present and having an effect is *adharmā*. It is ignorance to believe that self can be affected by something which is absent in it.

This has been explained with *nyāya* (logic). The root sound for *nyāya* is 'nī'. Meaning of 'nī' is to take away. Modification of every *samaya* does not manifest due to non-self substances or earlier modification. When modification of *jñāna*, with this true understanding, moves towards the undivided nature that is called *nyāya*.

To believe that modification of every *samaya* is due to non-self or due to earlier modification is ignorance and lack of logic.

Knowledge and speech are independent of each other, and neither arises due to the modification of other.

Modification of every *samaya* exists. Conventionality is due to conventionality, and it is not altogether absent. Many believe modification to be altogether absent, but that is not true because, at the time of arising of modification, it does exist; it is the state of change. From the view of permanent nature of self, modification is viewed as secondary. But during existence of modification, at whichever time, whichever modification is meant to be, only that arises. At the time of ignorance, correct knowledge does not arise, and the time of correct knowledge is not the time of ignorance.

Many believe that pure nature is supreme truth (*brahma satya*) and rest of the world is delusion (*jagata mithyā*) - but this is not correct. Substance is eternal, and in its state, there is modification of only one *samaya*. Infinite substances exist; that is not an illusion or falsity, and every modification also exists. From the view of eternal nature, modification is called non-existent, but from its own view the present modification exists. That is not a falsity.

Through all three time phases, every substance is within its own self time. *jīva* is doer, instrument and base of modification which arises every *samaya* and doer, instrument, and base of modification of the second *samaya* is *jīva* at the second *samaya*. But *pudgala* is not its doer, instrument and base.

In one *samaya*, one modification exists, and in the second *samaya*, second modification exists – this way its independence is proved. Modification of self is not due to non-self, and modification of non-self is not due to self. One modification which arises in self, is not modification of another, and there can be no change in the time of rising of a modification.

This chapter is called *jñeyatattva prajñāpana*. In this, it has been elucidated how *jñāna* sees self-knowable, self substance-attribute, self-modification, non-self substance-attribute-modification.

Modifications are related to *ānvaya śakti*, which is a part of substance. *ānvaya śaktis* (efficacies which are without origination and annihilation) are simultaneous attributes like knowledge, belief, and conduct, which are efficacies of *ātmā*, and efficacies of touch, taste, smell, and colour of insentient matter substance are related to their own attribute of existence.

Attributes, meaning permanent *sādrśya* (concord) efficacies are present, and modification of every *samaya* is interwoven with it. *ānvaya śaktis* do not stay separate from modification. Modification is interwoven with such permanent attributes as knowledge, belief and conduct. Permanence is not distinct. Origination of modifications arises sequentially, at its self-time. Here importance is of the word sequentially. Every modification originates in a sequence, one after another. In the first modification, second modification will not be found. Modification which is meant to arise in that specific one *samaya*, only that will

arise. There cannot be any break of sequence. Present modification of self-substance is not due to earlier modification of self-substance, then to believe he can keep or bring about changes in modification of the body of his son or in the modification of wealth, is gross ignorance.

Here, there is no reference to the belief that the reason for perturbation is *karma* or that changes have occurred due to associations, but the discussion is of self-modification. Present modification does not occur due to earlier modification. It is not so that attachment arose due to *karma*, and neither is it so that a lot of attachment earlier, is the reason for present attachments. This is because, earlier modification is not the reason for present modification. Similarly, modification arises at its own self-time – on deciding that modification is interwoven with *ānvaya guṇa*, focus goes on substance and attributes. Substance and attributes are pure – this kind of belief in the pure substance arises, and that interest in substance, focusing on substance only, is *dharma*.

Every *ātmā* and *paramāṇu* are substances. State of one *samaya* is not present in second *samaya*, and they cannot occur sooner or later either. From the view of similarity or permanence, each and every substance is the same, but from the view of its modification, it is distinct.

At the time of *śrutajñāna*, complete *ātmā* is in the form of *śrutajñāna*, it is not in the form of omniscience. In the present *samaya*, there is an absence of past and future modifications. In *pudgala* substance also, when mango is green, at that time there is a complete absence of its past or future states.

ātmā, whose nature is *jñāna*, is complete, taking support of it, the pure nature of modification which manifests, has arisen at that *samaya* and at no other *samaya*. Similarly, at the time of manifestation of modification of *siddha*, nature of bliss of self arises. It exists at that *samaya*, neither before nor after. Present modification does not occur at any other time except at its own time.

How many ever *samayas* are there in three time phases, that many modifications are in each and every substance. True belief and omniscience are modifications of one *samaya*, they are not attributes. Knowledge is the permanent efficacy, and modification comes from it. Attribute and modification together make the complete substance.

There is *asaṭ utpāda* (absence of one modification in another modification) in *ātmā* and physical matter. At that time, despite there being no origination of past or future, *asaṭ utpāda* occurs keeping a relation, with its own *ānvaya śakti*. Origination of omniscience has not occurred by breaking oneness of attribute of knowledge and state of scriptural knowledge. And even in particulate matter, *asaṭ utpāda* occurs having relation with its permanent attributes of touch, taste, smell, colour, etc.

Modification of one *samaya* of self will not be found in the second *samaya*, so if modification of self is searched in associations, then it will not be found there either. Modification which is supposed to arise at which ever time, will occur at that time only. It does not rise by *nimitta*, and neither can it occur before or after its destined time.

Question: If this is so, then modifications of true knowledge and omniscience will arise in their own self-time, so there is no need to put any effort into self, isn't it?

Answer: Why has the discussion of self-time been raised here? Self-time is a modification. When is self-time of false belief, cannot be the self-time of true belief. In one self-time, two modifications cannot occur, and in one self-time, there cannot be two types of experiences in one self-time. At the self-time of modification of false belief, it is not possible for modification of true belief to arise.

Question: On whose basis will self-time manifest?

Answer: Whoever wants to manifest self-time of *samyaktva*, it is necessary for him/her to focus on the permanent nature - without this focus/interest self-time of *samyaktva* will not occur.

Substance is a mass of permanent efficacies of generality. From the view of modification, it is a distinct and separate form. But from the view of modification, that manifested modification does not have a variegated form. Only one modification rises in one *samaya*, it is absent in any other *samaya*. Self-time of one *samaya* cannot be present in self time of second *samaya*. How can self- time of true belief arise by changing self-time of false belief? Will it be due to auxiliary cause? No! Auxiliary cause is a non-self substance. Is it possible for that which was the self-time of false belief, to give rise to the self-time of true belief? No! One modification does not manifest from another modification, because it is absent in the second *samaya*. When focus turns on the permanent substance which is present then, self-time of right belief will originate and false belief will be annihilated. So, when it is said that, *mokṣa* will happen at its own self-time, then that *jīva* does not have focus on permanent substance and merely has wild thoughts. *dharma* arises with focus on permanent substance. In this way, from the viewpoint of modification, substance is variegated.

Modifications arise one after another, in a sequential manner, in their own self-time. In that, there is an absence of present modification in the earlier modification, meaning, it is *prāgabhāva* (prior non-existence). That which is not separate from modification, which is the substance, is the doer, instrument, and base, due to which *asaṭ utpāda* of substance is defined. So, state of earlier perturbed modification is destroyed in *ātmā* and present unperturbed modification manifests. In that earlier state was destroyed and he turned to the nature of unperturbed state. So *ātmā* is separate and distinct from the view of modification, but modification itself is not separate and distinct.

Efficacies of knowledge, belief, conduct, etc., are permanent and as it is in *ātmā*, so from this view, *ātmā* is called *sadrśya* (same). *ātmā* was there in the first *samaya*, and it will not remain the same in the following *samaya*. So, from the view of modification, *ātmā* is said to be *visadrśya* (not the same).

New modification which arises in the second *samaya*, that modification does not exist at any other time except in its present, and neither did it exist in the past. Therefore, modification of one *samaya* cannot be doer, instrument and base of the modification of second *samaya*. But mass of substance of permanent generality efficacy is the doer, work done, instrument, and base of modification of every *samaya*. Efficacy of permanence is not separate from modification, so *asaṭ utpāda* of *dravya*(substance) is decided.

Now it is explained with example: –

ātmā's ability to be human is *manuṣyatva* (ability to be human). Similarly, *ātmā*'s ability to be *deva*, is the *devatva* (ability to be *deva*). Despite having the same sentient nature of self, human is not *deva* or *siddha*, and *deva* is not human or *siddha*. So, how can the same modification, which has gone, arise in the second *samaya*? It can never be so. But modification of *jīva dravya*, by itself, is separate and distinct in each modification.

States of gold are separate and distinct; that which is an earring is not a bracelet, and that which is a bracelet is not an earring. But from the view of modification, while holding to *sādrśya* (similitude) attribute of gold, like gold-ness, yellowness, stickiness, etc., in forms of gold like a bangle, earring, etc., gold remains concord, and it modifies by itself. Human, celestial beings, etc., states are separate and distinct. Therefore, from the view of modification, doer of these states, which is *jīva dravya*, is also separate and distinct.

Every substance exists in the present; it was not there earlier and did not exist due to another substance– he who sees modification as independent in this way has to only turn his focus towards the permanent substance and focus on permanent substance is the cause for passionless state.

Modification of *dharma* of self is not due to non-self. By deciding that present modification does not come from the past, focus on non-self, dependency on *nimitta*, and focus on a small part, is destroyed. When focus goes on the permanent, then modification of *dharma* is manifested. Modification of other substances cannot be changed by the self. Modification of one *samaya* does not turn into the form of another, because that substance by itself turns into another form.

When modification of self does not turn into another form, then how is it possible that, modification of another substance would be changed by self into another form? With manifestation of right knowledge, arrogance of oneness in non-self goes away.

Ignorant believe that when *rotī* (Indian bread) does not enter the body, then *dharma* arises, but to believe this is a mistake.

It is not that because *rotī* did not enter, so body became weak.

It is also not that because body became weak, so auspicious thoughts arose.

It is not possible that because auspicious thoughts arose, so body became thin.

Neither is it true that because auspicious thoughts arose, so *dharma* manifested.

Self-time of present origination of every *ātmā* and *paramāṇu* does not exist at any other time except for the present. It was not there earlier and does not exist because of any other substance.

Constant's attribute of similitude is interwoven with all its efficacies by itself. On keeping this relation, from the view of modification, it is separate and distinct, meaning it modifies as *asaṭ utpāda*.

bhāvārtha: From the view of substance, *jīva* being from eternity to infinity, even then at the time of modification of being a human, there is an absence of the state of celestial being and liberated soul. So, modification of a celestial being and liberated soul is separate and distinct. Instrument and base, due to which modifications manifest, is *jīva* substance. As modifications are separate and distinct, on seeing from the view of modification, it is separate and distinct. If it were not so, then whose modifications would these be? Therefore, from the view of modification, the constant nature by itself becomes impermanent. Similarly, from the view of modification, knowable of *jñāna*, which is the *dhruva* nature, is separate and distinct. This has been explained.

Every *ātmā* and *paramāṇu* is an independent substance. Every *samaya* they have their own modifications. Modification of one *samaya*, is not present in the modification of second *samaya* and one modification does not become the form of another. But permanent nature, by itself, modifies into another form. Permanent nature, by itself, is in the form of *samyaktva*.

Modification of true belief arises with annihilation of modification of false belief. But modification of false belief is not the doer, instrument or base of modification of true belief. In the same way, *deva-guru-śāstra* are also not the doer, instrument and base of modification of true belief. Nature of permanence, attribute, efficacy, and attribute of sameness, by itself, are the doer, instrument and base of true belief.

Here origination is being proved.

With the destruction of the earrings of gold, bracelet manifests, and who is the doer of that state of bracelet? Is goldsmith the doer of bracelet? Or is a hammer, tongs and other instruments the doer of bracelet?

Goldsmith, hammer, tongs, etc., *nimittas* are not the doer, instrument or base of bracelet, because they are absent in gold. Is the earlier state of earring, which existed, doer of the new state of bracelet? No, because the earlier state of earring is destroyed. It does not exist

in the present, and how can that which does not exist, be the doer? The earlier state does not exist in the present state. Therefore, earlier modification is not the doer, instrument or base of the present modification. Only the substance gold is the doer, instrument and base of the state of bracelet. Permanent nature of gold, its attributes which are its nature, like yellowness, stickiness, weight, etc., efficacies are said to of, modify by themselves into the state of bracelet, from the view of modification of gold, but this state does not manifest from goldsmith, hammer or any other instrument and neither from earlier modification.

Doer of origination of modification of money which moved from one place into another is not the thoughts of a *jīva*, and nor is earlier modification its doer. Money does not leave the characteristic of modification of its own nature, and change of place occurs due to its own nature of modification.

nimitta substance has not changed into another form; similarly, due to earlier modification, present modification has not changed its form. But from the view of modification, the permanent nature, its attributes and efficacies, due to their characteristic of modification, changes its form of modification.

When it is said to be *saṭ utpāda*, then it means that origination comes from permanence, and when it is said to be *asaṭ utpāda* then, that which was not there earlier has originated, so permanent itself has changed to another form. Permanent has become another form by itself, the same permanent has changed its form, by itself, and no one else has changed it.

In *gāthā* 112, *saṭ utpāda* was explained. Doer, instrument and base of that origination are permanent efficacies. This does not need any clarification because *saṭ utpāda* has originated from efficacies which are there...there...there. From that which exists, that which exists has originated; therefore, there was no reason to clarify the doer-instrument. But in *gāthā* 113, *asaṭ utpāda* is explained; so, clarification needed to be made in the *tīkā*.

Ignorant believes that present modification was not there earlier and has arisen now, so it should definitely be due to *nimitta*. His focus goes immediately on associations. Or he believes that it has occurred due to earlier mental impressions. Focus of an ignorant goes on earlier modification or on associations, but he does not accept that *aivaya śaktis*, themselves, being doer, instrument, base have modified in this form.

Earlier there was an attachment of lesser intensity, and then in the second *samaya*, it became intense. Intense attachment was not there earlier, and it happened later, meaning, *asaṭ utpāda* originated. So, what is the reason for this *asaṭ utpāda*? Intense rising of *karma* occurred, so intense attachment arose. Is that so? Did it occur because outer associations changed? Did it occur because of attachments of the past? No! Ignorant believes attachment to be due to associations or *karma*, but that is a mistake. Association or *karma* is not a doer, instrument and base of intense attachments.

Attachment, which was earlier, is also not the cause of present attachment, but the attribute of conduct is permanent, and that is the doer, instrument and base of perturbation.

Question: Attribute of conduct is permanent and pure then how can it be the doer of perturbation?

Answer: Listen! It is correct that from the view of substance, there is no impurity in attribute. But when seen from the viewpoint of modification, attribute by itself modifies for one *samaya* as impure. Therefore, doer, instrument and base are the attribute of conduct; because this is its modification. Attribute is a mass of modifications of all three-time phases, in that if it is said that, present modification with attachment is not of the attribute, then, there will be an absence of one modification, and the complete attribute will not be proved.

Attribute of conduct, by itself, is first modified as either a lower or intense form, and then it occurs in another form; besides this, there is no other reason or instrument. This modification of one *samaya* does not turn into another form, and neither does it modify due to any other, but attribute itself has modified into another form.

Here, attributes have been called efficacies, which are permanent and congruent. They have been called the generality of substance also. This topic is from the viewpoint of substance. Modification is in the form of *sādrśya* (congruence), and origination-annihilation, which occurs, is the subject from modification view point. Along with attribute and modification, complete substance with origination-annihilation-permanence is the subject of *pramāṇa jñāna*. (knowing which includes substance, attribute, modification).

Words which are spoken are not due to lips. Lips are made with *āhāra vargaṇā* (assimilative, projectable, aggregate of molecules), and words are made of *bhāṣāvargaṇā* (sound and speech mass of molecules). *jīva* also cannot speak words because there is a complete absence of *jīva* in words. Here, words do not come from earlier modifications either. First, *parmāṇu* was in the form of *bhāṣāvargaṇā*, and then it turned into form of words. They did not come due to lips or because *jīva* desired so. *parmāṇu* of words which have the efficacy of touch, taste, smell and colour, have come into the state of words.

There is *asaṭ utpāda* of substance, but it is not said that there is *asaṭ utpāda* of modification. Earlier manifestation has been destroyed. Where is separateness in the modification which has been destroyed? Or what sort of separateness is there due to modification? There is only one modification in one *samaya*, and it does not exist in the second *samaya*. But it is substance which modifies as separate-distinct. When origination cannot occur due to earlier modification, then to say that origination occurred

due to *nimitta* is gross ignorance. If it is said that origination is due to *nimitta*, then *nimitta* itself will become *niścaya* (absolute) and *upādāna* (substantial cause), but this is incorrect. *asaṭ utpāda* itself is *niścaya*. When this appropriate knowledge is acquired, then that which is *nimitta*, is called *vyavahāra*.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā* 114 ❧

अथैकद्रव्यस्यान्यत्वानन्यत्वविप्रतिषेधमुद्बुनोति --

Now contradiction in being other and not being other of one substance is repudiated/
removed:

द्वद्वद्विण सव्वं दव्वं तं पज्जयद्विण पुणो ।

हवदि य अण्णमण्णं तक्काले तम्मयत्तादो ॥ ११४ ॥

davvaṭṭhiṇa savvaṃ davvaṃ taṃ pajjayadviṇa puṇo |

havadi ya aṇṇamaṇṇaṇṇaṃ takkāle tammayattādo || 114 ||

Meaning: From the view of substance, each substance remains *ananya* (same), but from the view of modification, that substance is *anya* (other) because, at that time, that substance pervades in that particular modification and becomes identical with it.

īkā: Since, every substance, in fact, has *sāmānya* (generality) and *viśeṣa* (particularity) as its characteristic nature, those who think about the nature of a substance, have two standpoints to know it - *sāmānya* (generality) and *viśeṣa* (particularity), namely (1) *dravyārthika* standpoint (viewing from substance aspect) and (2) *paryāyārthika* standpoint (viewing from modification aspect).

When self is seen with *dravyārthika* (substance standpoint), at that time, *paryāyārthika* (modification standpoint) is made completely secondary. Then only the generality is seen in those being in the state of existence of hellish, animal, human, *devas* and in liberated states. So when particularity aspect of those *jīva* is not seen, all seem to be ‘*jīva* substance only’.

And when self is seen from modification aspect, and substance-aspect is made completely secondary, then to those who look only at particularities of *jīva* existing in hellish, animal, human, *devas* and liberated state, the modification form of particularities, and do not look at generality, it appears that – “that (*jīva*) is separate and again distinct”. Because, *dravya* (substance), at the time of those particularities, becomes identical with particularity of each time (i.e., not different than that particularity of each time); as in the case of fire, which has the characteristic nature of burning and modifies into the shape of dry cow-dung, grass, leaves or wood.

But when self is seen from both *dravyārthika* and *paryāyārthika*, standpoint, then they are seen simultaneously, and when seen by these *dravyārthika* and *paryāyārthika* standpoints, generality of *jīva* is pervasive in all modifications (states of existence) of

hellish, animal, human, *devas*, and liberated *jīvas* and particularities of *jīva* existing in these modifications of hellish, animal, human, *devas*, and liberated being in the *jīva*, particularity as well as generality, are seen simultaneously.

Here, viewing self-substance from one standpoint is a partial viewing, and viewing the same self-substance from both standpoints is complete viewing. Therefore, in complete viewing, *anya* (otherness) and *ananya* (not otherness) of self-substance are revealed, which is not contradictory.

bhāvārtha: Each substance is possessed of *sāmānya* (general) as well as *viśeṣa* (particular) nature. That is why each substance remains the same and changes (modifies) also. Even though such dual nature of substance exists, there is no contradiction in its ‘otherness’ and ‘non-otherness’. As in case of *jīva* of *Marichi* and omniscient *Mahāvīra*. There is no contradiction in his being ‘not other’ (*ananya*) from the viewpoint of generality and being *anya* (other) from the viewpoint of particularities.

On observing substance with one standpoint of *dravyārthika naya* (substance viewpoint), it is cognized that *jīva* has generality/sameness only. Therefore, substance appears to be *ananya* (same/not other) and on observing substance by the second standpoint of *pariyāyārthika naya* (modification viewpoint), particularities of modification-form of substance are cognized, therefore substance appears to be *anya* (other) separate and distinct. And on observing substance by view of both *nayas* (stand-points), both ‘generality’ and ‘particularity’ of substance are cognized together simultaneously. Therefore, the substance appears to be both *ananya* (same, not other) as well as *anya* (not the same) but other.

pravacana on gāthā 114

Now, view being stated here is that at the time of *saṅ utpāda* of substance, it is the same substance, and it also modifies as separate and distinct. There is no contradiction in it.

From *dravyārthika naya* (substance point of view), all substances are unchanging, and by *vyavahāra naya* (modification point of view), these substances modify as separate and distinct. Substance being identical with modification at that *samaya*, is not separate from modification.

Here, substance, which has been explained by way of substance standpoint, means, attributes, infinitesimal part, general efficacies, and efficacy of permanence. From a substance standpoint, an attribute in the form of permanence is *anvaya śakti*, which remains as it is, and is that only.

When seen from modification standpoint, attribute assumes different states. At that time, substance is identified with modification. State of knowledge-belief of *ātmā*, attribute of *samyak jñāna*, *darśana* is identified with modification. Similarly, at the time of state of touch, taste, smell, colour, etc., of attribute of matter substance, it is identified with

attribute-modification, meaning, modification is identified with substance, but it is not identified with the auxiliary cause, and neither is it identified with earlier modifications.

When mango is green, that *samaya*, its permanent nature of colour, is identified with modification of greenness. At that time, if any other colour is looked for, it will not be found. When greenness is destroyed, and yellowness manifests, it has not occurred due to grass. In the same way, yellowness does not come from greenness. Grass is not the doer, instrument and base of the yellow state, and earlier state of greenness also is not the doer, instrument, or base of the yellow state. Mango by itself modifies as *asaṭ utpāda* and is the doer, instrument, and base of the yellow state.

pravacana on tīkā 114

In reality, every substance is *sāmānyā-viśeṣātmaka* (with generality and particularities). Mass of substance-attribute-modification is a complete substance. That substance is the topic of *pramāṇa jñāna* (comprehensive true knowledge), and this meaning should be understood here.

Every substance is with generality and particularities. Permanence, attributes, and *añvaya śakti* (efficacy of connection) stay congruent, and these efficacies will always stay. Permanent efficacies are called general and the state, part, division, changing modifications, modifications arising one after another, individually, which is not another, such states which are dissimilar are said to be distinctive. The one who sees this form of substance has the knowledge with two standpoints of *sāmānyā*(generality) and *viśeṣā* (particularity)in succession.

1. *dravyārthika naya*(generality viewpoint): that part of knowing in detail (through senses and mind) which knows generality, permanence, and conglomerate of attributes, is called *dravyārthika naya*.
2. *paryāyārthika naya*(modification viewpoint): that part of knowing in details (through senses and mind) which knows modifications, and states, is said to be *paryāyārthika naya*.

Here, one has been asked to see the substance. It is not said to see *skāndha* (two or more units of matter). *karma* is *skāndha* of infinite *parmāṇus*. Every *ātmā* and every *parmāṇu* is said to be a substance. Now which substance has to be seen? Is *ātmā* to be seen, or is *karma* to be seen?

Efficacies of knowledge-belief, etc., are permanent in *ātmā*. That which sees this permanence is *dravyārthika naya*, and that which sees the state of *ātmā*, modifying into state of attachment-version, ignorance, etc., by its own ability is *paryāyārthika naya*.

