

Swayambhustotra
Shibir 3
Pravachan - 3 Summary
21-5-23 Morning
Shri Suvidhinath Jin Stuti

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

Today we are doing Shri Suvidhinath Jin Stuti. Years ago, Pujya Gurudevshri went to Abu-Ranakpur, Delwada with some other seekers for a pilgrimage. They had to go from Bhiladiyaji - North Gujarat, to Abu. In Bhiladiyaji Derasar, they sung 'Mein kino nahi, tum bin aur shu raag.' A group of sadhvijs who were present there got so engrossed listening to it, they requested for it to be sung again. They were so transported by joy by the bhakti, that later outside the temple, they said they felt as if they were in a Dev Viman - celestial abode. Gurudev remembers their words every time this stavan is sung. If you cannot appreciate someone or something on your own, remember such incidents, and appreciation will arise. Yashovijayji Maharaj has written this stavan in Hindi. This is not included in his Chovisi. It is a miscellaneous composition and is found in the latter pages of the book Nityakram.

This was His second visit to Bhiladiyaji. First one was after He completed 99 pilgrimages of Palitanaji, thence He did 8 of Idar and then here as a ritual at the completion of the 99 yatras.

The life of Bhagwan Suvidhinath was such that you feel joyful and blissful from within. The one who has intense delusion or is indulging in sins after singing devotional compositions for hours may get one auspicious thought. The one who stays in auspicious thoughts gets connected easily and is transported into exceedingly pure feelings with one stavan.

Samantbhadracharyaji has sung the glory of Bhagwan Suvidhinath in an academic and metaphysical way. Bhagwan Chandraprabh's stuti was done with the heart, where Chandraprabh was compared with the sun and the moon, His colour was described etc. But in this stuti, Samantbhadracharyaji says, "I have examined Your philosophy intellectually. I have seen the way You propounded the path with balance and logic, and Your explanation regarding the arrangement of bondage and liberation, and I felt that this method was the right method. In other places, I did not feel that this arrangement was described so rightly. Hence, I am doing Your bhakti."

The enlightened ones have recommended, "O soul! If you want to attain your spiritual welfare, look at your instincts." Param Krupalu Dev says, "Lahyu swarup na vruttinu" - He who does not understand his tendencies but takes external renunciation and vows is a matarthi – bigot. If there is "Lahyu swarup vruttinu" - He who understands his tendencies and adopts renunciation and vows - then that person will be called an atmarthi – seeker. When you are doing something wrong at vrutti level - the level of inclinations, the thought level or emotional level, it is called paap or sins. When something is done at pravrutti level - activity level, it is called aparadh or crime. It may not be a crime against society, but it may be against the ajna of Tirthankar Bhagwan. This happens because the soul is inclined towards short-term

happiness and he is either not interested or does not have the energy to think about long-term happiness. Param Krupalu Dev has written, “Parinaamna vicharvalo tha” - Think about the consequences, and behave that way.

You have to look at the consequences and then think whether it is heya - non-acceptable or upadeya - acceptable. Do not take decisions based on your likes and dislikes. When you will look at the consequences, then only you will come on the shrey marg - the beneficial path from prey marg - the pleasurable path. When you look at short-term happiness, you realise the transient and worthless nature of that happiness, and you start repenting that you did not think about long-term happiness.

Children want short-term happiness like lollipops, etc. They do not think about the consequences. You are grown up, are you doing the same thing? Sugar is a white poison. Avoid it.

Three white poisons- 1. Sugar, 2. Salt and 3. Maida.

Three red poisons- 1. Meat, 2. Alcohol - red wine, and 3. Chillies.

Three black poisons- 1. Coke, 2. Tea, and 3. Coffee.

Sugar is very sweet but it is acidic, so it would harm you. You need to understand how fitness works. Keep discipline in life.

Param Krupalu Dev has said, “Think about the consequences and endure difficulties but do satsang.” Even if you cannot understand certain satsangs, make sure that you listen to all the satsangs again and again. You will definitely understand, these are the words of Bhagwan, how can you not understand? If you cannot understand because of kshayopasham – intellect is unable to grasp, even then listen.

The enlightened ones say, “Have clarity of which consequences you do not want to have.” This is about your inclinations – vrutti. Ravan did not mind dying but seven of his desires were unfulfilled. Look at the strangeness of destiny! When Ravan’s soul will become Tirthankar, his first ‘gandhar’ - chief disciple will be Sita, who was kidnapped by him in the birth of Ravan. The same soul of Sita will accept the refuge of Ravan’s soul in that birth. Do not label any soul a ‘sinner’.

