

SOUL SCIENCE

Samayasāra by Jain Ācārya Kundakunda

(Part-2)

(Stanzas 145-287)

English Translation and Annotations by

Dr. Paras Mal Agrawal

About the book

A worldly soul is associated with physical body, pleasure, pain, emotions, etc. All such associates change with time. In the scripture *Samayasāra*, Ācārya Kundakunda (127-179 A.D.) very minutely and logically tries to show what the eternal soul is and what is not. For the bliss, peace, and happiness he suggests to realize I-ness only with the *Samayasāra*. The literal meaning of the word '*Samayasāra*' is 'soul in its essence'. Before the beginning of any auspicious work, Digamber Jains recite the name of Ācārya Kundakunda next only to that of Lord Mahāvīra and his chief disciple Gautama Gaṇadhara. The treatise *Samayasāra* is considered as the best work of Ācārya Kundakunda. This book presents the English translation and explanation of 143 stanzas of *Samayasāra* (stanza no. 145 to 287) using modern and scientific examples.

SOUL SCIENCE

Samayasāra by Jain Ācārya Kundakunda

(Part-2)

(Stanzas 145-287)

English Translation and Annotations by

Dr. Paras Mal Agrawal

Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha

584, M.G. Road, Tukogunj,
INDORE - 452001 INDIA

Soul Science, Part-2

Author - Dr. Paras Mal Agrawal

11 Bherava Dham Colony, Hiran Magri,
Sector 3, UDAIPUR (Rajasthan) INDIA
parasagrawal@hotmail.com
(Mo.) 97847-05711

© author

I.S.B.N. 81-86933-65-4

Edition First 2018

Price - (For India) Rs. 250=00 (Paper Back), Rs. 350=00 (Hard Bound)
(For Abroad) Rs. 600=00 (Paper Back), Rs. 800=00 (Hard Bound)

Printer – Payorite Print Media Pvt. Ltd.
Udaipur (Rajasthan)

Publisher- **Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha**
584, M.G. Road, Tukogunj,
INDORE - 452001 INDIA
0731-2545421, 2545744
anupamjain3@rediffmail.com

(Note: For purchasing the book, one may contact the publisher by SMS, letter, or email)

Publisher's note

After Tirthamkara Mahāvīra and his chief disciple Gaṇadhara Gautama, the name of Ācārya Kundakunda is recited just before initiating any auspicious work by Digamber Jains. This is evident from the following popular verse which is recited:

Maṃgalam Bhagavāna Vīro maṃgalam Gautamo Gaṇī,

Maṃgalam Kundakundādyo Jaina dharmostu maṃgalam.

Among all the scriptures written by Ācārya Kundakunda, Samayasāra is regarded as the best. Further, among all the available scriptures written by all the saints, Samayasāra is respected as the best scripture, in the spiritual area dealing with soul science, by the Jains. Samayasāra was written by Ācārya Kundakunda in Śaurasenī Prākṛta language. Its two commentaries in Saṃskṛta – Ācārya Jayasena's Tātparyavṛtti and Ācārya Amṛtacandra's ĀtmaKhyāti – have also been popular and have been source of inspiration to the Hindi scholars for writing the commentaries in Hindi. Pt. Jayachandji wrote the commentary in Dhundhari language (early version of the modern Hindi). Pt. Manoharlalji (from Padhan-Mainpuri), Pt. Pannalalji Sahityacharya (from Sagar), and Pt. Motichandji Kothari (from Falatan) also translated Samayasāra in Hindi. The translations and commentaries written by these and other scholars and saints provide many valuable dimensions of spiritual science for contemplation and meditation for the persons knowing Indian languages.

With the advancement of technology, almost every community has now crossed its old geographical and lingual boundaries. Jains settled abroad need their scriptures in English. In the international universities all over the world, the multicultural environment has created a spirit of harmony that leads to the requirement of teachings of great saints of all religions. Many persons who are tired of materialistic attitude feel the need of spiritual environment and peace. For many such needy and thirsty persons the availability of Samayasāra in English may be a blessing. With this view many authors in the past have come forward to translate Samayasāra in English. Ray Bahadur Shri J. L. Jaini initiated

this task. His translation of Samayasāra has been published in 1930 from Central India Publishing House, Lucknow. In 1950, Bharatiya Jnanpith, Delhi, published the English version of Samayasāra, edited and translated by Professor A. Chakravarti. In 2009, the English translation of Samayasāra with annotations by Shri J. S. Javeri assisted by Professor Muni Mahendra Kumarji-II has been published by Jain Vishva Bharati University, Ladnun. In 2012, Shri Vikalpa Printers Deharadun published the English translation of Samayasāra written by Shri Vijay K. Jain.

All these publications in English by the renowned authors are valuable. However, many readers are interested in more details. For example, some readers are interested in finding the relevance and application of various stanzas of this scripture in their day-to-day life. Some readers want to have the flavour of the discussion and description provided by Ācārya Jayasena and Ācārya Amṛtacandra. Some need to resolve the apparent contradiction between the facts mentioned by Ācārya Kundakunda in this scripture from the relative point of view (Vyavahāra Naya) and the real point of view (Niścaya Naya). In view of such requirements, one may be glad to note that Professor Paras Mal Agrawal has tried to fulfill such needs of the readers to some extent in his book Soul Science (Part-1) published by us in 2014. It covered first 144 stanzas out of total 415 stanzas of Samayasāra.

We are happy to note that the book, Soul Science (Part-1), has been widely appreciated by scholars and readers all over the world. **The book has also been recognized for a prestigious award, Muni-Brahmagulal-Award, in 2014, by Shrutseva Nidhi Nyas, Firozabad (U.P.).**

With painstaking efforts and enthusiasm, by now Professor Agrawal has completed the writing of translation and annotations of next 143 stanzas. These are being published in the form of this book – **Soul Science: *Samayasāra* by Jain Ācārya Kundakunda, Part-2.**

Dr. Agrawal is basically a physicist but he is equally interested in the spiritual aspects of life. As in Part-1, in this book also a reader would be able to see his interest, depth of understanding, and explanation with logical reasoning of a scientist cum teacher. The author has been in USA for more than 16 years as a scientist and visiting professor. One may note

that the American experience of the author has also been valuable to this work in many ways.

This institute with its name as **Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha** was formally founded on October 19, 1987, when the whole India was celebrating the 2000th birth year of Ācārya Kundakunda. It always feels glorified by having its association with Ācārya Kundakunda not only by its name but also by the activities which promote the philosophy elaborated by Ācārya Kundakunda. Professor Agrawal has been serving this Jñānapīṭha as a member of Board of Directors (or as a member of the editorial board of its quarterly research journal, **Arhat Vacana**) since 1987. Therefore, by this scholarly work of international importance, this institute also feels glorified and we feel a great pleasure in publishing his work. We look forward to publish the remaining stanzas as soon as possible, and are waiting for the completion of the work by the author.

We feel it our duty to express our thankfulness to Prof. Agrawal for providing us an opportunity to publish this work. We also acknowledge the personal efforts made by Shri Sanjayji Kothari and his staff associated with the printing press – Payorite Print Media, Udaipur – for an attractive, clean, and nice printing. In this task of bringing out this work in the present form, the personal interest taken and the encouragement provided by Dr. Ajit Kumar Singhji Kasliwal also deserve a special mention.

We hope the book would prove valuable to the curious readers, and we request for their feedback for our encouragement and further improvement.

Dr. Anupam Jain
Principal, Govt. College
Sanwer, Indore (M.P.)
& Executive Director,
Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha,
584, M.G. Road, Indore (M. P.)
anupamjain3@rediffmail.com

Blessings from Acharya Shri Sunil Sagarji

डॉ. पारसमलजी अग्रवाल,

चतुर्थ पट्टाधीश आचार्य श्री सुनीलसागरजी का आशीर्वाद ।

आचार्य श्री कुंदकुंद और उनके समयसार के बिना जैन धर्म और भारतीय अध्यात्म अधूरा है। समयसार में मोक्षमार्ग के जिन रहस्यों को दिखाया गया है यदि उसका एक प्रतिशत भी अनुभव कर लिया जाये तो वर्तमान की सारी समस्याएँ, टेंशन, डिप्रेशन, बेरोजगारी, भुखमरी, आतंकवाद आदि खत्म हो जायेंगे।

Soul Science में समयसार के जिन रहस्यों को आपने खोला है वह देखने लायक है। इसे सुन-सुनकर मन तृप्त ही नहीं होता है—ऐसी शैली है। समयसार पर हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी में कई टीकाएं हैं पर आचार्य अमृतचन्द और आचार्य जयसेन की प्राचीन टीकाओं का आधार लेकर जो आपने अंग्रेजी में लिखा है वह बेजोड़ और बेतोड़ है। गाथाओं का वैज्ञानिक स्पष्टीकरण गजब का है।

आचार्यश्री सुनीलसागरजी का पवित्र आशीर्वाद आपको और आपकी लेखनी को सदैव शक्ति और सुगंध देता रहेगा।

उदयपुर
2.3.2018

गुरु आदेश से
मुनि सम्बुद्धसागर

Excerpts from the book

Regarding a gold-mine we are clear that a large portion of the soil of the mine is not gold but every particle of the soil of the mine is valuable. In the same way, spiritual teachers clearly know this concept that *although every component of a living being is valuable but a living being in its entirety is not Jīva (soul), a living being is a combination of Jīva (soul) and non-Jīva (non-soul).*

(Taken from Introduction)

Regarding a gold-mine, we are clear that the nature of the soil of a gold-mine is very different from the nature of gold. Further, the nature of soil varies from mine to mine but the nature of gold coming from a mine in the USA is the same as that coming from a mine in India. Similarly, spiritual masters are clear about this concept that *the nature of soul is very different from the nature of living beings, and the nature of living beings change with time and varies from species to species and individual to individual, but the nature of soul is invariant.*

(Taken from Introduction)

Regarding a gold-mine we know very well that before carrying out any attempt to realize gold from gold-ore, we scientifically understand gold as well as associated non-gold, and attain an ability to differentiate between gold and non-gold. In the same way, spiritual teachers have clarity about this concept that *the realization of the soul that leads to peace, happiness and bliss is not possible without understanding the soul (Self) and attaining the ability of visualizing the difference between the soul and the associated non-souls.*

(Taken from Introduction)

One may feed others, one may help others but in the heart one should understand that in reality he is not the doer of the helping actions. To have an inner attachment or ownership with such helping actions amounts to the wrong-belief-sin, and it comes in the category of possessiveness sin.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 145-147)

VIII

A soul with attachment gets bonded with *Karma*, and the detached one gets liberation. This has been preached by omniscient lords. Therefore, do not have attachment with *Karma*.

(Translation of stanza 150)

The understanding of not having any desire of earning auspicious *Karma* is likely to lead to the attainment of enlightenment, and the actions of an enlightened being are likely to increase the level of acts related with charity, welfare, kindness, non-violence, etc. in the world, which in turn are likely to result in the advancement of peace, love, and harmony in the world.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 151-154)

A *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* knows the actions of body and mind as the actions of the soul's close neighbor, not as his own (soul's) actions. He, as a soul, does not become the owner or doer of the actions of his body and mind.

(Taken from annotations of stanza 166)

In reality, the actions of non-souls are not the actions of the soul. But the ownership of the actions of non-souls wrongly accepted by the soul becomes an erroneous act of the soul.

(Taken from annotations of stanza 167)

The President seriously participates in making and executing the budget of the nation. But as a person he knows that any negative or positive balance of the national budget does not affect his personal bank account. In the same way, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* person takes care of his personal finance and other aspects but at the same time he knows that any loss or gain of the money is not going to make his real-self (Self or soul) richer or poorer.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 177-178)

We know that by passing white light through a celluloid movie film the movie appears on the screen. We also know that the movie on the screen is not possible without the white light that passes through the film. However, on the top of all these we know that the celluloid film and the source of white light are separate and different. This analogy may be useful by taking the *Upayoga* of the soul as the white light, the celluloid film as physical body having memory-etc., and the movie screen as the vocal, mental and physical actions of the personality. We understand very well that the white light does not contain any recording of the fire, rain, train, fight, etc. appearing on the movie screen. In the same way, the *Upayoga* does not contain any memory, emotion, physical body, etc.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 181-183)

Stanza 184 conveys a significant point that even an enlightened person may be under severe hardship due to fruition of the previously bonded *Karma*. However, an enlightened person has clear knowledge about the true nature of his Self even during the stressful circumstances. He has an understanding of the science-of-separation; he realizes that he is the soul which is separate from the difficulties associated with his physical body and emotions.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 184-185)

Question: If acts or thoughts of liking and disliking are different from the nature of the soul then why do these happen to living beings only? Why not to dead bodies?

Answer: Let us take an example of a beautiful lake appearing blue (see Diagram-3). It is easy to check that the lake appears blue but its water is not blue. It can be verified by looking at the water taken out from the lake in a glass cup (see the inset in Diagram-3). On the basis of this observation, one can say that the color of the lake (blue) does not reveal the color of the water contained in the lake. One should accept the fact that water is not blue. Scientists know that the blue color of the lake is not possible without the water but they also know that the water is not

blue. Even the bottom of the lake may not be blue. Physicists do not ask about the owner of the blue color of the lake. They are interested in knowing and exploring the reason of its blue appearance. They simply ask and answer, "Why does the water of the lake appear blue?"

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 198-200)

Scientists know that the dance, music, dialogues, etc. on the TV screen cannot appear without the electric power supply but the source of scenes and music from the TV is not the electric power supply. Scientists know that the 220 volt supply line does not possess such signals of dance, music, etc.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 198-200)

The ego calls an achievement when someone acquires material prosperity and control over others, whereas the process of liberation starts with the acceptance of the truth. In the spiritual world, the acceptance of the truth as well as the true ownership of the soul is the most important achievement. The ownership over others and any desire of changing and controlling others go against the liberation.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 203-204)

In true sense, that which always stays with you is yours. *Ācārya* Kundakunda is using this criterion to state that the Self is the possession of the Self. Further, it is well known that the physical body, house, jewelry, etc. do not stay with oneself forever. Therefore, a wise person, on the basis of this realization, does not consider house, jewelry, etc. as his possessions in the real sense.

(Taken from annotations of stanza 207)

An enlightened being does not commit any mistake of identifying others, such as physical body, as the Self. However, such an enlightened being as a person may have worldly liking and disliking. This stanza asserts that despite the presence of such liking and disliking, he as a soul remains unattached with these, i.e., he as a soul does not consider himself an owner of such liking and disliking.

(Taken from annotations of stanza 217)

The ownership of the difficult circumstances frightens a person. The non-ownership or detachment may give a better perspective to respond to the situation.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 218-219)

Question: An enlightened person does not become the owner of his personality. After reading this point one question arises: Does it mean that a *Jñānī* would introduce himself as a soul while opening his bank account or while applying for a job?

Answer: No, he is not expected to do so. Neither soul can be the doer of the job nor can open any bank account. Neither a soul can be hired nor is it hired by anyone. Therefore, for the job or bank account the relevant information regarding the person is required. A *Jñānī* knows himself as a soul and he also knows his role as a person. Even while a *Jñānī* is involved with his role of the person he is aware of his real identity (as a soul) which is eternal. Playing more than one role is not uncommon. Even in a non-spiritual context, the professionals such as collectors, judges, doctors do remember their personal identification beyond their professional titles even while they execute their professional tasks as collector/judge/doctor.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 220-223)

Some description is given by preceptors with a focus on the acts of the physical body and some description is given by the same preceptors with a focus on the soul. When a preceptor writes: “A householder *Jñānī* should carefully discharge his/her duty towards his/her parents, spouse, sons, daughters, family, office, nation, temple, teachers, saints, etc.,” then the preceptor is describing the *Jñānī* as a person. When the same preceptor writes: “Even a householder *Jñānī* does not become the doer of any act of eating or earning or helping,” then the preceptor is describing the *Jñānī* as a soul.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 220-223)

If one is unable to visualize oneself (one's soul) as distinct, separate, and different from fear, desires, material possessions, etc. associated with the personality then he is not an enlightened person.

(Taken from annotations of stanza 228)

It is well known that a healthy person has immunity which safeguards his physical body against sickness causing bacteria, virus, etc. This analogy may be applied in the spiritual area. An enlightened being is spiritually healthy and has the immunity that protects his spiritual health against all external alien aspects. This attribute of spiritual immunity protects him against external disturbances.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 233-234)

Regarding physical health, we also know that despite a good level of immunity, one may sometimes become sick. For example, one may get cold. But the body of a strong healthy person has inbuilt mechanism which helps him recover the health in a short time. In the same way, *Ācārya* Kundakunda in stanza 234 says that an enlightened being is capable of keeping oneself on the right spiritual path.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 233-234)

Just as a car needs not only accelerator but brakes also, in the same way one should have brakes also in one's notions regarding the limitations of results of helping others. After making sincere efforts, one should be able to accept the outcome that occurs in accordance with the arising *Karma* of the person concerned. Such an outcome may or may not be in agreement to our expectations, and may provide a point of research for the advancement in the future, but without recognizing the value of the arising *Karma* of the person, we are likely to end up in guilt, fear, frustration, ego, etc.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 247-252)

Just as various branches of natural science deal with basic facts, and various branches of engineering and medical sciences deal with their application; in the same way *Dravyāṃuyoga* of Jainology deals with the facts, and *Caraṇāṃuyoga* of Jainology deals with their application. This scripture is to be considered as a scripture of *Dravyāṃuyoga*.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 257-258)

After reading two lines regarding the law of conservation of energy in the books of physics some persons may not be careful and may not make attempts to save the electricity. With this logic or apprehension the mention of the law of conservation of energy in the books of physics cannot be stopped.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 257-258)

From stanzas 255 and 256 one can also learn to be fearless: One can learn that his life depends on his thoughts, feelings, and actions (present as well as past); others cannot harm, the harm happens in accordance with one's own present or past deeds (*Karma*).

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 262-265)

These stanzas reveal that the external measures of the spiritual practices as described by the relative point of view can be achieved even by an *Abhavya*. The example of *Abhavya* highlights this point that if the realization of the soul as described by the real point of view does not happen then the liberation is impossible even though one can attain the peak of external conduct related to the physical body.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 273-275)

It is well known that the protection of six kinds of living beings is considered as the conduct from the relative point of view. If one goes deeper, one may have this view that the attitude of protecting six kinds of living beings is the conduct of the soul. Still deeper, one may say that the attitude of not disturbing anyone is the conduct of the soul. Still deeper, one may say that the act of relaxing of the soul in itself without any desire of disturbing others is the spiritual conduct. Still deeper, one may find that the conduct of the soul is to abide in the soul itself. In view of this depth, in stanza 277, *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that the real conduct of the soul is based on the soul only.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 276-277)

It may not be incorrect to assign the ownership even with the family, money, city, and country, from the relative point of view, with various

‘ifs’ and ‘buts’. But in the real sense, the true ownership is that which continues forever. The real ownership as recognized by the real point of view does not change with time.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 280-282)

The Jain religion attaches high importance to non-violence and non-toxicity in accepting anything worth eating. Non-vegetarian food and eggs are not allowed. Even many vegetarian items such as onion, garlic, etc. are also forbidden. In scriptures, one may also find the concept of different expiry periods of different food items in different seasons. Thus the relative point of view takes care of health and physical non-violence in the best possible way.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 286-287)

We are soul, not the body. One gets pleasure, pain, birth, death as per one's own bonded *Karma*. For one's suffering, one's own deeds, not of others, are responsible. All events in one's life occur as per fruition of *Karma* bonded by oneself. The *Kārmika* bonding takes place mainly due to the false notion of identifying oneself as body and mind, the false notion of controlling others' destiny, and the false notion of being controlled by others.

(Taken from annotations of stanzas 286-287)

Remain always focused on the soul, remain always contented with the soul, and be totally saturated by this. The supreme bliss would happen to you.

(Taken from Appendix-8)

CONTENTS

Blessings	VI
Excerpts from the book	VII
Foreword	XVI
Preface	XVIII
Acknowledgement	XXII
About transliteration, non-English terms, and stanzas	XXIV
Introduction	XXVII
Chapter 4. Virtue and Vice (<i>Puṇya</i> and <i>Pāpa</i>)	1
Chapter 5. Influx of <i>Karma</i> (<i>Āsrava</i>)	30
Chapter 6. Stoppage of influx of <i>Karma</i> (<i>Samvara</i>)	55
Chapter 7. Shedding of <i>Karma</i> (<i>Nirjarā</i>)	67
Chapter 8. Bonding of <i>Karma</i> (<i>Bandha</i>)	116
Appenendix-7. Five Sins	171
Appendix-8. Right Conduct	175
Subject index	181
Diagram-3	74
Diagram-4	160

Foreword

The present volume, namely Soul Science Part II, is the continuation of earlier released Part I that presents Samayasāra (stanzas 1-144) by Jain Ācārya Kundakunda together with annotations by Prof. Paras Mal Agrawal in English. This volume refers to stanzas 145-287 that covers the following important topics of Jain philosophy.

Chapter 4: Virtue and Vice (Punya and Pāpa)

Chapter 5: Influx of Karma (Āsrava)

Chapter 6: Stoppage of influx of Karma (Samvara)

Chapter 7: Shedding of Karma (Nirjarā)

Chapter 8: Bonding of Karma (Bandha)

These topics have great significance as they categorize our activities as inauspicious (*aśubha*), auspicious (*śubha*) and pure (*śuddha*), and their resultant bondage with the soul. Ultimately there is inadequacy of both, inauspicious and auspicious, to attain bliss, true knowledge, and liberation of the soul from its worldly transmigratory existence (Stanzas 145-148). The matter karmas bonded with the soul are inert as they are suppressed from action and hence do not matter to one with right vision. Activation/fructification of these inactive and bonded karmas produces impact/experience, but the one with right knowledge understands these as separate from his own nature and hence does not get further bondage. Such active karmas, like ripe fruits fall off the tree, also get separated from the soul after fructification.

Like a true teacher and in the tradition of Ācārya Kundakunda, Prof. Agrawal uses a number of real life examples to explain the minute difference in our activities which can be categorized as inauspicious, auspicious, and pure. Particularly, his use of examples of ordinary person's dealing with money and family matters to explain the philosophical cum spiritual message given by Ācārya Kundakunda is praiseworthy. Like Jain scriptures use Prākṛta, common man's language,

to bring home the doctrine, so does Prof. Agrawal use common man's English to enable lay practitioners understand the concepts.

I found this volume very interesting as it aroused more interest in me to go deeper in the subject and enhance my own understanding of auspicious and inauspicious activities resulting in bondage of meritorious and unmeritorious karmas, karmic influx, and bondage.

Prof. Agrawal had been associated with International School for Jain Schools as faculty member to teach soul and karma doctrines to overseas scholars. I always found him to be a serious dedicated practitioner cum inquisitive, truly imbibing the techniques indicated in Jain concept of Svādhyāya (self-study), for his own learning as well as teaching others. I wish Prof. Agrawal all the best in his untiring efforts to present this valuable scripture of Digambar Jains to English speaking audience.

Dr. Shugan C Jain

Chairman

International School for Jain Studies

D 28 Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi 110017

Preface

Before the beginning of any auspicious task the following verse is recited by Digamber Jains. Even on wedding cards many devotees print this verse.

Mangalam Bhagawan Viro , Mangalam Gautamo Gani.

Mangalam Kundakundadyo , Jain Dharmostu Mangalam.

This verse says that *Tirthankar* Mahavir, *Ganadhar* Gautam and *Acharya* Kundakund are auspicious. In this verse, recitation of the name of *Acharya* Kundakund just next to Lord Mahavir and his chief disciple Gautam reveals a lot about the status of *Acharya* Kundakund in the eyes of modern and ancient saints, scholars, and common people of Digamber Jain community. In this regard, it would also be appropriate to mention that in Jain temples on almost every Digamber Jain idol (*Jin Pratima*) having engraved details of its establishment, one would find the citation that this idol belongs to the tradition of *Acharya* Kundakund.

Amongst about 84 scriptures of *Acharya* Kundakund, today we possess a very few, and among all his scriptures five are considered as the-five-supreme-scriptures. Names of these five are: *Pravachansaar*, *Niyamsaar*, *Panchastikaya Sangrah*, *Ashtapahud*, and *Samayasaar*. It may be appropriate here to introduce these scriptures in brief:

Pravachansaar – It describes the source, function, nature, and holiness of omniscience, objects of the cosmos, helplessness and hopelessness of worldly pleasures, virtuous deeds, bliss, and the humble inspiration to be a decent monk.

Niyamsaar – This scripture is especially written for self-inspiration. It contains splendid blend of internal and external nature of monks. Six essentials (*Aavashyak*), deep meditation (*ParamSamadhi*), the supreme devotion (*ParamBhakti*), etc. have been elaborated from the real point of view (*Nishchay Naya*). In the end, *Acharya* Kundakund describes the knowing nature of omniscient Lords from the real as well as relative point of view.

Panchastikaya Sangraha – This scripture covers five *Astikaya* – soul, matter (*Pudgal*), *Dharm*, *Adharm*, and space (*Aakash*); six *Dravya* – *Kaal* (time) and five *Astikaya*; and nine *Tattva* – soul, non-soul, virtue, vice or sin, *Aasrav* (influx of *Karma*), *Samvar* (stoppage of influx of *Karma*), *Nirjaraa* (partial shedding of previously bonded *Karma*), *Bandha* (bondage of *Karma*), and *Moksha* (liberation or complete shedding of all *Karma*) – in very simple manner. In the end, *Acharya* Kundakund describes the path of liberation from the real as well as relative point of view.

Ashtapaahuda – As its name indicates, this scripture has eight chapters. It describes essential philosophy and provisions which are helpful in maintaining internal and external conduct of a monk. Thus it provides guidelines to every monk as well as to *Acharya* (the head of a group of monks) to maintain internal as well as external discipline. This scripture has proved very much helpful in preventing the monks going away from the path of non-attachment.

Samayasaar – This is the most outstanding scripture. The objective of this scripture is to show pure soul. In stanza 5, *Acharya* Kundakund explicitly mentions that in this scripture he is going to show the indivisible soul separate and distinct from others. Oneness with the pure soul leads one to the way to liberation. The first commentary of *Samayasaar* in Sanskrit entitled *Aatmakhyati* was written by *Acharya* Amritchandra who walked on this earth nearly 1000 years before us and 1000 years after *Acharya* Kundakund. Nearly 300 years after *Acharya* Amritchandra, the next commentary entitled *Tatparyavritti* was written by *Acharya* Jayasen, again in Sanskrit. One may find the translation of *Samayasaar* in many Indian languages. *Samayasaar* means the soul in essence. In *Kalash* 244 of *Aatmakhyati*, *Acharya* Amritchandra writes, ‘*Na Khalu Samaysaarat uttaram Kinchit Asti.*’ [Meaning: In reality, nothing is greater than *Samayasaar*, i.e., *Samayasaar* is the best.]

It would be worthwhile to have a glimpse of different scriptures of *Acharya* Kundakund through some original stanzas together with their meanings:

जो जाणदि अरहंतं दव्वत्तगुणत्तपज्जयत्तेहिं ।
सो जाणदि अप्पाणं मोहो खलु जादि तस्स लयं ॥

(*Pravachansaar – 80*)

Meaning: By understanding omniscient lord (Arahant) from three perspectives – soul substance of the Lord, attributes of the Lord, and past, present, and future states of the Lord – one understands the Self that leads to the destruction of delusion.

णियमेण य जं कज्जं तं णियमं णाणदंसणचरितं ।
विवरीयपरिहरत्थं भणिदं खलु सारमिदि वयणं ॥

(*Niyamsaar – 3*)

Meaning: *Niyam* is that which is worth doing. *NiyamSaar* means only relevant and useful *Niyam*. Therefore, *NiyamSaar* means right belief, right knowledge, and right conduct.

उप्पत्ती व विणासो दव्वस्स य णत्थि अत्थि सब्भावो ।
विगमुप्पादधुवत्तं करेति तस्सेव पज्जाया ॥

(*Panchastikaya Sangraha – 11*)

Meaning: A substance (*Dravya*) is neither created nor destroyed. Its states undergo creation and destruction together with sustainment of the substance (*Dravya*).

In Ashtapahud, 5th and 6th stanzas of SheelPahuda reveal the following:

णाणं चरित्तहीणं लिंगगहणं च दंसणविहूणं ।
संजमहीणो य तवो जइ चरइ णिरत्थयं सब्ब ॥
णाणं चरित्तसुद्धं लिंगगहणं च दंसणविसुद्धं ।
संजमसहिदो य तवो थोओ वि महाफलो होइ ॥

(*Sheelpaahuda – 5 and 6*)

Meaning: Without right conduct spiritual knowledge is meaningless, without right belief external conduct and marks of religious development are meaningless, and without self discipline and non-violence penance is meaningless. Spiritual knowledge with right conduct, external conduct and marks of religious development with right belief, and penance with self discipline and non-violence (*Sanyam*), all these

even in small amount, are very much fruitful.

अरसमरुवमगंधं अव्वत्तं चेदणागुणमसद्धं ।
जाण अलिंगगहणं जीवमणिद्धिसंठाणं ।।

(Samayasaar – 49)

Meaning: Soul is tasteless, invisible, odorless, without sound, imperceptible to sensory organs, without any definite shape, with consciousness attribute, and realizable not by any mark or symbol.

Professor Paras Mal Ji Agrawal has been devoting his time in writing translation and annotations of Samayasaar in English for the last many years. The first part of his work has been published in 2014 as a book entitled Soul Science (Part-1). It covers 144 stanzas out of total 415 stanzas. When that book came to my hands, I turned over a few pages, and felt extremely delighted. I liked it so much that I devoted a major portion of my time to that book and completed the first round of reading in less than two weeks. I became excited to receive the next part.

I am thankful to Dr. Agrawal for sending to me the manuscript of Part-2 for my feedback. I am again very much impressed. I find that as in Part-1, here also he focused on the subject matter in an extraordinary way. His scientific and logical approach is neither traditional nor monotonous. The presentation is nicely tuned to the demand of the present scientific age. He explains the contents in minimum possible words in a simple way without reducing the philosophical depth. By adding heart touching examples related to day-to-day life as well as science he has really added charm in the philosophical description that otherwise appears dry to many. I believe that a reader wishing to understand the hard core concepts of Jain philosophy will surely satiate his hunger here, and would move ahead in the direction of enlightenment.

Sachin Jain

Teerthdham Mangalayatan
Sasani (Aligarh) UP 204216

Acknowledgment

I feel that it is a right place to acknowledge my indebtedness for the help and encouragement received from my teachers, family members, and friends to complete this task.

Ācārya Kanaknandhiji inspired me to express concepts of *Samayasāra* through the examples of modern science. Ācārya Sunil Sagarji encouraged me to deliver many talks on *Samayasāra* in his *Sangh*; the interest of Muni Shri Sambuddha Sagarji and Muni Shri Shrutansh Sagarji of his *Sangh* in reading and listening annotations of many stanzas from *Soul Science* has been a rewarding experience to me; and their feedback has been very much helpful in improving the manuscript. Dr Hukam Chandji Bharill motivated me to translate *Samayasāra* in English and provided the soft copy of his book to let me extract original stanzas of Ācārya Kundakunda typed in *Devanagari*. I would also like to express my indebtedness to my father (late) Shri Bhanwarlalji Agrawal who taught me basics of *Samskṛta* and Jainology besides other worldly lessons. In this regard, I also acknowledge the encouragement provided by Shri Pawanji Jain (Mangalayatan). I have no words to express my indebtedness to these personalities.

I acknowledge the detailed feedbacks from my friends: Br. Hemachandji Jain 'Hem' (Devalali), Pandit Sachinji Shastri (Mangalayatan), Dr. Kirit Gosaliya (Phoenix), and Dr. N. L. Kachhara (Udaipur). They devoted a lot of their valuable time in reading the whole manuscript very thoroughly and provided their comments and suggestions. Without their feedbacks the quality of the work would have been different. In this regard, I also remember the importance of feedback from Dr. Prem Suman Jain (Udaipur), Dr. Shugan C. Jain (New Delhi), and Dr. Anupam Jain (Indore). In addition to providing the valuable suggestions, Dr. Shugan C. Jain has been kind enough to write the 'Foreword', and Pandit Sachinji Shastri Jain has encouraged me by providing the 'Preface' to be included in this work. My hearty thanks to these friends for all they have done in the completion of this book.

I also express my thankfulness to my close ones. Dr. Jayanti Lal Jain (Mangalayatan University), Dr. Veer Sagar Jain (Delhi), Dr. Jinendra Kumar Jain (Udaipur), Dr. S. L. Godawat (Udaipur), Shri Vimalji Jain (Udaipur), Mrs. Sheetal Vijen Shah (London), Shri I.S. Jain (Mumbai) and my family members (Manak Lal, Mahesh Kumarji, Nirmal Kumar, Kavita, Vishal, and Prateek) have been nice enough to go through the manuscript during different phases of its development and have provided encouragement and feedback that helped me a lot. My wife, Mrs. Pushpa Agrawal, encouraged and supported me in various ways. She took interest in discussing many stanzas with me, and she read a large number of pages of the manuscript. Her feedback specially helped me in making the language simpler.

While expressing my thankfulness, I cannot forget the names of Dr AjitKumar Singhji Kasliwal, his father (late) Shri DevKumar Singhji Kasliwal and Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha (Indore) who have been instrumental in encouraging me to learn and spread the tenets of Jain philosophy in the past 30 years. I am also thankful to Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha (Indore) as well as its Executive Director, Dr. Anupam Jain, and his associates for the publication of this work. At this point, I am also happy to express my admiration for Shri Sanajayji Kothari and his team including Shri Dinesh Prajapat for printing this work in very efficient way.

Udaipur

September 5, 2018

Paras Mal Agrawal

11 Bherava Dham Colony, Hiran Magri
Sector 3, UDAIPUR (Rajasthan) INDIA
parasagrwal@hotmail.com

About transliteration, non-English terms, and stanzas

- (1) In this work, the original stanzas of *Samayasāra* written by Ācārya Kundakunda have been first presented in the *Devanāgarī* script. Then their transliteration in English (in *italics*) has been written. Next, *Samṣkṛta* version of the stanzas in the *Devanāgarī* script provided by Ācārya Amṛtacandra has been included.
- (2) This book is the second part of the set of the three books on Soul Science (the third part is yet to be published). To avoid any confusion, the first Appendix in this book has been assigned number 7, as Appendix-1 to Appendix-6 have been included in Part-1. For assigning numbers to Diagrams and Chapters also the same criterion has been employed.
- (3) There are many new terms of *Samṣkṛta/Hindi* for which exact English words are not available. In the interest of accuracy, many *Samṣkṛta/Hindi* words have been adopted as such, and have been shown in *italics* in the text. Further, the glossary of various such words has been given as Appendix-1 in Part-1 of this series of books entitled Soul Science. To reduce the need of referring to the glossary again and again, at many places in the text the English equivalents (as close as possible) with the corresponding *Samṣkṛta* and *Hindī* terms have also been used.
- (4) In English, there are many words like 'advice', 'food', 'fish', 'knowledge', 'oxygen', 'police', 'deer', etc., which spell same in their singular as well as plural forms. To a reader familiar with the *Samṣkṛta* word '*Bhāva*', for example, it may not be easy to visualize '*Bhāvās*' as the plural of '*Bhāva*'. It is felt that if we adopt in English the same word '*Bhāva*' in singular as well as plural form then there would not be any confusion or misinformation. Therefore, in the interest of simplification, it would be very appropriate to adopt the word '*Bhāva*' in singular as well as plural

form. Similarly, whenever any confusion does not arise, many more *Saṃskṛta* words may be adopted with the same spelling in singular and plural forms. With such notion, the list of such words adopted in this work includes the following:

Ācārya, Ajīva, Ajñānī, Aṇu, Arahanta, Āsrava, Bhāva, Deva, Dravya, Gati, Gāthā, Guṇa, Indriya, Jina, Jīva, Jñānī, Kalaśa, Karma, Kaṣāya, Kāraka, Kevalī, Mithyādr̥ṣṭi, Naya, Nokarma, Paramāṇu, Parameṣṭhī, Paryāya, Pratyaya, Pudgala, Samaya, SamyagDr̥ṣṭi, SamyagJñānī, Sādhu, Sthāna, Siddha, Skandha, Spardhaka, Tattva, Tīrthaṃkara, Upādhyāya, Varga, Vargaṇā, Vikalpa, Yoga.

- (5) 'Karma' word of *Saṃskṛta* is a well known English word also. However, the word 'Karma' used here is a technical word of Jain metaphysics (see Appendix-6) and has somewhat different meaning. 'Karma' has also been used as 'Karma-Kāraka' (see Appendix-1). Similarly, a reader would note that the word 'Yoga' of Jain metaphysics has a meaning (see Appendix-1) very much different from its popular meaning. Therefore, if the meaning of a *Saṃskṛta* term written in *italics* has not been clarified in the running text, then in that case it may be helpful for a reader to comprehend the term by referring to the glossary (Appendix-1).
- (6) For the purpose of transliteration, the diacritical marks shown in the following table have been employed.

Diacritical Marks

अ (a)	आ (ā)	इ (i)	ई (ī)	उ (u)	ऊ (ū)	ऋ (r)	ए (e)
ऐ (ai)	ओ (o)	औ (au)	क् (k)	ख् (kh)	ग् (g)	घ् (gh)	ङ् (ṅ)
च् (c)	छ् (ch)	ज् (j)	झ् (jh)	ञ् (ñ)	ट् (ṭ)	ठ् (ṭh)	ड् (ḍ)
ढ् (ḍh)	ण् (ṇ)	त् (t)	थ् (th)	द (d)	ध् (dh)	न (n)	
प् (p)	फ् (ph)	ब् (b)	भ् (bh)	म् (m)	य् (y)	र (r)	ल् (l)
व् (v)	श् (ś)	ष् (ṣ)	स् (s)	ह (h)	क्ष् (kṣ)	त्र् (tr)	ज्ञ् (jñ)
अनुस्वार (ṁ) See the note			विसर्ग (ḥ)				

Note: In addition to the usual diacritical mark ṁ for an *Anusvāra*, alternative marks – ṅ, ñ, ṇ, n, and m – have also been used, in view of the pronunciation by scholars. Further, if the last letter is ‘m’ in the transliteration of any word of any stanza written in this book, then that ‘m’ is to be understood as the transliteration of the *Anusvāra*.

Introduction

मंगलं भगवान् वीरो, मंगलं गौतमो गणी ।
मंगलं कुन्दकुन्दाद्यो, जैन धर्मोऽस्तु मंगलं ॥

The above mentioned verse is recited by Jains (specially, by Digamber Jains) before the beginning of any auspicious work. In this verse, a devotee says that Lord Mahāvīra, Gautama Gaṇadhara, and *Ācārya* Kundakunda, etc., are auspicious. This shows the auspicious significance of *Ācārya* Kundakunda's name which is enumerated next only to that of Lord Mahāvīra and his chief disciple Gautama Gaṇadhara. The level of reverence of *Ācārya* Kundakunda can also be seen from the fact that *Ācārya* Vidyanandji [1], Aryika Gyanmati Mataji [2], and many saints and scholars have written titles like 'Bhagavāna' and 'His Holiness' before his name. *Ācārya* Kundakunda is considered to be borne in the southern part of India in the second century. He wrote a large number of scriptures and *Samayasāra* is considered as his most valuable scripture.

Samayasāra and its importance

Ācārya Kundakunda's *Samayasāra* has been a scripture of immense interest to a large number of eminent scholars and saints including *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra (10th century), *Ācārya* Jayasena (12-13th century), Pt. Rajmallaji (16th century), Pandit Banarasidasji (16th century), Pandit Todarmalji (18th century), Pandit Jayachandaji Chhabada (18th century), Shrimad Rajchandrajī (19th century), etc., who all had studied this treatise in great detail and used it as a basis for their own respective works. In the past 50 years, a large number of commentaries and discourses of eminent saints and scholars on *Samayasāra* have been published [1-12].

Ācārya Vidyasagarji [3] writes that every stanza of *Samayasāra* is filled with nectar and nectar, and he drank and drank this nectar through

his spiritual teacher *Ācārya* Shri Gyansagarji. It resulted into an unprecedented Self realization. In his words, “जिसकी (समयसार की) प्रत्येक गाथा में अमृत ही अमृत भरा है और मैं पीता ही गया! पीता ही गया!! माँ के समान गुरुवर अपने अनुभव और मिलाकर, घोल-घोलकर पिलाते ही गये, पिलाते ही गये। फलस्वरूप एक उपलब्धि हुई, अपूर्व विभूति की, आत्मानुभूति की!”

Satpurusha Shri Kanji Swami often used to comment that the scripture *Samayasāra* contains the essence of hundreds of thousands of scriptures; it is a pillar of Jainology; to a seeker it is a desire-fulfilling-cow (*Kamadhenu*)... In his words, “यह समयसार शास्त्र आगमों का भी आगम है। लाखों शास्त्रों का सार इसमें है; जैन शासन का यह स्तम्भ है; साधक की यह कामधेनु है...” [4, 5]. He was so much impressed with this scripture that he gave 19 rounds of discourses [4] on *Samayasāra*, and on the marble walls of a beautiful temple in Songarh (Gujarat) he got engraved all 415 stanzas of this scripture together with the stanzas of a few other scriptures written by *Ācārya* Kundakunada.

Ācārya Mahaprajna, a well known *Ācārya* from *Svetamber Terapanth* tradition very nicely summarizes the significance of *Ācārya* Kundakunda and his *Samayasāra*. He writes, “Jainism is seasoned with a mature tradition of metaphysics and spirituality. The name of *Ācārya* Kundakunda shines like a resplendent constellation in the sky of this tradition. He was an author of many treatises, **one of which is *Samayasāra*, which is the most outstanding one in the field of spirituality.** It is replete with many mystical ideas and many thoughts worth contemplation.” [9(a)].

Muni Mahendra Kumarji in the preface of his book entitled “*Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*” writes, “The ancient philosophical treatises which deal with the topic of deeper metaphysical and epistemological expositions have a very important place in the studies of Jain philosophy. *Ācārya* Kundakunda's *Samayasāra* can be considered as one of the most important of such treatises, as far as the Jain authors are concerned. It has the same value in Jain tradition as the treatises/scriptures like *Brahma*

Sutra in the *Vaidika* tradition and *Visuddhimaggo* in the Buddhist tradition. **In short, we can say that for anyone to understand the essence of Jain philosophy, *Samayasāra* has to be studied.**" [9(b)]

Before coming to the contents of *Samayasāra*, it may be useful to introduce some philosophical concepts through an example. We know very well that a mine containing a large amount of non-gold and a small amount of gold is called a gold-mine. Regarding a gold-mine we are clear that a large portion of the soil of the mine is not gold but every particle of the soil of the mine is valuable. In the same way, spiritual teachers clearly know this concept that *although every component of a living being is valuable but a living being in its entirety is not Jīva (soul), a living being is a combination of Jīva (soul) and non-Jīva (non-soul) (let us call this as concept-1).*

Regarding a gold-mine, we are clear that the nature of the soil of a gold-mine is very different from the nature of gold. Further, the nature of soil varies from mine to mine but the nature of gold coming from a mine in the USA is the same as that coming from a mine in India. Similarly, spiritual masters are clear about this concept that *the nature of soul is very different from the nature of living beings, and the nature of living beings change with time and varies from species to species and individual to individual, but the nature of soul is invariant (let us call this as concept-2).*

Again regarding a gold-mine we know very well that before carrying out any attempt to realize gold from gold-ore, we scientifically understand gold as well as associated non-gold, and attain an ability to differentiate between gold and non-gold. In the same way, spiritual teachers have clarity about this concept that *the realization of the soul that leads to peace, happiness and bliss is not possible without understanding the soul (Self) and attaining the ability of visualizing the difference between the soul and the associated non-souls (let us call this as concept-3).*

These three spiritual concepts are very important. Among these

three, concept-3 encompasses concept-2 as well as concept-1. In treatise *Samayasāra*, Ācārya Kundakunda has attempted to focus on concept-2 and concept-3. The literal meaning of *Samayasāra* is the soul in its essence or the pure soul. It corresponds to gold (nothing other than gold) existing in the mine in the above mentioned analogy. It also relates to the visualization and recognition of the nature of gold (nothing other than gold) even when it is associated with non-gold in the gold-ore. A reader may note that it is rare to find other scriptures that have gone as deep as *Samayasāra* to describe concept-3 and concept-2.

What to do and what not to do for the purification of our souls? Such questions fall in the area of the soul engineering which is based on the soul science. At some places, Ācārya Kundakunda has attempted to answer such questions (e.g., see stanza 206), however, in this scripture the main focus of Ācārya Kundakunda is on the soul science, not on the soul engineering. Therefore, in this treatise we find more detailed answers regarding questions such as what can be done and what cannot be done by the soul, and what the soul is and what the soul is not. A realization of the nature related with the possible actions of the soul leads to the reduction in the ego which in turn leads to bliss.

With a detailed and systematic coverage regarding the soul, Ācārya Kundakunda's *Samayasāra* is expected to be valuable to all those who are interested in soul philosophy, equanimity, harmony, and peace with a belief in the eternal soul associated with every living being. It would also be valuable to the academicians and scholars who are interested in Indian Philosophy.

Those who are interested in the contemporary motivational speakers and authors such as Wayne Dyer [13], Deepak Chopra [14], Eckhart Tolle [15], Gary Zukav [16], Louise Hay [17], Caroline Myss [18], David Burns [19], etc., may find, in this treatise, the basic foundation and a deeper understanding of various concepts mentioned by such authors. A reader may realize that the understanding of stanzas of *Samayasāra* leads to the clarity of his/her vision to such an extent that his/her worldly

problems can be tackled and faced in a better way with a higher degree of confidence and fearlessness which may improve the level of his/her peace, equanimity, and happiness. It is very likely that a person with an interest in the scripture *Samayasāra* does not become a victim of depression.

By formal training I am a physicist, but based on my studies and interest in *Samayasāra* in the past 45 years, I felt an urge of writing such a book. The previous book, *Soul Science (Part-1)* [20], as well as this book is an attempt to present English version of stanzas of *Samayasāra* together with my annotations to explain the concept related with the stanzas. While writing annotations, I have kept in mind the commentaries of *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra, *Ācārya* Jayasena, and various versions published by modern scholars and saints. I also kept in mind the length and breadth of Jainology provided by other scriptures such as *Tattvārthasūtra* [21], *Ratnakaraṇḍa Śrāvakācāra* [22], *Gommaṭasāra* [23] etc., and various scriptures written by *Ācārya* Kundakunda [24]. In view of the accuracy it could not be possible to avoid the technical terms. However, I tried to minimize the use of technical terms and explained the terms at the appropriate places or in Appendix-1 in Part-1 [20]. Some basic knowledge of six kinds of substances, eight types of *Karma*, *Anekanta*, *Arahanta*, *Siddha*, five kinds of sins, right conduct, etc., may also be helpful to some readers in understanding some stanzas. Therefore, these have been described in brief in the appendices. It may be added that a description of *Tattva* is also a basic requirement for understanding Jain tenets. Therefore, *Tattva* have been explained in the annotation of stanza (*Gāthā*) 13. For the benefit of those who are interested in the original text, the original stanzas of *Ācārya* Kundakunda in *Prākṛta*, their English transliteration with diacritical marks, and the *Samskṛta* version provided by *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra have also been included.