On seeing *ātmā*, the generality of *ātmā* and particularity of *ātmā* can be seen in succession. But another life form, *karma*, or body cannot be seen.

karma is in the form of a mass of numerous smallest matter particles. Here, only one substance is explained. In that one *karma parmāṇu*, its generality of touch, taste, smell, colour, etc., are permanent efficacies. *dravyārthika naya* is the one which sees these permanent efficacies. *pariyāyārthika naya* sees change in space and states of touch, etc. In *karma*, generality and particularities are seen in succession, but a *jīva* with attachment, and with *karma*, is not seen.

In *nigoda*, there are infinite *ātmās*, which are all together, that have not been discussed here. But here, each separate *ātmā* has been taken into consideration, and every *ātmā* is shown as independent.

Permanent means generality, and modification means particularity. In this way, both generality and particularity are to be seen in succession. This succession is not because of auxiliary cause, and it is not because of earlier modification either. Permanence and modification exist; they have to be seen sequentially.

jñāna, which sees such congruence in substance, that this substance is the said substance only that *jñāna* is said to be *dravyārthika naya*. And that is not this – *jñāna*, which sees these separate and distinct states, is said to be *pariyāyārthika naya*. This is about seeing the same substance in two different ways. It is ignorance to introduce the point of another substance, when explanation about seeing one substance is going on.

When modification of attachment of *ātmā*, is stated, then ignorant asks that, was *nimitta* not present? To him, it is said that when discussion is about seeing *ātmā*, then why should there be a discussion on any other substance? When *nimitta* has to be seen, then see its nature with both the permanent attribute of *nimitta* and state of *nimitta*. But when discussion is about *nimitta*, then to speak about *upādāna*, and when discussion is about knowing *upādāna*, then to bring *nimitta* into the picture, is confused knowledge, and it is a mistake.

To understand whatever needs to be understood in *jñāna* in its independent form, with appropriate knowing is *vītarāgi vijñāna* (science of the passionless-ness). Then passionless belief with aforementioned correct knowledge occurs, after which passionless conduct is accomplished, and *vitarāga vijñāna* (science of passionless-ness) is fulfilled. Then, state of *siddha* manifests.

When standpoint of modification is seen as secondary and knowing is done primarily from the standpoint of substance, then in all states of life as hellish being, animal, human, or celestial being, states of *jīvas* are seen with generality, so, they all are merely *jīva*. It is ascertained that this is not another *jīva*, and neither is it insentient. When *jīva* goes from one life form to another, at that time, it does not become another *jīva*.

When mango turns from green to yellow, then from substance point of view, constancy of *parmāṇu*, can be seen to be, as is. Its general efficacy of touch, taste, smell, and colour are seen as they are, where they are, in the form of oneness and constancy. In the same

way, *jīva* may be born in hell or as human; even then, efficacies of knowledge, belief, conduct, strength, etc., of *jīva* are as they are, constant, permanent and unchanging. It is understood that all these are substance-attribute itself and none other. Here, an example of a life form has been given. Similarly, when a *jīva* has auspicious attachment or inauspicious attachment, or becomes angry in a moment, and has aversion, arrogance or duplicity, at the time of all these modifications, if seen from the standpoint of substance, only one *jīva* can be seen. Nature of generality, efficacy of knowledge, belief, conduct etc., of *jīva* are seen to be congruent as it is, but is not of another *jīva*.

When viewpoint of a substance is made secondary and substance is seen from viewpoint of modification, then due to the viewpoint which sees each state as separate, that substance seems to be separate and distinct. For example, state of human is not the state of celestial being, and state of celestial being is not the state of *siddha*. When seen from the viewpoint of modification, *jīva* seems to be separate and distinct; because it being identified with modifications, it is not separate from them, and neither is it any another. At the time of being green, mango is completely identical with greenness, and at the time of yellowness, it is completely identical with yellowness. That which is green is not yellow, and that which is yellow is not green. So, from the view of modification, mango is separate and distinct.

Fire could be due to the trunk of a tree, due to grass and due to twigs. At the time of fire being due to tree trunk, it is identified with tree trunk; when it is due to grass, it is identified with grass; and when it is due to twigs, it is identified with twigs; it is not separate. The complete substance, at the time of the state of those modifications, is one with those states. Substance does not stay separate from its modification.

When *jīva* has anger, or arrogance, then in those states, *jīva* completely modifies as state of anger, or state of arrogance. At the time of auspicious attachments, *jīva* is as the state of auspicious attachments. In this way, from viewpoint of modification, *jīva* substance, is perceived as separate and distinct.

A *muni*, at the time of his death, when he leaves the body, could be in the sixth *gunasthāna* (stage of evolution of conduct), but the very next *samaya* he becomes a *deva* with fourth *gunasthāna*. If he leaves his human body in the eleventh *gunasthāna*, even then, in the life form of *deva*, he will be in the fourth *gunasthāna* only. Hence, the doer, instrument, base of modification of fourth *gunasthāna* is not the modification of eleventh *gunasthāna*. Permanence of *jīva* is the doer, instrument, and base of modification of fourth *gunasthāna*. *jīva*, by himself, modifies in separate and distinct forms.

Thousands of *devas* were in service of *Brahmadutta Cakravartī* (king of six *khaṇḍas*). He had a huge army and many sons, daughters, and sons-in-law. He used to sleep on an expensive bed. At the very moment he died, he went to the seventh hell. He did not

go to hell due to *karma*. Earlier modification was of human *cakravartī*, and present modification is of hell. Earlier modification is not the reason for going to hell. *jīva* of *Brahmadutta* went to hell due to the ability of his own self. At that time, he is one with it, and in the form of modification, he is separate and distinct.

In the commentary of verse 10 of *Pravacanasāra*, it is said that there cannot be any substance without modification. By saying this, all types of modifications have been accepted in substance. In verse 189, it is said that *jīva* himself is the doer of impure modifications. Substance is the doer of impure modification, which has manifested from it. It has not been said that it has manifested from *nimitta*. Right knowing of knowable of that *samaya* has been explained.

To know substance which is within particularities is *dravyārthika naya*.

To know particularities which are within substance is *paryāyārthika naya*.

Such generality- particularity is the nature of each and every knowable. At the time of seeing one knowable, if another is tried to be seen, then that is incorrect. But if knowing is done from both sides, and correct *jñāna* evolves, then that is the reason for *dharma*.

In whichever state, one *ātmā*, matter particle, etc., substance modify, at that time, that substance being identified with that modification, is not separate. State of *jīva* of being in the modification of a celestial being or hellish being is due to its own independent ability; *jīva* is identical with it, and is not separate from it.

When seen from the standpoint of substance, be it modification of *siddha* or of a mundane being, *jīva* is the same. To see substance as constant, in form of generality, is one standpoint. To see it as an impermanent, modifying form of particularity is another standpoint (contemplation); this is partial contemplation. Even when seen with correct notion in the form of comprehensive true knowledge, no substance has any relation with non-self. To think that thoughts or conventionality is advantageous, or *nimitta* is advantageous, is not the appropriate view of knowledge.

After knowing substance-modification independently, when focus is on the constant, then knowing of division of distinction, of modification, is called conventionality. If both absolute and conventionality are considered acceptable, then both don't remain. But when modification is considered secondary, then it is called conventionality. To get thoughts of non-divisibility towards the general substance, division of modification has been considered secondary, when generality has been considered as primary, then it is called absolute truth.

Thoughts are not the *parmārtha* (highest/sublime) nature of *jīva*. Thoughts are *asadbhūta upcāra* (that view which takes completely different substances as one), and distinction between attribute and beholder of attribute is *anupacarita sadbhūta* (that view which sees pure attribute and beholder of attribute as separate). In this way, all *vyavahāras*

are not for conventionality, but for having an undivided focus of pure self. It is not for taking auspice of another substance or to see associated *jīvas*.

When knowing of self arises, then knowing of non-self occurs by way of one's own absolute *jñāna*. Nature of *jñāna*, which knows self and non-self, is one's own. So *niścaya* exists, and modification also is a truth. Generality permanence is also *niścaya* (absolute truth). When substance is known and contemplated from all sides by way of comprehensive knowledge, then each and every independent substance, with its state of divisiveness/indivisiveness, does not create any antithesis. Antithesis is created with ignorance of believing in the necessity of non-self substance.

jīva, which was in the state of *nigoda*; if seen in the state of *siddha*, then from the view of modification, it is separate and distinct, and from a substance standpoint, it is undivided and one. It is not about seeing other associations. Present ability of every substance is its particularity, and permanence is its generality. Only substance should be seen, and to see any kind of changes in it due to any other, is erroneous.

Smallest matter particle exists in the form of modification of more than one particle, due to its own ability. It is what it is because it is identical with its own modification. This cannot be substantiated by looking at non-self.

For mundane beings, a space can have heaps of *nidhatta karma* (*karma* can shed, but have very strong effect) and *nikācita karma* (*karma* can shed only after bearing fruits), but that should not be seen. Its present modification, according to its own ability, and its permanence has to be seen, and not non-self associations. Entire *loka* has non-sentient *mahā skandha* (massive mass of *paramāṇus*). In that, too, every *paramāṇu* should be seen as identical with its modification of that time, which is with that ability at that relevant time. To see substance and modification together is the view of *pramāṇa*.

paramāṇu stays in the form of *paramāṇu* only. To be in gross or subtle form is its independent ability of that *samaya*. Modification of one *paramāṇu* does not touch the modification of another *paramāṇu*. Every *paramāṇu* substance, when seen by its own modification, is separate, and when seen as undivided, is as is.

It is the ability of *paramāṇus* of *karma* of that *samaya* to occur. Every substance is in the form of generality-particularity by itself. That is why every substance is as is, permanent, in the form of generality, and in all its states, from the view of the state of particularity, it is changing. For this, if base of any other is believed, then no substance can be proved. State of water became hot due to its own ability, so the one who believes it to have become hot due to fire is ignorant. From where did this erroneous belief come that due to the existence of fire, there is existence of heat in water?

Car does not move from one place to another due to petrol. *paramāṇus*, which are below, is not the reason for the ones on top. From the view of *pramāṇa jñāna*, independence of all can be seen, but associations cannot be seen in it. It may seem that because of

arising of life of *deva*, *jīva* went to heaven, but that is not so. *pramāṇa jñāna* shows independence of a substance and relation with its modifications. Its modifications are due to itself and not due to another substance.

Both, distinctions, due to modification and undivided state as substance are as it is, and are seen in one substance. Its variedness/plurality cannot be seen through other substances. *pramāṇa jñāna* is in the form of *ubhaya* (both ways). Be it in *siddha* or *nigoda*, both generality-particularity are present every *samaya*, by itself, and not due to non-self.

Stick rises due to the stick at that *samaya*. In that distinctness of modification is its particularity, and its permanence is its generality. In this way knowing of substance and modification, creates duality in one substance. Ignorant believes it to be done by some other; therefore, he does not believe in the existence of substance.

Change in substance and its infinite attributes is because of its distinction and its permanence; its oneness is also due to itself. Such are all knowables, and *jñāna* is in the form of knowing it as such.

Sentient is knower of self and non-self. He who does not accept that efficacy of knowing self and non-self modifies, while staying independent, has not accepted *ātmā* itself. Non-sentient substance is completely non-sentient because of all efficacies of non-sentient substance and sentient *ātmā* being in the form of sentience is complete *īśvara*.

From the viewpoint of substance, it is perceived to be as it is, and from the viewpoint of modification, same is seen in the form of another. Where the state of *nigoda* and *nārakī* and where the state of *siddha*! A human body may have cancer, blood may turn to water, poison may spread, etc., efficacy of non-sentient modifies at its own time, due to its own self. In a moment, *matī-śruta jñāna* changes and complete *jñāna* manifests. Hence, generality-particularity should be seen in self-substance and not in association.

☆☆☆

❁ *gāthā* 115 ❁

अथ सर्वविप्रतिषेधनिषेधिकां सप्तभङ्गीमवतारयति --

Now, *Ācārya* introduces the seven-fold style of narration (*sapta-bhangī*) which repudiates/removes all contradictory assertions:

अस्थि त्ति य णस्थि त्ति य हवदि अवत्तव्वमिदि पुणो दव्वं ।
पज्जाएण दु केण वि तदुभयमादिट्ठमण्णं वा ॥

*atthi tti ya ṇatthi tti ya havadi avattavvamidi puṇo davvaṃ |
pajjāeṇa du keṇa vi tadubhayamādiṭṭhamañṇaṃ vā || 115 ||*

Meaning: A substance, with respect to some particular aspect/modification or other, is stated that it is *asti*(exists) and is *nāsti* (does not exist), is *avaktavya* (indescribable), and is *asti-nāsti* both or being separate from some other modification, it is explained in the form of threefold parts.

ṭīkā: A substance, with reference to itself (its own characteristic nature) is:

1. Is *syāt* (in some way/quodammodo/) *asti* (exists) from the view of nature of self-substance. *syātasti* means quodammodo – it exists by itself.
2. Is *syāt* (quodammodo) *nāsti* (does not exist) from the view of a non-self substance. *syātnāsti* means quodammodo (in certain ways) – it is not (does not exist) by other self.
3. Is *syāt avaktavya* (quodammodo indescribable) from the view of simultaneity of the form of self/non-self. *syāt avaktavya* means quodammodo – it is indescribable by simultaneity of itself and other self.
4. Is *syāt astināsti* (quodammodo is/is not) from the view of sequentiality of self/non-self. *syāt asti-nāsti* means quodammodo – it is and it is not, successively by itself and self of other.
5. Is *syāt asti-avaktavya* (quodammodo, it exists and indescribable) from the view of self- substance and simultaneity of self-non self. *syāt asti avaktavya* means quodammodo – it is by itself and indescribable by simultaneity of itself and non-self.
6. Is *syāt nāsti avaktavya* (quodammodo, it does not exist and indescribable) from the view of self-substance and simultaneity of self-non self. *syāt nāsti avaktavya* means quodammodo – it is not by other self and indescribable by simultaneity of itself and self of other.
7. Is *syāt asti-nāsti avaktavya* (quodammodo it is/it is not and is indescribable) from the view of self-substance, non-self substance and simultaneity of self-non self. *syāt*

asti-nāsti avaktavya means quodammodo – it is by itself, it is not by other self and it is indescribable by simultaneity of itself and other self.

If the substance is described in this seven-fold way of narration, i.e., that which (1) is *saṭ* (existent) by itself, (2) is *asaṭ* (non-existent) by self of other, (3) is *avaktavya* (indescribable) simultaneously by itself and by non-self (4) is successively *saṭ* and *asaṭ* by itself and by self of other (5) is *saṭ* and *avaktavya* by itself and indescribable by simultaneity of itself and self of other (6) is *asaṭ* and *avaktavya* by self of other and indescribable by simultaneity of itself and self of other and (7) is *saṭ*, *asaṭ* and *avaktavya* by itself, by self of other and indescribable by simultaneity of itself and self of other.

Thus, a substance possesses infinite traits; so, by considering each trait of substance through affirmation of ‘what is meant to be said’ and negation of ‘what is not meant to be said’, this *saptabhaṅgī* (seven-fold predications or propositions) is developed. By applying this *saptabhaṅgī* through the infallible incantation of the word *syāṭ* (quodammodo/in certain ways), complete delusion of contrariety, existing in the assertion ‘*ja-kāra*’ (absolutely so) is dispelled.

pravacana on gāthā 115

All substances like *ātmā*, etc., which are present in the universe, are substances that exist and are perfect in themselves. That which exists has not been made by anyone, and if it was made by someone, then it would not be permanent. It is not so that existence of substance was not there. It is... is... is. In every substance, *asti-nāsti*, etc., exists as its characteristics. Every characteristic can be explained as primary, secondary, sequential, simultaneous, etc., in seven ways. That which is there can be spoken about, and that which is not there cannot be spoken about.

Every substance has its existence by self and lack of existence by non-self. If existence of self were due to non-self, then no one’s nature of reality would remain. Body does not stay due to *ātmā*, and *ātmā* also is not due to body. Similarly, non-sentient *karma* is also a separate independent substance of the universe, which exists by its own nature and is non-existent by the nature of *ātmā*. Therefore, they do not give any kind of benefit or loss to *ātmā*.

Every substance exists by its own nature, and is not due to non-self, *karma* or God; because by way of non-self, it is eternally non-existent. If it were to be by non-self exactly the way it is by self, then there would be no existence at all. Non-existence, meaning *nāsti* (not to be), is also the nature of every substance.

In the fourfold nature of self, fourfold nature of non-self is absent. *ātmā* is non-existent for physical *karma*, and physical *karma* is non-existent for *ātmā*. Then it can never happen that *karma*, etc., which are non-self substances, can give benefit or loss to *ātmā*. Some believe God to be the doer, and the so-called Jains believe that *karma* can make

jīva have attachment, aversion, and delusion, and make him have transmigration. In that case, they believe physical *karma* to be God.

Physical *karma* exists by its own substance-space-time-modification, and it is non-existent for *jīva*. Belief that *karma* gives rise to attachment-aversion-delusion in self exists in the modification of an ignorant *jīva*, and it is non-existent in physical *karma*. Existence of substance-space-time-modification of one cannot be because of another. Existence of modification of *karma* is not due to attachment of *jīva*.

Would modification of bondage of *karma* occur even if *jīva* would not be having attachment? If this question is asked, then its answer is that modification of *karma* exists from the view of *paramāṇu* of that time, and is non-existent for attachment of *jīva*. Time of one modification is only one *samaya*, and it is not eternal. Such *anekānta* exists in every substance.

If it is said that substance exists by its own nature and also exists the same way in the form of non-self, then its independent existence will not remain. Perturbed modification of one *samaya* is *nīścaya* (absolute truth), knowable, *svayaṁ siddha saṭ* (it exists complete in itself), and not due to non-self. Here it is stated primarily from the view of *jñāna*, and where attachment, etc., are called *puḍgala* (physical matter), it is said that *ajīva* does not pervade into the permanent nature of *jīva*. By saying so, the undivided focus has been explained.

From the state of *nigoda* to fourteenth stage of evolution, rising of disposition resulting in *saṁsāra* exists due to *jīva*. And they are not due to substance-space-time-modification of non-self. The one who has understood this understands the purpose of seven-fold predications/propositions.

In the discourse of Omniscient and in His *jñāna*, it has come that every substance exists by itself and is non-existent by non-self. So, it does not remain to be seen if there is a benefit or loss due to non-self. It is not due to non-self, but is not due to substance-attribute of self either; existence of attachment, etc., is due to the ability of its self at that time.

From eternity to infinity, every substance exists by self and is non-existent by non-self. It is so in this way and in no other way. Omniscient has known so and has said the same in His discourse. This is stated so in *śrūta jñāna* (scriptural knowledge) - *naya* (an aspect of knowing) *saptabhangi* (seven-fold predications or propositions) as well. *naimittika* (effect) does not exist due to *nimitta* (cause). Work is done due to its own ability at that time. Existence is due to non-self, e.g. a *paramāṇu* became cold or hot due to the weather, is not present in the nature of substance. Poison of transmigration cannot be destroyed without the non-failing mantra in the form of quodammodo.

Some say that texts written on principles of conventionality cannot be negated by the viewpoint of absolutism. Scriptures on principles of absolutism say that every substance

exists by its own nature and is eternally non-existent by the nature of non-self. And scriptures on principles of conventionality say, that in some ways, there is existence due to non-self, there is benefit by *nimitta* or attachment. To believe both to be equal, is gross ignorance. *saptabhaṅgī* contradicts this by ascertaining correct knowledge of true scriptures. Modification of *nidhatta* or *nikācīta karmas* of that *samaya* exist due to itself, and they are eternally non-existent in the nature of *jīva*. *karmas* have not gone away because *ātmā* modified as pure psychic activity.

A boil on the body exists in that form. Then *jīva* has inauspicious thoughts, so this inauspicious modification exists in its own form at that *samaya*. At the time of modification of transmigration, that modification exists, and at that *samaya*, modification of *mokṣa* is non-existent. Here, it is explained primarily from the view of *jñāna*. When *jīva* knows self as well as non-self objects of *jñāna* correctly, then there is a negation of attachments whose auspices is on non-self, and there is a deference towards the *samyak ekānta* (true one sided) nature.

Whenever a substance is seen, at that time, it stays permanent by its own nature and modifies also by its own nature. It is not possible for it to be in the form of non-self. It is not in the nature of any substance to take support of non-self or to give support to non-self. *ātmā* does not become a *karmic* particle. Therefore, there is no reason to focus on non-self. *paramāṇu* should be seen in blood, flesh or disease, or if seen them as separate, they are so because of their own ability of that *samaya* and not due to non-self. In this way, in every substance, *asti-nāsti* (existence/non-existence) can be proved. On considering essential attributes as primary and others as secondary, it is explained primarily with *asti-nāsti* in seven styles.

1. Substance from standpoint of its nature is *syāt-asti* (quodommodo/existing in a certain way).
2. From standpoint of non-self, it is *syāt nāsti* (quodommodo non-existent).
3. It is not possible to say simultaneously from standpoint of self and non-self, so it is *syāt avaktavya* (quodommodo indescribable)
4. From standpoint of sequence of self and non-self, it is *syāt asti-nāsti*
5. It exists by self, and is not possible to speak of self and non-self simultaneously, so it is *syāt asti avaktavya*.
6. It is non-existent by non-self, and is not possible to speak of self and non-self simultaneously, so it is *syāt nāsti avaktavya*.
7. It is *asti-nāsti* by self and non-self, and from standpoint of both being together, it is not possible to speak about them simultaneously, so it is *syāt asti-nāsti avaktavya*.

Focus of the seeker is constantly, primarily on the undivided pure nature and thoughts of division, which is an analytic standpoint is always secondary. He never has duality

as his primary focus. It is true that he has an analytic standpoint through *jnāna*, but he always has his focus on *niścaya*. So, in substance, knowing is complete in itself and in manifestation of words, the sevenfold pattern of narration is applicable to all. That which is always said with true experience of self and is in the form of quodammo, is the unfailing *māntra*, by which the poison of all contradictions and delusion are destroyed.

If only the efficacy that all substances are by way of their own pure nature is believed in, and all are seen as equal, then this is the poison of *mithyā ekañta*. But if it is understood that every substance exists by its own nature and does not exist by the nature of another, then, both standpoints – to be and not to be – are understood, and from it flows the nectar of nature of true *anekāñta*.

To explain any principle, if the term ‘only/solely’ is used, then that is not a flaw. That which is by self, is not by non-self, by saying this, absence of non-self, meaning, ‘it is not there’ standpoint is understood. State of transmigration is due to *jīva*’s own ability and not due to non-self. In this way, the sevenfold style of narration has been accepted, but if existence of modification of self is believed to be by non-self, then *anekāñta* will not remain.

It is true that, what is there, is not there from the view of non-self. Perturbation rises due to self, but to believe that it can rise due to non-self as well is the path of confusion. If it is believed that, *karma* makes way, then the path to liberation will occur, and sometimes liberation arises due to effort, then it is an erroneous belief. To believe that few will attain *dharma* by the attachment of auspices to non-self and few will attain *dharma* of passionless-ness due to *niścaya* is *mithyātva*. This kind of poison of singularity is destroyed by true quodammo.

★ ★ ★

❁ *gāthā* 116 ❁

अथ निर्धार्यमाणत्वेनोदाहरणीकृतसय जीवस्य मनुषयादि पर्यायाणं क्रियाफलत्वेनान्यत्वं द्योतयति –

Now, *ātmā* which is being understood, is made as an example of the concept that states/existence/modifications of *jīvas* such as human being, etc., are the fruit of his actions, so they have *anyatva* (otherness) which is explained here:-

एसो त्ति णत्थि कोई ण णत्थि किरिया सहावणिव्वत्ता ।
किरिया हि णत्थि अफला धम्मो जदि णिप्फलो परमो ॥ ११६॥

eso tti ṇatthi koī ṇa ṇatthi kiriyā sahāvaṇivvattā |
kiriyā hi ṇatthi aphaḷā dhammo jadi ṇipphalo paramo || 116 ||

Meaning: There is no modification (like human, *deva*, etc.) which can be said to be ‘this one only’ (i.e. permanent), as no modifications of mundane beings result from their pure nature (or in other words, he definitely has the perturbed modifications of *rāga-dveṣa*). And though the supreme state of *dharma* is without fruit (but), activity (of mundane beings) is not fruitless (i.e., only a passionless state does not produce fruits of the state of human, etc., but any activity which is full of attachment-aversion produces fruits of human, etc., states of existence).