Think about the consequences and think about which flaw is going to create maximum harm to you. Work on that on a priority basis. We usually want to complete useless activities. But you have to remove your flaws on a priority basis. Make sure that your life does not get wasted in doing useless activities. You can see the flaws of other people clearly because you are looking at them from a distance. You do not maintain distance from your inclinations and have oneness with them, so you cannot see your own flaws. In the association of and close contact of a Sadguru, you start seeing those flaws, such as self-will and insistence. Now, on a priority basis, you should work on your flaws. If you feel that your ‘Maitri bhaavna’ - friendliness is weak, you have to work on your friendliness. Even if you cannot do your nityakram to work on this friendliness, it is okay. If you lack friendliness, it will break your worthiness. Remember, collectively we are strong. If you do not have friendliness, you will become weak within. You become invisible in your worldly associations and your spiritual

development is brought to a standstill, where you are not happy with yourself. The problem is that you are not introspecting. You need to introspect and work on it.

If you understand the flaw, you will do 'ninda' - condemning the sins, 'garha' - repenting of one's sins before the Guru, 'alochana' - confessing completely and critically one's sins before the Guru, and 'prayashchit' – atonement. If you are conscious, then you will reach up to prayashchit - repentance. Otherwise, you will justify and leave it. You will say, "I felt it was good, so I did it." But when someone else is doing the same thing, you will condemn him. Your behaviour is not logical in any sense. If you have indulged in wrongdoing of a group, you have to ask for forgiveness in front of the group. If you have indulged in that flaw personally, you have to go to that person, describe your flaw, and then ask for forgiveness. If you ask for forgiveness this way, 80% of your sinful karma will be washed away. But if you have not entered the path of moksh, then you will keep sitting in your ego, and remain in the cycle of birth and death.

Samantbhadracharyaji also says, "My ego is like a thunderbolt. Please break it." You have to understand your mistake, accept it, resolve not to make that mistake again, and a strategy is made to remove the flaw. But this can only happen if your focus is on inclinations and not on your activities. You need to bring about transformation at various levels - physical, relations, thoughts, and emotions. The moment you start transforming at these four levels, you will experience a change in your state of being.

Physical level: The body is insignificant but it helps you walk towards your spiritual welfare. Your food, fitness, and sleep should be systematic. Do not eat when you are not hungry. You should feel hungry within four hours, you should only eat that much. You need the flexibility of the body for your spiritual pursuit. You need to do yoga for your fitness. Do yoga at least once a week, and twice-thrice if possible. You will realise the effect of yoga immediately or in the next day's meditation. You should have a regular sleep cycle. You should have a sound sleep. Bring out change at the physical level, that will change your frame of mind. Physical health is very important.

Relational level: This is about the family and social circle. You need to have good relationships with others. Do not avoid your near and dear ones. If you want to avoid someone, it shows that your social health is not good and somewhere, there are some suppressed passions within you. Accept people even if their natures are different. If you want to close the account, learn to accept them. Eg. In a pickle – chhundo, there are raw mangoes, salt, sugar, chilli powder, etc. All these spices are completely opposite to each other but they stay so nicely in chhundo. Keep a bottle of chhundo on a dining table and think that all these 6 people sitting on the dining table are various components of chhundo. You have to be supportive and adjust. If one of your fingers is hurt, all other fingers adjust with that finger and do the work. If someone is in a low phase or a phase of anger, adjust and support him. When you do Bhagwan's pooja, you do it with the third finger. No other fingers even oppose your decision or complain. Practice it in your small circle and then slowly, extend yourself in a larger circle. Learn to listen to others without advising and opposing others. You will enjoy yourself. Do not spread your knowledge when the other person is averse to it. When you are angry and the other person is also not receptive, at that time if you spread your knowledge, it

will be wasted, and aversion will increase. Learn to stay in harmony instead of changing someone. Let everybody live. Live and let others live.

Thought level: If you always have toxic thoughts, negative thoughts, condemn, criticise, blame karma and others, you will keep fighting with yourself. Love yourself. Enjoy yourself and your existence. To bring about transformation at the thought level, you need to go deeper into satsang. Listen to satsang with a lot of interest, get into the paravartana – revision, then change it into bhaavna – faith. You have to contemplate in this way: Whatever is transitory, worthless, and is not giving refuge should not become a reason of my liking. With this, you become more powerful. Even if you do not smile, people will ask you why you are so happy. Increase acceptance more and more. Sleeplessness is not a problem but non-acceptance of sleeplessness is the problem.

Emotional level: You have to remain emotionally balanced. Too many fluctuations should not be there. Some people are clapping and laughing in the morning, and in the afternoon - they are drowsy. To remain emotionally balanced, you need bhakti and seva. With the fragrance of dhoop - incense, you should go within.

Shlok 1:

Ekāntdrashtipratishedhi tattvam, pramānsiddham tadatatswabhāvam,
Tvayā praneetam suvidhe! Swadhāmnā, naitatsamālidhpadam tvadanyaihi.