In 2014, the first 144 stanzas have been published in the book – *Soul Science (Part-1)* [20]. Now the next 143 stanzas are being covered

in this book – Soul Science (Part-2). Hopefully, very soon it would be possible to complete the writing of the remaining 128 stanzas of this treatise – *Samayasāra*.

In stanza 5, *Ācārya* Kundakunda writes

तं एयत्तविहत्तं दाएहं अप्पणो सविहवेण ।

जदि दाएज्ज पमाणं चुक्केज्ज छलं ण घेतव्वं ॥५॥

Meaning: I shall show the indivisible soul separate from others (*Ekatva-Vibhakta* soul) using my own spiritual wealth. If I show it, then you should accept it. If I miss, then you should not pick up any aberration.

If a personality like *Ācārya* Kundakunda expresses the possibility of missing something then where do I stand? What should I say? I apologize in advance for my shortcomings and request the learned readers for their comments and suggestions for the corrections.

References and notes

1. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, with Hindi and English Translation, by Vijay K. Jain (Vikalp Printers, Deharadun, 2012).
2. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, Commentary in Hindi by Aryika Gyanmati Mataji (Digamber Jain Trilok Shodha Samsthan, Hastinapur, UP, 1990).
3. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, commentary in Hindi by *Ācārya* Gyansagaraji with translation of stanzas in Hindi-verses by *Ācārya* Vidyasagaraji (Shri Digamber Jain Seva Samiti and Sakal Digamber Jain Samaj, Ajmer, 1994).
4. *Pravacana Ratnakara*, Part I to 11, Lectures delivered by Shri Kanji Swami on *Samayasāra*; translated by Pt. Ratan Chandji Bharill in Hindi (Pandit Todarmal Smarak Trust, Jaipur, 1981).
5. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, commentary in Gujarati by Himmatlal Jethalal Shah and its Hindi translation by Pandit Parmesthidasji, (Shri Digamber Jain Swadhya Mandir, Songarh, Gujarat, 1974).
6. (a) *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, Commentary in Hindi by Pandit Dr. Hukam Chandji Bharill (Pandit Todarmal Sarvodaya Trust, Jaipur, 2007)

(b) *Samayasāra Anushīlan*, Commentary in Hindi by Pandit Dr. Hukam Chandji Bharill (Pandit Todarmal Smarak Trust, Jaipur, 1995).

7. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, Edited by Pandit Hemchandji Jain 'Hem', (Paras Mulchand Chatar Chritable Trust, Kota, 2010).
8. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, Edited by Pandit Pannalaji Jain (Shri Paramshrut Prabhavak Mandal, Shrimad Rajchandra Ashram, Agaas, Gujarat, 1997).
9. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, Annotations and translation in English by Shri Jethalal S. Zaveri and Muni Mahendra Kumarji (Jain Vishva Bharati University, Ladnun, Rajasthan, 2009); 9(a) page (iii), 9(b) page (v).
10. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, Edited and translated in English by Professor A. Chakravarti (Bharatiya Jnanpith, New Delhi, 1989).
11. *Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra*, Commentary and translation in English by J. L. Jaini (Sacred books of the Jainas, Vol. VIII, The Central Jain Publishing House, Ajitashram, Lucknow, UP, 1930)
12. *Samayasāra: Niscaya Aur Vyavahāra Kī Yātrā, Ācārya Mahaprajna* (Jain Vishva Bharati Prakashan, Ladnun, Rajasthan, 1991).
13. e.g see: *Your Sacred Self: Making the decision to be free*, Wayne W. Dyer, (Harper Paperbacks, 1995). A person who is interested in this reference with contents such as given below may be highly benefited by *Samayasāra*:

"Make an attempt to describe yourself without using any labels. Write a few paragraphs in which you do not mention your age, sex, position, title, accomplishments, possessions, experiences, heritage or geographic data. Simply write a statement about who you are, independent of all appearances."

(Taken from chapter 11, p. 269).

14. e.g., see: *Seven Spiritual Laws of Success*, Deepak Chopra, (Amber Allen Publishing, 1994). A person who is interested in this reference with contents such as given below may be highly benefited by *Samayasāra*:

"Your true Self, which is your spirit, your soul, is completely free of those things. It is immune to criticism, it is unfearful of any challenge, and it feels beneath no one. And yet, it is also humble and feels superior to no one, because it recognizes that everyone else is the same Self, the same spirit in different disguises."

(Taken from chapter 1, p.11-12).

15. e.g., see: *A New Earth: Awakening to Your Life's Purpose*, Eckhart Tolle, (Gale Cengage Learning, 2005). A person who is interested in this reference with contents such as given

below may be highly benefited by *Samayasāra*:

"So who is the experienter? You are. And who are you? Consciousness. And what is consciousness? ... Although you cannot know consciousness, you can become conscious of it as yourself. You can sense it directly in any situation, no matter where you are."

(Taken from chapter 8, p.304-5).

16. e.g., see: *The Seat of the Soul*, Gary Zukav, (Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 1990). A person who is interested in this reference with contents such as given below may be highly benefited by *Samayasāra*:

"Spiritual psychology allows the personality to detach itself from the illusion and, therefore, to see it from a knowledgeable perspective, to see it in action. Just as, for example, an intelligence with a knowledge of modern medicine would be able to live among the populations of Europe during the time of the bubonic plague and not be affected by it, a personality with knowledge of the illusion and how it works is able to live within it and not be affected by it."

(Taken from Chapter 14, p. 207)

17. e.g., see: *You Can Heal Your Life*, Louise L. Hay, (Hay House, Santa Monica, CA, USA, 1984). A person who is interested in this reference with contents such as given below may be highly benefited by *Samayasāra*:

"I believe that we choose our parents. Each one of us decides to incarnate upon this planet at particular points in time and space. We have chosen to come here to learn a particular lesson that will advance us upon our spiritual, evolutionary pathway. We choose our sex, our color, our country, and then we look around for the particular set of parents who will mirror the pattern we are bringing in to work on in this lifetime."

(Taken from Chapter 1, p.10)

18. e.g., see: *Anatomy of the Spirit*, Caroline Myss, (Three River Press, N.Y., 1996). A person who is interested in this reference with contents such as given below may be highly benefited by *Samayasāra*:

"Again and again I have witnessed that healing is a matter of becoming conscious – not of the illness but of a life-force that the person has never before embraced."

(Taken from Chapter 6, page 246)

19. e.g., see: *Feeling Good*, David D. Burns, (Signet, New York, 1981). A person who is interested in this reference with contents such as given below may be highly benefited by *Samayasāra*:

"Acknowledge that everyone has one "unit of worth" from the time they are born until the time they die. As an infant you may achieve very little, and yet you are still precious and

worthwhile. And when you are old or ill, relaxed or asleep, or just doing “nothing,” you still have “worth.” Your “unit of worth” can’t be measured and can never change, and it is the same for everyone.”

(Taken from chapter IV, p. 302)

20. *Soul Science (Part-1)*, Annotations and translation of stanzas 1-144 of *Samayasāra* in English by Paras Mal Agrawal (Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha, Indore, 2014).
21. *Tattvārthasūtra*, Ācārya Umāsvāmī.
22. *Ratnakaraṇḍa Śrāvakācāra*, Ācārya Samantabhadra.
23. *Gommaṣasāra* (a) *Jīvakāṇḍa* (b) *Karmakāṇḍa*, Ācārya Nemicandra.
24. (a) *Pravacansāra* (b) *Niyamasāra* (c) *Pancāstikāya* (d) *Aṣṭapāhuḍa*, Ācārya Kundakunda.

Virtue and Vice (*Puṇya* and *Pāpa*)

कम्ममसुहं कुसीलं सुहकम्मं चावि जाणह सुसीलं ।

कह तं होदि सुसीलं जं संसारं पवेसेदि ॥145॥

सोवण्णियं पि णियलं बंधदि कालायसं पि जह पुरिसं ।

बंधदि एवं जीवं सुहमसुहं वा कदं कम्मं ॥146॥

तम्हा दु कुसीलेहि य रागं मा कुणह मा व संसगं ।

साहीणो हि विणासो कुसीलसंसगारायेण ॥147॥

Kammamasuham kusīlam suhakammam cāvi jāṇah susīlam.

Kaha tam hodi susīlam jam saṃsāram pavesedi. ॥145॥

Sovaṇṇiyam pi ṇiyalam bandhadi kālāyasam pi jaha purisam.

Bandhadi evam jīvam suhamasuham vā kadam kammam. ॥146॥

Tamhā du kusīlehi ya rāgam mā kuṇaha mā va saṃsaggam

Sāhīṇo hi viṇāso kusīlasaṃsaggarāyeṇa. ॥147॥

कर्म अशुभं कुशीलं शुभकर्म चापि जानीथ सुशीलम् ।

कथं तद्भवति सुशीलं यत्संसारं प्रवेशयति ॥145॥

सौवर्णिकमपि निगलं बध्नाति कालायसमपि यथा पुरुषम् ।

बध्नात्येवं जीवं शुभमशुभं वा कृतं कर्म ॥146॥

तस्मात्तु कुशीलाभ्यां च रागं मा कुरुत मा वा संसर्गम् ।

स्वाधीनो हि विनाशः कुशीलसंसर्गरागेण ॥147॥

It is [commonly] known that a non-virtuous deed (*Karma*) is a bad conduct and a virtuous deed (*Karma*) is a good conduct. [But] how can that [virtuous *Karma*] become a good conduct which drags [soul] into cycles of birth and death? [145]

Just as a gold shackle, similar to an iron one, binds a person, virtuous as well as non-virtuous deeds bind a *Jīva*. [146]

Therefore, do not have any inclination of attachment or association with [these] both types of bad conducts. The inclination of attachment or association with bad conducts leads to the destruction of the independence [of soul]. [147]

Annotation

In verse 145, Ācārya Kundakunda raises one question with an implied answer. To strengthen the point raised in verse 145, he introduces an analogy in the next verse. Then in stanza 147, the Ācārya teaches a lesson on the basis of the inference drawn from verses 145 and 146.

In the first sentence of verse 145, the Ācārya describes that it is commonly known that a sinful action such as hurting others is a bad conduct, and a virtuous action such as helping others is a good conduct. Technically, a virtuous action is known as auspicious deed (*Śubha Karma*) as it leads to the bonding of auspicious *Karma* (*Śubha Karma*). Similarly, a sinful action of mind, speech, or body is known as inauspicious *Karma* (*Aśubha Karma*) as it leads to the bonding of inauspicious *Karma* (*Aśubha Karma*). The bonding of auspicious *Karma* brings fruits in the form of pleasant things, good physique, nice persons, and beautiful places. The next life in heaven may also be possible due to auspicious *Karma*.

As the life with pleasantries in heaven is also a life of mundane existence, and the heaven does not mean a ticket for the eternal happiness, therefore, Ācārya Kundakunda questions in the next half of verse 145 that how can the auspicious *Karma* that drags the soul in the world of mundane existence (*Samsāra*) be called a good conduct? He wants to say that an entry in the heaven or availability of worldly pleasures is different from the achievement of the eternal bliss by the soul. Therefore, its cause, i.e., an auspicious deed cannot be considered as a good conduct by a soul interested in the freedom and eternal bliss.

Question: Does it mean that pleasures of heaven and sufferings of

hell are equal?

Answer: The analogy given in verse 146 incorporates inequality as well as equality. In this verse *Ācārya* Kundakunda gives an analogy of shackles of gold and iron. No doubt, a gold shackle is more valuable and attractive than an iron shackle but as regards arresting a person a shackle is a shackle. It does not make much difference whether the shackle is made of gold or iron. The *Ācārya* wants to say that the freedom or eternal bliss is possible only when the soul is neither bonded by auspicious *Karma* (gold shackle) nor by inauspicious *Karma* (iron shackle).

Question: You may call it a gold shackle but would it not be good to be in heaven with a lot of pleasures? If I am given a choice, I would love to enjoy that gold shackle forever. To be honest, sometimes I realize that I am not even interested in thinking about the next life. If I can have peace and comforts in this present life then also I would be satisfied.

Answer: (i) As per scriptures, one cannot have abode in heaven forever. The scriptures also say that almost all of us might have been in heaven, as well as hell, for millions and billions of times in previous lives. Further, according to the scriptures, the sensual comforts in heavens do not guarantee the mental peace. A lack of mental peace exists in heavens also.

Here one may argue that scriptures also reveal that after some high positions in heavens a soul gets liberation immediately after the next birth in the human life. This may indicate that such high positions guarantee the liberation. But it may be noted that such high positions are attained by *SamyagDṛṣṭi*, i.e., by those who neither have any ownership (inner attachment) with auspicious *Karma* and inauspicious *Karma* nor do they consider themselves as the doer of auspicious *Karma* and inauspicious *Karma* (e.g. stanzas 19, 35, 75, 77,

126, etc.). In other words, according to scriptures, those who have ownership (inner attachment) with auspicious Karma are not on the path of liberation even if they are in heaven.

(ii) Regarding the present life, it is a popular idea to wish and aim for comforts and peace in the present life. But if your peace and comforts depend on the behavior of other persons and the availability of good things as per your desire then you are dependent. The dependence in any form is likely to become a source of discomfort and worry. Some persons may say that it is OK to have mutual dependence. But such persons are also aware that it is impossible to have comforts and peace all the times even if dependence is mutual. The point is that it is almost impossible to fulfill desires of comforts and peace all the times with dependence.

Yet there can be another class of advanced persons who simply want to help others without any sensual desire or any desire for physical comforts or title or fame for themselves. Such persons deserve appreciation by the society. Not many persons have such virtue. But in carrying out such tasks of helping others, one becomes dependent on others as well as on his/her own financial, physical and other resources. With this limitation, Ācārya Kundakunda says in stanza 147 that there would be destruction of your (soul's) independence if you have inclination of attachment or association with auspicious *Karma* or inauspicious *Karma*.

Question: Does it mean that one should stop helping others?

Answer: One should first try to reduce one's sinful actions. One of the biggest sinful acts is to consider oneself, in real sense, as the owner of the physical body, and as a controller of others [technically it is called *Mithyātvā* sin or wrong-belief-sin. Among the list of five sins, *Mithyātvā* sin falls in the category

of sin of possessiveness (*Parigraha*) [See Appendix-7]. One may feed others, one may help others but in the heart one should understand that in reality he is not the doer of the helping actions. To have an inner attachment or ownership with such helping actions is the wrong-belief-sin, and it comes in the category of possessiveness sin. Therefore, *Ācārya* Kundakunda in stanza 147 emphasizes over this point that one should not have any inclination of attachment or association with auspicious *Karma* or inauspicious *Karma*.

Through many stanzas (e.g. stanzas 36, 38, 51, 81-83, 100, 113, etc.) narrated earlier in this treatise, *Ācārya* Kundakunda has clarified that soul cannot be doer and owner of others. But still some readers may think that it may be a good idea to become the doer and owner of auspicious deeds. To remove such bias, *Ācārya* Kundakunda has written this chapter. He first describes commonly known categories of deeds: one as auspicious and another as inauspicious. Then he says that as both lead to the destruction of soul's independence and both prolong the sufferings of the cycles of birth and death, therefore, in real sense both are not good and both are to be kept in the same category. *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra in *ĀtmaKhyāti* has described this point in a special way with a touch of a theatre play. In the beginning of this chapter, he gives entry to virtue (*Puṇya*) and sin (*Pāpa*) as two different actors on the stage, and at the end of this chapter he shows exit of one actor (*Karma*) with an understanding to the audience that virtue or auspicious deed (*Puṇya*) and sin or inauspicious deed (*Pāpa*) are not two distinct actors but actually there is one actor (deed or action or *Karma*) that appears to perform double role.

Question: I have understood very well the meaning as well as the purpose of these three verses. However, these are very delicate issues and by reading these verses one may think that there is no significant difference between auspicious *Karma*

and inauspiciousus *Karma*, therefore, he may be inclined to enjoy the sensual pleasures without any sincere consideration for others. Would it not disturb the society? Would it not hurt the psychology of readers of these verses?

Answer: (i) It is very unlikely that after understanding previous 144 verses of this treatise, a reader would indulge in sensual enjoyment without being concerned over helping others. To care for those who have not understood well, Ācārya Kundakunda has already provided a caution in stanza 5 of this treatise. There, he has stated that '*I shall show the indivisible soul separate from others (Ekatva-Vibhakta soul) using my own spiritual wealth. If I show it, then you should accept it. If I miss, then you should not pick up any distortion/deception.*' Thus he has cautioned that after reading this treatise if one has not comprehended the concept of *Ekatva-Vibhakta* soul then he should not pick up any distortion. Thus, in case one has not comprehended the *Ekatva-Vibhakta* soul then, he should re-read and discuss with his spiritual teachers the meaning of various stanzas including these three stanzas.

(ii) In many books of great scholars we come across the teaching such as: 'One should be fearless. One should not fear death.' After reading such lessons, if somebody tries to be fearless by not taking any care in driving, or by jumping into deep waters without knowing swimming, or by facing tigers and snakes without any defense mechanism then what would happen? To avoid such possibility, should we stop giving the message of becoming fearless? The answer is: No. We should not stop giving the lesson of becoming fearless but we should provide sufficient caution and insight.

It may be noted that one of the objectives of this scripture is to help the readers gain enlightenment, i.e., right vision

or right faith (*SamyagDarśana*). Further, in stanza 228, *Ācārya* Kundakunda mentions that a person with right vision (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) becomes a fearless person. If somebody thinks that verses 145-147 may be misleading then such a person may also think the same for the fearlessness of *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*. It may be noted that the fearlessness (*Niśanka Guṇa*) is described not only in this scripture in verse 228 but in various scriptures by other *Ācārya* also.

Question: Thanks for providing valuable points. These points have enriched my understanding but still I am not ready to accept auspicious deed (*Karma*) as a bad conduct. If auspicious deed (*Karma*) is not a good conduct then what else has been called by Jain preceptors as a good conduct?

Answer: As per Jain preceptors, the *SamyakCāritra* is called right or truthful conduct. The conduct of realization of the Self and of 'abiding' in the Self is *SamyakCāritra*. [Some aspects of *SamyakCāritra* and auspicious *Karma* from the relative as well as real point of view are described in Appendix-8.] *SamyagDarśana*, *SamyagJñāna*, and *SamyakCāritra* have been described as three jewels of the path of liberation. It has also been described by Jain *Ācārya* that *SamyakCāritra* is not possible without having *SamyagDarśana*; and for *SamyagDarśana*, it is essential to realize the ownership of Self only. As a helping person a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* helps others but does not realize the ownership of the helping task. He, as a soul, does not consider himself as the owner of such actions. On the other hand, a spiritually ignorant person known as *MithyāDr̥ṣṭi* (who is not *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) becomes the owner of the action of helping others. In stanza 147, *Ācārya* Kundakunda teaches to avoid such attachment or association

as possessed by a *MithyāDṛṣṭi*.

जह णाम कोवि पुरिसो कुच्छियसीलं जणं वियाणिता ।

वज्जेदि तेण समयं संसग्गं रागकरणं च ॥148॥

एमेव कम्मपयडीसीलसहावं च कुच्छिदं णादुं ।

वज्जंति परिहरंति य तस्संसग्गं सहावरदा ॥149॥

Jaha ṇāma kovi puriso kucchiyasīlam jaṇam viyaṇittā.

Vajjedi teṇa samayaṃ saṃsaggam rāgakaraṇam ca. ||148||

Emeva kammaṇḍāṇīsilasahavam ca kucchidam ṇādum.

Vajjanti pariharanti ya tassaṃsaggam sahāvaradā. ||149||

यथा नाम कोऽपि पुरुषः कुत्सितशीलं जनं विज्ञाय ।

वर्जयति तेन समकं संसर्गं रागकरणं च ॥148॥

एवमेव कर्मप्रकृतिशीलस्वभावं च कुत्सितं ज्ञात्वा ।

वर्जयंति परिहरंति च तत्संसर्गं स्वभावरताः ॥149॥

After knowing about the bad conduct of someone, just as a person gives up association and attachment with that person [148]; in the same way, after recognizing the harmful nature of *Karma*, those absorbed in their own nature (soul's nature) give up the association and attachment with *Karma*. [149]

Annotation

It may first be noted that in these stanzas and at many other places the word *Karma* has also been used for thoughts, actions, or deeds responsible for *Kārmika* bonding.

In the previous three verses (145-147), Ācārya Kundakunda has focused on the following points:

- (i) In the path of liberation, the bonding with any kind of *Karma*, whether auspicious *Karma* (*Śubha Karma*) or inauspicious *Karma* (*Aśubha Karma*), is not to be considered as good.
- (ii) Therefore, one should not have any association or attachment with auspicious as well as inauspicious *Karma*.

Now in these two verses, *Ācārya* Kundakunda further advances the lesson of giving up any association or attachment with *Karma* by giving an analogy. In verse 148, he first presents a worldly example and then he applies it to *Karma* in stanza 149. In these two verses, *Ācārya* Kundakunda explains that when a person realizes that a particular person is a bad person then he/she gives up any association or attachment with that bad person. In the same way, after the realization that *Karma* are harmful, as they destroy the independence of the soul and prolong the continuance of the soul with physical body and worldly sufferings, a person engrossed with the soul gives up any association or attachment with *Karma*.

Question: Is there any time gap between the realization of the bad nature of *Karma* and ending the association and attachment with *Karma*?

Answer: The analogy of terminating association or attachment with a bad person described by *Ācārya* Kundakunda is very useful in getting the answer of this question. In our day-to-day life, after realization of the bad nature of a person, internally one terminates association or attachment with the harmful person immediately, and externally the termination may take some time. For example, if one owes a large sum of money to that person then the external association would continue till the debt is fully paid. Externally, the association cannot be stopped immediately due to the time required to pay the debt.

In the same way when a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* gets fully convinced about the existence of the soul, its attributes and its separateness with other *Tattva* (see stanza 13) then he becomes a *SamyagDṛṣṭi*. Such a realization of *Tattva* includes the realization that *Karma*, whether auspicious or inauspicious, are harmful and the association or attachment with *Karma* is not good. With such realization a *SamyagDṛṣṭi*

gets tuned to the soul internally and at that level he disowns and discards both types of *Karma*. In this regard it may be of interest to refer to stanza 34 also. Technically, in the language of scriptures this is described as non-association and detachment with *Karma* in the belief (*Śraddhāna*) of every *SamyagDṛṣṭi*. Thus if we focus on the belief (*Śraddhāna*), then there is no gap between the realization of the bad nature of *Karma* and ending the association and attachment with *Karma*.

Question: What about the time gap between the time of becoming *SamyagDṛṣṭi* and the time to be free from all kinds of associations and attachment with *Karma*, internally as well as externally?

Answer: To any person the transformation from *MithyāDṛṣṭi* to *SamyagDṛṣṭi* is a very significant event. It is considered as the first ladder towards climbing the ‘palace of liberation’. Therefore, the focus on the internal aspect described in the answer of the previous question is very important. One’s concern regarding the actions of body and mind is also important. It may be noted that immediately after such transformation from *MithyāDṛṣṭi* to *SamyagDṛṣṭi*, the external conditions of family, job, wealth, etc. are likely to remain unchanged. A new *SamyagDṛṣṭi* may be a shopkeeper, may be a king, may be a warrior, ... Technically, all such associations with job, family, and body are known as the effects of fruition of *Cāritra Mohaniya Karma* (see Appendix 6). A journey from an external state of a householder to an external state of no association with any type of *Karma*, in general, requires time. How much? We may consider extreme cases. Let us first consider a fast track mode. The fast track mode is a rare event but not impossible. Among many new *SamyagDṛṣṭi* there may be a person who may go for renunciation of worldly

possessions and may become a saint very soon. Further, though it is again rare but it is possible that very soon the new saint becomes so much absorbed in the Self that by body and mind also he does not consciously indulge in any association with *Karma* of any type. After this stage, the soul may become *Arahanta* and then after completing the present human life, the soul gets liberation and attains a state called *Siddha*. It may be noted that an *Arahanta* is a worldly living being in the state of omniscience and bliss whereas a *Siddha* is in the state of omniscience and bliss without any kind of physical body. One may refer to Appendix -2 for more details regarding *Arahanta* and *Siddha*.

It is important to note that after becoming *SamyagDṛṣṭi*, a majority of souls take many rebirths to achieve a state of total absorption with the soul, devoid of any association with *Karma*. The scriptures reveal that the important milestones mentioned in above paragraph [i.e., (i) renunciation of worldly possessions, (ii) to get absorbed in the Self such that by body and mind also one does not consciously indulge in any association with *Karma* of any type, (iii) becoming *Arahanta*, and finally *Siddha*] are reached in the spiritual path of every soul attaining liberation.

Regarding other extreme corresponding to the slow track mode, scriptures reveal that the time required to complete this journey, after becoming *SamyagDṛṣṭi* for the first time, is less than or equal to *Ardha-Pudgala-Parāvartana-Kāla* (APPK). According to scriptures, it is impossible that a soul after becoming *SamyagDṛṣṭi* does not get liberation within time period *Ardha-Pudgala-Parāvartana-Kāla* (APPK). This time duration, APPK, is very long time; it is more than trillions of years. Although APPK is well defined, its value in terms of the number of years is difficult to compute. However, it may

be noted in this regard that APPK time is negligibly small as compared to the long (infinite) time each soul has already been in this *Samsāra*. Thus with a broad vision of looking at the infinitely long time of soul's suffering, the time lapse between becoming *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* for the first time and the moment of achieving liberation is very small. It is well known that words small and long have relative meanings. The time required for the voice of a person to reach another person at a distance of 110 feet appears to be small (about 0.1 second), but it is nearly one million times large as compared to the time required for the light to cover the same distance.

Question: Does it mean that the realization of auspicious and inauspicious *Karma* as undesirable does not lead to immediate ending of association or attachment with *Karma*?

Answer: The realization of auspicious and inauspicious *Karma* as undesirable together with the knowledge of the Self transforms a *MithyāDr̥ṣṭi* into a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*. Internally, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not consider oneself as a doer of any activity of other *Dravya*. In this sense, there is immediate abandonment (see stanza 34) at internal or belief (*Śraddhāna*) level. As regards the total detachment (internal as well as external) leading to the state of omniscience, as mentioned in the answer of the previous question, it happens within the time duration *Ardha-Pudgala-Parāvartana-Kāla* (AAPK), after becoming *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* for the first time.

Technical question (A reader may skip the following question in the first reading.) Here at some places you have qualified *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* with the phrase 'for the first time'? Does it mean that one can become *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* many times?

Answer: Yes. If the *SamyagDarśana* attained is not by the total destruction of *Darśana Mohaniya Karma* then the *SamyagDarśana* attained may vanish in the course of time and

the soul may become *MithyāDrṣṭi* again. Such a soul would regain *SamyagDarśana* in the course of time. Such an alteration may continue many times till the *SamyagDarśana* is achieved by the total destruction of *Darśana Mohaniya*.

रक्तो बंधदि कम्मं मुच्चदि जीवो विरागसंपत्तो ।

एसो जिणोवदेसो तम्हा कम्मेषु मा रज्ज ॥150॥

Ratto bandhadi kammam muccadi jīvo virāgasampatto.

Eso jiṇovadeso tamhā kammesu mā rajja. ||150||

रक्तो बध्नाति कर्म मुच्यते जीवो विरागसंप्राप्तः ।

एषो जिनोपदेशः तस्मात् कर्मसु मा रज्यस्व ॥150॥

A soul with attachment gets bonded with *Karma*, and the detached one gets liberation. This has been preached by omniscient lords. Therefore, do not have attachment with *Karma*. [150]

Annotation

In this stanza, in very simple language, *Ācārya Kundakunda* has stated a basic fact:- If one has attachment with *Karma* then the soul would be bonded with new *Karma*, and if there is detachment then it would result into liberation. To highlight the importance of this fact, he emphasizes that this has been preached by omniscient lords (*Jinendra Deva*).

Ācārya Kundakunda further provides a valuable lesson derived from this fact. He says that in view of the above mentioned fact, one should not keep any attachment with *Karma*. It may be noted that in stanza 147, he has already stated that one should not have any attachment with any type of *Karma* (auspicious or inauspicious). Here to convey the message clearly and in a general way he does not qualify *Karma* by any adjective – auspicious or inauspicious.

परमट्टो खलु समओ सुद्धो जो केवली मुणी गाणी ।

तम्हि ट्टिदा सहावे मुणिणो पावन्ति णिव्वाणं ॥151॥

परमदृष्टिं दु अठिदो जो कुणदि तवं वदं च धारेदि ।
 तं सव्वं बालतवं बालवदं बेति सव्वण्हू ॥152॥
 वदणियमाणि धरंता सीलाणि तहा तवं च कुव्वंता ।
 परमदृष्टिबाहिरा जे णिव्वाणं ते ण विंदंति ॥153॥
 परमदृष्टिबाहिरा जे ते अण्णाणेण पुण्णमिच्छंति ।
 संसारगमणहेदुं पि मोक्खहेदुं अजाणंता ॥154॥

Paramatṭho khalu samao suddho jo kevalī muṇī naṇī.
Tamhi tṭhida sahāve muṇiṇo pāvanti ṇivvāṇam. ||151||
Paramatṭhamhi du aṭhido jo kuṇadi tavam vadam ca dhāredi.
Tam savvam bālatavam bālavadam beṃti savvaṇhū. ||152||
Vadaṇiyamāṇi dharantā sīlāṇi tahā tavam kuvvantā.
Paramatṭhabāhirā je ṇivvāṇam te ṇa vindanti ||153||
Paramatṭhabāhirā je te aṇṇāṇeṇa puṇṇamicchanti.
Samsāragamaṇahedum pi mokkhahedum ajāṇantā. ||154||
 परमार्थः खलु समयः शुद्धो यः केवली मुनिर्ज्ञानी ।
 तस्मिन् स्थिताः स्वभावे मुनयः प्राप्नुवन्ति निर्वाणम् ॥151॥
 परमार्थे त्वस्थितः यः करोति तपो व्रतं च धारयति ।
 तत्सर्वं बालतपो बालव्रतं ब्रुवन्ति सर्वज्ञाः ॥152॥
 व्रतनियमान् धारयंतः शीलानि तथा तपश्च कुर्वतः ।
 परमार्थबाह्या ये निर्वाणं ते न विंदन्ति ॥153॥
 परमार्थबाह्या ये ते अज्ञानेन पुण्यमिच्छन्ति ।
 संसारगमनहेतुमपि मोक्षहेतुमजानंतः ॥154॥

In reality, the supreme substance is the soul. [It may also be called as,] Pure, *Kevalī*, *Muni*, [or] *Jñānī*. By getting absorbed in the supreme nature, ascetics attain liberation. [151]

Omniscient lords say that one, who performs penance and takes vows without getting anchored to the supreme, is to be considered [as a person] engaged in childish penance and childish vows. [152]

Those who do not abide in the supreme substance (*Paramārtha*), do not attain the liberation, even though they take vows and resolutions, follow the rules of good conduct, and perform penance. [153]

Those who are not anchored to the supreme substance (*Paramārtha*) do not know the cause of liberation; and due to ignorance, long for the bondage with auspicious *Karma* (*Puṇya*) which are cause of wandering in cycles of birth and death. [154]

Annotation

In stanza 151, *Ācārya* Kundakunda explains that the attainment of liberation is possible by ascetics anchored to the supreme or the Self. The use of ‘ascetics’ (*Muṇiṇo* – plural of *Muni*, used in the second half of the stanza in *Prākṛta*) signify a basic tenet of Jain metaphysics that in the path of liberation the attainment of the monkhood is an essential stage.

In this stanza 151, *Ācārya* Kundakunda first introduced a few words – ‘*Samaya*’, ‘pure’, ‘*Kevali*’ (only consciousness), ‘*Muni*’ (one who has nature of existing as a knower or consciousness), ‘*Jñānī*’ (knower) – as synonyms of the supreme substance (*Paramārtha*). From the commentaries of this scripture written by *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra and *Ācārya* Jayasena as well as on the basis of the context, it may be noted that the meaning written in this paragraph in the brackets of some of these synonyms is different from their conventional meaning.

In these four stanzas, *Ācārya* Kundakunda explains the importance of staying (or remaining absorbed or anchored or engrossed) in the supreme in various possible ways:

1. Stanza 151: The monks attain liberation by abiding in the supreme substance (soul).
2. Stanza 152: Without abiding in the supreme substance

(soul) any act of vow is not a true vow, but it is simply equivalent to a vow undertaken by an ignorant child who does not correctly understand the meaning and intention of his actions. In this stanza, it has been termed as *Bāla Vrata*. The literal meaning of *Bāla Vrata* is ‘vow undertaken by a child’. This stanza thus implies that for a vow to be a true vow for the purpose of the spiritual development, staying in the supreme substance (soul) is an essential component.

3. Stanza 152: Without staying in the supreme substance (soul) any act of penance is not a true penance, but it is simply equivalent to an act of penance undertaken by an ignorant child who does not correctly understand the meaning and intention of his actions. In this stanza, it has been termed as *Bāla Tapa*. The literal meaning of *Bāla Tapa* is ‘penance undertaken by an ignorant child’. This stanza thus implies that for an act of penance to be a true penance for the purpose of the spiritual development, staying in the supreme substance (soul) is an essential component.
4. Stanza 153: The converse of stanza 151 and inference drawn from stanza 152 have been highlighted in this stanza. This stanza states that those who do not abide in the supreme substance (soul) do not attain liberation even though they do all possible actions of physical body and mind by following the rules of good conduct, by practicing penance and vows.
5. Stanza 154: After reading stanza 153, a question may arise in a reader’s mind. How can a person who follows the rules of good conduct, practices vows and acts of penance can remain out of the supreme substance (soul)? Its answer is provided in stanza 154. This stanza explains that all living beings who do not abide in the supreme substance (soul) are ignorant about the real cause of liberation, and due to

this ignorance even while practicing penance and vows they long for bondage with the auspicious *Karma* (*Punya*). In this stanza, *Ācārya* Kundakunda also provides a logic that any desire of bondage with auspicious *Karma* is a cause of wandering in the cycles of birth and death (*Samsāra*). *Ācārya* Kundakunda here does not talk about the desire of bondage with inauspicious *Karma* because he is referring to those nice persons who are following the vows and rules of good conduct.

On reviewing all these four stanzas together, we find that the bottom line is stanza 154: A person who longs for the bondage with the auspicious *Karma* (*Punya*) is ignorant about the path of liberation and is not anchored to the supreme substance (soul).

Question: How can the world advance without any desire of bondage with auspicious *Karma*?

Answer: The auspicious deeds are possible without any desire of bondage with auspicious *Karma*. While writing this scripture and these stanzas, *Ācārya* Kundakunda was also knowing that his task of writing the scripture is an auspicious *Karma* (deed). Various rules of good conduct and vows directed towards the actions of mind and physical body followed by a person anchored to the supreme substance (soul) also fall under the category of auspicious *Karma*. But a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* person anchored to the supreme substance (soul) does not consider oneself as the owner or doer of such auspicious *Karma*. Internally, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not long for earning auspicious bondage for getting worldly comforts or heaven. As mentioned in the annotation of stanza 149, internally, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not have any association with auspicious *Karma*, but only when a *Muni* is close to becoming *Arahanta*, the internal as well as external association with auspicious *Karma* stops. Therefore, with the spiritual progress of a

SamyagDṛṣṭi, it is very likely that there is an increase in the auspicious *Karma* and a decrease in the inauspicious *Karma*. Thus actions of a *SamyagDṛṣṭi* effectively increase the level of charity, welfare, kindness, etc. In other words, the understanding of not having any desire of earning auspicious *Karma* is likely to lead to the attainment of enlightenment, and the actions of an enlightened being are likely to increase the level of acts related with charity, welfare, kindness, non-violence, etc. in the world, which in turn are likely to result in the advancement of peace, love, and harmony in the world.

Question: Stanza 152 says that vows observed by a person who does not stay in the supreme substance (soul) are *Bāla Vrata*. This means that a person actually in 5th *Guṇasthāna* whose vows are not *Bāla Vrata* must be abiding in the soul. But we know that a person in 5th *Guṇasthāna* may be a householder. He/she may be involved in trade, business, and various kinds of household activities. How can a householder of 5th *Guṇasthāna* while present in the court of law in connection with some litigation can be considered as a person staying in the soul?

Answer: Let us first be clear that according to scriptures, a person in 5th *Guṇasthāna* has genuine vows and is also a *SamyagDṛṣṭi*. Therefore, as per stanza 152, he/she can be considered as a person anchored to the supreme substance (soul). One cannot prove this point by taking any photograph. One can either experience or can try to understand by taking some examples. In this regard, the following description may be helpful.

Suppose in some formal setting a person present in the court of the law is asked, “What is your present residential address?” He answers, “51 Gandhi Street, City: ABCD, State: XYZ”, and suppose his answer matches with his home address

in the record. At this answer, nobody argues. His answer becomes acceptable. No any wise person argues that at present he is 'residing' in the court premises, therefore, the above mentioned answer is incorrect as the address given by the person is not the address of the court premises. However, some ignorant persons with very limited intellect may fail to understand his answer.

In the same way, a person in 5th *Guṇasthāna* (or for that matter any *SamyagDṛṣṭi*) realizes and recognizes very well that the residential address of his soul is his eternal soul (*Paramārtha* or *Samaya*) itself. The spiritually advanced persons recognize the value and truthfulness of this realization. However, spiritually ignorant persons see only the external actions of body and mind and may either fail to think of soul or may say that the soul is anchored to the litigation in the court of the law. A spiritually ignorant person (*MithyāDṛṣṭi*) either does not recognize oneself as a soul or identifies himself with his physical and psychic actions dependent on the externals. Thus he is ignorant about the Self (soul) that may be anchored to the Self (soul) even while the personality is doing worldly tasks. It may be noted that though a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* also is a soul but he is not aware of the same. He does not recognize himself as an eternal soul. He does not realize that the residential address of his soul is the soul itself. In other words he is ignorant about it and, therefore, he always realizes that he is a wanderer; he is not anchored to the soul.

जीवादीसद्गुणं सम्मत्तं तेसिमधिगमो गाणं ।

रागादीपरिहरणं चरणं एसो दु मोक्खपहो ॥155॥

Jīvādīsaddahaṇam sammattam tesimadhigamo ṇāṇam.

Rāgādīpariharaṇam caraṇam eso du mokkhapaho. ||155||

जीवादिश्रद्धानं सम्यक्त्वं तेषामधिगमो ज्ञानम् ।

रागादिपरिहरणं चरणं एषस्तु मोक्षपथः ॥155॥

To believe in the soul-etc. is the right belief (*SamyakDarshan*), the knowing of them (soul-etc.) is the right knowledge (*SamyakJñāna*), and the elimination of attachment-etc. is the right conduct (*SamyakCāritra*). These constitute the path of liberation. [155]

Annotation

In this stanza, *Ācārya* Kundakunda first introduces right belief, right knowledge, and right conduct, and then states that this trio (right belief, right knowledge, and right conduct) also known as *Ratnatraya* (or three jewels) constitutes the path of liberation. Right belief has already been introduced by *Ācārya* Kundakunda in stanza 13. Here he reviews it in very brief, and to be concise, here the nine *Tattva* mentioned in stanza 13 have been simply replaced by two words: ‘soul’ and ‘etc.’ Thus ‘etc.’ stands for the remaining eight elements described in stanza 13.

A true belief about an entity is not possible without sufficient knowledge about that entity. Which is first? Knowledge or belief? If a king’s son gets kidnapped and after many years somebody brings one boy with this message that the boy is king’s son, then how would the king believe? The king would first enquire about that boy in various possible ways. He would correlate various facts and check for their consistency and accuracy. The boy would be accepted as his son only when the king is fully satisfied and believes, without any doubt, that he is his son. There is a difference between the knowledge he had before such belief and the knowledge he has after his believing. Before the firm belief or right belief the knowing was doubtful (he was not recognizing the boy as his son), and after the belief the same knowing becomes the true knowing or the right knowledge. In this sense, the right knowledge follows the right belief (of course, without any time gap).

Each living being has a soul but may not be aware of the same. Even if one is aware of the existence of the soul, he/she may not attach I-ness or oneness only with the soul. When through enlightened teachers, scriptures, and the self experience one has sufficient knowledge to the extent of getting fully convinced in the existence of the soul and I-ness with the soul, without any doubt, then such knowing leads to the right belief. Parallel to the above mentioned analogy, the right knowledge follows the right belief without any time gap. It may be noted that the description of the right belief presented here does not give sufficient details. It may be recalled that the right *Śraddhāna* of nine *Tattva* from the real point of view as mentioned in stanza 13 is required for attainment of right belief, and the nine *Tattva* are being explained by *Ācārya* Kundakunda one by one in different chapters of this treatise. Thus his description of the right belief would require an understanding of all the nine *Tattva* described in the previous, current, and the following chapters. In this regard, a brief description as mentioned in the annotations of stanzas 13 and 83 may be helpful.

In the previous verses (stanzas 147, 149, and 150), *Ācārya* Kundakunda has explained that any desire to have attachment even with auspicious *Karma* is not a good conduct. Therefore, it is natural for a reader to ask, “What is the right conduct?” To answer this question, *Ācārya* Kundakunda has introduced the right conduct in this stanza. As the right conduct is not possible without the right belief and the right knowledge, and since the trio of right belief, right knowledge, and right conduct constitute the path of liberation, he covered all three in a single stanza. Regarding right conduct, he explains that the elimination of the attachment (*Rāga*) and aversion (*Dveṣa*) is the right conduct. In stanzas 151-153, it has been narrated that abiding in the eternal soul (*Parmārtha*) is an essential component of the path of liberation, and without it even vows and penances undertaken are not the true vows and penances. From all these, one may infer that any attachment with *Karma* is

not a right conduct; and the elimination of attachment and aversion, which cannot be possible without abiding in the eternal soul (*Parmārtha*), is the right conduct. [For more details regarding right conduct, one may refer to Appendix-8]

मोत्तूण णिच्छयट्ठं ववहारेण विदुसा पवट्ठंति ।

परमट्ठमस्सिदाण दु जदीण कम्मक्खओ विहिओ ॥156॥

Mottuṇa ṇicchayaṭṭhaṃ vavahāreṇa vidusā pavattanti.

Paramaṭṭhamassidāṇa du jadīṇa kammakkhao vihio. ॥156॥

मुक्त्वा निश्चयार्थं व्यवहारेण विद्वांसः प्रवर्तते ।

परमार्थमाश्रितानां तु यतीनां कर्मक्षयो विहितः ॥156॥

[Many] scholars [without the true realization of the Self] leave aside the object of the real point of view (pure soul), and indulge in the path of the relative point of view (conduct based on body and mind). [But] the destruction of *Karma* is stated to take place to the monks absorbed in the supreme substance (pure soul). [156]

Annotation

We find two versions of this stanza. The difference is due to the difference in the method of writing a word (or two words) of this stanza. In one version one writes, ‘*vavahāreṇa*’ (as written above), and in the alternative version we find ‘*vavahāre ṇa*’. Both versions are to be understood to be consistent with the inference drawn in the second half of this stanza. The alternative version has the following meaning:

“Scholars [with the true realization of the Self] do not leave aside the subject of the real point of view (pure soul), and do not indulge in the path of the relative point of view (conduct based on body and mind). The destruction of *Karma* is stated to take place to the monks absorbed in the supreme substance (pure soul).”

Despite the disagreement in the first line of the stanza of the two versions, the main point can be understood by assigning different meanings to ‘scholars’ used in the first line. In one case

the scholars are those who have read the scriptures and are recognized as the scholars, but in reality they have not realized the Self and do not stay in the supreme substance, i.e., soul (*Parmārtha*). In another case the scholars are those who have really understood the *Tattva* and stay in the Self (*Parmārtha*).

Both these versions convey the same basic point:- Staying in the *Vyavahāra* does not lead to the liberation but staying in the *Parmārtha* leads to the liberation. It may be recalled that this stanza is in the chapter on *Puṇya-Pāpa*, and here *Ācārya* Kundakunda wants to alert those seekers who consider the desire of bondage with the auspicious *Karma* as a good conduct. *Vyavahāra* ‘includes’ various auspicious *Karma* (deeds) and, therefore, some seekers are likely to consider them as worth desiring. But there is a large difference between ‘desiring’ and ‘including’. To understand this difference one can take an example. It is well known that the packing material of the cookies (biscuits) is worth including with the biscuits during their transportation and storage, but the packing material is not worth eating (desiring). The wrapper of the packet of the edible biscuits needs to be removed before eating the biscuits. The packing material is not to be considered as something worth eating at any point of time.

वत्थस्स सेदभावो जह णासेदि मलमेलणासत्तो ।

मिच्छत्तमलोच्छण्णं तह सम्मत्तं खु णादव्वं ॥157॥

वत्थस्स सेदभावो जह णासेदि मलमेलणासत्तो ।

अण्णाणमलोच्छण्णं तह णाणं होदि णादव्वं ॥158॥

वत्थस्स सेदभावो जह णासेदि मलमेलणासत्तो ।

कसायमलोच्छण्णं तह चारित्तं पि णादव्वं ॥159॥

सो सव्वणाणदरिसी कम्मरणेण गियेणावच्छण्णो ।

संसारसमावण्णो ण विजाणदि सव्वदो सव्वं ॥160॥

सम्मत्तपडिणिबद्धं मिच्छत्तं जिणवरेहि परिकहियं ।

तस्सोदयेण जीवो मिच्छादिट्ठि त्ति णादव्वो ॥161॥

णाणस्स पडिणिबद्धं अण्णाणं जिणवरेहि परिकहियं ।

तस्सोदयेण जीवो अण्णाणी होदि णादव्वो ॥162॥

चारित्तपडिणिबद्धं कसायं जिणवरेहि परिकहियं ।

तस्सोदयेण जीवो अचरित्तो होदि णादव्वो ॥163॥

Vatthassa sedabhāvo jaha ṇāsedī malamelaṇāsatto.

Micchattamalocchaṇṇam taha sammattam khu ṇādavvam. ||157||

Vatthassa sedabhāvo jaha ṇāsedī malamelaṇāsatto.

Aṇṇāṇamalocchaṇṇam taha ṇāṇam hodi ṇādavvam. ||158||

Vatthassa sedabhāvo jaha ṇāsedī malamelaṇāsatto.

Kasāyamalocchaṇṇam taha cārīttam pi ṇādavvam. ||159||

So savvaṇṇānadarisī kammaraeṇa ṇīyeṇāvacchaṇṇo.

Samsārasamāvaṇṇo na vijāṇadi savvado savvam. ||160||

Sammattapadīṇibaddham micchattam jīṇavarehi parikahiyam.

Tassodayeṇa jīvo micchādīṭṭhi tti ṇādavvo. ||161||

Naṇassa padīṇibaddham aṇṇāṇam jīṇavarehi parikahiyam.

Tassodayeṇa jīvo aṇṇāṇī hodi ṇādavvo. ||162||

Cārīttapadīṇibaddham kasayam jīṇavarehi parikahiyam.

