

Nātak Samaysaar
Shibir 30
Sarva Vishuddhi Dwār
Pravachan - 2 Summary
17-10-2026 - Afternoon
Episodes - 393-395

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.

When a drop of oil falls into water, one may say it is in the water, but the oil never penetrates into the water; it remains strictly on the surface. So, if you understand terms like dravya daḷ (the substance's mass), it is very helpful. A drop of oil is there in the water; you can say, "I have put oil in the water," or "Oil is in the water." But it only floats. It does not mix with it.

In the same way, in spite of the impurities arising, they do not penetrate the soul's dravya daḷ. That is why the phrase is used: "It merely trickles on the surface." But this does not mean the soul literally has an outer physical layer and an inner one; that is not the case. Yet this remains the best way to explain it. "Trickling on the surface" simply signifies that it has no entry into the intrinsic nature.

The enlightened one knows and has placed unwavering faith in this inconceivable glory of the soul, of the soul's inherent nature, the eternal unchanging substance (dhruv tattva), and He fixes His focus upon it, becomes completely established there. We can say He is in 'a state of complete, unbroken focus.' (najarbandhi). This word, not the whole phrase, is drawn from Param Krupalu Dev's Vachanāmṛutji, where He writes that once the existence of the soul is perceived, it remains fixed in one's sight (najarāy chhe).

In hypnotism experiments, some people use a prism for focus, and you have to keep looking steadily at the prism. It became an exclusive captivation of sight: Nothing else remains for the enlightened one's focus except the unchanging substance (dhruv). His focus has become bound exclusively to the dhruv.

Outwardly, you can only see the modification (paryāy). We merely observe the outward behaviour. Now, do you stop at behaviour, do you move from behaviour to intention, or do you penetrate even deeper than intention, straight to the eternal substance?

So, if you want to proceed slowly, take your time. But the enlightened one says, "I don't want to go slow." He casts His focus directly upon the unchanging substance, "Despite all this external play, He knows that His intrinsic nature is the same as Siddh Bhagwān."

Consequently, even if feelings of joy, grief, attachment, aversion, like, or dislike arise due to conduct-deluding karma (chāritra mohanīya), they immediately fall away. This is the true remedy. What exactly will you achieve by fighting attachment? You have to anchor your focus more and more steadily upon the dhruv. First, bring it into your field of focus! Then stabilise it.

If someone feels like weeping inside but is forced to laugh, how much force (jor) can that laughter have? You can still manage to do it: you want to weep but you have to laugh, and you even put on a smile. But when you really want to cry, how much force can that smile have? Exactly such is the state of the enlightened one amidst the fruition of karma.

The soul longs to remain absorbed in its true self, but owing to karma that has to be experienced (bhogāvalī karma), He must pass through worldly activities. Just picture that great soul seated at the gemstone firm of Revashankar Jagjivan.

Imagine, in the midst of karmic fruition, you remain anchored in your true self; you don't even care about the profit and loss of your business, and yet, you must speak sensibly, display happiness, and handle everything. How little force there can be in that smile when deep down you want to weep! And yet the other person says, "Smile, please, do this." How little zest there is in it! Looking from the outside, you exclaim: "Amazing! What fabulous fruition of meritorious karma this enlightened soul enjoys! 96,000 queens, rule over six continents, and so forth." Yet inside, He yearns to weep and is compelled to laugh!

Look at Param Krupalu Dev's ten years of living and conducting business in Mumbai. Observe those ten years, and only then will the true enlightened master be revealed to you. In Idar or Uttarsanda, anyone with an external perspective can easily appreciate spirituality, and enthusiasm is bound to arise there. But appreciating the true jñānī lies in witnessing the mastery of those ten years in Mumbai. Keeping this exact reality in mind - that He longs to weep yet smiles - imagine the inner force at play! Even as a householder and the father of four children, imagine the detachment operating within!

This entire realisation must connect to your inner depths. Until such an experience takes place in your own life, you will never truly recognise an enlightened one. Once you find yourself having to play a worldly role, and you perform that role flawlessly, yet not a shred of it touches you within - only after that experience will you begin to recognise the enlightened one. Until then, you simply think, "What a delightful life!"

Ask the enlightened one: True joy is indeed present, but that joy arises only from abiding within the true nature. In every situation, the awareness "I am the knower (jñāyak)" remains, and it never wavers. That conviction never slips away from within. What comes to us only as a glimpse, at rare moments during meditation experiments, never wavers for Him, even in the midst of ongoing worldly engagements.

No matter how high a kite flies in the sky, the person flying it remains completely at ease. He does not worry, "My kite has soared so far away, what will happen now?" He says, "The string remains firmly in my hand."

The enlightened one says: "No problem. Whether managing six continents or 96,000 queens, the string of the knower (jñāyak) is firmly in my hand." Therefore, He is not frightened by any karma which has to be experienced (bhogavali karma) or by any manifestation of the karmic fruition. There is neither desire nor fear. One who has grasped that knower remains constantly mindful of the knower alone.

After that, what power could mere worldly activity hold? What force could external tendencies (vṛtti) possess? And if, propelled by past latent impressions, some states of attachment and aversion do arise, how quickly they wither and fall away!

No matter how far away the kite flies, the enlightened being has no anxiety. Amidst any karmic fruition (uday karma), He experiences no worry. This is because He knows: with a single subtle motion of mine, this will happen. He knows if the kite begins to somersault and veer off, what does the expert kite-flyer need to do? Just give a slight tug on the string, and it stabilises. Similarly, He knows precisely how to adjust the force of the knower (jñāyak). You don't need to do anything to the momentum of karma. You simply give a gentle tug to the force of the knower.

It is a state of complete, unbroken focus (najarbandhi); as said earlier, it keeps captivating the gaze; it is that sublime. That eternal constant substance (dhruv tattva) lies deep within the bedrock. The bedrock of dhruv is beneath the modification (paryāy). You have not even reached the modification properly,

and still, how much more time will you keep squandering in the superficial play of modifications? Only when you declare, "I do not even desire liberation (mokṣh)," will the journey toward that bedrock truly commence, because liberation itself is only a modification. Only when there is no longer even the desire for liberation alone (mokṣh mātranī abhilāṣhā) will your focus on modifications (paryāy dṛaṣṭi) finally drop away. The earlier emphasis was in the exposition related to conduct (charaṇānuyog); this is the exposition of pure metaphysics (dravyānuyog). If you do not grasp the contextual style (shaili), you will become thoroughly confused. Just now we are discussing how the Omniscient God (Sarvajna) perceives the truth. An Omniscient Lord makes it appear so effortless.

Yet the Omniscient Lord states, "Simultaneously, at that very same moment, I perceive the soul as a non-doer; at that exact moment, I see it as the doer of knowledge; at that same moment, I see it as the doer of attachment; at that same moment, I see it binding karma; and at that same moment, I see it engaged in outward activities. And while all of these perspectives hold true in their own contexts, the ultimate, supreme truth (param satya) remains the first one alone: That the soul is a non-doer."

Therefore, this entire framework of standpoints (nayas) must be thoroughly refreshed and understood. If these doubts keep recurring, you will end up confused. From here on, all the verses will begin by stating that, in reality, the soul is a non-doer (akartā). Up to the point of being a non-doer of the external (par), you will face no difficulty. But when it asserts that the soul is a non-doer of the modifications and attachment (rāg), then difficulties will arise. You will object: "But it clearly indulges in attachment, doesn't it? How can one say it is not doing it?"

You have to understand: When you zoom in, this larger picture disappears, and only this specific detail comes into focus. When you view it from afar, the entire picture appears. When you inspect it up close, only the fine part appears. We have such mirrors at home too: when people shave, if you turn the mirror one way, you see the whole face, and if you turn it the other way, you can see your tiniest pores. And then, you work accordingly.

Your primary purpose is: Contemplating upon what, by setting the focus on what, will the spiritual objective be achieved? The answer is: It will be achieved by focusing on that which lies beneath the modifications. So, now you will say: "Now, I don't want to keep revising the entire ladder from external objects down to modifications. I simply want to understand the nature of the bedrock beneath the modification and work directly on that." Otherwise, at the conclusion of

every single session, the same question will resurface: "That is all fine, but the soul does bind karma, doesn't it? It does generate attachment, doesn't it? How can you say 'I cooked this meal' and 'I didn't cook this meal'; how can you assert you were the doer in one sense and not the doer in another?" This question must not keep cropping up repeatedly. Therefore, it is being reiterated once more. After that, either you set it clearly in your mind, or you set it clearly in your mind! We love having choices; you always want "either / or." But either you simply have to do it, or you have to do it. Meaning, there is no other option.

Try fixing your steady gaze (trāṭak) upon the swinging pendulum of a clock. If you perform trāṭak on a moving pendulum, your neck will continuously have to move along with it. If you keep staring only at what is constantly shifting, what will happen to you? What will you gain by fixing your gaze on ever-changing elements? Undertake introspection once for half an hour or an hour, whatever is needed. Then you must switch to self-awareness. For practical purposes, introspection is necessary, but that phase of introspection is still akin to playing within the field of modifications. Once you gain clarity, "These are my suppressed instincts. These are my manifest instincts. This is what this is." Once the full picture is clear, then you must plunge deep within.