O Lord Suvidhinath! With the light of Your omniscience, You had promulgated the nature of reality in a manner which contradicts the absolutistic point of view, is well-founded, and incorporates the principle of predication involving both the affirmation and the negation, depending on the point of view. Others have not been able to view the nature of reality in such light.

When we discussed Samantbhadracharyaji's life, we learned that his prajna – subtle intellect was such that he learned various philosophies from scholars of that particular philosophy. He studied Siddhant granth - scriptures regarding the principles, nyay granth - scriptures of logic, and darshanik granth- scriptures of various philosophies. He was a nyay visharad- an expert in nyaay philosophy. In this stavan, he is describing through nyay, so we can understand his language and the way he taught. After studying so much, he preached this to people. Param Krupalu Dev also said the same thing, "After studying many scriptures and churning them within, I am writing this Mokshmala."

Samantbhadracharyaji is talking to Suvidhinath Bhagwan directly. He says, "You have attained omniscience and in the light of Your omniscience, You have seen everything." Because of Your dispassion and benevolent preaching (hitopadeshi), You do not have any selfish motives, attachments, aversions, or lies. You have propounded the fundamentals of the path. You understood the fundamentals with Your omniscience and propounded the path in Your divine sermon. You had promulgated the nature of reality in a manner which contradicts the absolutistic point of view. Others have not been able to view the nature of reality in such light. So, I worship you. I don't worship You because of my family traditions or past karmic connections. Your divine sermon had three specialities which are as follows:

1. You have negated the absolutistic point of view.
2. Well-founded.
3. Incorporates the principle of predication involving both the affirmation and the negation.

You have negated an absolutistic point of view: O Bhagwan! You knew in Your omniscience that every substance has infinite characteristics (anant dharmatmak). Since it is anant dharmatmak, it has infinite attributes and there are seemingly mutually contradictory attributes too in the same substance. Eg. Nitya and anitya – permanent and transitory. Till both are in different substances, there is no problem. But here, every substance is permanent with transient modifications. You have to know and accept seemingly mutually contradictory attributes. You can be foolish when it comes to cooking and knowledgeable in raising your grandchildren. You have accepted both mutually contradictory dharma. So, there is no absolutistic point of view in Your exposition. Sometimes You say that a substance is permanent and that becomes the main point but at the same time, You have accepted and propounded that the same substance is transitory too from another aspect. When You propound the transitory nature, You have the same clarity for its eternal nature. You do not say, “All things are only transient,” but You say, “All things are transient only.” If the word ‘only’ comes in the middle, it becomes absolutistic and if ‘only’ comes in the end, there is firmness. You negate an absolutistic viewpoint.

Well-founded: O Bhagwan! You give us proofs and if there are no tangible proofs, then You give us logical proofs. You just don’t quote that it is written in Agam. Your talk is not against valid sources. If we study Your preaching with impartiality, it seems logical. This does not happen with people with an absolutistic viewpoint. You understood each substance as it is and then propounded it with Syaadvad shaili – expression of multiplicity of viewpoints. The person who thinks impartially can understand what You preach.

Incorporates the principle of predication involving both the affirmation and the negation: O Bhagwan! Your explanations provide both the aspects of affirmation and denial. Your preaching says that affirmation and denial co-exists in a substance because that is the nature of a substance. Eg. Nitya-anitya- permanence and impermanence. Sat-asat- true and untrue, ek-anek- one and many, bhaav-abhaav- the existence of the present state and non-existence of the other state are some of the examples of this dual nature of substances and Bhagwan propounded the path in both ways. Both of them co-exist and this is the nature of a substance, whether it is an animate substance or an inanimate substance. You illuminated the path in both these ways.

How can affirmation and denial co-exist? Is Meghal over here or not? Yes and no - physically she is present and mentally she is absent. You can explain affirmation and denial by changing the apeksha - viewpoint. Without a viewpoint - apeksha, there will be nothing conclusive. Except for You, no one else who has an absolutistic viewpoint has this multiplicity of viewpoints. Ekaant - absolutistic viewpoint accepts only one dharma. It accepts one thing and does not accept the opposite with the argument, “How can opposites co-exist?” How can day and night co-exist? It is day in India and it is night in the US - when this viewpoint is given, you agree that opposites can co-exist. If you are asking specifically about India, then you will get a specific answer that it is day in India. Nobody else has this much clarity of fundamentals except Suvidhinath Bhagwan. The reason for this clarity is that Suvidhinath Bhagwan has

attained omniscience. From the viewpoint of the omniscient one, the one who is absolutistic becomes alpajna – knowing very little. If an alpajna accepts the permanent part of the substance, he negates the transient part of it. If all is not known, he cannot be called omniscient. Bhagwan has omniscience and He propounds the path of affirmation and denial with conviction. This is the reason for my bhakti towards You.

