Nātak Samaysaar

Shibir 31

Pravachan - 5 Summary

14-11-2026- Morning

Episodes 415-416

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.

All living beings desire happiness. No one desires any kind of misery. They strive to avoid misery, yet they do not avoid it, and they do not attain happiness, because they have not understood the cause of misery.

In Patrank – 816, the teaching began with the annihilation of all sorrow (sarva-dukh-kshay). Therefore, that whole pravachan went into questions about sorrow, its cause, its doer, etc. The cause of sorrow is delusion (moh). Due to delusion, the living being's beliefs, attitude, thoughts, feelings, behaviour, and the activities (yog) of mind, speech, and body become perverse, giving rise to passions (kashay), through which the living being binds karma and becomes miserable. The remedy for this is knowledge (jnan). The cause of misery is delusion, and the remedy for delusion is knowledge.

There are two difficulties:

1. Ignorance (ajnan) – There is ignorance, meaning there is no understanding of right and wrong at all.
2. Carelessness / Heedlessness (asavadhan) – Despite having understanding, during the rise of past impressions (purva sanskar), that knowledge cannot remain present and apply the brakes. You get carried away in your impulses and instincts, clearly knowing that you are going on the wrong track or you are slipping, but impulses and sanskars being so strong that you cannot but sway.

What is the remedy for this? The remedy for ignorance is knowledge. For ignorance, listen to the words (vani) of the Enlightened One (Jnani). To remain firm in good impressions (sanskar) and not get trapped in bad impressions (kusanskar), the remedy is pure devotion (shuddha bhakti) to the Enlightened One.

1. Listening to the words of the Enlightened One, and
2. Pure devotion to the Enlightened One—this alone is the remedy for the destruction of delusion, due to which all misery is destroyed and the supreme state (param pad) is attained.

This morning, Pujya Gurudevshri looked through a text written on Param Krupalu Dev's words "Jnan jnanima kalo" (Recognise knowledge in the enlightened one).

Pujya Gurudevshri noticed in it: recognise knowledge in the enlightened one alone; with the enlightened one, recognise knowledge alone; and is it knowledge "in" the enlightened one or "through" the enlightened one? Param Krupalu Dev has written "in" (jnanima), not "through" (jnanithi); otherwise, as a statement of the instrumental cause (nimitt), it would have been said, "Recognise knowledge through the enlightened one."

In it is written: "For what has been said above, inner yearning for liberation (antarang mumukshuta) is intended." When it is said, "Listen to the enlightened one," we are ready to sit every day; however, it will not happen through just that; inner yearning for liberation is intended. Desire for knowledge (jnanni jignasa) will be needed.

Some believe that today is the festival of Jnan Pancham, so Pujya Gurudevshri will talk about knowledge. But don't think that way; just be blank, empty, and pick up to fill that blank, which is retarding your speed. It is because of that blank that you do not experience any metamorphosis or transformation. Get inspired to experiment and experience.

Meditation (dhyan) went to China and became Chan. Among those people, it was a new knowledge; they were worshipping Buddha, because before that, Buddhism had already reached there. Emperor Ashok sent his children, Sanghamitra and Mahendra, to propagate Buddhism. Since then, Buddhism had reached far, but it was just as worship; it didn't translate into meditation (dhyan), which happened about 1000 years after Buddha, around the 5th century AD, when Bodhidharma went there, so dhyan became Chan, and going further, towards Korea and then Japan, it finally became Zen.

While giving an autograph, Pujya Gurudevshri wrote, "Trust Him, trust His timings, and trust His ways." Trusting Him is very easy, but when it comes to His timings and trusting His ways, it does not work. The problem is in your trust. Trust Him, trust His timing, and trust His ways, and trust that His ways are His ways.

There was a wonderful flowing river with fresh water, and a person was selling water beside the river. Everyone kept coming and buying bottles; it didn't even strike anyone that the river is right behind, and water is available for free! One person asked, "How can you sell water by the river?" If you want to sell Gangajal (Ganges water), don't sell it on the banks of the Ganges; if you want to sell it, sell it in Mumbai. But if you sell Gangajal right on the banks of the Ganges, then that person can just take a pot and fetch it! So that man says, "The problem is that the one who is not thirsty does not even see the river. Therefore, he paid a price, nourished his ego, and tried to attain something."