If you fix your sight on the pendulum, you are destined to remain unstable. First discover what is permanent and still, and then fix your gaze upon that. What happens when you fix your gaze on the unchanging? Your modifications also begin to stabilise. Your attention must be anchored to the changeless. Until now, such profound appreciation and understanding of the eternal, timeless reality (trikāli) was completely lacking. One might have interpreted lines like "Without understanding the true nature of the self..." (Je swaroop samajyā vinā...) in a purely superficial manner. But later, the distinction between swabhāv (the substance) and swaroop (the substance as well as the modifications) will be unpacked: why did Param Krupalu Dev write swaroop rather than swabhāv? To us, they seemed synonyms - whether you said the swaroop of the soul or the swabhāv of the soul, it all sounded the same. But further ahead, it will take you into such subtle depths that you will stand up and proclaim before Ātmasiddhi: "Aho Aho! Shri Sadguru!" You will marvel at how much profound metaphysical insight was packed into every single word! We often engage in repetitive recitation (pārāyan), and recitation is wonderful for cultivating devotion. But it is through contemplation and deep reflection that the inner mystery unlocks. Both conciseness and elaboration are necessary: one helps for retention and inspires reverence when one realises so much is told in so little words, and the other helps in deepening one's understanding. So, each has its rightful place.

During the Second World War, on one side were Germany, Japan, and Italy; and on the other side were England, Russia, and France. America joined in later, and that brought the end of the war. The Germans and the British were bitter enemies. Sometimes one gained the upper hand, sometimes the other. At one stage in the war, the Germans were suffering heavy losses against the British. Their ships were captured, their weapons seized, and several of their soldiers were made prisoners of war; yet the pride and spirit of Germany refused to waver. A British soldier asked: "You are suffering such immense losses, yet on what basis do you keep your spirits so high?" The German soldier replied: "You have seized so many of our weapons, captured our ships, and taken our soldiers prisoner. But there is one weapon you have not yet been able to conquer, and the more you win, the sharper that weapon becomes." The British wondered what weapon they could possibly possess in this warfare. And what was it? "Our utter contempt for the British. That is what you have been unable to capture."

Let us not use the word "contempt" (dhikkār), because contempt implies a degree of aversion; let us instead use the term "negation" (niṣhedh bhāv).

When one gains a firm hold on the pure intrinsic nature, niṣhedh bhāv directed towards attachment results in attachment finding no ground to sustain itself. Attachment may arise due to past conditioning, but it cannot prolong itself. It arises through latent impressions, but it cannot simply linger. It cannot even stretch into a second or third successive modification; the continuity snaps right there because a deep-seated negation prevails toward it.

In everyday terms: If you know what is right and what is wrong, the wrong must always remain acknowledged as wrong in your heart, even if you happen to commit it. Take consumption of alcohol as an example. You must abstain from alcohol. You should simply never touch it. It is up to you to decide whether you want to preserve the purity of your body for your entire life or not. But suppose you slip into it. Do not rationalise: "A little bit is fine." Acknowledge: "This is wrong, this is completely wrong; I am slipping, but this is undeniably wrong." If that wrong remains recognised as wrong in your heart, you are certain to recover and return to the right path in life.

However, this usually doesn't happen. Your wrong intellect (kubuddhi) will attempt to justify it: "It's normal, it is obvious, it is okay." The moment these three words arise, you must instantly remember Pujya Gurudevshri! Which words? Normal, okay, obvious. You rationalise: "We are growing up, after all," or "Isn't it obvious that such a desire would arise?" But there are those in whom it did not arise! The person who resisted it is not deficient; that person is a true,

courageous soul. If someone else could remain unaffected, then I too can remain strong. And even if you fail to remain strong, at least maintain the inner conviction: "This alone is right, and what I am doing is unequivocally wrong." Then you will surely return back. So, do not allow your mind to be seduced by the logic of: it is okay, it is obvious, it is natural, it is normal. No! That conditioning must be shattered: it is not natural; it is not normal. Even if the majority - why say majority, even if everyone is doing it - it is still neither natural nor normal. They lack an enlightened Master in their lives, so they do not discern right from wrong. You have one who has shown you not only right and wrong, but the true worth of all things.

For the most part, you will be protected and saved. But even if you slip, you will recover far faster than others. Thus, this negation of attachment, this disavowal of impure states (vibhāv), propels the soul even deeper within (swabhāv). That is precisely why the entire practice of discernment between the self and non-self (bhedjnān) was revealed. If attachment did not exist at all, what would there be to differentiate from? Therefore, bhedjnān becomes the foremost internal spiritual discipline, because attachment will arise. It manifests in accordance with stages of spiritual development (guṇasthānaks): at the fourth guṇasthānak, certain things happen and certain things do not; at the fifth guṇasthānak, it is different. At the sixth guṇasthānak, it is different from the fifth; at the ninth guṇasthānak, it is different from the earlier ones, and so on.

Finally, all attachment completely falls away at the 12th guṇasthānak. But up until then, He is already an enlightened being from the 4th guṇasthānak, isn't He? He does not become an enlightened being only at the 12th or 13th guṇasthānak; one is an enlightened being right from the 4th stage. So, what operates between the 4th and the 12th guṇasthānak? It is precisely this nishedh bhāv (negation) toward impure states (vibhāv) and modifications, which blossoms directly from an authentic understanding of one's intrinsic nature.

Having shared these contextual introductory remarks, the core subject begins with the second verse. Although the chapter is Sarvavishuddhi Dwār, the inquiry centres on whether the soul is the doer of impure feelings such as attachment, or not. In between, verses will appear designed specifically to test your comprehension. Thus, you must grasp the underlying, implied meaning. It may say that the ignorant soul (ajnāni) is the doer of attachment, whereas the enlightened being is not. Yet, in supreme reality, the soul is never the doer of attachment at all. You might wonder: at one moment it claims the ignorant soul is the doer of attachment while the enlightened soul is not, but two verses later it asserts that in reality, neither is a doer at all! The soul is never the doer of

attachment; the enlightened soul realises this, the ignorant soul does not have this realisation.

Now, we are zooming in on the soul strictly through the supreme pure absolute standpoint (param shuddh nishchay naya), not even through pure nishchay which says that the soul is the doer of states of knowledge. Now it is purely param shuddh nishchay naya because we are gradually moving toward the ultimate. In terms of verse count, we are only halfway through. Although nine chapters are behind us, verse-wise we are just at the midpoint. Yet conceptually, the subject matter is approaching its absolute completion. The second verse is extremely fascinating.

Chhand 2: Nature of the pure soul that is devoid of worldly entanglements

Karmanikau kartā hai bhognikau bhogtā hai,

Jāki prabhutāmai aisau kathan ahit hai.

Jāmai ek indree ādi panchadhā kathan nāhi,

Sadā nirdosh bandh mokhsau rahit hai.

Gyānkau samooḥ gyāngamya hai subhāv jākau,

Lokvyāpi lokāteet lokamai mahit hai.

Suddh bans suddh chetanākai ras ans bharyau,

Aisau hans param puneetatā sahit hai.

Meaning of Chhand 2: Here, the nature of the eternal pure soul is described:

- 1. It has full strength and is devoid of being the doer of karma. It also does not endure (bhoktā) - the resultant perplexity (ākultā).**
- 2. A transmigratory living being can have a body having one to five senses. The eternal soul is separate from the state of these five conventional states.**
- 3. It is faultless and devoid of all the impurities.**
- 4. It is free from the modal state of bondage and liberation state - paryay ma bandh ane mokshthi rahit chhe.**
- 5. It is the embodiment of the complete pure knowledge. It can be only perceived through the knowledge.**

- 6. The all-knowing soul substance in its pure knowledge comprehends the entire universe, yet remains distinct from it.**
- 7. Therefore, such a soul substance is worthy of worship (poojniya) - and thereby worthy of acceptance (upādey).**
- 8. It is pure forever and full of consciousness.**

What is the true nature of the soul? It is stated right in the title: The nature of the pure soul is devoid of all worldly entanglements (sarva upādhi rahita). It reveals the true nature of the one who assumed all these nine costumes. This entire chapter can be said to be an extension of the Kartā–Karma–Kriyā Dwār (Chapter on the doer - karma - action). Whatever was expounded there was in relation to jeev (soul) and ajeev (matter); now, it is extending that very theme: In what manner is it a doer? In what manner is it a non-doer? From the conventional perspective (vyavahār), from the absolute perspective (nishchay), why call it a doer, why call it a non-doer, and why even call it a doer conventionally when it is fundamentally not a doer at all? This will be exquisitely dissected and illuminated.

We are fortunate that we have received the Chha Padmo Patra; in the third pad, all this is so clearly explained that none of this will feel entirely alien to us, yet our understanding will grow increasingly refined and subtle. Despite understanding all this, mentally we continue thinking in our old patterns. But now, that conviction (shraddhā) must be maintained, and when thoughts, feelings, and responses genuinely flow from that true conviction, our lives will radically transform!

We knew it theoretically, but true knowing means genuine understanding, authentic conviction. True faith is exceedingly rare. Everything will emerge from faith, not from mere intellectual knowing. Mere intellectual information will deceive you. When it is not needed, you will remember it perfectly; but when the need arises, you will forget it. In the face of karmic fruition, you will forget that no one can do anything to another, and yet, in examinations on the shibirs, you score 100 out of 100!

The process remains the same: reading or listening, repeatedly churning (gholan), reflecting (chintan), assimilating, and deep contemplation (bhāvan). But once genuine conviction takes hold, you will feel: "Now, such thoughts do not even arise in me; such emotions do not stir within me. How could I have been so foolish for so many years to think like this? 'This happened to me because of karma' or 'This happened because of that person' - how could I be so foolish to believe this?!" You might feel like crying, thinking: "How could I

think that way? Did I have no common sense at all?" But then recall Param Krupalu Dev's words: "Samar samar ab hasat hai" (When one remembers the past, he laughs). Laugh remembering your past foolishness, but do not weep! Just look at the supreme glory of the Sadguru! Earlier, the worldly view seemed like common sense, and now, truth feels like common sense. Earlier, spiritual truth seemed illogical; and now, worldly thinking feels like pure stupidity.