ṭīkā: Here (in this world), in a mundane *jīva*, due to the presence of auspice of association of *karmic* matter particles since eternity, every moment is a state of constant change. Such a mundane *jīva* also has modifications from his own pure nature. Therefore, there is no such modification of humans, etc., which can be called ‘this one only’ (permanent). If it were etched in stone because fruit of action occurring due to destruction of former modifications are respectively destroyed by later arising modifications. And fruit of action should be believed to have occurred due to there not being destruction of delusion connected with soul; because action of *ātmā* (thinking sentient) is full of change characterised with a former and subsequent later state. And this evolution (of thinking sentience), embedded in delusion, bears fruit for *ātmā*, causing the effect such as human life, etc.; similarly, evolution of one *paramāṇu* when connected with another *paramāṇu* causes an effect such as a molecule of two atoms.

But with destruction of delusion, that same action connected with *ātmā*, does not have any effect, such as state of humans, etc. So, it is without fruit and is called the highest *dharma* owing to its nature being congruous with the highest self-substance. Just like evolution of an atom, which has ended its connection with another atom, causes no effect, such as a molecule of two atoms.

bhāvārtha: State of consciousness is the activity of *ātmā*. Activity of *ātmā*, devoid of delusion, does not produce fruit of human being, etc., forms of modifications, but *ātmā*'s activity imbued with delusion assuredly produces fruits of human being, etc., Since deluded dispositions of *ātmā* (mundane beings) are not of only one type, as a result of the state of human beings, etc., modifications are also not found to be chiselled in stone, permanent, or of only one type.

pravacana on gāthā 116

Every *ātmā* and *parmāṇu*, etc., are existing by themselves from eternity to infinity, hence they are existing by their own *svacatuṣṭaya* (substance-space-time-modification of self), but not by substance-space-time-modification of non-self. So, no one can do anything in the state of any other substance because there is a state of complete absence of one in another. Every substance, while remaining permanent, modifies - such an efficacy of *svacatuṣṭaya* is present in the substance by itself and not by non-self.

Question: If substance and attribute of *ātmā* are eternally pure, then from where did impurity in the present modification come from?

Answer: Impurity exists because of the ability of self-time of the present modification and not due to non-self. When one sees from the view of association, then impurity is believed to be from non-self, meaning one believes that non-self makes him do the impurities; hence, he has not understood the distinction between self and non-self.

As an example of that, in verse 116, it has been said that perturbed modification of the impurities of four *gatis* is due to *sva catuṣṭaya* (substance-space-time-modification) of *jīva*. And non-self *catuṣṭaya* is not the cause. If it were due to non-self, then there would be no need for any effort.

Due to the ability of its own self-time, in the state of humans, etc., manifestation of state of attachment-aversion, the *vibhāva svabhāva* (extrinsic nature) of *jīva*, successfully gives fruits of transmigration. State of passionless belief and supreme *dharma*, which is in the form of conduct, is not successful in giving transmigration. It cannot arise from *vītarāga bhāva*. It arises from auspicious and inauspicious extrinsic nature of self – this is the principle.

In the state of transmigration, even extrinsic perturbation is the nature of modification; it is not created due to non-self, because non-self's substance-space-time-modification is never present in self's substance-space-time-modification. Here modification of attachment-aversion is said to be arising from the nature of self. He, who believes that impure disposition arises due to *karma* or *nimitta*, does not have the ability to accept the independence of present modification. Then, he cannot accept that the eternal substance-attribute does not have any attachment-aversion. Transmigration present in *ātmā* is *udayabhāva* (emerging modification) of self-substance, but it is not its permanent nature. First, independence of

modification has to be accepted; then, it can be accepted that aversions have arisen due to the fault of weakness of self and not due to *karma*. He who believes that substance is pure and perturbation in modification is due to non-self has uncontrolled behaviour. He must understand that there is a permanent absence of *para catuṣṭaya* in *sva catuṣṭaya*. Without understanding this, if one believes the opposite, that attachment-aversion will rise according to the rising of *karma*, then it is the same as believing God to be the doer. He does not know the independence of existence.

If it is believed that *ātmā* has to be separated from attachment-aversion, then the question arises: how can present modification be removed, as it is in the form of origination? And in the second *samaya*, it is going to go away by its own self, then what will it remove and that which has not manifested how can that be removed? So, when focus moves from auxiliary cause, perturbation and distinction and turns towards the permanent nature, then attachment, etc., will not manifest. This is the process of distinction and separation.

Present new perturbation of *ātmā* is of only one *samaya*; and it occurs due to the efficacy of its own self time, but *karma* or God is not its doer. If perturbation were to occur due to non-self, then they can never be removed. Existence of false belief or attachment, etc., is not due to the presence of *darśanamoha* or *cāritramoha* (*karmas* which creates delusion of right faith and right conduct). And its absence will not be the reason for presence of *dharmā* in *jīva*. Rather, all are existing due to the efficacy of their own self time and due to their own self, and not due to non-self. Therefore, in the state of transmigration, modification of perturbed state of nature of *jīva* is due to his own fault; and this perpetuates transmigration. If focus turns towards *jñātā-dṛṣṭā, cidānanda* (knower-seer-sentient bliss), then ownership of infinitesimal part and of prominence of *nimitta*, which is the source of *mithyātva*, goes away, passionless belief and conduct manifests, which is not conducive to the continuance of transmigration.

Stick has gone up due to its own *sva catuṣṭaya*. It is delusional for an ignorant to not see its nature and see only associations. He may believe that words come out because of one's own desire. But if he does not believe that self-time of *bhaṣā vargaṇā* (karmic matter of speech) is due to those *paramāṇus*, and it is non-existent in non-self, or that desire of *jīva* is the modification of its own self-time, and that too is not due to non-self, then he has not understood the independent existence of substance.

Every substance modifies during its own appropriate time, but at no time does it leave the present to modify, either in the past or future. Ignorant, forgets pure nature, and only sees associations.

Nature of every substance is by its own *sva catuṣṭaya*. Modification of impure disposition is also the nature of modification of *jīva*, and it has not occurred due to any other. Similarly, by knowing the present modification and the eternal nature, independently, if it is believed that momentary perturbation occurs in modification due to its own fault and is absent in *nitya jñāyaka* (permanent knower), then right belief will manifest. Those whose focus is outside, think *dharma* to be in auspicious attachments of compassion-charity, so they have no opportunity to see and experience the inner complete nature. Omniscient knows the nature of substance just the way it is. Infinite *jñānīs* know this and say this. *jīva* does not have the ability to accept or release non-self in any way; because it is the independence of eternal state of substance to exist by self and be non-existent by non-self. Modification of the unnatural state is due to his own contrary effort, because of which the six causatives of *kartā, karaṇa*, (doer-instrument), etc., modify. *jīva* does it by himself. He does not depend on any other substance. This has been explained in the exposition of verse 62, and that is the state of substance.

All four *anuyogas* (types of scriptures) are presented in different styles, but their intent is the same. *ātmā* is not of two types, one which is the doer of non-self from the view of *vyavahāra* and another which is the doer of self from the view of *nīścaya*. One of the statements is merely *upacāra* (in name only). That statement explains instrumental cause which is present when work is done in *upādāna*. Second point is the statement the viewpoint of absolute truth and hence should be accepted as the truth. He, who believes that *karma* is very strong in *nigoda*, believes in the strength of non-self through three time phases. It is said in *Goṃmaṭasāra*, that, due to intense and deep fault in *jīva*'s psychic activity, he is unable to leave *nigoda*. It is wrong to believe that even for one *samaya*, *jīva* has as much perturbation as the existence of *karma* at that time.

pravacana on tīkā 116

Since eternity, by taking auspices of presence of existence of *karma* (non-self does not give auspices, but *jīva* leaves focus of self and takes auspices of non-self by himself), *jīva* modifies into an unnatural state. Impure modification of such *samsārī jīva* is his own. In that, no other *karma* is the doer, and by himself, he manifests new perturbation every *samaya*. This is not due to non-self, and neither is it due to earlier modification. It may be said that in past he had many inauspicious dispositions, so in the present, he does not have any inauspicious deeds. But the truth is that in every *samaya* of present, modification arises according to whatever psychic activity is done, by its own ability. Reason for life and death through the four life forms are auspicious and inauspicious attachments, and that is the action of the fault in self. This kind of perturbation does not exist in the eternal knowing nature of self. In this way, without accepting independence of the constant nature, which is the reason for ultimate *dharma*, effect of action cannot exist.

In this universe, there is the undivided knowable of substance-attribute-modification. *jīva* with transmigration modifies into its unnatural state by the auspices of non-self, due to his own fault. Unnatural state cannot arise with auspice of pure nature of self, and neither is unnatural state due to manifestation of *karmas*. When, by himself, perturbation arises in a *jīva*, then *nimitta* is alleged to be the reason. But he who believes perturbations arise due to non-self does not have knowledge of independence of present modification. Then how would he be able to experience the eternal pure substance-attribute? If it is assumed that because non-sentient is present, so sentient is also present, then how will it be proved that there is an absence of substance-space-time-modification of one in the other? Hence unnatural state of *jīva* is due to its own ability of that *samaya*. At that time, *nimitta* is present, but it has not done anything in *upādāna*(substantial cause).

Question: Why is *nimitta* said to be the cause?

Answer: When auspices is of self, then there is no perturbation, but when auspice is of non-self then *nimitta* present at that time is said to be the figurative doer, such is its capability, but *nimitta* does not provide any auspices. When hand moves, figuratively, it is said that *dharmāstikāya* is *nimitta*, and when it stops, *adharmāstikāya* is figuratively said to be *nimitta*, as it has the ability to be *nimitta* at the time of stopping.

Question: What is *nimitta*?

Answer: When *upādāna* (substantial cause) does its own work by itself, those associations which are present at that time are said to be *nimitta*. All *nimittas* have been said to be analogous with *dharmāstikāya*. Those reading scriptures do not believe in doer-ship and work done by *nimitta* straight away, but if they believe that, when *nimitta* is present, then work will be done, and if it is not present, then work will not be done, then there also belief of doer-ship and work done is present. This is the root problem in belief of *nimitta-naimitika*. Reason for the statement is to show associations and not to say that work is done in the substance due to *nimitta*.

Question: If state of *nimitta* is said to be just its presence, then what is its ability?

Answer: It means that *dharmāstikāya* has the ability to be *nimitta* in motion, and no other substance has it. To believe that if *nimitta* is present, then work will be done, is focus on dependency, and this is the basic flaw.

At whichever time, according to the ability of its self-time, whichever modification is meant to arise, only that will arise in its sequential order, it never occurs before or after. Cause for sequential modification is the substance. Sequential flow of all three time phases is in the substance. This order does not change. Independence of substance will not remain if it is believed that sequence of occurrence has changed or without *nimitta* modifications will stop.

Question: We need not believe *nimitta kāraṇa* (instrumental cause) to be the doer, but should we not believe that *nimitta* should be present?

Answer: Focus of *nimitta* is subjected towards belief that, if *nimitta* comes, then work will be done, and if it is not present, then work will not be done, emphasising the belief of *kartā-karma* (doer-work done). If it is believed that one must wait for *nimitta* to come, for work to be done in *upādāna*, then the principle of ability of self-time of *upādāna* will not remain.

karma manifests according to its own sequence-bound modification, and if *jīva* focuses on it or has attachments towards it, then figuratively, ensuing manifestation is called *nimitta*. But that allegation can never come on *karmas*, which exist as efficacies, as they do not have this ability; that is why they are not called *nimitta*. As the time of *nimitta*, *naimitika* is the same, mundane *jīva* is unable to grasp it, as this is known only in *kevalajñāna*. However, one with lesser *jñāna* can have belief in it.

Mundane *jīva* has attained unnatural activity by himself - as it is a part of his nature, it is not due to non-self. When true reason modifies as work done, then that which is present with it is said to be the conventional cause. If the un-alleged state exists, then allegation can be given.

Here unnatural modification of *jīva* is also true self-knowable from the view of *niścaya*. Origination of *karma* - which is the physical matter - is also a modification in the form of true knowable. There is a complete absence of one in the other. If *nimitta* were to do anything in *upādāna*, then it would become *upādāna*, and both would not remain separate. *sva catuṣṭaya* (fourfold self-state of substance-space-time-modification) of *karma* is in *karma*. Its manifestation is its *niścaya* self-time. When unnatural modification of *jīva* arises at its own self-time, by its own ability, at that time, *nimitta* is present by its own self, due to its own reason. In every *samaya*, both substances stay separate and are modified according to their own efficacy and ability.

If work in *upādāna* is done only in the presence of *nimitta*, then every work should be done according to *nimitta*, but this doesn't happen. If work of *nimitta* is done by someone else then, *niścaya* self-time of *nimitta* does not stay independent and separate, and if work of *upādāna* is done by *nimitta*, then present condition of the substance would not exist. The fault of absence of both will arise. If, even for one *samaya*, the present of substance does not remain independent, then its independence of three time phases will not remain. He who believes manifestation of modification due to non-self *nimitta* does not have belief of self-time of his own modification. Dependency of focus on the present modification does not allow one to see the eternal pure substance and attribute.

How can *nimitta* combine with a new modification which arises every *samaya*? Who can bring whom? If there is an absence of one substance in another, then how can one touch the other? When one *paramāṇu* does not even touch another *paramāṇu*, then to believe that due to one - work is done in another - is just a delusion.

Perturbation, which arises in a *jīva*, is, in reality, the form of ability of its own self-time. Modification of *pāriṇāmika bhāva* is causeless and stuck in the form of perturbation. In this way, first, the existence of causeless and absolute modification of impurity is proved; after that, the other figurative cause is called a *nimitta*. Existence of both is independent, by their own abilities at their own self-time. Due to auspices of associations, *jīva* modifies in an un-natural state, and its fruit is four *gatis*. That psychic activity which brings bondage cannot bring *dharma*. Therefore, leaving focus of modification of *nimitta* and perturbation and turning his focus on eternal knowing blissful pure-self and having undivided focus and equanimity on it, is *dharma*. Here, perturbation of every *samaya* is being proved as independent. It arises due to its own ability, and its fruit is not *dharma*, but is transmigration in four life forms.

Compassion, charity, vows, etc., are inflow of auspicious *karmas*. Violence, lies, theft, etc., are inflow of inauspicious *karmas*. Passionless belief-conduct is *saṁvara* (stopping inflow of *karma*) and *nirjarā* (shedding of *karma*) and the complete passionless modification is *mokṣa* state. As much increase in purity manifests, that much is *bhāva nirjarā*. Complete purity with auspices of pure nature is *mokṣa*. With bondage of auspicious-inauspicious dispositions - *saṁvara-nirjarā* cannot arise. Modification of *saṁvara-nirjarā* cannot arise from earlier modification of bondage of *puṇya-pāpa* or by dividing attributes.

Question: Are not *gupti-samiti* (restraint-carefulness) included as causes of *saṁvara*?

Answer: When passionless conduct manifests, then it is shown what kind of auspicious attachments and *nimittas* are present. Without manifestation of absolute, true *dharma*, conventional *dharma* belongs to whom? One modification cannot originate from another modification. One with gross ignorance and erroneous thoughts believes that if *nimitta* is present, then work will be done, but not otherwise.

A body of three and a half feet or of five hundred *dhanuṣas* (one *dhanuṣa* is seven feet), both are *vyañjana paryāya* (modification related only to attribute of shape of substance). *dharma* has no connection with space. *dharma-adharmā* is related to its own attribute in the form *artha paryāya* (modification related to all other attributes except shape). *dharma* cannot manifest with auspices of modifications of *udaya* (arising of *karmas*), *upaśama* (subsidence of *karmas*), *kṣayopaśam* (annihilation cum subsidence of *karmas*), *kṣāyika* (annihilation of *karmas*) *bhāva*. But purity, manifests, increases, and stays with auspices of *pāriṇāmika svabhāva bhava* (dispositions independent of *karma* which is the inherent nature of *ātmā*).

Inadvertence of *ātmā* is directly proportionate to attachments. And *dharma* is directly proportionate to the extent of carefulness of self-*bhagavāna ātmā*. As much he leaves his self focus, and focuses on outer states, that much he conjoins with delusion, and his modifications with attachments and aversions arises. That is the nature of present modification of *jīva*. All psychic activity responsible for bondage of 148 categories of *karma* are distortions. *dharma* can never be the reason for bondage.

When one *paramāṇu* joins with another, its work is manifestation of *skandha* (mass of two or more *paramāṇus*). Similarly, when *ātmā*, in the present modification, conjoins with delusion, and leaves focus of self, it manifests attachments, which is the form of non-self; those attachments give rise to modification of humans, etc., and hence are successful in continuing transmigration.

Because of erroneous delusional state, *ātmā* attaches itself to delusion, attachment and aversion, and till then, he will keep getting new life forms, meaning his transmigration will continue. But, when one *paramāṇu* separates from another, then that single *paramāṇu* does not have the ability to be in the form of *skandha* or manifest into *skandha*. Similarly, with destruction of delusion, supreme *dharma* manifests, and that does not give rise to life of humans, etc., so it fails to continue transmigration, meaning with activity of *dharma*, transmigration is destroyed.

Here, the sentence is “activity of destruction of attachment to delusion...” – The arrangement is not that first *ātmā* was attached to delusion, and then it was destroyed. It is stated that the arrangement is such that by taking auspices of the knower-seer, state of sentience, which is the nature to be a witness, does not allow delusion to arise, and this action destroys attachment to delusion.

Till focus of *jīva* is on oneness with *nimitta* or on a part of it, he will conjoin with delusion, and this is the work of delusion. This is a non-physical disposition. Disposition is not of physical matter; it is not due to physical matter and not in physical matter. *jīva*, by his own fault, by his own self, creates this manifestation in his own modification. This psychic activity of delusion is fruitful for transmigration through four types of mundane beings. In other words, one gets four types of life forms due to this.

Modification of passionless state cannot come because of focus on *nimitta* or from psychic activity. *samyagdarśana*, or state of being passionless, does not come from outside.

1. Focusing on *nimitta*, which are the true *deva-guru-śāstra*, cannot bring *samyadarśana*, or activity of *dharma* cannot manifest; because they are non-self substances and cause and effect relationship with them is of one *samaya*.
2. Auspicious thoughts of compassion, charity, and ritualistic praying are dispositions giving rise to *karmas*, and it is a blemished modification of one *samaya*. Manifestation of *dharma* cannot arise with their auspices, as they are perturbed modification of self of that *samaya*.
3. *mati-śruta jñāna* (sensorial-scriptural knowledge), becomes unimpeded according to reduction of passions. Taking its auspices will not manifest *dharma*, as that, too, is a modification of one *samaya*. *dharma* cannot manifest with focus of a small part.

Reasons given above, brings oneness with delusion, and the result is continuation of four *gatis*. It is explained how this oneness with delusion can be destroyed.

4. Self is complete with the permanent knowing nature. When focus goes on pure nature of self, and moves away from *nimitta*, or manifestation of *puṇya*, then *dharma* manifests from within. Then it can be said that oneness with delusion has been destroyed.

Substance and attributes are pure, even then, ignorant takes auspices of attachment of modification of one *samaya*. When effort and focus on pure self intensify, then earlier belief of oneness with one part is destroyed, and self leans towards its own pure nature. This destroys delusion, and time of both is the same.

Opinion, with the belief that he is only as much as one part, festers focus on a part, which is inattentiveness of the undivided whole. When this belief changes, focus shifts to *aṅśī* (undivided whole) and focus on *nimitta* goes.

When *jīva* engrosses into his own nature of *jñāna*, then it is said that his union with *moha* is destroyed. This manifestation of *jñāna* is not the accomplisher of transmigration, meaning, it does not originate new *gatis*.

It has been said that passionlessness manifests, meaning delusion is destroyed. In verse 7 it has been said that pure conduct is *dharma*. It means to play - be within - be steady in the blissful mass of pure nature, along with the experience of being a knower-seer. Auspicious thoughts or five *mahāvratas* (great vows) or skyclad state of body is not conduct.

Root of that conduct is *samyagdarśana*. '**daśaṇa mūlo dhammo**'. Root of *dharma* is *darśana* meaning root of conduct is belief. *samyagdarśana* itself is not *dharma* but is the root of *dharma*. Root of *samyagdarśana* is not conduct, but root of pure conduct is *samyagdarśana*. Without manifestation of *samyagdarśana* true conduct cannot manifest.

The term—to destroy delusion—is stated. So how can delusion be destroyed? Does wife-son need to be cast aside? Or does the present modification which gives rise to *karma* of *saṃsāra* need to be destroyed?

Family is non-self, so that cannot be accepted or renounced. Time of occurrence of disposition of *karma* and presence of that substance are the same. Despite its presence, to believe that it should be destroyed is an erroneous belief. But with focus on self, the permanent sentient nature, modification of right belief and passionless-ness manifests. Due to that, false belief does not arise, and thoughts of lack of vows also do not arise; hence, that is said to be the destruction of attachment.

Pure *ātmā* cannot be attained through *nimitta* of *sāstra*, with auspicious thoughts or with auspices of *jñāna* which focus on the non-self. But it is attained with auspices of sentient nature. Scriptures are insentient; Omniscient God is also another *jīva* in relation to this *jīva*. In relation to this, *jīva* omniscient is *adravya*, *akṣetra*, *akāla*, *abhāva* (non-substance/non-space/non-time/non-modification); because substance-space-time-modification of omniscient are not the substance-space-time-modification of self *jīva*.

Other *jīvas* are not this *jīva*, auspicious and inauspicious thoughts are not this *jīva*, *kṣyopāśama* (disposition which destroys cum subsides *karma*), is not this *jīva*, state of *saṁvara* (stoppage of influx of *karmas*) is also for one *samaya* and that too is annihilated; so that also is not *jīva* substance. Only that which is knowing-seeing substance which exists from eternity to infinity and is the permanent pure nature, is *jīva*.

As attachment-aversion manifests by itself, they are said to be the nature of substance; attachment has not arisen due to *nimitta*, and neither has it arisen due to arising of *karma*. Ignorant have attachments due to false belief, and *jñānī* has attachments due to his own instability. As it is done by self, it has been called the nature of self.

Modification of *dharma* has been described as *parama svabhāvabhūta* (present in the supreme nature of self) but while describing modification of attachment, the word *bhūta* (present) has not been used; because even if attachment has manifested due to its own self, it is not present within the permanent nature. Attachment is not present in the pure nature of substance. It arises and stops as attachments. Whereas modification of *dharma* is inseparable from pure nature, it manifests only with auspices of pure nature. Hence, it has been called *svabhāvabhūta*.

Unperturbed peaceful state which arises by not causing any distinction within the knowing-seeing pure nature is called *parama dharma*, and that is the cause of liberation. With manifestation of this modification, not remaining any further as transmigration does not remain. That is why it is not the accomplisher of life forms, and does not give fruits of transmigration. Hence it is said to be unsuccessful.

Here knowledge of both knowables has been stated. Without understanding the nature of substance-attribute when *jīva* has false beliefs and attachments, then the state with delusion-blemish arises, and that is successful in giving transmigration. That is one knowable. When he focuses on the pure substance attribute and is engrossed in the knowing nature of self, then the state which arises is unsuccessful for transmigration. That is the second knowable.

In this way, both activities have been shown in the form of knowable.