Queen Elizabeth II had an announcement made that the Queen is coming to the church to pray on this day. It was some important day. Seeing the crowd, the Queen was surprised that in my country, so many people have so much religious feeling that there is such a crowd! She was completely stunned and told the priest, "I am really, really very happy that so many people love religion, want to come to the church, etc." And that priest simply said, "All these people have not come to see God; they have come to see you. Sometimes, come suddenly without announcing, then you will even get a seat in the second row." Somewhere, you no longer have the desire for knowledge. Just as in the time of the Lord (Tirthankar), a

Samavasaran (holy assembly hall) was formed, some felt like going there merely out of curiosity. So, inner yearning for liberation is intended.

One man told Pujya Gurudevshri, "Ever since I attended Your satsang, there is nothing but peace in life. And not just me, my wife, children, neighbours - everyone is happy!" So, Pujya Gurudevshri felt that he must be taking the messages seriously, so He asked him, "How come?" Then that man said, "Ever since I attended satsang, my factory, which was closed, started running; receivables that were not maturing started maturing; there was some land-related case, that case got solved; the flow of money started coming in!" If the flow of money is good, there is bound to be peace. Pujya Gurudevshri does not believe in miracles (chamatkar); He believes in realisation (sakshatkar). He understands all this as the play of meritorious karma and unmeritorious karma (punya-paap). The man connected that with satsang. If he had connected that thing with knowledge (jnan), this mistake would not have happened. Then he would have said, "The power of glad acceptance increased in me; therefore, there is peace in my life. In the game of meritorious karma and unmeritorious karma, I maintain my devotional state, and that is the cause of happiness." Devotion that is tied to meritorious and unmeritorious karma, whether as the cry "I am miserable" or with a nidan (desire for a worldly fruit), has been called artadhyan (sorrowful contemplation) by the enlightened ones.

According to the Tattvartha Sutra, the practice/worship of knowledge (jnanni aradhana) should happen in five ways; only then does strength come into that practice of knowledge. If I push something with one finger, it might not fall; but if I gather all five together and strike hard with a fist, it might fall or get hurt. Why? Because all five are together.

1. **Vachana (Reading or Listening):** Vachana, which means reading or listening.
2. **Pruchchhana (Questioning):** Pruchchhana means asking; if there is any doubt, asking about it.
3. **Paravartana (Revision or Repetition):** The third is paravartana, which means to repeat; revise in a group and on your own.
4. **Dharmakatha (Religious Discourse or Sharing):** Discuss among yourselves. Do not preach. Dharmakatha means to share.
5. **Bhavana (Contemplation):** You begin to like that subject a little more. That which you have revised (paravartana) or discussed (dharmakatha), you begin to like that subject a little more, so it becomes your bhavana (deep feeling), it becomes your desire.

You have to do self-study (swadhyay) in five ways. Somewhere Pujya Gurudevshri had read that unless you revise what you read or hear in your mind nine times, it does not become a sanskar (deep impression). For entertainment, you can listen to a satsang just once. By listening to a satsang once, you will get some entertainment, you will get some information. But to change it into a sanskar, you will have to revise it nine times. The main thing is, you should be deriving joy in it, not boredom and not fear. When paravartana is kept, there is fear; you can use this fear constructively, but the outcome should be joy. And then you grow, then you evolve.

Now, we will begin the verses (chhand) of Natak Samaysaar. It is a very simple subject; three verses will be taken together at a time. There are just couplets (dohas) 18, 19, and 20. In these three couplets, the disciple raises a doubt. Today is the day of the worship/practice of knowledge (jnan aradhana), so Pujya Gurudevshri had a wish to bring in the Guru-disciple dialogue. Otherwise, He could have kept an independent topic, but He said, "Bring in the Guru-disciple; then it is understood how to do the worship of knowledge." So, in these three couplets, the disciple raises a doubt; only the doubt is to be explained in them. After that, there are five couplets.

Chhand 18, 19, and 20: A disciple's question on this subject:

Shishya kahai Prabhu tum kahyau, dubidhi karamkau roop,

Darav karma pudgal mai, bhāvkarma chidroop. 18

Kartā darvit karamkau, jeev na hoi trikāl,

Ab yah bhāvit karam Tum, kahau kaunki chāl. 19

Kartā yātau kaun hai, kaun karai fal bhog,

Kai pudgal kai ātmā, kai duhukau sanjog? 20

Meaning of Chhand 18,19, and 20: Now the inquisitive disciple is asking questions to his Guru.

So far, I understood that You have taught me that the karma are of two types. 1: Material karma –dravya karma and 2: The altered inclination of the soul, the psychic karma – Bhaav karma. 18.

Furthermore, You educated me that the soul substance can never be the doer of the material karma – dravya karma. Then please enlighten me with the fact that whose modification is the psychic karma – bhaav karma? 19.