On the subject of assumptions, Pujya Gurudevshri explains how assumptions destroy your relationships, and how you simply cannot assume. Even assumptions have rules; otherwise, it is sheer foolishness. You want something, you project it, and you lean on this foolish assumption, but it is just your personal desire.

Perhaps you have to assume because direct communication is not possible, yet a decision must be made. So, if one must assume, what are the criteria? If you do not follow those criteria, you do not even have the right to say, "I assumed," because the basic criteria for making an assumption were never met and so you were bound to go wrong. And in case you happen to be right, it is merely the fruition of your meritorious karma (punyodaya), not your intellect! Your mind is untrained.

Thus, the question is: Is your mind negative or untrained? Yes, you must assume at times, but even an assumption must have grounds. If you don't even see smoke and claim there is a fire, that will not do. Every time, He will insist, "Show me, show me, show me, show me!"

Assumptions have strict rules; you cannot just assume arbitrarily. Otherwise, even a madman can make assumptions! So: Is your mind bad, negative, or is it just untrained? The answer is that it is merely untrained; it is not inherently bad. It is simply an instrument, a faculty; what is inherently "bad" about it? It is what you make of it.

Pujya Gurudevshri has no problems with the mind! His mind obeys Him; whatever He wishes to recollect, it serves up for Him. He shares a wonderful friendship with His mind. Mirabai may say, "Mero mann bado harami" (my mind is a rascal), but for Pujya Gurudevshri, there is no such treachery. Addressing Mirabai, He said that this may have been her experiential reality when she uttered it, but as one progresses, it's not so.

To Pujya Gurudevshri, the mind is just like His hands - an instrument, a gadget. You should simply be wise enough to utilise it as you wish. But your mind is thoroughly untrained; consequently, you make false assumptions, damage your relationships, overthink, and worry - all simply because your mind is untrained.

If you reflect on this, you will realise how many mistakes you have made in life and how much you have falsely blamed on karma! "My karmas are like this," or "karma makes me do this"? You are acting like an idiot; your karmic fruition is like that of a Chakravarti (universal monarch). You have attained a human birth where a single moment is more valuable than all the wealth of a Chakravarti combined. Your fortune is royal like a Chakravarti's, but you act like an idiot!

All of this drama happens because this mind is stuck clinging to modifications (paryāya), while such a magnificent reality sits hidden and obscured right within. When the scriptures proclaim this so urgently, let go of the blind trust in your own intellect and, for once, place your trust in the scriptures and just try!

Sarvavishuddhi Dwār means that the ultimate reality I am speaking of is absolutely pure (sarva vishuddh). What does "absolutely pure" mean? It means this conscious substance (chetan dravya) is such that insentient matter (jaḍ) never enters it. You might say, "Yes, that sounds good, but we already knew that this is simply the inherent nature of substance." Nor does consciousness enter insentient matter. Right now, I have no concern with insentient matter, so do not bring up all six substances; I am talking about myself. Within me, despite sharing the very same space (ek kṣhetrāvagāh sambandh), insentient matter can never have the power to enter my true nature.

Pujya Gurudevshri does not usually say "inherent nature" (swabhāva); He says "within me." This is because whenever He speaks of the soul, He refers to the eternal pure nature of the soul. We have no business with the temporary. Just as one keeps no list of the different guests who come to dine each day, but does keep a list of those who dine there regularly! In the same way, whenever Pujya Gurudevshri says "the soul," understand it solely as the soul's intrinsic nature, that which is permanent. When He says soul, it means the soul's true nature alone: the soul is distinct from the external and distinct from modifications.

Consciousness has not entered matter, so there is no mixing whatsoever. Imagine receiving pure milk. What you have seen in the world is adulterated, diluted with water. Pure milk means milk without a drop of water. In the same way, there is only the soul, and within it, matter cannot enter at all, hence it is called absolutely pure (vishuddh). That pure soul into which matter has no entry, that will be spoken of now.

Even attachment (rāg) has no entry into it. Consider how profound its purity must be that even attachment cannot enter! So, what are you asserting here - is attachment a modification of consciousness (chetan) or a modification of insentient matter (jaḍ)? Because if you call it a modification of consciousness, it

belongs to consciousness. Then how can you claim that attachment has not entered? Attachment clearly exists in the modification, and after all, the modification belongs to the soul, doesn't it?

To that, the answer is: One cannot claim that attachment is a modification of matter, meaning a modification of pudgal (matter), or some modification of material karma (dravya karma). How is that so? On what basis can you say attachment is not a modification of matter, it belongs to the soul alone?

Attachment causes the soul to experience suffering. If attachment was a modification of insentient matter, then one substance would be acting upon another! If attachment was an attribute of matter and you were the one suffering, then one substance would be affecting another substance. That is impossible. It is a foundational principle that one substance cannot do anything to another substance.

Therefore, whatever is the fruit of attachment, it may be misery or pleasure, pleasure in ignorance and misery in spiritual awakening - that fruit is experienced by this very conscious substance. Can one entity act while another suffers the consequences? That cannot happen; it must belong to the soul.

Hence, attachment is not a modification of matter; it is a modification of consciousness. Saying it is a modification of consciousness means that whatever transformation has occurred was not caused by anyone else. Therefore, from this viewpoint, the soul must be called the doer: The living being is the doer of its own attachment. Otherwise, one could say he created my attachment! No one else can be the doer of my attachment, no one else can be the doer of my suffering, no one else can be the doer of my aversion.

Yet you yourself have uttered the lie: "My son makes me angry." Even right now, sitting here, you agree that another person cannot do anything, so how brazenly do you lie? 'He cannot make me angry; he cannot be the cause of my anger; I choose to be angry.' If you admit this openly, you will feel like hiding your face in shame: "Am I mad, that I am choosing to be angry?" But this is the hard fact: you will have to take full responsibility. Otherwise, you have come to the wrong place. Because here, it will be declared unequivocally that one substance cannot do anything in another substance. You alone are the doer of this attachment, which means you alone are the maker of your suffering. No one else can become the cause of your misery.

Yet our everyday language remains, "It happened because of you." Either we say, "You made me do this" (such is our deep-seated delusion!), or we say, "You are the cause of my pain and aversion." Whether you call them the "doer"

or the "cause," you have stated the exact same falsehood. But that is simply impossible. It is an outright lie you have been telling yourself for years.

In this chapter, you are caught red-handed by pure logic alone. So, either claim that external substances (par dravya) are the doers of attachment, in which case, if external things cause your attachment and aversion, you can go on complaining: "My wife is harassing me," or "this person is acting too bossy." Another substance cannot be the creator of your attachment, or else one substance would have acted upon another. The soul's true nature is eternally a non-doer (akartā) of attachment. Then who is the doer of attachment? The soul has to be accepted as its doer from the conventional standpoint (vyavahār), to prove that the external world is not causing it to arise within you. Otherwise, your delusion would only solidify into: "It is happening because of that person; I am merely a detached witness, an observer."

You created it yourself. This does not mean your son is right; no sides are being taken. But you are the maker of your own anger, and why single out anger? You are the maker of your attachment as well. Do not invoke the other person's name in front of Pujya Gurudevshri. That person is neither the creator of your happiness nor the creator of your misery. Whatever thoughts you entertained about them are the sole cause of your happiness or your suffering.

From now on, beware! Do not, even once, blame a single feeling on someone else. Say: "I have chosen this. Because I am an idiot, I am choosing wrong. Now, I am not an idiot; I am choosing right." But the full responsibility is entirely yours. You are permitted to feel miserable. Pujya Gurudevshri does not expect the impossible from you. You are also permitted to feel happy, but attributing that happiness to anyone else is strictly not permitted. Do just this, and samyag darshan (self-realisation) can dawn today or tomorrow.

If you actually make this your conviction, then samyag darshan is not difficult. Omniscience (kevalajnān) might be difficult because all attachment and aversion must cease. But samyag darshan does not even expect your attachment and aversion to vanish completely. Can you imagine? Samyag darshan says: "I can withstand any attachment and aversion, except the infinite bonding karma (anantānubandhī). Other than that, I can endure any attachment and aversion. I will endure, and they will persist alongside me. I am not expecting that much from you." So, Pujya Gurudevshri asked samyag darshan, "Then what are you expecting?" And samyag darshan replied, "Only right faith (sācī shraddhā), nothing else."

So, who is the doer of attachment? Inanimate matter or consciousness? Consciousness. But if so, doesn't it become the intrinsic nature of consciousness? You said "consciousness," not "the modification of consciousness." By saying consciousness, it implies it is the nature of consciousness, which would mean attachment could never be dispelled! So, why should this poor soul even make an effort? Now answer this: Since you claimed consciousness is its doer, if doing so is indeed the intrinsic nature of consciousness, meaning its nature is to be a doer, then it would go on creating attachment endlessly, over and over again!

If attachment were your intrinsic nature, it could never be removed. Yet you already witness your attachment subsiding and growing feeble. Because it can be eliminated, it simply cannot be your true nature. Your true nature is dispassion (vitarāgtā); attachment is not your nature. Matter was eliminated as the doer; the eternal nature of consciousness was eliminated as the doer. And if you wish to understand further, read the verses of Ātmasiddhi.

If you say, "I am full of attachment and aversion," you are trapped. If you say, "Someone else is making me do it," you are equally trapped. Just sit quietly. It is not my nature; otherwise, it would never leave. And the other person cannot cause it, because if one substance could interfere with another, everything would collapse, no relationship would have stability, no substance would retain its identity, and the cosmic order itself would disintegrate. Then I wouldn't even be able to tell whether you are you or your son!