Tassodayeṇa jīvo acaritto hodi ṇādavvo. ||163||

वस्त्रस्य श्वेतभावो यथा नश्यति मलमेलनासक्तः ।

मिथ्यात्वमलावच्छन्नं तथा सम्यक्त्वं खलु ज्ञातव्यम् ॥157॥

वस्त्रस्य श्वेतभावो यथा नश्यति मलमेलनासक्तः ।

अज्ञानमलावच्छन्नं तथा ज्ञानं भवति ज्ञातव्यम् ॥158॥

वस्त्रस्य श्वेतभावो यथा नश्यति मलमेलनासक्तः ।

कषायमलावच्छन्नं तथा चारित्रमपि ज्ञातव्यम् ॥159॥

स सर्वज्ञानदर्शी कर्मरजसा निजेनावच्छन्नः ।

संसारसमापन्नो न विजानाति सर्वतः सर्वम् ॥160॥

सम्यक्त्वप्रतिनिबद्धं मिथ्यात्वं जिनवरैः परिकथितम् ।

तस्योदयेन जीवो मिथ्यादृष्टिरिति ज्ञातव्यः ॥161॥

ज्ञानस्य प्रतिनिबद्धं अज्ञानं जिनवरैः परिकथितम् ।

तस्योदयेन जीवोऽज्ञानी भवति ज्ञातव्यः ॥162॥

चारित्रप्रतिनिबद्धः कषायो जिनवरैः परिकथितः ।

तस्योदयेन जीवोऽचारित्रो भवति ज्ञातव्यः ॥163॥

It is to be known that just as the whiteness of cloth is obscured by its being attached with dirt, in the same way, the right belief [of soul is obscured] by the covering of dirt of wrong belief. [157]

It is to be known that just as the whiteness of cloth is obscured by its being attached with dirt, in the same way, the knowledge [of soul is obscured] by the covering of dirt of [spiritual] ignorance. [158]

It is to be known that just as the whiteness of cloth is obscured by its being attached with dirt, in the same way, the conduct [of soul is obscured] by the covering of dirt of soul- soiling-passions. [159]

[Though by nature] it (soul) is capable of knowing and perceiving all, but due to bondage with its own *Karma* it wanders in the cycles of birth and death and does not know all with their all aspects. [160]

It is narrated by omniscient lords that the wrong-belief-*Karma* blocks the right belief, and it is to be known that due to its rise, the living being becomes wrong believer. [161]

It is narrated by omniscient lords that the ignorance [*Karma*] blocks the knowledge, and it is to be known that due to its rise the living being becomes ignorant. [162]

It is narrated by omniscient lords that the soul- soiling-passion [*Karma*] blocks the conduct, and it is to be known that due to its rise the living being becomes devoid of [truthful] conduct. [163]

Annotation

For the purpose of understanding the concepts introduced by

Ācārya Kundakunda in these stanzas, it may be helpful to consider the *Karma* responsible for the wrong belief (*Mithyātva*), *Karma* responsible for the lack of knowledge, and *Kaṣāya Karma* responsible for the lack of true conduct. With such consideration, Ācārya Kundakunda explains the following concepts through these stanzas:

- (1) By nature, a soul is capable of knowing all with their all aspects. It has a potential of knowing all with all details. However, the omniscient nature of the soul is not manifested due to the ignorance-causing-*Karma* bonded with the soul by the soul. [Stanza 160]
- (2) A soul bonded with *Karma* wanders in the cycles of birth and death. [Stanza 160]
- (3) Regarding the bondage of soul with *Mithyātva Karma*, the following points are worth noting:
 - (a) Due to bondage with *Mithyātva Karma*, the right belief (*SamyagDarśana*) remains absent, just as the whiteness of a piece of cloth is absent by its attachment with dirt. [Stanza 157]
 - (b) The bondage of *Mithyātva Karma* blocks the manifestation of the right belief. [Stanza 161]
 - (c) Due to fruition (*Udaya*) of *Mithyātva Karma*, *Jīva* (soul) becomes *MithyāDṛṣṭi*. [Stanza 161]
 - (d) For the manifestation of *SamyagDarśana* the fruition of any *Karma* is not a requirement. *Samyaktava* is inherent with soul in absence of *Mithyātva Karma*. [Stanzas 157, 160, 161]
- (4) Regarding the bondage of soul with *Karma* responsible for ignorance, the following points are worth noting:
 - (a) Due to bondage with ignorance causing *Karma*, soul lacks *Jñāna* (knowledge), just as a piece of cloth lacks its whiteness by its attachment with dirt. [Stanza 158]

- (b) The bondage of ignorance causing *Karma* blocks the manifestation of the infinite knowledge (omniscience). [Stanzas 160, 162]
- (c) Due to fruition (*Udaya*) of ignorance causing *Karma*, *Jīva* (soul) becomes ignorant. To avoid any confusion, it may be noted that in these verses 160 and 162, the word 'ignorant' refers to a living being who is not omniscient.
- (d) A lack of omniscience is due to fruition [*Udaya*] of ignorance causing *Karma*. But for the manifestation of the omniscience the fruition of any *Karma* is not a requirement. The omniscience is inherent within soul in absence of any ignorance causing *Karma*. [Stanzas 158, 160, 162]
- (5) Regarding the bondage of soul with *Kaṣāya Karma*, the following points are worth noting:
 - (a) Due to bondage with *Kaṣāya Karma*, there is a loss in the conduct (*Cāritra*) of soul, just as there is a loss in the whiteness of a piece of cloth by its attachment with dirt. [Stanza 159]
 - (b) The bondage with *Kaṣāya Karma* blocks the true conduct (perfect bliss) of soul. [Stanza 163]
 - (c) Due to fruition (*Udaya*) of *Kaṣāya Karma*, *Jīva* (soul) becomes *Acāritravāna* (a soul with the lack of true conduct). [Stanza 163]
 - (d) For the manifestation of the purity in the conduct (perfect bliss) the fruition of any *Karma* is not a requirement. The bliss is inherent with soul in absence of *Kaṣāya Karma*. [Stanzas 159, 160, 163]
- (6) In these last seven stanzas of this chapter on virtue and vice, *Ācārya* Kundakunda did not use the adjective auspicious or inauspicious with *Karma*. He simply used the word '*Karma*' at various places in these stanzas. In

ĀtmaKhyāti, Ācārya Amṛtacandra highlights this aspect by saying that this chapter ends with an inference that auspicious *Karma* and inauspicious *Karma* appearing as two entities in the beginning of the chapter, now appear as one entity which can simply be called as *Karma*.

Question: The analogy of whiteness of cloth given in stanzas 157-159 together with stanza 160 indicates the possibility that at some point of time in the past the soul might have been clean and pure, i.e., without any *Kārmika* dust. Is it right?

Answer: No, it is not possible. A soul free from any *Kārmika* dust is a *Siddha* (see Appendix-2). Without wrong belief, ignorance, and inclination of attachment and aversion (*Kaṣāya*), there cannot be any new *Kārmika* bonding. A pure soul (*Siddha*) always continues to be pure. Therefore, if a soul is associated with *Kārmika* dust at present, then for that soul one can say that it was never free from *Kārmika* dust in the past; and if a soul is free from *Kārmika* dust at present, then for that soul one can say that it would never be bonded again in the future.

Question: Stanza 160 says that soul is not omniscient due to bondage with the ignorance-causing-*Kārmika* dust. Does it mean that *Kārmika* dust can reduce the ability of soul? Further, stanza 83 says that soul is the doer of the transformations in the self and soul experiences only itself. How do we see agreement between stanzas 83 and 160?

Answer: In getting the answer of this question, the following points may be helpful.

(i) In reality, the past actions of the soul, not the *Kārmika* dust, are responsible for the lack of its omniscience. In this context, the words ‘own *Karma*’ of stanza 160 are also worth noting. Further, as discussed in the answer of the previous

question, it may also be kept in mind that the soul which is bonded at present was never free from the *Kārmika* dust earlier.

(ii) In this regard, stanzas 87, 90, and the discussion in the question-answer format in the annotation related with stanza 90 may also be helpful.

(iii) Despite the above mentioned facts, for the sake of convenience in communication in the worldly life, it may be helpful to describe *Pudgala* as the doer of *Jīva* (see stanza 84) from the relative point of view. As stated by *Ācārya* Kundakunda, the description of stanza 83 is according to the real point of view. The apparent disagreement between these two stanzas (83 and 160) is due to the difference in the points of view: stanza 83 considers the real point of view and another uses the relative point of view.

(iv) In short, the following points are worth remembering:

(a) A non-omniscient soul has never been omniscient in the past.

(b) A non-omniscient soul may become omniscient, and after becoming omniscient it never becomes non-omniscient in the future.

(c) The omniscience does not come from outside.

(d) A non-omniscient soul is non-omniscient because of its own actions. However, on many occasions, it is helpful to use the relative point of view to say that the soul is not omniscient because of the fruition of the ignorance-causing-*Karma* bonded by the soul itself.

5

Influx of *Karma* (*Āsrava*)

मिच्छत्तं अविरमणं कसायजोगा य सण्णसण्णा दु ।

बहुविहभेया जीवे तस्सेव अण्णपरिणामा ॥164॥

Micchattam aviramaṇam kasāyajogā ya saṇṇasaṇṇā du.

Bahuvihabheyā jīve tasseeva aṇaṇṇapariṇāmā. ॥164॥

मिथ्यात्वमविरमणं कषाययोगौ च संज्ञासंज्ञास्तु ।

बहुविधभेदा जीवे तस्यैवानन्यपरिणामाः ॥164॥

Wrong belief, vowlessness, soul-soiling-passions, and *Yoga* (physical, vocal, and mental activities) are of two types: (i) distortions of soul (ii) distortions of *Pudgala*. There are many kinds of distortions of soul and all these are dispositions of soul only. [164]

Annotation

This stanza spells out four points: (i) wrong belief (*Mithyātva*), vowlessness (*Avirati*), soul-soiling-passions (*Kaṣāya*), and *Yoga* (physical, vocal, and mental activities). Each of these is known as the cause of bonding and is of two types. (ii) These two types are *Sajñā* and *Asajñā*. *Sajñā* refers to the distortions (*Vikāra*) of soul. *Asajñā* refers to the distortions of matter (*Pudgala*) in the form of *Kārmika* dust that comes into fruition at the moment under consideration. (iii) *Sajñā* type is to be considered as dispositions (*Bhāva*) of soul only. (iv) There are many kinds of distortions of soul.

Before proceeding further, it would be appropriate to be clear about wrong belief, vowlessness, soul soiling passions, and *Yoga* (physical, vocal, and mental activities). As mentioned in the annotation of stanza 51, these are known as *Pratyaya*. *Pratyaya* leads to the influx and bonding of *Kārmika* dust. The wrong belief (*Mithyātva*) means the false world-view or the false view regarding oneself (soul) and others. Vowlessness (*Avirati*) means absence of spiritual vows. Soul-soiling-passions refer to anger, ego, deceit, and greed. *Yoga* refers to the physical, vocal, and mental activities. In this regard, the description of *Bhāva-Karma* and *Dravya-Karma* given in the annotations of stanzas 19 and 51, and in Appendix-1 may also be helpful. One may relate *Sajñā* kind to *Bhāva-Karma* and *Asajñā* kind to *Dravya-Karma*.

In this chapter on *Āsrava*, *Ācārya* Kundakunda describes the salient aspects of *Āsrava* with an emphasis from the real point of view. In stanza 13, he stated that the comprehension of nine elements (*Tattva*) from the real point of view is the right belief (*SamyagDarśana*). In the previous chapters, *Ācārya* Kundakunda has already described four elements. Now he takes up the fifth element, *Āsrava Tattva*. We shall see that the description in this chapter includes the views of Jain philosophy regarding *Kārmika* bonding, ineffectiveness of the bonded *Karma* for some duration known as *Kārmika*-waiting-duration (*Ābādhā Kāla*), fruition of *Karma*, the conditions under which the new bonding of *Karma* takes place, the oneness of attachment and aversion with the soul as perceived by an ignorant being, the separateness of attachment and aversion with the soul as perceived by an enlightened being, etc.

Question: As per stanza 51, attachment (*Rāga*), aversion (*Dveṣa*), and *Pratyaya* (*Mithyātva*, *Avirati*, *Kaṣāya*, and *Yoga*), etc. are not of soul. But in this stanza, we find that these belong to soul. How can we resolve this apparent contradiction?

Answer: In our day-to-day life also we come across such apparent contradictions. For example, for a rented flat, sometimes its tenant may say that it is his flat. For some privileges and responsibilities he is right in saying that he is the owner of that flat. But when any of his friends or relatives asks regarding the purchase details of the flat then without any hesitation he mentions that he is not the real owner of the flat, he is simply a tenant. In the language of *Anekānt* and *Naya*, one can say that from the real-owner-point-of-view (one may call it the real-owner-*Naya*) he is not the owner of that flat, but from the tenant-occupancy-point-of-view (one may call it the tenant-*Naya*) the flat belongs to him. This apparent contradiction is so common and acceptable that it is not called as a contradiction, and it does not need the mention of ‘real-owner-*Naya*’ and ‘tenant-*Naya*’ in our day-to-day life.

In the same way, in this scripture and elsewhere one may note apparently contradictory statements. An absence of the mention of the associated points of view (*Naya*), may create sometimes confusion or apparent contradiction. In such situation, one simply needs to understand the contradiction through some examples to see the associated points of view. Here in the light of the above mentioned example, one can say that the soul is not the real owner of any *Rāga* or *Dveṣa* or *Pratyaya* (see stanza 51), but just like the ownership of a tenant over the rented flat, these impurities associated with a worldly soul belong to the soul (see stanzas 87 to 90, 164, etc.). In the language of *Naya* and *Anekanta* (see Appendix- 5 for different points of view), one can say that from the pure real point of view the soul is not the real owner of *Rāga* or *Dveṣa* or *Pratyaya* but from the impure real point of view these impurities associated with a worldly soul belong to the soul.

Whether the wrong belief or *Kaṣāya*-etc. associated with the soul 'really' belongs to the soul. This point has been discussed in detail, through an example of a crystal placed on a banana leaf, in the annotations of stanza 90. Further, an example of two peacocks given in the annotations of stanzas 87-88 to illustrate *Pudgala* type wrong belief and soul type wrong belief may also be helpful. In *ĀtmaKhyāti*, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra has used the word '*Cidābhāsa*' for such distortions of soul (*Sajñā Āsrava*). The literal meaning of '*Cidābhāsa*': 'That which is not an attribute of soul in true sense but that which simply appears to be consciousness or of soul.' The rationale behind using the word *Cidābhāsa* is as follows: These *Rāga* or *Dveṣa* or *Pratyaya* of soul type are neither physical matter by nature nor are real (eternal) attributes of the soul, but these appear to be attributes of the soul.

णाणावरणादीयस्स ते दु कम्मस्स कारणं होति ।

तेसिं पि होदि जीवो य रागदोसादिभावकरो ॥165॥

Nāṇāvaraṇādiyassa te du kammaṣṣa kāraṇaṃ Hoṃti.

Tesim pi hodi jīvo ya rāgadosādibhāvakaro. ॥165॥

ज्ञानावरणाद्यस्य ते तु कर्मणः कारणं भवति ।

तेषामपि भवति जीवश्च रागद्वेषादिभावकरः ॥165॥

These (distortions of matter) become the [instrumental] cause for the [inflow and bonding of the *Kārmika* dust corresponding to] *Jñānāvaraṇīya* and other *Karma*; and by becoming the doer of dispositions of liking, disliking, etc., [an ignorant] soul becomes the [instrumental] cause for that. [165]

Annotation

The following two points may be very useful in understanding this stanza: (i) By context it can be seen that this stanza refers to ignorant living beings only. In *ĀtmaKhyāti*, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra

has also clarified this point. (ii) An analogy may also be useful in understanding this stanza. A duly filled cheque becomes the instrumental cause for the money transaction, but that cheque becomes the instrumental cause only when it is signed by an authorized person. In other words, the signature of the authorized person becomes the instrumental cause to let the duly filled cheque become an instrument for the money transaction.

The first half of this stanza says that *Asajñā* kind of *Pratyaya* become the instrumental cause for the inflow and bonding of the new *Karma*. The second half of this stanza further says that by becoming the doer of liking, disliking, etc. (*Sajñā Āsrava*) an ignorant soul becomes the instrumental cause for letting those *Asajñā* kind of *Pratyaya* become the instrumental cause for the inflow and bonding of new *Karma* such as *Jñānāvaraṇīya Karma*.

In simple words, an ignorant living being considers oneself as the doer of dispositions of liking, disliking, and other emotions. This is *Sajñā Āsrava*. Again in simple words, *Asajñā* kind of *Pratyaya* means the actions of matter related to the physical body. *Asajñā* kind of *Pratyaya* become the instrumental cause for the inflow and bonding of new *Karma*, and in becoming the *Asajñā* kind of *Pratyaya* as the instrumental cause, the *Sajñā Āsrava* becomes the instrumental cause.

Technical details:

In *ĀtmaKhyāti*, Ācārya Amṛtacandra has described the *Asajñā* kind of *Pratyaya* as *Āsrava*. He also mentions that *Rāga-Dveṣa-Moha* associated with an ignorant being are *Āsrava* in more rigorous sense. For the inflow of the new *Kārmika* particles towards soul, Ācārya Amṛtacandra uses the word '*Āsravaṇa*'. It may be noted that the word '*Āsravaṇa*' used in this sense in this stanza in *ĀtmaKhyāti* is also commonly known as *Āsrava* in the literature.

णत्थि दु आसवबंधो सम्मादिट्ठिस्स आसवणिरोहो ।

संते पुव्वणिबद्धे जाणदि सो ते अबंधंतो ॥166॥

Naṭṭhi du āsavabandho sammādiṭṭhihissā āsavaṇiroho.

Sante purvaṇibaddhe jāṇadi so te abandhanto. ॥166॥

नास्ति त्वास्रवबन्धः सम्यग्दृष्टेरास्रवनिरोधः ।

संति पूर्वनिबद्धानि जानाति स तान्यबध्नन् ॥166॥

In case of an enlightened person, the influx of *Karma* gets blocked, the influx of *Karma* does not lead to bonding; he knows the previously bonded *Karma* but does not get bonded with the new *Karma*. [166]

Annotation

A *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* recognizes oneself as a soul, and as a soul he does not identify with the bonded *Karma*. He is simply the knower of the previously bonded *Karma*. Due to the fruition of the previously bonded *Karma*, there can be *Dravya Āsrava*, but a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* knows the difference between the soul and the *Āsrava*. As a soul, he does not identify himself with the body or mind. Therefore, he does not become the doer of the tasks related to body and mind. Hence he is not bonded with the new *Karma*.

Question: Does this stanza also relate to a householder *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*?

Answer: According to this stanza, when a *Jīva* does not commit any erroneous act of becoming the doer of liking actions or disliking actions or owner of the physical body, mind, or others, then the *Jīva* does not become the doer of any new *Kārmika* bonding. Even a householder *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* comes in such category. This point would be explained further in stanzas 171, 172, 177, 178, 201, 202, 246, 279, and 280.

Question: Does it mean that a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* is free from any new *Kārmika* bonding?

Answer: A *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* knows the actions of body and mind as the actions of the soul's close neighbor, not as his own (soul's) actions. He, as a soul, does not become the owner or doer of the actions of his body and mind. As explained in the annotations of stanza 127, the 'Kārmika-Bank' keeps account of each and every soul, but does not open any account in the name of any non-soul (Note: The *Kārmika-Bank* does not exist. It is just a model. The *Kārmika-Bank-account-model* is being assumed here simply to convey the concept). In other words, the 'Kārmika-Bank' does not keep track of actions of non-souls, but it gives credit/discredit in the form of bonding to the associated soul if the soul makes mistakes of becoming the owner or doer of the actions of non-souls (body and mind). Since a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not become the owner or doer of the actions of his body and mind, he does not get bonded (see stanza 71 also).

At this point, a critical reader may raise some questions regarding some distortions of the soul of a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* that may lead to bonding. To consider such probable questions, it may be appropriate to consider an example: It is well known that the distilled water available for injection does not have impurities. But a molecular scientist would not agree to it. He knows that as compared to the ordinary tap water or RO water, the distilled water is very pure. However, he also knows that the number of molecules of impurities present in the distilled water is not zero, i.e., the distilled water is also not the pure water in the true sense.

In the same way, the spiritual masters also accept (e.g. see stanza 172) the bonding of a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*. The amount of bonding, duration of bonding, and intensity of bonding of the bonded *Karma* of a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* is, however, much less as compared to that of a *MithyāDr̥ṣṭi*. The difference between the

bonding of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* and a *MithyāDrṣṭi* is so large that the bonding of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* can be called as negligible as compared to that of a *MithyāDrṣṭi*. The logic behind such small bonding would be discussed in stanzas 171 and 172.

भावो रागादिजुदो जीवेण कदो दु बंधगो भणिदो ।

रागादिविप्पमुक्को अबंधगो जाणगो णवरि ॥167॥

Bhāvo rāgādijudo jīveṇa kado du bandhago bhaṇido.

Rāgādivippamukko abandhago jāṇago ṇavari. ॥167॥

भावो रागादियुतो जीवेन कृतस्तु बंधको भणितः ।

रागादिविप्रमुक्तोऽबंधको ज्ञायकः केवलम् ॥167॥

Dispositions of liking-etc. done by soul are called as the cause of [new] bonding. Dispositions free from liking-etc. are dispositions of knowing only, [they are] not the doer of bonding. [167]

Annotation

The first half of this stanza pertains to a *MithyāDrṣṭi* and the next half pertains to an enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*). An enlightened being does not become doer of dispositions of liking or disliking. He, as a soul, does not become owner of the body and mind. He does not become owner of thoughts of liking and disliking happening at the psychic level. But a *MithyāDrṣṭi* considers oneself as the doer and owner of the actions of body and mind. He considers himself as the owner of thoughts of liking and disliking happening at the psychic level. A false ownership is a mistake and it leads to bonding.

As explained in the annotations of stanza 127 and 166, the ‘*Kārmika-Bank*’ keeps account of each and every soul, but does not open any account in the name of any non-soul. The ‘*Kārmika-Bank*’ considers a soul responsible for its actions only. *In reality, the actions of non-souls are not the actions of the soul. But the ownership of the actions of non-souls wrongly accepted by the soul*

becomes an erroneous act of the soul. The belief of owning the physical body and mind is an erroneous act of the soul. It is an illusion or ignorance or *Moha*. The dispositions (*Bhāva*) of identifying the Self with the physical body and mind is an erroneous act of the soul. The *Bhāva* of ownership of mind's emotions/thoughts/tendency of liking or disliking may be considered as the soul's delusion of becoming the doer and owner of liking (*Rāga*) or disliking (*Dveṣa*) actions. For all such erroneous acts of the *Jīva*, the *Jīva* is bonded by the new *Karma*.

पक्के फलम्हि पडिअे जह ण फलं बज्झए पुणो विंटे ।

जीवस्स कम्मभावे पडिअे ण पुणोदयमुवेदि ॥168॥

Pakke phalamhi paḍie jaha ṇa phalam bajjhae puṇo viṇṭe.

Jīvaṣṣa kammabhāve paḍie ṇa puṇodayamuvedī. ॥168॥

पक्वे फले पतिते यथा न फलं बध्यते पुनर्वृन्तैः ।

जीवस्य कर्मभावे पतिते न पुनरुदयमुपैति ॥168॥

Just as a ripened fruit fallen from the tree does not get attached again with the tree, in the same way, the ripened *Karma-Bhāva* after separation do not get bonded with the soul again. [168]

Annotation:

It is well known that a ripened fruit after falling from the tree does not get attached with the tree. Ācārya Kundakunda uses this analogy to explain this point that the *Karma* after separation from a *Jīva* do not get bonded again.

The above mentioned concept may appear trivial to many readers, but it is valuable. Ācārya Amṛtacandra brings out deeper insight from this stanza in *ĀtmaKhyāti*. The word 'Kammabhāve' used in this stanza by Ācārya Kundakunda means the *Karma-Bhāva* or the *Bhāva* of considering the Self as the doer of actions of physical body and others. In other words, *Karma-Bhāva* means *MithyāDṛṣṭi-Bhāva* or wrong belief. Therefore, while discussing this stanza, Ācārya Amṛtacandra explains that after the detachment

(shedding) of *Karma-Bhāva* from the soul the *Jñāna-Bhāva* are manifested. By *Jñāna-Bhāva* we mean the dispositions of the soul of an enlightened being. An enlightened being considers oneself as the knower. He does not become the doer of bonding (see stanza 166 also), i.e., that *Jīva* is not bonded again by *Karma-Bhāva*. [In the language of *Karaṇānuyoga*, this applies to *Kṣāyika-SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* who does not become *MithyāDr̥ṣṭi* again.]

पुढवीपिंडसमाणा पुव्वणिबद्धा दु पच्चया तस्स ।

कम्मसरीरेण दु ते बद्धा सव्वे वि णाणिस्स ॥169॥

Puḍhavīpiṇḍasamāṇā puvvaṇibaddhā du paccayā tassa.

Kammasarīreṇa du te baddhā savve vi ṇāṇissa. ॥169॥

पृथ्वीपिंडसमानाः पूर्वनिबद्धास्तु प्रत्ययास्तस्य ।

कर्मशरीरेण तु ते बद्धाः सर्वेऽपि ज्ञानिनः ॥169॥

To an enlightened being all the previously bonded *Karma* (*Pratyaya*) assembled as *Kārmika* body are like a clod of clay. [169]

Annotation

Let us consider a person who has just become a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* (enlightened). Immediately after becoming enlightened, the shedding of all the previously bonded *Kārmika* dust does not take place. The soul remains associated with the previously bonded *Kārmika* dust corresponding to four or lesser than four types of *Pratyaya*. For example, with a *Upāsama SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* all the four types of *Pratyaya* remain associated with the soul (see stanzas 51 and 164 for the description of the four types of *Pratyaya*).

As discussed in stanza 166, an enlightened being does not become the doer of any activity of mind or body. He is free from any new bonding. Therefore, one can say that the existence of the above mentioned *Kārmika* dust related with *Pratyaya* does not have any effect on an enlightened soul. In other words, one can say that the material *Kārmika Pratyaya* associated with a

SamyagDr̥ṣṭi (enlightened) are ineffective just like a clod of clay.

चउविह अणेयभेयं बंधंते णाणदंसणगुणेहिं ।

समए समए जम्हा तेण अबंधो ति णाणी दु ॥170॥

जम्हा दु जहण्णादो णाणगुणादो पुणो वि परिणमदि ।

अण्णत्तं णाणगुणो तेण दु सो बंधगो भणिदो ॥171॥

दंसणणाणचरित्तं जं परिणमदे जहण्णभावेण ।

णाणी तेण दु बज्झदि पोग्गलकम्मेण विविहेण ॥172॥

Cauviha aṇeyabheyaṃ bandhante ṇāṇadaṃsaṇaguṇehiṃ.

Samae samae jamhā teṇa abandho ti ṇāṇī du. ॥170॥

Jamhā du jahaṇṇādo ṇāṇaguṇādo puṇo vi pariṇamadi.

Aṇṇattam ṇāṇaguno teṇa du so bandhago bhaṇido. ॥171॥

Daṃsaṇaṇāṇacarittam jam pariṇamade jahaṇṇabhāveṇa.

Ṇāṇī teṇa du bajjhadi poggalakammeṇa viviheṇa. ॥172॥

चतुर्विधा अनेकभेदं बध्नन्ति ज्ञानदर्शनगुणाभ्याम् ।

समये समये यस्मात् तेनाबंध इति ज्ञानी तु ॥170॥

यस्मात्तु जघन्यात् ज्ञानगुणात् पुनरपि परिणमते ।

अन्यत्वं ज्ञानगुणः तेन तु स बंधको भणितः ॥171॥

दर्शनज्ञानचारित्रं यत्परिणमते जघन्यभावेन ।

ज्ञानी तेन तु बध्यते पुद्गलकर्मणा विविधेन ॥172॥

At every moment, [to an unenlightened] four types of *Pratyaya* become cause of various kinds of bonding by [the erroneous state of the] knowledge (*Jñāna*) and perception (*Darśana*) attributes. Therefore, an enlightened being is free from [new] bonding. [170]

[At spiritual levels far from perfection,] due to low level of the knowledge attribute, the [level] of knowledge attribute fluctuates to different levels. It is [also] regarded as the cause of bonding. [171]

Because of the manifestation of the knowledge, perception,

and conduct attributes in their low level states, an enlightened being [at a spiritual level far from perfection] gets bonded with various types of material *Karma*. [172]

Annotation

In case of a worldly living being, not in the bliss state, there happens disturbance or fluctuation in the state of the soul. Without such disturbance, the soul would have become omniscient and have been in the perfect blissful state. The disturbance is also evident from the fact that the soul's attention shifts from one object to another. The soul's attention shifts from the Self. The magnitude of disturbance depends on the imperfection in the knowledge, perception, and conduct attributes. Such disturbance of the Self is continuously recorded in the '*Kārmika* Bank account'. Technically, stanza 171 reveals that even by such disturbance in the soul the *Kārmika* bonding takes place. As explained earlier, in case of an enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) the magnitude of duration (*Sthiti*) and intensity (*Anubhāga*) of such bonding is much less as compared to that of a spiritually ignorant (*MithyāDrṣṭi*). It may be added that though an *Arahanta* has one *Pratyaya* named *Yoga*, yet he is completely free from the new bonding because he is in the supreme state of perfection of knowledge, perception, and conduct attributes.

Question: Stanza 170 points out that an enlightened being with or without imperfections is free from the new *Kārmika* bonding whereas stanza 172 points out that an enlightend being far from spiritual perfection gets bonded with new material *Karma*? How can one resolve this apparent contradiction?

Answer: Due to very little amount of the new *Kārmika* bonding an enlightened person even far from spiritual perfection is called free from the new bonding. However, the new bonding is not zero to such enlightened being. In this regard the following points may also be helpful.

(i) One may think of smallness of the new bonding of an enlightened being (*SamyagDṛṣṭi*) as compared to the bonding that happens to a spiritually ignorant being (*MithyāDṛṣṭi*) with the fruition (*Udaya*) of four *Pratyaya*. It may be recalled that an enlightened being does not have fruition of *Mithyātva Pratyaya*. Thus an enlightened being has fruition of three or lesser than three types of *Pratyaya*. In case of an enlightened householder in 4th *Guṇasthāna* involved in various worldly activities, the bonding of various kinds of *Karma Prakṛti* (43 *Karma Prakṛti*) does not take place and the bonding of various kinds of *Karma Prakṛti* (77 *Karma Prakṛti*) takes place such that duration and intensity of the bonding is much less as compared to that of a spiritually ignorant being (**Reference:** For example, refer to commentary of stanzas 173-176 written by Ācārya Jayasena in *Tātparyavṛtti*). Due to these facts even an enlightened householder with the fruition of three or two *Pratyaya* with small bonding can be considered as the soul relatively free from new bonding.

(ii) No doubt, the soul of an enlightened being far from perfection gets bonded, but the new bonding is not induced by the Self due to his non-attachment with the inclination of liking (*Rāga*) and disliking (*Dveṣa*) as explained in stanzas 166-167. Therefore, he is called as a non-doer of bonding. We shall have more about this point in stanza 176.

(iii) A worldly example may also be helpful here. Let a person in the past had borrowed a large sum of money from a commercial Bank. Suppose by now he has paid a large portion of the debt and has stopped taking any new debt. Further suppose, he is also trying to reduce his existing debt by regular payments. However, in the account books of such a person there would still be debit entries due to the small amount of interest on the small amount of unpaid loan. But

what would the bank say about such person? Even with such debit entries of interest, the Bank may say that he is not taking any new loan and he is repaying his debt.

सव्वे पुव्वणिबद्धा दु पच्चया अत्थि सम्मदिट्ठिस्स ।

उवओगप्पाओगं बंधंते कम्मभावेण ॥173॥

होदूण णिरुवभोज्जा तह बंधदि जह हवन्ति उवभोज्जा ।

सत्तट्ठविहा भूदा णाणावरणादिभावेहिं ॥174॥

संता दु णिरुवभोज्जा बाला इत्थी जहेह पुरिसस्स ।

बंधदि ते उवभोज्जे तरुणी इत्थी जह णरस्स ॥175॥

एदेण कारणेण दु सम्मादिट्ठी अबंधगो भणिदो ।

आसवभावाभावे ण पच्चया बंधगा भणिदा ॥176॥

Savve puvvaṇibaddhā du paccayā atthi sammādiṭṭhiṣṣa.

Uvaogappāogam bandhante kammabhāveṇa. ||173||

Hodūṇa ṇiruvabhojjā taha bandhadi jaha havanti uvabhojjā.

Sattaṭṭhavihā bhūda ṇāṇāvaraṇādibhāvehim. ||174||

Santā du ṇiruvabhojjā bālā itthī jaheha purisassa.

Bandhadi te uvabhojje taruṇī itthī jaha ṇarassa. ||175||

Edeṇa kāraṇeṇa du sammādiṭṭhī abandhago bhaṇido.

Āsavabhāvābhāve ṇa paccayā bandhagā bhaṇidā. ||176||

सर्वे पूर्वनिबद्धास्तु प्रत्ययाः संति सम्यग्दृष्टेः ।

उपयोगप्रायोग्यं बध्नन्ति कर्मभावेन ॥173॥

भूत्वा निरुपभोग्यानि तथा बध्नाति यथा भवन्त्युपभोग्यानि ।

सप्ताष्टविधानि भूतानि ज्ञानावरणादिभावैः ॥174॥

सन्ति तु निरुपभोग्यानि बाला स्त्री यथेह पुरुषस्य ।

बध्नाति तानि उपभोग्यानि तरुणी स्त्री यथा नरस्य ॥175॥

एतेन कारणेन तु सम्यग्दृष्टिर्बंधको भणितः ।

आस्रवभावाभावे न प्रत्यया बंधका भणिताः ॥176॥

All the previously bonded *Karma* [even] in association with the soul of an enlightened being may become the cause of new

bonding [on their fruition]. [But] the bonding happens in accordance with the *Karma Bhāva* of the soul in response [to the arising *Karma*]. [173]

Initially, they (the bonded *Karma* in existence) are not operative. But when they become mature they result in the [new] bonding of seven or eight types of *Karma* such as *Jñānāvaraṇīya Karma*-etc., in accordance with the soul's response to them. [174]

[The bonded *Karma* in existence] are non-functional just as a [married] female child is unfit for the man (her husband) for consummation; and those *Karma* become functional on maturity just as the same female attracts the man when she becomes adult [provided the man takes interest]. [175]

Therefore, an enlightened being [without any attachment with *Karma*] is called as the non-doer of bonding. Without *Āsrava Bhāva* (soul's inclination of liking, disliking, and owning others), *Pratyaya Karma* [cannot cause bonding and, therefore,] are not regarded as the cause of bonding. [176]

Annotation

Regarding the new *Kārmika* bonding the following points are to be considered: (a) Existence of the previously bonded *Karma*, (b) Fruition of the *Karma*, and (c) *Āsrava Bhāva* or *Karma Bhāva*.

The existing previously bonded *Kārmika* dust leads to new bonding only when it comes in fruition and the *Jīva* at that moment of fruition has *Āsrava Bhāva*. This point is being explained by Ācārya Kundakunda through an analogy: Suppose, a female child gets married with a man. (Such a marriage is not common in the modern times but here we consider as an analogy provided by Ācārya Kundakunda to clarify the point.) Ācārya Kundakunda writes in stanza 175 that the consummation of the marriage by the husband cannot happen till she becomes adult; and even after her maturity when she attracts him then the union between the two cannot happen without the interest of the man.

In the same way, the circumstances generated by the fruition of the pre-existing *Karma* cannot result into the new *Kārmika* bonding if the soul does not have *Āsrava Bhāva*. In stanza 174, *Ācārya Kundakunda* explains that the bonding happens in accordance with the response of the soul to the external circumstances created by the fruition of *Karma*. With *Āsrava Bhāva* bonding takes place, and without *Āsrava Bhāva* there cannot be *Kārmika* bonding.

Ācārya Kundakunda then states in stanza 176 that in view of the above mentioned facts, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* cannot be called as doer of new bonding because he does not have *Āsrava Bhāva*. One can also say that in absence of *Āsrava Bhāva* of the *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*, the *Pratyaya* responsible for bringing the external circumstances at that moment do not lead to any bonding.

Question: What do we mean by *Āsrava Bhāva*?

Answer: The *Bhāva* of a *Jīva* responsible for the bonding are known as *Āsrava Bhāva*. *Moha*, *Rāga*, and *Dveṣa* are *Āsrava Bhāva*. Delusion about the Self is *Moha*. The word *Moha* includes the ignorance regarding the line of demarcation between the Self and non-Self. This also includes the ignorance about the role of the Self. To consider others as beneficial to the soul is *Rāga*, and to consider others as harmful to the soul is *Dveṣa*. We shall discuss about *Rāga* and *Dveṣa* in more detail in the next stanza (stanza 177). *Rāga* and *Dveṣa* terms have broader meaning but at present we focus on the meaning relevant to the present and next stanzas.

Question: Stanza 174 says about the bonding of seven or eight types of *Karma*. What is the significance of seven or eight?

Answer: Basically there are eight types of *Karma* (see Appendix-6). Out of eight, life-span-determining-*Karma* (*Āyu Karma*) gets bonded only once in a lifetime. Therefore, for most of the times the new bonding with seven types of *Karma* takes place;

and at the moment of bonding with the life-span-determining-*Karma*, the bonding with eight types of *Karma* takes place.

Question: Besides the analogy of the married female child, is there any technical detail regarding the requirement of some time for a bonded *Karma* to become operative?

Answer: Yes, the following description included in Appendix-6 is worth noting: “At the time of bonding the *Karma* gets bonded for a specified time period known as ‘*Sthiti*’. This duration depends on the *Prakṛti* of the *Karma* as well as on *Kaṣāya* that is responsible for the bonding. There are some schemes of depositing money in a financial institution under which the deposited money cannot be released for some time, and after completing that period it is continuously released in many installments. Thus there are two times: (i) when the release starts, and (ii) when the whole deposit is released. In case of *Karma* also there are two types of times: (i) The time that bonded *Karma* do not come in fruition or the time after which the release starts. It is known as *Ābādhā* time or *Ābādhā Kāla*, and (ii) the time when the final installment is released. It is known as *Sthiti*.”

Technically, in short, *Ābādhā* time or *Ābādhā Kāla* of any bonded *Karma* is the time required for the bonded *Karma* to become mature, i.e., a bonded *Karma* starts giving fruits only after the completion of its *Ābādhā* time.

रागो दोसो मोहो य आसवा णत्थि सम्मदिट्ठिस्स ।

तम्हा आसवभावेण विणा हेदू ण पच्चया होति ॥177॥

हेदू चदुव्वियप्पो अट्ठवियप्पस्स कारणं भणिदं ।

तेसिं पि य रागादी तेसिमभावे ण बज्झंति ॥178॥

Rāgo doso moho ya āsavā ṇatthi sammādiṭṭhissa.

Tamhā āsavabhāveṇa viṇā hedū ṇa paccayā hoṃti. ||177||

Hedu caduvviyappo aṭṭhaviyappassa kāraṇam bhaṇidam.

Tesim pi ya rāgādī tesimabhāve na bajjhanti. ||178||

रागो द्वेषो मोहश्च आस्रवा न संति सम्यग्दृष्टेः ।

तस्मादास्रवभावेन विना हेतवो न प्रत्यया भवन्ति ||177||

हेतुश्चतुर्विकल्पः अष्टविकल्पस्य कारणं भणितम् ।

तेषामपि च रागादयस्तेषामभावे न बध्यन्ते ||178||

A *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not possess inclination for attachment (*Rāga*), aversion (*Dveṣa*), and delusion (*Moha*). Therefore, without these *Āsrava Bhāva* the *Pratyaya* cannot cause [new] bonding. [177]

Four types [of *Pratyaya*] have been mentioned as cause of bonding of eight types [of *Karma*]. However, without *Rāga*-etc. there cannot be any [new] bonding. [178]

Annotation

These two stanzas explicitly describe the following facts which have also been mentioned earlier in this chapter:

- (i) Inclination for attachment (*Rāga*), aversion (*Dveṣa*), and delusion (*Moha*) are *Āsrava Bhāva*.
- (ii) An enlightened person (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) realizes that he is not the owner or doer of these *Āsrava Bhāva*.
- (iii) Four *Pratyaya*, as described in stanza 164, are considered as the cause of new bonding of *Karma*. *Āsrava Bhāva* is essential for the new *Kārmika* bonding. In absence of *Āsrava Bhāva* there cannot be any new *Kārmika* bonding to a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*.

Question: Let us consider a householder *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* in fourth *Guṇasthāna*. He may be engaged in trade, business, service, military job, or some other occupation. How can he/she do such worldly jobs without *Āsrava Bhāva*? Is it possible to protect one's family, property, and job without any liking (*Rāga*) and disliking (*Dveṣa*)?

Answer: Let us consider an example. We know that the President

of a country can play the role of the President keeping in mind his own private life and without considering the assets of the nation as his personal assets. In the same way, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* gets involved with worldly tasks as a person while recognizing the presence of soul and identifying oneself with the soul. A *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* householder acts as a person keeping in mind his own privacy as a soul. Further, he does not consider the assets and liabilities of the person as the assets and liabilities of the soul. As a person, the President knows that his official residence is not his personal property. In the same way a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* knows that the physical body belonging to his personality is neither a liability nor an asset of the soul (Self). The President seriously participates in making and executing the budget of the nation. But as a person he knows that any negative or positive balance of the national budget does not affect his personal bank account. In the same way, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* person takes care of his personal finance and other aspects but at the same time he knows that any loss or gain of the money is not going to make his real-self (Self or soul) richer or poorer.

In technical language, liking (*Rāga*) for the official profit and progress, and disliking (*Dveṣa*) for the official loss and deterioration are not owned by the honest President as a person. Similarly, liking (*Rāga*) for the personal profit and progress, and disliking (*Dveṣa*) for the personal loss and deterioration belonging to the person are not owned by a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* as a soul. This describes the absence of *Rāga* and *Dveṣa* of a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* while doing the worldly tasks as a person. In this regard, it is important to note that as a person a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* householder participates in various virtuous acts with enthusiasm but as a soul he does not consider oneself as the owner or doer of such acts. It may also be noted that the realization of the difference in the role as a President

and the role as a person does not adversely affect the President's role. Similarly, the realization of the difference between the role as a person and the role as a soul does not adversely affect one's life.

This analogy can be stretched one step further. To do so, we may consider an example of a President who is also a *SamyagDṛṣṭi*. Such a person owns and signs for the official account as a President; as a person he does not own the official money but he owns the salary of the President deposited in his personal account; and as a soul he neither owns the official account nor the personal account. On many occasions, all the three roles can go together. While attending an official dinner, he attends as a President, the eaten food goes to his (person's) stomach, and the soul acts as an observer (beyond mind and body).

Question: If a *SamyagDṛṣṭi* in fourth *Guṇasthāna* is free from any new bonding then why do *Tīrthaṃkara* preach us to adopt additional restrictions and renunciation to progress beyond 4th *Guṇasthāna*.

Answer: (i) As stated earlier in stanzas 171 and 172, a *SamyagDṛṣṭi* in fourth *Guṇasthāna* is not totally free from the new bonding.

(ii) Let us again consider the example of the President of a country. If a person recognizes and honors the difference between his personal property and the official/national property then he would be respected as an honest person. On the other hand, if the President deposits the official money in his personal account, due to ignorance or due to disrespect for the truth (law), then he gets lessons/punishment as per law. No doubt, the honesty is highly valuable and it is the first essential quality for a person taking the oath of the office of the President. But the honesty alone is not sufficient to make

him an effective President and a happy person. Besides the qualities of a good President, he is also advised to take care of his personal health and family life. He is also advised to forget the pressure of his office by spending regularly some time in his home. This is not the wastage of time for the President. It makes him more efficient as a President. Parallel to this analogy, spiritual teachers also teach the following to balance the personal and spiritual life:

(a) One should learn and realize the difference between the role of a person and the permanent role of a soul. One should identify oneself as a soul. (This corresponds to a state of a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* of 4th *Guṇasthāna*.) In the analogy of the President, this situation corresponds to the honesty or the realization of the difference between the personal wealth and the national wealth by the President.

(b) In addition to the honesty, the care of personal health and spending some time in the home given in the analogy of the President can be used as follows: One should take care of one's own spiritual health and should spend some time in *one's own spiritual home* (Self). This corresponds to stopping worldly personal activities for some time, spending some time with the spiritual-family (spiritual teachers, spiritual colleagues, etc.), and getting tuned to the Self by way of prayer, worship, meditation, staying-in-the-Self, etc. with some vows. This state corresponds to 5th or higher *Guṇasthāna*. As compared to the state of 4th *Guṇasthāna*, in this higher state there is peace of higher kind. After attainment of 4th *Guṇasthāna* such taste of peace of higher kind and other spiritual developments follow in due course of time (not necessarily in one lifetime). Water from a hill top comes down (by gravity) by directing it to a path leading to the downward slope. In the same way, after being in the right

path, the spiritual journey does not require burdening efforts (see *ĀtmaKhyāti Kalaśa* 94). In other words, the realization of the truth about the Self is like crossing the barrier. After crossing the barrier, further spiritual progress is like the journey of water on a downward slope.

(iii) For more details, the answer of the next technical question may also be helpful.

Technical question:

(This technical question and its answer may be ignored in the first reading). If a householder *SamyagDrṣṭi* is free from *Āsrava Bhāva* and free from the new bonding then what is the spiritual difference, in the technical language of scriptures, between a householder *SamyagDrṣṭi* and a saint who has renounced the world?

Technical answer:

(i) Drinking water filtered by the reverse osmosis procedure (RO water) is called as pure water and the distilled water meant for injection is also pure water. But both are not of equal purity. In the eyes of a nano-scientist or molecular physicist neither of these is perfectly pure. Same can be said about the absence of the new bonding of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* in 4th *Guṇasthāna* and 6th *Guṇasthāna*.

(ii) As discussed in the answer of the previous question, a person in 6th and 7th *Guṇasthāna* (one who is a *SamyagDrṣṭi* and has also renounced the world) experiences a higher degree of peace as compared to that experienced by a householder *SamyagDrṣṭi*.

(iii) *Rāga* and *Dveṣa* are due to *Kaṣāya*. *Kaṣāya* are of four types: anger, ego, deceit, and greed. Each type of *Kaṣāya* is of four kinds: *Anantānubandhī*, *Apratyākhyāna*, *Pratyākhyāna*, and *Samjvalana*. Thus in a simple language one can say that there are four kinds of *Rāga* and *Dveṣa*. These are:

Anantānubandhī Rāga/Dveṣa, *Apratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa*, *Pratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa*, and *Samjvalana Rāga/Dveṣa*.

A *SamyagDrṣṭi* person in 4th *Guṇasthāna* does not have *Anantānubandhī Rāga/Dveṣa* but he remains associated with other three kinds. The new bonding in case of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* is very small due to absence of *Anantānubandhī Rāga/Dveṣa*, but the same is not zero due to the association of these three types of *Rāga/Dveṣa*. Due to the presence of *Apratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa* one cannot take vows of a high class disciplined householder.