Bhagwan! Your 'Suvidhi' name is true to Your virtues. You have shown us the vidhi - the way of attaining moksh, it is su - right, good, and interesting. Or, whatever anushtan - rituals You have done for attaining omniscience were Suvidhi - good ones. They helped You reach omniscience. We also observe austerities like fasting but our fasting does not take us even towards self-realisation. But whatever rituals – vidhi You followed were Su-vidhi. One more meaning of vidhi is conduct too. You believed that self-abidance is the only conduct, so You are reverent and should be worshipped. Bhagwan has two names- 1. Suvidhinath. 2. Pushfadant. In Logassa Sutra, He is called Pushfadant. But He is more known as Suvidhinath.

Acharyashri has sung the glory of Bhagwan's sermon in this stavan.

Verse 2:

**Tadev cha syānna tadeva cha syāt tathā prateetastava tatkathanchit,
Nātyantamanyatvamananyatā cha, vidhernishedhasya cha shoonyadoshāt.**

O Lord Suvidhinath! Your description of reality postulates that, as established by experience, there is the conditional affirmation of a substance, from a particular point of view, and also the conditional negation, from another point of view. The two views, existence and non-existence, are not without any limitation; these views are neither totally inclusive nor totally exclusive to each other.

In this shlok, Acharyashri has said that every substance is anekaant swarup - it is multifaceted. If you think that it is ekant swarup - one-sided, you will get into many flaws: 1. Shankar dosh - hybridisation or mix fault by saying it has both. 2. Shunyata dosh - a fault of non-existence 3. Dosh of vastu lop -The substance will disappear.

In every substance, there are two attributes- 1. Astitva - existence 2. Nastitva- non-existence. Either the substance exists or it does not exist. If you think that the substance only exists, then you will have sankar dosh, where there is a hybridisation or mix fault, shunyata dosh- the fault of non-existence, and the substance will get lop - it will disappear. The substance exists with swa-chatushtay - self-quaternary of any substance, namely, dravya - substance, kshetra - place, kaal - time, and bhaav - attributes. The substance does not exist with par-chatushtay – quaternary of any other substance's dravya kshetra, kaal, and bhaav. Eg. Jeev dravya - soul exists as a swa-dravya - the substance which is in identical relationship with its own attributes of knowledge etc. and also with its own modes. Swa-kshetra - the soul maintains self in its own uncounted space points, swa-kaal - the one which does not get separated from its own eternal nature and also forever has modes in their own sequential order generating at their own given specified time is swa-kaal, and swa-bhaav- the eternal nature of infinite attributes staying with the shelter of their own substance. But if you look at the soul substance from the non-self viewpoint, the soul does not exist.

The moment you say that there is only one substance, you do not believe in non-existence or naasti. When you see the contradictory factors in the same substance that one is pure brahma and the other is maya - an illusion which deceives everyone, is it one or are they two? Does maya exist in brahma or does it not exist in brahma? If maya exists in brahma, then brahma is crack - why does it harass everyone? Why does it create worldly matters? This is the nature of an inanimate substance and this is the nature of an animate substance. The inanimate substance does not exist in the animate substance - it is naasti - non-existing there. The inanimate substance does not have anything animate in it. If it is one, then a clock also becomes brahma. Then why does the clock not have knowledge? Now, you will understand why this is said. You have shankar dosh - hybridisation fault, where you say a clock is also brahma and the person is also brahma. The person has knowledge and the clock does not have knowledge. This is shankar dosh- mixed fault, where you are saying both. You will also have shunyata dosh and the substance will disappear too.

Why should you get detached instead of getting into worldly matters? If you say that one is brahma and the other one is maya - illusion, then it is not advait - non-dual. Maya or avidya or illusion, and brahma have mutually contradictory dharma (paraspar viruddha dharma). You will make inanimate and animate substances as one, this will make the substance shunya - non-existent and the substance will disappear (lop thashe). If you say that something is inanimate, that substance should have the characteristics of the inanimate substance. If you label something as an animate substance, that substance must have the characteristics of the animate substance. Omniscient Lord has seen only these two fundamentals. Nav tattva or nine fundamentals are combinations of these two fundamentals only - soul - animate, and material substance or inanimate substance. Ishwar or God also do not get included in these two fundamentals. When an animate or conscious substance becomes supremely pure, that pure state is called 'Ishwar'.

Ajeev substance or non-living substance exists, it has swadravya, swakshetra, swakaal, and swabhaav. But from the viewpoint of the jeev substance or soul, it is atat - non-existent. Bhagwan Suvidhinath proved existence – astitva and non-existence - naastitva with syaadvaad shaili. This is nyay - logic, and metaphysics uses it extensively, so it is very important. Shri Atmasiddhi Shastra clearly says,

“Jad chetanano bhinna chhe, keval pragat swabhäv;
ekpanun päme nahin, trane käl dway bhäv”

Meaning: The nature of sentient and non-sentient substances is absolutely and evidently different. The two can never merge into one and they remain as two separate substances at all times (past, present, and future).

