

**Swayambhustotra**  
**Shibir 2**  
**Pravachan -2 Summary**  
**6-5-23 Afternoon**  
**Shri Sumatinath Jin Stuti**

Please Note: This is an English summary of the pravachan by a seeker, Rimaben Dhanky and has been uploaded here for the benefit of the English reader.

Today Mohanvijayji Maharajsaheb's religious hymn was sung in bhakti. It was a simple bhakti song, which could be understood easily. He has told Bhagwan Sumatinath: Bhagwan, the more pain of separation You give me, the nearer I come to You. If I leave You and go in the other direction, that road also brings me towards You.

In every shibir of Swayambhustotra, we learn in one session, about the true nature of the fundamental truths and their importance. You might be creating an illusion of difficulty regarding it. The Omniscient Lord has known this truth, experienced it, and propounded the path accordingly. The philosophies that take a one-sided approach end up having so many contradictions. If any inconsistency exists, you will understand everything in the wrong manner.

Param Krupalu Dev has said: The way the arrangement of bondage and moksha is propounded in Jain philosophy, I feel it is right. It is not seen elsewhere. By deep reflection, contemplation, sound reasoning, I have found it to be the best. Param Krupalu Dev had the essence of scriptures in His heart. He has not said it out of His memory.

This stavan - religious hymn is talking about the permanent - transient, truth - false, and dual - non-dual nature of the substance. A substance can never be only permanent or only transient. It is not logical also.

Just pray to God, "O God! Give me tremendous attraction for You. And if I am not worthy of that, give me a close association with those devotees, who have a tremendous attraction for You, and they consider You as their sun, moon, day, and night."

There are five types of devotees:

1. In the beginning, you are an admirer. You come for Satsang, enjoy it, and admire the speaker.
2. From an admirer, you become a lover. You want to know what He is doing, which place He is in, etc.
3. Here, you want to get initiated and committed. You follow a discipline. You take Bijam or Ankuram diksha.
4. You tend to do much beyond your disciplines. You do not count or calculate your spiritual practices.

5. When everything is constant, you are constantly connected with Him or a higher purpose.

Someone asked Gandhiji, "Bapu, when will we get freedom?" Bapu could have easily said, "When Britishers go away," or, "When we hoist the flag at Red Fort," or "When we make an independent government." But he said, "When we are ready, we will get freedom." From an ordinary person, by his experiments he became an extraordinary person. Whatever Gandhiji said became quotes like Sadguru Whispers. He would say: the satyagraha movement is a gross effort but within yourself, you need to be an aspirant of freedom. For the path of moksha, you need to have a yearning for liberation. Not living a life dependent on impure feeling or situations or karma, you should remain in a peaceful state. If your soul is ready, moksha is ready. You need to put in an effort.

There are three hindrances in the path.

1. Self-doubt: Due to a lack of self-confidence, self-doubt does not let you grow. You don't start any new thing with the thought that you won't be able to do it.
2. You give up too early. You should be ready to work for millions of years. You need millions of gallons of sweat before you achieve something. Rome was not built in one day. It is built among 7 mountains. It was visualised in one day but it took several years to build Rome. You can visualise your goal in one day but its accomplishment might take many years.
3. You do not push yourself hard enough. You must increase your limits and then run after them.

You need commitment, patience, and passion. Be ready for challenges. There are some who become more creative and stronger when challenges come up. Others get scared. You need patience as well, meaning you're ready for problems, challenges which increase your enthusiasm. Do not let your desires and moods stop you from celebrating your life today. Do not let them control your life. If you don't do that, you will cry on your deathbed. Even if you are 60, start living your dream.

George Bernard Shaw was 95 years old and he had a fracture. He was passing by a tree and felt that he had never climbed the tree, so he started climbing the tree, fell, and had a fracture. He did not give up even at the age of 95.

Param Krupalu Dev asked Lalluji Muni to learn Sanskrit when Muni was 56 years old. Muni was a sadhu, he had to follow samachari - the rules of a sadhu. But with the ajna of his Guru, he started learning Sanskrit. Param Krupalu Dev knew that Sanskrit would make Muni focus inwardly and he would be able to read many scriptures. Param Krupalu Dev Himself learned English in Rajkot for about one and a half years, but He realised that learning English could be a cause for extroversion. Two men from Kutch and Dr Pranjivandas Mehta wanted Him to go abroad for further studies but He said no, as He knew that it would be a reason for extroversion and worldly matters. Set a goal and do it in the right way.