A *SamyagDrṣṭi* householder in 5th *Guṇasthāna* does not have *Anantānubandhī Rāga/Dveṣa* and *Apratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa*. Due to the absence of *Apratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa*, the level of purity of such person is higher and the new *Kārmika* bonding is lesser than that of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* in 4th *Guṇasthāna*. Further, due to the presence of *Pratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa* one cannot renounce all the worldly possessions.

A *SamyagDrṣṭi* in monkhood in 6th and 7th *Guṇasthāna* does not have *Anantānubandhī Rāga/Dveṣa*, *Apratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa*, and *Pratyākhyāna Rāga/Dveṣa*. Due to the absence of these three kinds of *Rāga/Dveṣa*, the level of purity of such person is higher and the new *Kārmika* bonding is lesser than that of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* in 5th *Guṇasthāna*. Further, due to the presence of *Samjvalana Rāga/Dveṣa* the new bonding is not perfectly zero. (These technical details have also been described by Ācārya Jayasena in *Tātparyavṛtti* in connection with these stanzas.)

जह पुरिसेणाहारो गहिदो परिणमदि सो अणेयविहं ।

मंसवसारुहिरादी भावे उदरगिसंजुतो ॥179॥

तह णाणिस्स दु पुव्वं जे बद्धा पच्चया बहुवियप्पं ।

बज्जंते कम्मं ते णयपरिहीणा दु ते जीवा ॥180॥

Jaha puriseṇāhāro gahido pariṇamadi so aṇeyaviham.

Maṃsavasaṛuhirādī bhāve udarggisaṇjutto. ||179||

Taha ṇāṇissa du puvvam je baddhā paccayā bahuvīyappam.

Bajjhante kammam te ṇayaparihiṇā du te jīvā. ||180||

यथा पुरुषेणाहारो गृहीतः परिणमति सोऽनेकविधम् ।

मांसवसारुधिरादीन् भावान् उदरामिसंयुक्तः ॥179॥

तथा ज्ञानिनस्तु पूर्वं ये बद्धाः प्रत्यया बहुविकल्पम् ।

बध्नन्ति कर्म ते नयपरिहीनास्तु ते जीवाः ॥180॥

Just as the food eaten by a person transforms into flesh, blood, fat, etc. when that gets [appropriately] combined with digestive chemicals present in the stomach [179]; in the same way, the previously bonded *Karma* on their maturity become the cause of bonding of various types of [new] *Karma* to the *Jñānī* who has fallen from the [pure real] point of view. [180]

Annotation

Stanza 179 provides an analogy to explain stanza 180. In this analogy, the food eaten corresponds to the fruition of the previously bonded *Karma*, the conversion of food into flesh, blood, etc. corresponds to the new bonding of seven/eight types of *Karma*, and the presence of digestive chemicals in the stomach (*Udaragni*) corresponds to the presence of the spiritual ignorance due to the lack of understanding of the soul and non-souls from the pure point of view.

Here the following technical details may be helpful:

- (i) The attainment of *SamyagDarśana* is also called as an attainment of enlightenment; and a person with *SamyagDarśana* is called a *SamyagDṛṣṭi* or a *Jñānī* or an enlightened person.
- (ii) All persons in the fourth or higher *Guṇasthāna* are *SamyagDṛṣṭi* or enlightened or *Jñānī* persons.
- (iii) *SamyagDarśana* is of three types: (i) *Upāsama*

SamyagDarśana: Enlightenment with total suppression of belief-deluding *Karma* or spiritual-ignorance-*Karma* (*Darśana Mohaniya Karma*), (ii) *Kṣāyopāśamika Samyag-Darśana*: Enlightenment with some traces of insignificant spiritual ignorance and without total destruction of spiritual-ignorance-*Karma*, and (iii) *Kṣāyika Samyag-Darśana*: Enlightenment with total destruction of spiritual-ignorance-*Karma*.

- (iv) Out of these three, the enlightenment of the third type once achieved exists forever. But the first two types of enlightenment can vanish and may reappear after some short or long time. In the technical language, a person with *Upāśama SamyagDarśana* or *Kṣāyopāśamika Samyag Darśana* may become a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* again. Stanza 180 cautions to avoid such conversion of *SamyagDarśana* into *MithyāDarśana* by not abandoning the pure point of view. This stanza says that if one loses the understanding of the Self and others provided by the pure real point of view then he gets bonded with the new *Karma* (because with such loss he/she becomes a *MithyāDṛṣṭi*). In other words, by forgetting the distinction between the soul and non-souls, as given by the pure point of view, an enlightened being turns back into an un-enlightened being.

There are many characteristics of an enlightened person. Here Ācārya Kundakunda highlights one characteristic that an enlightened being (*Jñānī*) is that who has not fallen from the understanding about the Self and others as provided by the pure real point of view. On the basis of this point, Ācārya Amṛtacandra in *Kalaśa* 122 emphasizes that one should not abandon the pure real point of view.

6

Stoppage of influx of *Karma* (*Samvara*)

उवओगे उवओगो कोहादिसु णत्थि को वि उवओगो ।
कोहो कोहे चेव हि उवओगे णत्थि खलु कोहो ॥181॥
अट्ठवियप्पे कम्मे णोकम्मे चावि णत्थि उवओगो ।
उवओगम्हि य कम्मं णोकम्मं चावि णो अत्थि ॥182॥
एदं दु अविवरीदं णाणं जइया दु होदि जीवस्स ।
तइया ण किंचि कुव्वदि भावं उवओगसुद्धप्पा ॥183॥

Uvaoge uvaogo kohādisu ṇatthi ko vi uvaogo.
Koho kohe ceva hi uvaoge ṇatthi khalu koho. ||181||
Aṭṭhaviyappe kamme ṇokamme cāvi ṇatthi uvaogo.
Uvaogamhi ya kammam ṇokammam cāvi ṇo atthi. ||182||
Edam du avivarīdam nāṇam jaiyā du hodi jivassa.
Taiyā ṇa kiñci kuvvadi bhāvam uvaogasuddhappā. ||183||

उपयोगे उपयोगः क्रोधादिषु नास्ति कोऽप्युपयोगः ।
क्रोधः क्रोधे चैव हि उपयोगे नास्ति खलु क्रोधः ॥181॥
अष्टविकल्पे कर्मणि नोकर्मणि चापि नास्त्युपयोगः ।
उपयोगे च कर्म नोकर्म चापि नो अस्ति ॥182॥
एतत्त्वविपरीतं ज्ञानं यदा तु भवति जीवस्य ।
तदा न किञ्चित्करोति भावमुपयोगशुद्धात्मा ॥183॥

Upayoga (pure cognitive attribute of soul) is in *Upayoga* (soul), it is not in anger etc; and anger is only in anger; certainly, anger is not in *Upayoga* (soul). [181]

Also, *Upayoga* is not in eight types of *Karma* and *NoKarma*; and *Karma* and *NoKarma* are also not in *Upayoga*. [182]

When such un-perverted knowledge prevails in a *Jīva*, then he, as a pure awareness having *Upayoga* attribute, does not become doer of any disposition [of anger etc.]. [183]

Annotation

This chapter is on *Samvara*. *Samvara* is one of the nine elements introduced in stanza 13. There it has been mentioned that the nine elements comprehended from the real point of view amounts to enlightenment (*SamyagDarśana*). As explained there, *Samvara* means stoppage of influx of *Karma*.

For many living beings it is easy to see the combination of perception, knowledge, anger, greed, and other emotions with oneself. But an enlightened person realizes that knowledge and perception are eternal attributes of soul; whereas anger, greed, etc. are not eternal aspects of soul. Knowledge and perception are technically known as *Upayoga*. As explained earlier, [e.g. one may refer to stanza 14], anger, greed, etc. are different from the real attributes of soul. The realization of separation of *Upayoga* and anger, etc. leads to the realization of the true Self described from the pure real point of view. Among the nine elements described in stanza 13, knowledge and perception (*Upayoga*) get placement with *Jīva*; and anger, etc. find placement with *Āsrava*. One may also say that *Upayoga* is Self and anger is non-Self. In this stanza as well as at many places, *Upayoga* is also considered as the synonym of soul.

The knowledge of separateness of the Self and non-Self is technically known as *Bheda-Vijñāna* or the science-of-separation or the science-of-distinction or the science of differentiation.

Samvara is not possible without the science-of-separation (*Bheda-Vijñāna*). Therefore, *Ācārya* Kundakunda provides the description of *Samvara* from the real point of view by highlighting the science-of-separation (*Bheda-Vijñāna*) in the first 12 stanzas of this chapter.

Stanzas 181-183 convey the following points from the real point of view:

- (i) Pure cognitive attribute of soul (*Upayoga*) does not exist in the externals such as physical body (*NoKarma*), emotions (anger-etc.), and the *Kārmika* dust associated with the soul. *Upayoga* manifested as knowledge and perception attributes of the soul is separate and different from anger-etc.
- (ii) Neither anger has knowledge/perception attribute nor knowledge/perception attribute contains anger. Similarly, neither knowledge/perception attribute of soul possesses physical body nor physical body has knowledge/perception attribute of soul.
- (iii) To a common person a mixture of anger and knowledge/perception attributes appears in various activities of a living being. Therefore, he believes that anger contains knowledge/perception attribute and knowledge/perception attribute contains anger. *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that this is a perverted or wrong belief. Similarly, the belief that physical body contains knowledge/perception attribute is also a perverted or wrong belief. When a living being realizes the separation of anger and knowledge/perception attribute in the apparent mixed state, when a living being realizes the separation between the physical body and knowledge/perception attribute even during occupation of the same space points by the physical body and soul, then he has true spiritual knowledge, and

one can say that he is an enlightened person or *Jñānī* or *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*. Such an enlightened person realizes oneself as a soul with knowledge/perception attribute. He realizes the associated anger and associated physical body as separate and different from his real identity (true Self). With such realization he (as a soul) does not become doer of anger or doer of any intention or desire of doing any task of physical body, etc.

- (iv) The use of ‘etc.’ with the word ‘anger’ in stanza 181 shows that other emotions (*Āsrava Bhāva*) are also to be included with the word ‘anger’ in understanding these stanzas.

Question: Does it mean that a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not have any desire of eating food? Does it mean that a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not eat food? Does it mean that a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* never becomes angry?

Answer: If a person sees the non-separateness of the physical body and the soul, then he also sees that the soul is eating food. Such a person not only sees this for himself but also sees for all others. But a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* sees differently. He visualizes the separateness of the soul and physical body even though both occupy the same space (*Lokākāśa Pradeśa*). He also visualizes the desire arising in the mind for the food as well as the act of eating the food. He is also aware of the anger and other emotions arising in the associated physical body and mind. In the midst of all such tasks of his personality he knows the science-of-separateness (*Bheda-Vijñāna*) that reveals the separateness of his soul from emotions as well as physical body. As mentioned earlier, a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* identifies oneself as a soul only, and as a soul he does not become doer of these tasks or doer of intention of doing these tasks. As a soul he becomes simply a knower. In this regard, to avoid any

confusion, discussion presented in stanzas 126-127 and 167 is worth noting. There it has been discussed that a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* becomes owner and doer of *Bhāva Karma*, therefore, he acquires the new *Kārmika* bonding.

Question: Many times we become angry or sad when we get some unexpected disturbing information. How can we say that the knowledge/perception attribute is not the source of anger?

Answer: The information, memory, and emotions associated with mind are not to be confused with the knowledge/perception attribute (*Upayoga*) of the soul. The soul transcends the physical body and mind. Let us consider an analogy of a movie appearing on the screen.

We know that by passing white light through a celluloid movie film the movie appears on the screen. We also know that the movie on the screen is not possible without the white light that passes through the film. However, on the top of all these we know that the celluloid film and the source of white light are separate and different. This analogy may be useful by taking the *Upayoga* of the soul as the white light, the celluloid film as physical body having memory-etc., and the movie screen as the vocal, mental and physical actions of the personality. We understand very well that the white light does not contain any recording of the fire, rain, train, fight, etc. appearing on the movie screen. In the same way, the *Upayoga* does not contain any memory, emotion, physical body, etc.

Through the above mentioned analogy the separateness between the pure *Upayoga* and emotions can be visualized. However, it should be noted that it is just an analogy and cannot be stretched too far. An analogy covers only some aspects. Many aspects such as the link between the emotions and the soul as described by the relative point of view cannot be found in this analogy.

Each *Siddha* is omniscient. The soul of each *Siddha* became a *Siddha* after an infinitely long worldly journey. Souls of different *Siddha* in their past worldly lives have been associated with different experiences and associations, but there does not appear any difference in the omniscience and purity of all *Siddha*. This is possible only if the soul of each *Siddha* remains intact and undamaged during all worldly associations in all the past worldly lives. This implies that the pure cognitive attribute of the soul (*Upayoga*) of a worldly living being remains untouched with various kinds of associated emotions and physical bodies (see Stanzas 14, 15).

जह कणयमगितवियं पि कणयभावं ण तं परिच्चयदि ।

तह कम्मोदयतविदो ण जहदि णाणी दु णाणित्तं ॥184॥

एवं जाणदि णाणी अण्णाणी मुणदि रागमेवादं ।

अण्णाणतमोच्छण्णो आदसहावं अयाणंतो ॥185॥

Jaha kaṇayamaggitaviyaṃ pi kaṇayabhāvaṃ ṇa taṃ pariccayadi.

Taha kammaodayatavido ṇa jahadi ṇāṇi du ṇāṇittam. ॥184॥

Evam jāṇadi ṇāṇi aṇṇāṇi muṇadi rāgamevādam.

Aṇṇāṇatamocchaṇṇo ādasahāvaṃ ayāṇanto. ॥185॥

यथा कनकमग्नितप्तमपि कनकभावं न तं परित्यजति ।

तथा कर्मोदयतप्तो न जहाति ज्ञानी तु ज्ञानित्वम् ॥184॥

एवं जानाति ज्ञानी अज्ञानी मनुते रागमेवात्मानम् ।

अज्ञानतमोऽवच्छन्नः आत्मस्वभावमजानन् ॥185॥

Just as gold does not lose its nature of gold even while it is red hot under fire, in the same way an enlightened being does not lose his knowing-nature even while he is under burning-hardship due to the fruition of [the previously bonded] *Karma*. [184]

An enlightened person knows the above mentioned point, but an ignorant one clouded by the darkness of ignorance considers the inclination of attachment (*Rāga*) as soul because he does not know soul's nature. [185]

Annotation

Here *Ācārya* Kundakunda first describes an analogy of gold under intense fire. It is well known that gold does not lose the nature or qualities of gold by fire. Using this analogy, *Ācārya* Kundakunda explains that an enlightened person realizes that similar to the gold unaffected by fire, his true nature cannot be affected even by the difficult and painful circumstances due to the fruition of the previously bonded *Karma*. *Ācārya* Kundakunda further writes that on the contrary an ignorant living being does not know soul's nature and identifies oneself with his attachments and emotions. Due to such identification an ignorant being realizes that he is in trouble when his possessions and emotions are not in a good shape. Whereas an enlightened being identifies oneself with the eternal soul only; he realizes oneself unaffected by the external conditions, physical body, and emotions.

Stanza 184 conveys a significant point that even an enlightened person may be under severe hardship due to fruition of the previously bonded *Karma*. However, an enlightened person has clear knowledge about the true nature of his Self even during the stressful circumstances. He has an understanding of the science-of-separation; he realizes that he is the soul which is separate from the difficulties associated with his physical body and emotions.

सुद्धं तु वियाणंतो सुद्धं चेवप्पयं लहदि जीवो ।

जाणंतो दु असुद्धं असुद्धमेवप्पयं लहदि ॥186॥

Suddham tu viyāṇanto suddham cevappayam lahadi jīvo.

Jāṇanto du asuddham asuddhamevappayam lahadi. ||186||

शुद्धं तु विजानन् शुद्धं चैवात्मानं लभते जीवः ।

जानंस्त्वशुद्धमशुद्धमेवात्मानं लभते ॥186॥

By knowing the pure nature [of the soul], a *Jīva* attains the pure soul. By knowing that the soul is impure, a *Jīva* attains only impure soul. [186]

Annotation

In the first half of this stanza *Ācārya* Kundakunda conveys that even in the impure state (*Paryāya*) of the soul, the recognition of the true nature of the soul – the purity of the soul – leads to the purity in the state (*Paryāya*) of the soul. Further, the second half emphasizes the importance of this point by saying that the recognition of the false nature of the soul leads to the impurity in the state (*Paryāya*) of the soul. The recognition of the pure nature of the soul is the truth. The awareness of the science-of-separation is the true awareness. The science-of-separation recognizes the soul as pure and distinct from emotions, *Karma*, physical body, etc. [see stanzas 14, 181, 182, etc.].

With this recognition, the new *Kārmika* bonding to an enlightened person does not take place and the decrease in the old *Kārmika* dust takes place. With the continuance of such decrease, soon such soul becomes free from *Kārmika* dust, i.e., the state of the soul becomes pure.

Since the process of stoppage of new *Kārmika* bonding amounts to *Samvara*, therefore, one can say that the realization of the Self as the pure soul different from the emotions, physical body, etc. amounts to *Samvara*.

The next half of the stanza conveys that the *Samvara* cannot be achieved by the recognition of the associated impurities such as emotions and physical body as the soul. In other words, the second half of the stanza explicitly denies the possibility of *Samvara* by identification of the associated emotions as the soul. This fact has also been highlighted by *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra in *ĀtmaKhyāti* in the opening statement related with this stanza 186. In this statement, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra points out that for *Samvara*, the realization of

the soul as pure is necessary. We would come across such emphasis in other stanzas also. For example, in stanzas 201-202 *Ācārya* Kundakunda reveals that acceptance of even an iota of inclination of attachment (*Rāga*) as the soul keeps one away from becoming enlightened.

अप्पाणमप्पणा रुंधिरुण दोपुण्णपावजोगेसु ।
 दंसणणाणमहि ठिदो इच्छाविरदो य अण्णमहि ॥187॥
 जो सव्वसंगमुक्को ज्ञायदि अप्पाणमप्पणो अप्पा ।
 ण वि कम्मं णोकम्मं चेदा चित्तेदि एयत्तं ॥188॥
 अप्पाणं ज्ञायंतो दंसणणाणमओ अण्णमओ ।
 लहदि अचिरेण अप्पाणमेव सो कम्मपविमुक्कं ॥189॥

Appāṇamappaṇā ruṇḍhiṛuṇa dopuṇṇapāvajogesū.

Daṃsaṇaṇāṇamhi ṭhido icchāvirado ya aṇṇamhi. ||187||

Jo savvasaṅgamukko jhāyadi appāṇamappaṇo appā.

Na vi kammam ṇokammam cedā cintedi eyattam. ||188||

Appāṇam jhāyanto daṃsaṇaṇāṇamao aṇaṇṇamao.

Lahadi acireṇa appāṇameva so kammavimukkam. ||189||

आत्मानमात्मना रुन्ध्वा द्विपुण्यपापयोगयोः ।
 दर्शनज्ञाने स्थितः इच्छाविरतश्चान्यस्मिन् ॥187॥
 यः सर्वसंगमुक्तो ध्यायत्यात्मानमात्मनात्मा ।
 नापि कर्म नोकर्म चेतयिता चिंतयत्येकत्वम् ॥188॥
 आत्मानं ध्यायन् दर्शनज्ञानमयोऽनन्यमयः ।
 लभतेऽचिरेणात्मानमेव स कर्मप्रविमुक्तम् ॥189॥

By one's own soul, one who keeps one's soul away from acts of virtue (*Puṇya*) and vice (*Pāpa*); one who abides in perception and knowledge; one who remains isolated from the desires for other things [187]; one who experiences [oneself as] the soul unattached from all the associations; [one who] meditates over soul by the soul; [one who] does not pay any attention to *Karma* and *NoKarma*; [one who] concentrates over the solitariness [188]; [and one who] keeps on immersed in perception and knowledge

and in none other than the Self by being absorbed in the Self; such a being becomes the pure soul free from *Karma* very soon. [189]

Annotation

As mentioned earlier, *Samvara* means stoppage of new *Kārmika* bonding. *Samvara* starts with the realization of the science-of-separation between the soul and non-souls (emotions, *Kārmika* particles, physical body, etc.). With the spiritual advancement an increase in soul's devotion towards the soul takes place. In a highly advanced stage, one gets fully absorbed in the soul. What happens in the state of very high stage of *Samvara*? These stanzas answer this question. Ācārya Kundakunda writes that in a very high stage of *Samvara* one does not get associated with persons or things or desires. Even he does not get involved with any virtuous activity (helping others or praying). Then what does he do? He meditates over the Self. He experiences the solitariness of the Self and gets immersed in the perception and knowledge attributes of the Self. The second half of stanza 189 says that the occurrence of this level of spiritual development indicates that the liberation of such person is going to happen very soon.

तेसिं हेदू भणिदा अज्झवसाणाणि सव्वदरिसीहिं ।

मिच्छत्तं अण्णाणं अविरयभावो य जोगो य ॥190॥

हेदुअभावे णियमा जायदि णाणिस्स आसवणिरोहो ।

आसवभावेण विणा जायदि कम्मस्स वि णिरोहो ॥191॥

कम्मस्साभावेण य णोकम्माणं पि जायदि णिरोहो ।

णोकम्मणिरोहेण य संसारणिरोहणं होदि ॥192॥

Tesim hedū bhaṇidā ajjhasavāsāṇaṇi savvadarisīhim.

Micchattam añṇāṇam avirayabhāvo ya jogo ya. ||190||

Heduabhāve ṇiyamā jāyadi ṇāṇissa āsavaṇiroho.

Āsavabhāveṇa viṇā jāyadi kammaṣa vi ṇiroho. ||191||

Kammasābhāveṇa ya ṇokammāṇam pi jāyadi ṇiroho.

Nokammañiroheṇa ya saṃsārañirohaṇam hodi. ||192||

तेषां हेतवो भणिता अध्यवसानानि सर्वदर्शिभिः ।

मिथ्यात्वमज्ञानमविरतभावश्च योगश्च ||190||

हेत्वभावे नियमाज्जायते ज्ञानिन आस्रवनिरोधः ।

आस्रवभावेन विना जायते कर्मणोऽपि निरोधः ||191||

कर्मणोऽभावेन च नो कर्मणामपि जायते निरोधः ।

नो कर्मनिरोधेन च संसारनिरोधनं भवति ||192||

Adhyavasāna – false belief (*Mithyātva*), spiritual ignorance (*Ajñāna*), lack of self restraint (*Avirati*), and mental-physical-vocal activities (*Yoga*) – have been described by omniscient lords as the source of them (psychic-*Kārmika* influx). [190]

As a rule, the absence of these in a *Jñānī* leads to the blockage of psychic-*Kārmika* influx (*Āsrava Bhāva*), and the absence of *Āsrava Bhāva* leads to the blockage of material-*Kārmika* influx [191].

The absence of material-*Kārmika* bonding leads to the blockage of *NoKarma*, and the absence of *NoKarma* leads to the stoppage of the worldly wandering. [192]

Annotation

In these stanzas *Ācārya* Kundakunda explains the sequence of cause-effect relationship that is responsible for the stoppage of the cycles of birth and death. The finest level of *Samvara* is that which blocks all the worldly sufferings and leads to liberation or bliss forever. In these three stanzas it has been explained that by the absence of *Adhyavasāna* one can achieve the liberation.

False belief (*Mithyātva*), spiritual ignorance (*Ajñāna*), lack of self restraint (*Avirati*), and mental-physical-vocal activities (*Yoga*), all these are *Adhyavasāna*. These are different and separate from the eternal soul stuff (*Dravya*). This realization is called the realization of the science-of-separation (*Bheda-Vijñāna*). While explaining these stanzas, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra in *ĀtmaKhyāti*

writes that the realization of the Self through the realization of the science-of-separation leads to the absence of *Adhyavasāna*. Further, through stanzas 191 and 192 we learn that the absence of these leads to the blockage of *Āsrava Bhāva* (inclination of attachment, inclination of aversion, and delusion about Self and others); without *Āsrava Bhāva* there cannot be *Kārmika* bonding; and without *Kārmika* bonding there cannot be any physical body that becomes the source of worldly suffering (pain and pleasure).

Since the science-of-separation (*Bheda-Vijñāna*) described in the first six stanzas in this chapter is the key of *Samvara*, this chapter on *Samvara* has been concluded by Ācārya Amṛtacandra in *ĀtmaKhyāti* by *Kalaśa* 131 and 132 with an emphasis on the importance of the science-of-separation. In *Kalaśa* 131, Ācārya Amṛtacandra very nicely summarizes the significance of the science-of-separation (*Bheda-Vijñāna*):- he writes that all liberated souls got liberation by the realization of the science-of-separation, and all beings who have not yet realized the science-of-separation are suffering from the worldly bondage.

Shedding of *Karma* (*Nirjarā*)

उवभोगमिन्दियेहिं दव्वाणमचेदणाणमिदराणं ।

जं कुणदि सम्मदिट्ठी तं सव्वं णिज्जरणिमित्तं ॥193॥

Uvabhogamindiyehim dāvvaṇamacedaṇāṇamidarāṇam.

Jam kuṇaḍi sammadiṭṭhi taṁ savvaṁ ṇijjaraṇimittam. ||193||

उपभोगमिन्द्रियैः द्रव्याणामचेतनानामितरेषाम् ।

यत्करोति सम्यग्दृष्टिः तत्सर्वं निर्जरानिमित्तम् ॥193॥

To an enlightened being every experience of association or consumption (*Upabhoga*) of animate or inanimate object through the senses becomes the cause of shedding of *Karma* (*Nirjarā*).
[193]

Annotation

At every moment the *Karma* which come in fruition give rise to some experience to the living being. Immediately after that these *Karma* responsible for that experience get detached from the soul. Such detachment takes place at every moment to every worldly living being whether *MithyāDṛṣṭi* or *SamyagDṛṣṭi*. However, while experiencing the *Kārmika* fruition a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* realizes oneself as the owner and doer of that experience. Therefore, a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* gets bonded with the new *Karma*. Thus the advantage of detachment of the old *Karma* is lost by the bonding of the new *Karma* in case of a *MithyāDṛṣṭi*. But as explained in stanzas 71, 166, 176, etc., an enlightened being (*SamyagDṛṣṭi*) does not

become owner or doer of any experience associated with mind and body, therefore, he does not attract new *Kārmika* bonding. Thus, in case of a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*, *Karma* which come in fruition at every moment get detached after delivering the fruits, and the new *Kārmika* bonding does not take place. Therefore, there is a decrease in the net stock of the bonded *Karma*. In short, we can say that in case of an enlightened being (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) there is shedding of *Karma* or decrease in the stock of the bonded *Karma* or *Nirjarā* at every moment even while he/she experiences association of animate or inanimate objects through the senses as per *Kārmika* fruition.

दव्वे उवभुंजंते णियमा जायदि सुहं व दुक्खं वा ।
तं सुहदुक्खमुदिण्णं वेददि अध णिज्जरं जादि ॥194॥

Davve uvabhuñjante ñiyamā jāyadi suham va dukkham vā.

Tam suhadukkhamudiṇṇam vedadi adha ñijjaram jādi. ||194||

द्रव्ये उपभुज्यमाने नियमाज्जायते सुखं वा दुःखं वा ।

तत्सुखदुःखमुदीर्णं वेदयते अथ निर्जरां याति ॥194॥

As per [*Kārmika*] laws, the experience of association or consumption (*Upabhoga*) produces pain or pleasure. [A worldly living being] experiences pain or pleasure [due to the fruition of the previously bonded *Karma*] which then get shedded. [194]

Annotation

This stanza conveys the following:

- (i) Due to the fruition of the previously bonded *Karma* a living being experiences association or consumption of animate or inanimate objects.
- (ii) The association or consumption of external objects due to the fruition of the previously bonded *Karma* produces the feelings and thoughts of pain or pleasure.
- (iii) The feelings and thoughts of pain or pleasure get dissociated after that experience.

These points imply that thoughts and feelings occur as per fruition of *Karma*. The previous stanza refers to the shedding of the material *Karma* (known as *Dravya-Nirjarā*) whereas this stanza focuses on the shedding of *Kārmika* thoughts and feelings, i.e., *Bhāva-Nirjarā*.

This stanza applies to all worldly beings whether *MithyāDṛṣṭi* or *SamyagDṛṣṭi*. However, in view of the previous stanza and the following six stanzas it may be added that in case of an enlightened being (*SamyagDṛṣṭi*), at every moment, the shedding of the *Karma* takes place after their fruition without new bonding.

जह विसमुवभुंजंतो वेज्जो पुरिसो ण मरणमुवयादि ।
 पोगलकम्मस्सुदयं तह भुंजदि णेव बज्झदे णाणी ॥195॥
 जह मज्जं पिबमाणो अरदीभावेण मज्जदि ण पुरिसो ।
 दव्वुवभोगे अरदो णाणी वि ण बज्झदि तहेव ॥196॥

Jaha visamuvabhuñjanto vejjo puriso ṇa maraṇamuvayādi.
Poggalakammassudayam taha bhuñjadi ṇeva bajjhade ṇāṇī. ||195||
Jaha majjam pibamāṇo aradībhāveṇa majjadi ṇa puriso.
Davvuvabhoge arado ṇāṇī vi ṇa bajjhadi taheva. ||196||

यथा विषमुपभुंजानो वैद्यः पुरुषो न मरणमुपयाति ।
 पुद्गलकर्मण उदयं तथा भुंक्ते नैव बध्यते ज्ञानी ॥195॥
 यथा मद्यं पिबन् अरतिभावेन माद्यति न पुरुषः ।
 द्रव्योपभोगेऽरतो ज्ञान्यपि न बध्यते तथैव ॥196॥

Just as a medical practitioner does not die by using poison [in a medically appropriate way], in the same way by experiencing the fruits of the previously bonded material *Karma* an enlightened being does not get bonded. [195]

Just as a [special] person taking wine without any longing does not become intoxicated, in the same way by consuming things without any longing for them an enlightened being does not get bonded. [196]

Annotation

These two stanzas provide valuable analogies to support the

point described in stanza 193. *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that just as a medical doctor does not die due to the appropriate handling of poisonous medicine, or just as there may be some special persons who do not get intoxicated by the intake of some amount of wine without any desire for getting intoxicated, in the same way an enlightened being (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) does not get bonded with the new *Kārmika* bonding even while he/she is engaged in experiencing or consuming the animate or inanimate object as the fruits of the previously bonded *Karma*.

It is very rare and difficult to survive after consuming poison and it is also very rare and difficult to remain sober after taking wine. In this sense these rare analogies convey that it is very rare and difficult for a worldly being to remain un-bonded with new *Karma* at the time of experiencing the fruits of the previously bonded *Karma*. *Ācārya* Kundakunda writes that such rare events happen only to the spiritually developed beings who realize that they are not the owner or doer of the actions of body and mind.

Through these two stanzas *Ācārya* Kundakunda also wants to show that just as it is not impossible for some persons to survive even after consuming poison or just as it is not impossible for some persons to remain sober even after consuming wine without any desire to get intoxicated, in the same way it is not impossible for some special living beings to be free from new *Kārmika* bonding even while consuming or experiencing the fruits of the previously bonded *Karma*. Who are such special ones? As discussed earlier, *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that enlightened beings (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* or *Jñānī*) have such special characteristics.

सेवंतो वि ण सेवदि असेवमाणो वि सेवगो कोई ।

पगरणचेट्ठा कस्स वि ण य पायरणो त्ति सो होदि ॥197॥

Sevanto vi ṇa sevadi asevamāṇo vi sevago koī.

Pagaraṇaceṭṭhā kassa vi ṇa ya pāyaraṇo tti so hodi. ||197||

सेवमानोऽपि न सेवते असेवमानोऽपि सेवकः कश्चित् ।

प्रकरणचेष्टा कस्यापि न च प्राकरण इति स भवति ॥१९७॥

Some do not indulge [in a task] even while participating [in that task]; some indulge [in a task] even while not participating [in that task]. [For example, an employee] does a task [for his employer] but does not become the real doer [by not becoming the owner]. [197]

Annotation

It is well known that the profit or loss of a transaction carried out by an employee on behalf of the employer goes to the employer. An employer may not physically involve in the act of the transaction but owns the outcome. Even at the time of performing the work the employee knows that he is not the real owner or doer. He does it on behalf of the employer for the employer.

Here *Ācārya* Kundakunda wants to explain that someone may appear to be the doer but he may not be the real doer. Similarly, someone may not appear to be the doer but may be the real doer.

An enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) may appear to be involved with the tasks of his physical body but as a soul he does not become the owner or doer of such tasks. He identifies oneself with the soul. He does not become the owner of the actions of his physical body.

A *MithyāDrṣṭi* also has the soul of the same nature. In real sense, the soul of a *MithyāDrṣṭi* also is not the doer of the actions of the physical body, but he is not aware of this fact. He falsely identifies oneself with the physical body and becomes the owner and doer of the actions of the physical body.

उदयविवागो विविहो कम्माणं वणिदो जिणवरेहिं ।

ण दु ते मज्झ सहावा जाणगभावो दु अहमेक्को ॥१९८॥

पोग्गलकम्मं रागो तस्स विवागोदओ हवदि एसो ।

ण दु एस मज्ज भावो जाणगभावो हु अहमेक्को ॥१९९॥

एवं सम्महिद्वी अप्पाणं मुणदि जाणगसहावं ।

उदयं कम्मविवागं च मुयदि तच्चं वियाणंतो ॥200॥

Udayavivāgo viviho kammāṇam vaṇṇido jīṇavarehim.

Na du te majjha sahāvā jāṇagabhāvo du ahamekko. ||198||

Poggalakammam rāgo tassa vivāgodao havadi eso.

Na du esa majja bhāvo jāṇagabhavo hu ahamekko. ||199||

Evam sammaddiṭṭhī appāṇam muṇadi jāṇagasahāvam.

Udayam kammavivāgam ca muyadi taccam viyāṇanto. ||200||

उदयविपाको विविधः कर्मणां वर्णितो जिनवरैः ।

न तु ते मम स्वभावाः ज्ञायकभावस्त्वहमेकः ॥198॥

पुद्गलकर्म रागस्तस्य विपाकोदयो भवति एषः ।

न त्वेष मम भावो ज्ञायकभावः खल्वहमेकः ॥199॥

एवं सम्यग्दृष्टिः आत्मानं जानाति ज्ञायकस्वभावम् ।

उदयं कर्मविपाकं च मुंचति तत्त्वं विज्ञानम् ॥200॥

As described by omniscient lords, various kinds of fruits due to rise of *Karma* do not reveal my (soul's) nature. I am simply a knower. [198]

Desire or liking for something is [due to] *Pudgala Karma* on their maturity; it (*Rāga*) is not my nature. In reality, I am simply a knower (soul). [199]

In this way an enlightened being knows oneself as the knower (soul). By knowing such facts he disowns the fruits of the rising *Karma* on their maturity. [200]

Annotation

Stanzas 198 and 199 reveal the following concepts:

- (1) Pain, pleasure, and emotions such as anger experienced by a living being at any moment are due to the fruition of a fraction of the previously bonded *Karma*. Just like a scene on the movie screen depends on the part of the film being exposed by white light in a movie theatre, the quality of pain and pleasure depend on the quality of the *Karma* undergoing fruition. The quality of pain and pleasure does

not depend on the nature of the soul just as the scene on the movie screen does not depend on the nature of the white light. In this regard, it may also be noted that the nature of the soul does not change with time. But the feelings and emotions change with time.

- (2) I am the soul, the knower. 'To know' is the nature of the soul. Liking or disliking associated with the knowing is not the nature of the soul. Liking or disliking appearing at any moment depends on the quality of the *Karma* undergoing fruition at that moment. 'The soul is simply a knower' – this fact is so much valuable that *Ācārya* Kundakunda has stated it in these stanzas as well as in various other stanzas in this treatise.
- (3) The fruition of the rising *Karma* in the form of pain, pleasure, desire, hatred, etc. do not reveal the nature of the soul. Due to this fact these may be considered as non-souls.

The focus of *Ācārya* Kundakunda in these stanzas is to highlight this point that the knowing nature of the soul is different from the nature of pain, pleasure, desire, hatred, anger, etc.

Question: If acts or thoughts of liking and disliking are different from the nature of the soul then why do these happen to living beings only? Why not to dead bodies?

Answer: Let us take an example of a beautiful lake appearing blue (see Diagram 3). It is easy to check that the lake appears blue but its water is not blue. It can be verified by looking at the water taken out from the lake in a glass cup (see the inset in Diagram 3). On the basis of this observation, one can say that the color of the lake (blue) does not reveal the color of the water contained in the lake. One should accept the fact that water is not blue. Scientists know that the blue color of the lake is not possible without the water but they also know that

the water is not blue. Even the bottom of the lake may not be blue. Physicists do not ask about the owner of the blue color of the lake. They are interested in knowing and exploring the reason of its blue appearance. They simply ask and answer, "Why does the water of the lake appear blue?"

Just as the acceptance of the two facts – (i) lake appearing as blue, and (ii) the water in the lake is not blue – may go together; in the same way the acceptance of the two facts: (i) the existence of thoughts of liking and disliking in a living being, and (ii) the thoughts of liking and disliking are not of the soul, may go together. In short, in a worldly living being, colors of attachment and aversion appear with the living being, but in reality the soul is free from any color of attachment or aversion.



Diagram 3: Water of the lake appears blue but in reality the water taken out from the lake in a glass cup reveals that it is not blue (see the inset). Scientists know that the blue color of the lake is not possible without water, but they also know that the water is not blue. In the same way, in a worldly living being, colors of attachment and aversion appear with living beings, but in reality the soul is not colored by attachment or aversion.

Let us consider another example. Two facts – (i) The appearance of snow, fire, etc. on the movie screen, and (ii) the white light employed in the movie projector is free from the scenes of snow, fire, etc. – may go together. Scientists know that the snow, fire, etc. on the movie screen cannot appear without the white light source but they also know that the source of scenes of snow, fire, etc. on the screen is the film, not the white light.

We can take one more example: While watching dance, music, faces of actors and actresses on the TV screen, if the power (AC 220 volt) goes off then the screen on TV does not show all such scenes. Does it mean that all such dance, music, faces of actors, etc. come from the power line?

We know that its answer is 'No'. Here again scientists know that the dance, music, dialogues, etc. on the TV screen cannot appear without the electric power supply but the source of scenes and music from the TV is not the electric power supply. Scientists know that the 220 volt supply line does not possess such signals of dance, music, etc.

We are discussing *Nirjarā*. *Nirjarā* means partial shedding of the previously bonded *Karma*. *Ācārya* Kundakunda is logically explaining the core part of the shedding. For the physical shedding of *Karma* the shedding at the conceptual level is a necessary requirement. To explain the same, *Ācārya* Kundakunda in stanza 200 says that an enlightened being knows that he is a soul or knower and disowns the pain, pleasure, liking, disliking, etc. These are considered as the fruition of *Karma*. (Just as white light or AC power line in the above examples disowns the signals of fire, snow, dance, etc. appearing on the screen. Scientists know that the sources of signals of fire, snow, dance, etc. are different from the white light or AC power.)

परमाणुमित्तयं पि हु रागादीणं तु विज्जदे जस्स ।

ण वि सो जाणदि अप्पाणयं तु सव्वागमधरो वि ॥201॥

अप्पाणमयाणंतो अणप्पयं चावि सो अयाणंतो ।

कह होदि सम्मदिट्ठी जीवाजीवे अयाणंतो ॥202॥

Paramāṇumittayam pi hu rāgādīṇam tu vijjade jassa.

Na vi so jāṇadi appāṇayam tu savvāgamadharo vi. ||201||

Appāṇamayāṇanto aṇappayam cāvi so ayāṇanto.

Kaha hodi sammadiṭṭhī jīvājīve ayāṇanto. ||202||

परमाणुमात्रमपि खलु रागादीनां तु विद्यते यस्य ।

नापि स जानात्यात्मानं तु सर्वागमधरोऽपि ॥201॥

आत्मानमजानन् अनात्मानं चापि सोऽजानन् ।

कथं भवति सम्यग्दृष्टिर्जीवाजीवावजानन् ॥202॥

If in one's [belief] an iota of inclination for attachment-etc. exists, then he does not know the soul even if he might have read all scriptures. [201]

If he does not know the soul then [it implies that] he does not know non-souls also. How can he be an enlightened (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) without knowing soul and non-souls? [202]

Annotation

In stanza 13, Ācārya Kundakunda has stated that an enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) is the one who has comprehended, from the real point of view, nine elements including soul (*Jīva*) and matter (non-living or *Ajīva*). Here in stanza 202, Ācārya Kundakunda says that without comprehension of the soul, the comprehension of non-living or non-souls is also not possible; and without a true or clear understanding of the difference between soul and non-soul one cannot be an enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*).

At this juncture, a question arises about the diagnostic tests of not understanding the soul. One of such tests is given in stanza 201. As mentioned in stanzas 198 and 199, pleasure, pain, liking, disliking, etc. are beyond the true nature of the soul. Even if these

appear to be associated with the soul, they cannot be considered as the attributes of the soul substance. Here *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that if one does not know this fact then he has not understood the soul. If in one's knowing, there exists, in real sense, an iota of attachment, hatred, pleasure, pain, etc. in the soul then he is mistaken. The identification of soul plus something else as a soul shows an erroneous knowing about the soul. A person having such knowledge has a false understanding about the soul and he is not an enlightened being (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*).

To avoid any confusion and to emphasize the point, *Ācārya* Kundakunda also implicitly reveals through stanza 201 that one should not measure oneself as the knower of the soul simply by one's reading of scriptures. One can be a learned person and might have studied many scriptures but if in his knowing, pain, pleasure, attachment, etc. are the real attributes of the soul then he is mistaken and he is not an enlightened being (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*).

आदमिह दव्वभावे अपदे मोत्तूण गिण्ह तह णियदं ।

थिरमेगमिमं भावं उवलब्भंतं सहावेण ॥203॥

आभिणिसुदोधिमाणकेवलं च तं होदि एक्कमेव पदं ।

सो ऐसो परमट्ठो जं लहिदुं णिव्वुदिं जादि ॥204॥

Ādamhi davvabhāve apade mottūṇa giṇha taha ṇiyadam.

Thiramegamimam bhavam uvalabbhantam sahāveṇa. ||203||

Ābhiṇisudodhimaṇakevalam ca tam hodi ekkameva padam.

So aiso paramatṭho jam lahīdum ṇivvudim jādi. ||204||

आत्मनि द्रव्यभावानपदानि मुक्त्वा गृहाण तथा नियतम् ।

स्थिरमेकमिमं भावमुपलभ्यमानं स्वभावेन ॥203॥

आभिनिबोधिकं श्रुतावधिमनःपर्ययकेवलं च तद्भवत्येकमेव पदम् ।

स एष परमार्थो यं लब्ध्वा निर्वृत्तिं याति ॥204॥

The seats of *Dravya Karma* and *Bhāva Karma* are inappropriate for the soul; these are to be abandoned; and the one, permanent, and non-varying disposition realizable by the soul itself

is to be grasped. [203]

Knowledge based on sense perception (*Matijñāna*), scriptural knowledge (*Śrutajñāna*), knowledge by clairvoyance (*Avadhi Jñāna*), mind reading (*ManahParyayaJñāna*), and omniscience (*Kevalajñāna*), all these mean the same seat of knowledge. Such a knowledge-seat is the supreme; by achieving that one attains liberation. [204]

Annotation

Let us first consider one short story which may be helpful in assimilating the concept of these stanzas: One day a wise person meets a young boy in a forest. He recognized that this young boy is the prince who got lost a few years back. The wise person starts chatting with the young boy. At one point the young boy asks a question to the wise person, “Sir, I have been offered a job of a hunter as well as a cook by my group leader. I have an option to select one of these two jobs. Which position would be better for my career?” The wise person answered, “You are a talented person. You belong to the Royal family. You are the prince of the kingdom. The positions of hunter and cook are not for you. The throne of the kingdom is your seat. It is vacant for you. It is very simple for you to get the throne....”

In this regard *Kalaśa* 138 written by Ācārya Amṛtacandra just before stanza 203 is also worth noting. In *Kalaśa* 138, Ācārya Amṛtacandra addresses the worldly beings who are not aware of the soul. He says that the living beings intoxicated by the attachment have been sleeping with their worldly positions/seats. They are blind about their true status. They are eternally pure soul full of consciousness and they should grasp that position/seat of eternal purity of the soul.

In stanza 203, Ācārya Kundakunda intends to convey the following:

- (i) The psychic and physical states of pain, pleasure,

attachment, hatred, etc. in which the soul has been associating itself are inappropriate and unacceptable positions/seats (*Apada*) for the soul.

- (ii) All such seats/positions are to be abandoned.
- (iii) One should grasp the soul which always remains the same, i.e., eternal and non-varying. For achieving such status, one does not need anything else. It is realizable by the soul by its own nature.

Further, this point has been elaborated in stanza 204 which conveys the following:

The permanent position/seat achievable by one is one's faculty of knowledge (*JñānaPada*). It is the supreme seat (*Paramarthā*). The faculty of knowledge can be recognized by its various forms: (a) Knowledge associated with the sensual perception (*MatiJñāna*), (b) Knowledge associated with the contemplation of the scriptures and the input received through senses (*ŚrutaJñāna*), (c) Knowledge associated with the clairvoyance (*AvadhiJñāna*), (d) Knowledge associated with the ability of reading someone else's mind (*ManahParyayaJñāna*), and (e) Omniscience (*KevalaJñāna*).

It may be noted that here focus is not on the form or the name of the form of the knowledge. *Ācārya* Kundakunda wants to point out that the soul's faculty of knowledge is eternal. The form changes but the faculty of knowledge is eternal. A soul whether in an insect life or in a less advanced form never becomes devoid of this knowledge faculty. Therefore, one should try to associate I-ness with this eternal faculty. One should remain absorbed with this supreme seat (see stanza 151 also). This would lead to liberation.

Question: It sounds very strange that realization of the eternal knowledge faculty and its grasping leads to the liberation. Am I missing some hidden facts behind it?

Answer: This stanza indirectly conveys that acquisition of wealth, political status, etc. does not lead to liberation. The question raised here has come from the ego which views the liberation as an external achievement. The ego calls an achievement when someone acquires material prosperity and control over others, whereas the process of liberation starts with the acceptance of the truth. In the spiritual world, the acceptance of the truth regarding the true ownership of the soul is the most important achievement. The ownership over others and any desire of changing and controlling others go against the liberation. Further, the realization of the faculty of knowledge (*JñānaPada*) does not need any external object as it exists with every soul all the times. Thus the acceptance of the knowledge faculty (*JñānaPada*) as the Self is the truthful and the supreme acceptance. By accepting and grasping the pure Self one becomes the pure Self [stanza 186]. In other words, it amounts to the truthful realization of the Self, and it leads to the liberation.

In this regard, it may also be appropriate to add a few points: (a) The soul has the faculty of knowledge whereas other kinds of substances such as matter do not have this faculty. Therefore, the focus on the eternal knowledge faculty is significant for the focus on the eternal Self. (b) Here we are not talking of the quantity or quality of the knowledge possessed by a living being at this moment or any other moment. We are talking of the ever existing knowledge attribute of the soul. (c) The grasping of soul includes the practice (penance) of grasping the soul. The development of the personality also takes place during the practice of grasping the soul. The development of the personality entails reduction in desires, possessions, fear, etc. of the personality. Such a development is also commonly known as the spiritual development. (In the rigorous sense, the concept given in stanza 6

always holds good.)