If you try to mix the living and non-living substances, you are going to go into shankar dosh. Either brahma will become impure or maya - illusion will become pure and conscious. How can the pure have impure energy? This too, you are talking about the supreme power. For an ignorant soul, you may say, “Swabhaav parinaman - modification of the true nature of the self and vibhaav parinaman - modification of the impure nature of the self.” – This can be understood. Or you can say ‘sadrashya paryay’ - sameness in modifications and ‘vidrashya paryay’ - non-resemblance in modifications or ‘sajatiya paryay’ - modification belonging to the same class and ‘vijatiya paryay’ - modification belonging to the other class. Once you

understand it properly, you start getting convinced why the fundamental is shown this way. If you do not understand 'nyaay', you are believing the fundamentals blindly. Your faith is blind. You have not understood it with logic. Then your faith is not the right faith. You have not understood Jain philosophy. Samantbhadracharyaaji was Darshan Acharya and he wrote only after proper investigation and logic. He had written 'Aapt Mimansa,' explaining this subtle logic.

'Syaadvaad Manjari' also explains that Ishwar is not the doer. Your logic has to be very strong to understand it. 'Astitva swabhaav'- the existence of the nature of the soul is neither 'sarvatha bhinna' – separate in every way from the soul nor it is 'sarvatha abhinna' - not separate in every way from the soul.

“O Lord Suvidhinath! Your description of reality postulates that, as established by experience, there is the conditional affirmation of a substance, from a particular point of view, and also the conditional negation, from another point of view.” You have explained anekantvad with syaadvad shaili beautifully. You made it logical and authenticated it. You taught us that a substance from one viewpoint exists and from the other viewpoint does not exist because a substance can be understood with bhaav-abhaav - the existence of the present state and the non-existence of the other state. A substance exists from one viewpoint and does not exist from the other viewpoint. Eg. If you have seen Devdutt as a child and then you see him after 10 years, you will say, “This is Devdutt only, and he was so small when I saw him last time, now, he has changed a lot.” You are the one, who has said that this is Devdutt only and he has changed. Param Krupalu Dev also said,

“Athavā jñān kshanikanun, je jāni vadanār;

Vadanāro te kshanik nahin, kar anubhav nirdhār.”

Meaning: The narrator or the speaker who has knowledge of momentary states, is not momentary himself. The speaker who knows and speaks that the substance is momentary, cannot be momentary – the speaker must be continuous to speak. Ascertain this by your own experience.

Here, the logic of memory is given that you can remember and then narrate the incident, it shows that you cannot be momentary.

.

The substance will become clearer when you say that it exists with swachatushtay and does not exist with parchatushtay. You can see a jeev - soul moving and you can see ajeev- an inanimate substance like a car also moving. How will you differentiate between both of them? You should be clear regarding swa-dravya, swa-kshetra, swa-kaal, and swa-bhaav of the animate and inanimate substances. You must know that even though the car is moving, it is inanimate.

You are a human being and not a tiryanch - an animal being. You should know the swa-dravya, swa-kshetra, swa-kaal, and swa-bhaav of human beings and the swa-dravya, swa-kshetra, swa-kaal, and swa-bhaav of tiryanch. You should also know the par-dravya, par-kshetra, par-kaal, and par-bhaav of humans to conclude that you are a human being. This shows that you are a human being now and not an animal just now. That's why you are a human being. If you are a boy, you should know swa-dravya, swa-kshetra, swa-kaal, and swa-

bhaav of a boy and the swa-dravya, swa-kshetra, swa-kaal, and swa-bhaav of a girl, you should also know the par-dravya, par-kshetra, par-kaal, and par-bhaav of a boy. You should know swachatushtay and parchatushtay of a substance to come to the right conclusion. Only then, you will be able to prove that you are a boy.

When you get into a philosophical discussion, you will realise that this whole thing is very important to clarify the concepts of nitya-anitya- permanent and transitory, shuddh-ashuddh - pure and impure, sat-asat - true and untrue, ek-anek - one and many, bhaav-abhaav - existence of present state and non-existence of the other state. If you say, "There is only one soul," Bhagwan will say, "I can prove that there are infinite souls and they all are independent." There cannot be one brahma, there are infinite brahma - souls. All these things will reflect the metaphysics of Jainism. This is Nyay.

Two attributes exist in one substance at the same time from various viewpoints. We will call swachatushtay - self-quaternary as vidhi - rules regarding what should be done, and parchatushtay - alien-quaternary as nishedh - what is forbidden. To explain a substance, we will say, "This exists," and to explain it further, we will also say, "This does not exist." To prove that he is a man, you will have to say, "He has these characteristics like beard etc., and he does not have these characteristics, which a girl has." This shows that existence and non-existence, both are present within you.