Coca-Cola was to be advertised in Arabia. It was decided - an Arab comes on a camel and it is shown that the weather is hot. He drinks Coca-Cola and feels happy. So, it was written in

Arabic, “He is frustrated, he had coke, and he is very happy.” But the sales did not increase. Then it was realised that in Arabic they read from right to left, so the readers used to read, “He is very happy, he had coke, he is frustrated.” If you go the wrong way, you will remain focused outside, then how do you expect to grasp the subtle? It should be done in the right order – chintan - contemplation, anupreksha, bhaavna; dhyan - meditation; and samadhi. If you don’t follow the order, you make things difficult – it becomes boring, mechanical, and you want to leave it and lose hope in yourself – that must not happen. If you put in the right effort, you will attain success with the Guru's grace.

The Sadguru has experienced the soul. In His words, lies our welfare. He has compassion along with self-experience.

A disciple went with His Guru for a walk. On the way, the disciple said, “I want to attain self-realisation. A lot of time has passed now.” The Guru remained silent. The Guru knows what virtues yet need to be cultivated. While walking, a tree came. The Guru asked him to climb the tree and also gave instructions of how to climb it, and see the three beautiful eggs in the nest of a bird. The disciple could not even see the nest from the ground. So he felt that his Guru has clairvoyance or some special knowledge. The disciple had a lot of faith in his Guru. He started to climb the tree. He followed the instructions of the Guru and it was exactly how the Guru had said, which made him very happy. He could see the nest and three eggs. He saw that the eggs were the same size and colour that Gurudev had said. He felt, ‘My Guru is God, He has special powers. He can see what I cannot see.’

He started coming down the tree. Suddenly the Guru asked him to stop. He said, “Just now your leg is on the weakest branch of the tree. You will fall. You step on that branch.” The disciple was more amazed by the Guru’s knowledge. He came down and fell at the Lotus Feet of the Guru. The disciple said, “You are the Lord, you have clairvoyance and other supernatural powers.” At that time, Gurudev told him, “I do not know about my supernatural powers. Yesterday I climbed this tree; I saw the nest and eggs. While coming down, when I tried putting my leg on that weak branch, I fell. But I was saved. This is my direct experience.” Sadguru has seen the soul Himself; He knows the path to reach the soul, He has walked on that path Himself, and that's why He can show you the path. You need a Sadguru who has passed through the phases of desires, passions, self-will, and indolence like you. Just now Sadguru is in a pure state. He does not want you to waste time and does not want you to suffer any of the agony that He passed through. With the grace of the experienced and compassionate Enlightened One, this can happen.

In the first shlok, the name of Sumatinath is described and why it is the right name for Bhagwan is described.

**Shlok 1:**

**"Anvarthsanjnaha Sumatirmunistvam, swayam matam yena suyuktineetam,**

Yatshcha shesheshu mateshu nāsti, sarvakriyākāraktattvasiddhihi."

O Omniscient Lord Sumatinath! Your name appropriately signifies right knowledge since You had expounded, with incontrovertible logic, the reality of substances, while the doctrines of the others are opposed to reasoning as these fail to explain logically the world phenomena involving actions and actors.

Samantbhadracharyashriji is having a dialogue with Bhagwan and says, "O Sumatinath Bhagwan! You have virtues as per Your name. This means Your name is not only 'naam nikshep' - names without reference to one's nature, but it also is 'gunavachak' - expounding the qualities. Which quality am I looking at when I am saying that Your name shows those qualities?

O Bhagwan! You are the enlightened one. You are the master of knowledge. You have the supreme intellect. You have the right intellect and complete knowledge because of omniscience. So, you are 'Sumati' – 'mati' means intellect and 'su' means best, right, and pure. Your intellect is the best, right, elegant, and pure. Wise, sound and good reasoning, and rational intellect is called 'Sumati.' Your intellect is noblest and wisest, so Your name is appropriate. You had expounded, with incontrovertible logic, the reality of substances without anyone's preaching, satsang, and inspiration. You have done self-examination and had faith in the fundamentals. You understood the incontrovertible logic first and then You propounded it.

Without anyone's words, discourses or inspiration, You examined the fundamentals and then accepted it. So whatever You have accepted has the best logic - 'nyaay'. You have propounded the fundamentals in 'anekant' way – multiplicity of viewpoints, and You expounded it in 'syaadvaad shaili' – relative pluralism. In Your knowledge and intellect, You saw each thing, accepted it as it is, and then You proved it with your style of syaadvad to convince people. You explained with apeksha - per particular viewpoints, You explained pramaan – comprehensive view and naya - various viewpoints. You even taught us the vyavahar – to have a practical outlook for when to give importance to which viewpoint. When you are asked at immigration, "Who are you", you cannot say that by one point of view I am the soul and by another I am this person. You have to say your name keeping in mind that you are the soul. In meditation, you have to know that you are a pure and eternal substance, and not a particular name or form. Bhagwan proved that from different viewpoints, how the soul is eternal and how the soul is transient. If you focus on the dravya ansh - nature of substance, you will only see the eternal, and if you focus on the paryay ansh - modifications, you will only see transience.