Who is the doer of this psychic karma – bhaav karma and who endures its fruition? Is the soul or the matter separately the doer and enjoyer of the bhaav karma? Or the soul and the matter association is the reason for being doer or enjoyer – karta-bhokta? 20.

Here, the disciple addresses the Guru as "Prabhu" (Lord). We are reminded of Shri Atmasiddhi Shastra: "Shu Prabhucharan kane dharu?" (O Lord! What can I offer at Your lotus feet?). He utters, "Prabhu!" How should your Guru appear to you? So, the disciple says, 'O Prabhu!' and then presents his doubt. How many virtues are seen in this: By uttering the word 'Prabhu,' his reverent devotion (vinay bhakti) is seen; and his awe and reverence (ahobhav) towards the Guru is seen. An unexpressed, yet distinct faith is seen: 'My Guru will certainly give the solution to this!'

The disciple says, "I feel that I am in a loop, but my Guru will have the solution for sure." Otherwise, he could have just jumped to a negative conclusion and gone ahead, but he felt like asking because he had that faith that his Guru will surely answer. Here, three qualities of the disciple are displayed: reverence (vinay), awe (ahobhav), and faith (shraddha) that I will get the solution. Here, the disciple's ignorance regarding the knowledge of standpoints (naya

jnan) is revealed. He does not have clarity on ashuddh nishchay naya (impure absolute viewpoint), vyavahar naya (conventional viewpoint), and param shuddh nishchay naya (supremely pure absolute viewpoint), which is why this doubt arises.

In the 18th verse (chhand), the disciple says, "Prabhu, You explained that karmas are of two types: One is dravya karma, one is bhav karma." There is no talk of nokarma (physical body and surroundings) right now. So, dravya karma and bhav karma, and You also explained that dravya karma is composed of matter (pudgal) and bhav karma is composed of consciousness (chaitanyamay). This couplet (doha) ends here. Dravya karma is made of matter, in the form of a cluster of matter; the particles of karman vargana (karmic matter) are in dravya karma. Bhav karma, being an impure modification (vibhav parinati) of consciousness, is composed of consciousness.

The disciple says, "Karta darvit karamkau" - darvit means dravya (material). The soul cannot be the doer of this dravya karma in the past, present, and future. From Your preaching, I also understood that one substance (dravya) cannot cause the modification of another substance, so the soul can never, at any time, be the doer of dravya karma; thus, this is not the disciple's doubt at all. His doubt he will express now. The soul cannot be the doer of dravya karma at all, because that is a modification (paryay) of matter and you are an element of consciousness, so you cannot do anything in dravya karma. This is precisely what has been taught to us! When scriptural knowledge (siddhant jnan) is given, such as "by disrespecting an enlightened one, jnanavaraniya karma (knowledge-obscuring karma) is bound," that is correct from the doctrinal viewpoint; however, it speaks from a slight distance. If we go closer and look at it, only the phenomenon of nimitt-naimittik - law of correlation and coexistence is seen; doer and deed (karta - karma) are not seen. Thus, when spirituality zooms in and sees, the independence of substance (dravya swatantrata) is right there. From a distance, it feels as though, because of mohaniya karma (deluding karma), my mind went haywire: that is the enjoyer speaking. Or else, "Because I did this, I bound vedaniya karma (feeling-producing karma)." So, it is said that this is right from the doctrinal viewpoint.

Right now, we are doing spirituality, where there is independence of substance; one substance can only make its own modification. That is, "Karta darvit karam ko jiva na hoy trikal" (The soul is never the doer of material karma in the three times). The disciple understood this too because one substance cannot become the doer of another substance's modification. In short, the soul is not the doer of an external substance (par-dravya). The moment you segregate that this is an external substance, then other objects, other living beings, nokarma (meaning the body), and dravya karma such as jnanavaraniya, etc. - I cannot be the doer of any of these four. I cannot be the doer of any other person's modification; I cannot be the doer of a watch's modification; I am not the doer of this body, because the body is matter and one substance cannot do anything for another substance.

"I am dieting, and I became thin." Leave all this! If you wish, do dieting, but "if you diet like this, then this will happen," there is nothing like that at all; even if we take utmost care, the scale still shows the exact same thing! And I am not the doer of dravya karma like knowledge obscuring karma either, because that too is an alien substance and only it can be the doer of its own mode, not me. So, the first line of the second couplet is also complete.