Without understanding the working of self-knowable, which is the undivided, sentient, substance, *dharma* cannot arise. Focus of an ignorant is on *nimitta*, or on association, or one part, perturbation, etc., and he attaches importance only to one part, but not to the whole pure nature of self, whereas every *samaya jñānī* has importance of his pure nature of self and does not attach importance to *nimitta* or to one part.

Statements of *nimitta* are given in many ways in the scriptures, but their context should be understood. *muni* did not create speech, speech occurred due to speech. He does get auspicious thoughts, but he has no ownership of those. *muni*, focused on his pure nature is immersed between the sixth/seventh stages of spiritual evolvement.

In verse six of *Samayasāra*, *Bhagavāna KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya* has said that self is neither *apramatta guṇasthānas* (stages of evolution from seventh to twelfth) nor *pramatta guṇasthānas* (stages of evolution from one to six), but he is ‘*eka jñāyaka bhāva*’ (only one knowable state). There the meaning does not translate into being either with equanimity or without, with passions or without passions, with vibrational activity of *ātmā* or without vibrational activity. But it has been said that he is neither *apramatta* nor *pramatta*. Why have the words *apramatta* and *pramatta* been used here? No words are used without purpose. Present modification of self modifies in the form of *pramatta-apramatta*. State of a *bhāva liṅgī muni* has manifested; but his focus is not on modification. His focus accepts only *eka jñāyaka bhava* (only one knowable state). Conduct of supreme *dharma* is not the cause of transmigration, so has been said by *Ācārya Bhagavāna*. He will get a life in heaven due to auspicious thoughts, but his focus is not on that.

A seeker has undivided *jñāna*, but complete *jñāna* has not manifested. After it is absolutely ascertained and experienced that *ātmā* is complete *jñāna* by nature, meaning of *nimitta* and *vyavahāra* is understood, but by auspices of the conventional knowable, *dharma* will not arise. *nīścaya* and *vyavahāra* both are explained, but auspice is only of *nīścaya*.

Ignorant assumes that both *nimitta* and *vyavahāra* are beneficial, so believes both to be acceptable, but this is an error in his understanding. *nīścaya* and *vyavahāra*, both do not remain if *nimitta* is believed to be beneficial. *vyavahāra* is the knowing of whatever modifications which arise after manifestation of *nīścaya*.

Passionless *muni* has thoughts to follow the 28 basic rites of a *muni* as per the evolution to the sixth stage. Those thoughts are attachments and not *dharma*. Sixth stage of evolution does not last due to these thoughts. It lasts due to experience of the knowing-seeing self, engrossment in it and annihilation of passions. Thoughts arise according to the degree and intensity of the sixth stage of evolution.

Following five great vows are thoughts of a sky-clad *digambara* state, which is the outside. *muni*’s state can never be with clothes, and to believe so is the exact opposite of truth. The faultless outer *vyavahāra* of a *muni* is not the sixth stage of evolution. Sixth stage of evolution is the inner passion-less state.

The focus of effort of a *muni* is towards the inner permanent pure nature. Due to this, he has no intense indulgence towards *pramatta* state. It may be seen that there is a difference in intensity of thoughts, and due to that, certain rituals may not be carried out, or because of weakness in the body, he may not be able to perform certain rituals, but all this is according to the present state. He never has thoughts of possession or ownership of material things, which are concurrent to the fifth stage of evolution; in other words, focus on the permanent pure nature is always very strong within him.

A householder may have made food which is free of any fault and is appropriate for a *muni* to eat. But if the *muni* has doubts about it, he will leave the thought of eating food and will not take that food. Despite this doubt, if he accepts that food, then he will be at fault.

He who has manifested such an inner state never has fruits of transmigration, meaning his transmigration ceases.

As experience of the pure nature of *jñāna* is without delusion, it cannot give life forms. It is not successful in giving transmigration, whereas faith-deluding *karmas* give fruits of four *gatis*. Delusional thoughts are not one but varied, which results in the state of human, *deva*, etc. These modifications are neither permanent nor of the same form. They keep changing into many forms. State of *mokṣa* is unchanging as if etched in stone, permanent, and of only one form. However transmigration has many forms, not just one.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-117* ❧

अथ मनुष्यादिपर्यायाणां जीवस्य क्रियाफलत्वं व्यनक्ति –

Now, it is explained that for the *ātmā*, the human beings, etc., modifications are the fruits of his deluded actions:

कम्मं णामसमक्खं सभावमध अप्पणो सहावेण ।

अभिभूय णरं तिरियं णेरइयं वा सुरं कुणदि ॥ ११७॥

*kammam ṇāmasamakkhaṃ sabhāvamadha appaṇo sahāveṇa |
abhibhūya ṇaraṃ tiriyaṃ ṇeraīyaṃ vā suraṃ kuṇadi || 117 ||*

Meaning: *karma* by the name of *nāma karma*, by its own nature, separating from the nature of *jīva*, manifests as modifications of human, *tiryancha* (animal), *naraka* (denizen of hell) or *deva* (celestial being).

ṭīkā: As *kriyā* (effect/ action) is really obtained by *ātmā* (or *ātmā* obtains *kriyā* – modifies it, so in reality, *kriyā* is *karma* (work done) of *ātmā*). And its (*pudgala*/ physical matter) state of *kārya*, being with such an action of *jīva*, which is with the inherent reason of modifications of humans, etc., is the fruit of that *kriyā*; because with absence of *kriyā*, *pudgala* will also be absent as state of *karmas*, due to which there will be an absence of *kriyā* of modifications of humans, etc.

Now, the question is how are those humen, etc., modifications, fruits of *karma*?

Because nature of *karma*, is separated from the nature of *jīva*. Like a lamp. It is in this way- the lamp separates nature of flame from that of oil, and it is the work of the flame. Similarly, by separating the nature of *jīva* from nature of *karma*, manifestation of modifications of humans, etc., is the *kārya* of *karma*.

bhāvārtha: Modifications of humans, etc., (as said in *gāthā-116*) are fruits of activities/ dispositions full of attachment-aversion because due to that activity, there is bondage of *karmic-matter* to *jīva* and those *karmas* manifest modifications of humans, etc.

pravacana on gāthā 117

jīva destroys his own peaceful nature by his self-ability, then it is said that *nāma karma* (*karma nimitta* in having body, etc.) is the opposite of its pure nature.

ātmā modifies in the form of attachment and aversion due to its own ignorance. Dispositions of compassion, charity, and worship, as well as of desires and anger, are done by *ātmā* himself and not by inert matter. So, the word “in reality “ is used here. As

ātmā itself is the doer, his state is originated by *ātmā*, is the work of *ātmā*. Auspicious and inauspicious dispositions do not originate through *karma* but originate by *ātmā*. Disposition is the work of *ātmā* and not of physical matter.

ātmā knows auspicious and inauspicious states. Here, knowable is proved to be independent. On getting *nimitta* of perturbation, indivisible matter particles undergo transformation due to their substantive cause, and physical matter modifies into karmic forms. Perturbed modifications of *ātmā* and modifications of physical matter in the form of *karma* have a cause-effect relationship, but they are distinct from each other.

Result of inert *karma* is the fourfold state of mundane beings. Root cause of fourfold states of mundane beings is the belief that “auspicious and inauspicious states are mine”, but that is a state of ignorance. The extent to which *ātmā* manifests in the form of delusion, attachments and aversion, to that extent inert *karmas* come into bondage, by itself, due to itself, and to that measure, various life forms etc., types, etc., also come into bondage.

It is not that there is an abundance of *karma* for beings in *nigoda* because they are devoid of mind. But when that *jīva* leaves his own knowing-seeing nature and modifies opposite to his pure nature, and modifies as *moha*, then due to this *nimitta*, physical karmic matter comes into a state of bondage by its own self. Result of this ignorance is the life of *nigoda*. *ātmā* has the ability to manifest in *nigoda*. It is unrelated to the (physical) mind. *Siddhas* also do not have (physical) mind, but they are in a state of infinite bliss.

COMPLETE JÑĀNA IS THE REASON FOR THE STATE OF SIDDHA, AND PERSISTENT AJÑĀNA IS THE REASON FOR THE STATE OF NIGODA.

jīva is in *nigoda* since eternity due to his own ignorance and not due to *karma*. When *jīva* modifies into a state of ignorance by its own self, then *karma* is merely alleged to be the reason for ignorance.

Does not manifestation in the form of matter *karma*, modify as modification of human, animal, etc.? Its main reason is the state of ignorance and attachment-aversion of *jīva*. Therefore, result of modification of delusion-attachment-aversion is transmigration of four *gatis*. When *ātmā* does not modify as delusion-attachment-aversion by itself, then due to their own self, non-living *karmas* do not modify as karmic matter particles, then there is an absence of non-living *karmas*. There is also an absence of the state of human, animal, etc.

There is no effect of one substance on another because there is a complete absence of relation between them.

In a *samavaśaraṇa* (congregation where discourse by *Bhagavāna* is given), mouse and snake forget their enmity. But this is not because of *puṇya* of *Kevalī Bhagavāna*. Those *jīvas* forget their enmity due to their own ability. *Bhagavāna* has manifested complete non-violence, but that is not the reason for mouse and snake to forget their enmity. In the story of *Sukauśala muni*, a tigress tears the *muni* apart, even though the inner state of *muni* was one of complete and absolute non-violence. He was in a state of pure

nature of knowledge within and on the outside, he was following the great vow of non-violence. So why did this supreme follower of non-violence not have any influence on that animal? Therefore, each *jīva* emotes according to its own ability.

An ignorant *jīva* believes benefit and loss in non-self substance and maintains enmity in his own modification. When a vegetable is fried in oil, many *jīvas* die at the same time. But those *jīvas* have not died due to *nimitta*. It was the ability of all those *jīvas* to leave their body at that time. Modification of every one of them is separate and independent. Non-self substance is merely present over there.

Other substances cannot be forced to be present, just so that work is done in substantive cause. Ignorant has many erroneous beliefs, like, all *jīvas* merge into one supreme being, there is no perturbed modification, there is no physical karmic matter in the state of transmigration, and there are no life forms like humans, etc. This delusion is broken by explaining that in the state of transmigration, *jīva* does have false belief, attachment, aversion, and perturbed states. When it gets such a *nimitta*, physical karmic matter forms bondage in the same space. Result of this is life in four states of mundane beings. Impermanence is also an existing nature of modification. *ātmā* is permanent and with nature to modify. It is neither completely permanent nor completely modifying.

If it is not accepted that four states of mundane beings manifest according to modification of self from the view of conventionality, then state of *mokṣa* which is without *gatis* will not manifest. If the distorted state did not exist in the present, then the present should have a state of manifested bliss and joy. If present modification does not have manifestation of joy and happiness, then it is definite that there is existence of attachment and aversion.

It is true that impurity in modification is due to its own state, and it brings sorrow. If nature of permanence were to bring sorrow, then perplexity would become the eternal nature of *ātmā* and would never give way to an un-perplexed state.

- 1 Eternal permanent nature is pure, blissful and joyous.
- 2 But because of one's own ignorance and instability, attachment-aversion arises in modifications.
- 3 With this *nimitta*, physical karmic matter is bonded by itself.

This results in transmigration through the four life forms of mundane beings.

Suffering of *jīvas* in hell is not due to them being in hell but is from their own ignorance. Their sorrow is in the delusional disposition of having ownership of non-self and forgetting their own knowing-seeing nature. Absence of unfavourable associations is not the reason for happiness. Nature of substance is proved by the teachings of the Omniscient. Ignorant is unaware of this reality. *Shrīmad Rājacañdrajī* has said

te te bhogya viśeṣanā,sthānaka dravya svabhāva |
gahana vāta che śiṣya ā, kahi saṃkṣepesāva ||

Whichever types of places (*nimittas*) are there to be experienced, according to that, there are non-sentient and sentient substances, and each is with their own modifications. O! student, this is a very deep and subtle concept, but it has been explained in brief.

It is said in scriptures that, fires in hell are so intense that a huge iron ball would melt like clarified butter. This shows the ability of *nimitta*. But it is not in the nature of substance to allow *nimitta* to make any changes in the modification of *jīvas* of hell. Modification of fire is in fire, modification of body is in body, and modification of *ātmās* of hellish beings is in their *ātmā*. All three are completely separate. When one substance does not even touch the other, how can they change each other? A hellish being forgets his own sentient knowing-seeing nature and due to his own self, attaches himself to delusion of false belief, attachment-aversions, and restlessness.

Impure disposition is not due to associations, nor due to *nimitta* (*karma*) and neither due to eternal, pure nature, but it exists due to its own impure state of that one *samaya*.

It is the ability of a needle to be pulled towards the magnet. One doesn't pull the other. It is the efficacy of that *samaya* of needle to get pulled. A hundred per cent of *upādāna* is in *upādāna*, and a hundred per cent of *nimitta* is *nimitta*.

How does modification of *karma* of human and celestial beings work?

ātmā has forgotten its knowing-seeing nature, he assumes ownership of non-self substance and acts in the form of delusional beliefs. With this *nimitta*, physical karmic matter turns into a state of bondage, and the result of this physical karmic matter is modification of humans, etc. So, it has been said that, nature of *karma* is totally different from the nature of *jīva*.

Because of the nature of fire, oil is burnt, and lamp gives light; hence lamp is the work of fire; similarly, *jīva* modifies into a distorted state by itself, result of which is karmic bondage. Due to this, *jīva* has an unnatural state, and it gets life of human, etc. So, modification of humans, etc., is said to be a work of *karma*.

pravacana on bhāvārtha

Modification of *moha* was explained in verse 116. When *jīva* forgets his own pure nature, then he modifies as such. Result of this is modification as humans, etc. Bondage of karmic matter is due to perturbation. Then *karma* obstructs the nature of self and gives rise to the life of humans, etc. The real reason for modification as human, etc., is attachment-aversion only. Bondage of karmic matter particles come due to attachment-aversion. So, rhetorically, it is said that, due to karmic matter, pure nature of *jīva* is obstructed, and *jīva* continues his transmigration.

❧ *gāthā-118* ❧

अथ कुतो मनुष्यादिपर्यायेषु जीवस्य स्वभावाभिभवो भवतीति निर्धारयति --

Now, the reason for obscuring of pure nature of *jīva*, with modifications of human, etc., is determined:

णरणारयतिरियसुरा जीवा खलु णामकम्मणिव्वत्ता ।
ण हि ते लद्धसहावा परिणममाणा सकम्माणि ॥ ११८ ॥

ṇaraṇārayatiriyasurā jīvā khalu ṇāmakammaṇivvattā |
ṇa hi te laddhasahāvā pariṇamamāṇā sakammāni || 118 ||

Meaning: Human, hellish being, animal, etc., *tiryāṅca* and *deva*/celestial beings, which are (embodied) forms of *jīva* (sentient beings), are, in fact, brought about by *nāma-karma* (physique-making karma). But in reality, as they are modifying as per their own *karmas*, they do not attain their own (true) nature.

ṭīkā: Firstly, human, etc., modifications are brought about by *nāma-karma* (physique-making *karma*) but is this not the reason for obscuring the pure nature of *jīvas*? for e.g., in all bracelets of gold set with rubies, the nature of rubies set in gold is not subdued. So, why does this *jīva* (sentient being) not attain/experience his own nature? It is because he evolves/modifies into his own *karmas* (good-bad dispositions), just like a mass of water. As a mass of water, evolves/modifies with its *pradeśas* (spatial units) and goes into different trees like neem (*zadirachta indica*), *chaṇḍana* (sandalwood tree), in the forest, then it does not maintain/manifest as its own nature of fluidity (*drayatva*) and tastefulness; in the same way when *ātmā* also evolves/modifies with its *pradeśas* (spatial units) and *bhāvas* (dispositions) into psychic-karmic form, then it does not attain its nature of *amūrtatva* (non- physical attribute) and *niruparāga viśuddhimattvarūpa* (without blemish and perturbation).

bhāvārtha: In humans, etc., modifications of karmic matter neither destroy nor covers the intrinsic nature of *jīvas*, but there, *jīva* himself modifies according to the manifestation of *karmas* due to his own fault; so, he does not attain his own nature. Just like a mass of water. When seen from the view of its *pradeśas* (space points), it modifies as the form of a tree, and does not obtain and experience its nature of fluidity. From the view of taste, when it modifies into the form of a tree, it does not obtain its own natural taste. In the same way, *ātmā*, when seen from the view of *pradeśas*, modifying according to his own manifestation of *karmas*, does not obtain his nature of unembodied state, and

from his *bhāvas* (impure dispositions) point of view, modifying into his psychic-karmic form, does not obtain his intrinsic nature of supreme purity, devoid of attachment/passion. From the above (logical discussion), it is inferred that non-attainment of intrinsic nature of (mundane) *jīvas*, in their human, etc., modifications, is due to their own fault, and not due to karmic matter, etc., or any other reason. It is said from the conventional viewpoint that *karmas* dominate nature of *jīvas*, but it is not so from the absolute standpoint.

pravacana on gāthā 118

Now it is being ascertained that because of modifications as humans, etc., how *jīva* is *parābhava* (defeated/ separated) of its pure nature.

Firstly, the four life forms of humans, *tiryāṅca* (sub-humans), *nāraki* (infernal beings of hell), and *deva* (celestial beings) are attained by *nimitta* of *nāmakarma* (*karma nimitta* in giving shape, etc., to body). But in this also, nature of *jīva* is not defeated. Attaining a body is not the reason for sorrow.

“In a gold bangle studded with gems, gems are studded in gold, but that does not change the nature of gems”. Similarly, *jīva* has the body of human, etc., due to association of sharing the same space, but *jīva* does not modify into a distorted state due to this. Meaning the knowing-seeing nature of self is not destroyed by body.

His own happiness and bliss are within his own pure self, but he does not experience it. He modifies in a perturbed state due to his ignorant beliefs of ownership of body, and assumption of happiness from non-self. This is the reason for his modification into a state of deviated form.

vyañjana paryāya (modification related to shape) of a mass of water, or the nature of its shape, is to flow in the form of a mass. Nature of *artha paryāya* (modification related to everything except shape) or those related to touch-taste-smell, etc., is to remain tasteful. Even then, due to its own ability, it modifies as a neem or a sandalwood tree.

Forms of modification, like the high or broad shape of water or bitter taste and fragrant smell, are due to their own self. Water does not rise up or become bitter due to neem tree. It modifies due to the ability of its own self. It is its inherent nature to be in the shape of flowing form and be tasteful. This inherent nature is not acquired.

Similarly, *ātmā* modifies by its own efficacy, as *vibhāva vyañjana paryāya*, which is various shapes of humans-*devas*, etc. It is due to its own ability that it modifies as the lower state of knowing-seeing and attains forms due to attachments and aversions. It is due to this that it does not modify as its nature of being intangible, impenetrable, and pure.

The question may arise: did *ātmā* not get the shape of a human because it got the body of a human? Or is not the shape of *ātmā* of *nigoda* so because it has body of *nigoda*

which is shared by many *ātmās*? Or that shape of *ātmā* of a centipede is such because it attained the body with many legs. This assumption is incorrect. *vyañjana paryāya* (shape modification) of every *ātmā* is due to its own efficacy, and not due to the body. Similarly, it is incorrect to assume that the reason for lower state of *jñāna* or of attachment-aversion is manifestation of *karma*. *arthaparyāya* (all other modifications except that of shape) of every *ātmā* is due to its own ability. For example, if water is poured into a vessel, then its shape becomes similar to that of the vessel due to its own self. Body is like a vessel. *jīva* turns into the shape of body which it acquires and stays so, due to its own efficacy.

In verses 116 and 117, *artha paryāya* of *jīva* was explained, and in verse 118, both *vyañjana* and *artha paryāya* are explained.

It is due to modification of *vyañjana paryāya* (modification related to shape) that finger changes from being straight to being crooked. Its state did not change because of change in space points of *ātmā*. Neem tree is not the reason for water to modify into the form of a neem tree and turn bitter in taste, but this modification is due to the ability of water. Every *samaya*, *jīva*, keep modifying, and its shape keeps manifesting.

Can there be a time when *pradeśatva guṇa* (attribute of shape formation), is not there? If an attribute exists, then it has to have some shape. *ātmā* is a substance, so it has to have a shape. *ātmā* does not have a shape like physical matter, so it has been called without shape. But in reality, *ātmā* is with innumerable space points, so it does have a shape. Even space/sky is with shape. All substances exist by their own self shape.

pravacana on bhāvārtha 118

This chapter is on knowables. Here, an appropriate understanding of the complete independence of *artha and vyañjana paryāya* of every *samaya* of knowable has been explained.

Physical karmic matter does not obstruct *jīva*, which is with modification of any of the four lifeforms of humans, animals, etc. In fact, *jīva* modifies into a state of delusion attachment-aversion due to his own ignorance. This is the reason for him not attaining peace.

The way, water rising up a tree is in the shape of a tree from the view of space, from the view of taste it modifies as bitter or sour according to the tree, but it does not modify as its own inherent flowing nature and also does not attain its inherent state of being tasteful. Similarly, from the view of space points, *ātmā* modifies in the form of *vibhāva vyañjana paryāya* (not natural modification of shape), due to which he modifies in the form of human modification, celestial being modification, etc. At that time, he does not modify into his intangible inherent shape. It modifies its dispositions according to the ability of its own *artha paryāya*. When he modifies in the form of sensory knowledge or as auspicious and inauspicious dispositions, then he does not modify as the complete nature of passionless omniscience.

Here, it has been proved that even if there is a modification of *vyañjana paryāya* of *ātmā* or if *artha paryāya* modifies as inferior or superior, it is due to one's own distorted modification, and not due to *karma* or any other substance.

One dust particle cannot bring changes in another dust particle. One dust particle cannot bring changes in any *ātmā*, one *ātmā* cannot change a dust particle, and there can be no change in one *ātmā* due to another *ātmā*. Each *artha* (modifications of all attributes except attribute of shape) and *vyañjana* (modification of attribute of shape) *paryāya* of every substance has its own self-time, which is due to self.

When it is said that substance modifications of the same type are made of two or more *paramāṇus*, it shows that those smallest units of matter particles are separate. It shows that one is not due to another. When substance modifications of different types are stated then it refers to two substances which are completely different, for example *ātmā* and body. *ātmā* is not due to body, and body is not due to *ātmā*.

There are infinite *paramāṇus* in one stick, and when seen in the gross form, each and every *paramāṇu* has the ability to stay there in that form. *paramāṇus* are separate. Ability which was present at the time of its subtle state is not present in its gross form, and ability which was present in its gross state will not be present in its subtle form. Be it subtle or gross form; its ability is due to its own self and not due to non-self.

In this verse, example of *jīva* has been stated. When *jīva* understands its own efficacy of *sva-para prakāśaka* (illumination self and non-self) nature in the correct way, then it understands substance, attributes, along with *vyañjana paryāya* and *artha paryāya* of all knowables. With this, it can be deduced that when *jīvas* from *nitya nigoda* (place where only *nigoda jīvas* are found) to life of *deva* are not experiencing their own knowing-seeing nature, it is because of their perturbed modification. They are not attaining a passionless state and omniscience, due to their own fault. Manifestation of intense *karmas*, body, wealth, spouse, family, relationships or any other non-self substance is not the reason for attachments-aversions.

It is said metaphorically that *karma* defeats the very essence of *jīva*. But in reality, it is not so. Real reason for the defeat of *jīva*'s own passionless pure nature of self is his own fault. When *jīva* makes mistake by himself, then metaphorically *karma* is said to be at fault.

Jainadarśana (perception of *jaina* teachings) is perception of the nature of substances. In this, nature of sentience is main, and it is not perturbed states, or *karmas*. On knowing the sentient nature, all non-self substances like perturbed state and *karma* are known.