You have to know what is permanent and what is transient. Your hair is transient, it will not become permanent. Then you have to take care of your hair with gaun bhaav – give it less importance. You cannot convert something transient into a permanent thing, so do not put in efforts to make changes in transient things to make them permanent. When you take too much care of transient things, you will miss out on taking care of the soul. Look at the true nature of the thing, and if it is transient, leave it; and if you are interested in permanent,

focus on that permanent substance. Sumatinath propounded this whole path with various logical explanations and examples.

You can see this same thing even in Shri Atmasiddhi Shastra. “Atma dravye nitya chhe.” - The soul as a substance is eternal. If it is not eternal but is momentary itself, how can it know about anything but the present? If only momentariness is there, then after knowing in 1 moment, the knower is destroyed, and so the speaker who speaks does so without knowing. In such a small composition, principles are given with logic and examples. You can never feel that it is blind faith, you have to say that you are convinced. If you really go deep, you will say that it is common sense. The moment you have the right knowledge, then philosophy won't remain blind faith because there is a conviction from within that a substance is dravyaparyayatmak – nature is eternal while the states keep changing.

Kshanikvaadi philosophy states that there is nothing eternal, everything is momentary. Kutasthavaadi philosophy says nature never changes, there is nothing like modifications. But both these philosophies accept only one viewpoint. Bhagwan, You have always accepted anekantvaad - multiplicity of viewpoints. It is not about the names of various philosophies, it is about the philosophies who have not expounded the path with anekaantvaad. If anekantvaad is there in some other name, it is fine. But instead of anekaant, if it is ekaantik - only one viewpoint, where they believe that the soul is only eternal or the soul is only temporary, it is not right. There is no sound logic or reasoning in adopting only one viewpoint and rejecting the others.

Those who adopt a one-sided viewpoint, for them, it is said in this shlok, “The doctrines of the others are opposed to reasoning as these fail to explain logically the world phenomena involving actions and actors.” By adopting this, things like kaaran-kaarya – cause and effect, karta-karma – doer and activity, bandh-moksha – bondage and liberation, cannot be logically explained. The moment you believe that everything is transient only, nothing holds any importance. If you believe that everything is permanent - you are pure and will remain pure, you do not accept the modifications and label the changes that you experience as false, untrue, an ‘upchaar’ – conventional usage, or upadhijanya – born out of associations, then you won't believe in shubhashubh bhaav - good and bad feelings, and then the arrangement of bondage and liberation will not work.

When you learn a language, you learn ‘kaarak - case. There are six kaaraks as follows:

1. Karta - doer
2. Karma - deed
3. Karan – instrumental cause
4. Sampradaan - for whom the deed is performed
5. Apaadaan - source
6. Adhikaran – substratum

So, six-fold causations are 1. Doer- performer, 2. Deed- performance, 3. Means, 4. Purpose- Receiver of performance, 5. Source-donor and 6. Supporting stage.

Let's understand it with an example. 1. Karta or a doer is a potter. 2. Karma is a pot. 3. Karan or his instruments are stick, potter wheel, etc. 4. Sampradan is for whom the pot is being made - he is making it for a woman for fetching water. 5. Apaadaan is the place from where he is removing things – there is earthen mud in a basket, he removes this earthen mud and puts it on the potter wheel. 6. Adhikaran the support - he puts it on the floor.

Jineshwar Bhagwan has said, “You are the reason for your miseries. You are the karta, karma, karan, sampradaan, apadaan and adhikaran. You create your miseries. You take out miseries from your ignorance- this is adhikaran. The support of your misery is also wrong thinking. You are only responsible for everything.

The following mantra is also based on shatkarak only.

“Om Purnamadah Purnamidam Purnat Purnamudachyate

Purnasya Purnamadaya Purnamevavashisyate

Om, shanti, shanti, shanti.”

Meaning: You are the fullness. There is fullness, here is fullness. From the fullness, the fullness is born. Remove the fullness from the fullness, and the fullness alone remains.

Only you are responsible, no one else including a thing, person, or situation is responsible for your misery, even karma is not responsible for your misery. The whole arrangement is explained this way but this can only happen if you accept the fundamental as dravyaparyayatmak – existing as modes and the substance itself. It can be an animate substance or an inanimate substance, you have to accept each thing as a substance and its modifications.