Modification (paryāy) is the transient manifested form of a substance. The eternal nature of the soul is not the doer of that modification, nor is an external object the doer of that modification. The rest of the answer is your homework.

“Chetan jo nij bhānmā, kartā āp swabhāv, varte nahi nij bhānmā, kartā karma prabhāv.” (If the soul abides in the awareness of its pure nature, then it becomes the doer of its own nature, in the sense of its pure manifestation. When it does not abide in the awareness of its pure nature, then it is the doer of impure feelings which are instrumental in binding material karma).

Expressed with such exquisite brevity, before you can even grasp the verse, it is already concluded! The entire essence of Sarvavishuddhi Dwār is captured in a single line; what more is there to say! To meet such an enlightened being is supreme good fortune.

Tirthankar Bhagwan's discourse is vast and detailed. The chief disciples (Gaṇḍhar Bhagwans) condense it, because they must bind everything into concise aphorisms (sūtras). The Bhagwan does not speak merely three words.

He speaks for 7 hours and 20 minutes daily. The Bhagwan elaborates, the Gandhars condense it into aphorisms, the Āchāryas elaborate again, Krupalu Dev condenses it once more, and then, those like Pujya Gurudevshri elaborate on it in detail again. Such is the way: It emerges in full expanse from the Omniscient God, so that no question remains unanswered. Before a question can even arise in your mind, the answer is already delivered in the next sentence. So, you request an appointment, and then you cancel the appointment, saying, "I got my answer."

Yet, how can you remember a one-and-a-half-hour discourse? Saubhagyabhai could not memorise the Chha Padno Patra. He requested: "Please compose something in verse and make it a bit concise." And so we got Shri Atmasiddhi Shastra. Observe this entire methodology of transmitting knowledge. Realise the limitations of our intellect; understand the limitations of sensory and scriptural knowledge (matijnān and shrut jnān). It is elaborated, then condensed, elaborated again, condensed again, elaborated once more, and so on.

The moment Pujya Gurudevshri completed the four volumes, people realised what a magnificent scripture Ātmasiddhi must be. Many people pointed out to Him that every commentator gives their commentary another distinct title, because it stands as an independent work in its own right. Every commentary has a different title. Pujya Gurudevshri replied, "I will not give it a separate title, because then that commentary will become famous. I want Ātmasiddhi itself to be renowned."

Then the question arose: How would people know this Ātmasiddhi was not authored by Pujya Gurudevshri? People read so superficially and make casual assertions. So, Pujya Gurudevshri had the title Ātmasiddhi printed at the top in Param Krupalu Dev's own original handwriting, and below it, He wrote, "Commentator" (Vivechankartā), clarifying that this is merely a commentary, while the core substance belongs entirely to Ātmasiddhi.

Dr Bhagwandasbhai's commentary was titled Rāj Jyoti Mahābhāṣhya. He wrote a single volume. From Pujya Gurudevshri, four volumes emerged. So Pujya Gurudevshri quipped that by that standard, this would have to be called Rāj Jyoti Mahā-Mahā-Mahā-Mahābhāṣhya! Initially, His Ph.D. guide said that a poem of 142 verses could not form the basis of a doctoral thesis. Gurudev said, "Sir, let me begin. If it does not seem satisfactory for a PhD, I will add comparative studies or other material later." So, the guide was pleased. Gurudev was prepared to add Apūrva Avsar and other compositions if needed, but He was completely confident. That very guide later pleaded with Gurudev: "Condense it, please condense it!" Sixty full-scap papers were drafted for each

section, and after editing, only twenty were published. More of His time was spent cutting down the text. Thus, as the exposition expanded, everyone felt its majesty even greater.

Later, Nemiji remarked: "Look, nobody is going to read four whole volumes. Apart from people like Kothariji, nobody wades through something this long." So, in June 2021, Nemiji suggested: "Now create a version of two paragraphs per verse, and write it in English." Gurudev replied, "I can do it, but you must give me a solid six months. I am not Shrimad Rajchandra, who could compose it in an hour and a half. That power my Guru has; we are merely His servants." Nemiji responded, "Fine, He wrote it in two hours; You write it in two months." Pujya Gurudevshri and Kothariji threw themselves into the work, working 16 to 17 hours a day, and it was accomplished.

So, that phase returns every 50 to 100 years, and here, it returned in just 25 years: "No one will read this much; condense it." Soon enough, this condensed version will feel too brief! Then people will tell Pujya Gurudevshri, "Take one year to teach one Rāj Gītā again." This is how it inevitably unfolds. Both elaboration and brevity have their distinct power. Conciseness is needed for retention; elaboration is needed to comprehend value.

Naturally, no matter how much you try, you cannot memorise an entire commentary. But if you ask people to memorise Ātmasiddhi, everyone will commit it to memory. Let us make that resolve this time. And when reading Vachanamrutji, read it this way. Even if you have just ten minutes, that is completely fine. But do not step away midway to attend to other chores; that is not allowed. If you have five minutes, tell yourself: "I will read just two paragraphs," that too is fine. But recite the invocation "Anant Anant..." before you begin. Conclude your study by closing the book after reciting the line: "Sukh dhām anant susant chahī, dinrāt rahe tad dhyān mahī," and place the scripture back in its designated spot, not just leaving it where you sat reading. It will transform your inner state in a profound way. The Bhagavad Gita also instructs that one should cultivate reverent humility (vinay) toward the source of knowledge, offering prostrations etc.

Who creates the waves or ripples - the beach or the ocean itself? You are forced to admit: Certainly not the beach, yet ripples are not the intrinsic nature of the ocean either because you can observe the ocean without ripples, without waves as well. So, you must be very clear on this point, and these represent different standpoints (nayas).

From the perspective of the supreme pure absolute standpoint (param shuddh nishchay naya), the soul is not even the doer of its modifications (pariṇāmas). Supreme pure nishchay naya asserts: "I am immutable and eternal (dhruva); hence I am not even the doer of this changing modifications." The cosmos is ever transforming naturally on its own. It does not even acknowledge transformation; it does not acknowledge modifications, so where is the question of being their doer? From param shuddh nishchay naya, one is a non-doer even of modifications.

From the pure absolute standpoint (shuddh nishchay naya), one is not the doer of impure feelings (bhāv karma), one is solely the doer of states of pure knowledge (jnānbhāv) etc.

From an impure absolute standpoint (ashuddh nishchay naya), one is the doer of attachment and aversion.

From the unattributed actual approach standpoint (anupcharit vyavahār naya), one is the doer of material karma (dravyakarma).

From the attributed unreal approach standpoint (upcharit vyavahār naya), "I built this house," or "I established this," and so forth.

This profound clarity was delivered in the third fundamental expounded in the Chha Padno Patra.

So now, this entire discussion will revolve around "doer and non-doer"; it will continue across this shibir and the next shibir. Once you gain mastery over these five standpoints, there is no confusion whatsoever. The five standpoints are:

Param shuddh nishchay naya states: "The soul is unchanging, unmoving; within it, waves never arise." "Then what is it that we are perceiving?" The answer is, "You are perceiving māyā - illusion."

Shuddh nishchay naya intervenes: "The soul is pure consciousness, and it is the doer of the modifications of pure knowing."

Ashuddh nishchay naya responds: "But attachment coexists alongside knowledge, so the soul is indeed the doer of attachment. The waves were not created by the beach; the ocean alone formed them."

Then anupcharit vyavahār naya chimes in: "So, the soul is also responsible for material karmas (dravya karma)?" In fact, the two have a relation of instrumental cause and effect (nimitt-naimittik).

It is magnificent to comprehend! The supreme pure absolute standpoint will keep asserting itself: "No, the soul is entirely a non-doer." Shuddh nishchay

naya says: "No, no, that is getting a bit carried away. The soul is the doer and receiver of the states of knowing."

Ashuddh nishchay naya challenges: "Then who creates attachment and aversion? Does the external world do it?" The reply comes: "No, they are created through one's own thoughts, but because they are temporary, they are not counted." And immediately, param shuddh nishchay naya reaffirms again: "The soul is purely a non-doer!"

So, anupcharit vyavahār naya says: "Well, the soul binds karmas and so they are bound, hence the soul is the doer of material karma; it's that simple." Ashuddh nishchay naya replies: "The soul may generate impure feelings (bhāv karma), a gravitational slope is created, attraction occurs, and all this unfolds. But, suppose a person gives a push, and he falls onto a second person, and if the second tumbled onto a third, why blame the first for it all? The soul merely generated attachment and aversion. Now, if karmic particles (kārman vargaṇā) were stirred by that, drawn in, and bound, why place the whole blame on the soul?"

Then the upcharit vyavahār naya declares: "Come on, I built this house! You say that you built this ashram, didn't you?" To which, the ultimate answer comes: "Take refuge in the supreme pure absolute standpoint: I am not the doer even of my modifications, neither of knowledge, nor of ignorance; I am the constant, eternal substance."

In Sarvavishuddhi Dwār, as we zoom in closer and closer, what are we now focusing on? A little more clarity is needed: Constant, unchanging (dhruvatva).

Within an entity, there is an aspect that undergoes change, and there is an aspect that never changes at all. So, zooming in, and by that, we are now looking exclusively at the substance, which never changes.

When we speak of gold, certain aspects can change, like, it can be in the form of a crown, a necklace, or a bangle, but something does not change, which is gold. When focus shifted away from the external factor (par) and turned toward the soul (ātmā), we discovered both. Something is changing: in my previous life, as a soul whose intrinsic nature is knowledge, I was known in one form; in this life, I am known in another form. Thus, there is an element of change, yet something remains unchanged.