❧ *gāthā-119* ❧

अथ जीवस्य द्रव्यत्वेनावस्थितत्वेऽपि पर्यायैरनवस्थितत्वं द्योतयति --

Now, it is evident that *ātmā* being permanent in its substantiality, it is non-permanent with respect to its modifications:

जायदि णेव ण णस्सदि खणभंगसमुब्भवे जणे कोई ।

जो हि भवो सो विलओ संभवविलय ति ते णाणा ॥ ११९ ॥

jayadi ñeva ña ñassadi khaṇabhaṅgasamubbhave jaṇe koī |

jo hi bhavo so vilao saṁbhavavilaya tti te ṇāṇā || 119 ||

Meaning: This universe with living beings, in which *utpāda* (origination) and *vināśa* (destruction) of modifications is taking place every moment, no one is born or dies, because origination (of new modification) is destruction (of its former modification), yet both origination and destruction are different also.

ṭkā: Firstly, nothing is born, nor does anything die (or in this *loka*, nothing originates, and nothing is destroyed). Despite this, *jīva loka* with humans, devas, animals and *nāraṁkī*, constantly modifying, are connected to *utpāda* (origination) and *vināśa* (annihilation) occurring every moment. There is no contradiction in this. This is because origination and annihilation have oneness and multipleness. When there is oneness in origination and annihilation, then it is the earlier alternative, and when there is multipleness, then there is the latter alternative. (or when origination and annihilation are seen from the view of oneness, then the alternative that ‘nothing originates and nothing is annihilated’ is proved, and when origination and annihilation are seen from the view of multipleness, then the thesis of ‘constantly occurring origination and annihilation’, every moment is proved).

If it is said, “that which is the pot is the pitcher”, even then, it is impossible for the state of pot to be the same as pitcher, and due to this, clay which is the base of both is understood. Similarly, when it is said, that which originates, that itself annihilates - it is impossible for nature of origination and annihilation to be the same, and *dhrauvya* (permanence), which is the base of both, is understood. Oneness of characteristic nature of pot and pitcher is impossible. Hence, in mentioning ‘origination is destruction’, oneness of characteristic nature of origination and destruction is impossible, and permanence, which is the base of both of them, is recognised. Therefore, when *deva*-modification arises, and human-modification disappears, then with the acceptance that ‘origination is with destruction’, *jīva* substance, which is the base of both states, is recognised (is understood). So, always *jīva* exists as *dhrauvya*, as definitive as if chiselled in stone.

Further, when it is said ‘a different pot and a different pitcher’, it is impossible for clay, which is the base, to be different (state of being separate and one), so the nature of pot and pitcher (separate nature of both) manifests. When it is said that in this way, ‘separateness’ originates and separateness annihilates, it is impossible for the base of both, which is permanence, to be separate, and nature of origination and annihilation is understood.

Therefore, when *deva* modification arises, and human modification disappears, then with acceptance that ‘origination is different and destruction is different’, - *deva* and human - both modifications representing origination and destruction, respectively, evolve (is perceived). So, *jīva* every moment is impermanent by its *pariyāyas*.

pravacana on gāthā 119

First, it is important to understand that in this universe, no substance is born/created/made, and none is destroyed; Because from the view of substance, *jīva* remains as it is; *jīva*, born as human, celestial being, animals, etc., and hellish beings are modifying every *samaya*. They are connected to origination-annihilation which occur every *samaya*. There is no contradiction in this. In all four states of mundane being, *jīva* modifies every *samaya*, but it is not because of *karma*. Earlier state is destroyed, a new state originates, and through this, *jīva* stays permanent; it does not stay separate.

jīva stays as it is, meaning, from the point of view of permanence, *jīva* is steady, and it changes its state every moment. From the view of state, it is variable or unsteady. This is said so from the point of view of modification. But unsteadiness is not due to *karma*.

jīva from *nigoda* to *sarvārthasiddhi* (name of one of the heavens), and from those with one sense to five senses, all are transmigrating due to their own self. To modify is the nature of every substance. Every *jīva* is attached to origination and annihilation every *samaya*, but that does not mean that every *jīva* is attached to origination of *karma*. When there is oneness of origination and annihilation, then there is a subsequent state. For example, *jīva* annihilates modification of a human and originates as a celestial being; but *jīva* is the same. From this view, it can be said that *jīva* is neither born nor dies; it is where it is. This steadiness is from the view of *dravya*, and at that time, the manifoldness of origination and annihilation is from the view of subsequent state; When modification of human is destroyed and origination of *deva*’s arises, earlier state leaves and new state arises. This is multiple-ness. This is said to be unsteadiness in the modification form of a *jīva*. Oneness and multiple-ness are applicable to self.

It is the nature of *jīva* to remain as it is, and it is the nature of modification of *jīva* that earlier state be annihilated and for new state to originate.

If *ātmā* understands his own nature of substance and modification, then he is his own friend, and due to ignorance, if he believes himself to be dependent and does not understand his own self, then he is his own foe.

Here it is not about just one life form but is about modification of every *samaya*. From the view of substance, *jīva* is steady, and, from the view of modification, it is unsteady, so there is no contradiction in every knowable being steady from the view of substance and unsteady from the view of modification; in this way, knowing of knowable is done.

If it is said, ‘that which is the pot is the jug’, then that oneness does not apply, as the shape of a pot is different from the shape of a jug. To prove oneness between pot and jug, the viewpoint of clay will have to be taken because clay is permanent in both.

Saying that origination is the same as annihilation, duality between origination and annihilation is proved and not oneness. But permanence, which is the base of origination and annihilation, is the same - the base of both origination and annihilation is permanence, which is as it is, and steady. Similarly, if it is stated that in origination of modification of the state of *deva* and destruction of modification of humans, that which originated itself is destroyed, then from this viewpoint, oneness between them is not proved. In fact, multiple-ness will be proved. But *jīva* is the base of origination and annihilation. It is steady and common to both. It stays as it is. Hence, it is proved to be to be steady.

When the question arises that both these states are whose? Then it is determined that state of permanence is steady and is present in both. When belief and knowledge of the permanent, continuous, eternal, blissful nature arises, then focus on permanent manifests, and focus on modifications is destroyed. This is *dharma*. This topic is about *samyaktva* with the predominance of *jñāna*.

If it is said that ‘pot is separate and jug is separate’, then it does not prove multiple-ness in clay, which is the base of both, but multiple-ness of pot and jug manifests. From the view of modification, there is unsteadiness in clay, and clay transforms into pot and jug due to its nature to modify. But transformation is not due to a potter, wheel, stick, etc.

When a finger is straight, and then it is bent, it proves unsteadiness of *paramāṇus* of the finger, it proves its efficacy of modifying. But it does not prove that finger was bent due to the presence of another *jīva*.

After having a desire, that same desire of *jīva* goes away, and this kind of multiplicity or unsteadiness of *jīva* applies to a *jīva*. But to think that desires have gone because certain associations took place is incorrect. Here one undivided knowable is being proved. This statement is about pure nature and not of associations.

If it is said that ‘origination is different and annihilation is different’, then the base of both, which is permanence, will have oneness, and multiple-ness in it would be impossible. If both origination and annihilation are taken, then the separate nature of both is decided.

With origination of modification of *deva* and annihilation of modification of human form, there is a separate origination, and annihilation, and base of both is *jīva*. In that, there is otherness but not separateness. So when it is seen from the view of separateness, then manifestation of modification of *deva* and annihilation of modification of human comes into focus.

Due to the changing, unsteady nature of modification of *jīva*, earlier state is destroyed and new state originates, but origination and annihilation do not occur due to non-self substances. It is the characteristic of every substance to be in unsteady form of origination and annihilation from the view of modification. This statement is about pure nature itself.

Destruction of the old state of a mill and origination of a new updated state proves *paramāṇus* of the mill. Those *paramāṇus* have modified in this form due to its characteristics of transformation/modification. But this state does not prove, the owner of the mill. When a *paramāṇu* of speech modifies, then its earlier state is destroyed; this proves the characteristic of *paramāṇu* but it does not prove the desire of a *jīva*.

State of poverty originated and state of position of abundance annihilated, proves the unsteady nature of *jīva*, but it does not prove association with the kingdom. It is completely incorrect to say that - poverty manifested due to the loss of kingdom.

Annihilation of modification of flour and origination of modification of *roti* (Indian flat bread) proves the characteristic of the modification of *paramāṇu*, but it does not prove the maker of *roti*.

It is incorrect to assume that shop was not running well due to the absence of its owner. And as soon as the owner came it started doing well. *jīva* of the owner is in the form of the nature of his own modification, and shop is in the form of nature of its own modification.

It is an incorrect belief that non-self can affect any other substance. There can be no changes in anything or anyone due to any other. So, every moment from the view of modification *jīva* is unsteady, but state of unsteadiness is not due to non-self substance.

Form of origination-annihilation of modification of *karma* is due to the nature of modification of *karma*, and not due to attachment of *jīva*. Similarly, origination-annihilation of attachment in *jīva* is due to the nature of modification of *jīva* and not due to *karma*.

If oneness in *jīva* is to be seen, then it has oneness from its permanent nature. And if multiple-ness is to be seen, then its impermanent nature has multiple-ness.

Both are nature of *jīva* and are not due to non-self. In this way, both the nature of *jñeyas* is independent. To have this correct knowledge is *samyagjñāna* and that is the reason for *dharma*.

☆☆☆

❧ *gāthā-120* ❧

अथ जीवस्यानवस्थितत्वहेतुमुद्योतयति-

Now, the cause of non-permanence of soul is explained: -

तम्हा दु णत्थि कोई सहावसमवट्ठिदो त्ति संसारे ।

संसारो पुण किरिया संसरमाणस्स दव्वस्स ॥ १२०॥

tamhā du ṇatthi koī sahāvasamavaṭṭhido tti saṃsāre |

saṃsāro puṇa kiriyā saṃsaramāṇassa davvassa || 120 ||

Meaning: Therefore, in this transmigratory world, no one is stable/permanent by nature (i.e., in this world no physical body remains the same forever); and transmigration is the action of transmigrating *dravya* (*ātmā* substance).

ṭīkā: In fact, *jīvas*, although being permanent/stable from substantiality point of view, are non-permanent from modification point of view. With this fact, it appears that no one is stable/permanent in this world of transmigration (i.e., it is not the nature of any substance, and neither is it to remain uniform/stable, in this world). Here, the cause of this non-permanence is transmigration because it is so by its characteristic nature, owing to it creating modifications of humans, etc., for self. The activity of evolving substance, which is *ātmā*, consists of forsaking the former state and modifying it into the next state. This is the characteristic nature of this transmigrating world.

pravacana on gāthā 120

Now the reason for variability in *jīva* is explained –

In this *gāthā*, what is the universe and where does it exist, is explained. Pure nature of *ātmā* is characterised by knowledge and bliss. Forgetting this nature of *ātmā* when perturbation arises in one's own modification, then that is *saṃsāra* (transmigration). A spouse, family, etc., are not the reason for transmigration. Similarly, substance and attributes of self, which are always pure, also do not have transmigration. Existence of the four types of life forms in one's modification is transmigration.

In reality, *jīva* exists, meaning it is steady in the form of substance and is unsteady in modifications. Hence, it can be decided that in this world, no one remains in the same form, because it is its nature to keep manifesting new states.

Transmigration is of only one *samaya* and not of two *samayas*. Earlier worldly state is destroyed, and a new worldly state originates. It is not the nature of state of transmigration to remain the same, without changing.

There are infinite *jīvas* in *nitya nigoda*. Substance and attributes of infinite *jīvas* of *nitya nigoda* are always pure, but modification of each moment is perturbed. *jīva* of *nitya nigoda* has not accumulated the eternal transmigratory existence all at once, but it is due to distortion in its modification of one *samaya*, as they have forgotten their own knowing nature, so a new existence arises every *samaya*.

saṁsāra exists from *nigoda* to the fourteenth stage of evolution. This is due to the fault of *ātmā* and not due to *karma* or body.

From the view of pure substance, *ātmā* has no transmigration, and from the view of modifications, transmigration exists in the modifying states. Reason for this, is the inability of *jīva* to remain in one form. Body of a human is not the life form of human. But the ability of *ātmā* to be in the form of a human is said to be the modification of being human.

Transmigrating *jīva* assumes many forms in all four states of mundane beings, and in each mundane state, he modifies into numerous perturbed states. Humans, at certain times, can have a life of over ten million purvas* (very long life). Even in that, he assumes multiplicity by modifying as one state in one moment and a second state in the second moment, because nature of transmigration is such. Annihilation of perturbation of the earlier state and origination of perturbation in the new state is constantly occurring in *jīva*, which is modifying every *samaya*. This modification is known as *kriyā* (action), and it is the nature of *saṁsāra*.

A spouse, children, and body are all non-self substances. *ātmā* is incapable of either obtaining or leaving these in any way. It is ignorance to believe that transmigration can be renounced by renouncing spouse, children, or business.

There is a complete absence of non-self substance in *ātmā*, as it is absolutely separate. When *karma*, children, body, etc., are anyway separate then how can they be forsaken? When one forgets the knowing-seeing nature of self, he assumes a sense of ownership of the body, spouse, children, etc., in his own modification and forsakes the earlier perturbed modification. This kind of modification of ignorance, attachment, aversion, and ability to get a state of mundane being is said to be the perturbed modification of one *samaya* of *saṁsāra*.

Ignorance did not arise because *jīva* was associated with *kudeva* (*deva* who is not passionless), and *kuguru* (guru who is not on the path of *vītarāga*). But he himself arises

*1 purva is 70,560,000,000,000 years

in an ignorant state, which is unconnected to the efficacy of *kāla*. Transmigration is not due to physical matter, and neither is it due to the existence of *karma*; this is because *karma* is non-self knowable. Non-self knowable does not enter the self-knowable.

This chapter is about *jñeyatattva prajñāpana* (assertion of principles of knowable). It is explained here that, in *ātmā*, perturbed modification of one *samaya* is a self-knowable substance. If interest arises in *ātmā* then it is important to know whose nature one has to know and see, along with appropriate knowledge, then desire for transmigration will go.

Question: Even *Tirthaṅkara Bhagavāna* took *dīkṣā* and then left *saṃsāra*, is it not?

Answer: *Bhagavāna* was not attracted to or nor did he partake any non-self substance, and neither did he forsake it.

He had the appropriate knowledge that he was by his own self with a pure knowing, blissful nature, and a mundane state was excluded from his belief. When he left the unsteadiness of attachment-aversion and became equanimous within himself, then it is said that he left his family and clan.

In *nigoda*, infinite *jīvas*, stay together in one body. Over there, food senses, or breath, are neither taken nor left, as they are non-self substances. They leave their perturbed state of ignorance and partake a new state of ignorance.

Here too, mundane state is not due to *karma*, because if it were so then when *karma* would go then the mundane state would also go. But *saṃsāra* is due to one's own ignorance. When ignorance is given up, then transmigration is renounced, and an unperturbed state manifests.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-121* ❧

अथ परिणामात्मके संसारे कुतः पुद्गलश्लेषो येन तस्य मनुष्यादिपर्यायात्मकत्व- मित्यत्र समाधानमुपवर्णयति--

Now, the question is - in this transmigratory world, what is the reason for bondage of karmic matter with *ātmā* (mundane being), due to which he modifies into human, etc., modifications? This question has been resolved here: -

आदा कम्ममलिमसो परिणामं लहदि कम्मसंजुत्तं ।

तत्तो सिलिसदि कम्मं तम्हा कम्मं तु परिणामो ॥ १२१ ॥

*ādā kammamalimaso pariṇāmaṁ lahadī kammasañjuttam̐ |
tatto silisadi kammaṁ tamhā kammaṁ tu pariṇāmo || 121 ||*

Meaning: *ātmā*, stained with karmic matter, undergoes dispositions linked with karmic matter (i.e., *ātmā* modifies into impure dispositions connected with *dravya karmas*); due to that, fresh karmic matter gets attached [with *ātmā pradeśas* (space points)] therefore, dispositions are called *karma*.

īkā: Modification of *ātmā*, which is by the name of *samsāra* (transmigration), is the reason for adhering to karmic matter (*dravya karmas*). What is the cause again of such type of dispositions? (In reply to this question, *Āchārya* says that) *dravya karma* (karmic matter particle) is its cause because it is always seen in association with *dravya karma* (karmic matter particle)

Question: In that case, would not the fault of *itaretarāśraya* (mutual dependence) arise?

Answer: No. (fault of mutual dependence will not arise); existence of *dravya karma* is since eternity, and earlier *dravya karma* of *ātmā*, is associated with it. And that is accepted as the reason.

So existing modifications of *ātmā*, whose work is new work done and whose cause is earlier karma, in that, existing *pariṇāmas* of *ātmā*, are said to be due to *dravya karma* figuratively. As *ātmā* is the doer of its modification, it is said to be a doer of *dravya karma* figuratively.

pravacana on gāthā 121

Here, cause for the bondage of *karma* particles in this modifying mundane existence due to which modifications of human, etc. manifests, has been explained: -

Modification of *ātmā*, of the kind, which is called *samsāra*, is the reason for bondage of karmic matter particles. Here the word *tathāvidha* (likewise) has been used. Mundane

existence is for one *samaya*. It is incorrect to believe that transmigration is completely non-existent, or that there is no impurity in modifications and say that ‘*brahma satya jagata mithyā*’ (brahma is reality, world is deceptive). Modifications have been described as such, which means that due to one’s ignorance, modification of attachments-aversion exists for one *samaya* in the modification of *ātmā*.

Now, auxiliary cause of *aśuddha upādāna* (impure substantive cause) is being told. The earlier particulate *karma* is said to be the auxiliary cause of state of impurity. When *jīva*, by himself, forgets his knowing-seeing pure nature and has attachment-aversion due to auspices of outer associations, then earlier physical *karma* is said to be the reason or *nimitta*. Real cause is the ability of self, and auxiliary cause is physical karmic matter particles. If self does not modify into a perturbed state, then *karmas* cannot be said to be *nimitta*.

Impure modifications arise with association of physical karmic matter; without this association, there can never be any impurity. Due to this, physical karmic matter is said to be *nimitta* of impure modification. Here, the statement is not to highlight the rising of attachment due to earlier *karma*. This is because attachment is in modification of *ātmā*, and the substance *karma* is non-sentient, as are its attributes and modifications. Karma does not cause perturbation because there is an absence of non-sentient in the sentient. It has been said that perturbation arises only with association of physical *karma*, which shows *nimitta-naimittika* (cause-effect) relationship. With the word association, separateness is highlighted.

itaretarāśraya (mutual dependence) fault occurs when, to prove the one that is unproven, help of another that is unproven is taken, and to prove the second, help of first is taken.

Cause for *dravya karma* is said to be impure modifications. When clarification about the cause for this impure modification is asked, then it is said to be the earlier physical matter. So, it creates a doubt that this statement raises the fault of mutual dependence.

Resolution: Fault of mutual dependence does not arise in this, because cause for new physical *karma* is impure modifications of *ātmā*. The reason for this impure modification is not the same new physical *karma* which has bonded, but it is the old or the earlier physical *karma*.

Perturbed modification of *ātmā* arises with *nimitta* of older physical *karmas*. If these modifications were to be *nimitta* in the bondage of the same older *karmas*, then fault would arise, and the above doubt would be justified. But physical *karmas*, which were there earlier, move away, and due to *nimitta* of impure modifications, other new *karmas* come into bondage. Hence no fault arises. In this way-

With *nimitta* of earlier *karmas*, if *jīva* modifies in a perturbed state, then, in that perturbation older *karmas* are said to be *nimitta*. Perturbation of *jīva* is said to be *nimitta*.

- 1 If *jīva* would not modify in a perturbed state, then older *karmas* are not called *nimitta*, and there *jīva* will not have bondage of new *karmas*.

Nature of *ātmā* is of being a knower-seer. There is no perturbation in the pure nature. *jīva* forgets his nature by himself and modifies in a perturbed state, then earlier *karmas* are said to be *nimitta*.

It has been accepted that *ātmā* and *karma* are associated since eternity.

- 1 If perturbation is believed to be due to earlier *karma*, then dependency will arise. If this is the case, then perturbation will go only if *karmas* go, and in this way, dependency will never go. But this is an incorrect assumption.
- 2 If it is believed that in the state of transmigration, during impurity, there is no presence of *karma* in the form of association, then impurity will become the permanent nature of *jīva*, then there will be no question of attaining *mokṣa*. So, this, too, is incorrect.

This chapter is about knowables. In this, an appropriate understanding of the relationship between perturbed modification and *karma* has been explained. When *jīva* modifies in a perturbed state by itself, then earlier *karmas* are said to be *nimitta*, and in the bondage of new *karmas*, perturbed modification is *nimitta*.

It is not that perturbed modifications arose, so old *karmas* arose. But *karmas* were *nimitta* in the earlier perturbed state, and with *nimitta* of new perturbation, new *karmas* come into bondage but not the earlier *karmas*. That is why the fault of mutual dependence does not apply.

In scriptures, there are many references to *nimitta*. In that, it is said that *jñāna* is stopped by *jñāvarṇīya karma*. So, does *karma* stops *jñāna*? No! When *jīva* has incomplete *jñāna*, *karma* is said to be its *nimitta*. Modification of *jīva* cannot be stopped by modification of *ajīva*. Every *jīva* modifies into a perturbed state due to his self, but pure nature does not have any perturbation. If he believes in his pure nature, then perturbation will not arise. Work of the perturbed state of *ātmā* brings new *jaḍa karmas* (physical karmic matter), and perturbed state arises with *nimitta* of the earlier physical *karmas*. It is due to this that figuratively, perturbed modifications are called *dravya karmas*.

If perturbed state would not arise, then earlier *karmas* would not be called *nimitta*, and there would be no bondage of new *karmas*. But as perturbed modifications do arise, so bondage of new *karmas* is its work, and earlier *karmas* are its cause. When this kind of modification of *ātmā* arises, then, figuratively, psychic *karmas* are said to be the cause for bondage of physical *karmas*.

From the view of *aśuddha niścaya naya* (impure absolute point of view) *ātmā* and insentient *karma*, both are *kartā* (doer) of their respective modifications. But when *jīva* modifies in a perturbed state, then with that *nimitta*, *dravya karmas* come into bondage. That is why, figuratively, *ātmā* is said to be a doer of *dravya karma*.

This is said with pre-dominance of *jñāna*. The purpose is to understand the modification of attachment and *karma* and move one's focus away from these, and towards the undivided passionless nature.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā-122* ❧

अथ परमार्थादात्मनो द्रव्यकर्माकर्तृत्वमुद्योतयति-

Now, it is explained that *ātmā*, in reality, is not the *kartā* (doer) of *dravya karma* (physical karmic matter): -

परिणामो सयमादा सा पुण किरिय ति होदि जीवमया ।

किरिया कम्म ति मदा तम्हा कम्मस्स ण दु कत्ता ॥ १२२ ॥

pariṇāmo sayamādā sā puṇa kiriyā tti hodi jīvamayā |

kiriyā kamma tti madā tamhā kammassa ṇa du kattā || 122 ||

Meaning: Modification itself is *ātmā*, and that *kriyā* (action) is *jīvamaya* (endowed with sentience). *kriyā* is believed to be *karma*, so *ātmā* is not *kartā* of *dravya karmas* (karmic matter).

īkū: Firstly, *pariṇāma* (disposition/modification) of *ātmā* is really *ātmā* itself because *pariṇāmī* (that which modifies) is *kartā* (doer) of the form which modifies, and hence is *ananya* (not any other) from it. That *ātmā*'s modification, which is manifesting at that time, is *kriyā* (activity) of *jīva* because modifying characteristics of all substances is accepted to be a part of self, and is endowed with qualities of self. Further, *kriyā* is *karma* (deed) of *ātmā*, as it is attained independently by *ātmā*. Therefore, from the view of *parmārtha*, *ātmā* is *kartā* (doer) of its *bhāva-karma* (psychic karma) but not of *dravya karma* (karmic matter particles) which is in the form of modification of *pudgala* (physical matter).