If you only accept modifications and think that it is only transient or if you only accept the substance and think that it is only permanent, shatkarak will not work. In ekantik way- a one-sided viewpoint, the arrangement of karta, karma, etc. will not get set. The arrangement of bondage and liberation, cause and effect will not get set if you take a one-sided viewpoint. E.g. You can see the result in the soul (atmanu parinaam) and you say that it is the result of the non-living substance (prakrutinu parinaam). It is not logical that someone else is doing something and you receive the consequences. How can you eat and another person burp?

Kshanikvaadi Darshan – Philosophy of impermanence believes that the soul is only transient, they are ekaantik – having a one-sided viewpoint. If they had said that modification is momentary, then they are right. But when they say that the substance is momentary, they have not known the nature of the things completely. They say that there is nothing like permanence and ever-changingness is the truth. This is illogical. E.g. This soul has committed sin and he died. Now who will receive the fruits of his sin? How will you have the arrangement of the bondage of karma? Who will receive the fruit of this bondage? Now, why did the new soul take birth? He was not existing earlier. If you talk about the modification, this is right. But if you say that fundamental substance is ever-changing, then you are wrong.

This way the one who has done something will be destroyed and the one who has not done it will have to receive the fruits. Param Krupalu Dev has logically explained, “Vadnaro te kshanik nahi”- the one who speaks about momentariness is not momentary himself. So, nothing like memory can exist. If you think that a substance is momentary as it changes at every moment - here, the one who has known is dead and nothing has happened with the one who is born. This way, parlok, rebirth, principles of karma, etc. will not remain logical.

If you say that it is always pure - the words used can be the soul, Brahma, etc. and there are no impurities or modifications in it, there are no good and bad modifications, it is constant, it is never changing, then also, the arrangement of bandh-moksh or bondage and liberation will not work. In this case, whatever happens with the soul is not the fruit of his impure modes, as he is not doing any impure things. If bondage and liberation are not possible, why should you study the scriptures? If you are bonded by karma and you want to attain liberation, you will study the scriptures. But if the soul is always pure, why should you study the scriptures? He does not need to do religious rituals.

O Bhagwan! Your opinion and the way You have expounded the fundamentals, it can be said that You are ‘Sumati’- One with the right intellect. You have comprehended and You can prove it with syaadvaad shaili, using the theory of relativity.

## Shlok 2:

“Anekamekam cha tadeva tattvam, bhedānvayajnanmidam hi satyam,  
Mrushopachāronyatarasya lope, tachchheshalopopi tatonupākyam.”

The reality of substances as expounded by You considers a thing as one or many depending on the point of view. That the substance (dravya) is one and its qualities (guna) are many is the real point of view; it is a delusion to consider any of the two as a metaphorical expression since the one (dravya) cannot exist without the other (guna) and if both are absent, the identity of the object is lost and it becomes a meaningless abstraction.

In the second shlok, Samantbhadracharyaji says that the fundamental nature is bhed-abhed - dual and non-dual. In the third shlok, he says that the fundamental nature is sat-asat. In the fourth shlok, he says that the fundamental nature is nitya-anitya – it is permanent and transitory. These three shloks are totally metaphysical. This is the core of Jain philosophy. In the fifth shlok, he will appreciate Bhagwan’s style of exposition. Our Jain Acharyas used to study various scriptures with such depth, it was not for condemning or criticising. Every dharma is based on a principle, so the one, who has written a scripture must have gone in so much depth of that principle so they felt that they should study that also. With this positivity, they used to study the scripture.

Samaysarji will be acceptable to you completely - is it just because the whole scripture is a Jain scripture? Do not accept things because of any religion, you have to understand the scripture with the exposition of viewpoint – naya nirupan. Eg. When Param Krupalu Dev was asked, where Lord Krishna is, He said, “In the soul.” This is the glory of the enlightened ones.



In this shlok, Samantbhadracharyaji is appreciating the fact that anekaant - multiplicity of viewpoints is very logical. Ekaantik - one-sided view either accepts a substance or a modification, they do not accept both. It is not because it is the other philosophy, it is wrong. If they use some other name and their philosophy is anekaant, it is acceptable to the enlightened one.

O Sumati Jinendra! Based on Your deep understanding, sound reasoning, and right knowledge, You have established that the substance is multi-faceted. It is one and it is many. It is dual and it is non-dual. It is certainly true because the variants which are depicted are in reference to modifications or forms, while the natural attributes are unchanging and pure.

If you accept only one - it is only unchanging or it is only changing - you are rejecting the whole substance. The substance loses its nature and when the substance loses its nature, it becomes inexpressible and it cannot be explained.