णाणगुणेण विहीणा एदं तु पदं बहु वि ण लहंते ।
 तं गिण्ह णियदमेदं जदि इच्छसि कम्मपरिमोक्खं ॥205॥
 एदम्हि रदो णिच्चं संतुट्ठो होहि णिच्चमेदम्हि ।
 एदेण होहि तित्तो होहदि तुह उत्तमं सोक्खं ॥206॥

Nāṇagūṇeṇa vihiṇṇā edam tu padam bahu vi ṇa lahante.

Tam giṇha ṇiyadamedam jadi icchasi kamma-parimokkham. ||205||

Edamhi rado ṇiccam santuṭṭho hohi ṇiccamedamhi.

Edeṇa hohi titto hohadi tuha uttamam sokkham. ||206||

ज्ञानगुणेण विहीना एतत्तु पदं बहवोऽपि न लभन्ते ।
 तद्गृहाण नियतमेतद् यदीच्छसि कर्मपरिमोक्षम् ॥205॥
 एतस्मिन् रतो नित्यं संतुष्टो भव नित्यमेतस्मिन् ।
 एतेन भव तृप्तो भविष्यति तवोत्तमं सौख्यम् ॥206॥

Without [realizing] the knowledge attribute [of the soul] many [seekers] have been unable to achieve that seat (*Pada*). [Therefore,] if you desire the liberation from *Karma* then grasp this steady [seat of knowledge]. [205]

Remain always focused on this [seat of knowledge or pure soul or Self], remain always contented with this [soul], [and] be totally satisfied (*Trpta*) by this [soul]. The supreme bliss would happen to you. [206]

Annotation

One may come across many kinds of persons who are engaged in various kinds of activities to seek the liberation. In the name of efforts and penance, many persons believe in inflicting pain to the physical body for getting liberation. Some persons like to depend on the mercy of some other persons. In stanzas 152 and 153, *Ācārya Kundakunda* has already clarified that without abiding in the eternal pure Self (the supreme substance or *Paramarthā*), the external penance is not going to lead to the liberation. Here he reiterates and elaborates the concept provided in stanzas 151-153

regarding identification of the eternal soul by the faculty of knowledge. To be specific, in stanza 205 Ācārya Kundakunda conveys the following:

- (i) Many persons have tried to get liberation through the path that ignores their attention over their own soul, and they have failed.
- (ii) Therefore, if you wish to be free from the bondage of *Karma* then you should pay attention to your own soul by grasping the soul's eternal and steady faculty of knowledge.

To emphasize the above mentioned point, Ācārya Kundakunda further provides the following in stanza 206:

- (a) You should always remain focused on the soul, i.e., the soul's faculty of knowledge.
- (b) You do not need anything else. You should have contentment with the soul.
- (c) You should remain fully satisfied and saturated by your own soul.
- (d) By such conduct you would experience the supreme bliss.

को णाम भणिज्ज बुहो परदव्वं मम इमं हवदि दव्वं ।
अप्पाणमप्पणो परिग्रहं तु णियदं वियाणंतो ॥207॥

*Ko ṇāma bhaṇijjam buho paradavvam mama imam havadi davvam.
Appāṇamappaṇo parigrahaṃ tu ṇiyadam viyāṇanto. ||207||*

को नाम भणेद्बुधः परद्रव्यं ममेदं भवति द्रव्यम् ।
आत्मानमात्मनः परिग्रहं तु नियतं विज्ञानम् ॥207॥

After knowing the fact that the Self is the possession of the Self, which kind of knowledgeable person will say that other substances are mine? [207]

Annotation

In true sense, that which always stays with you is yours. Ācārya Kundakunda is using this criterion to state that the Self is

the possession of the Self. Further, it is well known that the physical body, house, jewelry, etc. do not stay with oneself forever. Therefore, a wise person, on the basis of this realization, does not consider house, jewelry, etc. as his possessions in the real sense.

Question: This point has already been conveyed in stanzas such as stanza 38. What is special in this stanza?

Answer: First, this is a valuable concept, therefore, *Ācārya* Kundakunda wants to elaborate it by providing a simple logic through this stanza. Let us see this logic in short in the language of mathematics in the following box:

If

X is the possession of X, Y is the possession of Y, Z is the possession of Z, and so on,

then

Y cannot be the possession of X, Y cannot be the possession of Z,

Z cannot be the possession of X, Z cannot be the possession of Y,

X cannot be the possession of Y, X cannot be the possession of Z,

and so on.

Application of this logic:

By saying that the Self is the possession of the Self in this stanza, *Ācārya* Kundakunda is also saying that an atom is the possession of the atom itself, and so on. Therefore, an atom cannot be the possession of the soul; thus, in general, only the soul is the possession of the soul; nothing else can be the possession of the soul.

One may see this view of independence of each and every *Dravya* in this scripture at many places. For example, one may refer to stanzas 81, 103, 308-310, and 372.

Question: Does it mean that it is meaningless to talk of one's bank account, one's house, one's spouse, etc.?

Answer: No, it is not meaningless to talk of one's bank account, one's house, one's spouse, etc.. Day-to-day worldly life, law and order, etc. cannot be possible if we do not recognize persons and their lawful worldly possessions. The relative point of view accepts such possessions as one's possessions. To clarify this point let us consider one example:

A collector (the highest Govt. official of the district) named Rajesh has 10 million rupees in his official account. One day his teenage son requests him to withdraw one million rupees from this account to buy a car for him. Rajesh responds by 'No'. Rajesh explains that he is simply a custodian of Govt. money. He is not the real owner of these 10 million rupees. It is not his personal wealth. It belongs to public.

At this response, his son asks, "Does it mean that the bank account in your name as the collector is meaningless?" Rajesh answers, "That account or the related money is not to be considered as my personal possession, but it is not meaningless. it is meaningful for the public."

In the same way this question is being answered with the remark that personal bank accounts and possessions are not to be considered as the possession of the soul.

मज्झं परिग्गहो जदि तदो अहमजीवदं तु गच्छेज्ज ।

णादेव अहं जम्हा तम्हा ण परिग्गहो मज्झ ॥208॥

Majjham pariggaho jadi tado ahamajīvadam tu gacchejja.

Nādeva aham jamhā tamhā ṇa pariggaho majjha. ||208||

मम परिग्रहो यदि ततोऽहमजीवतां तु गच्छेयम् ।

ज्ञातैवाहं यस्मात्तस्मान्न परिग्रहो मम ॥208॥

If possessions are mine then I become non-living entity. [But]

I am only knower. Therefore, possessions cannot be mine. [208]

Annotation

After explaining the fact that the possession of the Self is the Self only, here in this stanza *Ācārya* Kundakunda advances the same point in a different manner by saying the following:

- (i) If substances other than the Self (soul) become my possessions then I become a non-living entity.
- (ii) But I am only a knower, I always have consciousness, I never become a non-living entity, therefore, the so called possessions cannot be mine.

Question: When someone says that this particular house is mine then how would he become a non-living entity simply by such acceptance?

Answer: (i) When one accepts in true sense that he is the owner of a house (or for that matter owner of jewelry, physical body, etc.) then he also accepts that he is a person in true sense, not a soul. After accepting oneself as a person, one automatically accepts the death of that person at some point of time. Thus he not only sees his identity as a living person in the present but he also sees his identity as a non-living or dead person in near or distant future. In short, when one realizes (in true sense) that this house or this thing is mine then he is also realizing that he is a person in true sense. It means he is also realizing that at some instant he would become non-living or dead. Thus in his realization he is going to become non-living entity at some point of time.

(ii) If one visualizes oneself as the soul and recognizes the personality associated with him as a 'combination' of his soul and the physical body then the story becomes different. Such a being may also utter such words that this house or thing or the physical body is 'mine'. But he knows and realizes that his 'mine' is not mine in true sense. He knows that his 'mine'

means 'so called mine' or the 'mine from the relative point of view'. An enlightened person (*Jñānī*) even engaged in business and household activities knows very well that he is a soul as described in stanzas 38, 51, 73, etc.

छिज्जदु वा भिज्जदु वा णिज्जदु वा अहव जादु विप्पलयं ।
जम्हा तम्हा गच्छदु तह वि हु ण परिग्गहो मज्झ ॥209॥

Chijjadu vā bhijjadu vā ñijjadu vā ahava jādu vippalayam.

Jamhā tamhā gacchadu taha vi hu ṇa pariggaho majjha. ||209||

छिद्यतां वा भिद्यतां वा नीयतां वाथवा यातु विप्रलयम् ।
यस्मात्तस्मात् गच्छतु तथापि खलु न परिग्रहो मम ॥209॥

Any possession whether it gets pierced or cut or dragged away or destroyed or undergoes deformity in whatever manner, even then it is not mine. [209]

Annotation

In this stanza *Ācārya* Kundakunda conveys that in the true sense an enlightened being does not become owner of anything other than his own soul. This stanza asserts that such non-ownership of other substances is unconditional, i.e., it does not depend on the condition of the substance under consideration.

Question: Does it mean that an enlightened person ignores his physical body and other belongings to the extent of their physical destruction? :

Answer: This stanza simply says about the *ownership* of the physical body and other so called possessions. Depending on the level of one's spiritual advancement, the care of the physical body, house, jewelry, etc. by the person can happen without accepting their ownership by the soul.

अपरिग्गहो अणिच्छो भणिदो णाणी य णेच्छदे धम्मं ।
अपरिग्गहो दु धम्मस्स जाणगो तेण सो होदि ॥210॥
अपरिग्गहो अणिच्छो भणिदो णाणी य णेच्छदि अधम्मं ।

अपरिग्रहो अधम्मस्स जाणगो तेण सो होदि ॥211॥

अपरिग्रहो अणिच्छो भणिदो णाणी य णेच्छदे असणं ।

अपरिग्रहो दु असणस्स जाणगो तेण सो होदि ॥212॥

अपरिग्रहो अणिच्छो भणिदो णाणी य णेच्छदे पाणं ।

अपरिग्रहो दु पाणस्स जाणगो तेण सो होदि ॥213॥

एमादि ए दु विविहे सव्वे भावे य णेच्छदे णाणी ।

जाणगभावो णियदो णीरालंबो दु सव्वत्थ ॥214॥

Apariggaho aṇiccho bhaṇido ṇāṇī ya ñecchade dhammam.

Apariggaho du dhammassa jāṇago teṇa so hodi. ||210||

Apariggaho aṇiccho bhaṇido ṇāṇī ya ñecchade adhammam.

Apariggaho adhammassa jāṇago teṇa so hodi. ||211||

Apariggaho aṇiccho bhaṇido ṇāṇī ya ñecchade asaṇam.

Apariggaho du asaṇassa jāṇago teṇa so hodi. ||212||

Apariggaho aṇiccho bhaṇido ṇāṇī ya ñecchade pāṇam.

Apariggaho du pāṇassa jāṇago teṇa so hodi. ||213||

Emādie du vivihe savve bhāve ya ñecchade ṇāṇī.

Jāṇagabhāvo ṇiyado ṇīrālambo du savvattha. ||214||

अपरिग्रहोऽनिच्छो भणितो ज्ञानी च नेच्छति धर्मम् ।

अपरिग्रहस्तु धर्मस्य ज्ञायकस्तेन स भवति ॥210॥

अपरिग्रहोऽनिच्छो भणितो ज्ञानी च नेच्छत्यधर्मम् ।

अपरिग्रहोऽधर्मस्य ज्ञायकस्तेन स भवति ॥211॥

अपरिग्रहोऽनिच्छो भणितो ज्ञानी च नेच्छत्यशनम् ।

अपरिग्रहस्त्वशनस्य ज्ञायकस्तेन स भवति ॥212॥

अपरिग्रहोऽनिच्छो भणितो ज्ञानी च नेच्छति पानम् ।

अपरिग्रहस्तु पानस्य ज्ञायकस्तेन स भवति ॥213॥

एवमादिकास्तु विविधान् सर्वान् भावांश्च नेच्छति ज्ञानी ।

ज्ञायकभावो नियतो निरालंबस्तु सर्वत्र ॥214॥

One without desire is known as non-possessor. An enlightened being does not have any desire for virtues (*Dharma*). Therefore, he is the non-possessor of virtues; he is the knower of them. [210]

One without desire is known as non-possessor. An enlightened being does not have any desire for sins (*Adharma*).

Therefore, he is the non-possessor of sins; he is the knower of them. [211]

One without desire is known as non-possessor. An enlightened being does not have any desire for food. Therefore, he is the non-possessor of food; he is the knower of that. [212]

One without desire is known as non-possessor. An enlightened being does not have any desire for the liquid food. Therefore, he is the non-possessor of the liquid food; he is the knower of that. [213]

An enlightened being does not desire any of many kinds of such dispositions (*Bhāva*). [He realizes that] he is always a knower and does not depend on all these. [214]

Annotation

Stanza 210 says that an enlightened being is a non-possessor of virtues because he does not desire virtues. He is simply the knower of the virtues associated with him. He does not consider his soul as owner and doer of virtuous activities. He recognizes himself a soul and as a soul he simply remains the knower of the virtues.

In stanzas 211-213, *Ācārya* Kundakunda writes exactly similar words except that the word ‘virtues’ is replaced by ‘vice’ in stanza 211, by ‘food’ in stanza 212, and by ‘liquid food’ in stanza 213.

After describing four aspects – virtue, vice, food, and liquid food – in stanzas 210-213, *Ācārya* Kundakunda intends to describe many similar aspects (such as anger, greed, sensual pleasure, etc.) which are not desired by an enlightened being. To do so, in stanza 214, *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that an enlightened being does not have desire for any of many kinds of such inclinations (*Bhāva*). He further asserts that an enlightened being realizes the knowing nature of his soul. He further qualifies this nature by saying that this nature is invariant and does not depend on others.

To elaborate various kinds of dispositions, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra in *ĀtmaKhyāti* writes that these four aspects – virtue, vice, food, and liquid food – are just some examples. One may write 16 similar stanzas by using aspects such as anger, greed, sensual pleasure, etc. in place of virtue or sin or food or liquid food.

From these stanzas one can also infer that even if a person does not possess a particular thing but if he has a desire for that thing, then in the spiritual sense he is the possessor of that thing because he intends to possess the same.

Earlier while discussing stanzas 207-209, we have seen that an enlightened being may appear to possess house, money, etc., but still *Ācārya* Kundakunda has used the word ‘non-possessor’ for him. Why? An enlightened being recognizes himself a soul (a knower) and does not become owner of the physical body and the so called temporary possessions of the physical body. The actions of his personality including the feelings of pain and pleasure, vocal actions, mental contemplation, etc. are not recognized by an enlightened being as his own actions, because he identifies himself a soul.

The same reasoning may be helpful here in assimilating this point that an enlightened being may appear to be making choice for his food, but here *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that he, as a soul, does not have any desire for the food, he as a soul is simply the knower of the act of eating the food.

Question: An enlightened person and an unenlightened person both are eating same food on the same table. What difference does it make if one is called as the non-possessor of the food and another as the possessor of the food?

Answer: In worldly life such titles may not be helpful or unhelpful. Spiritually, there is a large difference between the two. The difference between the two persons gets reflected in

their *Kārmika* accounts also. One may refer to stanzas 193 and 197 also to note the difference between the two persons at the spiritual level.

उप्पण्णोदय भोगो वियोगबुद्धीए तस्स सो णिच्चं ।

कंखामणागदस्स य उदयस्स ण कुव्वदे णाणी ॥215॥

Uppaṇṇodaya bhogo viyogabuddhīe tassa so ṇiccam.

Kamkhāmaṇaḡadassa ya udayassa ṇa kuvvade ṇāṇī. ||215||

उत्पन्नोदयभोगो वियोगबुद्ध्या तस्य स नित्यम् ।

कांक्षामणागतस्य च उदयस्य न करोति ज्ञानी ॥215॥

An enlightened being always has detachment with the consumption of the fruition of *Karma* in the present; and he does not long for any *Kārmika* fruition for the future. [215]

Annotation

In this stanza *Ācārya Kundakunda* explains that an enlightened being (*Jñānī*) experiences the fruits of the previously bonded *Karma* without any attachment. He also does not have any desire for any physical comfort, fame, etc. for the future.

What about past experiences? Answer: Any memory or emotion in the present related with the past is recognized by an enlightened being as something different from him. He identifies himself with the soul. As such he does not become owner of all such memories, emotions, and physical things associated with his personality.

जो वेददि वेदिज्जदि समए समए विणस्सदे उभयं ।

तं जाणगो दु णाणी उभयं पि ण कंखदि कयावि ॥216॥

Jo vedadi vedijjadi samae samae viṇassade ubhayam.

Tam jāṇago du ṇāṇī ubhayam pi ṇa kamkhadi kayāvi. ||216||

यो वेदयते वेद्यते समये समये विनश्यत्युभयम् ।

तदज्ञायकस्तु ज्ञानी उभयमपि न कांक्षति कदापि ॥216॥

Both, *Vedya Bhāva* (a desire of having a particular

experience) and *Vedaka Bhāva* (the experience of fulfillment of that desire in future), vanish at their own times. An enlightened being is knower of [nature of] both, and never desires them. [216]

Annotation

This stanza contains two new technical words: (i) *Vedya Bhāva* (ii) *Vedaka Bhāva*. Desire of having a particular outcome or experience for the future is called *Vedya Bhāva*, and the experience of fulfillment of that desire, when it happens, is known as *Vedaka Bhāva*. Ācārya Kundakunda in this stanza says that these two aspects are not simultaneous, and a particular desire as well as the corresponding experience of fulfillment are not permanent, they vanish. An enlightened being knows this state of affairs. Such temporariness is not attractive to him.

An enlightened person, as a person, may also experience many sets of such fulfilled and un-fulfilled desires one after another. However, an enlightened being realizes his I-ness with the soul and as a soul he remains simply a knower of such *Vedya* and *Vedaka Bhāva*. As a soul he does not have any attachment or ownership with desires.

This stanza focuses on the point that an enlightened being may have desires as a person but considers oneself a soul, and as a soul he does not have any attachment with any desire or the fulfillment of any desire.

We may also learn from this stanza to contemplate to see how many desires does a person make for future one after other; and out of that how many times does a person enjoy the anticipated outcome at the time of fulfillment? Do we notice that many times the experience of enjoyment of fulfillment is destroyed by the creation of the new desires at that time? Many times one loses interest in the delayed outcome. This stanza may provide a new outlook to see the nature of generation of desires and the experience of the fulfillment of the same.

Further, this stanza may provide some relief to those who suffer from the anxiety produced by the creation of new desires at the time of fulfillment of old desires. The remedy is in recognizing oneself a soul and in not having any attachment (ownership) with the creation as well as the fulfillment of the desires. Besides the spiritual development, this spiritual remedy may be a recipe of happiness as it may reduce the anxiety which very much depends on the ownership of the desires.

बंधुवभोगणिमित्ते अज्झवसानोदएसु णाणिस्स ।

संसारदेहविसएसु णेव उप्पज्जदे रागो ॥217॥

Bandhuvabhogaṇimittē ajjhasasāṇodaesu ṇāṇissa.

Samsāradehavisāesu ṇeva uppajjate rāgo. ||217||

बंधोपभोगनिमित्तेषु अध्ववसानोदयेषु ज्ञानिनः ।

संसारदेहविषयेषु नैवोत्पद्यते रागः ॥217॥

An enlightened being does not have any attachment (*Rāga*) for the rise of *Adhyavasāna-Karma* (liking, disliking, etc.) which are instrumental cause for the bondage and pleasures of the physical body and worldly life. [217]

Annotation

This stanza has a technical word: *Adhyavasāna*. Here *Adhyavasāna* means thoughts and feelings associated with liking and disliking (*Vikārī Bhāva*). In this stanza Ācārya Kundakunda conveys the following:

- (i) The *Kārmika* fruition in the form of *Adhyavasāna* in a worldly living being becomes the instrumental cause for physical and psychological pain and pleasure. This also becomes the instrumental cause for association with the worldly things, other living beings, and places.
- (ii) *Adhyavasāna* are instrumental cause for the new *Kārmika* bonding.
- (iii) An enlightened being (*Jñānī* or *SamyagDrṣṭi*) does not

have any longing or attachment for *Kārmika* fruition in the form of *Adhyavasāna*. He considers himself a soul, and as a soul he neither needs nor desires *Adhyavasāna*.

It may be recalled that an enlightened being does not commit any mistake of identifying others, such as physical body, as the Self. However, such an enlightened being as a person may have worldly liking and disliking. This stanza asserts that despite the presence of such liking and disliking, he as a soul remains unattached with these, i.e., he as a soul does not consider himself an owner of such liking and disliking.

णाणी रागप्पजहो सव्वदव्वेसु कम्ममज्झगदो ।

णो लिप्पदि रजएण दु कद्दममज्झे जहा कणयं ॥218॥

अण्णाणी पुण रत्तो सव्वदव्वेसु कम्ममज्झगदो ।

लिप्पदि कम्मरएण दु कद्दममज्झे जहा लोहं ॥219॥

Nāṇi rāgappajaho savvadavvesu kammamajjhagado.

No lippadi rajaṇa du kaddamamajjhe jahā kaṇayam. ||218||

Aṇṇaṇi puṇa ratto savvadavvesu kammamajjhagado.

Lippadi kammaraṇa du kaddamamajjhe jahā loham. ||219||

ज्ञानी रागप्रहायकः सर्वद्रव्येषु कर्ममध्यगतः ।

नो लिप्यते रजसा तु कर्दममध्ये यथा कनकम् ॥218॥

अज्ञानी पुना रक्तः सर्वद्रव्येषु कर्ममध्यगतः ।

लिप्यते कर्मरजसा तु कर्दममध्ये यथा लोहम् ॥219॥

Just as gold placed in mud does not get corroded by mud, [in the same way] an enlightened person even immersed in *Kārmika* dust does not get contaminated by the dust, as [from his inner belief] he has abandoned attachment with all substances and living beings. [218]

Just as iron placed in mud gets corroded by mud, [in the same way] a spiritually ignorant person immersed in *Kārmika* dust gets contaminated by the dust, as [in his inner belief] he has attachment with all substances and living beings. [219]

Annotation

In this chapter on *Nirjarā*, Ācārya Kundakunda has been explaining the non-ownership experienced by an enlightened being with all things other than his own Self (e.g., one may refer to stanzas 198-201, 203, 207-217). This point of non-ownership has also been narrated in various stanzas in previous chapters (e.g., one may refer to stanzas 34, 36-38, 51, 73, 177, 186, etc.). Here in these two stanzas, Ācārya Kundakunda wants to convey this point that due to such non-ownership, an enlightened being does not get bonded with new *Karma*, even while he is immersed in the circumstances which lead an un-enlightened (*Ajñānī*) person to heavy *Kārmika* bonding.

We all know that at every moment circumstances appear in one's life in accordance with the fruition of the arising *Karma*. An enlightened person engaged in the tasks of maintenance of his family, physical body, etc. is to be recognized as a person immersed in the circumstances created by the fruition of the previously bonded *Karma*. In other words, he may be considered as an enlightened person (*Jñānī*) immersed in *Kārmika* mud. Ācārya Kundakunda in stanza 218 says that the enlightened person in such circumstances, as a soul, does not have any ownership of the *Kārmika* fruition (i.e. circumstances). Therefore, he does not get bonded with the new *Karma*. To illustrate the point, Ācārya Kundakunda takes an example of non-deterioration of a piece of gold placed in mud. He compares this behavior of gold with that of an enlightened person.

Further, to show the contrast, Ācārya Kundakunda writes stanza 219 to explain that a spiritually ignorant person (*Ajñānī*) gets bonded with the new *Karma* in similar circumstances because an un-enlightened person has attachment with the physical and psychological pain and pleasures as well as things and persons associated with the circumstances. An un-enlightened person

responds in this manner due to his ignorance. Due to ignorance he does not recognize that his true identity is his eternal soul which transcends physical pain and pleasure. Many persons may believe in soul but a mere belief in the soul is not sufficient for the enlightenment. In the context of this scripture, so far as the meaning of the word 'Ajñānī' or un-enlightened is concerned, if one realizes that his Self is the owner of the physical or psychological pain and pleasure then he is un-enlightened (see stanzas 39-44, 51, etc. for a description about the non-ownership of soul).

To illustrate this point of bondage of *Ajñānī*, in stanza 219 *Ācārya* Kundakunda gives an example of rusting of a piece of iron placed in mud. *Ācārya* Kundakunda compares this behavior of iron in mud with that of an *Ajñānī* (spiritually ignorant) in the *Kārmika* mud.

These stanzas may also provide a strong motivation to a person to rise above the fearful and difficult circumstances. The ownership of difficult circumstances frightens a person. The non-ownership or detachment may give a better perspective to respond to the situation.

भुंजंतस्स वि विविहे सच्चित्ताचित्तमिस्सिए दव्वे ।
 संखस्स सेदभावो ण वि सक्कदि किण्हगो कादुं ॥220॥
 तह णाणिस्स वि विविहे सच्चित्ताचित्तमिस्सिए दव्वे ।
 भुंजंतस्स वि णाणं ण सक्कमण्णाणदं णेदुं ॥221॥
 जइया स एव संखो सेदसहावं तयं पजहिदूण ।
 गच्छेज्ज किण्हभावं तइया सुक्कत्तणं पजहे ॥222॥
 तह णाणी वि हु जइया णाणसहावं तयं पजहिदूण ।
 अण्णाणेण परिणदो तइया अण्णाणदं गच्छे ॥223॥

Bhuñjantassa vi vivihe saccittācittamissie davve.
Samkhassa sedabhāvo ṇa vi sakkadi kiṇhago kādum. ||220||
Taha ṇāṇissa vi vivihe saccittācittamissie davve.
Bhuñjantassa vi ṇāṇam ṇa sakkamaṇṇāṇadam ṇedum. ||221||
Jaiyā sa eva samkho sedasahāvam tayam pajahidūṇa.

*Gacchejja kiṇhabhāvam taiyā sukkattaṇaṃ pajahe. ||222||
 Taha nāṇī vi hu jaiyā nāṇasahāvam tayam pajahidūṇa.
 Aṇṇāṇeṇa pariṇado taiyā aṇṇāṇadam gacche. ||223||*

भुंजानस्यापि विविधानि सचित्ताचित्तमिश्रितानि द्रव्याणि ।
 शंखस्य श्वेतभावो नापि शक्यते कृष्णकः कर्तुम् ॥220॥
 तथा ज्ञानिनोऽपि विविधानि सचित्ताचित्तमिश्रितानिद्रव्याणि ।
 भुंजानस्याऽपि ज्ञानं न शक्यमज्ञानतां नेतुम् ॥221॥
 यदा स एव शंखः श्वेतस्वभावं तत्कं प्रहाय ।
 गच्छेत् कृष्णभावं तदा शुक्लत्वं प्रजह्यात् ॥222॥
 तथा ज्ञान्यपि खलु यदा ज्ञानस्वभावं तत्कं प्रहाय ।
 अज्ञानेन परिणतस्तदा अज्ञानतां गच्छेत् ॥223॥

A conch (shellfish with a large spiral shell) consumes and interacts with various kinds of – inanimate, animate, and mixed – things. But whiteness of its shell cannot be blackened [by any of such things]. [220]

In the same way, an enlightened being also consumes and interacts with various kinds of – inanimate, animate, and mixed – things, but his state of enlightenment cannot be perverted [by any of such things]. [221]

When the same conch gives up its whiteness [on its own accord] and tends to turn black then it loses its whiteness. [222]

In the same way, in reality, when an enlightened being disowns his knowing nature and transforms himself into ignorance, then he gains ignorance. [223]

Annotation

The previous two stanzas suggest that the response to the circumstances is far more meaningful than the circumstances. This point is further strengthened by these stanzas.

Stanza 221 explicitly conveys this point that others cannot convert an enlightened person (*Jñānī*) into an un-enlightened person (*Ajñānī*); and stanza 223 says that whenever a *Jñānī* becomes *Ajñānī* then it happens by his own actions.

The analogy of conch given in stanzas 220 and 222 may be

helpful to all those who are familiar with the behavior of conch. Though a conch consumes various kinds of black, white, and colored food but the conch does not become black by the black food. Through this analogy the *Ācārya* wants to explain that just as a white conch does not become non-white by consuming the non-white food, a *Jñānī* also does not become *Ajñānī* by his interaction with others. In other words, a *Jñānī* who is *Jñānī* due to the realization of the clear distinction between the Self (his soul) and non-Self does not become *Ajñānī* simply due to his interaction or consumption or enjoyment with non-Self.

It may be added that the same *Jñānī* would become *Ajñānī* if he forgets this distinction and considers him as owner and doer of others. Thus, it is he, not others, who transforms himself into *Ajñānī*. *Ācārya* Kundakunda explains this point with the analogy of a conch in stanza 223, where he writes that it is the conch who itself becomes black.

Ācārya Kundakunda goes to the extent of saying that the consumption or interaction of a *Jñānī* person with other things or persons does not convert a *Jñānī* into an *Ajñānī*. As a word of caution, it may be noted that here the objective of *Ācārya* is not of showing the difference between the appropriate and inappropriate food, or the appropriate and inappropriate activities of a householder *Jñānī*. A *Jñānī* is expected to know such difference. Here the focus of *Ācārya* Kundakunda is to convey this point that other things/persons cannot compel an enlightened to become an un-enlightened one.

While undergoing appropriate physical actions, if a *Jñānī* as a soul becomes the owner of physical ability or doer of those actions such as the task of eating the food, then in the language of stanza 223 one would say that the *Jñānī* has become *Ajñānī* on his own accord.

Question: An enlightened person does not become the owner of

his personality. After reading this point one question arises: Does it mean that a *Jñānī* would introduce himself as a soul while opening his bank account or while applying for a job?

Answer: No, he is not expected to do so. Neither soul can be the doer of the job nor can open any bank account. Neither a soul can be hired nor is it hired by anyone. Therefore, for the job or bank account the relevant information regarding the person is required. A *Jñānī* knows himself as a soul and he also knows his role as a person. Even while a *Jñānī* is involved with his role of the person he is aware of his real identity (as a soul) which is eternal. Playing more than one role is not uncommon. Even in a non-spiritual context, the professionals such as collectors, judges, doctors do remember their personal identification beyond their professional titles even while they execute their professional tasks as collector/judge/doctor.

Question: According to stanza 223, a *Jñānī* becomes an *Ajñānī* on his own accord. What about an *Arahanta*?

Answer: An *Arahanta* never becomes an *Ajñānī*. Anyone who has become *Kṣāyika SamyagDrṣṭi* by way of total annihilation of *Darśana Mohaniya Karma* (see Appendix-6 and annotations of stanzas 179-180) does not and cannot become *Ajñānī* or *MithyāDrṣṭi* again. Without attaining *Kṣāyika SamyagDarśana* one does not become *Arahanta*, Therefore, the question of an *Arahanta* becoming *Ajñānī* does not arise.

In this regard, it may also be noted that even a householder may also be a *Kṣāyika SamyagDrṣṭi*. For example, the emperor Bharata (son of the first *Tīrthaṃkara* Ādinātha) was a *Kṣāyika SamyagDrṣṭi* householder even when he was an emperor.

Question: Stanza 221 says that an enlightened person (*Jñānī*) does not become un-enlightened (*Ajñānī*) even by enjoying a

variety of things and persons. Does it mean that one should not bother to reduce one's consumption?

Answer: (i) There are advantages in the reduction and moderation of consumption. The reduction in the consumption in itself is an important area which has been covered by *Ācārya Kundakunda* and many other preceptors elsewhere.

(ii) One of the main objectives of this stanza 221 is to reveal the fact that may be valuable in dealing with the circumstances without any fear of becoming non-spiritual. This stanza assures an enlightened householder to become fearless even to the extent of participating in the defense of the country.

Question: Verses (*Kalāśa*) 150 and 151 of *ĀtmaKhyāti* written by *Ācārya Amṛtacandra* in context with these stanzas of *Ācārya Kundakunda* appear to possess some contradiction regarding the consumption/use/enjoyment of external things. It appears that verse (*Kalāśa*) 150 does not provide any brake on the consumption whereas verse 151 appears to impart a strong brake. How can we resolve the apparent contradiction?

Answer: To resolve the contradiction, one is required to keep in mind that the act of eating food or doing any task by a *Jñānī* as a person and his realization of the separateness of the body and the soul with his I-ness with the soul can go together.

Some description is given by preceptors with a focus on the acts of the physical body and some description is given by the same preceptors with a focus on the soul. When a preceptor writes: "A householder *Jñānī* should carefully discharge his/her duty towards his/her parents, spouse, sons, daughters, family, office, nation, temple, teachers, saints, etc.," then the preceptor is describing the *Jñānī* as a person. When the same preceptor writes: "Even a householder *Jñānī* does not become

the doer of any act of eating or earning or helping,” then the preceptor is describing the *Jñānī* as a soul.

In reality, a *Jñānī* recognizes oneself as an eternal soul and as a soul does not eat the food even while he as a person appears to be eating (basis of *Kalaśa* 150). If he realizes that he in *reality* is eating the food then he is identifying oneself as a physical body. In that case he is not a *Jñānī* because he has a false sense of his identification (basis of *Kalaśa* 151).

पुरिसो जह को वि इहं वित्तिणिमित्तं तु सेवदे रायं ।
तो सो वि देदि राया विविहे भोगे सुहुप्पाए ॥224॥
एमेव जीवपुरिसो कम्मरयं सेवदे सुहणिमित्तं ।
तो सो वि देदि कम्मो विविहे भोगे सुहुप्पाए ॥225॥
जह पुण सो च्चिय पुरिसो वित्तिणिमित्तं ण सेवदे रायं ।
तो सो ण देदि राया विविहे भोगे सुहुप्पाए ॥226॥
एमेव सम्मदिट्ठी विसयत्थं सेवदे ण कम्मरयं ।
तो सो ण देदि कम्मो विविहे भोगे सुहुप्पाए ॥227॥

Puriso jaha ko vi iham vittiṇimittam tu sevade rāyam.
To so vi dedi rāyā vivihe bhoge suhuppāe. ||224||
Emeva jivapuriso kammarayam sevade suhaṇimittam.
To so vi dedi kammo vivihe bhoge suhuppāe. ||225||
Jaha puṇa so cciya puriso vittiṇimittam ṇa sevade rāyam.
To so ṇa dedi rāyā vivihe bhoge suhuppāe. ||226||
Emeva sammadiṭṭhi visayattham sevade ṇa kammarayam.
To so ṇa dedi kammo vivihe bhoge suhuppae. ||227||

पुरुषो यथा कोऽपीह वृत्तिनिमित्तं तु सेवते राजानम् ।
तत्सोऽपि ददाति राजा विविधान् भोगान् सुखोत्पादकान् ॥224॥
एवमेव जीवपुरुषः कर्मरजः सेवते सुखनिमित्तम् ।
तत्तदपि ददाति कर्म विविधान् भोगान् सुखोत्पादकान् ॥225॥
यथा पुनः स एव पुरुषो वृत्तिनिमित्तं न सेवते राजानम् ।
तत्सोऽपि न ददाति राजा विविधान् भोगान् सुखोत्पादकान् ॥226॥
एवमेव सम्यग्दृष्टिः विषयार्थं सेवते न कर्मरजः ।
तत्तन्न ददाति कर्म विविधान् भोगान् सुखोत्पादकान् ॥227॥

If a person serves [appropriately] a king for the livelihood then the king also provides various kinds of comfort producing

things. [224]

In the same way, if a living being serves [appropriately] the *Kārmika* matter for getting pleasures, then the *Kārmika* matter also provides various kinds of [sensual] pleasure producing objects. [225]

Again, if that person does not serve the king for his livelihood, then the king also does not provide various kinds of comfort producing things. [226]

In the same way, [since] an enlightened being does not serve the *Kārmika* matter for the sensual pleasure, the *Kārmika* matter also does not provide various kinds of sensual pleasure producing objects. [227]

Annotation

Stanzas 224 and 226 provide simple analogies to illustrate the facts mentioned in stanzas 225 and 227 which reveal the following:

- (i) An un-enlightened person (*MithyāDrṣṭi*) believes in the happiness derivable from the pleasure producing objects. He makes efforts to achieve pleasure producing things for his happiness. Based on his actions, attitude, and the fruition of the *Karma* he may get things that become instrumental cause for his sensual pleasure. It may be noted that these stanzas are silent about physical and emotional suffering of un-enlightened persons. The existence of suffering with an un-enlightened person is implied. *Ācārya* Kundakunda already wrote about suffering in stanzas 45, 72, 74, etc.
- (ii) *Ācārya* Jayasena in his commentary of these stanzas considers two cases of enlightened beings (*SamyagDrṣṭi*):
 - (a) A *SamyagDrṣṭi* absorbed in the Self to such extent that he does not have any attention towards his physical body and external things, and
 - (b) A *SamyagDrṣṭi* engaged in the worldly tasks (such as earning livelihood for the family).

It is easy to see that a *SamyagDrṣṭi* of former type has no desire for food, sensual comforts, etc., even as a person. In such state *Kārmika* bonding responsible for the objects of sensual pleasure (as well as pain) does not take place. Such a person in the advanced state of sainthood is free from experiencing any worldly inconvenience even when the circumstances of worldly comforts may not exist.

In case of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* of later type, though *Kārmika* bonding in response to the actions of mind and body is negligible (see stanza 172), yet only an enlightened person (*SamyagDrṣṭi*), not an un-enlightened person (*MithyāDrṣṭi*), gets *Kārmika* bonding which provides high positions such as *Tīrthaṃkara*, *Baladeva*, etc. Such high positions appear to contain worldly comforts but an enlightened person remains unattached with the worldly gains and comforts associated with such high positions.

(iii) A *Jñānī* who neither needs sensual pleasures nor serves *Kārmika* matter by mind, physical body or words is the one who neither eats nor keeps any possession. He is a great saint engaged in meditation. These stanzas convey this fact that the *Kārmika* laws are such that he is not disturbed by the availability of physical comforts through *Indra* or any god (*Deva*) at the time of penance.

(iv) An enlightened person as a soul neither becomes doer of *Kārmika* matter nor becomes recipient of any *Kārmika* fruition.

सम्मादिद्धी जीवा णिस्संका होंति णिब्भया तेण ।

सत्तभयविप्पमुक्का जम्हा तम्हा दु णिस्संका ॥228॥

Sammādiṭṭhī jīvā ṇiassaṃkā hoṃti ṇibbhayā teṇa.

Sattabhayavippamukkā jamhā tamhā du ṇissaṃkā. ||228||

सम्यग्दृष्टयो जीवा निश्शंका भवन्ति निर्भयास्तेन ।

सत्तभयविप्रमुक्ता यस्मात्तस्मात्तु निश्शंकाः ॥228॥

Enlightened beings are non-skeptical, therefore, they are fearless. Since they do not have seven kinds of fear, therefore, they are non-apprehensive. [228]

Annotation

Stanzas 228 to 236 describe eight special attributes of an enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*). These eight attributes are also known as eight organs of *SamyagDarśana*.

This and the next stanza describe an attribute which is known as *Niśanka* attribute in *Samskṛta*. The literal meaning of this word is 'absence of skepticism'. Another meaning of this word is absence of apprehensiveness.

The first half of this stanza says that a *SamyagDrṣṭi* is non-skeptical (*Niśanka*), therefore, he is fearless, i.e., he does not have any kind of fear. The second line of this stanza reveals the following: A *SamyagDrṣṭi* does not have seven kinds of fear, therefore, he is non-apprehensive (*Niśanka*).

A *SamyagDrṣṭi* has this realization that any cause of fear of any kind does not affect his soul. The list of seven kinds of fear as given by *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra in *ĀtmaKhyāti* is as follows:

- (i) Fear related to the present life, i.e., the present world.
- (ii) Fear related to the life after death, i.e., the next world.
- (iii) Fear of pain or sickness (*Vedanā*).
- (iv) Fear of insecurity (*Asurakṣā*).
- (v) Fear of lack of privacy (*Agupti*).
- (vi) Fear of death (*Marāṇa*).
- (vii) Fear of casual happening (*Akasmāta*).

Ācārya Amṛtacandra has nicely described these seven kinds of fear in *ĀtmaKhyāti* in verses 155 to 160. In these verses, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra explains that a soul does not possess any physical body; a soul is eternal; nothing can damage a soul; soul's world is its world of consciousness... Therefore, problems of death, sickness, insecurity, etc. do not arise to a soul.

Question: Does it mean that an enlightened (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) householder never experiences any anxiety? Does it mean that he is not afraid of a tiger or a snake or fire...? Does an enlightened person (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) not take any measure to avoid or minimize any danger?

Answer: An enlightened (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) householder as a person may have anxiety and may try to protect his physical body from tiger, snake, fire, etc. He, as a person, may plan in advance to avoid or minimize the probable losses. However, he is called fearless or non-apprehensive on the basis of his conviction and firm knowing that in reality he is an eternal soul and as a soul neither he owns nor experiences the fear, anxiety, etc. In other words, an enlightened person is internally fearless but may have fear in his actions of body and mind, i.e., as a person he may have fear, but as a soul he does not have any fear.

Question: What is the advantage in saying that an enlightened (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) person is fearless when he as a person may have fear?

Answer: In this treatise, specially, in this chapter, Ācārya Kundakunda intends to explain the vision of an enlightened person (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) from the soul's point of view. An un-enlightened (*MithyāDrṣṭi*) may not have even an iota of such visualization that a person may be fearful but his soul may be fearless. A *MithyāDrṣṭi* does not have such realization because he identifies himself with his body, mind, and their actions. But a *SamyagDrṣṭi* is well aware of his true identity which is beyond any fear, insecurity, sickness, death, etc. Thus there is a large difference between a *MithyāDrṣṭi* and a *SamyagDrṣṭi*. Besides the spiritual peace, this realization and awareness of one's true identity may also prove beneficial to the personality of the *SamyagDrṣṭi*.

Therefore, such stanzas may be helpful for a person to assess one's own visualization. This is more important for those who are devoting a lot of time to achieve spiritual development. If one is unable to visualize oneself (one's soul) as distinct, separate, and different from fear, desires, material possessions, etc. associated with the personality then he is not an enlightened person. In other words, such stanzas may also prove as diagnostic tools to assess one's lack of spiritual understanding.

जो चत्तारि वि पाए छिंददि ते कम्मबंधमोहकरे ।

सो णिस्संको चेदा सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥229॥

Jo cattāri vi pāe chindadi te kammabandhamohakare.

So nissāṅko cedā sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||229||

यश्चतुरोऽपि पादान् छिनत्ति तान् कर्मबंधमोहकरान् ।

स निश्शंकश्चेतयिता सम्यग्दृष्टिर्ज्ञातव्यः ॥229॥

A living being who dismantles the four legs related to the delusion and *Kārmika* bonding, is to be known as an enlightened being without skepticism. [229]

Annotation

As discussed in the annotation of stanza 164, we come across the four causes of *Kārmika* bonding:

- (i) The first cause is *Mithyātvā* or wrong belief or delusion or spiritual ignorance or misunderstanding regarding the distinction between the Self and non-Self. According to the scriptures, living beings in *Guṇasthāna* 4 and higher do not have *Mithyātvā*.
- (ii) The second cause is vowlessness (*Avirati*) or lack of spiritual vows for disciplining the self. Due to lack of efforts and confidence in the physical and psychological strength, one may hesitate to take vows. One of the objectives of taking any spiritual vow is to reduce the dependence of oneself on others. Many vows have been

described in scriptures. To illustrate, here we may consider an example: A householder can take a vow to not make any deliberate attempt to harm any living being with senses two or higher than two (*TrasaKāyika* living beings). This vow is called as the minor vow of non-violence. There may be many persons who adopt such non-violence but are not ready to adopt it with a vow.

It may be noted that as per scriptures, the true spiritual vows are possible only to an enlightened being. The enlightened beings without any vow are considered as living beings in fourth *Guṇasthāna*.

- (iii) The third cause is known as *Kaṣāya* (anger, deceit, pride or ego, greed). For the *Kārmika* bonding *Kaṣāya* is necessary. As per scriptures, the total elimination of *Kaṣāya* takes place in 12th *Guṇasthāna*. Immediately after the total elimination of *Kaṣāya* a person becomes *Arahanta* (13th *Guṇasthāna*).
- (iv) The fourth cause is known as *Yoga*. Here *Yoga* means the vibratory activity of the *Pradeśa* of the soul associated with the activity of the mind, speech, or body. There are three kinds of *Yoga*. The thinking activity is known as mind-*Yoga*, the speaking activity is called vocal-*Yoga*, and the movement of the physical body is called physical-body-*Yoga*. *Yoga* exists even with *Arahanta* (13th *Guṇasthāna*).

This stanza says that one who dismantles the above mentioned four legs is to be known as an enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) without doubt or skepticism. In other words, a *SamyagDrṣṭi* does not have any doubt in the description of soul as given in scriptures, e.g. as given in stanza 14. He knows very well that the above mentioned four legs related to *Karma* are separate from his real-Self. He has no delusion that these four are non-separate from his real-self. In *Samskṛta* this organ of *SamyagDarśana* is known as

Niśankita Aṅga or *Niśanka* attribute of a *SamyagDrṣṭi*.

Question: Based on the above description of four legs of *Kārmika* bonding it appears that only beings in 14th *Guṇasthāna* are free from these four legs. Does it mean that beings of 14th *Guṇasthāna* are only to be called as *SamyagDrṣṭi* with doubtlessness (*Niśanka* attribute)?

Answer: A *SamyagDrṣṭi* of 4th *Guṇasthāna* also visualizes the separateness between the soul and these four legs of *Kārmika* bonding. Therefore, such a person is also a *SamyagDrṣṭi* with doubtlessness. This stanza says that anybody who has broken the attachment of Self with these four legs of *Kārmika* bonding is to be known as *SamyagDrṣṭi* having *Niśanka* attribute.

Question: What is correlation between the breaking of the four legs of *Kārmika* bonding and doubtlessness?

Answer: The philosophy of the path of liberation deals with the pure Self and the breaking of these four legs of *Kārmika* bonding. An understanding of the detachment of the soul with these four legs shows an understanding of the entire basic philosophy (see stanza 15 also). The understanding of the entire basic philosophy results into the absence of doubt or skepticism. Further, if one has any doubt regarding the separateness of his real Self with any of these four legs of *Kārmika* bonding then he is not a *SamyagDrṣṭi*.

This stanza in combination with the previous stanza thus shows that *Niśanka* attribute of an enlightened being describes two qualities: (a) Fearlessness or absence of apprehensiveness, and (b) Doubtlessness or absence of skepticism.

In next stanzas we would come across more attributes of a *SamyagDrṣṭi*.

जो दु ण करेदि कंखं कम्मफलेसु तह सव्वधम्मोसु ।

सो णिक्कंखो चेदा सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥230॥

Jo du ṇa karedi kaṅkham kammaphalesu taha savvadhammesu.