The disciple says, "Now my doubt is this: bhav karma, tum kaho kaun ki chaal? (tell me, whose doing is it?). Who is the doer of dravya karma is not a question for me at all, because

now it's very clear; You answered it this way. But who is the doer of this bhav karma? Who is the doer, and how does it happen?" Then the disciple himself gives options, saying, "I have thought about this matter." This disciple is exactly like the disciple in Shri Atmasiddhi Shastra! It used to take us four days just to understand his doubts! We feel that he is so thoughtful that he raises his doubts under the influence of some philosophy; sometimes it doesn't fit in logic, sometimes because of contrary examples seen in the world, so because of all these, he raises a doubt. Then, philosophically, logically, and empirically - in all three ways - the Guru resolves it, saying: "You felt this under the influence of Buddhist philosophy, but from what perspective is that?"; then logically He tells him, "You say the soul is always unattached, yet if it does things, then why so?"; and then empirically also He gives the solution that the gradation of anger, etc., comes from past-life impressions (purvajanma sanskar), which proves that the soul is eternal. The Guru explains to the disciple in all three ways.

So, the same thing is happening here. So, "karta ya to kaun hai," meaning who is the doer of bhav karma? For that, the disciple gives three options: Either it is matter (pudgal) - this cannot be correct because it becomes another substance. Now, he points out who is the doer of bhav karma, i.e., distortion (vikar). So, he says, the doer of distortion is either the soul itself, or matter, or these two do it together. So, one might ask, "But we already said earlier that it is a distorted modification (vaibhavik-vikari parinati) of consciousness, so where does this question arise?" So, he says, "No, before that, You had said that the soul is a non-doer and non-receiver (akarta-abhokta)! I understood it that way."

The entire division of viewpoints (naya vibhag) is not clear to the disciple - that is, the soul is a non-doer and non-receiver, and matter cannot possibly make the modification of another substance, so now only one option remains: These two - call them Prakruti (matter) and Purush (soul), or call them jiv (soul) and pudgal (matter) - both together are causing this distortion! "Karta ya to kaun hai." Who is the doer of this? "Kaun kare fal bhog?" (Who enjoys the fruit?) And now he says, "Who is the doer? Out of the three, I know this much clearly: It is either the soul, or matter, or both do it together." And we also speak in this exact way: "Due to the fruition (uday) of knowledge-obscuring karma, knowledge does not register with me." That means, as if matter does a little bit, and consciousness does a little bit! Our very language of speaking is like that!

"Due to the fruition of my bad-feeling-producing karma, my back hurts," or "Bad-feeling-producing karma (asata vedaniya karma) has subsided right now, so it doesn't hurt me right now." We speak the conventional language (vyavaharni bhasha) in that way. And up until now, we used to speak like this; had this scripture not come, it would have continued just like this. Even now, it will continue like this, but the understanding will be right!

In America, a vidhikar came and said, "Oh, because of the fruition of obstacle-creating karma (antaray karma), we don't get things like this." So, Pujya Gurudevshri said, "No, antaray karma cannot do anything to us." Not getting gain is called labhantaray (gain-obstructing karma). So, over there, one must speak just like that - Yes, it is the fruition of labhantaray karma bound in some past birth, and from within, you should ask yourself, "what is it?" If there is a fruition of karma, it is a modification of antaray karma; what is that to me? I will speak just like this; I have no objection at all to speaking like this, but now my faith (shraddha) will not be spoiled.

Then further, the same thing: "karta ya to kaun hai, kaun kare fal bhog." Who is the doer, and then who is the receiver? Because you straightaway say, "I bound karmas, but I suffer /enjoy because of their fruition." If you say, "I suffer/enjoy because of the fruition of karma," then your doer-receiver concept is very mixed up! You have not spoken in front of a true knower of truth (tattvajnani) yet, so you have passed! You do it, and you enjoy/suffer because of the fruition of karma - meaning you enjoy/suffer because of a modification of matter!

Either it is the soul, or it is matter, or soul and matter together make these distorted/impure modifications. Why so? Because in worldly experience (vyavahar), it appears so: mix lime (chuno) and turmeric (haldar). What colour is lime? White. Turmeric is yellow, but when they get mixed, it turns into red! That means, through the mixture of both consciousness and matter, the red colour in the form of attachment, etc. (ragadi), is produced! Having seen this, such a question arose. Here we are also reminded of Ganadharavaad - that even this doubt, why does it arise? Is he crazy? How can both soul and matter do it? So, he says, "I have seen such a thing that if you put turmeric into lime, a completely red colour comes out, yet the red colour is neither in the lime nor in the turmeric." Even if you look at paan (betel leaf), you will realise that they apply lime and catechu (katho) and the mouth or the lips become red in colour. That means it can happen when the two combine! And after that, he says, "Who is the doer of this and who is the receiver?"