The thing is dual and non-dual. It is one and it is many. This is because every substance has modifications - dravyaparyayatmak. From the viewpoint of modifications, you realise that one thing has many modifications. From the viewpoint of substance, you realise that many modifications belong to one substance. You feel happiness-unhappiness, joy-sadness, etc. When you look at it externally: a person is a child, he becomes a young man, and becomes old. From that viewpoint, the thing has duality, it has many forms. But in this, happiness-unhappiness or childhood-youth-old age, 'he' is the one, this conviction of oneness shows that he is the only one. Eg. Abhay was a child, he became a young man, and now he is old, but he is Abhay only - this has the conviction of oneness. This shows that he is one. And whatever changes you see in him show many forms of the same Abhay. Everything is one as well as many.

You have to accept this one and many or dual and non-dual. If you accept a substance as dravyaparyayatmak, then you have to understand that he was there, he is there, and he will be there. But if you go from the one-sided viewpoint, you won't be able to establish bandh-moksha – bondage and liberation. If you only accept 'many', you will not be able to set the arrangement of kaarak - cases. So, only anekantdrashti is true and logical, and Sumati Jinendra has propounded it in that way only.

A substance cannot exist without modifications and modifications cannot exist without a substance. The earthen mud is a substance and a pot or a cup are its modifications. If you look at its various forms, you will feel that there are many and if you look at the basic substance, you will feel that it is only one. Look at everyone as a Godly soul, accept different states of things and make that secondary. Instead of making primary and secondary, you are negating one side, that is where a one-sided viewpoint arises. Then that propounding becomes false. Become a witness to a changing substance and be steady in the unchanging substance. You must check your emotions in this - Now, I am peaceful, and this means that I am in the witnessing mode. You will have to keep your eyes open but keep your feet on the substance. Let your knowledge know both - substance and modification, but your focus should be the substance.



You were in nigod - a one-sensed being where many souls shared one body, then you became an earth being etc., where you were sthavar and could not move, then you became vikalendriya - 2-4 sensed living being, then you became panchendriya- a living being with five senses, then you became a human being, and finally attained liberation. This shows different stages - there are many states, but it is the same soul from nigod to liberation. This shows that there is one and many in the same thing, this also shows that there is duality and non-duality, both. If only one of them is accepted and the other one is not accepted, or you call it imaginary or illusion or untruth or upchaar – a formality, it is wrong. E.g. If you say that this child is a lion, it is upchaar - it is the formality. He is not the lion, he is a child. But when you see his bravery, you say that he is a lion. Or, this lady is chandramukhi - her face is like the moon. But there are no craters like the moon on her face, her face is long and not round. But we can see the attributes of the moon in her, so we say in upchaar that she is chandramukhi. But if you label a modification as upchaar or formality, it means that it does not exist in reality, then why should you receive the fruits of karma of that modification? You are saying that the modification is not actual and that whatever situations of happiness and unhappiness arise in life are actual - how is this possible?

Do not bring God into this discussion. How can an equanimous God send one person to heaven and the other one to hell? If God is of one 1 nature ie., consistent – how can He do this injustice? If you say that this is because of the karma of the soul, then if everything happens according to karma, why do you need God? As a manager? You do not need God if He has to see your account and then give you rewards or punishments. If God is there, He should have an eternal nature with compassion and He won't do injustice.

The one that labels one as false, that knowledge itself is false. If you say one is true and many is false or many is truth and one is false - here your knowledge is false. It is the substance and modification of one thing only. If you do not accept the substance and modifications, how can you prove one and many or dual and non-dual?

Some philosophies say that a fundamental is a modification and it keeps changing. Some philosophies say that the fundamental is unchanging. When you accept one form and do not accept the other form, it is false knowledge. If you keep a red flower near a crystal, you will feel that the crystal is red in colour. But in reality, nothing happens in the crystal. The problem is with the person who is seeing it. But here the soul becomes impure, it is not about the seer. The example of a crystal is not getting set here. Have you never had any impure modes? Then why do you look down when some flaws are mentioned? Then it will be, “Bandh moksha chhe Kalpana” - Bondage and liberation are imagination. ‘Bandh-moksha chhe kalpana’ is in inverted commas, it is not a principle. The one who says this is a dry intellectualist - this is what Param Krupalu Dev has said. Those who speak of bondage and liberation as being imaginary, but behave under the influence of delusion are termed dry intellectualists, they do not have purity of inclinations, and their knowledge is false.

O Sumati! Your knowledge is true. Your exposition is right, supreme, and the best. A person sees a crystal as red because of the red flower near it, the seer is seeing the crystal with the wrong perspective, then why should the crystal receive the fruits of someone else's karma?

This topic is deep, but if Acharyashri finds this important, understanding it will add depth to your spiritual practice.