Gradually, two dimensions emerged: earlier there was self (swa) and other/external (par); now, two aspects begin to appear - one that changes, and one that

does not change. Presently, in this chapter, we are focusing solely on that which does not change. We do not negate the one which changes. During introspection, you observe the changing part. But right now, I am looking at this part which never changes.

What does "never changes" mean? What are other words for it? Dhruv (unchanging), kutasth (constant), trikāli (eternal), and most importantly, apariṇāmī (non-transforming/changeless). Pariṇām means change; pariṇāmī means undergoing change. But we are looking only at the changeless. Are you going to find modifications (pariṇām) there? No. Changes there? No. Hence, it is apariṇāmī (without change).

That means the soul is not the doer (kartā) of modifications at all. When modification itself does not exist there, where is the question of its doer? So again, why are you getting confused? This is precisely what is being discussed.

You might ask, "If it does not undergo change, then who generates this attachment and aversion (rāg-dwesh)?" In the language of Jainism, you can call it paryāy (modification). Our modification certainly changes; it is sometimes categorised under pudgal (matter). The modification of consciousness is called par (external). How can you call it par? Because we define par in this way: Whatever is not to be focused on is par.

Do you focus on the modification? No. One must not focus on the swinging pendulum. Therefore, whatever must not be the object of focus, we designate as par. And if you say that swa (self) and par (other, external) simply mean soul and pudgal, then classify it under pudgal. If you wish to call it pudgal, call it pudgal; if you maintain that there is only the self and pudgal, then place it in pudgal. But we will certainly not grant it entry into the self (swa).

So, right now, you are focusing on the changeless fundamental (apariṇāmī tattva), which possesses no modifications, no changes, no appearances, not even illusory appearance (vivart) - nothing; it is only that pure substance. In that realm, modification does not exist at all; so can you ask the question: "Who is the doer of these modifications?" No.

Now, once one begins to understand this verse, clarity dawns. The first point stated is: to assert that within its core essence, the soul is the doer of karma and the receiver of karma is detrimental and defamatory to its nature. Here, let us take "karma" to mean bhāv karma - that it is the doer of bhāv karma or the receiver of bhāv karma. Karma can be anything: It can be nokarma/quasi karma (the physical body), it can be dravya karma/material karma (material karmic particles such as knowledge-obscuring karma), and bhāv karma refers to

attachment and aversion. To state that within essence, it is the doer of karma or the receiver of karma is spiritually harmful.

The conventional standpoint (vyavahār naya) states that the living being is the doer of karma. What does the metaphorical conventional standpoint (upcharit vyavahār naya) say? Sachinji's department here is maintenance. From the metaphorical conventional standpoint, who is the doer of maintenance? Sachinji.

Now let us zoom in a little. Who is the doer of this entire ashram? The trustees. All of that gets subsumed under "I," doesn't it? Yes. Everything unfolds strictly according to what was inscribed in karma. Someone might feel, "I did this," but there is no such thing. It was written that this is how it would happen, all that was to happen here over 26 years; call it destiny (bhavitavya) or whatever you like, but here, we require the framework of karma, so it happened according to karma. Otherwise, your intellect would not even have conceived doing something here. Thus, all of this occurred according to karma.

If you zoom in even further: the desire arose, "Let me come here, let me do something here." You did nothing else. You were merely the doer of that attachment; you have now arrived at the impure absolute standpoint (ashuddh nishchay naya). We moved through the metaphorical conventional standpoint (upcharit) and the non-metaphorical conventional standpoint (anupcharit), and now, zooming in further, came to the impure absolute standpoint (ashuddh nishchay naya). You merely generated the attachment: "I want to build a beautiful Derasar here; I want to construct a beautiful Rāj Sabhāgrah here." You are the doer of only that much attachment. Beyond that, your territory ends, and whatever transpires thereafter, one must also take into account the realm of matter (pudgal), mustn't one?

In the Tattvārth Sūtra, there is the topic of adattādān (taking what is not given). Pujya Gurudevshri explained that adattādān means taking something without permission; if "it was not given to you and yet you enjoy it or harbour attachment to it," that constitutes adattādān. As this topic was being discussed, Pujya Gurudevshri illustrated it in four progressive dimensions:

1. A basket full of tomatoes is lying here; no one knows who they belong to. But I needed one or two tomatoes, and seeing no one around, I took two tomatoes. What is this called? It is adattādān, because no one gave it to you and you took it. Whether someone wanted them, or had discarded them, or whatever the case, you did not ask for the owner's permission, and without that, you took them.

2. The owner is present right there; you ask him, and he says, "Here, take them if you wish." Then it is not *adattādān*, is it? Because now, he is giving them. To which the reply is: "No, even then it can be *adattādān*. Did you ask the living soul within the tomato, the one whose body that is? This person is not the true owner at all!" You think that simply asking anyone and getting their consent means it is no longer *adattādān*. But ask the soul within the tomato: "I wish to eat you; may I eat you?" If that was not done, then up to that level, it remains *adattādān*.
3. Suppose for a moment, that even the tomato granted permission. Did you ask the Tirthankar Bhagwan? Do you have His permission/command to eat tomatoes? Just as there is a command not to eat potatoes, if potatoes are lying there, the vendor is willing, the potato is willing, but the Tirthankar is not willing! And now, you walk the path of the Tirthankar Bhagwan; your personal whims will no longer apply. Here, we are speaking in the context of tomatoes. Let us say the Tirthankar Bhagwan's precept allows it: "Today is not a *tithi*, so you may eat tomatoes."
4. Did you ask your Guru? The Guru is your Master, and without asking your Master, you cannot eat.

One may ask, "What is there to ask about a tomato?" If we go about asking even for a tomato like this, we enter the true disciple-Guru relationship. And the Guru may say no, because you harbour intense attachment toward tomatoes, for you, it becomes unsuitable food (*abhakṣhya*). You are bound to accumulate severe karma.

It was a profound topic, and Pujya Gurudevshri touches upon it with great conciseness. But through this progression, it came down to this: ultimately, everything is encompassed within the Guru's command (*Guru ājnā*).

So, what was the ultimate conclusion? Until you have the Guru's permission, everything is *adattādān*! Observe the sublime beauty of the *Tattvārth Sūtra*.

When a dead body is carried, it is called an *arthī* (bier). Why is it called *arthī*? A-rathī - the *rathī* (charioteer, the soul) has departed, and so it is *arathī*.

Even in the conventional expressions we use every day, what they convey is: The soul is not there, the soul is gone! When someone passes away, we say "He has departed," or "he expired," or "he passed away." He passed away, but he still exists. The soul is eternal. Our traditional social customs years ago were

designed in this way, so that spirituality was woven into every aspect. Today, everything has been forgotten.

From the conventional standpoint (vyavahār naya), the soul is described as the doer and receiver of karma; and wherever statements appear in the scriptures combining anupcharit vyavahār naya and the ashuddh nishchay naya, they will state that due to the feelings of attachment, deluding karma (mohaniya karma) was bound. Thus, the soul became the doer of deluding karma, or the doer of attachment.

Hearing this, you should not reject or deny it; simply adjust the analytical standpoint (naya): "Ah, in Adhyātmāsār, it is written this way. In Ātmasiddhi, it is stated that you are the doer of karma, that is, from the anupcharit vyavahār naya. And what is the reason for it? Because, from the ashuddh nishchay naya, you are the doer of attachment, and consequently, you became the doer of deluding karma." In this manner, keep adjusting the perspectives; otherwise, you will conclude that one enlightened Master is right and another is wrong. Because whatever is needed at a particular stage must be applied. Statements are made appropriately according to context.

Until now, you sat with a single persistent grievance that you are suffering because of others. So, Bhagwan had to declare: "No, you suffer because of your own karma." Then you asked, "Who wrote my karma?" So, it had to be said: "Your own psychological defilements (bhāv karma), and due to them material karma (dravya karma), its fruition, and because of that you suffer." To completely remove the habit of blaming the external, the teaching was presented from this standpoint.

Now you say, "No, I want self-realisation (ātmajnān)." The Master replies: "No, no, that earlier teaching was merely to pacify the mind, and to cultivate equanimity. If you seek the soul, take the leap: you are solely the doer of states of knowledge (jnānbhāv). You are the doer of states of knowing alone, because even while experiencing attachment, the one who knows 'this is attachment' is knowledge; therefore, you are continuously engaged only in knowing. Attachment comes and goes; aversion comes and goes; all of that is temporary. What do you do eternally? Knowing, knowing, knowing, knowing."

Now you become thoroughly convinced: "I am solely the doer of knowledge." To that, the Master responds: "No, zoom in even further!"

The constant substance (dhruv tattva) is fundamentally non-transforming (aparīṇāmi). In that framework, modification is an effect, a karma. And where there is a karma, there is a doer. But in that dhruv, where modification does not

exist at all, where there is no change, where all is non-transforming, where does a doer remain? It simply is what it is. What was present ages ago is present right now, and will remain just so forever: that is aparināmi.

This is a matter of profound subtlety, not a subject meant to confuse you. If you cannot grasp this, return to Ātmasiddhi and remain anchored within those two standpoints.

Yet, don't drift outward to the point where you claim, "I built this ashram," that is, into upcharit vyavahār naya; that illusion must be shattered: the notion that "I built this home," "I accomplished this," and so forth. If someone said, "I built this rest house (dharmashālā)," from upcharit vyavahār naya, it can be considered valid.

If you must designate who the doer is, you have to say: "I did not build it; that person built it." At a certain level, one must speak in this way to differentiate: "I have no personal participation in this."