The question which arises here is if *jīva* is *kartā* (doer) of *bhāva-karma* (psychic karma), then,

Question: Then, who is the *kartā* (doer) of *dravya-karma*?

Answer: Firstly, modification of *pudgala* (matter) is matter itself; because *pariṇāmī* (that which modifies) is doer of the form of *pariṇāma* (modification) and hence is *ananya* (not any other) from its *pariṇāma* (modification). Modification of *pudgala*, is of the same sort, is *kriyā* (action) of *pudgala*, as it is endowed with characteristics of *pudgala*. It is accepted that modification of every substance is endowed with the same characteristics as substance; hence, *kriyā* is of substance itself. Modification of *pudgala* is independently modified by it. Hence it is *karma* (work done). So, from the view of *parmārtha*, *pudgala* is the doer of *dravya karma*, which is the form of its modification, but it does not modify *bhāva karma* (psychic karma) of *ātmā*.

From the above discussion, it should be understood that *ātmā* modifies in the form of *ātmā* but never modifies in the form of *pudgala*.

pravacana on gāthā 122

From the view of *parmārtha* (absolute truth), it is said that *ātmā* is not the doer of physical *karma*. Thoughts of compassion-charity-prayer are of *jīva* itself; so, they are *ātmā*. In *Samayasāra*, to foster *dravyadr̥ṣṭi* (focus of substance), attachment is said to be non-sentient from the view that, attachment is not in the eternal nature of substance. But here, reference is to modification, so the perturbed state is of *jīva*. This activity is believed to be work done, or it is called *bhāva karma* (psychic *karma*), and *jīva* is its doer, but it is not the doer of karmic matter particle.

The extent to which *jīva* is entangled in attachment-aversion, in that proportion, there is bondage of physical karmic matter. If attachment-aversions are weak, then bondage of *karma* is weak, and if it is intense, then *karma*'s bondage is intense. This kind of cause-effect relationship does exist; even then, *jīva* is not the doer of *karma*.

Usually, there is a *nimitta-naimittika* relationship between attachment-aversion and karmic matter particles, but there too, *ātmā* is not the doer of karmic matter particles. In many instances, *ātmā* does not even have *nimitta-namittika* relationship with attachment-aversion and non-self substances. To believe that *jīva* is the doer of non-self substance, and can move body, etc., is gross ignorance.

Modifications of *ātmā*, like falsity, attachment, aversion, *avrata* (vow-less state), *pramāda* (carelessness), vibration of space points of *ātmā*, are *ātmā* itself. On seeing modifications as undivided from *ātmā*, it is said that attachments, etc., modifications are of *ātmā*. This is because *ātmā* by itself is modifying. To say it in another way, it is with modifications. *ātmā* is the one that modifies in auspicious state with thoughts of compassion, charity, etc., and into inauspicious state with thoughts of violence, lies, theft, etc. So, *ātmā* is not separate from its modifications; it is not as any other, meaning it can be said that *ātmā* identifies with its modifications, and those actions are endowed with *jīva*. But modifications of *ātmā* are not due to *karma* or outer non-self substance. In this way, correct knowledge of modification has been imparted.

guṇasthānas (stages of evolution) are said to be 'mohajogabhāva'. It means that stages of evolution are due to delusion and *yoga* (vibration of space points of *ātmā*) and they are not due to *karma*. *jīvas* from *nigoda* to the fourteenth *guṇasthāna*, have impurity in their actions, which is due to the modification of *ātmā*. Every *ātmā* is one with his impurity and modifies so independently. *ātmā* independently modifies as an incomplete state of *jñāna-darśana*, perturbed state of attachment-aversion, vibration of space points due to self, but *karma* does not modify them.

Question: To show *karma* as *nimitta* in *karṇānuyoga* (scriptures that describe universe and doctrinal principles with explanation of cause and effect relationship), it is said that the incomplete state of *jñāna* is due to manifestation of *karma*, or because attachment-

aversion arose. Are we to assume that in such instances, *ātmā* is of a different kind? In *dravyānuयोग* (scriptures on real metaphysics/ontology), it is said that *ātmā*, by nature, is pure. Then is that *ātmā* separate from the one described in *karṇānuयोग*?

Answer: No! In *dravyānuयोग* statements are from the view of focus on pure substance, whereas in *karṇānuयोग* it is explained by showing *karma* as an auxiliary cause for rise of perturbed modification which is *ātmā*. There is a difference in the narration style of both. But intent is the same. *jīva* who cannot accept modification or a part as independent, will not accept the beholder of parts – *ātmā*, as independent. If there is a dependency that one's modification can be raised by another person, then one can never focus and look towards his own nature. Therefore, in reality, *ātmā* is the doer of all modifications of its own perturbed state, of impure state of *pratijīvē guṇa*, of *kriyavartī śakti* (efficacy of operative-ness). It is not so, that, modifications of attachment-aversion rise because of the rise of *karma*. He is the doer of psychic impure disposition, but not the doer of karmic matter particles.

Question: When *jīva* is the doer of psychic *karma*, then who is the doer of physical *karma*?

Answer: Modification of non-living matter substance is insentient only because insentient substance, which is the holder of modifications, being the doer of modifications, is not separate from them. But it is one, and modification in such form is the action of physical matter only, because all *dravyas* have the nature to manifest their own modifications, but they cannot manifest modifications of other *dravyas*.

Question: Is it that because knowledge-belief is incomplete, therefore perception obscuring *karma* occurs and knowledge obscuring *karmas* are bonded? Or bondage of deluding *karma* is because of attachment-aversion?

Answer: No. Bondage of physical *karma* is not dependent on attachment-aversion. Modification of insentient substance is at its own time, independently, resulting in the form of work done. But physical substance is not so dependent that because attachment arose, therefore physical substances had to come.

Attachment-aversion and physical *karma*, both are independent. None are dependent.

This chapter is on knowable. Correct knowing of knowable is that physical *karma* modifies independently, and *jīva* also has attachment, independently.

Physical substance is not the doer of impure dispositions of *ātmā*. This means that *ātmā* is not so dependent that because of rising of *karma*, *ātmā* had to have such disposition, because physical substance modifies in the form of insentience, but it cannot modify *ātmā*.

Hence, it should be understood that *ātmā* modifies as per the nature of *ātmā*; but it cannot have the nature of insentience; therefore, *ātmā* is not the doer of physical *karma*.

❧ *gāthā-123* ❧

अथ किं तत्स्वरूपं येनात्मा परिणमतीति तदावेदयति --

What is the form into which *ātmā* modifies – has been explained:-

परिणमदि चेदणाए आदा पुण चेदणा तिधाभिमदा ।

सा पुण णाणे कम्मे फलम्मि वा कम्मणो भणिदा ॥ १२३ ॥

pariṇamadi cedaṇāe ādā puṇa cedaṇā tidhābhimadā |

sā puṇa ṇāṇe kamme phalammi vā kammaṇo bhaṇidā || 123|

Meaning: *ātmā* modifies in the form of sentience. Sentience is believed to be three-fold. It is described as related to *jñāna* (knowing), *karma* (deed) and *karmaphala* (fruits of *karma*).

īkā: As *cetanā* (sentience) pervades through all attributes of *ātmā*, so, sentience is the characteristic nature of *ātmā*, and *ātmā* modifies in the form of sentience. Whatever disposition of *ātmā* maybe, it never violates the boundary of sentience (or none of the modifications of *ātmā* leave the attribute of sentience and are never without sentience) – this is the inherent meaning. *cetanā* (sentience) is of three kinds. 1) *jñāna cetanā* 2) *karma cetanā* and 3) *karmaphala cetanā*. There, modification of *jñāna* (modification of knowing) is *jñāna cetanā*, modification of *karma* (activity of *karma*) is *karma-cetanā* and modification of fruits of *karma* is *karmaphala-cetanā*.

pravacana on gāthā 123

Now, nature into which *ātmā* modifies is explained here –

jñāna cetanā, *karma cetanā* and *karmaphala cetanā* are modifications of *ātmā* only. Sentience is of three types. Awareness related to *jñāna* is *jñāna cetanā*; for sentience to get stuck in perturbation is *karma cetanā*; and for sentience to focus on modifications of joy-sorrow is *karmaphala cetanā*.

Sentience is the holder of nature, and *caitanya* (consciousness) is nature of *jīva* – it is an attribute. Attribute of consciousness pervades through all *dharmas* of *ātmā*. (*dharma* here does not mean purity or shedding of *karma* but means attributes and modifications). So sentience is the nature of *ātmā*. *ātmā* modifies into sentience form by itself. None of the modifications of *ātmā* leave the sentience. Nature of consciousness pervades by itself to modify in the form of *jñāna*. By becoming the doer of *ātmā*, it modifies in the form of activity of attachment-aversion, and further *ātmā* modifies as fruits of *karma* which is happiness and sorrow.

In *gāthā* 116, it was said that *kriyā* (activity) is from the view of a specific antecedent and precedent form of modification of sentience. Modifications of desires, anger, falsity, ignorance, negligence, *ārtadhyāna* (distressed contemplation), *raudradhyāna* (cruel contemplation), *śuklaleśyā* (whitish aura), vibration of *ātmā*, etc., each of them, be it pure or impure- does not transgress the boundary of consciousness. In the same way, no one's modifications can be due to other *jīvas* or due to *karma*. No modification of *ātmā* ever leaves consciousness.

Question: In *Samayasāra*, it has been said that *margāṅāsthāna* (14 different places where *jīva* can be found), fourteen *guṇasthāna* (stages of evolution), etc., are non-sentient, and here, why has it been said that all modifications do not leave sentience?

Answer: Distorted and impure modifications are not the eternal form of pure nature, as they leave *ātmā*. Hence, in *Samayasāra*, to move the focus away from them and to create interest in the eternal nature, they have been called non-sentient. But who can say this? This can be said only by him, who believes that *ātmā* is an independent doer of its distorted modification and turns his focus towards his eternal nature.

In *Pravacanasāra*, an appropriate understanding of the nature of modifications is given. Self modifies in the form of *jñāna*, form of attachments, as well as in the form of psychic activity of happiness and sorrow. But self does not modify due to *karma*. In this way, understanding of modification of self, which is a knowable, has been explained.

Essence of this verse is that impure modifications arising from first to the fourteenth stages of evolution are due to *jīva*. And it definitely does not mean that impurity of *ātmā* is due to *karma*.

It has often been said that perturbation is of the self – but intent here is not for *jīva* to remain with perturbation. The meaning of this scripture is that if self focuses on substance-attribute which is pure by nature, then perturbation and transmigration will be destroyed.

In this way, deliberations/meanings are of two types –

1. *sūtra tātparya* (gist/meaning of aphorism/discourse) -- Meaning of every verse should be understood independently the way it is. For example, in this verse, it is said that *ātmā* itself is the doer of impure modifications of attachment-aversion, but *karma* or other *ātmās* do not do them. This kind of intrinsic understanding of this aphorism is *sūtra tātparya*.
2. *śāstra tātparya* (gist/meaning of scripture) -- After having a correct understanding of the verse, understanding the essence of the complete scripture is *śāstra tātparya*. For example, in this verse, it is said that *jīva* independently modifies as impure by itself – understand this notion. But, if only understanding that, *jīva* is the doer of impure modification is done, but substance-attributes are pure,

and it is desirable to manifest the passionless state by focusing on them is not understood, then essence of the complete scripture, has not been understood. This is *śāstra tātparya*.

Intrinsic essence of scripture is the complete passionless state and omniscience. But *jīva*, who makes a mistake in understanding *sūtra* and believes modification to be dependent, cannot understand *śāstra tātparya* and cannot manifest the passionless state. And if he is stuck only in the meanings of *sūtra*, does not understand the meaning of scriptures, and does not manifest the passionless state, then it cannot be said that he has understood the meaning of *sūtra* in the right way.

jñānī says that after having the correct understanding of aphorism, one must manifest the true essence of the full scripture, which is a passionless state along with right belief. *cetanā* is of three types - *jñāna cetanā*, *karma cetanā*, *karmaphala cetanā*.

jñāna cetanā – The self itself is a pure nature who is the knower-seer; body, and *karma* are non-self substances. Having the state of knowledge that these as well as perturbations are distinct from self, and along with belief in the undivided whole, one becomes stable. This is *jñāna cetanā* and that is the *dharma* of *ātmā*.

karma cetanā – When there is a lack of realization that *ātmā* by itself is the knowing-seeing nature of self, then disposition of carrying out activity of non-self substance and activity of distorted disposition in the form of virtue-sin is *karma cetanā*. To be stuck in the perturbed modification of *jñāna* is *karma cetanā*, which is a modification of *adharmā*.

karmaphala cetanā – Due to a lack of realization that *ātmā* by itself is the pure form of joy and bliss, self does not experience joy and bliss. Hence, he is enthused towards happiness-sorrow, and the experience of happiness-sorrow is *karmaphala cetanā*. This also is modification of *adharmā*.

A detailed explanation of the meaning of these three types of *cetanā* will be given in the following chapter.

Omniscient God has complete *jñāna cetanā*. In the state of a seeker, mainly there is a presence of *jñāna cetanā*. And to the extent the self conjoins with attachment-aversion due to instability, or conjoins with happiness and sorrow, to that extent, he is said to have *karma cetanā*, and *karmaphala cetanā* is said to be secondary.

A false believer does not have *jñāna cetanā*. He has only *karma cetanā*, and *karmaphala cetanā* at the same time. The time at which *ātmā* modifies to a perturbed state is the same as when he experiences happiness and sorrow. This is not about enjoying non-self substance because *jīva* cannot experience non-self substance; he experiences happiness-sorrow. There is no difference in time between action and gratification; both are at the same time. In this way, *cetanā* modification of *ātmā* is of three types.

❧ *gāthā-124* ❧

अथ ज्ञानकर्मकर्मफलस्वरूपमुपवर्णयति -

Now, characteristics of *jñāna* (knowledge), *karma* (modification), and *karmaphala* (fruits of modification) are being described: -

णाणं अट्टवियप्पो कम्मं जीवेण जं समारद्धं ।

तमणेगविधं भणिदं फलं ति सोक्खं व दुक्खं वा ॥ १२४ ॥

ṇāṇaṃ aṭṭhaviyappa kammaṃ jīveṇa jaṃ samāradḍhaṃ

tamaṇegavidhaṃ bhaṇidaṃ phalaṃ tti sokkhaṃ va dukkhaṃ vā ॥ 124 ॥

Meaning: *arthavikalpa* (manifestation of knowledge of knowing self/non-self, all together and distinctively) is *jñāna*; acts which are carried out by *jīva* are *karma cetanā* and which of varied types; happiness and sorrow are fruits of deeds and is called *karmaphala*.

ṭīkā: *jñāna* is ‘*arthavikalpa*’. What does *artha* (object) mean here? All that is in the universe, all substances with all their attributes and all modifications, along with the distinction of self/non-self, is *artha*. Manifestation or illumination or state of knowing in their form is *vikalpa*. Like the expanse of a mirror (or like in the expanse of mirror, the shape of self and non-self illuminate all together, simultaneously). That in which simultaneously shapes of self and non-self illuminates is *jñāna*.

That (disposition), which is done by *ātmā*, is *karma* (deed). *ātmā* is a modifying and evolving substance. Every modification modifies every *samaya*, and that disposition, which is really done by *ātmā*, is modified by *ātmā*, so it is its deed. That deed is of only one type, but due to the imposition of proximity of, presence or absence of physical karmic matter, it assumes many kinds.

Happiness and sorrow created by deed is *karmaphala*. There, fruit of *karma* which rises due to the absence of proximity in the form of imposition of *dravya karma* (karmic matter), is bliss, which is its nature and is due to its attribute of unperturbedness; and *karma* which is present due to proximity of imposition in the form of karmic matter, its fruit is unnatural suffering because there is an absence of characteristic of bliss in that state. Thus, nature of *jñāna* (knowledge), *karma* (modification) and *karmaphala* (fruits of modification) is ascertained.

bhāvārtha: That in which self is reflected as self, and non-self is reflected as non-self, simultaneously, without any mutual mixing, clear and distinct is *jñana cetanā*.

Disposition capable of being done by *jīva* is deed. It is mainly of two types – 1. *nirupādhika svabhāvika śudha bhāva rūpa karma* [absolute (natural passionless) form

of pure deed] 2. *aupādhika śubhāśubha bhava rūpa karma* (unnatural auspicious-inauspicious form of modifying deed).

Happiness or sorrow arising from this deed is *karmaphala*. There, by not conjoining with associated conditions of *dravya karma*, natural unconditional pure modifying form of *karma* evolves. Its fruit is nature which is pure bliss - whose characteristic is the unperturbed state, and by conjoining with associated condition of *dravya-karma*, the unnatural condition of auspicious-inauspicious thought activity form of *karma* evolves. Its fruit is distorted, unnatural suffering caused by perverse auspicious-inauspicious *karma*, because instead of the unperturbed state, it has a perturbed state. In this way, nature of *jñāna* (knowledge), *karma* (modification), and *karmaphala* (fruits of modification) is explained.

pravacana on gāthā 124

Now nature of *jñānacetanā*, *karmacetanā* and *karmaphalacetanā* is being described: -

Nature of *jñāna cetanā*- Knowing of substances with distinction and separation is *jñāna*. All substances have two divisions, that of self and non-self. That which is of the knowing *ātmā* is self, and all else is non-self. To know those substances distinctly just the way they are is called *vikalpa*. Here attachment aversion has not been called *vikalpa*. But *vi*= with distinction; *kalpa*= to know, meaning to know with distinction is *vikalpa*.

bhāvārtha: *jñāna* is that in which self and non-self reflect simultaneously in the form that they are, without mixing with one another.

Here, the word *ākāra* does not mean modification related to the shape of a substance, but it means specificity or particularities. This chapter is about knowable. In this, substance-attribute-modification of self is self-knowable, and substance-attribute-modification of non-self is non-self knowable. To know both specifically is called *vikalpa*. *vikalpa* is the nature of *jñāna*. Therefore, omniscience is also called *vikalpa*.

Specific states of self and non-self are known simultaneously in the expanse of a mirror, in the same way, that in which self and non-self, along with their distinctions, are known all together is said to be *artha vikalpa* or *jñāna cetanā*.

He who believes that only *ātmā* is known, and perturbation, non-self are not known, or that they don't come into knowledge, has not known *ātmā* and it cannot be called *jñāna cetanā*. Further, it would be incorrect to say that non-self substances, *nimitta*, and perturbations are known, but *ātmā* is not known. Then, he has not know the non-self substances correctly. That, too, cannot be called *jñāna cetanā*.

It is not possible that the self is known correctly, but non-self substance does not come into knowing. To have a singular expanded knowing of non-self without experience of self is said to be false belief.

Self is a knowing-seeing substance and pure by nature. Non-self *jīva* and physical matter are separate substances, and *ātmā* is separate from them. Nature of self *ātmā* is full of efficacies and is complete in itself. Attachment-aversion in modification is due to his own self; attachment-aversion arises with focus on non-self, and physical karmic matter is *nimitta* in it. With *nimitta* of physical karmic matter, other *no-karma* (*karma nimitta* in forming body) etc., substances come into bondage. It is possible to attain purity by manifesting *saṁvara* (stoppage of influx of *karma*) by focusing on self. This way, self and non-self substances should be recognized in outer substances. *jñāna cetanā* is appropriate knowing with correct recognition of self and non-self. Self is complete in its pure nature of knowing-seeing while perturbed and incomplete states are non-self.

samyagdr̥ṣṭi jīva knows self and non-self simultaneously. When *upayoga* (concentrated attention) of a *dharmī* (he who has experience of pure self) is on non-self, at that time, *jñāna* of self is in *labdha* (perception form). This modification of *jñāna* has not left perception form and become singularly concentrated on non-self. And when concentration is on self *ātmā*, then knowledge of external substance is in perception form in its modification. This modification of knowledge does not leave its perception and does not singularly concentrate on self.

Perception form and concentrated attention of *jñāna* are in one modification, in the same *samaya*. That is why, to a seeker, meaning *dharmī*, illumination of *jñāna* of self and non-self substances occur simultaneously in the same *samaya*, there is no time difference. At the time of *jñāna*, which is in the form of *upyoga* of self-substance, *jñāna* of non-self which is in perception form, does not get destroyed. Rather there is a presence of *jñāna* which knows non-self in the form of perception at that *samaya* in that modification. At the time of *jñāna* being in the form of *upyoga* of non-self substance, *jñāna* of self which is in the form of perception is not destroyed. In fact, there is a presence of *jñāna*, which knows self in perception form at that *samaya* in that modification. Therefore, even in the state of seeker, *jñānacetanā* illuminate self and non-self simultaneously.

In this way, modification of *jñāna* which differentiates correctly between *ātmā* and non-self substances becomes identical to *ātmā*, and is called *jñānacetanā*.

karmacetanā – Modification that occurs due to *ātmā* is called *karma* (deed). *ātmā* by itself manifests perturbed modifications of charity-compassion or pure modification of knowledge-perception. *ātmā* himself modifies as these modifications, be they perturbed or unperturbed. So, they are deeds of *ātmā*. Physical karmic matter or other substances cannot modify them.

Modification of *ātmā* does not have such dependency on *karma*. It is not that perturbation will arise with *karma*, and passionless state to occur with absence of *karma*. *ātmā* by itself modifies into that state, be it with or without attachments. So those modifications are deeds of *ātmā*. Be it called *karma* or *kārya*, it is of only one type, but still, due to

absence or presence of proximity of *dravya karma* in the form of *upādhi* (postulates), they are of many kinds. In the main verse, reference is only to *karma* or deed. In the exposition, it has been elaborated that at the time of deed, which is in the form of perturbed modification, there is a presence of physical karmic matter, and at the time of deed in the form of unperturbed modification, physical karmic matter is absent. In this way, *nimitta* has also been explained here. Deed is said to be of two types-

1. When *ātmā* modifies in the form of its pure natural state with belief in its attribute of being a knower-seer, then there is an absence of physical *karma*. But pure state has not manifested because there is a presence of *karma*. It has been clarified that when pure state arises, then there is an absence of *karma*. This is the *avikārī śuddha* (unperturbed pure) deed of *ātmā*, and is the reason for *dharma*.
2. When *ātmā* leaves its knowing-seeing nature and modifies in the perturbed form of compassion-charity, etc., which is the form of virtue-sin, then physical *karma* has the proximity of sharing the same space.