So, every substance when viewed from different standpoints gives us a true knowledge of the substance. You cannot say, “I don’t accept gold and I accept the earrings (made of gold), or I accept gold and do not accept gold bangles.” If you accept only one of them, how was an earring made without gold? Accept one and many.

The omission of even one aspect will lead to the substance losing its true nature. If you do not accept one thing, it means that you have not understood the true nature of a substance. The substance and modifications cannot stay without each other, they are avinabhaavi – non-separable. When something loses its basic nature, it becomes impossible to describe that thing. It become inexpressible - anirvachaniya. It cannot be expressed. When it cannot be expressed, it becomes like akash kusum – sky lotus, inexplicable because it doesn’t exist.

O Sumatinath Bhagwan! Whatever You have expounded is proven, logical, and true.

**Shlok 3:**

**“Satah kathashchittadasattvashaktihi khe nasti pushpam tarushu prasiddham,**

**Sarvasvabhāvchryutampramanam, swavāgviruddham tava drashtitonyat.”**

The nature of reality (sat) involves two logical predications – one affirmative (asti) and the other negative (nasti); like a flower exists in the tree and does not exist in the sky. If reality be accepted without any of these two predications (asti and nasti), nothing can exist logically and will lose validity. O Lord Sumatinath, the assertions of all others not following Your doctrine are self-contradictory.

Every substance is one and many, dual and non-dual, permanent and transient. Both seem contradictory but both are existing in a single substance. You have to understand it from various viewpoints and when it is experienced, both can be understood together. Till then, if you try to understand with your intellect, you have to understand it from various standpoints or naya vibhag.

A thing has both dharma together, it is sat- true, it exists and is asat- false too, it does not exist. This seems like the limit but just be in awe of Sumatinath Bhagwan and aspire for the state of omniscience where the truth will be understood in its entirety. Because Samantbhadracharyaji has understood it so well, he is talking at the emotional level and we are trying to understand from the intellectual level. All the substances- animate or inanimate are sat - true from the viewpoint of swa dravya-kshetra-kaal-bhaav –and are asat - false from the viewpoint of pardravya-kshetra-kaal-bhaav.

Let’s understand the soul substance - what are swa dravya, swa kshetra, swa kaal and swabhaav of this soul substance?

Swa dravya: The soul is a mass of infinite virtues- it is one and unfragmented. If you are having dal - lentil soup, it is not possible that on the right of the dal, there is the taste of chilli

and turmeric powder on the left. Every drop of dal has the same taste. In the same way, the soul substance is one and unfragmented. - it is not possible that only one part has faith, and another has vigour.

Swa kshetra: The soul maintains self in its own uncouneted space points - asankhya pradesh.

Swa kaal: The present state of the soul.

Swa bhaav- The nature of the soul is knowledge, etc. If it knows, it is animate and if it cannot know, it is inanimate.

From this viewpoint of swa dravya, swa kshetra, swa kaal, and swa bhaav, the soul is sat-true, it exists. But the soul substance does not have pudgal - inanimate substance, dharmastikaay – medium of motion, adharmastikaay - medium of rest, or kaal - time. From this viewpoint, the soul or jeev dravya is asat - false, non-existent. A pot from the viewpoint of a pot is sat - true, and from the viewpoint of a cloth, it is asat – false. If you go to see the qualities of a pot in a cloth, you won't find them. If you go to see the qualities of a pot in the pot, you will find them. 'It is there'- for this, use sat - true and 'It is not there'- for this, use asat - false.

Here an example of a flower is given. A flower exists in the tree and does not exist in the sky. Flowers grow on a tree, they are in the sat form - they exist on the tree. But flowers are not present in the sky- they are in the asat form - they do not exist in the sky. If you say that flowers sarvathaa sat chhe- flowers exist in every way, then they should be present in the sky. If you say that flowers sarvathaa asat chhe - flowers do not exist at all, then how can they grow on trees? The nature of the thing cannot be sarvathaa sat- always true or sarvathaa asat- always false. It is sat – true with an apeksha – viewpoint of swa dravya, swa kshetra, swa kaal, and swa bhaav. and asat - false with an apeksha- viewpoint of par dravya, par kshetra, par kaal, and par bhaav.

A flower is real blooming on a tree and it is unreal when imagined in the sky. The existence of contradictory attributes is inherent in any object. You are a daughter of your parents and a sister of your brother - both at the same time. If you say that this is gold, then all the qualities of gold should be there, from this viewpoint, the thing is present there, and qualities of silver cannot be existing in gold and from that viewpoint, the thing is not there. How to use this principle practically, will be explained later.