The Jain scriptures (Jinagam) explain through different styles; we call that style naya (viewpoint), and we have to understand from different standpoints. Here the problem is: Who is the doer of attachment and aversion (raag-dwesh)? Immediately, the disciple remembers the supremely pure absolute viewpoint (param shuddha nishchay naya): The soul is indeed unchanging (aparinami), there is no modification at all! He remembers the supremely pure absolute viewpoint. But he forgets that this is from the perspective (apeksha) of the supremely pure absolute viewpoint; it is not universal (sarvatra). This is a naya (partial viewpoint), not pramaan (complete valid knowledge)! Praman includes every aspect; naya includes only one aspect. A woman, from the perspective of her husband, is a wife; she is also a mother, also a grandmother - having all that knowledge is praman. And if you use a naya, you must also state the perspective: This is a mother, but she is not her husband's mother; she is the husband's wife. So, you have to state that if she is a mother, from which perspective is she the mother? If you use a naya and do not give the perspective, everything will become a mess.

You can utter a praman statement that the soul is both a doer and a non-doer, yet you will still have to explain it a little. Thus, from the supremely pure absolute viewpoint, the soul is indeed a non-doer and non-receiver, because doing and enjoying are both modifications (parinam), whereas the soul itself is an unchanging eternal substance (aparinami dhruv tattva). Therefore, from the supremely pure absolute viewpoint, there is neither pure modification nor impure modification in it.

If you look from the pure absolute viewpoint (shuddha nishchay naya), then it will say that the soul is the doer of its state of knowledge (jnan bhav); every single time it is only knowing. It is caught in his knowledge that there is attachment; it is caught in his knowledge that one has become dispassionate (vitarag), yet it is all knowledge, so the soul is the doer of the state of knowledge.

If we look from the impure absolute viewpoint (ashuddha nishchay naya), then what happens along with this knowing? Attachment and aversion, then guilt, then forgiveness, then compassion and, going on like this, dispassion further ahead! So, the soul is the doer of auspicious and inauspicious states (shubhashubh bhav), the doer of bhav karma, the doer of attachment and aversion.

This is your true nature (swabhav), this is your modification (parinaman). When it comes to your true nature, give a clear answer that the soul is not even the doer of modification; it is universally a non-doer and non-receiver. But do not refuse to accept modification. All that will be explained very nicely in Mokshamala. If you say, "I am simply unchanging," even then you will fall into a pit! Because then explain: Is this strange behaviour of yours your true nature? You say, "No, that is not my nature; at that time, I got a little angry, so it happened like this." Then who was the doer of this anger? You say, "I," but you are the eternal Brahma, aren't you? You are constant (kutastha), aren't you? So, if you do not accept all three—"upanneva, vighaneva, dhuveva" (origination, destruction, and permanence) - then 18 problems will arise, and those 18 problems are explained in Mokshamala.

Param Krupalu Dev once had a conversation with a learned scholar, and He has put that whole dialogue into Mokshamala. If you just read it casually, you will feel that this went completely over my head (total bumper)! Then think that a 16-year-old boy wrote it, so you will read it a second time, thinking, "We are not 32; now we have become 64. We are four times older than when Param Krupalu Dev wrote Mokshmala, so don't we have the intellect; what is it that we still don't understand?" Read it again and again. But this key has been given to you: The substance (dravya), origination of a modification (paryayni utpatti), and destruction of a modification (paryayno nash). If you read all the lessons keeping these three in focus, then you will understand it. So the proponent of Brahma too is shown to be one-sided (ekant). Who is responsible for these impurities? Either say “Brahma,” or say " not Brahma "; then don't bring out all new things like jivatma (individual soul) and all! Then call jivatma itself the atma (soul). Brahma does nothing. Brahma does not do anything, but jivatma does, doesn't it? So, all this vagueness won't work; explain it very clearly whether the soul does something or does not do anything!

This lesson can leave even the staunchest believer in a Creator God (Ishwar) without an answer! So many questions have been put forth that, at first, they simply have to say, "Believe whatever you want to believe; we will believe in God!" But they will not be able to answer the questions! They can just say bluntly, "Believe whatever you want to believe; we will believe in God"; logically, there is no possibility at all of a Creator God of the universe! So many questions were asked; at first Pujya Gurudevshri tried to answer two or four of them, then He Himself left it and said, "It is wonderful; when we take the chapter on God (Ishwar), we will take this lesson." It means you should be crazy after Mokshamala! The topic of the enlightened one and the ignorant one is still to come: the enlightened one is not the doer of attachment and aversion; the ignorant one is the doer of attachment and aversion.

So, don't feel it is complicated. The true nature of the soul is just like this: the capacity (kshamata) is this; despite having this capacity, the enlightened one does like this; the ignorant one does like this. These four things should be clear; the solution is in five couplets.