It is not that action of attachment-aversion arises because there is proximity of *karma*. But it has been explained that when self, by himself, does attachment-aversion, then physical *karma* in the form of *nimitta* is its reason. They are perturbed, impure *karma* of *ātmā*, and reason for *adharma*.

karmaphalacetanā – Manifestation of results of happiness and sorrow by these *karmas* or these modifications is *karmaphala*. There is no discussion of enjoying non-self substance because *ātmā* cannot have carnal pleasure of non-self substance. *ātmā* either experiences its perturbed modification of happiness-sorrow or can experience the knowing-seeing nature of pure nature of happiness which is the unperturbed disposition.

karmaphalacetanā are of two types-

1. Self is the inherent pure substance with the knowing-seeing nature. Believing that manifesting the unperturbed inner steady state and becoming equanimous in the pure, knowing nature, is the natural state of happiness. Passionless calm has manifested. Passionless state has not manifested due to an absence of physical karmic matter. But at the time of the state of bliss of *ātmā*, physical karmic matter is absent. So, this knowing is from the aspect of modification of *nimitta*, which does not exist in self-substance. This is the natural form of joyous state of *ātmā* and is the result of *dharma*.
2. *ātmā* by itself is the knowing-seeing nature of joy and bliss. Forgetting this joy and happiness and believing joy and bliss to be in non-self substance, he manifests the delusion of happiness-sorrow. These substances cannot give the experience of happiness-sorrow, but due to his own self, *jīva* experiences thoughts of a favourable state, and at that time, physical karmic matter is present in the form of *nimitta*. It is not that *karmas* have given carnal pleasures, but when a *jīva* experiences perplexity at that time, *karmas* are

in the form of *nimitta*, thus it has been explained so. This is the perturbed state of sorrow of *ātmā*, and it is perplexed because there is an absence of bliss. This is not passionless peace. Perturbation is the result of unrighteousness. There is no difference in the time between *karmacetanā* and *karmaphalacetanā*. In other words, when *karmacetanā* is in perturbed form, at that time, *karmaphalacetanā* modifies as the result of perturbation. When *karmacetanā* is in the unperturbed form, at that time, *karmaphalacetanā* modifies as equanimity and peace. *jñānacetanā* (knowing sentience) and *śuddha avikārī bhāva karma rūpa cetanā* (pure unperturbed psychic *karma* in the form of sentience) both have a state of purity. There is no difference between them from the view of the undivided. But when attribute of *jñāna* is seen primarily, then by distinguishing between self and non-self, *jñāna* becomes identical with *ātmā*. This modification of *jñāna* is called *jñānacetanā*. When attribute of doer-ship is seen primarily, it is said that *ātmā* is the doer of its purity in the form of unblemished modification. From this point of view, it is said to be the form of pure psychic *karma*, or unperturbed *karmacetanā*. *karmaphalacetanā*, or that which is said to be the natural joy, when seen from the view of attribute of *bhoktā* (enjoyer), is the result of modification of purity. From the view of the undivided, one who manifests *jñāna*, one who manifests unblemished modification, and one who experiences un-perplexed happiness, is one *ātmā*. But from the view of distinction of attributes, separate divisions are seen.

Nature of *jñāna cetanā*, *karma cetanā* and *karmaphala cetanā* have been explained in this way.

pravacana on bhāvārtha of gāthā 124

jñāna cetanā - To know with distinction that *ātmā* is self and body, *karma*, etc., substances, are non-self is called *jñānacetanā*. *jīva* with contrary understanding, that perturbation is due to physical matter, and *karma* had to come due to perturbation, do not have *jñānacetanā*. *jīva* modifies in an unperturbed state independently and physical karmic matter also moves away independently. In this way recognising self/non-self with clarity is called *jñānacetanā*.

Nature of *karma* – Both perturbed or unperturbed modifications which arise from *jīva* are *kārya* (work) of *jīva*, meaning it is *bhāva karma*. They are of two kinds:–

1. ***śuddha bhāvarūpa karma*** (deed of pure disposition) - To take auspices with the understanding of *ātmā*, to know that *ātmā* by nature is a knower-seer, and due to that, manifestation of pure, unblemished, passionless, pious modification of right belief, right knowledge and right conduct is *śuddha bhāva rūpa karma*. This is the form of the state of *śuddha bhāva rūpa kartavya - kārya*, and there is no connection with physical matter. Physical karmic matter is separate from *ātmā*. *dharma* of *ātmā* is to do deeds in the form of a natural and pure state.

2. *aupādhika-śubhāśubha bhāvarūpa karma* (perturbed auspicious-inauspicious dispositions)– Intangible modification like thoughts of compassion, charity, vows, prayers, as well as violence, lies, and theft are *aupādhika-śubhāśubha bhavā*. This is not about physical karmic matter. And they do not modify the dispositions of *ātmā*. Both inauspicious as well inauspicious dispositions have limitations. *ātmā* by itself modifies in the form of a perturbed state due to focus on non-self; so, there is *aupādhika-śubhāśubha bhāva rūpa karma*, and that is *adharmā*.

Happiness or sorrow which manifests from this deed, meaning, from the above said deed *śubhāśubha bhāva* is in the form of *karmaphala*. They are of two kinds-

- 1 *svabhāvabhūta sukha* – When *jīva* does not conjoin with physical karmic matter, then pure modification which manifests is without limitations, it arises with auspices of *ātmā* and a passionless state manifests. Its result is joy which is of the pure nature of self. Its characteristic is the un-perplexed state. With auspices of *ātmā*, deed of pure modification arises, which is without support of mind and pious dispositions. Its result is peace and bliss. Result of modification of purity, meaning fruit of *dharma*, is a lack of bondage. Modification and its result occur at the same time.
- 2 *vikārabhūta du:kha* - *jīva* forgets his nature of being *jñātā-dṛṣṭā*, and focuses on limitations in the form of physical karmic matter and manifests auspicious-inauspicious modifications. That is *aupādhika-śubhāśubha bhāvarūpa karma*. The inauspicious state is intense, and auspicious state is mellow. On abstaining from inauspicious, auspicious will rise, but that is not joy. To believe sorrow to be joy is perversity. The moment modification of auspicious or inauspicious thoughts rises, sorrow will be present. It is not stated that sorrow will come in the future. When thoughts, be they auspicious or inauspicious in nature, arise, and one forgets the peaceful nature of self, that is a form of sorrow. Result of auspicious-inauspicious thoughts, meaning *dharma*, is perturbation. Auspicious or inauspicious thoughts and their result are at the same time. They are not before or after.

In this way, nature of *jñāna*, *karma*, and *karmaphala* is explained.



❧ *gāthā-125* ❧

अथ ज्ञानकर्मकर्मफलान्यात्मत्वेन निश्चिनोति -

Now, it is ascertained that knowledge, deed and fruit of deed are soul itself:

अप्या परिणामप्या परिणामो णाणकम्मफलभावी ।

तम्हा णाणं कम्मं फलं च आदा मुणेदव्वो ॥ १२५ ॥

appā pariṇamappā pariṇāmo ṇāṇakammaphalabhāvī |
tamhā ṇāṇaṃ kammaṃ phalaṃ ca ādā muṇedavvo || 125 ||

Meaning: *ātmā* by itself is *pariṇāmātmaka* (modifying by nature). It evolves as *jñāna*, *karma*, and fruits of *karma*, So, it should be understood that *jñāna*, *karma* and fruits of *karma* are *ātmā*.

ṭīkā: First, *ātmā* is modifying by nature because ‘evolution/disposition itself is *ātmā*’- this is said (in *gāthā-122*) by *KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya* himself. And *pariṇāma* (disposition), owing to its being sentient by nature, is of the nature to be *jñāna*, *karma*, and fruits of *karma*; because sentience is made up of it (*jñāna*, *karma*, and fruit of *karma*). Therefore, *jñāna*, *karma* and fruit of *karma* is *ātmā*.

Thus, while defining the pure *dravya*, there is an impossibility of association with non-self substance, and modification gets engrossed in *dravya*. So, *ātmā* remains a pure substance only.

pravacana on gāthā 125

Now, knowledge, *karma* (deed) and fruits of *karma* (deed) are determined in the form of *ātmā* – *ātmā*, by nature, has modification. Modification or disposition is of three kinds-

1. *svayaṃ jñātā-drṣṭā śuddha svabhavī* – when it modifies as this state of *jñāna*, then it is in the form of *jñāna*.
2. It is in *karma* (deed) form when it modifies either in the form of blemish-free or blemished disposition
3. When the fruit is either in the form of unblemished peace or in the form of perplexed disposition, then that is the modification of fruit of *karma* (deed).

This is the chapter on knowable. Knowable and its different state, which is knowledge of self’s modification, are explained in this.

Auspicious and inauspicious modifications themselves are *ātmā*.

ātmā is constantly modifying, it stays permanent by itself and modifies. Change does not occur by destroying self, but it changes while remaining constant. It does not modify due to *karma*. It is his nature to modify. It is the nature of *ātmā* to be in the form of perturbation or non-perturbation.

First, it should be understood that by nature, *ātmā* is the one which modifies. *Bhagavāna KuṇḍaKuṇḍa Ācārya* has said in *gāthā 122* that disposition itself is *ātmā*, and disposition is the nature of sentience. Therefore-

1. When *jīva* modifies as knower and seer, then sentience is one with it, in other words, it is one with *jñāna*, and sentience is not separate from disposition.
2. When *jīva* modifies in a perturbed or unperturbed state in the form of *karma* (deed), then sentience is one with it, meaning, it identifies with perturbed or unperturbed deed. Sentience is not separate from that modification.
3. When *jīva* modifies with fruits of the result of perplexity or with fruits of the result of peace, then sentience is one with either perplexity or peace. Sentience is not separate from this result.

Perplexity is at this moment. There is no discussion about favourable or unfavourable associations or their results of sorrow and happiness because they are non-self substances. These can neither be attained nor enjoyed by *ātmā*. To believe the presence of spouse-family to be the reason for happiness when, in fact, they are devoid of any happiness is ignorance. This belief and thought of an ignorant is a form of sorrow.

Both auspicious and inauspicious thoughts are forms of sorrow. Auspicious thoughts do arise to avoid inauspicious thoughts, that is a different matter, but it is never possible for auspicious thoughts to be the reason for happiness. Both auspicious and inauspicious dispositions are the cause of sorrow. There is no happiness in non-self substance, or virtues. But the belief, experience, and equanimity that knowing-seeing nature of self is joy is true happiness. Result of modification is at the same time as its manifestation. State of being a doer and enjoyer is present simultaneously, in one's own modification, and this state does not exist in substance outside of self.

Question: How does the body move?

Answer: Body is a non-sentient, physical matter. Substance with physical existence also has infinite efficacies. Hence, it moves due to its own *kriyāvātī śakti* (efficacy of movement of substance, with the ability to move). So, believing that body moves due to *ātmā* is a mistake. *ātmā* and body are separate substances, and modifications of both are also distinct.

Question: If this is so, then when *ātmā* leaves the body, why does it not move?

Answer: Body is a physical substance with the trio of its substance-attribute-modification. Body and *ātmā* may or may not share the same space points; even then, body being in

a state of movement or being stationary is due to its own substance-attribute. Nothing happens in the body due to *ātmā*. It is evidently seen many times that even if *ātmā* wishes, a body stricken with paralysis or due to some other reason, does not move. In other words, the argument that body moves due to *ātmā* is invalid. Many times, even though *ātmā* is present, body is seen not to be moving, but is stationary. Body is a mass of its own *parmāṇus*. It's every state is due to its own self and not due to *ātmā*.

One who believes that universe is made by God, is delusional. Since he has not accepted substances to be independent, so he cannot attain *dharma*. *jīva*, who believes that *ātmā* is the doer of activity of body, is also in a state of similar delusion because he does not believe that *jīva* and body are entirely independent substances. Therefore, he, too, cannot attain *dharma*. One may not believe that God runs the world, but if he believes the activity of body is being done by *ātmā*, even if he is called a Jain, still, there is no difference between him and the one who believes God is the administrator of this universe. He is in a state of delusion, and he will definitely not attain *dharma*.

Question: Here, why is *kartā* (doer) mentioned as well?

Answer: Listen! *ātmā* is not the doer of any activity of body. To believe that activity of *ātmā* can be done by physical matter and activity of physical matter can be done by *ātmā* is *adharmā*. *ātmā* is an intangible mass of *jñāna*, *darśana*, *vīrya*, etc., infinite efficacies. When this is known, then it is said that *ātmā* is the doer of modification of *jñāna*. If it modifies as an ignorant, then *ātmā* is the doer of virtues-vice, and then *ātmā* experiences fruits of happiness-sorrow in its modification. But *jīva* cannot experience physical substances like bread, lentils, or rice. It experiences its intentions-thoughts and perplexities. When *jñāna* ascertains the belief that activity of physical matter is not mine and self *ātmā*'s nature is *jñāna*, then *ātmā* experiences un-perplexed peace. *ātmā* cannot be the doer-enjoyer of non-self substances, be it by way of absolute truth or by conventionality.

As soon it is ascertained that *ātmā* is distinct from non-self substances, then the pure *dravya* is determined. Focus moves away from non-self substance, and pure modification of self manifests by itself. Correct *jñāna* of self cannot arise without this knowing; in this way, in the explanation of pure *dravya*, there is an absence of connection with non-self substance. *ātmā* is a mass of infinite efficacies; as there is an absence of connection with non-self substance, modifications of infinite efficacies of *ātmā* are of the *ātmā*. With this knowledge and notion, focus is on pure *dravya-guṇa*, and it moves away from perturbed modification to go on the pure substance. As focus goes on the pure substance, perturbed modification becomes secondary and unperturbed modification becomes similar to *dravya*. Thought of getting rid of the current perturbed modification and manifesting an unperturbed one also does not remain. Because manifested unperturbed modification being same as the substance, is identical with the substance.

dhruva-sādrśya (permanent-analogous) nature modifies by himself and becomes disparate by focusing on modification. In the state of ignorance, self modifies in the form of the doer of attachment, believes himself to be the doer of attachment, and experiences sorrow. But by focusing on the knowing-seeing nature, he modifies in the form of knower, as the form of pure modification and begins to experience un-perplexed joy. There *ātmā* remains pure only.

jīva, who has the contrary belief that perturbation occurs due to *nimitta*, *karma* and association, or if *karma* and association move away, then perturbation would go; his focus is on association. It is not on *ātmā*, which is an existent substance with power, infinite efficacies, and modification, whether pure or impure. This way, all three together are the undivided substance. He does not focus on this; in other words, he does not focus on substance.

Without experience of self, undivided state of substance-attribute-modification is not understood. And without determining that perturbation is due to self, experience of self is not possible.

There is an absence of non-self substance in *ātmā*. So, there is no need to look at non-self as secondary. Perturbed modification is the state of self for one *samaya*, and that has to be made secondary. If there is a complete absence of substance, then how can it be made secondary? With primary focus on pure substance, in *Samayasāra*, attachment-aversion is said to be secondary and has been called *vyavahāra*. There, to turn the focus on pure substance, attachment-aversion is called *abhūtārtha* (unreal), but it has not been said that they are entirely absent. It is only for a purpose that attachment has been stated as secondary.

If the primary-secondary state is not there, then state of seeker does not remain, and omniscience should manifest. *Kevalī Bhagavāna* does not have primary-secondary because complete *pramāṇa jñāna* (comprehensive true knowledge) exists in Him. In the state of a seeker, primary-secondary does exist. But who has primary-secondary in the correct way? *jīva*, who believes that modification, meaning part, is of the whole substance and not because of non-self. Constant is general, and origination, as well as annihilation, is distinctive. In *Pravacanasāra*, correct knowing of this undividedness of substance-attribute-modification has been stated. He who understands this, only he can make the state of attachment-aversion secondary, and attains focus of pure substance as said in *Samayasāra*. Then he focuses on the substance-attribute, which is pure, and when this focus arises, unblemished modification manifests, which is undivided from *ātmā*. Distinction between substance and pure modification does not remain.

In this way, modification getting engrossed intensely in the substance, *ātmā* remains as pure substance only.

ātmā is in the form of knowledge as well as knowable. In this chapter of *jñeya tattva prajñāpāna*, generality of substance is presented. In this, knowable in the form of *ātmā* has been included. Substance-attribute and perturbed as well as unperturbed modification of *ātmā*, all three together, comprise of the complete *ātmā* in the form of knowable. That is known by *jñāna*. According to what has been said above, on knowing the knowable and on deciding about the pure state of *ātmā* in absolute terms proves the *jñāna tattva* (principle of *jñāna*).

If it is believed that perturbation arises due to *karma*, then knowable does not remain independent. Due to this, knowable cannot be proved, and as knowable is not known correctly, true knowledge also cannot be determined, and without appropriate knowing, *dharma* cannot manifest. On deciding that perturbed modification is of *ātmā*, knowable is known the way it is in *jñāna*, and because of this, appropriate *jñāna* arises, and substance-attribute remains pure. By knowing knowable in the right way, *jñāna* substance is determined, and this leads to the experience of pure *ātmā*.

Now, *Ācārya Bhagavāna* thanks the complete ascertainment of the purity of his own *ātmā*. This ascertainment is with the predominance of *jñāna*.

With this the conclusion of the description of generality of substance is done.

★ ★ ★

❧ *gāthā 126* ❧

भवतीति तमभिनन्दन् द्रव्यसामान्यवर्णनामुपसंहरति-

In this way, *ātmā* is greeted with absolute ascertainment of purity of knowable or praising the ascertainment of the pure state of *ātmā*, and acclamation is showered on the tenet through which *jñāna tattva* is proved, and through which pure *ātmā* substance is attained (experienced). Hence, epilogue to the description of generality of substance is done.

कत्ता करणं कम्मं फलं च अप्य त्ति णिच्छिदो समणो ।

परिणमदि णेव अण्णं जदि अप्पाणं लहदि सुद्धं ॥ १२६ ॥

*kattā karaṇam kammaṃ phalaṃ ca appa tti ṇicchido samaṇo |
pariṇamadi ṇeva aṇṇaṃ jadi appāṇaṃ lahadī suddhaṃ || 126 ||*

Meaning: If a *śramaṇa* (monk) has determined that *ātmā* being the *kartā* (doer), *karaṇa* (instrument/means), *karma* (deed), *karmaphala* (fruits of deed), does not modify as any other form, then he attains the pure *ātmā*.

ṭīkā:- *ātmā* who decides that the *kartā* (doer), *karana* (instrument/means) *karma* (deed) and *karmaphala* (fruits of deed) is *ātmā* only, does not change into the form of external substance. Only those *ātmās* who have stopped contact with external substances and whose *pariyāyas* have disappeared into his *dravya* attain the pure state, whereas others do not obtain such a pure *ātmā*.

This is explained clearly as under:-

uparāga (perturbed state) arises due to the peculiarity of nearness of bonded physical karmic matter, which has existed since eternity. Due to this, self-modification is defiled/blemished, but it is the self. The way pure *sphatika* (clear crystal) emits a reddish tinge due to the proximity of the *jasuda* flower (china rose), and its self-modification is blemished. Like the crystal gem, self, being influenced by *nimitta* of non-self, modifies as a perturbed state, due to which he is a *samsārī*. Even at that time (even in the state of ignorance) self really has no association with it. At that time, too, self is *kartā* by itself because self is independent in its blemished form of sentience (meaning, the doer, independently). Self itself was *karaṇa* (instrument) because he alone, was the *sādhakatama* (supreme instrument) with the blemished form of sentient nature. He alone was *karma* (deed) because he, by himself, being with the blemished form of sentience which is with the nature to modify was *prāpya* (capable of being modified) by *ātmā*; and he by himself was in the form of *karmaphala* (fruits of deed) as *dukkha*

(misery), which is the opposing characteristic to *sukha* (joy). That *phala* (fruit), being a blemished form of sentience, came to fruition due to its nature to modify.

Now with destruction of the proximity of peculiarity of bondage of physical karmic matter, which exists since eternity - he has manifested the *suviśuddha sahaja* (*svabhāvika*) *svapriṇatī* (supremely pure effortless inherent self modification).

Like the crystal gem which has manifested as *suviśuddha sahaja svapriṇatī* due to destruction of its proximity to the *jasuda* flower, in the same way, one whose new state of perturbation due to arraignment of non-self has stopped, is an *ekānta* (singularly) *mumukṣu* (desirous of *mokṣa*). Even at this point (in the state of *mumukṣu* or the state of *jñāna* also), nothing belongs to the self. Even now, self alone is the *kartā* (doer) because he by himself is independent in the state of *suviśuddha caitanya svabhāva* (supremely pure sentient nature), meaning, he modifies independently. He alone is *karāṇa* (instrument) by himself because he alone is *sādhaktama* (supreme instrument) by the *suviśuddha caitanya rūpa svabhāva*. He alone is *karma* (deed) because he, by himself, being the nature to modify as *suviśuddha caitanya svabhāva* is *prāpya* (experienced/attained) by *ātmā*. And he alone is *karmaphala* by the name of *sukha*, which is with the characteristic of *anākūlta* (non-perplexity). This has been brought forth.

In this way, whether on the path of *bandha* (bondage) or *mokṣa* (liberation), *ātmā* is always alone – he who experiences/understands/ruminates this – becomes like a *paramāṇu* which modifies alone unrestrained, (meaning, it is eager to be in the disposition of oneness), it does not have any state which is in the form of external substance; and like a particulate matter (meaning, the way a particle modifies as oneself and does not have association with external substance), he who is engaged in *ekatva bhāvanā* does not associate with non-self. So, due to non-association with non-self substance, he is *suviśuddha* (perfectly pure). Then again, experiencing *kartā*, *karāṇa*, *karma*, and *karmaphala* as *ātmā* (undivided self), self does not get divided by *paryāya*, and because it is undivided by *paryāya*, he is *suviśuddha*.

pravacana on gāthā 126

dharma arises to him who attains correct *jñāna*. *ātmā* itself is the doer of its own modification. *ātmā* is the instrument of its own modification, *ātmā* itself is the form of modification of deed, and *ātmā* itself is the fruits/result of its modification.

In this way, the doer, instrument, deed, and fruits of deed is *ātmā* only, and not physical matter. Meaning, *ātmā* has no connection with non-self substance. Those *jīvas* who have ascertained this through correct *jñāna* will not modify in a perturbed state. When it is said that association with non-self and *karma* has stopped, it means that it has separated from *nimitta*, meaning he will surely enter pure *ātmā*, or he experiences pure *ātmā*.

Second point is that though doer, means, deed and fruits of deed are present at the time of thoughts, but when focus of that modification turns towards the undivided pure substance, then in that undivided focus, this distinction is destroyed. On deciding that this too is *ātmā*, modification immerses into the substance, and pure *ātmā* is experienced. A person who does not experience the pure *ātmā*, does not attain *dharma*.

He who has incorrect *jñāna* does not experience the pure *ātmā*, meaning, he does not attain *dharma*.

1. The belief that - perturbation is due to *karma*, with intense rising of *karma*, intense attachment occurs, and when it is feeble, then perturbation is weak, and *samsāra* will go when *nimitta* goes, is gross ignorance
2. And he who believes that perturbation occurs due to the presence of *nimitta* and if *nimitta* is present, then modification in *upādāna* occurs is also an ignorant *jīva*.

Focus of both these types of *jīvas* will not move from *nimitta* and towards self.

1. He who believes that *dharma* is from virtue, virtue-vice is the nature of self, and *añśa* (part) is the self, his focus will not move from *añśa*. He will not focus towards *añśī* (beholder of infinitesimal parts). Such an ignorant will not have manifest the experience of *ātmā*. This has been explained with clarity-

In the main verse, there is no reference to physical karmic matter. *Amṛtacandra Ācārya* has explained in the commentary that in the state of transmigration, physical karmic matter is *nimitta*, and so it has been stated. Perturbation does not arise by knowing *karma*, but reason for perturbation is the belief in oneness with *karma*. *jñāna* removes perturbation, because *jñāna* is by nature *samādhāna* (solution through deep contemplation).

In this way, state of ignorance is explained. In a state of ignorance also, self by itself is *kartā*, *karma*, etc.; no other non-self substance is the doer of attachment-aversion of ignorance.

Here, a pious soul connects by knowing his earlier state and reaffirms the particularity of *jñāna*.

Modification of self was blemished with perturbed modification because of *nimitta* of proximity of physical karmic matter, which has been present since eternity; because perturbations are not the form of pure nature, but they manifest due to *nimitta* of *upādhi* (fallacy), there is no attachment-aversion in the nature of substance. Attachment-aversion arises due to self's focus on modification, so it was alleged that perturbation occurred due to *karma*. At that time, self was a *samsārī*.

When a crystal gem has the ability to change into the form of red colour by itself, then it is said that the red flower turned it into red. Red flower did not turn the crystal red, but it modified into the form of red by itself. When the crystal gem, by itself, modifies as red, and as the redness manifests due to the proximity of the red flower, it is said that it is red due to the red crystal gem.

Question: What is the meaning of cause and effect relationship and *anukula* (conductive) as well as *anuprūpa* (suitable)?

Answer: Ability to modify, in substance itself, is the effect, and it is called suitable. Presence of non-self substance at that point of time is the cause and is called conducive. In this example, redness of crystal gem is suitable, and the red flower is the cause, so it is conducive.