Astitva - existence is an attribute and not the substance. Nastitva - non-existence is also an attribute. If you believe that existence is sarvatha bhinna - always separate, what will happen? Existence or astitva is an attribute and the attribute always depends on a substance. No substance can exist without its attribute and no attributes can exist without a substance. If you say that nastitva – attribute of non-existence is not there, if you remove that attribute, on whose support, this attribute of nastitva would stay? What is the difference between a boy and a girl? What is the difference between Kothariji and Seemaji? Kothariji is sitting on the men's side and Seemaji is sitting on the women's side - this way astitva- existence is proven. Just now, Kothariji is a man and Seemaji is a lady, this proves their nastitva - non-existence as a female for Kothariji and as a man for Seemaji. You will not be able to do bhedjnan- discernment between the self and non-self if you do not accept asti - existence and naasti – non-existence.

If you want to have quinoa khichadi today and ask Kothariji to make it for you, he won't be able to cook it. But Seemaji will immediately cook it for you. To differentiate between Kothariji and Seemaji, you should know an attribute of nastitva – non-existence. If this is not there, you won't be able to discriminate between a pot and a cloth. The existence of a pot and a cloth is proved but if you cannot prove the non-existence, you will mix up a pot with a cloth and cloth with a pot. You must know the attributes of both separately. Param Krupalu Dev has used the language of 'Nyay' in 'Chha padno patra.'

If you think that the substance is sarvatha abhed - non-dual in every way, then astitva- existence and nastitva - non-existence will become one. In this case, you won't be able to prove that one substance is different from the other. Shankar dosh means mixed fault. If you say that someone has knowledge and is also devoid of knowledge, this is called shankar dosh.

You are contradicting yourself. The whole sentence will become shunya - worthless as existence and non-existence do not exist. Both existence and non-existence should be present as mutually opposite attributes in the same substance. Otherwise, by doing this, the substance itself will disappear - lop thai jashe.

Shlok 3:

**Nityam tadevedamiti prateeterna nityamanyatpratipattisiddhehe,
Na tadvisuddham bahirantarang nimittanaimittikyogataste.**

When we reckon the existence of a substance we maintain that it is eternal and when we reckon the non-existence of that substance we maintain that it is perishable. O Lord Suvidhinath! You had declared that the two views that proclaim the same substance to be eternal as well as perishable are reconciled by the doctrine of material or internal cause (upadana karta) and the auxiliary or external cause (nimit karta) in the performance of any action.

Every substance has attributes of utpad - creation, vyay - destruction, and dhruv – constancy. At every moment and simultaneously, the earlier modification is destroyed, a new modification is created, and there is something that remains constant - all these things happen at the same time. This means that the substance is always constant and still, it changes its modes. Modifications can be sajatiya - belonging to the same class or vijatiya - heterogenous, sadrashya - sameness or vidrashya - non-resemblance, or shuddh – pure or ashuddh - impure. But the substance will stay. Eg. I was egoistic, then I felt bad about why I was becoming egoistic, I felt miserable, then I showed my humility - Here, 'I' remained constant and my modifications kept changing. You have to accept the constant substance and its modifications.

I went to the market. I bought rice and came back from the market. When I went, my bag was empty. When I came back, my bag was filled with rice. Here, 'I' remained constant as a substance and my modifications kept changing. You have to accept sameness and differences. If you don't accept sameness, the substance does not sustain and it becomes temporary. If you don't accept the difference, then no substance is useful. Eg. If you want rice for food, you will need to cook it. That rice is not useful till it changes its form. When it changes its form, still, it remains carbohydrates only. When it was raw, it was rice, and when it was cooked, it was cooked rice. In both modifications, it remains as carbohydrates only.

You were given a golden necklace years ago. Now, you feel that this type of necklace is not in fashion. So, you decide to change it into a bracelet. You got a bracelet made from that necklace. Even though the necklace does not exist, gold still exists. If something is not temporary or if its modifications do not change, then that thing is of no use. But while changing, if the original substance was destroyed, that gold would have become zero. This is common sense. If it was not going to remain gold, you would not have made a gold bracelet from the gold necklace because you cannot waste gold. Gold is still valuable for you. But because it changes, you can use it. The substance is only useful if it changes and still, it remains constant. A gold necklace or a bracelet is only useful if it remains gold only. it remains gold. You do not want it to change if it does not remain gold. This is utpad - creation, vyay - destruction, and dhruv - constancy. If you do not believe in constancy - nityatva, the

substance cannot sustain. If you do not believe in its transitory nature, then that thing is of no use.

You are seeing Devdutt after 15 years. You will say, “He is the same Devdutt that I saw 15 years ago. He has changed so much.” Devdutt has remained constant and he has changed temporarily. **“When we reckon the existence of a substance, we maintain that it is eternal and when we reckon the non-existence of that substance we maintain that it is perishable.”** He is that - this shows that something is constant. The substance cannot be always permanent or always temporary. It is nitya-anitya - permanent and temporary. If you were sarvatha nitya – always permanent, you would have remained the same 18-year-old boy. If you were sarvatha anitya - always temporary, you won’t be existing now. If you look at the modifications, you will realise that the thing is temporary. If you look at the stability, you will realise that it is permanent. Focus on your objective and make that temporary or permanent thing as primary and accept the other as secondary.