Chhand 21 and 22: Shri Guru explains this matter

Kriya ek kartā jugal, yau na Jināgam māhi,

Athvā karni aurkee, aur karai yau nāhi. 21

Karai aur fal bhogvai, aur banai nahi em,

Jo kartā so bhogtā, yahai jathāvat jem. 22

Meaning of Chhand 21 and 22: In the teachings of the omniscient being it does not say that there is one act – karya and there are two doers – karta of the same act. Each substance does its own act. One substance cannot perform the act of the other substance. 21.

Furthermore, that one substance is the doer-karta and the other endures – bhokta, can never happen. Because the one who is the doer, endures the fruition of its act. 22.

There cannot be two doers for a single action. 1. A single action has only one doer. 2. That doer is solely one's own substance (swa - dravya). There is no doer - deed (karta - karma) relationship between two substances, so leave aside the talk of two doers altogether. Just as you say regarding a task, "We all did it together," that is fine for seva. However, it will not work in the metaphysics (dravyanuyog); it will work in the exposition of service (sevanuyoga)! At that time, one should not say that a single action has only one doer, "I performed this action!" Not like that! At that time, say, "We all did it together," or "It happened by the grace of the Guru." You know, sometimes you have to give the volunteer (sevak) credit. Sometimes, by saying, "Krupalu Dev did all this," you conventionally negate the contribution of the volunteer. Understand everything in its appropriate context, use that: sometimes credit is to be given to the Sadguru, sometimes giving it to the volunteer, and you can't say both. You cannot say, "Krupalu Dev did all this," and in the same breath ask for the volunteers to be credited for their hard work.

So, in certain places, do not use that. Say, "This is the tireless hard work of all these volunteers."

If you want to praise the volunteers, that too is good conventional conduct (sadvyavahar), so praise them, and say, "Only by the grace of Krupalu Dev did so much devotion and such passion awaken in us; otherwise, we did not even understand anything in this." But if you say, "He alone did it," then no other doer remains to be praised.

There cannot be two doers! If He has done it, then what is this team doing? This is not sevanuyog; dravyanuyog is going on here, so we will proceed.

"Kriya ek, karta jugal"—jugal means two; one action and it has two doers, the soul (atma) and matter (pudgal)—"yo na Jinagam mahi," you will not find any such statement in the Jain scriptures.

Two principles of the Jain scriptures (Jinagam) have been proved. 1. The soul (jiv) and matter (pudgal) together cannot produce bhav karma, because two substances - a pair - cannot perform a single action. 2. One substance cannot be the doer of the modification of an external substance (par dravya). Therefore, the soul alone does it. Now, how and all, we will learn it later on.

There can be two instrumental causes (nimittas) for any action. However, there cannot be two doers. God (Dev) and Guru are two instrumental causes, and you alone are the single doer. To digest this, mere meritorious karma (punya) will not suffice; yearning for liberation (mumukshuta) is needed. There can be a hundred instrumental causes, but the doer is only you for your impurities (vikar).

The 22nd verse (chhand) says, "Whoever does, experiences." Right now, you say yes to this statement, but in daily conduct (vyavahar), you blame others, saying, "How much of my time was wasted because of you?" The fault lies with the one who suffers. Whoever became the doer, that very one will become the receiver. From whichever viewpoint (naya) the soul becomes the doer, from that very viewpoint the soul becomes the receiver. If you do it and I receive it, it is not possible. If I myself am the doer of whatever I undergo, how can I ever feel that the mistake is someone else's and I am the one suffering? The blame game is over when this principle is accepted.

If your son is walking along the pavement and falls, then you blame the government: "The government does not build roads properly." If someone else's son falls, then you say, "Teach him to walk while watching where he is going." If your son fails in an exam, your thought will be just like this: "The paper was very tough. They did not teach at all. The teacher never liked my son." You don't want to accept that your son is not very intelligent or that he is not hard-working. Even if you accept it, you will still say, "Actually, he is very hard-working, but right then he got dengue." Because you just don't want to take the responsibility! You will find out several reasons. Now, don't do so; just say that, okay, next time he will work hard, and it's over. No one is so much interested in your son's intelligence either, but why are you justifying it? Work hard next time.

If you are driving, nobody in the world knows how to walk at all! They cross whenever they please; we say all these things in India while driving. When you are driving, it is the pedestrians' fault. When you are walking, you say, "Nobody knows how to drive a car at all!" It is always others' fault! You are not ready to take the responsibility. Here, we have stated the clear principle: "Whoever does it, receives it. Whoever receives has done it himself, so it is the fault of the one who receives."