O Sumatinath Bhagwan! In Your anekaant darshan, in the knowledge of Your Sumati - good intellect, a form of a thing is sat - true and asat - false both. Those who do not accept this, their opinion becomes self-contradictory. E.g. My mother is barren - It is not possible - this is self-contradictory. If you say a mother, she won't be barren and if you say barren, then she cannot become a mother. You say, "I do not have a tongue in my mouth," then how did you speak? This is self-contradictory.

There are two types of adwaitvaadi - non-dualists. 1. Satta adwaitvaadi 2. Shunya adwaitvaadi. Adwait means those who accept only one fundamental. While Jain Philosophy says, "In the knowledge of the Omniscient God, only one fundamental is not there, by one

point of view there are 2 fundamentals - animate and inanimate and by another, there are 7 or 9 fundamentals.”

Adwaitvaadi is of two types. 1. Satta adwaitvaadi 2. Shunya adwaitvaadi. Shunya adwaitvaadi says there is only emptiness, nothing else. Satta adwaitvaadi says that there is nothing else existing but Brahma. With this philosophy, you do not exist and I also do not exist. Those who believe that the thing is sarvathaa sat – true and it is not even kathanchit asat - false in any way. If you believe in this way, then pot should be present in the same quantity in swa dravya – pot and par dravya like a cloth. This is against your conviction also. You cannot go to a shop and ask for a pot, and then take a cloth. This is illogical. If you believe in two, then dwait - duality will arise and the principle of adwait – non-duality will be false. Shunya adwaitvaadi believes that everything is asat – nothing exists. If you believe it this way, then a pot cannot be used for carrying water because it just doesn’t exist. According to them, the pot does not exist in a cloth or in the pot itself. This is illogical. O Sumatinath Bhagwan! Your anekaantvaad – multiplicity of viewpoints is pramaansiddha – it can be proved and abaadhit – unchallenged. Other doctrines are self-contradictory. If you go deeper and ask them to explain the reality of substances, they will label everything as an illusion. If you are focusing from the viewpoint of eternal substance, then this illusion of temporary is perfect. But if you say that it does not exist at all, then that is incorrect - it is in some ways sat and some ways asat.

**Shlok 4:**

**“Na sarvathā nityamudetyapaiti, na cha kriyākārakmatra yuktam,**

**Naivāsato janma sato na nāsho deepastamah pudgalbhāvatosti.”**

**If it be accepted that objects are eternal without a beginning and an end then this assertion will negate the phenomena involving actions and actors; non-existence denies origination and eternity denies destruction. When a lamp is extinguished, the existence of light, which is matter (pudgal), gets transformed into another form of matter (pudgal) that is characterised by darkness.**

Sumatinath Bhagwan said, “Everything is dravyaparyayatmak - with modes of a constant substance.” From the viewpoint of the substance, it is permanent and from the viewpoint of modifications, it is transitory. This means everything is permanent and temporary. Yoghurt was made from milk, so the state of milk was destroyed. But as a substance, milk exists as a modification of milk as yoghurt, butter, and ghee - it is yet a dairy product. Some believe that a substance is only permanent and some believe that the substance is only temporary. Both expositions are false and this knowledge is also false, this knowledge is not of the omniscient.

In a substance, new modification arises and old modification gets destroyed. As a soul, when the modification as a human being is destroyed, the soul can go into a modification of a celestial being. If you take pudgal - an inanimate substance like a pot, if a pot breaks, the modification of a pot is destroyed and the modification of a mound has arisen. It is permanent as mud. When a new form arises, it is utpaad and when an old form is destroyed,

it is vyay. If you believe that something is only permanent or only temporary, how can the whole thing of utpaad and vyay work? If you think that something is always permanent, it does not have parinaamipanu - changingness, it does not have modifications. In this case, how can a human being become a celestial being? If he was permanent, how could he live in this body and go in the other body? If something is always permanent, the old modification cannot be destroyed and new modification cannot arise. Kriyaakaarakatva like actor – action etc. do not get set here. The arrangement of bandh-moksha cannot get set. When it is sarvathaa nitya – always of a singular nature. E.g. If a substance is moving and if that is always its nature, it will never stop. The moment it stops, a change of form will arise. If something is stable, it should remain stable forever in this philosophy. In this way, cotton will never become a thread. Milk turns into yoghurt and still, it is permanent as a dairy product, and still, there is nothing like milk in yoghurt. If you want to make a milkshake, this yoghurt will not work.

If something is sarvathaa anitya - always transitory, then that thing is destroyed as a substance along with its modifications. Then you will have to accept that existent substances are destroyed and non-existent substances are produced. This is also a hindrance because science says, “The matter can never be created nor destroyed. It can only change its forms.” When you say that you produced something, in reality, you have only transformed something. If the substance is always transitory, wheat cannot turn into chapattis. If you burn a cloth, it cannot turn into ashes, it should be destroyed completely, where did these ashes come from? Something was created from nothing and that which existed was completely destroyed. This seems illogical, You have to say, “The cloth transformed its modification from a cloth to ashes.”