“You had declared that the two views that proclaim the same substance to be eternal as well as perishable are reconciled by the doctrine of material or internal cause (upadan karta) and the auxiliary or external cause (nimit karta) in the performance of any action.” When a modification gets created, it has a specific cause. It is because of the instrumental factor or external cause or auxiliary cause (nimit karta). The internal cause is upadan - the principal cause. The work done by nimit (cause) is called naimittik (effect.) Any effect means a change or a modification. Bhagwan has clearly explained that the effect definitely occurs. If the thing is always permanent, no activity can ever take place in it. Those who believe that ‘Sarvatha shuddh chhe - it is always pure, or sarvatha nitya chhe - it is always permanent,’ then no activity will ever take place in it.

Samaysaarji will not show the activity or karya because the scripture talks about the constant substance. If it focuses on modification, then only it can show the activity. You have to understand the viewpoint of each philosophy and scripture. But if you only accept one viewpoint, it is wrong. If you are making one as the primary and the other as secondary, it is syadvad shaili and that is accepted.

Shlok 4:

**Anekamekam cha padasya vāchyam, vrukshā iti pratyayvatprakrutyā,
Ākāṅkshinaha syāditi vai nipāto, gunānapeksheniyamepavādah.**

The spoken word, depending on the interpretation, can carry one or several meanings – like when the word ‘vruksha’ is spoken. While referring to the attribute under consideration of a substance, the speaker uses the word ‘syaat’ (meaning, conditional, from a particular standpoint); without this qualification, all other attributes stand ignored and, therefore, the statement implies contradictions.

Now, we will learn this shlok through grammar. From the viewpoint of grammar, vruksha (tree), ghat (pot), pat (cloth) are called ‘pad’- a word having a meaning or ‘shabd’- or a word. The ‘pad’ or ‘shabd’- the word having a meaning is ‘vaachak’ – word signifying a particular meaning. With the help of that word, you understand that substance, that is ‘vaachya’ – literal or expressed meaning. You can understand vaachya with the help of a vaachak.

You heard the word 'gaay - cow,' immediately, and you will conceptualise the word 'gaay-cow' within you. You immediately think about the cow even if the cow is not present right now because of 'vaachak-vaachya sambandh'. The relationship between the word and its meaning is your shrutjan - scriptural knowledge.

If someone says 'hathi' - elephant - then the word 'hathi' is vaachak and by that, you understand the meaning of 'vaachya'.

When a 'vaachak' makes you understand 'vaachya', that vaachya can be of two types: 1. Samanya – common characteristic 2. Vishesh – special characteristic. Samanya is pertaining to substances or dravya. Vishesh is pertaining to its modification or paryay. When samanya is explained, there is only one. When vishesh is explained, there are many things. Eg. Soil - as a substance, it is one. But as a modification, it can be a pot, cup, saucer, horse, dish, or many other things.

When 'vaachak' makes you understand 'vaachya', you should be knowing the viewpoint. If "gaay" is said, is it 'gaay samanya' - cow as a substance or 'gaay vishesh' particular modification of a cow?

In this shlok, an example of 'vruksha' is given. 'There are trees here.' You conceptualised many trees here. But do you have to see samanya - a common characteristic and look at 'vrukshatva' – treeness (characteristics of a tree), or do you have to see vishesh - special characteristic and look at which type of tree it is - mango tree or an orange tree? When you look at a substance, you will only see vrukshatva or treeness. When you look at the modifications, you will ask which type of tree it is. As a substance, all trees are one. For a tree, you need to have bark, leaves, fruits, etc. If you want to know the detailed meaning of vruksha, you should look at the modifications, whether it is a mango tree, orange tree, etc. You must accept samanya and vishesh both. You should look at the desire of the speaker, what he wants to make as a primary, and what he wants to make as a secondary. If your focus on a tree plantation is to get some shade, you are looking at 'vruksh samanya' and if your focus on a tree plantation is to get a specific type of mango, you are looking at 'vruksh vishesh.'

"While referring to the attribute under consideration of a substance, the speaker uses the word 'syaat' (meaning, conditional, from a particular standpoint); without this qualification, all other attributes stand ignored and, therefore, the statement implies contradictions." Do not keep asking questions like a foolish person. Just understand the objective of a speaker. Is it towards 'vastu samanya' or vastu 'vishesh'?