What a Jain scripture this is! The fruit of psychic karma (bhav karma) is received immediately, whereas the fruit of material karma (dravya karma) is received in the future! You felt anger; that is bhav karma, and you immediately become its receiver: you become restless! However, the cake needs to be baked; it will bear fruit only after putting it in the oven for 40 minutes; you have bound the karma right now, but it will go into a latent state (satta), mature, and only then will its fruition (udaya) occur. The fruit of dravya karma is received in the future, while the fruit of bhava karma is received immediately; that is why religion (dharma) is important: you become unhappy right now, and that can be averted right now.

Chhand 23 and 24:

Bhāvkaram karatavyatā, swayamsiddh nahi hoi,

Jo jagki karni karai, jagvāsi jiy soi. 23

Jiy kartā jiya bhogtā, bhāvkaram jiychāl,

Pudgal karai na bhogvai, duvidhā mithyājāl. 24

Meaning of Chhand 23 and 24: One cannot be the originator of the internal act – bhaav karma – by self only. The transmigratory living being who performs worldly acts like moving, and wandering in the ocean of transmigration becomes the doer of its internal acts – bhaav karma. 23.

The living being in his ignorant state become the doer of the psychic karma – bhaav karma. Therefore, such a living being endures its fruition – bhokta chhe. Such type of psychic karma are the altered modification of the living being. The matter substance is not the doer of it. It does not endure – bhokta – its fruition. To believe that the soul as well as the matter substance are both the doer and endure the fruition is a wrong belief. 24.

Now, what all have you dropped? So, it is said that the soul and matter together do not perform bhava karma. An external substance (par-dravya) is not the doer of the soul's action. The soul is indeed a non-doer and non-receiver (akarta-abhokta), so who is the doer of bhav karma? Take the support of Atmasiddhi: "Hoy na chetan prernā, kon grahe to karma? Jad swabhāv nahi prernā, juo vichāri dharma." (If there is no inspiration of the soul, who will acquire karma? It is not the nature of the inanimate to inspire. Reflect upon the nature of both the substances). The verse (gatha) after that is: "Jo chetan kartu nathi, nathi thatā to karma, tethi sahaj swabhāv nahi, tem ja nahi jeevdharma." (If the soul does not do it, then karma is not accumulated. Therefore, neither is karma bound automatically, nor is it the nature of the soul to bind karma). That means, even if consciousness creates impurity (vikar), that is still not the inherent nature of consciousness; even if consciousness becomes the doer of knowledge-obscuring (jnanavaraniya) and other karmas, that is still not the inherent nature of consciousness. The 78th verse of Atmasiddhi is: "Chetan jo nijbhānmā, 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).

It does not happen in such a way that consciousness is a non-doer and non-receiver, and karmas just come rushing in on their own. Sankhya philosophy says, "Kare prakruti bandh" [It is prakruti (matter) that creates the bondage of karma]. In Sankhya philosophy, it has been shown that the soul (purush) is strictly a non-doer, non-receiver, pure, and eternal, yet prakruti causes bondage. You can call it prakruti or call it karma.

Then why do karmas not attach to the liberated Lords (Siddha Bhagwan)? Here it is written "swayamsiddh nahi hoi": bhav karma does not arise on its own. If it did, then karmas ought to attach to the Siddha Bhagwan too, because neither do we wish for bondage nor do Siddha Bhagwans wish for bondage; then why do karmas not attach to the Siddhas while karmas attach to me? Because there is impurity (vikar) within me and not within the Siddhas. Therefore, "Hoy na chetan prernā," and after that, "Jo chetan kartu nathi" - as long as the soul remains attentive in its own true nature (swabhav), until then no karma bondage occurs. However, by not remaining vigilant in its own true nature, it goes into states of passion (kashay bhav), and right there it subsequently becomes the doer of bhav karma.

And then the second last: "Ke jiya karta jiya bhogta" - the soul alone is the doer; the soul alone is the receiver. "Bhava karam jiya chaal" - this is the doing of the soul; it is the soul's own impure modification; it is the soul's own unnatural state (vibhav bhav). Don't say that the soul remains solely in its inherent nature and has nothing like an unnatural state, that it is always that eternal and constant (kutastha) entity. Rather, this is the state of the soul itself! With respect to which viewpoint (apeksha) was it called constant? Yet if you say it is always constant and never modifying, then it is as if the soul is pure, and matter or another soul creates the modification, while this soul gets punished!