So ṇikkankho cedā sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||230||

यस्तु न करोति कांक्षां कर्मफलेषु तथा सर्वधर्मेषु ।

स निष्कांक्षश्चेतयिता सम्यग्दृष्टिर्जातव्यः ॥230॥

A living being who does not have any desire for any *Kārmika* fruition as well as for any attribute [of other entities] is to be known as an enlightened being without desires. [230]

Annotation

This stanza describes another attribute of an enlightened being (*SamyagDrṣṭi*). In *Samśkrta* it is known as *NiḥKāṇkṣita* attribute. The literal meaning of this word is ‘absence of desire’.

An enlightened being realizes that he is a soul, and the soul is whole and complete by itself. He knows that there is no any need for anything else to make his soul more complete. Therefore, as a soul he does not desire for any specific *Kārmika* fruition for himself or for any change in anything or any living being. This characteristic of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* is known as an attribute of absence of desires.

Question: How can it be possible for a worldly person to not have any desire?

Answer: Similar question can be raised in context with many stanzas of this scripture. We already have raised and answered similar question earlier in the annotations of stanza 228. As mentioned there, such descriptions are to be considered in context with the soul. It is to be remembered that an enlightened being also becomes hungry as a person and may desire food as a person. Even while an enlightened being as a person desires or eats food, he realizes that in reality he is a soul and his soul neither becomes hungry nor desires nor eats food. An un-enlightened being (*MithyāDrṣṭi*)

does not realize the difference between the person and soul. A *MithyāDṛṣṭi* associates I-ness to his personality. Therefore, according to a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* the survival of the person is equivalent to the survival of his identity and the actions of the physical body are his actions.

Question: As a person, an enlightened being (*SamyagDṛṣṭi*) may have desires though as a soul he does not have any desire. What is the advantage in talking about such absence of desire?

Answer: It may be useful in many ways in one's life. As mentioned earlier (annotations of stanza 228) the message of this stanza may also be helpful in assessing one's own realization by seeking the answer of the questions: "Have I ever considered myself as a soul free from any desire? Do I consider myself a soul free from any desire?" Through this stanza, *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that if one is enlightened then it is sure that the answer of such questions would be 'yes'.

Further, the realization of I-ness with the soul, and not to one's personality, makes a lot of difference in one's life. It is very likely that the desires of the personality also may get modified. With time the personality of an enlightened being gains a tendency to be aligned with his soul. This alignment or reduction in desires at the level of the physical body may be gradual or fast. (For details one may refer to a discussion about the time gap between the time of becoming *SamyagDṛṣṭi* and the time to be free from all kinds of associations and attachment with *Karma*, internally and externally, in the annotation of stanzas 148-149.)

In short, the detachment with desires occurs in two phases. First, one gets unwavering faith that he is a soul, and as a soul he is separate and different from physical body, etc. The first phase is all or none, i.e., either one has faith in the eternal soul

or does not have faith. The second phase leads to reduction in desires at the level of the physical body. As narrated above, this phase may be gradual or fast.

जो ण करोदि दुग्गुंछं चेदा सव्वेसिमेव धम्माणं ।

सो खलु णिव्विदिगिच्छो सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥231॥

जो हवदि असम्मूढो चेदा सद्धिट्ठी सव्वभावेसु ।

सो खलु अमूढदिट्ठी सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥232॥

Jo ña karedi duṅguñcham cedā savvesimeva dhammāṇam.

So khalu ñivvīdigiccho sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||231||

Jo havadi asammūḍho cedā saddhiṭṭhi savvabhāvesu.

So khalu amūḍhadiṭṭhī sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||232||

यो न करोति जुगुप्सां चेतयिता सर्वेषामेव धर्माणाम् ।

सो खलु निर्विचिकित्सः सम्यग्दृष्टिर्ज्ञातव्यः ॥231॥

यो भवति असमूढः चेतयिता सदृष्टिः सर्वभावेषु ।

स खलु अमूढदृष्टिः सम्यग्दृष्टिर्ज्ञातव्यः ॥232॥

A living being who does not have any abhorrence towards any attribute [of anything or living being] is to be known as an enlightened being without abhorrence. [231]

A living being who is free from stupidity and has clarity of vision regarding all attributes [of things and living beings] is undoubtedly to be known as an enlightened being with the non-stupid vision. [232]

Annotation

These stanzas narrate another two attributes of an enlightened being. Stanza 231 describes an attribute which in *Samśkṛta* is known as *Nirvicikitsā* attribute. The literal meaning of this word is ‘absence of abhorrence’. Stanza 232 describes an attribute which in *Samśkṛta* is known as *AmūḍhaDṛṣṭi* attribute. The literal meaning of this word is ‘non-stupid vision’ or ‘un-blurred vision’.

A householder enlightened being may be interested in improving his own personality, family, city, country, etc. However, while doing so, as a soul he is comfortable with each and every

constituent of the cosmos and does not have any abhorrence with any attribute of any substance or any living being. Stanza 231 underlines such attribute of an enlightened being (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*). This attribute in technical words is known as the absence of abhorrence or non-abhorrence attribute of an enlightened being.

Further, as a soul, an enlightened being does not have any illusion or ignorance of owning or manipulating any attribute of anything or living being. He, as a soul, visualizes constituents of the cosmos without any motive of controlling or manipulating. This attribute is known as an attribute of having non-stupid vision or un-blurred vision or vision without follies.

जो सिद्धभक्तिजुत्तो उवगूहणगो दु सव्वधम्माणं ।
 सो उवगूहणकारी सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥233॥
 उम्मगं गच्छतं सगं पि मग्गे ठवेदि जो चेदा ।
 सो ठिदिकरणाजुत्तो सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥234॥

Jo siddhabhattijutto uvagūhaṇago du savvadhammāṇam.
So uvagūhaṇakāri sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||233||
Ummaggaṃ gacchatam sagam pi magge ṭhavedi jo cedā.
So ṭhīdikaraṇājutto sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||234||

यः सिद्धभक्तियुक्तः उपगूहनकस्तु सर्वधर्माणाम् ।
 स उपगूहनकारी सम्यग्दृष्टिर्ज्ञातव्यः ॥233॥
 उन्मार्गं गच्छतं स्वकमपि मार्गे स्थापयति यश्चेतयिता ।
 स स्थितिकरणयुक्तः सम्यग्दृष्टिर्ज्ञातव्यः ॥234॥

A living being who has reverence for emancipated souls and who safeguards [oneself] against all alien aspects is to be known as an enlightened being endowed with the attribute of safeguarding. [233]

A living being who keeps oneself on [right] path even in an adverse situation of slipping towards wrong path is to be known as an enlightened being endowed with the steadfastness. [234]

Annotation

Four attributes of enlightened beings have been described in

the previous five stanzas. Here Stanza 233 presents the fifth attribute which in *Samṣkṛta* is known as *Upagūhana*. The literal meaning of *Upagūhana* is 'to safeguard against alien aspects'. Stanza 234 describes 6th attribute named as *Sthitikaraṇa* in *Samṣkṛta*. The literal meaning of this word is 'steadfastness for staying on the right path'.

It is well known that a healthy person has immunity which safeguards his physical body against sickness causing bacteria, virus, etc. This analogy may be applied in the spiritual area. An enlightened being is spiritually healthy and has the immunity that protects his spiritual health against all external alien aspects. This attribute of spiritual immunity protects him against external disturbances. For example, if somebody tells him that there is nothing like the existence of soul then he is not misled. This attribute of spiritual immunity is called as the attribute of safeguarding (*Upagūhana*).

Regarding physical health, we also know that despite a good level of immunity, one may sometimes become sick. For example, one may get cold. But the body of a strong healthy person has inbuilt mechanism which helps him recover the health in a short time. In the same way, Ācārya Kundakunda in stanza 234 says that an enlightened being is capable of keeping oneself on the right spiritual path. This ability of keeping oneself on the right path even at the moment of deviating towards wrong path is called as an attribute of steadfastness.

Here one may ask: What about helping other enlightened persons to keep them on the right spiritual path? Scriptures describing these eight attributes from the relative point of view answer this question in affirmation. For example, Ācārya Samantabhadra in *Ratnakaranda Śrāvakācāra* in stanzas 1.15 and 1.16 explains that an enlightened (*SamyagDṛṣṭi*) householder has a tendency of helping other enlightened beings also. An enlightened

person not only helps to keep other enlightened beings on the right path but also does not make any publicity of any incidence of deviation from the right path by another enlightened being.

Question: Stanza 233 related with *Upagūhana* attribute also writes that an enlightened being has reverence for the emancipated souls (*Siddha*). It is a trivial quality of an enlightened being. What was the necessity of specifying this trivial aspect here?

Answer: Let us consider the analogy of health and immunity. Regarding the physical health and protection against external virus and bacteria when we talk of immunity then we also like to describe the cause of such immunity present in the physical body. In the same way, for the spiritual immunity one needs to describe the cause (the instrumental cause).

जो कुणदि वच्छलत्तं तिण्हं साहूण मोक्खमग्गम्हि ।
 सो वच्छलभावजुदो सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥235॥
 विज्जारहमारूढो मणोरहपहेसु भमइ जो चेदा ।
 सो जिणणाणपहावी सम्मादिट्ठी मुणेदव्वो ॥236॥

Jo kuṇaḍi vacchalattam tiṇham sāhūṇa mokkhamaggamhi.
So vacchalabhāvajudo sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||235||
Vijjārahamaṛūḍho maṇorahapahesu bhamai jo cedā.
So jiṇaṇāṇapahāvi sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||236||

यः करोति वत्सलत्वं त्रयाणां साधूनां मोक्षमार्गे ।
 स वत्सलभावयुतः सम्यग्दृष्टिर्ज्ञातव्यः ॥235॥
 विद्यारथमारूढः मनोरथपथेषु भ्रमति यश्चेतयिता ।
 स जिनज्ञानप्रभावी सम्यग्दृष्टिर्ज्ञातव्यः ॥236॥

One who has affection for the sacred trio on the path of liberation is to be known as the enlightened being endowed with the affection attribute.[235]

[Even while] cruising around the mind-chariot-path a living being who is mounted on the chariot of knowledge is to be known as an enlightened being propagating the preaching of omniscient *Jinendra Deva*. [236]

Annotation

Here Stanza 235 presents the seventh attribute which in *Samskṛta* is known as *Vātsalya*. The literal meaning of *Vātsalya* is ‘to have affection or to serve with affection’. Stanza 236 describes the eighth attribute named as *Prabhāvanā* in *Samskṛta*. The literal meaning of this word is ‘to glorify or propagate the goodness’.

Many persons do not like their job but they do their job with the hope that they would be happy after becoming rich or after getting promotion by doing the job which is not of their liking. Such persons may also have this notion that the religious persons are also doing their activities without any liking but with the hope that in the next life they would get the reward in terms of worldly pleasures. Stanza 235 clarifies that this thinking is not right. It says that an enlightened being (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) has affection for his spiritual path.

The last stanza of this chapter, stanza 236, says that an enlightened being is mounted on the chariot of the knowledge, and his life itself propagates the preaching of the omniscient *Jinendra Deva*. His life sets an example before many due to his inner qualities of fearlessness (absence of negativity), non-attachment with the desires, affection for his path, clarity of vision, realization of the soul as Self, steadfastness, etc.

In stanza 235, we come across words: ‘affection for the sacred trio in the path of liberation’. Question arises about the meaning of ‘sacred trio’. Ācārya Jayasena in *Tātparyavṛtti* as well as Ācārya Amṛtacandra in *ĀtmaKhyāti* answers this question by saying that *SamyagDarśana*, *SamyagJñāna*, and *SamyagCāritra* are the sacred trio of the path of liberation. Stanza 235 highlights that an enlightened being (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) has affection for these three jewels of the path of liberation.

From the relative point of view three kinds of saints – Ācārya, Upādhyāya, Sādhu – are also considered as the sacred trio.

Ācārya Samantabhadra goes to the extent of saying in stanza 1-17 of *Ratnakaranda Śrāvakācāra* (*Ratnakaranda Śrāvakācāra* is a classic scripture related with the code of conduct of householders) that a *SamyagDṛṣṭi* has affection for all the living beings on the path of liberation. Regarding the description of *Prabhāvanā* attribute from the relative point of view stanza 1-18 of *Ratnakaranda Śrāvakācāra* is also worth noting. There *Ācārya* Samantabhadra says that an enlightened being makes efforts to enlighten others by appropriately removing the darkness of ignorance through the preaching of the omniscient *Jinendra Deva*.

In the commentary *Tātparyavṛtti* written by *Ācārya* Jayasena, a few words of stanza 236 are somewhat different from what has been written in *ĀtmaKhyāti* by *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra. The stanza mentioned above describes the version of *ĀtmaKhyāti*. In *Tātparyavṛtti*, the stanza is as follows:

Vijjārahamārūḍho maṇoraharesu haṇadi jo cedā.

So jiṇaṇāṇapahāvi sammādiṭṭhī muṇedavvo. ||236||

Meaning: A living being who is mounted on the chariot of knowledge and destroys the [oneness with the] desires arising in the mind-chariot is to be known as the enlightened being propagating the preaching of omniscient *Jinendra Deva*.

It may be noted that both the versions reveal a common theme that by keeping oneself on the chariot of knowledge an enlightened being propagates the preaching of *Jinendra Deva*.

As an instrumental cause, the life of a *SamyagDṛṣṭi* creates some effect on the persons who interact with him. *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that the effect amounts to the propagation of preaching of *Jinendra Deva*. In other words, the happiness (as well as response to the occasional adverse circumstances) reflected by the life of a *SamyagDṛṣṭi* in itself may become the source of inspiration to those who come in contact with him/her.

8

Bonding of Karma (Bandha)

जह णाम को वि पुरिसो णेहब्भत्तो दु रेणुबहुलम्मि ।
ठाणम्मि ठाइदूण य करेदि सत्थेहिं वायामं ॥237॥
छिंददि भिंददि य तहा तालीतलकयलिवंसर्पिंडीओ ।
सच्चित्ताचित्ताणं करेदि दव्वाणमुवघादं ॥238॥
उवघादं कुव्वंतस्स तस्स णाणाविहेहिं करणेहिं ।
णिच्छयदो चिंतेज्ज हु किं पच्चयगो दु रयबंधो ॥239॥
जो सो दु णेहभावो तम्हि णरे तेण तस्स रयबंधो ।
णिच्छयदो विण्णेयं ण कायचेट्ठाहिं सेसाहिं ॥240॥
एवं मिच्छादिट्ठी वट्ठंतो बहुविहासु चिट्ठासु ।
रागादी उवओगे कुव्वंतो लिप्पदि रएण ॥241॥

Jaha ñāma ko vi puriso ñehabbhatto du reṇubahulammi.
Thāṇammi thāidūṇa ya karedi satthehim vāyāmaṃ. ||237||
Chindadi bhindadi ya tahā tālītalakayalivamsapaṇḍīo.
Saccittācittāṇaṃ karedi davvāṇamuvaghādam. ||238||
Uvaghādam kuvvantassa tassa ṇāṇāvihehim karaṇehim.
Nicchayado cintejja hu kim paccayago du rayabandho. ||239||
Jo so du ñehabhāvo tamhi ṇare teṇa tassa rayabandho.
Nicchayado viṇṇeyam ṇa kāyaceṭṭhahim sesāhim. ||240||
Evam micchādiṭṭhī vaṭṭanto bahuvihāsu ciṭṭhāsu.
Rāgādī uvaoge kuvvanto lippadi raṇa. ||241||

यथा नाम कोऽपि पुरुषः स्नेहाभ्यक्तस्तु रेणुबहुले ।
स्थाने स्थित्वा च करोति शस्त्रैर्व्यायामम् ॥237॥

छिनत्ति भिनत्ति च तथा तालीतलकदलीवंशपिण्डी ।
 सचित्ताचित्तानां करोति द्रव्याणामुपघातम् ॥238॥
 उपघातं कुर्वतस्तस्य नानाविधैः करणैः ।
 निश्चयतश्चित्यतां खलु किं प्रत्ययिकस्तु रजोबंधः ॥239॥
 यः स तु स्नेहभावस्तस्मिन्ने तेन तस्य रजोबंधः ।
 निश्चयतो विज्ञेयं न कायचेष्टाभिः शेषाभिः ॥240॥
 एवं मिथ्यादृष्टिर्वर्तमानो बहुविधासु चेष्टासु ।
 रागादीनुपयोगे कुर्वाणो लिप्यते रजसा ॥241॥

Consider a man with oil on his body exercises with martial art equipments in a place having a lot of dust; and cuts and breaks trees such as palm, *Tamāla*, plantain, bamboo, *Aśoka*, and destroys in-animate and animate objects. [237, 238]

Think about the real cause of deposition of dust [on his body] while destroying these in many ways by appliances. [239]

The deposition of the dust happens due to the oil on the body. In reality, it (the deposition of dust) is not due to other factors and actions of the body. [240]

In the same way, an un-enlightened gets bonded with *Kārmika* dust while doing various activities having attachment, etc. in his *Upayoga* (pure cognitive attribute of soul). [241]

Annotation

In this chapter on *Kārmika* bondage, *Ācārya* Kundakunda discusses various aspects of bondage. In the first five stanzas he first explains the real cause of bonding in case of an un-enlightened being [*MithyāDṛṣṭi*]. To illustrate the point, he considers an example of a person engaged in exercising with martial appliances with following details:

- (i) The person has applied oil on his body.
- (ii) He is exercising at the place having a lot of dust.
- (iii) He cuts and breaks various kinds of trees while exercising

with the martial appliances.

(iv) As a consequence dust gets deposited on his body.

After describing this, in stanza 239 Ācārya Kundakunda asks a question to consider the real cause of deposition of dust on his body. The question is answered in stanza 240 that says that the deposition of the dust is due to oil on his body. Other actions are not the real cause.

Using this analogy in stanza 241, Ācārya Kundakunda explains that the real cause of *Kārmika* bondage is the attachment of the soul with the actions of physical body and mind. Or, the 'oil' responsible for the *Kārmika* bondage is the false realization of oneness of oneself with the actions of the physical body and mind. In other words, one can say that the cause of bondage is the placement or attachment of actions of body and mind with the soul by an un-enlightened person (*MithyāDṛṣṭi*).

Through these stanzas the Ācārya also wants to compare the actions of body and mind of a *MithyāDṛṣṭi* with the actions of cutting and breaking of trees by the person doing exercise. For dust deposition, such actions are not the real cause. In the same way, for the deposition of the *Kārmika* dust, the actions of body and mind are not the real cause.

In chapter 2 and elsewhere, it has already been discussed that the soul is not the owner of the body and mind. Therefore, the ownership of actions of mind and body is false. This falsehood or the departure from the truth acts as 'oil' for the purpose of *Kārmika* bonding.

Question: What about the sinful acts of the body and mind?

Answer: A *MithyāDṛṣṭi* has oneness with body and mind. A *MithyāDṛṣṭi* considers oneself as the doer of such actions. He, therefore, gets bonded.

The point raised in these stanzas is not yet complete. The

value of analogy and inference drawn through these stanzas would become more clear after going through the next five stanzas.

जह पुण सो चेव णरो णेहे सव्वम्हि अवणिदे संते ।
 रेणुबहुलम्मि ठाणे करेदि सत्थेहिं वायामं ॥242॥
 छिंददि भिंददि य तथा तालीतलकयलिवंसपिंडीओ ।
 सच्चित्ताचित्ताणं करेदि दव्वाणमुवघादं ॥243॥
 उवघादं कुव्वंतस्स तस्स णाणाविहेहिं करणेहिं ।
 णिच्छयदो चिंतेज्ज हु किं पच्चयगो ण रयबंधो ॥244॥
 जो सो दु णेहभावो तम्हि णरे तेण तस्स रयबंधो ।
 णिच्छयदो विण्णेयं ण कायचेट्ठाहिं सेसाहिं ॥245॥
 एवं सम्मादिट्ठी वट्ठंतो बहुविहेसु जोगेसु ।
 अकरंतो उवओगे रागादी ण लिप्पदि रएण ॥246॥

Jaha puṇa so ceva ṇaro ṇehe savvamhi avanide sante.
Reṇubahulammi thāṇe karedi satthehim vāyāmaṃ. ||242||
Chindadi bhindadi ya tahā tālītalakayalivaṃsapinḍīo.
Saccittācittāṇaṃ karedi davvāṇamuvaghādam. ||243||
Uvaghādam kuvvantassa tassa ṇāṇāvihehim karaṇehim.
Ṇicchayado cintejja hu kim paccayago ṇa rayabandho. ||244||
Jo so du ṇehabhāvo tamhi ṇare teṇa tassa rayabandho.
Ṇicchayado viṇṇeyam ṇa kāyacettahim sesāhim. ||245||
Evam sammādiṭṭhī vaṭṭanto bahuvihesu jogesū.
Akaranto uvaoge rāgādī ṇa lippadi raṇa. ||246||
 यथा पुनः स चैव नरः स्नेहे सर्वस्मिन्नपनीते सति ।
 रेणुबहुले स्थाने करोति शस्त्रैर्व्यायामम् ॥242॥
 छिनत्ति भिनत्ति च तथा तालीतलकदलीवंशपिंडीः ।
 सचित्ताचित्तानां करोति द्रव्याणामुपघातम् ॥243॥
 उपघातं कुर्वतस्तस्य नानाविधैः करणैः ।
 निश्चयतश्चिंत्यतां खलु किं प्रत्ययिको न रजोबन्धः ॥244॥
 यः स तु स्नेहभावस्तस्मिन्ने तेन तस्य रजोबन्धः ।

निश्चयतो विज्ञेयं न कायचेष्टाभिः शेषाभिः ॥245॥

एवं सम्यग्दृष्टिर्वर्तमानो बहुविधेषु योगेषु ।

अकुर्वन्नुपयोगे रागादीन् न लिप्यते रजसा ॥246॥

Again just as the same person, after removing the oil from his body, exercises with martial appliances in the place having lot of dust; and cuts and breaks trees such as palm, *Tamāla*, plantain, bamboo, *Āśoka*, and destroys in-animate and animate objects. [242, 243]

Think about the real cause of non-deposition of dust [on his body] while [he is] destroying these in many ways by appliances. [244]

[As mentioned earlier,] the deposition of the dust happens due to the oil on the body. In reality, it (the deposition of dust) is not due to all other factors and actions of the body. [245]

In the same way, an enlightened [*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*] does not get bonded with *Kārmika* dust while doing various activities without attachment and the like in his *Upayoga*. [246]

Annotation

The inference drawn by *Ācārya* Kundakunda in stanza 240 regarding the cause of deposition of the dust on the body and the cause of deposition of the *Kārmika* dust in the previous example has been strengthened further by these stanzas. Here, the *Ācārya* takes an example of the same man in the same situation doing similar exercise with similar appliances. Here also he cuts and breaks various kinds of trees. But here in this example, the person is without oil on his body. Thus here the person exercises after removing the oil. The *Ācārya* says that the absence of oil becomes the cause of non-deposition of the dust on this person's body.

The inference drawn from this example is given in stanza 245 which says that in reality, the deposition of dust is due to oil, not due to other factors. It may be noted that stanza 245 is exactly the

same as stanza 240, and stanza 243 is also exactly the same as stanza 238.

In stanza 246, *Ācārya* compares the analogy of the person without oil on his body with an enlightened person (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) who does not attach his I-ness with the activities of his body and mind. It may be recalled that an enlightened person considers oneself a soul, and as a soul does not consider oneself a doer of any action of body or mind. He perceives that his *Upayoga* (pure cognitive attribute of soul) is separate and distinct from the psychic liking, disliking, etc. With such perception, despite the actions of the body and mind, he does not attract *Kārmika* bonding.

Question: Does it mean that a *SamyagDrṣṭi* of fourth spiritual development stage (*Guṇasthāna*) does not undergo any new *Kārmika* bondage?

Answer: There happens very small bondage. This question has been discussed in detail earlier. For example, one may refer to annotations of stanzas 177-178 (also 166, 171-172).

Question: If this point is already discussed then what is new in these stanzas?

Answer: While writing the commentary of these stanzas in *ĀtmaKhyāti*, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra has very nicely written *Kalaśa* 165 to narrate some valuable concepts described by these stanzas. *Kalaśa* 165 says the following:

The cosmos is filled with *Kārmika* dust. Let it be. A living being performs physical, vocal, and mental actions. Let them be. There is disturbance/destruction of material things and living organism by a living being. Let it be. (All these may happen with an enlightened person also). However, an enlightened person (*SamyagDrṣṭi*) does not bring his thoughts (*Bhāva*) of liking-etc. (pain, pleasure, loss, gain, fear, guilt, anxiety, worry, hate, sickness ...) on the 'soil' of his *Upayoga* (soul). He identifies his oneness with his knowing nature. By being so, he does not get any new *Kārmika* bondage.

(Note: Regarding the small amount of new bondage to an enlightened person with imperfections, stanzas 171-172 and the related annotations may be referred.)

जो मण्णदि हिंसामि य हिंसिज्जामि य परेहिं सत्तेहिं ।

सो मूढो अण्णाणी णाणी एत्तो दु विवरीदो ॥247॥

आउक्खयेण मरणं जीवाणं जिणवरेहिं पण्णत्तं ।

आउं ण हरेसि तुमं कह ते मरणं कदं तेसिं ॥248॥

आउक्खयेण मरणं जीवाणं जिणवरेहिं पण्णत्तं ।

आउं ण हरंति तुहं कह ते मरणं कदं तेहिं ॥249॥

जो मण्णदि जीवेमि य जीविज्जामि य परेहिं सत्तेहिं ।

सो मूढो अण्णाणी णाणी एत्तो दु विवरीदो ॥250॥

आऊदयेण जीवदि जीवो एवं भणंति सव्वण्हू ।

आउं च ण देसि तुमं कहं तए जीविदं कदं तेसिं ॥251॥

आऊदयेण जीवदि जीवो एवं भणंति सव्वण्हू ।

आउं च ण दिति तुहं कहं णु ते जीविदं कदं तेहिं ॥252॥

Jo maṇṇadi hiṃsāmi ya hiṃsijjāmi ya parehim sattehim.

So mūḍho aṇṇāṇī ṇāṇī etto du vivarīdo. ||247||

Āukkhayeṇa maraṇam jīvāṇam jiṇavarehim paṇṇattam.

Āum ṇa haresi tumam kaha te maraṇam kadam tesim. ||248||

Āukkhayeṇa maraṇam jīvāṇam jiṇavarehim paṇṇattam.

Āum ṇa haranti tuham kaha te maraṇam kadam tehim. ||249||

Jo maṇṇadi jīvemi ya jīvijjāmi ya parehim sattehim.

So mūḍho aṇṇāṇī ṇāṇī etto du vivarīdo. ||250||

Āūdayeṇa jīvadi jīvo evam bhaṇanti savvaṇhū.

Āum ca ṇa desi tumam kaham tae jīvidam kadam tesim. ||251||

Āūdayeṇa jīvadi jīvo evam bhaṇanti savvaṇhū.

Āum ca ṇa dinti tuham kaham ṇu te jīvidam kadam tehim. ||252||

यो मन्यते हिनस्मि च हिंस्ये च परैः सत्त्वैः ।

स मूढोऽज्ञानी ज्ञान्यतस्तु विपरीतः ॥247॥

आयुःक्षयेण मरणं जीवानां जिनवरैः प्रज्ञप्तम् ।

आयुर्न हरसि त्वं कथं त्वया मरणं कृतं तेषाम् ॥248॥

आयुःक्षयेण मरणं जीवानां जिनवरैः प्रज्ञप्तम् ।

आयुर्न हरति तव कथं ते मरणं कृतं तैः ॥249॥

यो मन्यते जीवयामि च जीव्ये च परैः सत्त्वैः ।

स मूढोऽज्ञानी ज्ञान्यतस्तु विपरीतः ॥250॥

आयुरुदयेन जीवति जीव एवं भणन्ति सर्वज्ञाः ।

आयुश्च न ददासि त्वं कथं त्वया जीवितं कृतं तेषाम् ॥251॥

आयुरुदयेन जीवति जीव एवं भणन्ति सर्वज्ञाः ।

आयुश्च न ददति तव कथं नु ते जीवितं कृतं तैः ॥252॥

One, who has this perception, “I can kill [others] and can be killed by other living beings,” is deluded and spiritually ignorant, while the opposite of that is enlightened. [247]

Jinendra Deva revealed that the death of living beings happens due to the completion of their life-span *Karma*. You cannot reduce [their] life-span *Karma*, therefore, how can you be the doer of their death? [248]

Jinendra Deva revealed that the death of living beings happens due to the completion of their life-span *Karma*. Your life-span *Karma* cannot be reduced by others, therefore, how can they be the doer of your death? [249]

One, who has this perception:- “Others are alive due to me and I am alive due to others,” is deluded and spiritually ignorant, while the opposite of that is enlightened. [250]

Omniscient lords revealed that a living being remains alive due to his life-span *Karma*. You cannot provide life-span *Karma*. Therefore, how can you be the doer of their survival? [251]

Omniscient lords revealed that a living being remains alive due to his life-span *Karma*. Others cannot provide life-span *Karma* to you. Therefore, how can they be the doer of your survival? [252]

Annotation

Before discussing these stanzas, I (the author of the annotations) want to describe one experience that happened nearly two decades back during a train journey. In the upper class coach my co-passenger was a senior person and was looking sad. For the sake of further description let me call this person Anantji (not his real name). In that compartment there were not many passengers. Anantji initiated conversation with me and soon he expressed his desire to express his personal problem. On my green signal he took about one and half hours to describe his problem. I listened to him carefully with full attention.

He first took about 15 minutes to introduce himself. He mentioned as follows: “I am Anant Agrawal (Name changed here) and live in ... There, I am the president of the Lions club. I have factories that manufacture products such as ... I am the founder president of a college for girls in my city ...”

Before arriving at the main problem he expressed the gravity of his problem in words such as the following: “I was having a very pleasant and comfortable life in my city with my family that includes my son, daughter-in-law, and a grandson. Six months back, a misfortune spoiled our life. Since then I could not sleep well even for a single night. All my family members do their best to make me happy but it has not worked. My family members and relatives also arranged many meetings with various renowned saints and scholars but nothing has worked so far...”

Anantji was describing his feelings in detail in very emotional and sad voice. I continued my patience as I thought that he is a smart, intelligent, and rational person, therefore, I should not make any haste, I should allow him to speak in the way he wants. After a long time he arrived at his main problem. In brief, the problem was as given below:

“My grandson died due to illness. He was treated by expert

doctors in the best hospital of the state. Doctors were hopeful. They did not warn us about the danger. Otherwise, we could have taken him to the USA for the treatment. Due to technical reasons, I don't see any possibility of any next child in my family. I feel guilty for not providing proper treatment to my grandson. I feel guilty for the death of my grandson. I feel guilty for the sufferings of my daughter-in-law ...”

Regarding the current status of his daughter-in-law, he said, “It appears my pain is many times more than that of my son or daughter-in-law. Even my daughter-in-law consoles come.”

After speaking all this, when he looked at me for some helpful tips to reduce his sufferings, the train was very noisy due to high speed. I told him to wait for the reduction in the noise. This wait gave me some time to think. I thought Anantji has already contacted many renowned saints and scholars who might have consoled him with the words such as: ‘Your grandson died but his soul is immortal’, ‘Everything happens as per the wishes of the Superpower’, ... I contemplated that such valuable words have not worked for Anantji, therefore, he needs some more powerful, logical, and explicit messages from the scriptures to lift the load of guilt from his head. Suddenly, I recalled these stanzas of *Ācārya Kundakunda*, and I tried to convey the message of these stanzas to Anantji in an appropriate way. Before presenting these stanzas of *Ācārya Kundakunda* to Anantji, I weighed pros and cons and made sure in my mind that this gentleman is not going to pick up any wrong meaning from these stanzas.

With some introduction, recitation and explanation of some *Samskṛta* and Hindi verses from Hindu and Jain tradition I mentioned the following points:

- (i) You know very well that the soul is eternal. Your grandson's soul is also eternal.
- (ii) You have made efforts as much as you could think of. But

none among us is omnipotent. We have our limitations.

- (iii) We all experience pain and pleasure as per the fruition of our *Karma*. The same event gives suffering and pain of different quality to different persons. You are suffering according to the rise of your *Karma*, not due to *Karma* of others. Your wife, son, and daughter-in-law are also suffering but their suffering is in accordance with the rise of their *Karma*, not due to your *Karma*. Though we don't know about the current status of that departed soul, but we know so much that at this moment the departed soul might be in pleasant or un-plesant situation as per rise of his *Karma*. Family members, doctors, etc. were *Nimitta* (instrumental cause) for the medical treatment, care, and comforts of the child. But the effect of all these on your grandson happened according to the rise of *Karma* of that child.

While explaining I also recited stanzas 247 and 250 in Hindi in verse form with their meaning with this remark that Ācārya Kundakunda is one of the greatest Ācārya of the Jain tradition. He has written these stanzas nearly 2000 years back and it appears that he wrote these lines exactly for the persons like you.

I might have taken about half an hour to explain these points. I noted that as soon as the message of these stanzas of Ācārya Kundakunda entered his logical mind he said, "It appears, today I will get a sound sleep. For the first time in the past six months I am feeling a great relief as if a heavy burden from my head has been removed."

Now we come to the main topic. In stanzas 248 and 249, Ācārya reveals an important fact of the philosophy: One survives in accordance with the provisions of the bonded life-span *Karma* (*Āyu Karma*). It would be incorrect to have this notion that somebody got killed by him without the completion of that

person's life-span *Karma* (*Āyu Karma*). Similarly, it would be incorrect to have this notion that others can kill him without the completion of his life-span *Karma*.

Similarly, stanzas 251 and 252 reveal that a living being remains alive in accordance with the provisions of the previously bonded life-span *Karma*. Others cannot increase or decrease the life-span beyond that bonded by the concerned living being.

In view of these concepts of *Karma* theory and independence of each and every soul at the deeper level, *Ācārya* Kundakunda reveals the following in stanzas 247 and 250:

- (a) A spiritually deluded and ignorant person has this notion that he can kill others and can be killed by others. An enlightened person (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) does not have such notion. An enlightened person knows that he cannot kill others and cannot be killed by others.
- (b) A spiritually deluded and ignorant person has this notion that he can save the life of others and others can save his life, whereas an enlightened person (*SamyagDr̥ṣṭi*) has this notion that he cannot save others and others cannot save him from his death without the life-span *Karma* (*Āyu Karma*) balance of the person concerned.

Question: Such stanzas may prove counter-productive. If a medical doctor or nurse or any member of family or any friend has this notion that he cannot save others then he may become indifferent and lazy. If many persons in the society have such notion then there would be a collapse of the health system and hospitals. The system would be very different when many persons start adopting this attitude that he cannot make a difference in other person's life. Would it not be so?

Answer: No, it would not be so, if the stanzas are properly understood. These stanzas do not lead to the collapse of the health system. These stanzas indirectly caution everybody that

one should not take or give 100% guarantee, because the helper does not know the *Karma* which are going to arise at the moment. Further, it may be noted that this is the chapter on bondage, and through these stanzas Ācārya Kundakunda is explaining to avoid the bondage by not accepting oneself as the 'doer' of tasks of other living beings in a deep sense.

Before going further, it is also to be kept in our mind that when we talk about the death and life then we are in the regime of the relative point of view, whereas from the real point of view there is nothing like death and birth.

It may be noted that almost all philosophers and spiritual masters have advised the masses to help others. The importance of helping others has also been described by Ācārya Kundakunda in the scriptures. Even in this chapter in stanza 260 he clearly mentions that the desire and acts of helping others are virtuous *Karma* (*Punya*).

The helping attitude is like an accelerator. Without recognizing the value of efforts a person with worldly desires may become lazy and indifferent. The scriptures, in general, do not approve such lazy and irrational persons who have worldly desires but do not want to make efforts. It is a sin to be lazy or non-sincere in discharging one's duty. A doctor who does not believe in making change in other's health does not qualify to work as a doctor. Such a doctor should also not believe in expecting any fee from others, i.e., one cannot say that he believes in stanza 251 in one way and stanza 252 in another way.

But just as a car needs not only accelerator but brakes also, in the same way one should have brakes also in one's notions regarding the limitations of results of helping others. After making sincere efforts, one should be able to accept the outcome that occurs in accordance with the arising *Karma* of the person concerned. Such an outcome may or may not be in agreement to our expectations, and may provide a point of research for the

advancement in the future, but without recognizing the value of the arising *Karma* of the person, we are likely to end up in guilt, fear, frustration, ego, etc.

In this regard it may also be worth noting that in the name of improving the life of others many quarrels take place between husband and wife, son and father, and so on. Psychologists know that many quarrels happen because of not realizing the independence of others in an appropriate way. These stanzas and similar stanzas (253, 256, 259, etc.) may be helpful in keeping the balance.

Question: If one dies according to the provisions of the life-span *Karma* (*Āyu Karma*) bonded by the person concerned then why does a murderer get punishment?

Answer: The punishment by the court of the law is given according to the laws framed by the parliament. See the next question also.

Question: Why does the parliament frame such laws?

Answer: Not only the parliament but the *Kārmika* laws also ‘punish’ a murderer though the victim might have died as per his own *Karma*. The *Kārmika* bondage to the murderer takes place due to each of the following reasons:

- (i) The killer had a wrong notion that he can kill others.
- (ii) The killer had an intention of disturbing life of other persons (intention of committing crime).
- (iii) The killer made attempts to achieve that inappropriate goal (attempts to commit a crime).

We shall discuss more details in this regard in the annotations related with stanzas 262-265.

जोअप्पणा दु मण्णदि दुक्खिदसुहिदे करेमि सत्ते ति ।

सो मूढो अण्णाणी णाणी एत्तो दु विवरीदो ॥253॥

कम्मोदण जीवा दुक्खिदसुहिदा हवन्ति जदि सव्वे ।
 कम्मं च ण देसि तुमं दुक्खिदसुहिदा कह कया ते ॥254॥
 कम्मोदण जीवा दुक्खिदसुहिदा हवन्ति जदि सव्वे ।
 कम्मं च ण दिति तुहं कदोसि कहं दुक्खिदो तेहिं ॥255॥
 कम्मोदण जीवा दुक्खिदसुहिदा हवन्ति जदि सव्वे ।
 कम्मं च ण दिति तुहं कह तं सुहिदो कदो तेहिं ॥256॥

Jo appaṇā du maṇṇadi dukkhidasuhide karemi satte tti.

So mūḍho aṇṇāṇī ṇāṇī etto du vivarīdo. ||253||

Kammaḍaṇṇa jīvā dukkhidasuhidā havanti jadi savve.

Kammam ca ṇa desi tumam dukkhidasuhidā kaha kayā te. ||254||

Kammaḍaṇṇa jīvā dukkhidasuhidā havanti jadi savve.

Kammam ca ṇa dinti tuham kadosi kaham dukkhido tehim. ||255||

Kammaḍaṇṇa jīvā dukkhidasuhidā havanti jadi savve.

Kammam ca ṇa dinti tuham kaha tam suhido kado tehim. ||256||

य आत्मना तु मन्यते दुःखितसुखितान् करोमि सत्त्वानिति ।

स मूढोऽज्ञानी ज्ञान्यतस्तु विपरीतः ॥253॥

कर्मोदयेन जीवा दुःखितसुखिता भवन्ति यदि सर्वे ।

कर्म च न ददासि त्वं दुःखितसुखिताः कथं कृतास्ते ॥254॥

कर्मोदयेन जीवा दुःखितसुखिता भवन्ति यदि सर्वे ।

कर्म च न ददति तव कृतोऽसि कथं दुःखितस्तैः ॥255॥

कर्मोदयेन जीवा दुःखितसुखिता भवन्ति यदि सर्वे ।

कर्म च न ददति तव कथं त्वं सुखितः कृतस्तैः ॥256॥

One, who has this perception that – I make other living beings unhappy or happy – is deluded and spiritually ignorant, while the opposite of that is enlightened. [253]

Whereas living beings become unhappy or happy in accordance with the fruition of [their own] *Karma*, and you cannot give *Karma* [to them], then how can you be the doer of their unhappiness or happiness? [254]

Whereas living beings become unhappy or happy in accordance with the rise of [their own] *Karma*, and others cannot give *Karma* to you, then how can they be the doer of your unhappiness? [255]

Whereas living beings become unhappy or happy in accordance with the rise of [their own] *Karma*, and others cannot give *Karma* to you, then how can they be the doer of your happiness? [256]

Annotation

In the previous six stanzas *Ācārya* Kundakunda mentioned that each one is the master of one's own destiny regarding survival and death. Here in these stanzas he is generalizing this point. Here *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that each one becomes unhappy or happy in accordance with the rise of one's own *Karma* at that moment.

These stanzas highlight some useful concepts such as follows. Besides providing a clarity in the vision, these concepts may also be helpful in reducing the guilt, anger, ego, and fear.

- (i) Each living being is independent in the sense that one becomes unhappy or happy in accordance with one's own *Karma*. A person is un-enlightened if he does not understand this basic independence.
- (ii) An enlightened person understands very well that he cannot control happiness of others and others cannot control his happiness.
- (iii) The *Kārmika* bonding is non-transferable.

Question: It appears that according to these stanzas, *Karma* can do something which other souls cannot. Does it mean that *Karma* are more powerful than any other soul?

Answer: These stanzas do not compare the power of soul with that of *Karma*. These stanzas convey this message that it is the power of the soul 'A', not of any other person or thing, which controls the destiny of 'A'. Here *Ācārya* Kundakunda writes

about the bonded *Karma*, and the bonded *Karma* means the *Karma* bonded by the soul concerned. For the *Kārmika* bonding of soul 'A', the actions of 'A' are responsible. In verse (*Kalaśa*) 168 written along with the commentary of these stanzas in *ĀtmaKhyāti*, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra explicitly writes that every occurrence of death, life, unhappiness, and happiness happens in accordance with the rise of the *Karma* bonded by oneself, not by others.

Question: Can the fruition of bonded *Karma* alone bring the food on the table?

Answer: (i) *Karma* theory cannot be applied to hypothetical situations.

(ii) When a commercial bank says that an account holder can get money in accordance with the rules of the bank and the balance available in his account, then it does not mean that for getting money from one's account from the bank, an ATM machine or the help of a cashier is not needed. Here the emphasis is over this point that one gets money as per one's own balance in the account.

(iii) Through these stanzas *Ācārya* Kundakunda also wants us to realize similar roles of ours, sometimes as a 'cashier' and sometimes as a 'customer', in various walks of life. Just as a cashier of a bank knows that a customer receives money through him in accordance with the bank balance of the customer and the rules of the bank, just as he knows that he does not give money from his pocket, in the same way while doing one's duty one should also keep in mind the relationship of others' happiness and unhappiness with their own *Karma*.

(iv) Further, in the example of commercial banks, sometimes one may not get money from the bank despite one's ample balance in the account, but the *Kārmika* bank is such an

efficient and lawful system that one gets unhappiness, happiness, etc. exactly in accordance with the fruition of the then arising *Karma*.

Question: If a cook is also a *Nimitta* and the arising *Karma* are also *Nimitta* then why do we give credit to *Karma* only?

Answer: We should be thankful to cook, host, cashier, etc. also. However, when work is done by us for others or others could not do work for us then this logic of *Karma* may be useful in reducing our ego, anger, guilt, fear, etc. These stanzas are not meant to make any list of recipients of 'thanks'. The main theme of these stanzas is to express this point that just as in the transaction of money between a customer and a cashier, the cashier neither gives money from his pocket nor puts any money in his pocket; in the same way, in a deeper sense, during all worldly interactions, one cannot control happiness of other persons. (Despite such independence, through stanzas 259 and 260 we would learn further that one gets bonded by sin *Karma* if one desires to make others unhappy and one gets bonded by virtuous *Karma* if one desires to make others happy.)

To illustrate this point further, we may consider one example: Mahesh gets a gift voucher from Suresh and enjoys dinner in a restaurant with his family. The dinner is served by a waiter, Bunty. In this scenario we ask a question: Who is to be considered as the provider of the dinner? Suresh or Bunty? Their five-year old child may name Bunty, his wife may name Suresh, and here these stanzas name 'the fruit of their *Karma*'. Depending on the objective/purpose of the questioner, different answers may be appropriate in our day-to-day life. For example, for paying the tip, the appropriate answer would be Bunty. However, the answer provided by these stanzas is highly valuable in resolving various kinds of conflicts and

unrest in one's mind.

जो मरदि जो य दुहियो जायदि कम्मोदण सो सब्बो ।

तम्हा दु मारिदो दे दुहाविदो चेदि ण हु मिच्छा ॥257॥

जो ण मरदि ण य दुहियो सो वि य कम्मोदण चेव खलु ।

तम्हा ण मारिदो णो दुहाविदो चेदि ण हु मिच्छा ॥258॥

Jo maradi jo ya duhido jāyadi kammōdaṇa so savvo.

Tamhā du mārīdo de duhāvīdo cedi ṇa hu micchā. ॥257॥

Jo ṇa maradi ṇa ya duhido so vi ya kammōdaṇa ceva khalu.

Tamhā ṇa mārīdo ṇo duhāvīdo cedi ṇa hu micchā. ॥258॥

यो म्रियते यश्च दुःखितो जायते कर्मोदयेन स सर्वः ।

तस्मात्तु मारितस्ते दुःखितश्चेति न खलु मिथ्या ॥257॥

यो न म्रियते न च दुःखितः सोऽपि च कर्मोदयेन चैव खलु ।

तस्मान्न मारितो नो दुःखितश्चेति न खलु मिथ्या ॥258॥

One dies or one becomes unhappy, all such events happen in accordance with the rise of [one's own] *Karma*. Therefore, are you not wrong [in having this opinion] that he died because of you or he is unhappy because of you? [257]

One does not die [but survives] or one does not become unhappy [but remains happy], all such events happen in accordance with the rise of [one's own] *Karma*. Therefore, are you not wrong [in having this notion] that he did not die [but survived] because of you or he is not unhappy [but is happy] because of you? [258]

Annotation

Many times it appears that one has harmed or helped another living being. The events of helping or harming may be intentional or un-intentional. In these two stanzas Ācārya Kundakunda states that, one dies or one becomes unhappy in accordance with the rise of one's own *Karma*. Similarly, the survival of a living being or the happiness of a living being at any moment also happens in

accordance with the rise of one's own *Karma*.

Ācārya Kundakunda further says that it is an erroneous thinking that you can be doer of others' unhappiness or happiness or death or survival.

Question: Will such stanzas not make a person irresponsible?

Answer: (i) For the guidance two stanzas are insufficient. In the next two stanzas *Ācārya* Kundakunda reveals that one gets bonded by sin *Karma* if one desires to make others unhappy, and one gets bonded by virtuous *Karma* if one desires to make others happy. A proper understanding of all such stanzas is required in becoming 'responsible' and 'kind' to the self as well as to others. These stanzas (257 and 258) may be helpful in reducing complaints, guilt, fear, anger, ego, etc.

(ii) It may be noted that in this scripture *Ācārya* Kundakunda is not focused on prescribing any ideology or code of conduct. He is describing the basic philosophy. He is describing the basic facts. Just as various branches of natural science deal with basic facts, and various branches of engineering and medical sciences deal with their application; in the same way *Dravyānuyoga* of Jainology deals with the facts, and *Caraṇānuyoga* of Jainology deals with their application. This scripture is to be considered as a scripture of *Dravyānuyoga*. After reading two lines regarding the law of conservation of energy from the books of physics some persons may not be careful and may not make attempts to save the electricity. With this logic or apprehension the mention of the law of conservation of energy in the books of physics cannot be stopped.