From the conventional standpoint, the soul is the doer and receiver of karma. From the impure absolute standpoint, you can say the soul is the doer of attachment and defilements. From the pure absolute standpoint, you will say the soul is the doer of states of knowledge. It performs only knowing, knowing, knowing; yet the objects of knowledge (jñey) keep changing. Right now, if I look this way, the clock is my object of knowledge; then I look here, and something else is my object of knowledge. From that viewpoint, one could say it is the knower of this glass, the knower of this person - in that sense, doer, doer, doer; but fundamentally, it is the doer of knowing.

To call the soul a doer and a receiver, in the sense intended here, is a stain upon the true understanding of its essential nature. The constant substance (dhruv) - now Pujya Gurudevshri is speaking directly of the dhruv. To call the dhruv a doer or a receiver is spiritually harmful. Harmful in the sense that it is a blemish, and completely inappropriate.

Does it feel right now? Perhaps not until now, but with this explanation you see: modification does not exist there at all, so how could it be the doer of modifications of knowledge or the doer of modifications of attachment? And outside, there is no discussion at all beyond its territory.

Thus, this is the reality wherein classifications of five-sensed beings do not exist. Descriptions of one-sensed, two-sensed, and other beings find no place here. One-sense refers to plant life and the like. Take two-sensed beings: worms - all different varieties of worms - possessing only two senses. Three-sensed beings: insects possessing three senses. Four-sensed beings: flies. And within

five-sensed beings, there are souls with the mind (sanjni) and souls without the mind (asanjni), encompassing celestial beings (devas), humans (manuṣhya), animals (tirynch), and hellish beings (nārakis) - all of them.

Therefore, in that reality, even the classification of five senses finds no place. When it comes to the soul, all such descriptions pertain exclusively to the physical body. But I am not the body at all! In reality, I have penetrated all the way to the dhruv, and you are pulling me back out to the periphery!

When anchored in the dhruv, to say, "Brother, this being is five-sensed," to that, the enlightened one replies, "Even that other being appears to me as identical to the liberated soul (Siddh); I too am like the liberated soul, equal to the liberated soul."

Then Param Krupalu Dev writes: "Je samaje te thāy" – The one who realises this fact becomes liberated.

"Sarva jeev chhe Siddh sam" (All souls by nature are like the liberated ones). Hearing that, we felt: "Well then, let us retire! Now we don't need to practise any religion; when all are already like the liberated soul, why make any effort at all?" Param Krupalu Dev immediately foresaw that laxity and that spiritual lethargy would set in.

If people grasped teachings correctly, this wouldn't be the Fifth Era (Pancham kāl). But because it is the Fifth Era, one's immediate reaction is: "Oh, I am like the liberated soul; I have no need to do anything at all." That is why Param Krupalu Dev added: The one who realises this fact becomes liberated.

Do you truly understand it? No. Then you must engage in spiritual practice. Undertake an āyambil tomorrow. Undertake it precisely to gain that understanding. Do it to discern whether you truly live by food or whether you live by your inherent knowing consciousness (jñān-bhāv).

The ultimate essence lies in meditation (dhyān) and detachment from the body (kāyotsarg); yet it should not feel like a forced chore: "I was compelled to do this." It should be: "I longed to do this," and it happened effortlessly, with fountains of pure joy bursting forth! Only when austerity is practised like this does the enlightened Master approve. You engaged in spiritual study (swādhyāy) the entire day, meditated, did an hour and a half of exercise, and nothing felt extraordinary; the day proceeded normally. None of that dread: "Today is an āyambil, so by nightfall, it will feel burdensome." The day must flow normally.

Karma can be classified as psychic karma (bhāv karma), material karmic matter (dravya karma), and the body and other quasi-karma (nokarma). To declare that I am the soul, I am the doer and receiver of these things is the destruction of my divine sovereignty (prabhutā). Do not label me a doer and receiver. Do not diminish my inner sovereignty!

I am that changeless (apariṇāmī), constant (dhruv) substance like an ice cube kept deep inside a freezer: completely changeless, without modifications, without disturbances, devoid of lack, free from imperfection, and untouched by impurity. I have reached the deepest freezer of the refrigerator, not the house, not the kitchen, not the outer fridge, but the freezer itself. And now, sitting in that realm, if you tell me, "You are the doer and receiver of karma," it does not fit; it is defamatory. It has been expressed so exquisitely.

Consider a woman who has a husband whom she calls "my husband," and a son whom she calls "my son." Now suppose, at some point, a major conflict breaks out between the two. She refers to both as "my husband" and "my son." Scriptural propriety dictates that while both are hers, if she is compelled to align with only one, her duty is to stand by her husband.

Modification (paryāy) arises from you; yet do not side with the modification! It merely originates from you. So, it is secondary. Had this underlying reality not existed, that modification would never have arisen in the first place. Therefore, you must take the side of the eternal substance.

In our expositions of conduct (charaṇānuyog), a son is indeed a son, isn't he? Your son is your own. Who could be closer or dearer to you than your own son? Yet, after the age of 10, a mother must not sleep beside her 10-year-old son. She may sleep beside her husband, but not beside her 10-year-old son. This is the boundary of propriety set by charaṇānuyog. An exposition of metaphysics (dravyānuyog) would claim: "One substance never truly touches another substance at all!" Yet expositions of conduct like Ratnakaraṇḍ Shrāvakāchār and several others articulate such sublime practical discipline!

One might wonder: what mental impressions might be running in the mind, and what external catalysts (nimitt) might appear? Whatever catalyst arises, when one's inner state (bhāvdashā) combines with it, it can bind karma; there may be a specific reason for it.

Yet, such rigorous boundaries are explicitly laid down. Even while dravyānuyog insists that one substance cannot do anything to another, one may casually ask, "What difference does it make?" But if it is not grounded and supported by charaṇānuyog, pursuing such dravyānuyog will lead to ruin.

Following this, there is the chapter on Syādvād, followed by the chapter on Sādhya - Sādhak, and then the exposition on the stages of spiritual development (guṇasthānaks). In that section, the first spiritual stage will be described, where a soul oriented toward right faith (samkit-sanmukh jeev) still resides at the first stage. Yet, as it journeys towards samyag darshan, it renounces the seven vices (sapta vyasan) and renounces the seven forbidden foods (sapta abhakṣya). That verse, or rather, that couplet has been cited by Param Krupalu Dev in the Vachanāmṛtji. It has been quoted in the Updesh Nondh.

We might wonder: after expounding such profound heights in Sarvavishuddhi Dwār, where the soul is revealed as not even the doer of its states of knowledge, how can the very same author, Pandit Banarasidasji, declare that one must never commit adultery, never visit a prostitute, and that if these vices are present, right faith (samkit) is utterly out of the question for you! He delineates the seven vices and the seven forbidden foods with such uncompromising strictness, and Param Krupalu Dev cited that very text.

Therefore, just as the verse "Samtā, ramtā, uradhtā." [Samtā means sameness (sarakhapanu), ramatā means beautiful (sundarpanu) and charm (ramaniyata) of the soul, and uradhtā means if the soul is not present, nothing can be known] is quoted and cherished by us, this disciplinary verse should be embraced with equal reverence. Without the bedrock of charaṇānuyog, pure dravyānuyog will spiritually destroy a person. For, only one whose ethical conduct (charaṇānuyog) is properly grounded can truly assimilate this metaphysical truth (dravyānuyog). Anyone can understand it intellectually, but if it is not internalised properly, it produces perverse delusions.

One might rationalise, "If the soul doesn't eat, what does food matter? If one substance never touches another, what is the meaning of celibacy (brahmacharya)?" By engaging in such false rationalisations, you accomplish nothing except causing immense harm to your own soul. And if someone asks, "Then why explain something that could cause harm?" The reply is: "Look, simply because someone might drink it as poison, you do not withhold nourishment from everyone. If it turns into poison for an unfit person, you cannot decree that everyone must stop eating good food." The very best truth must be imparted. For an ignorant fool will remain a fool; it makes no difference to him; but when an earnest seeker receives such fundamental truth, one day it will blossom into omniscience (kevalajnān).

Therefore, we do not withhold truth merely because someone might misuse it. Param Krupalu Dev also stated: "Now, whatever I reveal, I shall reveal openly, without concealment" (agopya kahish). If you fail to grasp it, you alone are

responsible. Yet, He revealed the inner secret of the path without hiding anything. Many speak of the path, but rare are those who reveal the core essence of the path, and that too with such unshakeable clarity: "Pratyakṣ Sadguru sam nahi parokṣ Jina upakār" (The benevolence of a living Sadguru is not the same but greater than that of the non-present omniscient Lords, the Tirthankars); one must possess immense courage to declare this so explicitly!

The matter is thoroughly logical, so there is nothing far-fetched about it - first logical, and then experiential as well.

Once, when Pujya Gurudevshri was just 19 years of age, a holy saint told Him something that left Him astonished. That saint praised Pujya Gurudevshri's profound devotion toward Param Krupalu Dev, yet said: "No matter how immense Your devotion for Param Krupalu Dev, when it comes to expounding the 11th verse of Ātmasiddhi, that personal devotion toward Param Krupalu Dev must not stand in the way; You must possess the courage to voice what Param Krupalu Dev's heart truly intended."

At that time, He was surprised: how could devotion ever obstruct explaining Param Krupalu Dev's words?

And later, Pujya Gurudevshri saw how the word "living/present" (pratyakṣ) can be twisted.

It is emotional attachment in the guise of devotion that gets in the way. When an explanation is given in that Great Being's name, you must voice what was in His heart, not what suits your emotional comfort.

Later, when the work of writing and commentary of Shri Atmasiddhi Shastra began, as Pujya Gurudevshri mentioned, setting aside all personal sentiment, He articulated precisely what Param Krupalu Dev intended. At that moment, He felt: "Oh! I did not possess such strength on my own; the power to speak with such uncompromising clarity belongs only to an epoch-maker, a spiritual Master (Yugpuruṣh) like Param Krupalu Dev."