This way, only permanent and only transient- both these expositions are wrong. A question is raised here - What remains when a lighted lamp is extinguished? The answer to that is - When a lighted lamp is extinguished, the existence of light, which is matter (pudgal), gets transformed into another form of matter (pudgal) that is characterised by darkness. The light was never a substance, it was a modification of a form of matter – pudgal. Darkness is another modification of a form of matter. It has only transformed as a substance, it is never destroyed, its state is destroyed. In Anekaant darshan - relative pluralism, destruction of state is always accepted. Earlier state is destroyed and the new state arises. A student of the 9 fundamentals of Jainism will be aware of the fact that darkness is a modification of matter. The mistake of the one who raised the question was that they thought it is a substance, and hence asked this question of a lighted lamp.

No object can be created or destroyed. No imaginary object can be created and no real object can be destroyed. Only the transformation of modes is happening. Every substance in the world is made up of a basic material and modification is a corresponding form. With reference to dravya - substance, the thing is permanent and with reference to paryay - modification, the thing is non-permanent.

Shlok 5:

“Vidhinishedhashcha kathanchidishtau, vivakshayā mukhyagunavyavasthā,

Iti praneetihi sumatestaveyam, matipravekah stuvatostu nāth.”

The attributes of existence and non-existence in an object are valid from particular standpoints; the validity of the statement is contingent on the speaker's choice, at that particular moment, of the attribute that he wishes to bring to the fore as the other attribute is relegated to the background. O Lord Sumatinath, You had thus explained the reality of substances; may Your adoration augment my intellect!

O Sumatinath Bhagwan! As a fruit of my stuti, I am not asking for material wealth, power, or family. I want to have Your type of intellect; May I too attain omniscience.

Vidhi is required for vidhaan - establishing a fact and nishedh is negation of untruth.. E.g. This pot is a pot - this is vidhi. This pot is not a cloth - this is nishedh.

From the viewpoint of the last shlok, if you say that something is permanent from this viewpoint, then it becomes vidhi as you described that first and something that is non-permanent will become nishedh, as that is described later on. Before that was 'sat - asat', so sat becomes vidhi, asat becomes nishedh.

Vidhi - assertion and nishedh – negation remains in a substance together and the validity of the statement is contingent on the speaker's choice or purpose, at that particular moment, of the attribute that he wishes to bring to the fore as the other attribute is relegated to the background. One thing has to be primary and the other thing should become secondary. This is syaadvaad vidhi.

You have to know from which viewpoint you are asked a question and give the answer accordingly. Otherwise, you will never be confident in answering. If the speaker is focusing on the substance, he will propound permanence. If the speaker is focusing on modifications, like for the contemplation of impermanence, he will propound non-permanent things like body, son, wife, associations, etc. You should be clear about your viewpoints when you use 'jakaar'-only. Relative pluralism is not about the policy of appeasing, where you want everyone to be happy. After clarifying the viewpoint, use 'j' – only directly. You are only a sister of your brother and only a daughter of your parents. The speaker has to answer as per the motive of the listener.

“Nishchay rakhi lakshama, sadhan karva soy.” - The means should be pursued, keeping the absolute viewpoint in mind.

In the end, Samantbhadracharyaji said, “This methodology of understanding the truth by syaadvaad shaili is appropriate. It is the best method. It is logical. It is proven. By doing Your stuti, I too have started to develop the same syaadvaad shaili within me. O Bhagwan! Your knowledge is pure and your awareness is of the top level. Even while describing the modifications, You keep the substance in Your mind. You have that in Your knowledge and awareness both. I only see a modification and start doing attachments and aversion. May this be in my knowledge and awareness both.”

Samantbhadracharyaji continued, “O Prabhu! I am doing Your stuti – devotion and I only want one thing in return - May the veil over my knowledge, the manifestation of my delusion be destroyed. May my knowledge become right and grow. You attained the state of Arihant by attaining omniscience, may I too attain omniscience like You. I want to swim away from the ocean of transmigration by attaining omniscience. This is what I am asking for.”

O Sumatinath Bhagwan! The wick of the lamp should be absorbed in ghee, then only, it will be lit properly. I am absorbed in Your love. The day is not far when my lamp of omniscience is lit. Your wisdom is supreme. Please help me to awaken this wisdom within me. In this methodology of analysing the substance or situations, I should think about the other viewpoint. It is true from this viewpoint and false from the other viewpoint. With this perspective, weaken my passions. May I be bestowed with the same wisdom as You as a reward of my devotion - stuti towards You.