(iii) In this regard, the story of Anantji and the related discussion in the annotations of stanzas 247-252 may also be helpful.

एसा दु जा मदी दे दुक्खिदसुहिदे करेमि सत्ते त्ति ।

एसा दे मूढमदी सुहासुहं बंधदे कम्मं ॥259॥

दुक्खिदसुहिदे सत्ते करेमि जं एवमज्झवसिदं ते ।

तं पावबंधगं वा पुण्णस्स व बंधगं होदि ॥260॥

मारिमि जीवावेमि य सत्ते जं एवमज्झवसिदं ते ।

तं पावबंधगं वा पुण्णस्स व बंधगं होदि ॥261॥

Esā du jā maḍi de dukkhdasuhide karemi satte tti.

Esā de mūḍhamadī suhāsuham bandhade kammam. ||259||

Dukkhdasuhide satte karemi jam evamajjhavasidam te.

Tam pāvabandhagam vā puṇṇassa va bandhagam hodi. ||260||

Mārimi jīvāvēmi ya satte jam evamajjhavasidam te.

Tam pāvabandhagam vā puṇṇassa va bandhagam hodi. ||261||

एषा तु या मतिस्ते दुःखितसुखितान् करोमि सत्त्वानिति ।

एषा ते मूढमतिः शुभाशुभं बध्नाति कर्म ॥259॥

दुःखितसुखितान् सत्त्वान् करोमि यदेवमध्यवसितं ते ।

तत्पापबंधकं वा पुण्यस्य वा बंधकं भवति ॥260॥

मारयामि जीवयामि वा सत्त्वान् यदेवमध्यवसितं ते ।

तत्पापबंधकं वा पुण्यस्य वा बंधकं भवति ॥261॥

‘I make other living beings miserable or happy’ – such conviction of yours, O’ deluded one!, leads you to bonding with inauspicious or auspicious *Karma*. [259]

‘I [intend to] make other living beings miserable or happy’ – such erroneous disposition of yours becomes the cause of bonding with sin-*Karma* or virtuous-*Karma*. [260]

‘I [intend to] kill or protect other living beings’ – such erroneous disposition of yours becomes the cause of bonding with sin-*Karma* or virtuous-*Karma*. [261]

Annotation

Stanza 259 reveals that it is a delusion to have this notion that one can make another unhappy or happy. Such a deluded thinking

leads to inauspicious or auspicious *Kārmika* bonding.

Stanza 260 says that disposition (*Adhyavasāna*) of making others miserable or happy is erroneous. Such a disposition leads to sinful or virtuous *Kārmika* bonding.

From stanza 261 we learn that disposition (*Adhyavasāna*) of killing or protecting others is erroneous. Such a disposition leads to sinful or virtuous *Kārmika* bonding.

In this treatise in chapter 4 (stanzas 145 to 147), we have already seen that *Ācārya* Kundakunda considers not only the bondage of sin-*Karma* as a handcuff but the bondage of virtuous-*Karma* also as a handcuff. *Ācārya* Kundakunda calls former as a handcuff of iron and later as a handcuff of gold. Here also in these three stanzas we notice that the focus of *Ācārya* Kundakunda is not to make distinction between the sin-*Karma* and virtuous-*Karma* but to show that the erroneous thinking or disposition (*Adhyavasāna*) leads to bondage which may be inauspicious or auspicious.

Question: Can't we distinguish between the cause of inauspicious and auspicious bonding?

Answer: (i) Yes, we shall see in stanzas 263 and 264.

(ii) *Ācārya* Kundakunda mentions two names of bondage, (a) sinful or inauspicious ('*Pāva*' or '*Asuha*' in *Prākṛta*) (b) virtuous or auspicious ('*Puṇṇa*' or '*Suha*' in *Prākṛta*), in these three stanzas. *Ācārya* Kundakunda used adjectives 'gold' and 'iron' with handcuff in stanza 146 for these two types of bondage. In *Caraṇānuyoga* one finds more detailed distinction and instructions to avoid sin. *Caraṇānuyoga* highlights in detail that helping others leads to bondage with auspicious *Karma* and making others unhappy leads to bondage with inauspicious *Karma*. However, here the focus is on showing the cause of bondage. If one does not recognize the independence of another living being then he is going to get

Kārmika bondage. In *ĀtmaKhyāti* also, *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra has explicitly emphasized over such focus of *Ācārya* Kundakunda.

अज्झवसिदेण बंधो सत्ते मारेउ मा व मारेउ ।

एसो बंधसमासो जीवाणं णिच्छयणयस्स ॥262॥

एवमलिए अदत्ते अबंधचेरे परिग्गहे चेव ।

कीरदि अज्झवसाणं जं तेण दु बज्झदे पावं ॥263॥

तह वि य सच्चे दत्ते बंधे अपरिग्गहत्तणे चेव ।

कीरदि अज्झवसाणं जं तेण दु बज्झदे पुण्णं ॥264॥

वत्थुं पडुच्च जं पुण अज्झवसाणं तु होदि जीवाणं ।

ण य वत्थुदो दु बंधो अज्झवसाणेण बंधोत्थि ॥265॥

Ajjhavasideṇa bandho satte māreu mā va māreu.

Eso Bandhasamāso jīvāṇaṃ ṇicchayaṇayassa. ॥262॥

Evamalie adatte abambhacere pariggahe ceva.

Kīradi ajjhasāṇaṃ jaṃ teṇa du bajjhade pāvaṃ. ॥263॥

Taha vi ya sacche datte bambahe apariggahattāṇe ceva.

Kīradi ajjhasāṇaṃ jaṃ teṇa du bajjhade puṇṇaṃ. ॥264॥

Vatthum paḍucca jaṃ puṇa ajjhasāṇaṃ tu hodi jīvāṇaṃ.

Ṇa ya vatthudo du bandho ajjhasāṇeṇa bandhotthi. ॥265॥

अध्यवसितेन बंधः सत्त्वान् मारयतु मा वा मारयतु ।

एष बंधसमासो जीवानां निश्चयनयस्य ॥262॥

एवमलीकेऽदत्तेऽब्रह्मचर्ये परिग्रहे चैव ।

क्रियतेऽध्यवसानं यत्तेन तु बध्यते पापम् ॥263॥

तथापि च सत्ये दत्ते ब्रह्मणि अपरिग्रहत्वे चैव ।

क्रियतेऽध्यवसानं यत्तेन तु बध्यते पुण्यम् ॥264॥

वस्तु प्रतीत्य यत्पुनरध्यवसानं तु भवति जीवानाम् ।

न च वस्तुतस्तु बन्धोऽध्यवसानेन बन्धोऽस्ति ॥265॥

Whether one kills or does not kill other living beings, the bondage is due to *Adhyavasāna*. This is the essence of the theory

of bondage of living beings from the real point of view. [262]

Similarly, in case of actions of falsehood, stealing, non-celibacy, and possessiveness, the bondage of inauspicious *Karma* takes place due to the related *Adhyavasāna*. [263]

In the same way, due to *Adhyavasāna* of not to lie, not to steal, celibacy, and renunciation, the bondage of virtuous *Karma* takes place. [264]

Again, in living beings *Adhyavasāna* happen with the involvement of other objects. However, in reality, the bondage is due to *Adhyavasāna*, not due to other objects. [265]

Annotation

In these four stanzas one of the important keywords is *Adhyavasāna*. This word has been explained in the glossary (Appendix-1). However, here it may be appropriate to review its meaning in context with these stanzas: Thoughts, feelings, emotions, desires, inclination of liking some things, events, and persons, and disliking some other things, events, and persons, with spiritual ignorance (*Mithyātva*) are known as *Adhyavasāna*. Further, in addition to this meaning at some places in the scriptures this word is also used to mean liking and disliking without spiritual ignorance.

There are five kinds of sins: (i) violence (ii) falsehood (iii) stealing (iv) non-celibacy (v) possessiveness [see Appendix -7]. According to stanza 265, for the bonding of any type of *Karma* corresponding to any kind of sin other objects are not responsible but the *Adhyavasāna* of the concerned soul are responsible. *Adhyavasāna* cannot happen in absence of other objects or living beings in thoughts or feelings. However, other objects and living beings cannot be held responsible. Other objects and cause of disturbance may continue to exist but the continuance of disturbance at psychic level can be absent even in the presence of

external objects.

Stanza 262 may be considered as the essence of the theory of *Kārmika* bonding. Here the *Ācārya* emphasizes this point that for the *Kārmika* bondage of sin *Karma*, the harm of another living being is not necessary. If one intends to harm another living being then one gets bonded whether or not another living being suffers (see stanzas 263 and 265). Similarly, if one has an intention or desire of helping or protecting another living being then the auspicious *Kārmika* bonding takes place (see stanzas 264 and 265) whether or not another living being receives the outcome. The point which *Ācārya* Kundakunda wants to highlight is that the *Kārmika* bonding to soul 'A' does not depend on the outcome to soul 'B', but it depends on *Adhyavasāna* of 'A' (stanza 265).

Regarding the outcome to soul 'B', *Ācārya* Kundakunda already mentioned in stanzas 254-256 that it depends on the rise of *Karma* of 'B'. The *Karma* of 'B' were acquired by 'B' at some point of time in the present or past life by his own actions.

The relative point of view describes the interdependence of living beings 'A' and 'B' based on the cause-effect formulas of the natural and social sciences. However, the independence of souls of 'A' and 'B' continues to exist at the spiritual level, from the impure real point of view, in the following way:

- (i) 'A' gets bonded as per *Adhyavasāna* of 'A' (stanza 265).
- (ii) The outcome to 'B' happens in accordance with the rise of *Karma* of 'B' (see stanzas 254-256).

Killing someone is a sin and *Adhyavasāna* of protecting someone is an auspicious *Karma* (*Punya*). In the same way the thought/desire of telling a lie is a sin and the thought/desire of not telling a lie is an auspicious *Karma*. However, it may be noted that the thought/desire of killing is *Adhyavasāna* and the thought/desire of not killing is also *Adhyavasāna*. Similarly, the thought/desire of telling a lie is *Adhyavasāna* and the thought/desire of not telling a

lie is also *Adhyavasāna*. *Adhyavasāna* of killing leads to bonding with inauspicious *Karma* and *Adhyavasāna* of protecting leads to bonding with auspicious *Karma*. In the same way, *Adhyavasāna* of telling a lie leads to bonding with inauspicious *Karma* and *Adhyavasāna* of not telling a lie leads to bonding with auspicious *Karma*.

Similarly, one can say that *Adhyavasāna* of stealing or *Adhyavasāna* of non-celibacy or *Adhyavasāna* of possessiveness leads to bonding with inauspicious *Karma*; and *Adhyavasāna* of non-stealing, *Adhyavasāna* of celibacy, or *Adhyavasāna* of non-possessiveness leads to bonding with auspicious *Karma*.

In short, any desire of controlling or manipulating others in auspicious or inauspicious way is *Adhyavasāna* and leads to auspicious or inauspicious *Kārmika* bonding.

These stanzas may be useful in various ways in a householder's day-to-day life also. For example, from these stanzas one may infer that if a man has illicit intention regarding another woman and even if that woman is not affected and is unaware about it, then also the sinful bonding takes place to that man. Similarly, if a woman has illicit intention regarding another man and even if that man is not affected and is unaware about it, then also the sinful bonding takes place to that woman. Further, from stanzas 255 and 256 one can also learn to be fearless: One can learn that his life depends on his thoughts, feelings, and actions (present as well as past); others cannot harm, the harm happens in accordance with one's own present or past deeds (*Karma*).

दुःखिदसुहिदे जीवे करेमि बंधेमि तह विमोचेमि ।

जा एसा मूढमदी गिरत्थया सा हु दे मिच्छा ॥266॥

अज्झवसाणणिमित्तं जीवा बज्झंति कम्मणा जदि हि ।

मुचंति मोक्खमग्गे ठिदा य ता किं करेसि तुमं ॥267॥

Dukkhdidasuhide jīve karemi bandhemi taha vimocemi.

Jā esā mūḍhamadī nīratthayā sā hu de micchā. ||266||

Ajjhavasāṇaṇimittam jīvā bajjhanti kammaṇā jadi hi.

Muccanti mokkhamagge tīdā ya tā kim karesi tumam. ||267||

दुःखितसुखितान् जीवान् करोमि बन्धयामि तथा विमोचयामि ।

या एषा मूढमतिः निरर्थिका सा खलु ते मिथ्या ॥266॥

अध्यवसाननिमित्तं जीवा बध्यन्ते कर्मणा यदि हि ।

मुच्यन्ते मोक्षमार्गे स्थिताश्च तत् किं करोषि त्वम् ॥267॥

‘I make [other] living beings happy and unhappy. I bind and set them free.’ Such deluded conviction of yours is [spiritually] futile and, in reality, is erroneous. [266]

If [other] living beings get *Kārmika* bondage due to *Adhyavasāna* and get released from *Karma* by staying on the path of liberation, then what is your role? [267]

Annotation

Before coming to the main point, I would like to share an experience. Long back, one of my close acquaintances Mr Dayachand (name changed) casually mentioned, “I made Dr. Mogra (name changed) as Professor. He became professor because of me.”

Prof. Mogra was a well known reputed professor in the university. I was surprised by this remark of Dayachand. I asked him, “How?” He calmly replied, “Sir, I was the chief clerk in the process of his recruitment. I devoted a lot of time in the process of advertisement of the vacancy and in receiving and processing his application for the job. I was the person who typed his interview letter and many other letters to the members of the selection committee. I typed his appointment letter. During the process of recruitment I did various kinds of paper work at every stage. To complete such tasks in the minimum time, as desired by my boss, I had to work in the office till 10 PM on many occasions. How can I forget this hard work and pain that resulted into the recruitment of Prof. Mogra?”

After hearing so much I responded with a smile, “Oh, now I understood the meaning of your remark.” I did not argue with him. I was realizing that neither he was expecting nor was it possible for him to get anything in return from that past event. To me it appeared simply an erroneous and futile conviction.

To make this story of Dayachand more meaningful in the context of these stanzas, I want to add here two paragraphs to narrate an imaginary event that might have happened after a few months.

On some other day during our gossip, Dayachand mentioned about the opening of a new grocery store named Model Provision Store in his neighborhood. He admired the price, services, and quality of the goods. He also mentioned that he gets all his kitchen requirements from that store. At this, I jokingly commented, “Oh, Model Provision Store provides you your food material. You eat the food provided by Model Provision Store.” He did not like this joking comment of mine. He got irritated and said, “What do you mean by this? Nobody provides me my food. I eat my hard earned food.”

At this point, in a joking tone I said, “If you can make Dr. Mogra as Prof. Mogra then why can’t you accept that Model Provision Store provides you your food.” He realized my point and said, “Yes, you are right. You have opened my eyes. I did my duty of the clerk and received my salary as well as reward for the excellent work from my employer. Just as I eat my earning, Dr. Mogra also became professor by virtue of his own ability. My ego is baseless and futile. It is not helping me in any way.”

One may ignore or laugh at the notion of Dayachand. But *Ācārya* Kundakunda wants to explain through these stanzas that many of us become Dayachand and by ignorance take credit (or discredit) in providing the worldly happiness (or unhappiness) to others. Through these stanzas *Ācārya* Kundakunda clarifies that for

all worldly happiness or unhappiness or spiritual growth of any living being that living being is responsible. It is futile to have the deluded conviction of recognizing oneself as the owner or doer of the happiness or unhappiness or the spiritual growth of others.

When one is capable of realizing the existence of soul and *Kārmika* laws then in every event he sees the independence of every soul as mentioned earlier. He sees that in every interaction between two persons, 'A' and 'B', 'A' gets new *Kārmika* bonding as per *Adhyavasāna* of 'A' and gets fruits (happiness or unhappiness) as per rise of his own *Karma*; and similarly, at every instant, 'B' gets new *Kārmika* bonding as per *Adhyavasāna* of 'B' and gets fruits (happiness or unhappiness) as per rise of his own *Karma*.

From the real point of view, it is very easy to understand this point that soul 'A' cannot control soul 'B'. In this regard, the annotation of stanza 100 written in this work may also be helpful. Further, an understanding from the relative point of view may also be helpful. One should keep in mind that every person has limitations. Nobody is omnipotent, therefore, even from the relative point of view, nobody can claim with 100% certainty that he can provide happiness or unhappiness to others.

To clarify these stanzas further we shall now illustrate some points by raising and answering a few questions:

Question: If one cannot provide happiness or unhappiness to others then would it be appropriate to ignore the importance of the role of a god-father in one's life?

Answer: From the relative point of view, we see the effect of the actions of a god-father. (Stanza 98 describes the effect of actions of a person from the relative point of view.) The placement of a right person at right place is not an easy task. One who is helped in acquiring the right chair or help by the kindness of someone usually feels thankful to him. Any helper

may be understood as god-father for the purpose of understanding the point. A cancer patient considers his doctor as 'god' when he gets cured. An accused in the prison considers his lawyer as 'god' when he gets the judgment for his release.

But such successful outcome does not always happen with every doctor and lawyer. Many times an influential and powerful god-father also becomes unsuccessful in achieving the objectives. These stanzas are going to be very useful to those who feel that they are powerful and are helping and making lives of many persons pleasant. To all helpers and persons devoted to the progress of their fellow beings these stanzas may be helpful. For deriving the benefit one is required to keep in mind the following:

- (i) He should not forget that despite his efforts and influence the outcome would be in accordance with the rise of *Karma* of the person or persons concerned. With this notion he would be less egoist on the success and less guilty on the failure.
- (ii) He should not ignore moral and ethics in his actions. It is he who would pay the price of violating moral and ethics in the form of *Kārmika* bonding to him.
- (iii) On the top of all the worldly tasks he should realize that in true sense he is not the physical body. In reality he is a soul and as a soul he neither owns his body nor he can make anybody happy or unhappy. He should realize that he, as a soul, is not the doer of the events which appear to be happening through his personality. He is neither the doer nor the owner of the actions of his body. Thus he should realize that his notion of making other living beings happy or unhappy is incorrect in the true sense. He should be clear that his role as a soul is to know. (We would see more about this role in stanza 320.)

Question: Everywhere we are taught that we should try to help and please others. If nobody can make others happy or unhappy, then what about the actions of a householder enlightened person (*Jñānī*)?

Answer: We are also taught that we should give charity by one hand in such a way that even the other hand does not know it. If we keep this teaching also in our mind then it would be easy to understand the help on one hand and the notion of realizing oneself as the non-doer of happiness or unhappiness on the other hand.

Jain preceptors including *Ācārya* Kundakunda have also taught to help others. Jain scriptures have described four kinds of charity – (a) to provide food (b) to provide medical support (c) to provide scriptures/knowledge/books (d) to provide security – for the benefit of others. The protection of even a small insect is also taught. A householder *Jñānī* who knows and believes in the philosophy of these stanzas may also be seen doing the act of generosity and help. Mythological scriptures are filled with examples of enlightened kings who believed, knew, and followed the philosophy described in these stanzas and were still engaged in the tasks of public benefit. The point is that one should not have this impression that after believing in such philosophy the actions of mind and physical body cannot be in the direction of helping others.

As explained in chapter 3, a *Jñānī* does not consider himself as the doer of actions of his physical body and mind. However, the actions of the physical body of a *Jñānī* happen in accordance with the rise of his own *Karma*. *Karma* bonded earlier due to his inclination of helping and serving others in the past when come to fruition then the actions of serving and helping take place through the physical resources and intellect available. A seed grown in the form of a tree does not need

permission of the soil at the time of giving its fruits.

Question: According to stanza 267 a living being achieves liberation on his own. Does it mean that even an *Arahanta* or *Tīrthaṃkara* can't provide liberation to his devotees or to the persons of his choice?

Answer: Yes. As stated elsewhere (for example, see Appendix-2) an *Arahanta* or *Tīrthaṃkara* does not favour or disfavour any living being. Further, the law of independence works everywhere. One gets *Kārmika* bondage or liberation according to one's own actions.

सव्वे करेदि जीवो अज्झवसाणेण तिरियणेइए ।

देवमणुए य सव्वे पुण्णं पावं च णेयविहं ॥268॥

धम्माधम्मं च तहा जीवाजीवे अलोगलोगं च ।

सव्वे करेदि जीवो अज्झवसाणेण अप्पाणं ॥269॥

Savve karedi jīvo ajjhasvasāṇeṇa tiriyaṇeṇaie.

Devamaṇue ya savve puṇṇam pāvam ca ṇeyaviham. ||268||

Dhammādhammam ca tahā jīvājīve alogalogam ca.

Savve karedi jīvo ajjhasvasāṇeṇa appāṇam. ||269||

सर्वान् करोति जीवोऽध्यवसानेन तिर्यङ्नैरयिकान् ।

देवमनुजांश्च सर्वान् पुण्यं पापं च नैकविधम् ॥268॥

धर्माधर्मं च तथा जीवाजीवौ अलोकलोकं च ।

सर्वान् करोति जीवः अध्यवसानेन आत्मानम् ॥269॥

By *Adhyavasāna* a soul makes oneself a living being of *Tiryamca* realm (animal, insect, bacteria, plant, etc.), hell realm, celestial realm, human realm, and a living being of various auspicious and inauspicious kinds. [268]

Similarly, by *Adhyavasāna* a soul makes oneself all types of substances – *Dharma Dravya*, *Adharma Dravya*, animate, inanimate, cosmos, and trans-cosmos. [269]

Annotation

Here one of the important keywords is *Adhyavasāna* which has been explained in the annotation of stanzas 263-265. As explained there, for the purpose of these stanzas, thoughts, feelings, emotions, desires, inclination of liking some things, events, and persons, and inclination of disliking some other things, events, and persons, with spiritual ignorance (*Mithyātvā*) are known as *Adhyavasāna*.

Stanza 268 says that the *Adhyavasāna* leads to the false resume of the Self. For a soul having oneness with violent *Adhyavasāna* one can say that the soul is making oneself violent at that time. In the same way, when there is the rise of *Adhyavasāna* of oneness with human realm then one can say that the soul is making oneself a human being. Such identification is not permanent. When the same soul has *Adhyavasāna* of hellish being then he is making oneself as a living being of hell realm, and so on. By mentioning four realms – *Tiryamca*, hell, celestial, and human – Ācārya Kundakunda has covered living beings of all realms.

Further, even while identifying oneself as a living being of a particular realm (say, human being) one makes oneself sometimes a pious and sometimes a sinful being in accordance with one's *Adhyavasāna*. There can be a variety of ways of piousness and sinfulness. Ācārya Kundakunda in stanza 268, therefore, writes that by *Adhyavasāna* one also makes oneself pious and sinful in various ways.

Through stanza 269, Ācārya Kundakunda indicates another probable mistake that is based on the attachment with other entities which come in one's knowing. In reality though the soul is the knower (*Jñāyaka*) yet one can have *Adhyavasāna* of oneness with many entities other than one's own soul. For example, an entity may come in the knowing of the soul, and by *Adhyavasāna* of oneness the soul may make oneself that entity. The names of such

entities as mentioned in this stanza are: animate, inanimate, cosmos (*Lokākāśa*), trans-cosmos (*Alokākāśa*), *Dharma Dravya*, and *Adharma Dravya* substances (see Appendix-3, and stanzas 37 and 95 for more details regarding *Lokākāśa*, *Alokākāśa*, *Dharma Dravya*, and *Adharma Dravya*).

Question: If one knows about the existence of atoms and molecules then how does that knowing make him atoms and molecules?

Answer: The knowing of any entity does not make anybody that entity. It is the *Adhyavasāna* that leads to the falsehood. If one realizes one's existence or one's worth on the basis of knowledge of physics then he is making himself a physicist. According to his *Adhyavasāna* his worth depends on his knowledge of atoms and molecules or on the acceptance of his hypothesis and research outcome about atoms and molecules. Such a dependence on atoms and molecules amounts to making atoms and molecules as a part of his identity.

If we review these and some of the previous stanzas then we arrive at the following types of erroneous concepts regarding one's identity:

- (i) One's worth or existence depends on the associated physical body and the quality of one's thoughts and actions.
- (ii) One's worth or existence depends on one's ability to help or influence other living beings.
- (iii) One's worth or existence is measured by the knowledge of external objects.

One may note that during many mutual interaction and transactions in day-to-day worldly life of common persons the worth measured by the above mentioned criteria may be meaningful (and hence acceptable by the relative point of view) but that is not the end of the story.

One should be aware of the real worth which is beyond the above mentioned criteria. By pointing out the error in the above criteria Ācārya Kundakunda wants us to realize our true identification. Through stanza 269, Ācārya Kundakunda wants to highlight that our true or real identity is beyond physical body and the knowledge of externals gained through the physical body. By including these points in this chapter on bondage, Ācārya Kundakunda conveys that such false identification of the Self becomes the source of *Kārmika* bondage.

एदाणि णत्थि जेसिं अज्झवसाणाणि एवमादीणि ।

ते असुहेण सुहेण व कम्मेण मुणी ण लिप्पंति ॥270॥

Edāṇi ṇatthi jesim ajjhasasāṇāṇi evamādīṇi.

Te asuheṇa suheṇa va kammaṇa muṇī ṇa lippanti. ||270||

एतानि न संति येषामध्यवसानान्येवमादीनि ।

ते अशुभेन शुभेन वा कर्मणा मुनयो न लिप्यंते ॥270॥

Those saints, who do not have such (as described in previous stanzas) and any other type of *Adhyavasāna*, do not get bonded by any auspicious or inauspicious *Karma*. [270]

Annotation

While concluding the annotation part of the previous stanzas, *Adhyavasāna* have been described as three kinds of erroneous concepts/thoughts. Further, in the first paragraph of annotations of stanzas 262-265, it has been pointed out that desires associated with liking and disliking without spiritual ignorance are also considered as *Adhyavasāna*. This stanza says that saints who do not have any type of *Adhyavasāna* are not bonded by any kind of *Karma* whether auspicious or inauspicious.

A householder *SamyagDrṣṭi*, i.e. an enlightened being associated with home, money, family, etc., does not have *Adhyavasāna* with spiritual ignorance, but he remains associated with desires of liking and disliking without spiritual ignorance. A

saint in the meditative state who is free from home, money, family, desires, etc. is free from all kinds of *Adhyavasāna*. According to this stanza, such saints do not attract any *Kārmika* bondage.

Question: Here we learn that a saint without any *Adhyavasāna* does not get bonded. Thus this stanza indicates that a householder *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* gets *Kārmika* bondage; whereas stanzas 71, 166, 176, 195, 246, etc. reveal that a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* does not get new *Kārmika* bondage. How can we resolve this (apparent) contradiction?

Answer: This point has been discussed in detail by raising a similar question in the annotations of stanzas 170-172

बुद्धी ववसाओ वि य अज्झवसाणं मदी य विण्णाणं ।

एककट्टमेव सव्वं चित्तं भावो य परिणामो ॥271॥

Buddhī vavasāo vi ya ajj havasāṇam madī ya viṇṇāṇam.

Ekkaṭṭhameva savvam cittam bhāvo ya pariṇāmo. ||271||

बुद्धिर्ववसायोऽपि च अध्यवसानं मतिश्च विज्ञानम् ।

एकार्थमेव सर्वं चित्तं भावश्च परिणामः ॥271॥

Buddhi, Vyavasāya, Adhyavasāna, Mati, Vijñāna, Citta, Bhāva, and Pariṇama, all [these words] have same meaning. [271]

Annotation

When a soul abides in the soul itself (see stanza 73) then there is absence of new bonding. Further, in such state there also happens shedding of the previously bonded *Karma*. In other situations, as explained in the previous stanza, there is presence of *Adhyavasāna* and there happens new *Kārmika* bonding. As the previous stanza highlights the significance of *Adhyavasāna*, *Ācārya* Kundakunda considers it appropriate to elaborate the meaning and scope of *Adhyavasāna* by stating synonyms of *Adhyavasāna* in this stanza.

How to translate eight synonyms by using eight words in

English? When words have same meaning then we are in the area of thesaurus. Normally two different words in any language cannot be mathematically equal just as 5 equals 3+2. It also becomes difficult to say that for the first word the appropriate word in English is this and for the second word the appropriate word is not the first one. In view of this fact for writing the synonymous words in English, here we consider the previous stanza (stanza 270) and keep in mind that any synonym chosen must be able to illustrate the word 'Adhyavasāna' as used in stanza 270. With such consideration we can write as follows:

This stanza says that contemplation, resolution, *Adhyavasāna*, opinion, logic, reflection, emotion, feeling, etc. all these words have the same meaning. Further, in context with an un-enlightened person one can say that all these words are synonymous in the sense that they all become the cause of bonding.

It may be noted that earlier also in stanza 151, to highlight a particular concept, Ācārya Kundakunda has highlighted a word by giving its synonyms.

एवं व्यवहारणओ पडिसिद्धो जाण णिच्छयणएण ।

णिच्छयणयासिदा पुण मुणिणो पावन्ति णिव्वाणं ॥272॥

Evam vavahāraṇao paḍisiddho jāṇa ṇicchayaṇaṇa.

Ṇicchayaṇayāsīdā puṇa muṇiṇo pāvanti ṇivvāṇam. ||272||

एवं व्यवहारणयः प्रतिषिद्धो जानीहि निश्चयनयेन ।

निश्चयनयाश्रिताः पुनर्मुनयः प्राप्नुवन्ति निर्वाणम् ॥272॥

And know that the relative point of view is not accepted by the real point of view. Further, saints who take refuge in [the soul as described by] the real point of view attain liberation. [272]

Annotation

This stanza conveys following points:

- (i) The relative point of view is not accepted by the real point

of view.

- (ii) The liberation is attained by those saints who take refuge in the soul described by the real point of view.

Here we explicitly note the importance of the real point of view over the relative point of view in attaining the liberation. This point is further emphasized by *Ācārya* Kundakunda in the next three stanzas. (For details regarding real and relative points of view one may refer to Appendix-5)

Question: In the previous two stanzas *Ācārya* Kundakunda describes bondage due to *Adhyavasāna*. Now abruptly he comes to the real and relative points of view. Is there any connection of this stanza with the previous ones?

Answer: The previous two stanzas say that *Adhyavasāna* or contemplation, resolution, opinion, logic, reflection, emotion, feeling, etc. leads to *Kārmika* bonding. In each of these, the basic element is the dependence of soul on others. This dependence of soul on others comes in the area of relative point of view. In the commentary of this stanza *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra as well as *Ācārya* Jayasena writes that the real point of view means refuge in the Self and the relative point of view means refuge in non-Self. In other words, there is a close connection between *Adhyavasāna* and the relative point of view.

वदसमिदीगुत्तीओ सीलतव जिणवरेहि पण्णत्तं ।

कुव्वंतो वि अभव्वो अण्णाणी मिच्छदिट्ठी दु ॥273॥

मोक्खं असद्वहंतो अभवियसत्तो दु जो अधीएज्ज ।

पाठो ण करेदि गुणं असद्वहंतस्स णाणं तु ॥274॥

सद्वहदि य पत्तेदि य रोचेदि य तह पुणो य फासेदि ।

धम्मं भोगणिमित्तं ण दु सो कम्मक्खयणिमित्तं ॥275॥

Vadasamidīguttīo sīlatava jīṇavarehim paṇṇattam.

Kuvvanto vi abhavvo aññāñī micchadiṭṭhī du. ||273||

Mokkham asaddahanto abhaviyasatto du jo adhīeja.

Pāṭho ña karedi guṇam asaddahantassa ñāṇam tu. ||274||

Saddahadi ya pattedi ya rochedi ya taha puṇo ya phāseḍi.

Dhammam bhogaṇimittam ña du so kammakkhayaṇimittam. ||275||

व्रतसमितिगुप्तयः शीलतपो जिनवरैः प्रज्ञप्तम् ।

कुर्वन्नप्यभव्योऽज्ञानी मिथ्यादृष्टिस्तु ॥273॥

मोक्षमश्रद्धधानोऽभव्यसत्त्वस्तु योऽधीयीत ।

पाठो न करोति गुणमश्रद्धानस्य ज्ञानं तु ॥274॥

श्रद्धाति च प्रत्येति च रोचयति स तथा पुनश्च स्पृशति ।

धर्मं भोगनिमित्तं न तु स कर्मक्षयनिमित्तम् ॥275॥

A soul incapable-of-liberation-forever remains spiritually ignorant with perverted spiritual vision even by adopting vows, carefulness, restraints, rules of good conduct, and penance as preached by omniscient lords. [273]

A soul incapable-of-liberation-forever lacks faith in the liberation. He may study scriptures but it does not benefit him due to lack of faith in the soul. [274]

[A soul incapable-of-liberation-forever] believes in, accepts, becomes interested in, and touches *Dharma* as an instrument for achieving physical pleasures [for the present or next life], not for shedding the *Kārmika* bondage. [275]

Annotation

Souls are of two types: (i) Those who would never attain liberation, neither in this life time nor in any future life. Such souls are known as souls incapable-of-liberation-forever. These are called *Abhavya* in *Samskṛta*, (ii) Those who are not *Abhavya*. These are called *Bhavya* in *Samskṛta*. The scriptures also reveal that most of the souls are *Bhavya*.

These stanzas reveal the following facts regarding souls incapable-of-liberation-forever (*Abhavya*):

- (i) An *Abhavya* always remains spiritually ignorant. An *Abhavya* never gets enlightenment, i.e., he always remains *MithyāDrṣṭi*. He remains spiritually ignorant even while he is involved with spiritual practices through his physical body as preached by omniscient lords (*Jinendra Deva*). For example, an *Abhavya* may go to the extent of adopting vows (*Vrata*), carefulness (*Samiti*), restraints (*Gupti*), good external conduct (*Śīla*) and penance in accordance with the preaching of omniscient lords (*Jinendra Deva*). In other words, stanza 273 says that the actions of physical body of an *Abhavya* may be in accordance with the preaching of omniscient lords (*Jinendra Deva*) but still it is certain that internally he is not on the spiritual path.
- (ii) It is also possible that an *Abhavya* may devote a lot of time in reading holy scriptures. Stanza 274 says that internally even such a well read *Abhavya* does not have faith in the soul, and cannot be on the right track as far as the spiritual realization is concerned.
- (iii) Internally an *Abhavya* considers and adopts the spiritual practices as means of acquiring physical pleasures for the present or future. (stanza 275)
- (iv) An *Abhavya* does not have any interest in the spiritual liberation. (stanza 275)

Question: Is there any connection between these stanzas and the previous stanza (stanza 272) which says that the liberation is possible to those saints who take refuge in the soul described by the real point of view?

Answer: Yes. These stanzas reveal that the external measures of the spiritual practices as described by the relative point of view can be achieved even by an *Abhavya*. The example of *Abhavya* highlights this point that if the realization of the soul as described by the real point of view does not happen then the liberation is impossible even though one can attain the

peak of external conduct related to the physical body. Thus these stanzas strengthen the importance of the real point of view revealed in the previous stanza.

Question: Even after the realization of the soul as described by the real point of view one cannot attain the liberation without undergoing renunciation process as described by the relative point of view! Does it not mean that the relative point of view is also valuable?

Answer: Yes, the relative point of is also valuable. To avoid any confusion, it is important to keep in mind the value of the relative point of view as described by Ācārya Kundakunda in stanzas 11 and 12. Stanzas 11, 12, and 272 are not inconsistent. Further, stanza 13 is also to be kept in mind that shows that even attainment of *SamyagDarśana* (4th *Guṇasthāna*) is not possible without comprehending nine *Tattva* as described by the real point of view. It may also be noted that earlier also in various stanzas such as stanzas 14-15, 73, 151-154, 180, 186, and 206, Ācārya Kundakunda has highlighted the importance of the realization of the soul as described by the real point of view. All such descriptions become helpful in understanding the real point of view and relative point of view in proper perspective.

आयारादी णाणं जीवादी दंसणं च विण्णेयं ।

छज्जीवणिकं च तहा भणदि चरित्तं तु व्यवहारो ॥276॥

आदा खु मज्झ णाणं आदा मे दंसणं चरित्तं च ।

आदा पच्चक्खाणं आदा मे संवरो जोगो ॥277॥

Āyārādī ṇāṇam jīvādī daṃsaṇam ca viṇṇeyam.

Chajjīvaṇikam ca tahā bhaṇadī carittam tu vyavahāro. ||276||

Ādā khu majjha ṇāṇam ādā me daṃsaṇam carittam ca.

Ādā paccakkhāṇam ādā me saṃvaro jogo. ||277||

आचारादि ज्ञानं जीवादि दर्शनं च विज्ञेयम् ।

षड्जीवनिकायं च तथा भणति चरित्रं तु व्यवहारः ॥276॥

आत्मा खलु मम ज्ञानमात्मा मे दर्शनं चरित्रं च ।

आत्मा प्रत्याख्यानमात्मा मे संवरो योगः ॥277॥

[The reading of scriptures] *Ācārāṅga*-etc. is the knowledge, [the understanding of] *Jīva*-etc. is the faith, [the protection of] six kinds of living beings is the conduct – these are statements of the relative point of view. [276]

In reality, my soul is the knowledge, my soul is the faith and conduct, my soul is renunciation, my soul is stoppage of *Kārmika* bondage (*Samvara*) and meditation (*Yoga*). [277]

Annotation

Through these stanzas one may learn some significant aspects from the relative point of view as well as the real point of view. A physics teacher considers it necessary to convey to his students that the electric wiring, switches, bulb, tube-light, etc. associated with electricity are not electricity in true sense. But the electric current is the electricity in the true sense. In the same way, *Ācārya* Kundakunda considers it necessary to describe what real spiritual knowledge, belief, and conduct are, and what are not.

It is well known that the protection of six kinds of living beings is considered as the conduct from the relative point of view. If one goes deeper, one may have this view that the attitude of protecting six kinds of living beings is the conduct of the soul. Still deeper, one may say that the attitude of not disturbing anyone is the conduct of the soul. Still deeper, one may say that the act of relaxing of the soul in itself without any desire of disturbing others is the spiritual conduct. Still deeper, one may find that the conduct of the soul is to abide in the soul itself. In view of this depth, in stanza 277, *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that the real conduct of the soul is based on the soul only. Any description that says that the

spiritual conduct of the soul is based on the protection of six kinds of living beings is an outer description of the spiritual conduct and comes in the regime of the description from the relative point of view. In stanza 273 Ācārya Kundakunda has already pointed out that such conduct of protecting others is possible even by an *Abhavya* who, by definition, cannot have spiritually right conduct or right knowledge or right faith.

Similarly, one can see the difference between the study or memorization of scriptures and the knowing about the Self. The former indicates the knowledge from the relative point of view and the later shows the spiritual knowledge in true sense.

In the scriptures nine *Tattva*, *Jīva*-etc. (see stanza 13), are described. The memorization of the names and definitions, and exploration of various details of these nine *Tattva* does not guarantee the true faith, therefore, the faith based on the reading or contemplation may not be the true faith. In contrast, in reality the true faith is that state where there is faith in the existence of eternal soul and the belief that “I am nothing but soul”. It may be noted that the process of exploration of nine *Tattva* may take place before the realization of the soul but there is a large difference between the contemplation of nine *Tattva* and the faith based on the realization of the Self.

We all know the difference between the packing material and the diamond packed within the packing case. These stanzas provide the motivation to visualize beyond the packing case and to find the real stuff associated with the packing case.

Stanza 277 conveys a lot in a few words. It explicitly conveys this point that various specialties such as spiritual knowledge, faith, conduct, renunciation, stoppage of *Kārmika* bondage (*Samvara*) and *Yoga* are neither away nor different from the soul.

जह फलिहमणी सुद्धो ण सयं परिणमदि रागामादीहिं ।

रंगिज्जदि अण्णेहिं दु सो रत्तादीहिं दव्वेहिं ॥278॥

एवं णाणी सुद्धो ण सयं परिणमदि रागमादीहिं ।

राइज्जदि अण्णेहिं दु सो रागादीहिं दोसेहिं ॥279॥

Jaha phalihamanī suddho ṇa sayam pariṇamadi rāgāmādīhim.

Raṅgijjadi aṇṇehim du so rattādīhim davvehim. ||278||

Evam ṇāṇī suddho ṇa sayam pariṇamadi rāgamādīhim.

Rāijjadi aṇṇehim du so rāgādīhim dosehim. ||279||

यथा स्फटिकमणिः शुद्धो न स्वयं परिणमते रागाद्यैः ।

रज्यतेऽन्यैस्तु स रक्तादिभिर्द्रव्यैः ॥278॥

एवं ज्ञानी शुद्धो न स्वयं परिणमते रागाद्यैः ।

रज्यतेऽन्यैस्तु स रागादिभिर्दोषैः ॥279॥

Just as a transparent-jewel-crystal is pure, and it does not become red or so on its own, but appears red or so due to other objects [in the surrounding] [278]; in the same way, an enlightened soul is pure, and does not become tainted with attachment, etc. on its own, but gets tainted with attachment, etc. by the external causes. [279]

Annotation

Here in stanza 278, *Ācārya* Kundakunda first presents an analogy and then in the next stanza he applies it to explain an important spiritual concept. Various aspects of the analogy and the spiritual concept are being illustrated in the following table and the Diagram 4:

	Analogy (Stanza 278)	Concept (Stanza 279)
1	A pure transparent-jewel-crystal appears tainted red in presence of another red object [Diagram-4(b)]. (Physics)	An enlightened worldly soul appears tainted with attachment or aversion in presence of external <i>Kārmika</i> causes of attachment or aversion. (Meta-Physics)
2	The crystal in itself is pure, not red. The redness is not the nature of the crystal. [Diagram-4(a)].	The soul in itself is pure. Attachment or aversion is not the nature of the soul.
3	The crystal does not appear tainted red on its own. It appears due to the presence of external red objects in the surrounding.	The soul does not get tainted on its own. By <i>Kārmika</i> fruition it gets tainted.
4	For the sake of further discussion, it may be appropriate to be familiar with two technical words <i>Upādāna</i> and <i>Nimitta</i> : For such transformation the crystal is called <i>Upādāna</i> and the associated externals are called <i>Nimitta</i> .	For the sake of further discussion, it may be appropriate to be familiar with two technical words <i>Upādāna</i> and <i>Nimitta</i> : For such transformation the soul is called <i>Upādāna</i> and the associated externals are called <i>Nimitta</i> .



(a)



(b)

Diagram 4.

The diagram on the left shows a pure transparent-jewel-crystal. When the photograph of the same with an additional red paper nearby (not shown) is taken then we get the red tinge in the crystal as shown on the right. It has been observed that the crystal does not get tainted red on its own but gets tainted by the presence of surrounding objects [stanza 278]. Similarly, a worldly enlightened soul is pure and does not become tainted with the attachment or aversion on its own, but appears tainted with attachment or aversion due to the rise of the previously bonded *Karma* [stanza 279].

Question: Here it is explained that an enlightened soul does not get tainted on its own, but by *Kārmika* fruition it gets tainted. Does it mean that *Nimitta* (Karma) is more powerful than *Upādāna* (soul)?

Answer: Let us consider the analogy. In this analogy, the crystal is *Upādāna* and the surrounding red objects are *Nimitta*. The crystal becomes red in presence of surrounding red objects because it has the ability of becoming red in presence of surrounding red objects [Diagram-4]. Instead, a wooden block does not have such ability and as such it does not appear red by the presence of surrounding red objects. In other words, without the ability of the *Upādāna* any transformation in the *Upādāna* cannot be possible. In the same way, it should be kept in mind that it is the ability of the soul (*Upādāna*) of becoming tainted with attachment or aversion in the presence of external *Kārmika* causes (*Nimitta*). It may also be noted that the crystal (*Upādāna*) has this ability that it does not become red on its own, and the enlightened soul has this ability that it does not become tainted with attachment or aversion on its own. This answer is based on the commentary of these stanzas by *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra as well as *Ācārya* Jayasena. *Kalaśa* 175 written by *Ācārya* Amṛtacandra also nicely touches this point.

Question: Again, if *Kārmika Nimitta* can lead to the transformation then what is the value of this point that the enlightened soul does not get tainted with attachment or aversion on its own?

Answer: The value of this point is to learn that it is not appropriate to become owner of the dispositions of attachment or aversion associated with the soul. This non-ownership is a valuable spiritual truth known as the science of separation. On one hand, by realizing that his soul is tainted with attachment or

aversion due to his own ability an enlightened being does not curse *Karma*; and on the other hand, by recognizing this point that the tainting has not been done by the soul on its own, the enlightened being does not become owner or doer of the same. This opens the gate of equanimity and the path of liberation. We will see more details in the next three stanzas.

ण य रागदोसमोहं कुव्वदि णाणी कसायभावं वा ।

सयमप्पणो ण सो तेण कारगो तेसिं भावाणं ॥280॥

रागमिह य दोसमिह य कसायकम्मेषु चेव जे भावा ।

तेहिं दु परिणमंतो रागादि बंधदि पुणो वि ॥281॥

रागमिह य दोसमिह य कसायकम्मेषु चेव जे भावा ।

तेहिं दु परिणमंतो रागादी बंधदे चेदा ॥282॥

Na ya rāgadosamoham kuvvadi ṇāṇī kasāyabhāvaṃ vā.

Sayamappaṇo ṇa so teṇa kārāgo tesim bhāvāṇam. ||280||

Rāgamhi ya dosamhi ya kasāyakammesu ceva je bhāvā.

Tehim du pariṇamanto rāgādi bandhadi puṇo vi. ||281||

Rāgamhi ya dosamhi ya kasāyakammesu ceva je bhāvā.

Tehim du pariṇamanto rāgādi bandhade ceda||282||

न च रागद्वेषमोहं करोति ज्ञानी कषायभावं वा ।

स्वयमात्मनो न स तेन कारकस्तेषां भावानाम् ॥280॥

रागे च द्वेषे च कषायकर्मसु चैव ये भावाः ।

तैस्तु परिणममानो रागादीन् बध्नाति पुनरपि ॥281॥

रागे च द्वेषे च कषायकर्मसु चैव ये भावाः ।

तैस्तु परिणममानो रागादीन् बध्नाति चेतयिता ॥282॥

An enlightened being does not do dispositions (*Bhāva*) of attachment, aversion, delusion, and *Kaṣāya* in the soul on his own accord; therefore, he is not the doer of such dispositions. [280]

[An unenlightened soul] gets bonded again with [new *Karma* corresponding to] attachment-etc. by [the false notion of]

becoming the doer of dispositions [of attachment-etc.] happening due to the rise of [the previously bonded] *Karma* corresponding to attachment, aversion, and *Kaṣāya*. [281]

[In general, an unlightened] soul gets bonded with [*Karma* corresponding to] attachment-etc. by [the false notion of] becoming the doer of dispositions [of attachment-etc.] happening due to the rise of *Karma* corresponding to attachment, aversion, and *Kaṣāya*. [282]

Annotation

In stanza 279, it has been revealed that an enlightened living being may appear to possess dispositions (*Bhāva*) of attachment-etc., but he is not the doer of those dispositions. He knows that such dispositions are happening due to the rise of the previously bonded *Karma*. Now in stanza 280 this point is being strengthened. Here *Ācārya* Kundakunda says that an enlightened being does not do dispositions of attachment, aversion, delusion, and *Kaṣāya* in the soul on his own accord. In the second half of this stanza he further emphasizes this point by saying the following: “Therefore, he is not the doer of such dispositions (*Bhāva*).”