We all are same as 'vastu samanya' - Sarva jeev chhe Siddh sam- All the souls are like liberated ones. Then by focusing on 'vishesh', Param Krupalu Dev said, "Je samje te thay." -The one who realises this fact becomes liberated." This way, principles are connected with logic. We are different as 'vastu vishesh'. One will be liberated very soon and another one may take millions of years. Keep the primary as your focus and keep the contradictory dharma in your mind at that time. Those who do not keep the 'secondary - gaun' in their mind, they become ekantvadi - people insisting on a one-sided point. While talking, even a person believing in

anekantvad will also speak about one thing only. If someone has died, anekantvadi will say, “The soul is eternal, only clothes have changed.” The same thing will be said by ekant nityavadi (the person who believes that he is only eternal) too. But there is a difference in their belief. Anekantvadi keeps both permanent and temporary in his mind, whereas ekantvadi keeps only one of them in mind.

Here the word ‘akanksha’ is used. It means he is looking at the secondary viewpoint too along with the primary one. The one who does not look at the other viewpoint is ‘ekantvadi’ - a person with a one-sided opinion.

“Without this qualification, all other attributes stand ignored and, therefore, the statement implies contradictions.” You will say, “You had asked me to sow the trees, I have sown the trees of jamun.” But when the other person had said, “I want to sow 100,000 trees like Dhirubhai Ambani”, he meant mango trees. Why did you take his statement as samanya - common characteristic?” So, apeksha - viewpoint, is important along with ‘vaachak’ and ‘vaachya’. The one who does not look at the viewpoint, his statements are false.

Shlok 5:

**Gunapradhānārthmidam hi vākyaṃ, jīnasya te tad dwishtāmapathyaṃ,
Tatobhivandya jagdishwarānāṃ, mamāpi sādhostava pādapadmam.**

O Lord Jina! While describing a particular (primary) attribute of a substance, Your statement does not ignore the existence of other (secondary) attributes in it; for this reason, Your doctrine contradicts the doctrines of all those relying on absolutistic viewpoints. As such, Your lotus feet are worshipped by the lords of the devas and the men; I too offer my adoration.

Samantbhadracharyaji is explaining why Bhagwan’s words are so important. Because of omniscience, Bhagwan knows each substance. Because of His syadvad shaili, one viewpoint becomes prime and the other quality becomes secondary. If you are talking about Seemaji’s cooking, her other virtues are made secondary, but they have to be accepted in the mind. If she has not cooked properly, you have to tell her about it. At that time, you cannot appreciate her virtues or her bhakti. If you are making one dharma prime, should you have the other qualities in your mind also. Because of Bhagwan’s dispassion and omniscience, such a beautiful propounding sermon took place.

Bhagwan’s sermon is based on the principle of syadvad, which takes into account the primary and secondary aspects. O Bhagwan! You said that the speaker can speak as he wishes. He has to keep in mind what is right at what time. But he has to accept secondary dharma also in his mind. That’s why Your teachings are beneficial to all. If they are used in practical life, people will be benefiting. If they are used for the faith in fundamentals, then also people will benefit. Anekaant and syadvad are helpful in the kitchen, office, home, and spirituality.

Bharat Chakravarti was a king and had to give punishments too. Sometimes he had to give death punishment. Still, he attained omniscience and moksh at the end of that birth. We can imagine how much softness he must be having while punishing the person. He must be

thinking, 'Just now it is my duty to punish him for his crime. But I have compassion for this soul.' You have to live a detached life like Bharat Chakravarti. Remain detached.

Those who accept only one dharma, remain ekantvadi and they do not like Your talks. They feel it is sanshayvad – scepticism. They feel that there is no clarity between permanent and temporary things. If you study Jainism, you always remain inconclusive. Or they feel that it is a policy of appeasement. If a Buddhist person is there, he will say, "Even we believe in transient." If a Vedanti is there, he will say, "We also believe in pure and eternal soul." Such accusations have occurred, where they say, "Anekantvad is a policy of appeasement to make everyone happy." Acharyashri says, "I do not accept this thing of ekantvadis. If ekantvadi starts believing anekantvad, he will have to put a cross on his own opinion. Even if you say 'sorry,' that means you were wrong. If you are wrong, say sorry by saying that this was a wrong part of me, and I am sorry for that - this is love.

Ekantvadi does not like to change his opinion, so he goes against Bhagwan. He cannot tolerate Bhagwan's words: The substance is permanent and temporary; the substance is pure and impure. He cannot tolerate two opposite things in the same substance, so he becomes Your opponent. Acharyashri says, "As such, Your Lotus-Feet is worshipped by Indra - the lords of the celestial beings, and the men; I too offer my adoration. I want to humbly worship You. I may or may not understand but I understand that the one who understands everything worships Your Lotus-Feet. Indra, Chakravarti, and powerful men are influenced by You and they love You dearly. They have surrendered to You. O Suvidhinath Bhagwan! While singing the glory of Your speech, I too offer my adoration at Your Lotus-Feet."