If you look at the entire 'Doer' (Karta) tenet of Atmasiddhi and this section, you feel how easy Param Krupalu Dev has made it! He had just been in the inner state of describing the characteristics of a true seeker (atmarthi), and then suddenly to explain so much philosophically: an intellect cannot do that. O Lord, You did not write Atmasiddhi with the intellect at all! Pujya Gurudevshri's conviction of this grows day by day. Atmasiddhi is such a deep philosophy, and within it, speaking of philosophical, doctrinal, and all these things - even if it comes right before one's eyes, it still wouldn't come out like this! That this is it: these five doubts are in it - or four if you want to count four - and this is each individual solution to them. We are indeed very fortunate that we studied it beautifully, so we have started respecting it. If one day Atmasiddhi becomes mechanical, then you feel, "I have committed disrespect (ashatana)! Param Krupalu Dev took so much effort to write Atmasiddhi for me."

If you cannot manage, do Atmasiddhi once a month, but do not leave it by making it mechanical like this. Only 5–10 minutes of attention is needed, nothing more. So here, the talk is solely about "kare prakruti bandh" - Why do karmas not attach to the Siddhas too? He too is pure, and I too am pure! Karmas do not attach to Siddha Bhagwan, whereas karmas attach to me.

Therefore, "Jo chetan kartu nathi," will definitely come; the word "if" (jo) will definitely come. And this is the modification of the impure state (vibhav); matter does not do it, matter and soul together do not do it, rather the soul, remaining unaware, engages in attachment and aversion (raga-dwesh), and therefore, it happens. Here, this matter is not to be understood from the supremely pure absolute viewpoint (param shuddha nishchay naya), because the supremely pure absolute viewpoint does not accept modification at all; therefore, you have to change gears and understand this verse (chhand) as being spoken from the pure absolute viewpoint (shuddha nishchayanaya) or the impure absolute viewpoint (ashuddha nishchay naya). So, for now, temporarily set aside the supremely pure absolute viewpoint and understand this point; afterwards, the supremely pure absolute viewpoint is bound to come ahead.

Chhand 25:

Tātai bhāvit karamkau, karai mithyāti jeev,

Sukh dukh āpad sampadā, bhunjai sahaj sadeev

Therefore, it is proven that the doer of the psychic karma is the living being with wrong belief. He also endures the fruition of it in the form of pleasure/ pain, association/ dissociation states.

This is not the conclusion; it is another problem. You might think it says "therefore," so you can wrap it up in one line, yet it is not so! There is the greatest trouble (upadhi) in this. Right now, it will be mentioned, and further ahead its resolution will take place. So, it becomes clear that the soul with the false belief (mithyatvi jeev) is the doer of bhav karma. Right here lies the problem: Had it been "The soul is the doer of bhav karma," this matter would have finished in 20 seconds. It has said 'soul with the false belief' (mithyatvi)! That means, again, the soul with right faith (samyak drashti) is not the doer of bhav karma! Then does a samyak drashti soul not experience attachment and aversion (raga-dwesh)? Is that not bhav karma? Here, it is denied, saying, “No, He is not the doer of bhav karma! Only the deluded soul (mithyatvi jeev) is the doer of bhav karma!” That means, at the first stage of spiritual development (gunasthanak), the soul is the doer of bhav karma, whereas from the fourth gunasthanak onwards, he is not the doer!

Yet from the fourth gunasthanak onwards, attachment (raag) does exist; so what if anantanubandhi (infinite bonding passions) are annihilated? Apratyakhyani (passions which hinder partial vows), pratyakhyani (passions which hinder complete vows), sanjvalan (most subtle passions), and nokashay (quasi-passions) - all of these are present, yet the enlightened one is not the doer of bhava karma! Impure modifications (vibhav) are present, yet the enlightened one is not the doer of vibhav, not the doer of bhav karma. You know the answer, yet how much subtlety is there. Only a modification imbued with a sense of identification (ekatva) has been called doership (kartrutva); the one who maintains separateness (bhinnata) has not been called the doer at all!

That is why this is the very essence of Atmasiddhi: “Chhoote dehādhyās toh, nahi kartā tu karma, nahi bhoktā tu tehno, ae ja dharmano marma.” (On renouncing the false identification with the body, you no longer remain the doer of karma, nor the receiver of its fruits. This is the essence of religion. The enlightened one is the enjoyer of the self alone; He holds on solely to the nature of knowledge (jnan swaroop), even if there is a burning brazier (sagadi) outside. He holds onto His nature of knowledge; He does not pay attention to the burning brazier on His head.

It is so beautiful that only the soul with false belief (mithyatvi jeev) has been called the doer. It didn't even strike you that, again, only the ignorant one (ajnani) has been called the doer of karma! The enlightened one is not the doer. By its nature, too, the soul is not the doer.