Stanza 281 extends this point by showing the contrasting aspect that happens with an unenlightened being: Though the dispositions of attachment, aversion, and *Kaṣāya* happen due to the rise of the previously bonded *Karma*, an unenlightened being believes that he is the doer of such dispositions, and by becoming the doer of the dispositions of attachment-etc. he again gets bonded by the new *Karma*.

Stanza 282 conveys the same point with a different emphasis. One may note that stanzas 281 and 282 are exactly the same except that ‘*puno vi*’ (meaning: ‘again’) words of stanza 281 have been replaced by a word ‘*Ceda*’ (meaning: ‘soul’) in stanza 282. The absence of ‘*puno vi*’ in stanza 282 generalizes the concept that the false belief of becoming the doer leads to bonding.

In this regard, it may be remembered that an unenlightened being is spiritually ignorant and he believes that he is doer, enjoyer, and owner of the fruits of arising *Karma*.

Question: Dispositions of attachment-etc. are due to the rise of the previously bonded *Karma* by the soul. Thus the past actions of the soul are responsible for the present dispositions of attachment-etc. If it is so then how can we say that the soul is not the doer of the present dispositions of attachment-etc.?

Answer: (i) The rise of *Karma* bonded in the past does not compel the soul to become the owner and doer in the present. In the present, *Karma* on their rise deliver the fruits, but it is for the soul to become doer and owner or non-doer and non-owner of such fruits. **(ii)** The bonding of the *Karma* in the past took place because of the false belief that he is the doer and owner of the dispositions of attachment-etc. If in the present also one continues to have such belief then he gets bonded again. Therefore, to be free from the new bonding one has to understand this truth that he is not the owner of these dispositions of attachment, aversion, etc. The perspective which shows non-ownership also leads one to realize that he is non-doer.

In this regard, it may also be added that it may not be incorrect to assign the ownership even with the family, money, city, and country, from the relative point of view, with various 'ifs' and 'buts'. But in the real sense, the true ownership is that which continues forever. The real ownership as recognized by the real point of view does not change with time.

अप्पडिकमणं दुविहं अपच्चखाणं तहेव विण्णेयं ।

एदेणुवदेसेण य अकारगो वणिदो चेदा ॥283॥

अप्पडिकमणं दुविहं दव्वे भावे अपच्चखाणं पि ।

एदेणुवदेसेण य अकारगो वणिदो चेदा ॥284॥

जावं अप्पडिकमणं अपच्चखाणं च दव्वभावाणं ।

कुव्वदि आदा तावं कत्ता सो होदि णादव्वो ॥285॥

Appaḍikamaṇaṃ duviham apaccakhāṇaṃ taheva viṇṇeyam.

Edeṇuvadeseṇa ya akārago vaṇṇido cedā. ॥283॥

Appaḍikamaṇaṃ duviham davve bhāve apaccakhāṇaṃ pi.

Edeṇuvadeseṇa ya akārago vaṇṇido cedā. ॥284॥

Jāvam Appaḍikamaṇaṃ apaccakhāṇaṃ ca dāvabhāvāṇaṃ.

Kuvaddi āda tāvam katta so hodi ṇādavvo. ॥285॥

अप्रतिक्रमणं द्विविधमप्रत्याख्यानं तथैव विज्ञेयम् ।

एतेनोपदेशेन चाकारको वर्णितश्चेतयिता ॥283॥

अप्रतिक्रमणं द्विविधं द्रव्ये भावे तथाऽप्रत्याख्यानम् ।

एतेनोपदेशेन चाकारको वर्णितश्चेतयिता ॥284॥

यावदप्रतिक्रमणमप्रत्याख्यानं च द्रव्यभावयोः ।

करोत्यात्मा तावत्कर्ता स भवति ज्ञातव्यः ॥285॥

It is to be known that *Apratikramaṇa* as well as *Apratyākhyāna* is of two types. By this tenet the soul is described as non-doer [of attachment-etc.]. [283]

Apratikramaṇa is of two types: *Dravya-Apratikramaṇa* and *Bhāva-Apratikramaṇa*; and similarly, *Apratyākhyāna* is [of two types: *Dravya-Apratyākhyāna* and *Bhāva-Apratyākhyāna*]. By this tenet the soul is described as non-doer [of attachment-etc.]. [284]

So long as a soul continues to be the doer of *Dravya-Apratikramaṇa*, *Bhāva-Apratikramaṇa*, *Dravya-Apratyākhyāna*, and *Bhāva-Apratyākhyāna* the soul is to be considered as the doer [of attachment-etc.]. [285]

Annotation

These stanzas have two technical words: *Apratikramaṇa* and *Apratyākhyāna*. First, it would be appropriate to discuss their meaning in brief:

***Apratikramaṇa*:** The interaction with other living beings and

things that took place in the past (for example, past events of vacationing, litigation, wedding, cooking, etc.); and the related psychic concern.

***Apratyākhyāna*:** The interaction with other living beings and things likely to happen in the future (for example, events of vacationing, litigation, wedding, cooking, etc. likely to happen in the future); and the related psychic concern.

The first sentence of stanza 283 reveals that *Apratikramaṇa* as well as *Apratyākhyāna* is of two types. Further, the first sentence of stanza 284 describes that *Apratikramaṇa* is of two types: (i) *Dravya-Apratikramaṇa* – It refers to the things and other living beings related with the *Apratikramaṇa*, and (ii) *Bhāva-Apratikramaṇa* which may be understood as psychic *Apratikramaṇa*, i.e., the psychic experience related with the *Apratikramaṇa*. This sentence of stanza 284 similarly describes that *Apratyākhyāna* is of two types: (a) *Dravya-Apratyākhyāna* – It refers to the things and other living beings related with the *Apratyākhyāna*, and (b) *Bhāva-Apratyākhyāna* which may be understood as psychic *Apratyākhyāna*, i.e., the psychic experience related with the *Apratyākhyāna*.

The second sentence of stanza 283 is the same as that of stanza 284. It clarifies this point that the acceptance of these two types of *Apratikramaṇa* and *Apratyākhyāna* implies that the soul is not the doer of *Apratikramaṇa* and *Apratyākhyāna*. How? Logic? Answer: *Dravya-Apratikramaṇa* and *Dravya-Apratyākhyāna* indicate things and other living beings, i.e., non-Self; and *Bhāva-Apratikramaṇa* and *Bhāva-Apratyākhyāna* relate to thoughts of attachment, aversion, emotions, etc. which are also different from the soul, i.e., non-Self (for example, see stanza 51). In other words, both types of *Apratikramaṇa* as well as both types of *Apratyākhyāna* are not in the jurisdiction of the Self (soul) in the true sense.

The contents of the above paragraph are based on the nature of the eternal soul which is different from the material things, material *Karma*, and psychic *Karma*. One who realizes this fact is an enlightened being or a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* or a *Jñānī*. Ācārya Kundakunda is not ending this description here. In stanza 285, he is covering that point which might be coming in the minds of many readers. Here Ācārya Kundakunda says that if one identifies oneself, in real sense, with psychic *Karma*, emotions, material things or physical body then he is a doer. He is a *MithyāDr̥ṣṭi* or unenlightened because he is not realizing the tenet described in the stanza, stanza 284. Such a being thinks that he has been the doer of many good and bad actions with other persons and things in the past and shall do so in the future also. In this way by ignorance he becomes the doer of *Apratikramaṇa* and *Apratyākhyāna*. As explained earlier (see stanza 282) he gets *Kārmika* bondage due to such ignorance of doership.

आधाकम्मादीया पोगलदव्वस्स जे इमे दोसा ।

कह ते कुव्वदि णाणी परदव्वगुणा दु जे णिच्चं ॥286॥

आधाकम्मं उद्देसियं च पोगलमयं इमं दव्वं ।

कह तं मम होदि कयं जं णिच्चमचेदणं वुत्तं ॥287॥

Ādhākammādiyā poggaladvassa je ime dosā.

Kaha te kuvvadi ṇāṇī paradvagunā du je ṇiccam. ||286||

Ādhākammam uddesiyam ca poggalamayam imam dvvam.

Kaha tam mama hodi kayam jam ṇiccamacedaṇam vuttam. ||287||

अधःकर्माद्याः पुद्गलद्रव्यस्य च इमे दोषाः ।

कथं तान् करोति ज्ञानी परद्रव्यगुणास्तु ये नित्यम् ॥286॥

अधःकर्मादेशिकं च पुद्गलमयमिदं द्रव्यं ।

कथं तन्मम भवति कृतं यन्नित्यमचेतनमुक्तम् ॥287॥

Adhaḥ-Karma and the like are the transgressions of matter. Then how can an enlightened soul be the doer of these which are

always [described as] attributes of matter? [286]

Adhaḥ-Karma and *Uddeśika* are matter. How can these, which are always described as non-living, be my creation? [287]

Annotation

These stanzas have two technical words: *Adhaḥ-Karma* and *Uddeśika*. First, it would be appropriate to discuss their meaning in brief:

***Adhaḥ-Karma*:** It is used in context with food (and sometimes with accommodation). Actions related with the production and preparation of food are known as *Adhaḥ-Karma*.

***Uddeśika*:** This word is also used in context with food. If the food is cooked for a particular person or persons then it is *Uddeśika* food for that person or persons.

To avoid any misunderstanding or confusion, before coming to the main theme of the stanzas, it would be appropriate to explain in brief some points related with food as preached by Jain preceptors from the relative point of view.

- (i) With the spiritual development, the personality of an enlightened person may advance to such a high level (level of a monk) that he neither participates in *Adhaḥ-Karma* nor eats *Uddeśika* food.
- (ii) A monk neither is expected to participate in *Adhaḥ-Karma* nor is expected to eat *Uddeśika* food. In other words, a monk neither cooks nor eats the food cooked for him. But, a householder is expected to cook some extra food for the unexpected guests, and should be ready to offer the food to monks who may happen to pass through the area in the vicinity of his/her residence. Both these objectives are practically met by the standard procedure described in the scriptures.
- (iii) If the householder has this concept in his/her mind that he/she is cooking to offer a part of the food to some

specific monk then that food is considered as the *Uddeśika* food for that monk. On the other hand, if he/she has cooked the food without any specific monk (or monks) in his/her mind then that food is not considered as *Uddeśika* food for that monk (or monks).

- (iv) The Jain religion attaches high importance to non-violence and non-toxicity in accepting anything worth eating. Non-vegetarian food and eggs are not allowed. Even many vegetarian items such as onion, garlic, etc. are also forbidden. In scriptures, one may also find the concept of different expiry periods of different food items in different seasons. Thus the relative point of view takes care of health and physical non-violence in the best possible way.

Now we come to the main theme of these stanzas. In the previous stanzas it has been mentioned that one who becomes doer of *Apratikramaṇa* and *Apratyākhyāna* is not an enlightened soul. An enlightened soul does not become doer of *Apratikramaṇa* and *Apratyākhyāna*. At this point, one may be interested in knowing more about *Apratikramaṇa* and *Apratyākhyāna* through some examples. *Ācārya* Kundakunda takes an example of food and says in these stanzas that an enlightened being does not become doer of *Apratikramaṇa* or *Apratyākhyāna* related with food. He also provides a logic that an enlightened being (*Jñānī*) knows that food is *Pudgala* (matter), i.e., it is different from the soul and, therefore, he as a soul is neither owner nor doer of food.

Question: This is the last stanza of the chapter on Bonding of *Karma*. Therefore, this question pertains to the theme of the whole chapter. The real point of view does not accept any *Kārmika* bonding with soul, then what is the significance of writing so many stanzas on *Kārmika* bonding?

Answer: One may ask similar question for some other chapters also. The answer would be almost the same and it would be as

follows.

(i) To show indivisible soul separate from others (*Ekatva-vibhakta-soul*), Ācārya Kundakunda in this scripture presents a comprehensive or *Anekānta* description of who we are and why we are suffering. It is important to learn not only about the eternal reality but also about the source of delusion and suffering from the impure real point of view (see Appendix-5). The impure real point of view covers the impure dispositions of soul that includes bondage and suffering.

(ii) Some enlightened beings may not need to revisit these stanzas. However, many enlightened beings may like to read such stanzas again and again to be refreshed. What about un-enlightened (*MithyāDṛṣṭi*) living beings? For those un-enlightened beings who intend to become enlightened to be free from their suffering and restlessness due to greed, hatred, anger, envy, poor relationship, inferiority complex, etc., it becomes useful to learn various concepts such as the following, as described in this chapter and in other chapters: We are soul, not the body. One gets pleasure, pain, birth, death as per one's own bonded *Karma*. For one's suffering, one's own deeds, not of others, are responsible. All events in one's life occur as per fruition of *Karma* bonded by oneself. The *Kārmika* bonding takes place mainly due to the false notion of identifying oneself as body and mind, the false notion of controlling others' destiny, and the false notion of being controlled by others.

Appendix-7

Five sins

Basically, any act or thought of harming oneself or any other living being is a sin. This is a very broad definition of sin. With this definition, even a thought of any attachment or hatred towards any living being or anything would become a sin. In fact, *Acārya AmṛtaCandra* [1] has described the sin of violence as follows:

Aprādurbhāvaḥ khalu rāgādīnām bhavatyahiṃseti.

Teṣāmevotpattirhiṃseti jināgamasya saṃkṣepaḥ.

Meaning: Non-occurrence of dispositions (*Bhāva*) of liking (*Rāga*) or disliking (*Dveṣa*) amounts to non-violence; and an occurrence of them is violence; this is to be considered as the essence of Jain scriptures.

At the level of belief, each enlightened person does not become owner of any thought of attachment or hatred. Therefore, at the level of belief an enlightened person is non-violent. However, at the level of mind and body, zero level of non-violence happens to highly advanced enlightened persons who are very close to the attainment of omniscience. In general, the attainment of such advanced state of zero level of sins happens in a gradual manner. In view of this, scriptures have also described sins from the perspective of beginners. Here in this appendix, we shall describe sins in very elementary fashion mainly from the relative point of view. For details and depth one may refer to advanced scriptures. Five kinds of sins have been mentioned in the scriptures. These are as follows:

(1) Violence (*Himṣa*)

Violence means oppression of other creatures, inflicting pain on them, or killing; delusion, attachment, hatred, or any desire to harm or hurt any living being is also violence; to hurt the self is also violence; to harm or hurt the self or others unknowingly by the laziness (*Pramāda*) is also violence.

There are two types of violence: psychic or internal violence (*Bhāva Himṣa*), and external or physical violence (*Dravya Himṣa*). Four kinds of soul-soiling-passions (*Kāṣāya*) – anger, greed, ego, and deceit – are internal violence. To torture or kill or hurt others or self is physical violence. Both types of

violence are sins.

In an alternate classification, there are four kinds of violence: (i) Violence in defense (*Virodhī Himṣa*), (ii) Violence in agriculture, industry, and business (*Udyogī Himṣa*), (iii) Violence incurred during essential chores (*Ārambhī Himṣa*), and (iv) Intentional violence (*Saṅkalpī Himṣa*).

It is not possible for a householder to be totally free from the first three kinds of above mentioned violence related to defense, trade and industry, and essential chores of day-to-day life. But the fourth kind, intentional violence, does not serve any essential purpose. Therefore, for householders, preceptors prescribe to totally avoid the intentional violence and to minimize the other three. It may be seen that hunting, fishing, consuming non-vegetarian food, etc. fall in the list of intentional violence. Further, in a large number of cases, planning and execution of any fight with one's near and dear well wishers also fall in the category of intentional violence. Similarly, harming or hurting others by negligence or laziness also needs to be avoided.

Suicide is a sinful and cowardly act of intentional violence, and it is to be totally avoided in all situations. The *Sallekhanā* prescribed in scriptures is not to be understood as suicide. While describing *Sallekhanā*, Ācārya SamantaBhadra explicitly writes [2] that a person undergoing *Sallekhanā* should not have the following five: (i) desire to live, (ii) desire to die, (iii) fear of pain or death or of any kind, (iv) remembrance of friends and relatives, and (v) any materialistic wish for the present or next life. One finds almost similar description in *Tattvārthasūtra* [3].

(2) Falsehood (*Asatya*)

Not to say what has been seen, known, or heard, but to say it otherwise, is falsehood. To mislead someone by telling the partial truth is also falsehood. To assert any point without understanding it correctly is also a sin of falsehood.

If one hears from some ignorant person that the violence is not bad, and it can be a part of the religious practice, then the propagation of this wrong information also amounts to falsehood.

It is necessary that one understands, verifies, and knows the truth reasonably well before preaching the truth.

Question: (a) While entering my office one of my colleagues says, "Good morning. How are you today?" At that time I am suffering from headache. Would it be a sin of falsehood if I say, "Thanks, I am fine."

(b) In a dinner party, I am served ten items. I liked eight and did not like two. The enthusiastic hostess casually asks, "Did you like the food?" Would it be a sin of falsehood if I say, "Oh yes, I liked it very much."

(c) What about the harm to others by one's words?

Answer: Regarding the first two questions, almost all the readers would agree to the view that it would not be a sin of falsehood. Further, in stanza 55 of *Ratnakarandaśrāvaka-cāra Ācārya* Samantabhadra writes that a householder having vows of speaking truth does not speak with any intention of harming others. An elaborate understanding of this stanza and the related *Sūtra* 7.5 of *TattvārthaSūtra* may be useful in this matter. Further, in this regard, it is needless to say that a householder has to keep in mind the minimization of all the five sins in every task.

(3) Stealing (*Corī*)

To pickup somebody's forgotten, misplaced, or fallen thing without his/her permission, or to give the picked up thing to someone else is the sin of stealing. Even any desire of stealing is also the sin of stealing.

(4) Illicit relationship (*Kuśīla*)

Desire to satisfy the craving of five senses, specially the sense of touch, by wrong means amounts to illicit-relationship sin (*Kuśīla*).

(5) Possessiveness (*Parigraha*)

To collect or to have desire for the collection of things, or to have attachment for anything is the sin of possessiveness. The belief that the soul can own others or other things is also the sin of possessiveness.

There are twenty-four types of possessiveness sin. *Mithyātva* (wrong belief) is the very first one in this list of twenty-four [4]. Four kinds of soul-soiling-passions (anger, ego, deceit, and greed) are also in this list of 24. Possessions at the psychic level are called as internal possessions, and possessions such as house, ornaments, utensils, servants, etc. are known as external possessions.

A householder needs money, family, clothing, etc. for his/her sustenance. In this regard, scriptures provide guidance to householders in two ways:

- (i) From soul's perspective one should realize that the soul cannot be the owner of even a single atom [5].
- (ii) One should neither keep nor should have any desire for limitless possessions. One should make a sincere attempt to decide a limit. For example, one can decide an upper limit of possession of clothing, ornaments, vehicles, .., and an upper limit of total monetary value of his/her material possessions. It may be noted that based on the past and present circumstances such a limit may vary from person to person. The requirements of a king and a teacher to play their worldly roles cannot be the same. Therefore, preceptors have not prescribed the upper limit to householders. Scriptures suggest each individual to decide one's own upper limit of possessions. Further, in

the interest of spiritual development one should try to reduce this limit with time.

Before concluding this elementary description of sins, it may also be noted that to motivate or to ask other person to do any sin is also a sin. Similarly, an admiration or endorsement of any sinful act is also a sin. This applies to all kinds of sins.

References

1. Ācārya AmṛtaCandra, *PuruṣārthaSiddhyupāya*, verse 44.
2. Ācārya SamantaBhadra, *Ratnakaraṇḍa Śrāvakācāra*, verse 129.
3. Ācārya Umāswamī, *Tattvārthasūtra*, *Sūtra* VII.37.
4. Ācārya AmṛtaCandra, *PuruṣārthaSiddhyupāya*, verse 116.
5. Ācārya Kundakunda, *Samayasāra*, stanza 38.

Appendix-8

Right Conduct

In stanza 18 we noted: One who is desirous of attaining the liberation should make all efforts to know, believe in, and immerse in the soul. Similarly, in stanza 155 one finds: The right belief, the right knowledge, and the right conduct constitute the path of liberation. Without the attainment of perfection in the right conduct the liberation is not possible. The path of liberation starts from the attainment of the right belief (*SamyagDarśana*). The right knowledge (*SamyagJñāna*) happens just immediately after the attainment of the right belief, just as light in the room appears immediately after lighting the lamp. However, the completion or perfection in the right conduct (*SamyagCāritra*) may take a long time even after attaining the right belief.

For understanding the right conduct, the following points explicitly mentioned in various stanzas in this scripture are worth noting:

- (i) In reality, the supreme substance is the soul. By abiding (staying) in such supreme the ascetics attain liberation. [Stanza 151]
- (ii) Those who do not abide in the supreme substance do not attain the liberation even though they take vows and resolutions, follow the rules of good character, and perform penance. [153]
- (iii) Many scholars without the true realization of the soul leave aside the object of the real point of view (pure soul), and indulge in the actions of body and mind. But the destruction of *Karma* takes place to those saints who are absorbed in the supreme substance (pure soul). [156]
- (iv) One who experiences unattached from all the associations; one who meditates over one's own soul and does not pay any attention over *Karma* and physical body, etc., one who concentrates over the solitariness [188]; one who keeps on immersed in perception and knowledge and in none other than the soul by being absorbed in the soul; such a being becomes the pure soul free from *Karma* very soon. [189]
- (v) Remain always focused on the soul, remain always contented with the soul, and be totally saturated by this. The supreme bliss would happen to you. [206]

- (vi) Know that the relative point of view is not accepted by the real point of view. The saints who take refuge in the soul as described by the real point of view attain liberation. [272]

The summary of above mentioned stanzas in a single sentence may be written as follows: the right conduct of the soul is to abide in the soul.

In this regard, verse 111 of *ĀtmaKhyāti* written by *Ācārya Amṛtacandra* is also worth noting:

मग्नाः कर्मनयावलंबनपरा ज्ञानं न जानन्ति यत्
मग्ना ज्ञाननयैषिणोऽपि यदतिस्वच्छंदमंदोद्यमाः ।
विश्वस्योपरि ते तरन्ति सततं ज्ञानं भवन्तः स्वयं
ये कुर्वन्ति न कर्म जातु न वशं यांति प्रमादस्य च ॥

Meaning: Those who only depend on actions of body are immersed as they do not know the soul; persons desiring the real point of view are also immersed due to laziness and lack of discipline [of body, speech, and mind]. Those who realize themselves as soul, do not become doer of physical tasks, and never become lazy, float on the world.

A traditional ladder of spiritual conduct for householders

To streamline the gradual progress of enlightened householders, preceptors have described eleven stages of spiritual progress. These eleven stages are known as eleven *Pratimā*. Before coming to the explicit description of these eleven stages, the following points may also be noted in this regard:

- (a) The brief description of eleven *Pratimā* presented here is based on details given in the scripture entitled, '*Ratnakarandaśrāvākācāra*' written by *Ācārya Samantabhadra* (120-185 A.D.). *Ācārya Kundakunda* also mentioned these 11 stages in the same order in stanza 22 in *CāritraPāhuda*:

दंसण वय सामाइय पोसह सचित्त रायभत्ते य ।
बंभारंभपरिग्गह अणुमण उद्धिद्द देसविरदो य ॥

- (b) We shall see that in the list of 11 *Pratimā*, the first 10 can be possible without renouncing one's home, but 11th *Pratimā* cannot be possible in one's home.
- (c) One may stop at any stage, and somebody may go beyond these 11 stages even before the formal adoption of these stages. If one wants to travel beyond these, then he/she may like to become a monk or nun.
- (d) The attainment of *SamyagDarśana* without adopting any vow indicates that the soul is in 4th *Guṇasthāna*.

- (e) A *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* with these *Pratimā* is considered in 5th *Guṇasthāna*. *Guṇasthāna* higher than 5 indicate the spiritual progress beyond 11th *Pratimā*.
- (f) Time required for switching from one stage to another may be short or long. After attainment of *SamyagDarśana*, some may not be able to achieve any *Pratimā* in many lifetimes; and some may very quickly transcend all these 11 stages.
- (g) The transition directly from 4th to 7th *Guṇasthāna* is uncommon, but as per scriptures such a possibility cannot be ruled out.
- (h) Those who prefer to gradually climb the ladder are advised to go one after another, i.e., one is not advised to take vows of 7th *Pratimā* without having vows of previous 6 *Pratimā*. However, if one has vows of first two *Pratimā* and if he/she wants to practice celibacy (7th *Pratimā*) then he/she can do so with this consideration that he/she is in second *Pratimā*, not in 7th. In other words, if a person has adopted first and second *Pratimā*, and without adopting third to sixth *Pratimā* if he/she has the vow of celibacy, then he/she is considered as a person of second *Pratimā*.
- (i) In practice, the adoption of this ladder needs a guide and more details from the scriptures. It may be added that the adoption of any *Pratimā* depends on various factors such as will and strength of the person concerned, family condition, social environment/culture, guide's approval, etc. This is a less travelled road; in recent years, hardly one percent followers of Lord Mahāvīra might be travelling on this ladder.
- (j) One should keep in mind that the main objective of climbing on this ladder is to reduce, not to increase, the ego.
- (k) To some seekers, even an informal practice of some good points of this ladder, as per one's circumstances and choice, may be helpful.

Eleven stages of spiritual progress

(1) *Pratimā 1* or stage 1: It is called *Darśana Pratimā*.

A *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* not interested in worldly physical pleasures, and ready to walk on the spiritual path through the adoption of vows to minimize the necessities and diversions of body and mind, is to be considered at stage 1. The intensity of soul-soiling-passions is very less in this state as compared to that of a *SamyagDr̥ṣṭi* without vows in 4th *Guṇasthāna*.

It may also be noted that at this stage or before this stage the person becomes pious enough in terms of his/her conduct. For example, he/she is not

having following seven bad habits: (i) Gambling (ii) meat eating (iii) intoxication (iv) prostitution (v) hunting (vi) stealing in any form (vii) illicit relationship with other's spouse.

(2) Pratimā 2 or stage 2: It is called *Vrata Pratimā*.

At this stage one adopts five *Aṇuvrata*, three *Guṇavrata*, and four *Śikṣāvrata*. A brief introduction of these 12 vows is as follows:

Five Aṇuvrata

Vow to avoid five kinds of sins, described in Appendix-7, leads to five kinds of vows. There are two version of avoidance of sins: (a) Mega version (*Mahāvratā*) (b) Mini version (*Aṇuvratā*). It is not possible to adopt mega version without renunciation. In other words, mega version is for monks and nuns, and the mini version is for householders.

- (i) *Ahimsā-Aṇuvrata* (vow of adopting mini version of non-violence)

A person takes a vow of not harming any life including oneself with an intention of harming. Even without any intention of harming other lives, in many tasks such as defense, earning, cooking, etc., there happens some violence. A householder having a vow of mini non-violence leads his life such that he performs such necessary activities; however, he/she takes care that there happens disturbance to other lives as small as possible.

- (ii) *Satya-Aṇuvrata* (vow of adopting mini version of truthfulness).
 (iii) *Acaurya-Aṇuvrata* (vow of adopting mini version of non-stealing).
 (iv) *Brahmacarya-Aṇuvrata* (vow of not having extra-marital relationship).
 (v) *Parigraha-parimāṇa-Aṇuvrata* (vow of having the possessions within a pre-decided limit).

Three Guṇavrata

- (vi) *Dig-vrata* (vow of not travelling beyond a pre-decided boundary in all ten directions).
 (vii) *Anartha-Danḍa-vrata* (vow of non-indulgence in purposeless disturbance/harm to other living beings).
 (viii) *Bhogopabhoga-parimāṇa-vrata* (vow of having sensual pleasures and consumption within a pre-decided limit).

Four Śikṣāvratā

- (ix) *Deśa-vratā* [on the top of the limit of the travel set by vow (vi), under this vow the limit of travel for a specified time is reduced further].
 (x) *Sāmāyika* (vow to have a regular period of contemplation and silence everyday).

- (xi) *Proṣadhopavāsa* (vow to observe fasts on 8th as well as 14th day of every lunar-calendar-semi-month, i.e., four fasts in a lunar-month).
- (xii) *Vaiyāvratya* (vow to devote time and resources in serving the spiritually advanced persons).

(3) Pratimā 3 or stage 3: It is called *Sāmāyika Pratimā*.

Vow to have regular periods of contemplation and silence three times, morning-noon-evening, everyday.

(4) Pratimā 4 or stage 4: It is called *Proṣadha Pratimā*.

Vow to observe fasts on 8th and 14th day of every lunar-calendar-semi-month, i.e., four fasts in a lunar-month; and to devote such days of fasting towards spiritual objectives.

(5) Pratimā 5 or stage 5: It is called *Sacitta Tyāga Pratimā*.

Not to eat or drink any food which has life in any form. It may be noted that even a green vegetable in its raw form has life and fresh tap water also has life. The boiled water, freshly prepared juice, steamed or boiled small pieces of permissible vegetables and fruits, grains, pulses, etc. are permissible. It may be added that honey and various root vegetables, etc. are not permissible even at first stage.

(6) Pratimā 6 or stage 6: It is called *Rātri-Bhukti-Tyāga Pratimā*.

Not to eat any food including water in night hours. Even medicine is not taken in the night. Persons at this stage do not even cook in the night. To be more rigorous, a person at this stage does not apply any ointment or oil or medicine on one's body in the night.

(7) Pratimā 7 or stage 7: It is called *Brahmacarya Pratimā*.

Vow of adopting sexual abstinence.

(8) Pratimā 8 or stage 8: It is called *Ārambha-Tyāga Pratimā*.

Not to indulge in any worldly task such as service, agriculture, business, etc.

(9) Pratimā 9 or stage 9: It is called *Parigraha-Tyāga Pratimā*.

At this stage, one keeps only the minimum essentials such as limited number of clothes, bed, books, etc., and relinquishes all his/her worldly possessions such as house, ornaments, cash, credit or debit cards, or bank deposits, etc. (It is assumed that he is not having a burden of loan on him/her.)

(10) Pratimā 10 or stage 10: It is called *Anumati-Tyāga Pratimā*.

At this stage, the person may live in the family but relinquishes all controls over other members. Even he/she does not keep in his control any approval or permission to any one regarding any worldly task.

(11) Pratimā 11 or stage 11: It is called *Uddiṣṭa-Āhāra-Tyāga Pratimā*.

At this stage the person does not live with his family. He/she relinquishes all connections with his/her family and lives with the spiritual master with a new name. The name of this *Pratimā* shows that he/she does not eat the food cooked for him/her; there is a well defined procedure of getting the food such that such a person neither has to ask/request nor he/she gets invitation in advance.

Question: Is it justified for a person to undergo penance or to follow the path of renunciation with a burden on the society and family? Is it not better to utilize one's physical and mental strength to do some creative work to earn and enrich the family and society?

Answer: Similar questions can be asked for sports, fine arts, and scientific pursuits in the field of subatomic particles, cosmology, etc. If one recognizes the value of peace, non-violence, love, brotherhood, virtuous acts, reduction in ego then he/she should also recognize the value of spiritual seekers and masters.

Question: How do actions of body and mind of a *SamyagDrṣṭi* be called as right conduct of soul?

Answer: At the level of soul a *SamyagDrṣṭi* does not become doer of any act of body and mind. Any transformation in the soul happens due to soul's own ability. However, as discussed in the annotations of stanzas 171-172, in case of a worldly enlightened persons (*SamyagDrṣṭi*), not in the bliss, there happens disturbance or fluctuation in the state (*Paryāya*) of the soul. Without such disturbance, the soul would have become omniscient and have been in the perfect blissful state. The disturbance is also evident from the fact that the soul's attention shifts from one object to another. The soul's attention shifts from the Self. Stanza 171 reveals that even by such disturbance in the soul the *Kārmika* bonding takes place. In case of a *SamyagDrṣṭi*, the new *Kārmika* bonding depends on the magnitude of disturbance or fluctuation in the state of the soul. The spiritual vows are such that they decrease the need of sensual pleasures as well as need of controlling, harming, liking (*Rāga*), or disliking (*Dveṣa*) others; and such a decrease becomes an instrumental cause to a decrease in the fluctuation or disturbance, corresponding to *Rāga* and *Dveṣa* in the state of the soul.

Question: What is beyond 11th *Pratimā*?

Answer: Beyond this stage the conduct of monks and nuns starts. The description of such conduct is beyond the scope of this appendix. It may be noted that the conduct of monk falls in 6th and 7th *Guṇasthāna*. The perfection in the conduct takes place in 12th *Guṇasthāna*; the omniscience starts from 13th, and the soul just before liberation is considered in 14th *Guṇasthāna*. A liberated soul (*Siddha*) is beyond 14th *Guṇasthāna*.

Subject Index

Ābādāhā Kāla, 31, 46
Ābādāhā time, (see *Ābādāhā Kāla*)
Abhavya, 154, 155, 158
Ācārāṅga, 157
Ācārya Amṛtacandra, 5, 15, 28, 33, 34, 38, 54, 62, 66, 78, 89, 99, 103, 114, 115, 121, 132, 138, 153, 161, 176
Ācārya Jayasena, 42, 52, 101, 114, 115, 153, 161
Ācārya Samantabhadra, 112, 115, 173, 176
Ācārya Umāswamī, 174
Adhaḥ-Karma, 167, 168
Adharma Dravya, 147, 149
Adhyavasāna, 65, 92, 93, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153
Ajñānī, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98
Alokākāśa, (see trans-cosmos)
AmūḍhaDr̥ṣṭi, 110
Anantānubandhī, 51, 52
anger, 31, 51, 56, 57, 58, 59, 72, 73, 88, 89, 106, 131, 133, 135, 170, 171, 173
animate, 67, 68, 70, 96, 117, 120, 147, 149
Aṇuvrata, 178
Apratikramaṇa, 165, 166, 167, 169
Apratyākhyāna, 51, 52, 165, 166, 167, 169
Arahanta, 11, 17, 41, 98, 106, 147
Ardha-Pudgala-Parāvartana-Kāla, 11, 12
Asajñā, 30, 31, 34

Āsrava, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 44, 45, 47, 51, 56, 58, 65, 66
Āsrava Bhāva, 44, 45, 47, 51, 58, 65, 66
Aśubha Karma, 2, 8
ĀtmaKhyāti, 5, 28, 33, 34, 38, 51, 62, 65, 66, 89, 99, 103, 114, 115, 121, 132, 138, 176
auspicious, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 27, 136, 137, 140, 141, 147, 150
AvadhiJñāna, 79
aversion, 21, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 42, 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 66, 74, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 171, 180
Avirati, 30, 31, 65, 105
Āyu Karma, 45, 126, 127, 129
bad conduct, 1, 2, 7, 8
Bāla Tapa, 16
Bandha, 116
belief, 4, 10, 12, 20, 21, 25, 26, 30, 31, 33, 38, 54, 57, 65, 76, 93, 95, 157, 158, 163, 164, 171, 173, 175
Bhavya, 154
Bheda-Vijñāna, (see science-of-separation)
bliss, 2, 3, 11, 27, 41, 65, 81, 82, 175, 180
bonded *Karma*, 31, 35, 36, 39, 43, 44, 46, 53, 61, 68, 70, 72, 75, 90, 94, 132, 151, 160, 163, 164, 170
Caraṇāṇuyoga, 135, 137
celestial realm, 147
charity, 18, 146
Cidābhāsa, 33

clairvoyance, 78, 79
 consciousness, 15, 33, 78, 85, 103
 consumption, 67, 68, 90, 97, 99, 178
 contentment, 82
 cosmos, 111, 121, 147, 149
Darśana, 12, 40, 54, 98, 177
 delusion, 38, 47, 66, 105, 106, 136, 162, 163, 170, 171
 dependence, 4, 105, 149, 153
 detachment, 10, 12, 13, 38, 67, 90, 95, 107, 109
Dharma Dravya, 147, 149
Dravyānuvoga, 135
Dveṣa, (see aversion)
Ekatva-Vibhakta, 6
 eleven stages of spiritual progress, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180
 emotions, 34, 38, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 72, 90, 139, 148, 152, 153, 166, 167
 emperor Bharata, 98
 enlightenment, 6, 18, 53, 54, 56, 95, 96, 155
 envy, 170
 equanimity, 162

example

atoms and molecules, 149
 Bank account, 48, 84, 98
 Bank balance, 132
 clerk taking credit, 142
 clod of clay, 39, 40
 collector, 84, 98
 conch, 96, 97
 consummation, 44
 credit to waiter, 133
 custodian of Govt. money, 84
 digestive chemicals, 53
 dinner party, 172
 distilled water, 36, 51
 donate and forget, 146

example

eating same food, 89
 facing tigers, 6
 god-father, 144, 145
 gold in mud, 93, 94
 gold shackle, 1, 3
 gold under fire, 60
 ignorant child, 16
 intoxication and wine, 69, 70
 iron in mud, 93, 95
 iron shackle, 1
 jewel-crystal, 159, 160
 jumping into deep waters, 6
Kārmika independence of living beings, 140
Kārmika-Bank model, 36, 37
 king's missing son, 20
 lake appearing blue, 73
 loss of grandson, 124, 125
 medical practitioner, 69
 movie on the screen, 59
 need of brakes, 128
 official and personal life, 50
 packing material, 23, 158
 physical exercise, 117
 protection from snakes, 6
 punishment to murderer, 129
 repayment of debt, 9, 43
 residential address, 18, 19
 rewards from the king, 100
 seed, fruits, and help, 146
 tenant-*Naya*, 32
 the movie projector, 75
 throne of the kingdom, 78
 TV screen, 75
 whiteness of cloth, 25, 28
 falsehood, (see sin: falsehood)
 fear, 6, 7, 80, 99, 103, 104, 105, 114, 121, 129, 131, 133, 135, 141, 172

food

expiry period of edibles, 169
 forbidden, 169
 non-vegetarian, 172, 178
Uddeśika, 168, 169
 vegetarian, 169
 fruition of *Karma*, 10, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 35, 42, 44, 45, 46, 53, 60, 61, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 75, 90, 92, 93, 94, 101, 102, 108, 126, 130, 132, 133, 146, 160, 161, 170
 frustration, 129
 greed, 31, 51, 56, 88, 89, 106, 170, 171, 173
 guilt, 121, 125, 129, 131, 133, 135
Guṇasthāna, 18, 19, 42, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 105, 106, 107, 121, 156, 176, 177, 180
Guṇavṛata, 178
 happiness, 2, 92, 101, 115, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 143, 144, 146
 heaven, 2, 3, 4, 17
 hell, 3, 147, 148
 help, 4, 5, 6, 128, 132, 144, 146, 149
 honesty, 49, 50
 householder, 10, 18, 35, 42, 47, 48, 51, 52, 97, 98, 99, 104, 106, 110, 112, 141, 146, 150, 151, 168, 172, 173, 178
 human realm, 147, 148
 hunting, 172, 178
 illicit relationship, (*see sin: illicit relationship*)
 inauspicious, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 27, 136, 137, 139, 141, 147, 150

independence, 2, 4, 5, 9, 83, 127, 129, 131, 133, 137, 140, 144, 147
 I-ness, 21, 79, 91, 99, 109, 121
 influx of *Karma*, 35, 55, 56
 instrumental cause, 34, 92, 101, 113, 115, 126, 133, 160, 161, 180
 intoxication, 178
Jinendra Deva, 13, 113, 114, 115, 123, 155
Jñāna-Bhāva, 39
JñānaPada, 79, 80
Jñānāvaraṇīya, 33, 34, 44
Jñānī, 14, 15
Kalaśa, 51, 54, 66, 78, 99, 100, 121, 132, 161
Karaṇānu yoga, 39
Karma Prakṛti, 42
Karma-Bhāva, 38
 Kārmika bonding
 four causes, 105
Kārmika dust, 28, 30, 31, 33, 39, 44, 57, 62, 93, 117, 118, 120, 121
Kaṣāya, (*see soul-soiling-passions*)
Kaṣāya Karma, 26, 27
KevalaJñāna, 78, 79
Kevalī, 14
Kṣāyika SamyagDarśana, 98
 liberation, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 64, 65, 66, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 107, 113, 114, 115, 142, 147, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 162, 175, 176, 180
 life-span Karma, 123, 126, 127, 129
Lokākāśa, 58, 149
ManahParyayaJñāna, 78, 79

MatiJñāna, 78, 79
Mithyātva, (see wrong belief)
Moha, 34, 38, 45, 47
Mohaniya Karma, 10, 12, 54, 98
 monk, (see *Muni*)
Muni, 14, 15, 17, 22, 168, 169, 178, 180
NihKāṃkṣita, 108
Nimitta, (see instrumental cause)
Nirjarā, 67, 68, 69, 75, 94
Nirvicikitsā, 110
Niśanka, 7, 103, 107
NoKarma, 56, 57, 63, 65
 non-celibacy, 139, 141
 non-souls, 36, 37, 53, 54, 64, 73, 76
 non-violence, 18, 106, 169, 171, 178, 180
 non-virtuous, 1
 omnipotent, 126, 144
 omniscient, 13, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 41, 60, 65, 72, 113, 114, 115, 154, 155, 180
Paryāya, 62, 180
Pāpa, (see sin: *Pāpa*)
Parigraha, (see possession)
 perception, 40, 41, 56, 57, 59, 63, 64, 78, 79, 121, 123, 130, 175
 physics, 135, 149, 157
 possession, 5, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 102, 173, 178, 179
Prabhāvanā, 114, 115
Prākṛta, 15, 137
Pratyākhyāna, 51, 52
Pratyaya, 31, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47

Pudgala, 11, 29, 30, 33, 72, 169
Punya, 1, 5, 15, 17, 23, 63, 128, 140
PuruṣārthaSiddhyupāya, 174
Rāga, 21, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 42, 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 60, 63, 72, 92, 171, 180
Ratnakaranda Śrāvakācāra, 112, 115
 real point of view, 7, 21, 22, 29, 31, 32, 54, 56, 57, 76, 128, 139, 140, 144, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 164, 169, 170, 175, 176
 relationship, 65, 132, 170, 173, 178
 relative point of view, 22, 29, 59, 84, 86, 112, 114, 128, 140, 144, 149, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 164, 168, 169, 171, 176
 renunciation, 10, 11, 49, 139, 156, 157, 158, 178, 180
 right conduct, 20, 21, 158, 175, 176, 180
 right faith, 7, 158
 right vision, 6
Sādhū, 114
Sajñā, 30, 31, 33, 34
Samaya, 15, 19
Samjvalana, 51, 52
Samskṛta, 103, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 125, 154
Samvara, 55, 56, 57, 62, 64, 65, 66, 157, 158
SamyagCāritra, 114, 175
 science-of-separation, 56, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66
Siddha, 11, 28, 60, 113, 180
Śikṣāvṛata, 178

sin

- falsehood, 118, 139, 149, 172, 173
 five sins, 4, 171, 173
 illicit relationship, 173, 178
Pāpa, 1
 possessiveness, 5, 139, 141, 173
 stealing, 139, 141, 173, 178
 violence, 106, 139, 169, 171, 172, 178
 soul-soiling-passions, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 46, 51, 106, 162, 163, 171, 173, 177
Śraddhāna, 10, 12, 21
ŚrutaJñāna, 78, 79
 stealing, (*see sin: stealing*)
Sthiti, 41, 46
Sthitikaraṇa, 112
 stoppage of influx of *Karma*, (*see Saṃvara*)
Śubha Karma, 2, 8
 supreme substance, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 81, 175
Tātparyavṛtti, 42, 52, 114, 115
Tattvārthasūtra, 172, 174
Tīrthaṃkara, 49, 98, 102, 147
Tiryamca realm, 147
 trans-cosmos, 147, 149
TrasaKāyika, 106
Udaya, 26, 27, 42
Uddeśika, (*see food: Uddeśika*)
Upādāna, 160, 161
Upādhyāya, 114
Upagūhana, 112, 113
Upāsama SamyagDarśana, 54
Vātsalya, 114
Vedaka Bhāva, 91
Vedyā Bhāva, 90, 91

- virtuous, 1, 2, 48, 64, 88, 128, 133, 135, 136, 137, 139, 180
 vow, 16, 105, 106, 176, 177, 178, 179
 vowlessness, 30, 31, 105
 worry, 4, 121
 wrong belief, 4, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 38, 57, 105, 173
Yoga, 30, 31, 41, 65, 106, 157, 158



Dr Paras Mal Agrawal [1946; Jawad MP India; M. Sc. **(Physics)**, Ph.D.] served as Lecturer, Reader, and Professor in India (Bhilwara, Kota, Jhalawar, Ajmer, Ujjain), and as Visiting Professor, and Research Professional in the USA. In the USA he served for 16 years till September 2010 in Oklahoma State University, Stillwater OK. He has published more than four books and 70 research papers in the top-notch research journals (Journal of Chemical Physics, Physical Review B, Operations Research, etc.) in the field of Molecular Dynamics, Nano-Science, Chemical Physics, and Quantum Mechanics. From the early age, he used to enjoy studying philosophical and self improvement literature written by Jain, Vedic, Christian, and western authors. Regarding Jainology, he extensively studied original texts of all the four branches of Jain scriptures, and published more than 120 articles, ten book-chapters, and three books. He is a popular speaker and is associated with various Universities and Jain organizations. He is recipient of various awards in the field of science as well as Jainism including the prestigious Jain Laureate award by the Gyansagar Science Foundation, New Delhi.

समयसार पर हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी में कई टीकाएं हैं पर आचार्य अमृतचन्द और आचार्य जयसेन की प्राचीन टीकाओं का आधार लेकर जो डॉ. अग्रवाल ने अंग्रेजी में लिखा है वह बेजोड़ और बेतोड़ है। गाथाओं का वैज्ञानिक स्पष्टीकरण गजब का है।

गुरुवर आचार्यश्री सुनीलसागरजी के आदेश से, मुनि सम्बुद्धसागरजी

Congratulations to Dr. Agrawal upon very good illustration and highly commendable annotations for the scientific oriented brains.

Br. Hemchandji Jain 'Hem' (Devalali)

This book would be helpful in modifying the views of attachment of common people towards material things. Congratulations to Prof. Agrawal upon this literary achievement in the field of spirituality.

Prof. Premsuman Jain (Udaipur)

An excellent blend of science and philosophy, and the best English version of Ācārya Kundakunda's Samayasāra. The logical explanation of the deep concepts of Jain philosophy through simple examples makes the subject easy to comprehend.

Prof. Anupam Jain (Indore)

Dr. Paras Mal Agrawal has very eminently put before us the clear meaning of the writings of learned Acharya Kundakunda in a scientific way using logical arguments and examples to express the difficult subject in a simple way.

Dr. N. L. Kachhara (Udaipur)

It aroused more interest in me to go deeper in the subject and enhance my own understanding of ..., karmic influx and bondage.

Dr. Shugan C. Jain (New Delhi)

By adding heart touching examples related to day-to-day life as well as science, Prof. Agrawal has really added charm in the philosophical description that otherwise appears dry to many. I believe that a reader wishing to understand the hard core concepts of Jain philosophy will surely satiate his hunger here.

Pandit Sachin Shastri (Mangalayatan)

Kundakunda Jñānapīṭha

584, M.G. Road, Tukogunj,

INDORE - 452001 INDIA