When modification of a pot occurs, it is suitable, and hands forming the round shape are conducive *nimitta* in forming the pot. But pot was not made because of the hand. Here the cause and effect relationship of both has been explained.

Perturbed dispositions of *ātmā* are called suitable, and *karma* is said to be the conducive cause. *ātmā* modifies as lesser *jñāna* due to its own self, then knowledge obscuring *karma* is said to be the cause; in this, a lesser state of *jñāna* is suitable and knowledge obscuring *karma* is called the conducive *nimitta*. But deluding *karma* cannot be called *nimitta* for the state of lesser *jñāna*, because deluding *karma* does not have the ability to be conducive to lesser *jñāna*. At the time of modification of delusion, deluding *karma* only can be the conducive *nimitta*.

Similarly, at the time of rising of *virya āntarāya* (*karma nimitta* in interfering in the manifestation of strength), it is not possible that there is a lesser state of *jñāna* in the modification of *jīva*; because manifestation of modification of a more deficient state of *jñāna* is a not conforming to *virya āntarāya*. But if a *jīva* attaches itself to its manifestation, then modification of contrary effort is conforming here to *virya āntarāya*.

It is not so that - arising of deluding *karma* lowers strength. In the same way, it is not so that because there is manifestation of *virya āntarāya jñāna* will become less.

When *jñāna* modifies in a lesser state, at that time, manifestation is of knowledge obscuring *karma* only; In this way, *anuprūpa* (suitable) and *anukula* (conductive) should be understood clearly. In verse 86 of *Samayasāra* also, *anuprūpa* (suitable) and *anukula* (conductive) have been explained.

Here, there is no such discussion that physical karmic matter modifies *ātmā*, and neither is it said that because *ātmā* modified, karmic matter had to come. *nimitta-naimittika* relationship has been stated with the explanation, that effect which is the modification of *ātmā*, has the ability to be suitable due to its own self and what kind of ability which *karma* has, is by itself, and it is a conducive *nimitta*.

The way, crystal gem modifies with a red hue due to its own ability in the presence of the red flower. Similarly, since eternity, with the association of *karma*, because of one's own engrossment towards *karma*, even though there is an absence of perturbation in the pure nature of self, due to focus on modification, self was with perturbation, it was alleged to be due to *karma*. Therefore, there was *saṃsāra*.

In the state of ignorance, rather even in a state of *dharmā*, *ātmā* is *kartā*, *karāṇa*, *karma*, and *karmaphala*. *dharmi* realises that even in the state of ignorance, he did not have any associations.

kartā- Even in the state of ignorance, self alone is the doer of false belief and of manifestation of attachment-aversion. *jīva* and *karma* have not colluded to do this work. Doer of all auspicious or inauspicious modifications from *nigoda* to the ninth *graiveyaka* is *ātmā* himself. Time or *karma* has not made the self do these auspicious or inauspicious modifications, but it is only due to self that self was the doer of auspicious-inauspicious modifications.

karāṇa – Self was the highest instrument in the modification of attachment-aversion. It is untrue that because the instrument of body, family, etc., was present, there was inauspicious modification, or because *deva-śāstrā-guru* were present, there were auspicious modifications because they are non-self substances. Self, by himself alone, is the highest instrument of attachment-aversion, with the nature to modify.

karma- Self modifies in the form of auspicious-inauspicious modification, and self modifies in the form of *saṃsārī*. To modify into a blemished state was due to self's nature to modify the self. Self was capable of manifesting in the form of that *kārya* (effect).

karmaphala- It is self which is the form of fruit of perplexity, which has the opposite characteristics of non-perplexity because self modifies as happiness-sorrow due to the archetype modification of self, which modifies in that unnatural state. Self has different space points in all life forms, from *nigoda* to crow, dog, human, *devas*, etc., but that is not the result of perplexity. Self did not experience those *kṣetras*, but he did experience the result of happiness-sorrow, and modified in that form.

Here, someone may question how a *muni* would be thinking about this state of ignorance.

Answer: On attaining *samyagjñāna*, having manifested the illuminated nature of self and non-self, a *jñānī* has correct *jñāna* of the state of ignorance of past, and he becomes even more firm in himself.

Now state of purity is being described –

Proximity of eternal karmic bondage is not there, meaning, on having left the focus of *karma*, the naturally pure modification of self manifests.

State of purity is not dependent on *karma* to move away, to manifest purity; but in the knowing of *nimitta-naimittika* it has been stated, that when purity manifests, then *karma* does not remain in the form of bondage of *eka kṣetrāvṛgāha* (being present in the same space) as *ātmā*.

When red flower is not near the crystal gem, then it illuminates its own resplendent nature; in the same way, with the manifestation of state of purity by itself, perturbation which was

alleged to have occurred because of inflow of *karma* stops and such a self is desirous of *mokṣa* in every way. Focus on perturbations is destroyed, meaning, perturbation which was alleged upon by *karma* has stopped, because they were really not the pure nature of self. No one was of self in the state of ignorance, and in the present state of *jñāna* also, no one is of self.

Listen, *muni* ruminates *ekatva bhāvanā* (meditation on aloneness). In the earlier state of transmigration self was alone; spouse, family, body, none was associated with self. At that time, self was the *kartā*, *karma*, *sādhana* and *phala* of modification of attachment-aversion, etc. Ignorance of attachment-aversion was not because of physical karmic matter or other non-self substance. Here in the state of *jñāna* also, self is alone. *deva-guru-śāstra* are also not of self. In the state of *jñāna*, *kartā* of unblemished modification, *kārya* in the form of unblemished state, *sadhana* of purity and self who is the one who experiences the *phala*, is self only. In this way, purity of *ātmā* or doer, work done, instrument/means, and fruit of deed of the state of *dharma* is *ātmā* itself.

kartā - After ascertaining the knowing-seeing pure nature to be the substance, doer of purity of self is independently, the self only. It is untrue that when the ability of time is ripe, then *dharma* arises. Whose time? There is an absence of non-self *kāla* in *ātmā*. No other substance is the doer of modification of *dharma* of self. Self-time ripens or awakens itself; so, self alone is independently the doer of purity.

karāṇa – To manifest the work done in the form of *dharma*, instrument is *ātmā* itself which is in the form of *jñāna*. Nature of self is to be a knower-seer, and that is an extremely high instrument. Disease-free body, human body, and association of *deva-guru-śāstra* are not the instruments. Self itself is the instrument of *dharma*.

In this way, *muni* ruminates on the *ekatva bhāvanā* (meditation on aloneness).

In the pure state of self, doer in the form of *dharma* is self, and for the state of *dharma*, instrument is self itself. This has been said before.

karma – To have disposition in the form of a pure complete state as an aspirant of liberation is the work of self, and there is no other work to be done. Self is attained by itself, so nature modifies as a completely pure form of sentience, without the help of anyone, without the help of absence of *karma* and without the help of pious attachments. Self is such that work in the form of state of purity is attained from its own pure nature. But it is not so that any other work can be done by it. Self is attained by self only. *kārya* is *karma*, and that is self.

karmaphala – Self is modified as the knowing-seeing form of pure nature, and result of that work done is manifestation of un-perplexed bliss. So, bliss is the fruit of deed. Bliss being the state of *ātmā*, self is the fruit of deed. To have associations and non-self substances is not joy, they are non-self substances only. But manifestation of peace within is the result of *dharma*. Peace is *ātmā*; so, fruit of deed is *ātmā* only.

Now, it is said that *jīva* who meditates on thoughts of *ekatva* attains supreme purity: - Result of thoughts of *ekatva* is purity and joy of *ātmā*. In this way, in a state of perturbation, doer of perturbation is *ātmā*, arising of work done in the form of perturbation is *ātmā* and result of perturbation which is perplexity is also *ātmā*. In the state of purity, doer of purity is *ātmā*, instrument for purity to arise is *ātmā*, work done in the form of purity is *ātmā*, and result of purity, which is joy, is also *ātmā*. A *dharmī jīva* thinks in this way. *ātmā* is alone in *samsāra* as well on the path to *mokṣa*.

Neither a *jñānī* nor an *ajñānī* has any association with non-self substance.

Transmigration is not due to the presence of *karma*; in the same way, absence of *karma* is not the reason for *mokṣa*. Forgetting one's own knowing-seeing passionless nature, *ātmā* becomes a doer, work done, instrument/means of attachment and experiences its result, which is perturbation; on the path of *mokṣa*, *ātmā* itself is liberated, is liberated by itself, liberates its own self, and experiences un-perplexed joy by itself.

jīva with erroneous belief has *jñāna*, which is the opposite of this. He has the belief that *dharma* will arise due to the presence of *deva-guru-śāstra*, or will arise when the time is appropriate, or if *karma* goes away. Due to this, he desires and has thoughts of associations, *karma*, and pious attachments. So, he does not attain *dharma*, but here, the discussion is in the context of *dharmī jīva*. Thoughts do arise in the state of a seeker, but he knows that understanding has occurred due to his own perception and not due to *deva-guru-śāstra*, and if he is in transmigration, then that too is due to his own self (it is not due to manifestation of *karma* or due to spouse-children).

One *paramāṇu* has no relationship with another *paramāṇu*. The way that *paramāṇu* is an axiomatic substance; similarly, *ātmā* also is an axiomatic, pure nature of joy, a singular substance. *jīva* who meditates over the *ekatva bhāvanā* (reflections), experiences it, understands it, contemplates on it, that there is no relationship with spouse, family, and *deva-guru-śāstra*; Hence that *jīva* has absolutely no perturbation.

Till one *paramāṇu* stays single, it does not attain the impure state of *skandha*. Similarly, *jīva* who meditates on *ekatva bhāvanā* does not need to look at non-self substance for his own happiness and joy. He does not associate with non-self. As he is not associated with non-self substance, when his thoughts of associations go and thoughts of pure nature of self arise, then the state of purity occurs. *dharmī jīva* does not think of such distinctions that doer, instrument/means, work done, and fruit of deed of this pure state is *ātmā*. But he remains as generality in these four and perceives only the undivided *ātmā*; due to this, he does not get divided by modifications. Until he has auspices of modification, distinctions of doer, work done, etc., occur, and he is divided by modifications. But when he becomes one with the pure form of *ātmā*, when rising of perturbation did not remain, or modification with attachments does not manifest, and when unblemished modification

of *dharma* manifests, then that becomes one with *ātmā*; therefore, by not being divided by distinctions of modification *ātmā* becomes *suviśuddha* (completely pure).

In this way, result of *ekatva bhāvanā* is shown as un-perplexed bliss.

Now through *śloka* the same intent has been expressed and *śuddha naya* is glorified: -

★ ★ ★

śloka-7

द्रव्यान्तरव्यतिकरादपसारितात्मा

सामान्यमज्जितसमस्तविशेषजातः

इत्येष शुद्धनय उद्धतमोहलक्ष्मी-

लुण्ठाक उत्कटविवेकविविक्ततत्त्वः ॥ ७ ॥

dravyāntaravyatikarādapasāritātmā

sāmānyamajjitasamastaviśeṣajātaḥ |

ityeṣa śuddhanaya uddhatamohalakṣmī-

luṅṭhāka utkaṭavivekaviviktatatvaḥ || 7 ||

Meaning: He who has moved away his *ātmā* from other substances by way of distinction (meaning has shown it to be different from non-self substance) and who has engrossed aggregate of all particularities within the generality (meaning has shown all *paryāyas* as immersed within *dravya*), such a *śuddha naya* which robs the arrogant *laxmi* [*rddhi* (pomp) *śobhā* (splendour)] of delusion, has separated the pure *tattva* (form of *ātmā*) by superior wisdom.

pravacana on śloka 7

śuddha naya separates *ātmā* from non-self substances like spouse-family, *deva-guru-śāstra*, body, and *karma*, meaning, it shows him as distinct from them. Here it is not about being separate from space points; but the belief of association, of dependence on *nimitta* has been removed, and belief of self has arisen; this disposition has separated *ātmā* from non-self substance. It has been stated that *śuddha naya* does not accept division of modifications; it accepts only the undivided *ātmā*.

The division that *ātmā* removes perturbation and manifests purity does not exist in pure disposition. *kartā-karaṇa*, etc., distinctions do exist in modification, which attains destruction, when focus is on the pure nature of self and modification goes in the substance. So *śuddha naya* (pure standpoint) engrosses particularities into the generality of substance, meaning, destroys thoughts of modification, thoughts of infinitesimal part and thoughts of attachments, and manifests thoughts of pure nature of self. Such a *śuddha naya* merges the present modification into the undivided pure nature of self, therefore, false belief-attachment-aversion does not manifest.

In the *mūla kalaśa* (verse from the main text), it has been written that – *śuddha naya* will rob the conceited wealth of delusion. If a person is standing and he is robbed, in the same way, delusion is standing, and it will be robbed-will it be like that? Sentient is a mass of infinite attributes; each and every attribute is independent, one attribute is not due to another, its nature is in the form of absence of non-self, perturbation is not its nature - by being at one with such a nature of *jñāna*, the beauty of transmigration attains destruction, and falsity-attachment-aversion does not manifest. To create this inner state, it has been said that – *śuddha naya* will rob the wealth of delusion.

śuddha naya separates attachment-aversion and division of attributes from the pure nature of *ātmā* by way of true knowledge. As much as that becomes one with *ātmā* by way of *śuddha naya*, by that much, the *ātmā* keeps evolving purity in modifications. And on being completely at one, the state of complete passionlessness and state of omniscience is attained.

In this way, *śuddha naya* has been glorified.

Now splendour and grace of pure form of *ātmā*, which is attained through *śuddha naya*, has been glorified through this *śloka*. This completes the description of the generality of *dravya*.

śloka-8

इत्युच्छेदात्परपरिणतेः कर्तृकर्मादिभेद -
भ्रान्तिध्वंसादपि च सुचिराल्लब्धशुद्धात्मतत्त्वः ।
सञ्चिन्मात्रे महसि विशदे मूर्च्छितश्चेतनोऽयं
स्थास्यत्युद्यत्सहजमहिमा सर्वदा मुक्त एव ॥ ८ ॥

*ityucchedātparapariṇate: kartṛkarmādibheda-
bhrāntīdhvaṅsādapi ca sucirāllabdhasūddhātmatattva: |
sañcianmātre mahasi viśade mūrccchitaścetano syaṁ
sthāsyatyudyatsahajamahimā sarvadā mukta eva || 8 ||*

Meaning: In this way, with annihilation of modification which is of external form (meaning, with the destruction of modification in the form of *para dravya*) and also with the destruction of delusion of divisions like *kartā*, *karma*, etc., finally, he who has attained the pure *ātma-tattva* - such an *ātmā*, being engrossed in the illumination of only *caitanya viśada* (unblemished sentience) will always remain liberated and be, in the natural glory of the state of illumination.

pravacana on śloka 8

In *gāthā* 126, it was said that since eternity it is the self only, which is in substance-space-time-modification of self. Self is not present in non-self substance-space-time-modification. It is an ignorant thought that *ātmā* would attain *kevalajñāna* if he was

born in the fourth era or that territory of *naraka* gives sorrow. But when it is decided that nature of substance is not such, then, through *samyajjñāna*, *ātmā* decides that attachment-aversion manifests due to delusion arising from association of non-self.

The thought of four divisions, that purity of *ātmā* has *kartā*, *karāṇa*, *karma*, and *karmaphala* are mixed with attachments. Belief in the delusion that nature of self is as much as those distinctions or if attachments is destroyed, only then pure nature of *ātmā* is attained is also impure.

Belief that favourable substance-region will be beneficial for *ātmā* and unfavourable substance-region will not be beneficial is gross delusion. Belief that with contemplation of the state of *ātmā*, which is without any attachment, and after making divisions of *kartā*, *karāṇa*, etc., one can go into the undivided *ātmā* and *jñāna*, which was stuck on divisions, will gradually go within, is also a delusional belief. Such delusion has also been destroyed with the auspices of the pure undivided *ātmā*. This kind of *ātmā*, remaining engrossed in his pure nature of self, will always remain liberated by the form of illumination of natural glory.

After becoming completely liberated, the pure *ātmā* does not take birth again to have a crowd of devotees or to punish the sinner. He who is born is not liberated. In this way, *ātmā* which has become pure, will always remain liberated. So, it has been said.

śloka -9

‘द्रव्यसामान्यविज्ञाननिम्नं कृत्विति मानसम् ।

तद्विशेषपरिज्ञानप्राग्भारः क्रियतेऽधुना ॥ ६॥

dravayasāmānyavijñānanimnam kṛtveti mānasam |

tadvīṣeṣaparijñānaprāgbhāra: kriyate S dhunā || 9 ||

Now through this *śloka*, a new topic- the description of *dravya viśeṣa* (particularity of substance) is being told

Meaning: Now, by calming the mind with *jñāna* of *dravya sāmānya* (generality of substance), complete *jñāna* of *dravya viśeṣa* (particularity of substance) is being stated below.

This completes the *dravya sāmānya prajñāpāna* (chapter on generality of substance) of *jñeya tattva prajñāpāna* (chapter on knowable substance) in the *tīkā*, by the name of *Tattvadīpikā* written by *Śrīmadā Amṛtacañdra Ācāryadeva*, on the *śāstra Śrī Pravacanasāra* as written by *Śrīmadā Bhagavat Kuṇḍakuṇḍa Ācāryadeva*.



GLOSSARY FOR GĀTHĀS 93 TO 126



A

āgamas - scriptures

agurulaghu guṇa - attribute because of which one substance does not take the form of another substance, one attribute does not take the form of another attribute and attributes in each substance do not disperse and spread out

āhāra vargaṇā - assimilative, projectable, aggregate of molecules

anādi-ananta - no beginning-no end

anarthmṭara – substances which are undivided/substances which are not separate

anīṣṭa - unfavourable

aṅśa - infinitesimal part

anukūla – conducive

anupacarita sadbhūta - that view which sees pure attribute and beholder of attribute as separate

anuprūpa - suitable

aṅyatva - otherness

apramatta guṇasthāna - stage of evolution from seventh to twelfth state

ārtha paryāya - modification related to all other attributes except shape

asadbhūta upcāra - that view which takes completely different substances as one

asamāna jāṭīya - heterogeneous

aśuddha upādāna - impure substantial cause

aśuddha - impure

atadbhāva - not to be so

ātmadyāna - focus of ātmā/pure psychic activity

audārikaśarīra - physical body

āyata sāmānya rūpa - nature of lengthwise generality

āyata-sāmānya-samudāya - a mass of lengthwise generality

āyata-viśeṣa-svarūpa - lengthwise particularities

B

bhāṣāvargaṇā -mass of karmic particles of sound and speech

bhāvaliṅgī - true muni

bhāvas - thoughts/ psychic activity

bheda jñāna - knowledge of distinction

darśanamoha - karmas which create delusion of right faith

C

cāritramoha - karmas which create delusion right conduct

cidānanda – sentient bliss

D

devagati - life of a celestial being

devatva - ability to be deva

dhruvatva - eternal constancy

dravya - substance

dravya drṣṭivāna - one with the focus on substance

dravyamaya - substantiality

dravyārthika - viewing from substance aspect

dravyātmaka - substantial/consisting of substance

E

eka kṣetrāvṅāha - being present in the same space

ekatva bhāvanā - meditation on aloneness

G

gati - life-form

guṇā - attribute

guṇātmaka - consisting of attributes

guṇātmaka vibhāva paryāya - qualitative unnatural modification

H

hiṁsā - violence

I

īṣṭa - beneficial

J

jaīndarśana - perception of Jain teachings

jasuda - china rose

jñāna cetana - modification of jñāna

jnātā - knower

jñātā-dṛṣṭā - knower-seer

jñeya - knowable

K

kāla - time

karma-cetanā - modification of karma

kārmaṇavargaṇā - mass of karmic particles of it karmas

karmaphala-cetanā - modification of fruits of karma

kartutva - being doer of non-self

kārya - effect

kathāncitta - in some ways

krambaddha - sequence bound modification

kṣāyika - annihilation of karmas

kṣāyopaśam- annihilation cum subsidence of karmas

kṣetra - space

M

mahā skandha - massive mass of *paramāṇus*

manuṣyatva - ability to be human

mithyābhrānti - erroneous delusional belief

mithyādrṣṭi - with erroneous belief / false believer

moha - delusion

mūḍha - ignorant

N

naimitika – effect/incidental

naimittika bhāva - modification of effect

nidhatta karma - karma can shed, but has very strong effect

nikācita karma - karma can shed only after bearing fruits

nimitta - auxiliary cause

nirguṇa - it is not made up of attributes

nirvikalpa - unwavering

nīścaya āvaśyaka - absolute necessity

nitya nigoda - place where nigoda jīvas are found eternally and have not come out yet

P

padārtha – substance

para samaya - non-self conscious jīva

parābhava - defeats

parasamaya - unconscious about self

pāriṇāmika svabhāva bhāva - dispositions independent of karma, which is the inherent nature of *ātmā*

parmāṇu - smallest unit of physical matter particle

parmārtha - highest/sublime

parmātmā - supreme ātmā

pramatta guṇasthānas - stages of evolution from one to six

paryāya mūḍha - those perplexed by modification/focus only on modification

paryāyārthika - viewing from modification aspect

paryāyārthika naya - modification point of view

piṇḍa - conglomeration/mass

pramāṇa - that which takes the whole as its subject

pramāṇa jñāna - knowing, which includes substance, attribute, modification

prāpta - complete/already obtained

prāpti- obtained

prāpya - object to be obtained

praśama - tranquility

prthaktva - separateness

R

rāgī - with attachments

S

sādhakatama - supreme instrument

sādrśya – congruence / similitude / same

samādhāna - solution through deep contemplation

samāna jātiya dravya-paryāya - homogenous substance-modification

samāna jātiya - homogeneous
sāmānya dravya - generality of substance
samsāra - transmigration
samsārī jīva - mundane beings
sāpekṣa - relative
sarvajña vītarāga - omniscient passionless
sarvajña vītarāgī deva - omniscient passionless Bhagavāna
saṭ samāgama - congregation for understanding truth of the highest order
ṣaṭ sthānapatita hānivrddhi - increase-decrease form of falling in six places/parts
skandha - more than one parmāṇu
sphatika - clear crystal
śubhāśubha - auspicious-inauspicious
suviśuddha sahaja (svabhāvika) svapriṇatī - pure effortless inherent self modification.
sva sāmārthya self ability
svabhāva paryāya - modification with intrinsic nature/ natural modification
svabhāva viśeṣa - particularity of nature
svajñeya - self knowable
sva-para prakāśaka - illumination of self and non-self

T

tadbhāva - to be that
tejasa vargaṇā - auric body

U

ubhaya - both ways
udaya - arising of karmas
upādāna - substantial cause
upādeya - acceptable

upādhi - fallacy
uparāga - perturbed state
upāsama - subsidence of karmas
upayoga - manifestation of conscious attentiveness
upādāna kāraṇa - substantial cause
vastusvabhāva darśana - perception of nature of substances
vibhakta-pradeśatva - with separate spatial points
vibhāva artha paryāya - extrinsic modification related to all attributes except shape
vibhāva paryāya - modification with alienated nature/ unnatural modification
vibhāva vyañjana paryāya - extrinsic modification of the attribute of shape
vidhāyaka - maker of substance/attribute which shows the substance
vikāra - perturbation
vikārī - with perturbation
virya āntarāya - karma nimitta in interfering the manifestation of strength
visadrśya - not the same
viśeṣana - of a unique type
vistāra-sāmānya-samudāya - a mass of width/ area wise generality
vistāra-viśeṣa-svarūpa-guṇa - consisting of horizontal area-wise particularity
vr̥ttisvarūpā - has the nature to exist
vyañjana paryāya - modification related only to attribute of shape of the substance
vyavahāra - conventionality