The truth is: the unchanging constant substance (dhruv) is yours. You must stand by the eternal. It is not that when the modification errs, you should claim it is acting correctly - for while it is indeed the divine soul, its innate divinity has not yet manifested. Yet, as the scriptures instruct, your ultimate allegiance remains with the eternal substance alone.

This is a realm where distinctions from one-sensed to five-sensed beings cannot even be drawn, because every soul is inherently a pure soul (shuddhātmā). If you consider the impure soul or look at the modification, degrees and

distinctions exist. But here, all are identical. The unchanging in me (dhruv tattva) and the unchanging in you are identical. If I speak of the state of my soul and the state of your soul, a difference exists. Even though both of us are five-sensed human beings, differences remain in our states or modifications. But from the perspective of the dhruv, both are identical; meaning that in that realm, descriptions of classes of beings (jātis) cannot even arise.

Under jāti, one can also include social orders (varṇas): the four classifications of Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, and Shudra. All the chief disciples (Gaṇdhars) were originally Brahmins! All 11 Gaṇdhars of Bhagwan Mahavir were Brahmins. So many Kshatriyas sought refuge in Bhagwan and took renunciation. Countless Vaishyas did the same, and there were Shudras too, such as Muni Harikeshi; all of this came up when we studied the Uttarādhyayan Sutra.

Enlightened beings exist across all classes. All classes and categories find their true spiritual meaning within the enlightened one:

- When absorbed in the supreme reality (Brahman), He is a Brahmin.
- When ascending the ladder of spiritual destruction of karma (kṣhapak shreṇi), He is a Kshatriya.
- When He discerns Himself as distinct from both auspicious and inauspicious states (bhedjnān), He is a Vaishya.
- And when offering devotion to the Lord and the Guru, He is a Shudra: "I am your humble servant."

All four qualities are found within a single enlightened Master:

- In the thought-free state (nirvikalp), He is a Brahmin.
- In the conceptual, reflective state (savikalp), He is a Vaishya.
- When resolving to achieve spiritual victory within 48 minutes, the warrior spirit of a Kshatriya manifests within Him.
- Yet, when offering devotion to the enlightened Master and the divine, even as an ascetic already revered in the Navkār Mantra, when that monk worships Arihant Bhagwan, He does so as a humble servant and an innocent child, as though He is saying, "I am Your lowly servant, I am nothing before You; I am not worthy even to be called a fraction of the magnificent reality that You are."

We have seen the devotional hymns composed by venerable Āchāryas - we took up Samantbhadra's composition, but reading other Āchāryas, one wonders: Why do they describe themselves as lowly, sinful, fallen, passionate, deceitful, and lustful? While we behold immaculate celibacy (brahmacharya) in them, and the radiance of their eyes dispels all unchaste thoughts within us, they describe themselves as lustful and attached! Why? Because they say: "I still perceive how this pencil is, how this chair is, how this glass is. I still register this as masculine and that as feminine! I still retain the awareness of gender distinctions; therefore, I have not attained absolute absorption in the soul (brahmachāri)! I am not fully celibate because the consciousness of gender still lingers! Only if I am not totally established in the genderless soul (aliṅg ātma tattva) would my mind even register grammatical gender: that this is masculine and that is feminine." (In Gujarati, a pencil is feminine – ‘kevi’ – and a glass masculine – ‘kevo’.)

To attribute doership (karṭṛtva) and receivership (bhokṛtva) to the soul is defamatory. To ascribe differences of class (jāti) is likewise defamatory, because what is five-sensed and what is one-sensed - both are essentially equal to the liberated soul.

That reality is free from all flaws; it neither gets bound by karma, nor is it liberated from karma. Saying "I am the maker of worldly transmigration (sansār)" - and where doer is mentioned, receiver is naturally implied - or saying, "I am the doer of omniscience, omniscience has just arisen within me" - both assertions are spiritually groundless from this ultimate standpoint.

The one in whom omniscience dawns does not hold a celebration. He says: "That which was already present within simply manifested in the modification; what is there to celebrate in that?" When food is brought from the kitchen to the dining table, do you hold a grand celebration? Then what is there to celebrate about omniscience? What have I created in it? Where is my doership in it? What always existed simply is.

The Omniscient One does not desire a celebration, but the celestial beings around Him celebrate nonetheless! The celestial beings exclaim: "Ah! What magnificent spiritual valour - displaying valour of the highest calibre! Just forty-five minutes ago, You were at the sixth or seventh spiritual stage, and right now, You have ascended directly to the thirteenth spiritual stage!" Thus, they feel that this victory is truly worthy of celebration.

Further, it is free from all flaws, and free from both bondage and liberation. Only where a flaw exists can it be shed or removed; but the presence of a flaw

exists only in the modification (paryāy), and the shedding of that flaw also exists only in the modification. Where are we right now? In the constant, unchanging (dhruv). Was there any flaw there? No. Is there anything to renounce there? No. Is anything to be discarded there? No. Is anything destined to happen there? No. Through endless time, whether with a beginning (sādi anant) or without beginning or end (anādi anant), is there anything to occur there? No. Therefore, indulging in statements like "You have 15 lives left," "You have 17 lives left," or "You have three lives left," makes no sense. Do not utter such defamatory remarks.

There was a day when you yourself desperately wanted to know: "How many lifetimes do I have left?" But today, the entire perspective has changed: by stating or inquiring about such things, I will not cast a blemish upon my soul. I transcend both worldly existence (bhav) and liberation (mokṣh). And I have no desire to ask how many lives remain before my liberation, because I am inherently liberated by nature; I am the embodiment of mokṣh. Look into Ātmasiddhi as well: "You are the embodiment of liberation" (Tu chho mokṣh swarup). It is such a wonderfully subtle scripture: once you are drawn into Ātmasiddhi, you will never come out of it! For oscillating between the absolute standpoint (nishchay naya) and the conventional standpoint (vyavahār naya), it ultimately establishes: this alone is the truth. And how we will ever repay our debt to that sacred land, we do not know. That sacred place, Nadiad, where Ātmasiddhi was composed, holds infinite benevolence over us.

Is it true or false to say, "I am the doer of worldly existence (sansār)"? Well, if you alter the perspective (apekṣhā), it is certainly true. The fact that you remained silent proves you have not yet fully grasped the system of analytical standpoints (naya vibhāg). Even if it is a blemish from the perspective of the dhruv, it is not entirely false in every sense; the conventional perspective affirms that in this realm, you are indeed the author of sansār. Then we can point out to the conventional standpoint: Look, how many untruths you speak in daily life!

When your train pulls into Dhanbad station, you announce, "Dhanbad has arrived." Did you speak the truth or an untruth? Dhanbad station remained right where it was; it does not travel. You arrived at Dhanbad. So, what is the objective truth? "I arrived at Dhanbad." Yet what do you say? "Dhanbad has arrived." Even so, doesn't it pass completely unchallenged in conventional parlance (vyavahār)? Does anyone object: "Hey, you can't say that!" Conventional usage operates precisely like this. No one ever objects when people say, "The sun rises and the sun sets." In reality, the sun neither rises nor

sets. Convention, by its very definition, is an untruth from the ultimate standpoint. It is designated as conventional precisely because it is ultimately untrue.

In the same way, the enlightened being explains: "We too must employ conventional expression, because all language belongs to convention." Yet, it is untruth; it is not meant to be grasped as ultimate reality. But because we are social animals, conventional conduct must be engaged in. Pujya Gurudevshri observes: "See, we are not only intellectual animals; we are emotional animals too." If we were purely logical or rational beings, we would simply debate these principles, and that would be the end of it. We are emotional beings as well, and one fundamental human emotion is the desire to be respected.

Everyone harbours that longing to be respected. If your child, your neighbour, or anyone fails to show respect, if you do not feel respected, an inner turmoil erupts in your emotional state immediately. To a daughter-in-law, His counsel is: "Keep this in mind: never compromise respect for the sake of asserting the truth. If you need to remain silent regarding the truth, stay quiet; if you can communicate it gracefully, that is best; but under no circumstance should the mother-in-law's respect be undermined, and certainly never in public." Because everyone is an emotional being. Had human nature been purely rational, one could speak with stark logic: "You ought not to act this way; you did this, and therefore you are wrong."

But we are not solely rational beings; we are emotional beings. Sometimes, even when we are in the wrong, we still want to be treated with respect. We want people to speak kindly with us. Only a strictly rational person respects sheer right and wrong; an emotional person desires the other to be gentle and loving toward them. Everywhere in life, when we are right, we want to proclaim it immediately; and when we are wrong, we expect the other person to forgive us. You protest: "Don't stretch this issue so much! I admitted my mistake once, just forgive me." And you demand your respect. If you don't receive it, you initiate another activity or bring up another topic, because having been caught red-handed, you feel your respect is threatened. But the Guru operates entirely differently. The Guru knows precisely where a crack must be driven into this ego, and He will act accordingly. We are not social reformers.

We are not here to clean up the world. Who comprises your world? Your husband, your son, your domestic helpers - these people make up your immediate world. Yet, even at this age, you still want to change your husband! Anyone in this world who seeks to change even a single person other than themselves is acting as a social reformer. Whoever seeks genuine spiritual

transformation, come here. Your sole thought should be: "I have come only to change myself, my attitude, my way of processing, my way of not judging, and my way of not reacting, but responding. And I just want to die happily. When I die, I want to be at peace with myself: 'Yes, I moved a little further ahead than when I was born; even if I could not attain perfection, at least I depart somewhat transformed.'" So, blanking out everything external for now, you must focus entirely on yourself.

Bondage and liberation - just as we say conventionally "Dhanbad has arrived" or "Delhi has arrived" - pass in practical parlance. Similarly, if you say, "I am the doer of karma, the doer of attachment," it passes conventionally. But if you encounter an ordinary person, and proclaim, "I do not do anything whatsoever, nor do I experience anything," the poor soul will faint in sheer bewilderment! It took you two years to internalise this perspective, and you expect to transmit it to him in two minutes! He will cry: "What kind of nonsense is this? The soul is neither a doer nor a receiver?!" And he will say, "I have never heard of anything like this supreme pure absolute standpoint (param shuddh nishchay naya)!" For not everyone is destined to receive this truth. It is the profound grace of Bhagwan Kundakundacharyaji that He penetrates so deeply within to illuminate the soul. In other traditions and texts, they barely touch the external, or at most reach the modification (paryāy). When a discourse merely touches upon the modification, people exclaim: "What a revolutionary discourse! Look at what this saint spoke on introspection!" If merely touching the modification makes a speaker appear so extraordinary, then imagine the gratitude owed to Kundakundacharyaji and Banarasidasji! Param Krupalu Dev Himself said how immensely beneficial Kundakundacharyaji's Samayasaar proved for Him in contemplating the true nature of the self (swarūpānusandhān).

Upon receiving such a scripture, Param Krupalu Dev handed over silver coins to the person who brought the scripture, and said, "No, I will not let you leave empty-handed. Because you have filled my soul, I will surely fill your hands." And He immediately presented silver coins. This is an actual incident that took place in Limbdi.

From different analytical standpoints, someone might say: "He is the receiver (bhoktā) of this laddu." We are replacing the doer with the receiver for a moment - the receiver of a laddu. When you zoom in, you realise: how could one substance ever do anything to another substance? He is strictly the receiver of his internal attachment toward the laddu; otherwise, one substance would be acting upon another. Then a third person will observe: "No, when I zoomed in further, he merely knows the laddu and its taste." A fourth person explains,

“Because he merely knows, he is not actively doing anything.” The sun shines; is the sun labouring to shine right now? What does "the sun shines" mean? Its very nature is such that radiance, light, and brilliance radiate continuously; it does not wake up in the morning deciding to shine. As Pujya Gurudevshri delivered in the satsang on the 25th or 26th, He remarked: "The river simply flows; the river does not decide in the morning, 'Today I wish to perform charity, and whoever comes to me, I want to nourish them with water.'" There is no such intent. It simply flows, and in its flowing, it gives. You too should make compassion your natural state.

The soul is a mass of knowledge, a solid embodiment of knowledge, sheer knowing, and all-pervading in scope, not in the physical sense of permeating the universe, but in the sense that the entire universe and non-universe (lokālok) are reflected in its own omniscience (kevaljnān).

Conscious attribute, conscious embodiment, conscious mass! Pujya Gurudevshri playfully said that He put it to Banarasidasji: "You people keep repeating 'consciousness, consciousness' (chaitanya), but that doesn't excite us much; we would be far more drawn if you used the word 'bliss' (ānanda). The soul is the abode of bliss, the sanctuary of bliss. Hearing the word 'knowledge' that I am a conscious soul, one wonders, 'So what?' But when you speak of bliss, we feel: 'Come, if this is attained, we will no longer wander into worthless pursuits.'" When we had gone to Agra, while everyone else was engaged in bhakti, Pujya Gurudevshri was in conversation with Banarasidasji, and asked him: “You constantly proclaim that consciousness and knowledge are the defining characteristics (lakṣhaṇ) of the soul. That is unquestionably true, and I harbour no doubt about it. But I wish to understand why don't you say bliss instead? We Bombay people love the word ānand - bliss much more; the word bliss is deeply appealing.”

Banarasidasji replied: 'Look, only that attribute whose pure fraction is currently manifested can serve as a defining characteristic. Bliss is indeed an inherent attribute, but at present, it is completely distorted and obscured by worldly passions. Thus, despite bliss being an intrinsic quality, it is defiled in the mundane state; not even a pure fraction is manifested. Knowledge, on the other hand, remains inherently pure. Ignorance signifies lesser knowledge, not inherently defective knowledge. We label it wrong knowledge only due to the association with delusion (moh); but if we separate delusion, the capacity to know remains pure. Whether it is limited knowledge or omniscience (kevaljnān), knowing itself is inherently pure. Therefore, only that which has a

manifested pure fraction can be designated as the defining characteristic." Pujya Gurudevshri stepped outside, completely satisfied, offering His salutations.

When a doubt exists, ask; but once the resolution arrives, bow your head and absorb it. Speak as little as possible, because the more you speak, the more the transmission of spiritual vibrations from the enlightened one gets disrupted. In the process of non-doing, vibrations flow at their peak. The more you speak, the more disturbances enter the subtle field. Hence, silence (maun) is the best; but when unbroken silence is not possible for us and the mind begins to race, then speak. Yet, remember that you are reducing the receptivity to those vibrations. If you keep the enlightened Master at peace and remain at peace yourself, the highest reciprocal spiritual exchange occurs. It is simply higher energy gravitating; it is a pure science. The very principles governing atomic energy apply here, only this is energy of a far higher dimension.

What I can transmit through inner states of being (bhāv), could I ever provide through mere physical objects? We call this science; we call it the science of the dispassionate one (vitarāg vijnān). Both are forms of science, but while one science investigates only insentient matter (pudgal), this spiritual science expounds both consciousness (chaitanya) and matter. And the meaning derived is that science is that through which extraordinary bliss is attained.

Thus, moving from lesser joy to greater joy is true religiousness, true spirituality. It is an inner journey. Watching television offers a certain measure of pleasure, but contemplating the soul presents a categorical difference, leave alone comparisons; it is supreme bliss! We are on a pilgrimage from fleeting pleasure to supreme bliss. We are learning the science of the dispassionate one, and so Pujya Gurudevshri takes it into the language of bliss; yet, technically, one must utilise the term knowledge (jnān), because its fraction alone is manifestly present. Why have all enlightened Masters converged on knowledge, knowledge, and knowledge out of all the infinite attributes of consciousness? Because its pure fraction is manifestly available right now.

All other attributes currently manifest in distorted modifications; therefore, whatever word is used, you will take it in the opposite sense. If Pujya Gurudevshri says "love," you might hear "lust." If He says "bliss," you hear ordinary sensual "joy" or happiness according to your mundane definitions.

Thus, a magnificent truth was articulated here, culminating in the declaration: That pure swan - the swan being a metaphor for the pure soul, whose lineage is immaculate and who is brimming with the nectar of consciousness - that swan is supremely sacred (param pavitra).

Supremely sacred: It is "supremely" because it was never rendered unholy at any point in time! Pujya Gurudevshri is speaking strictly of the focal point onto which we are currently zooming. Otherwise, the conventional perspective holds that it was impure and will become pure, as with gold, impure in the mine and later refined: the soul was impure and becomes pure through spiritual practice; that is the analogy provided in conventional discourse. But this scripture proclaims: You were eternally pure, you are pure right now, and you do not have to become pure; you are destined to remain ever pure.

These are distinct contextual styles of exposition. Listen to the science of dispassion only if you possess the spiritual stamina. Listen to the science of dispassion only if you have the inner courage. But once this truth is truly comprehended, whenever you proclaim "Jainam Jayati Śāsanam" (May the Jain order prevail), a profound yearning will surge from your heart: "O Lord, may I attain Your path life after life! Perhaps in this life my spiritual vigour (vīrya) is weak, which is why I could not accomplish it; but if I receive Your teachings again and again, one day the highest spiritual effort will surely awaken within this soul."

Today, our spiritual energy appears utterly feeble; later it becomes moderate, and eventually supreme spiritual vigour will burst forth. Souls of the Tirthankars' stature possess supreme vigour. They never adopt vows with loopholes or compromises, nor do they undertake vows for limited durations; every vow they take is lifelong. For their vigour surges so! Whereas one who hesitates, thinking, "What if this happens, what if that happens?" shows feeble vigour. Whatever the case may be, there is a profound science behind it: feeble vigour stems from the operation of energy-obstructing karma (viryaantarāya karma). That relates to the manifest or unmanifest state based on the subsidence and destruction (kṣhayopasham) of energy-obstructing karma.

Why is a soul in this particular state? Because a soul attained liberation, and on account of that you emerged from nigod (where infinite souls share one body); you came out with that soul's original vigour! Param Krupalu Dev elaborated an entire section on feeble vigour, moderate vigour, and intense vigour; when that comes up in your reading, we will elaborate on it further.

With this, the exposition of the second verse is concluded.

Chhand 3:

Jo nihachai nirmal sadā, ādi madhya aru ant,

So chidroop Banārasi, jagat māhi jayvant.

Meaning of Chhand 3: That which according to the absolute point of view (nishchay naya) is eternally pure in the beginning, middle, and end, Atmarasi Pandit Banarasidasji says: "May that soul, an embodiment of pure consciousness (chaitanya pind), remain forever victorious in the world."

Looking from the absolute standpoint (nishchay naya), the soul does not have to become pure; it is eternally immaculate in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end.

Banarasidasji is one who is relishing the Self (ātmarasi); his joy is centred exclusively in the soul, and he will speak solely of the soul. And what kind of soul will he speak of? The one that is ever immaculate in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end.

The soul is already inherently pure! We used to think that the soul is impure and that by listening to this repeatedly, we will eventually become pure. But why do you still engage with it? Because you simply love it so deeply!

May the soul, this solid embodiment of pure consciousness, forever triumph in the universe - meaning, may all living beings realise its profound glory, and may it abide unceasingly within my heart. Aum.